

University Senate

Proposed: December 13, 2024

Adopted: December 13, 2024

## PROPOSED AGENDA

University Senate

Friday, December 13, 2024 at 1:15 p.m.

**In Person Only | Pupin Hall, Room 301**

### Registration Required

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of November 22, 2024
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions
5. New business:
  - a. Resolutions:
    - i. Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Reflect the Number of Students on the Student Affairs Committee (Structure and Operations)
    - ii. Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Correct the Language of the Campus Planning and Physical Development Mandate (Structure and Operations)
    - iii. Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Add a Vice Chair to the Executive Committee (Structure and Operations)
  - b. Committee updates and reports:
    - i. Statement About Community (Student Affairs)
  - c. Other reports and updates:
    - i. Petition under Section 1.m. of the University Senate By-Laws (Sen. S. Bernofsky)
    - ii. Update from Rules Administrator Gregory Wawro
6. Adjourn

### **Minutes of the Meeting of November 22, 2024**

Eighty out of 108 Senators were present

Senator Jeanine D’Armiento (Ten., P&S), Executive Committee Chair, called the plenary to order at 1:16pm on Zoom. Sen. D’Armiento welcomed Senators and guests to the third Plenary of the 2024-2025 session. Sen. D’Armiento reminded attendees of the Parliamentary procedures for the Zoom meeting.

Senators adopted the [agenda](#) for the plenary. Senator Brent Stockwell (Ten., A&S/NS) stated that he did not find it acceptable that Senators received the plenary materials at 4:44pm the day before the plenary. He stated that it did not allow enough time for Senators to review the materials. He stated that he disagreed with the continued practice of the Chair of releasing plenary materials in this way. Sen. D’Armiento responded that she will speak to the Senate staff about this as she has done in the past and that Sen. D’Armiento does not release the plenary material.

Senators then adopted the [minutes](#) of the October 25, 2024 Plenary.

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

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

President Armstrong began her updates by discussing what it means to embody the principles and mission of the University at this time and that she is deeply committed to sharing these principles with the University community. She added that she will be sharing more thoughts in an email to the University community next week but wanted to bring them to the University Senate first. She emphasized the importance of the intellectual growth and development of students at the University. President Armstrong recounted her experiences with students at the Columbia Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons. She added that the mission of educating students is a crucial part of the mission of the University and that she hoped that, going into the next semester, members of the University community can focus on that mission. President Armstrong stated how students frequently discuss the impact that faculty have had on them and the importance of having an open debate in class modeled by the leadership of faculty inside and outside of the classroom. She added that the faculty need resources and support to continue the work to help students. President Armstrong continued by stating that not all members of the University community will agree and that she has witnessed many instances of dialogue for members across the community that have resulted in relationships and understanding of different perspectives. She

emphasized that many of these principles have been shared by Sen. D'Armiento and the University Senate and that she sees the University having an opportunity to continue to support free expression.

President Armstrong thanked Professor Gregory Wawro for serving as the Rules Administrator for the [Rules of University Conduct](#) and for the work to continue clarifying the Rules. President Armstrong stated that she looks forward to figuring out ways to continue opening up dialogue and creating opportunities for that. She also added that she acknowledges that members of the University community have felt unheard and have not received sufficient acknowledgement of the distress that they feel on campus and that she is committed to ensuring that everyone on campus feels that they can thrive at the University. President Armstrong added that one of the best parts of her jobs is to be able to see moments where the community has come together to create a more resilient community. She acknowledged that there were many events occurring that are putting stress on the trust that community members have for each other but that she is focused on building the type of University community that all community members can believe in. She recalled her first University Senate meeting and how much she has learned about the University community since then. She ended with her intention to redouble the focus on students, faculty, and the community. President Armstrong then took questions.

Senator Melinda Aquino (Admin. Staff, Morningside-Lamont) asked what the administration was going to do to support particularly vulnerable populations of students such as undocumented and trans students in the aftermath of the presidential elections. Sen. Aquino asked if the University administration had any plans to create a statement of affirmation in support of these students. President Armstrong responded that there was a group of student-facing professionals and others working to put together the appropriate resources in order to address those concerns.

Senator Jeffrey Wayno (Libraries) asked about campus access. Sen. Wayno mentioned that, at the September plenary, President Armstrong [stated](#) that campus access restrictions would be reconsidered after the November elections. Sen. Wayno added that there are individuals such as international scholars who needed to access the libraries more easily but faced difficulties currently. President Armstrong responded that she is assembling a group to consider campus access changes and related timing.

Senator James Applegate (Ten., A&S/NS) commented that faculty are nervous about the risk of being deemed responsible for creating a hostile environment when leading educational discussions. Sen. Applegate asked how the administration will support faculty in continuing their mission to have dialogue and discussion. President Armstrong responded that she is in agreement with Sen. Applegate and that she wants to ensure that the University can embody the principles that Sen. Applegate had shared.

Senator Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/HUM) asked about if there is a process underway for the University to name a non-Interim University President. President Armstrong responded that she would like to ask the Trustees first and she would get back to the Senate with more information. Sen. D'Armiento stated that

there was an upcoming Trustee meeting where she hoped to ask about this and bring the answer to the University Senate at the next plenary.

Senator Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., LAW) addressed the U.S. House of Representatives Republican Staff Report, specifically the report's criticism of Columbia's disciplinary procedures. Sen. Gordon asked whether the University planned to respond to the Report or to comment on the accuracy of its' claims. President Armstrong responded that the University is working on addressing concerns raised by the Congressional Report and that she is soliciting feedback on how to make that response as effective as possible.

Senator Helen Han Wei Luo (Stu., GSAS/HUM) restated some of the concerns about campus access, specifically around bringing guests onto campus for research as well as instances of graduate students with legitimate academic reasons being denied access. Sen. Luo stated that she sees no continued reason for continued access restrictions. Sen. Luo emphasized that, in the September plenary, there was a commitment to open campus after the November elections and that there may have been a worry that there would be continued protests in response to the election results, which she believes is no longer a legitimate concern. President Armstrong stated that the administration will be revisiting the campus access restrictions as she had previously mentioned.

Senator Joseph Howley (Ten., A&S/HUM) raised questions brought to him by concerned students. Sen. Howley stated that he told these students that normally these questions should be brought to student Senators but that, because individual Senators are being doxed and targeted, Sen. Howley agreed to ask the questions on behalf of the concerned students. Sen. Howley began by stating that these questions were in part raised by the [letter from the Student Affairs Committee](#) that would be discussed later but that, since other Senators had already raised the issue and that President Armstrong needed to leave early, he would like to discuss the student concerns now. Sen. Howley first read a concern from students that Columbia Deans may have been collecting information on Arab students or students based on ethnicity and transferring it to the administration and the concern that students have regarding how this information is being used and whether it complies with anti-discrimination policies. Sen. Howley also raised concerns from students about Trustee involvement in individual student disciplinary cases and the risk of FERPA violations for providing this information to the Trustees. Finally, Sen. Howley raised concerns from students that the House Report contained many reported alleged incidents of antisemitism that concerned students mentioned were fabricated and that student information was identifiable and published by the House of Representatives. Sen. Howley stated that the concerned students wanted to know how the administration would respond. President Armstrong responded that she wants to be clear about the administration's principles moving forward as she previously stated. She also mentioned that the University needs to address a lot of misinformation contained in the House Report. President Armstrong stated that she had met with the Student Affairs Committee to understand the concerns raised by the House Report. She ended by restating that she is committed to protecting the privacy of students and that she acknowledges the distress of students.

Sen. Stockwell mentioned that yesterday national Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) had issued a takeover challenge and that two buildings had been taken over at other universities. Sen. Stockwell asked whether the administration was concerned about that with the closure to campus the night before. President Armstrong responded that the University has a group that assesses risk in order to safely ensure the University can continue its mission of research and education. She stated that this group makes decisions on campus closures. Sen. Stockwell wanted to know if posts and protests by groups such as national SJP and CUAD had contributed to campus closures. President Armstrong responded that the administration is assessing how to best continue academic activities and that access is a multidimensional set of considerations. Sen. D'Armiento stated that President Armstrong has come to the Senate Executive Committee frequently on issues of campus safety and access in the spirit of shared governance.

Senator Lisa Rosen-Metsch (Dean of the School of General Studies, Adm.) responded to Sen. Howley's earlier comments. Sen. Rosen-Metsch raised a text conversation referenced in the House Report between herself and then-University President Minouche Shafik regarding the Tel Aviv Dual Degree program with the School of General Studies.

Sen. Rosen-Metsch said that there had been a personal smear against her on a student website surrounding the disclosure of information on Arab students since the report was released. Sen. Rosen-Metsch said that President Shafik had asked her for the percentage of Arab students at Tel Aviv University, which Sen. Rosen-Metsch shared was approximately 16 percent. She added that Tel Aviv University's student population includes both doctoral students who are Palestinian and from the West Bank.

After providing this explanation, Sen. Rosen-Metsch asked Sen. Howley to clarify his earlier comments. Sen. D'Armiento reminded Sen. Rosen-Metsch that Sen. Howley had received those concerns from students and not stated them himself. Sen. Rosen-Metsch responded that she wanted Sen. Howley to clarify in case the questions he asked were regarding a different section of the House Report. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she was glad that Sen. Rosen-Metsch clarified this at the Senate and that she hopes that Sen. Rosen-Metsch could address this to the GS student community directly. Sen. Rosen-Metsch stated that no student had brought this up to her directly and that she wanted to hear from Sen. Howley. Sen. D'Armiento reemphasized that she was glad that Sen. Rosen-Metsch was clarifying this issue and that the concerns were raised by students and not Sen. Howley. Sen. Rosen-Metsch responded that she would have liked to have these issues raised to her directly rather than to have heard about this through the Senate. Sen. D'Armiento agreed with Sen. Rosen-Metsch but stated that the University was in a time where students feared being identified. Sen. Rosen-Metsch stated that she appreciated the opportunity to speak to this issue and wanted Sen. Howley to respond. Sen. D'Armiento shared that she understood how statements can be misrepresented. Sen. Rosen-Metsch mentioned that she is an administrative appointee to the Senate as a Dean and normally does not speak up in the Senate but felt the need to here. Sen. D'Armiento added that administration appointees to the Senate are full members of the Senate and have the right to speak as much as they would like.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) wanted to share that she has also been smeared by students and in the House Report. She added that this document from the House of Representatives contained many harmful and inaccurate portrayals of members of the community, including herself and other faculty members. Sen. Bernofsky stated that there was a difference between members of the community being mentioned negatively by students and being mentioned negatively by those holding political power.

After expressing sympathy with colleagues mentioned in the Report, Senator Oren Pizmony-Levy (Ten., TC) asked for confirmation that, given the experiences of students, staff, and faculty, no one is claiming that antisemitism is not real and is not happening on campus. Sen. D'Armiento responded that unequivocally antisemitism is an issue and needs to be addressed regardless of misinformation contained in the Report. Sen. D'Armiento reaffirmed the Senate's commitment to addressing antisemitism. Sen. Pizmony-Levy noted his appreciation for Sen. D'Armiento's explanation, reiterating that antisemitism is real and is happening. President Armstrong responded that, as she had stated in addressing the Report earlier, that the University is committed to ensuring that everyone can thrive.

Sen. Luo said that to characterize student activities as violent is unwarranted and unfair and excludes the involvement of outside interest groups, including Congress, that do not have students' best interests at heart. She said that the anger from the students was an understandable response to failures to protect students' privacy, freedom of speech, and the freedom to protest. Sen. Luo said that speaking about antisemitism as a particular ill on campus is not the right approach. Rather, Sen. Luo stated the University should be looking to protect students as a body, as a whole, and that means looking beyond this particular set of grievances. Sen. Luo recognized the seriousness of these grievances but argued that focusing only on them left out many other legitimate concerns, including those of anti-Zionist Jewish students.

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

Sen. D'Armiento began her report by addressing the recent U.S. national elections by stating the following: "President Armstrong, her leadership team, and the Offices of Public Affairs and Government Affairs are closely monitoring developments with respect to the Presidential transition and the incoming 119<sup>th</sup> Congress. For much of the last year, Columbia's Government Affairs team has been working with internal stakeholders, with our lobbyists and consultants based in DC, and with the broader higher education advocacy community to plan for the scenario of a second Trump presidency and unified GOP control of Congress. These teams are now fully mobilized and working to prepare the University for all eventualities, including a potentially challenging regulatory, legislative, and policy landscape. As the new Administration and Congress identify and execute their respective policy priorities, this work will remain a top priority as the University advocates on behalf of the Columbia community. Last month, the House Education & Workforce Committee released a comprehensive report addressing anti-Semitism on US College campuses. As expected, Columbia was among 11 institutions featured in the report, which was the culmination of a year-long investigation by Chairwoman Virginia Foxx and her Committee. Columbia

received a subpoena from the Committee in connection with its inquiry and cooperated extensively throughout this investigation by providing documents and information to the Committee.”

Sen. D’Armiento then summarized the agenda items for the plenary. Sen. D’Armiento added that there was a second petition submitted to the Senate under Section 1.m. of the By-Laws and would be verified by the Executive Committee before being sent, if validated, to the appropriate Committee for review. There were no questions for the Chair.

### **Report on the Proposal to Institute Professor of Practice Appointments in the Mailman School of Public Health (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)**

Sen. D’Armiento introduced Senator Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM) to lead the report on the proposal to institute Professor of Practice appointments in the Mailman School of Public Health, and Sen. D’Armiento thanked Senator Elizabeth Corwin (Ten., NURS) and Dr. Jonathan Susman for their work on the proposal. Sen. D’Armiento mentioned that the Faculty Affairs Committee had already approved the appointments and that no action was needed from the Senate. Sen. Moss-Salentijn gave an overview of the [report](#), emphasizing that Professor of Practice appointments are the only faculty appointments requiring the approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee in order to acquire faculty that are highly trained professionals in their field. Sen. Moss-Salentijn mentioned that other Columbia Schools had Professors of Practice and that the Mailman School of Public Health could benefit from having Professors of Practice. She mentioned that the number of Professors of Practice shall not exceed 10% of the number of tenured and tenured-line faculty across the University with the exception of the School of the Arts and the Journalism School.

### **Letter Concerning the Committee on Education and the Workforce, U.S. House of Representatives Republican Staff Report (October 31, 2024) (Student Affairs)**

Sen. D’Armiento next gave a summary of a [letter from the Student Affairs Committee](#) regarding the U.S. House of Representatives Republican Staff Report from October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024. Sen. D’Armiento said that she would be presenting an overview of the letter because student Senators were fearful of speaking out on contentious issues at the moment and that some student Senators had already faced consequences for bringing their fellow students’ concerns to the Senate. Sen. D’Armiento shared the main concerns that the Student Affairs Committee had regarding the information contained in the House Report: alleged betrayal of students’ right to privacy and confidentiality by the University’s Board of Trustees, alleged improper influence on student disciplinary processes by Trustees. Sen. D’Armiento emphasized that the full letter voted on by the Student Affairs Committee was located in the plenary materials. Sen. D’Armiento then opened the floor for questions or comments.

Senator Heidi Allen (Ten., SSW) read aloud a statement sent to her from a faculty member in the School of Social Work, stating the following: “As a faculty in the School of Social Work, I am troubled by reports that any member of the Board of Trustees accessed student records, a violation of FERPA. This incident highlights the significant power differentials within our institution, raising concerns for both students and

faculty. Trustees have a crucial responsibility to uphold the highest ethical standards, especially regarding student privacy, the foundation of our university. I urge our administration to address this matter transparently, implement safeguards against future breaches, and reaffirm its commitment to ethical governance that prioritizes the well-being of students and the broader university community. I am grateful for the University Senate, which remains the only platform for sharing my concerns on such important issues.”

Sen. Stockwell commented that the Trustees have a fiduciary responsibility to the University and asked what information the Trustees were entitled to and whether the [Office of General Counsel](#) should give input. Sen. D’Armiento stated that this question was valid and is one of the reasons that the Student Affairs Committee wrote the letter in order to understand what role the Trustees have in general and with regards to these specific disciplinary cases. President Armstrong stated that everyone in the administration is committed to meeting with members of the Student Affairs Committee to rebuild trust between students and administration and that she wished to reaffirm this commitment before leaving the Senate meeting due to another conflict.

Sen. Gordon emphasized that he agreed that the Trustees needed to respond to the concerns raised by the Student Affairs Committee. Sen. D’Armiento responded that she will get back to the Senate with a response if given in the future.

Sen. Slaughter agreed with Sen. Gordon that students deserved a response from the Trustees given the severity of the allegations. Sen. Slaughter stated that he was slandered in the House Report as well and that it was clear to him that the House Report did not care about facts and accuracy of anything stated. Sen. Slaughter stated that he felt that the Report was crafted in order to create distrust between the Trustees and Senators and nothing in the Report was given any context and cited disreputable and discredited publications as trusted facts. Sen. Slaughter stated that the anger produced by this Report was its’ intention. Sen. Slaughter mentioned that it was not the point to have individuals on the Senate attempt to defend themselves from representations in that Report. Sen. D’Armiento stated that she believes that the University community needs to commit further to the system of shared governance between the Trustees, President, and the Senate moving forward.

Sen. Applegate thanked Sen. Slaughter for his words. Sen. Applegate mentioned that there are many things that the University deems confidential that are not confidential in the wider world, such as letters of evaluation for tenure decisions. Sen. Applegate stated that he did not know the exact relationship between the fiduciary responsibility of the Trustees in relation to student disciplinary hearings but that confidentiality at the University may not apply in the case of lawsuits or other matters.

Sen. Howley agreed with Sen. Slaughter and added that University community members are subject to national political scrutiny that is not interested in the well-being of Columbia. Sen. Howley mentioned that the Senate is the best place to handle these sorts of discussions, even if not always completely ideal.



Sen. Howley mentioned that the attacks on the Senate are counterproductive to this mission and that he hopes that the Senate can address inaccuracies and misinformation without spending all of its time addressing lies about the Senate. Sen. D’Armiento noted the high volume of requests being sent to the Executive Committee, which have slowed down the plans for the Senate to have smaller, in-person conversations with different constituencies. Sen. D’Armiento said that the community will need to rally around many of the changes that will potentially come in the spring.

Sen. Stockwell mentioned that he agreed with much of what Sen. Howley and Sen. Slaughter had mentioned, adding the University has a significant target on its back at the moment. Sen. Stockwell asked if there was a consideration to form a committee to look at institutional risk. Sen. D’Armiento responded that the administration has already been doing this work and that, when the administration updates the Executive Committee, it will be brought to the Senate. Sen. D’Armiento added that she expects updates from the administration soon, particularly for the Budget Committee to understand the financial implications the new administration might have.

#### **Update on Section 1.m. Petition from Professor J. Mitts (Structure and Operations)**

Sen. D’Armiento turned the meeting over to Provost Angela Olinto to chair the discussion of the [petition submitted to the Senate under Section 1.m.](#) of the Senate By-Laws and validated by the Executive Committee. Provost Olinto introduced Professor of Social Work and member of the Structure and Operations Committee Susan Witte to lead the presentation on the petition. Susan Witte began a presentation updating the Senate on the [findings of the Structure and Operations Committee](#). Professor Witte gave a presentation (see also report in the plenary packet). Professor Witte stated that this report addressed the concerns of allegations of partiality in the report under Section 1.m of the By-Laws. Professor Witte stated that the Structure and Operations Committee is not a judiciary committee and only responded based on the facts at hand. Professor Witte mentioned that the report has no summary or conclusion. Professor Witte walked through each allegation in the petition and the response from Structure and Operations, which can be found in the full report. Provost Olinto opened the floor for comments or questions.

Sen. Stockwell commented that he wanted to get to the origin of the orange-jacketed faculty at the April encampment and that he wanted clarification from the administration on this matter and whether the administration provided the orange jackets. Sen. Stockwell stated that many in the community felt that those faculty were intellectually aligned with the encampment protesters and wanted the administration to clarify this. Sen. Stockwell asked why the Chair did not ask the “All Out for Lebanon” protesters to move rather than the counter-protesters and why the Chair was acting as a University Delegate when she herself is not one. Sen. Stockwell questioned what the sanction or penalty is for not giving notice for a protest. Sen. Stockwell asked why the Senate leadership shut down the Zoom chat in a May plenary. Finally, Sen. Stockwell requested that the Chair publicly apologize for muting a faculty Senator in the May 3, 2024 plenary, as this had not been done on the record.

Sen. D'Armiento made a general statement about the petition. Sen. D'Armiento stated that in advance of the petition in front of us that she had been asked by Senator Marks to meet with Professor Mitts in order to address many of the issues stated in the petition. She met with Professor Mitts, Sen. Marks and was accompanied by Professor David Pozen, a member of the Rules Committee. She was then surprised to see the petition subsequently submitted after she had already met with Professor Mitts to address his concerns. Sen. D'Armiento expressed she had never experienced a situation like this in dealing with her professional colleagues. Sen. D'Armiento addressed the orange-jackets by stating that during the second encampment, there was a concern from administration that non-University affiliates may be entering the encampment. In response to this concern, faculty with the yellow jackets were speaking with individuals entering the encampment to assure that they were affiliates. Dr. D'Armiento, Chief Operating Officer Cas Holloway and Vice President of Public Safety Gerald Lewis had gone to the encampment to observe the system which was serving to deescalate and prevent non-Affiliates from entering. Sen. D'Armiento mentioned that, for the "All Out for Lebanon" protest, she and members of the administration had received an email expressing concern that the protestors and counter protestors were close together and this could cause issues. President Armstrong called Sen. D'Armiento after receiving the email to ask her to go to the protest and see what could be done. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she therefore went to the protest and observed that the two groups were close to each other. Sen. D'Armiento stated that there were no Delegates that were willing to tell the two groups to separate and that, given the email and the request from President Armstrong, she told the counter-protesters to move back away slightly from the protestors. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she did not tell the protestors to move because they had signed up for a demonstration and had been assigned to the sundial and that the counter-protest was assigned a space farther away and had not followed that notice. She told the counter protestors that she understood they did not want to be so far away but that they had to allow some distance from the protestors. Sen. D'Armiento mentioned that she is not in charge of the Rules Committee and does not enforce the Rules and that concerns regarding the [Rules of University Conduct](#) should be directed to the [Rules Committee](#) and their listening sessions. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she was not aware of any letters posted in the Zoom chat at the May 8 plenary and that she had sent the letter she had received to both the Student Affairs Committee and the Diversity Commission, following up with them later to see if they were raising any items or statements in response to those letters. She said that this is the procedure she follows when receiving letters in the Senate as they are referred to the proper committee. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she has no control over how committees respond to materials sent to them. She added that there had been issues with the Zoom chat and that the chat has been shut down. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she did apologize to the faculty Senator she had muted in the May 3 plenary, made a mistake, and that some of the online comments about the situation were not in response to the faculty Senator but in response to other Senators interruptions.

Sen. Luo mentioned that she was surprised to see this petition submitted to the Senate and that she felt that it was a waste of time both institutionally and individually. Sen. Luo stated that she felt that this petition was ill-spirited and represented an inability to move forward as a University. Sen. Luo stated that she felt that some of the alleged instances that were stated to have occurred at meetings she was present

for did not actually occur, highlighting the allegation of giving more time to respondents to the Task Force on Antisemitism than to the Task Force itself. Sen. Luo encouraged University members to stop litigating what she felt are these minor issues in order for the institution to move forward.

Senator Andrew Marks (Ten., P&S) stated that Sen. D'Armiento had implicated him in being involved with the petition because he had arranged the meeting with Dr. Mitts and that he had nothing to do with the petition. He stated that he had only set up the meeting between Sen. D'Armiento and Professor Mitts but knew nothing of the petition at the time. Sen. Marks stated that he visited the faculty wearing the orange-jackets outside the encampment and that he felt that they were there to support the students in the encampment, which was their right, but that everyone should be honest about that.

Sen. Slaughter agreed with Sen. Luo about her thoughts on the petition. Sen. Slaughter stated that, while he was going to address particular allegations, that some of the allegations were repeated and exacerbated by the Congressional House Report. Sen. Slaughter mentioned that he can't speak to the orange-jackets and the faculty wearing them but that there was a picture of him holding an orange-jacket but not wearing one that was turned into a defamatory story about him keeping out community members from the encampment. Sen. Slaughter stated that he was there monitoring the protest around the encampment and that he goes out to monitor any protest and that this picture has been used to defame himself and the work of the Senate in general. He restated that he does not know whether his reasons for holding the vest or wearing the vest, which were accidental, were the same as other faculty members. Sen. Slaughter stated that he was in the video when Sen. D'Armiento asked the counter-protesters to move and that he would be willing to motion to allow the sender of the email to the Senate to have the floor to speak to address their email. Sen. Slaughter recounted that he was walking home from his office and a senior administrator asked Sen. Slaughter to go stand with Sen. D'Armiento as she was asking the counter-protesters to move back to create more room between the two groups, which he agreed to do. Sen. Slaughter then stated that the photograph and video taken of him led to accusations that he was taking a stance on promoting or demeaning certain viewpoints expressed in the protests. Sen. Slaughter ended by stating that Sen. D'Armiento had already apologized for the only thing he actually found to be inappropriate, which was the muting of a faculty Senator.

Senator Henry Ginsberg (Ten., P&S) stated that he is a member of the Structure and Operations Committee and helped contribute to the presentation that Professor Witte made. Sen. Ginsberg stated that, speaking for himself, that the proposal submitted to limit the number of times for someone to be the Chair was used as a foundation to be a personal attack to the current Chair and he found that to be inappropriate.

Senator Amy Hungerford (Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Adm.) stated that she was present on the plaza during the counter-protest incident and that there were not available Delegates to help with separate the two groups. Sen. Hungerford stated that many people were worried and that she herself was prepared to get involved to separate the groups and that Sen.

D'Armiento was acting on the same concern. Sen. Hungerford added that, in that moment, everyone was thinking about getting a few more feet of distance between the protesters and counter-protesters.

Senator Greg Freyer (TTOT, SPH) stated that he felt, with all of the attacks leveraged at the University from external sources, that the Senate was spending time discussing attacks leveraged at the Chair who has devoted immense time to the institution, the Senate, and has done an amazing time. Sen. Freyer hoped that attacks leveraged at the Chair by other faculty immediately stop. Sen. Freyer added that the proposed amendments to the By-Laws were coming out of the spirit of seeing how much work the Chair of the Executive Committee takes on and that the interpretation of those proposed amendments were done in bad faith against the Chair.

Provost Olinto concluded the discussion on the petition and passed the meeting back to Sen. D'Armiento.

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting and wished all of the Senators a happy holiday.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

University Senate

Proposed: December 13, 2024

Adopted: Postponed to February 7, 2025

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BY-LAWS  
TO REFLECT THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ON THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approves the updates to the University Senate-By-Laws, as set out, below.

**SEC. 4: COMMITTEES.**

k. The composition and jurisdiction of the several standing committees shall be as follows:

vi) Committee on Student Affairs: The Committee on Student Affairs shall consist of all ~~24~~ 25 student Senators, as well as one non-Senator observer from Union Theological Seminary. One of its members shall also be a member of the Committee on Rules of University Conduct. Its jurisdiction shall cover matters of student life including, but not limited to, student organizations, student housing, extracurricular activities and student concerns in the community. The Committee shall have jurisdiction to consider matters of University-wide student concerns and concerns of students in more than one faculty or school. Where student interests are closely related to the interests of other groups in the University, the Committee shall cooperate with other appropriate committees of the Senate.

Proponent:

Senate Structure and Operations Committee

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BY-LAWS  
TO CORRECT THE LANGUAGE OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING AND PHYSICAL  
DEVELOPMENT MANDATE**

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approves the updates to the University Senate-By-Laws, as set out, below.

**SEC. 4: COMMITTEES**

k. The composition and jurisdiction of the several standing committees shall be as follows:

iv) Committee on Campus Planning and Physical Development of the University: The Committee on Campus Planning and Physical Development of the University shall consist of 16 members apportioned as follows: 5 tenured faculty, 2 non-tenured faculty, 2 administrators, 3 students, 1 alumnus or alumna, 1 library staff, 1 officer of research, and 1 administrative staff. The primary mandate of the Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee is to review and comment upon the processes for planning, reviewing, assigning priorities and implementing the University's physical development and assess how they impact the academic mission of the University. This shall include plans and projects to change space available for specific schools and departments as well as space for the well-being of the University community. The Committee will report to the Senate, President, and Trustees whether major projects have been properly reviewed and serve the best interests of the University. In addition, the Committee will work with the administration and appropriate committees of the Trustees in reviewing, with respect to the University's academic goals, the long-term physical development plans of the University, for the campus and for off-campus properties, and the effects of those plans on the community. The Committee shall meet periodically with the appropriate vice president and their designates to discuss the status of planned and ongoing

major capital improvements for the University. In addition, the Committee shall regularly receive reports from pertinent departments and committees charged with academically relevant aspects of physical development. The Committee may also advise the administration and the Trustees on faculty, student, and staff concerns, priorities and particular projects related to campus planning and physical development. The Committee shall work closely with the Committees on Education, Budget-~~Review~~, and Libraries and Digital ~~Media~~-Resources so that developmental plans may bear close relationship to the fulfillment of educational policies and purposes. The Committee shall also work closely with the Committee on External Relations and Research Policy to minimize areas of conflict and maximize areas of cooperation with the community. On behalf of the Senate, the Committee shall also serve as a forum for reviewing reports of exceptional difficulties experienced with the academic physical plant, buildings, grounds, and maintenance.

Proponent:

Senate Structures and Operations Committee

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BY-LAWS  
TO ADD A VICE CHAIR TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate approve the updates to the University Senate By-Laws, as set out, below.

**SEC.3: ELECTORAL CAUCUSES AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

- a. Establishment of Electoral Caucuses. There shall be the following Electoral Caucuses: Tenured Faculty Caucus, TTOT Faculty Caucus, ~~and~~ Student Caucus, and Research Officer Caucus.
- b. Other Caucuses: Nothing in Section 3 of these By-Laws shall preclude the establishment of other Senate entities that use the word “Caucus” in their name.
- c. The composition and jurisdiction of the several electoral caucuses shall be as follows:
  - i) Tenured Faculty Caucus. The Tenured Faculty Caucus shall consist of all members of the Senate elected pursuant to Section 20.b.1 of the Statutes of the University. The Tenured Faculty Caucus shall select members of the Executive Committee, as specified in Section ~~(4)(i)(1)~~ 3.d. of these By-Laws, and shall conduct other business as appropriate.
  - ii) TTOT Faculty Caucus. The TTOT Faculty Caucus shall consist of all members of the Senate elected pursuant to Section 20.b.2 of the Statutes of the University. The TTOT Faculty Caucus shall select members of the Executive Committee, as specified in Section ~~4.i.1~~ 3.d. of these By-Laws, and shall conduct other business as appropriate.
  - iii) Student Caucus. The Student Caucus shall consist of all members of the Senate elected pursuant to Section 20.c. of the Statutes of the University. The Student Caucus shall select members of the Executive Committee, as specified in Section ~~(4)(i)(1)~~ 3.d. of these By-Laws, and shall conduct other business as appropriate.
  - iv) The Research Officer Caucus. The Research Officer Caucus shall consist of all members of the Senate elected pursuant to Section 20.f. of the Statutes of the University. The Research Officer Caucus shall select a member of the Executive Committee, as specified in Section 3.d. of these By-Laws, and shall conduct other business as appropriate.



d. Composition of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ 15 members apportioned as follows: 1 tenured faculty member who shall be Chair, 1 tenured faculty member who shall be Vice Chair, 5 additional tenured faculty, 2 ~~non-tenured~~ TTOT faculty, 1 research officer, 2 administrators, and 3 students. All shall be members of the Senate. The two administration representatives shall be the President and another officer of administration of their choice. Elected members of the Executive Committee, except for the Chair and Vice Chair, shall be chosen by the appropriate electoral caucuses established in Section 3.a. of these By-Laws.

e. Powers of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall be the Senate's agenda committee and its committee on committees. It may authorize standing committees without regular and recurring duties, if they request to be put on a stand-by basis, to meet once a semester and otherwise be on the call of the Senate or the Executive Committee or of a majority of the Committee concerned as the need for the activity of such committees may arise. The Executive Committee shall have the power to call the Senate into extraordinary session, and shall have such powers, functions and duties as the Senate may delegate to it during periods when the Senate is not in session.

f. Liaison with central administration. The Executive Committee shall serve as a continuing liaison between the University Senate and the central administration. The Executive Committee may create subcommittees and may delegate any of its powers, functions, and duties. The Executive Committee shall participate pursuant to the Statutes of the University and the By-Laws of the Trustees, in the selection of University Professors, the President of the University, the Provost or Provosts, and six Trustees. In performing these functions, the Executive Committee or the appropriate subcommittee thereof shall act in executive session and in a confidential manner and shall not be required to report its deliberations or actions to the Senate as a whole.

~~d-g.~~ Recognition of service. To the extent possible, officers of instruction may be allowed a reduction in their teaching loads and students may be granted appropriate credit for serving as members of the Executive Committee.

~~e-h.~~ In the spring of each odd-numbered year, the Senate shall nominate and elect the Chair of the Committee, and shall nominate and elect the Vice Chair of the Committee, who shall take office fourteen days before the day of Commencement. Both officers shall take office on the following September 1. A candidate for Chair or Vice Chair must be a member of the Tenured Caucus at the time of their nomination, ~~and he or she must have qualified to be a member of the Senate at the time he or she would take office.~~ In addition, he or she they must have served on the Senate at least two years in the immediately preceding four years. Each nomination shall require a petition signed by at least six current members of the Senate, at least 3 of whom shall be members of the Tenured Caucus and at least 2 of whom shall not be members of the Tenured Caucus. The Elections Commission shall prescribe the format and timing of the nominations. The current members of the Senate shall elect the Chair and the Vice Chair by confidential electronic ballot as prescribed

and supervised by the Elections Commission. A separate ballot shall be used for each position, and votes shall be tallied separately for each position. Each ballot shall include an option to abstain.

~~f.i.~~ Vacancies. If the position of chair becomes vacant ~~in an odd-numbered year at any point starting fourteen days before the day of Commencement and extending to fifteen days before the day of Commencement of the next odd-numbered year, then the remaining members of executive committee, voting as a whole, shall select an interim chair who shall serve until a new chair can be elected by the regular election procedure.~~ the Vice Chair shall become Chair for the remainder of the term of the Chair. If the position of Vice Chair becomes vacant, the remaining members of the Executive Committee, voting as a whole, shall select an interim Vice Chair until a new Vice Chair is elected for the remainder of the term of the Vice Chair. The election shall be held as soon as possible on a date determined by the Elections Commission. In the event of any vacancies in the Executive Committee other than the Chair or Vice Chair, a new member shall be selected in the same way that the departing member was selected, and shall serve for the unexpired term.

~~g.j.~~ Term limits: No Vice Chair. A person shall be elected chair of the Executive Committee more than three consecutive times. A person who becomes ineligible to be elected as chair because of the number of consecutive times they have been elected shall not become eligible to become chair or vice chair until at least one year has elapsed since the completion of their previous term. No person shall be elected Vice Chair of the Executive Committee more than three consecutive times. A person who becomes ineligible to be elected as Vice Chair because of the number of consecutive times they have been elected shall not become eligible to be elected as Vice Chair until at least one year has elapsed since the completion of their previous term.

## **Sec. 1 ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE.**

e. Presiding Officer. The President of the University shall be the presiding officer of the Senate. In their absence, or at their request, the Chair of the Executive Committee shall preside as Speaker pro tempore. In the absence of the Chair of the Executive Committee or at the request of the Chair of the Executive Committee, the Vice Chair shall preside as Speaker pro tempore if the President does not preside.

Proponent:

Senate Structure and Operations Committee

## **University Senate Student Affairs Committee**

### **Statement About Community**

**December 8, 2024**

As members of an academic community and as public-facing individuals, we understand and accept that we are subject to both support and criticism. Critique is an essential part of our work and of the dynamic environment we foster in our institution, where diverse ideas and perspectives come together. However, it is important to acknowledge that certain forms of behavior extend beyond the boundaries of healthy, constructive dialogue and only serve to shut down open discussion.

We are deeply concerned by recent events in which select comments made in plenary from one of our student Senators were shared on social media. Despite vicious racist and sexist online harassment in response to this post, fellow community members continued to target the Senator and provided a platform for further harassment. Harassment and doxing is a violation of privacy and an unacceptable form of aggression. Such actions, including the sharing of personal information without consent, not only harm individuals but undermine the core values of respect and integrity that define our community. Sexual harassment, cyberbullying, and other forms of harmful behavior are not, and will never be, tolerated within our community. These actions do not align with the values we strive to uphold and fail to meet the standards we expect of one another.

In light of this, we call on all members of our community to return to a norm of respectful discourse without utilizing online platforms to effectively silence individuals with whom you disagree. We invite those who disagree with us or who seek clarification of a senator's statements or comments to engage through the appropriate channels rather than resorting to actions that may generate hostility or harm. We must hold each other—and ourselves—to this norm of interaction, discussion, and debate. As a deliberative community, we must be able to engage in the type of open and productive communication that reflects our institution's academic pedigree and supports the growth and well-being of all individuals. Let us focus on fostering a climate in which dialogue, collaboration, and understanding can thrive, and let us remember that every space we share—whether physical or virtual—is an opportunity for respectful exchange and intellectual growth.

We remain steadfast in our commitment to ensuring that every member of our community can safely speak without fear in a respectful and supportive academic environment.

Student Affairs Committee

Thank you, I'd like to be the first to express my gratitude to the Student Affairs Committee for this statement, which I wholeheartedly endorse. My name is Helen Han Wei Luo, I represent Graduate Humanities and I am the most recent student leader to be targeted by individuals both within our campus community and from outside interest groups. My November 22<sup>nd</sup> remarks were filmed, in violation of Senate bylaws, by a fellow student and distributed on social media with the explicit intent to incite harassment and violence.

The student in question has deliberately misconstrued my remarks by characterizing them as minimizing the issue of antisemitism on campus. I reiterate now, once and for all: antisemitism is an egregious form of discrimination at Columbia, especially when Jewish students and faculty are intimidated for speaking critically about the Israeli government. This form of discrimination has been amplified through the creation of an informal system where individuals at Columbia are being platformed and rewarded for doxing with the support of outside entities as they distribute defamatory media to silence dissent. To be sure: this incident has almost nothing to do with me, or my role as a student leader, the intent is only to prohibit free speech.

I am reminded of the doxing trucks that circulated campus for months last term especially during the encampment. They drove circles outside my apartment, singlehandedly broadcasting the names of my fellow students which they branded as terrorists for exercising the right to free speech and to protest. These individuals operated anonymously then. Not anymore. There is no secret as to who the student responsible for doxing me is, he apparently feels no need to hide. Columbia's continued inaction on the matter has emboldened them to operate openly – they are *proud*, even – to hold our institutions like the Senate hostage to serve at their whims. They will not stop until they have ICE brought onto campus to deport our students, and I am so disappointed that even today our president was not able to give us assurances against this outcome.

Here is exhibit A of our administration's bias and ineptitude: the University has known for weeks that my remarks were being filmed and distributed online, thus undermining me and student leaders like myself from representing their constituency, and they have not taken action. Even right now they are filming me in the back of this very room. This is unfortunately unsurprising, doxing has now become predominant culture at Columbia and is symptomatic of the institutional backing for the perpetrators as Columbia fails to impose due process to hold them accountable, even dedicating significant institutional resources to protect them. Columbia has the resources to punish students for behavior on social media – but apparently not this group. Not once. Not ever.

Would anyone like to know what I, and other female and minority students at Columbia, have been called in the last week alone? Ask yourselves what kind of violence young women, young women of color, can be threatened with, and you will know, and your stomach should churn as you realize the kind of dehumanizing behavior these perpetrators are capable of. They have no appetite for civil discourse or reasonable criticism. Just

last week Professor Shai Davidai posted a photo of me, from when I was 20 years old in a swimsuit – for his hundreds of thousands of followers to leer at and eroticize. This individual in particular is unsafe around female students and should never again enjoy the privileges of teaching. He has a proven pattern of targeting young women online after dozens of reports about his harassing behavior and the only reason we are talking about me today is because I happen to be a privileged student leader who enjoys tremendous support from my department and my constituents. Other vulnerable students have not had the same privilege. Columbia has failed them. Columbia could have stopped him, but chose not to, and even now is electing to ignore the harm they have facilitated by allowing these perpetrators to monopolize institutional resources.

Finally, to the faculty, scholars, students and administrators of good faith here with me today, I urge you to consider that the perpetrators of this harassment at Columbia will one day grow bored of us. Their interest in our institution is insincere at best and only an instrument to amplify their ideological rhetoric. This is true of the recent House Republican report, and I imagine, true of the upcoming federal administration. These individuals will work to discredit, spin lies, undermine, harass, and embarrass our institution, we will cower to their intimidation by trading away our civil liberties and the humanity of our students, and then they will *grow bored* and we will be left to clean up the mess they make of our school, our students, our legacy as an institution. Columbia was my dream school. I was waitlisted for my program and I went to my department and begged to come here, and when the perpetrators of this harassment are gone, I, and all the scholars and leaders like me, will be left to clean up the mess they make of our home, the home that I love. So I urge that our administration take action today, and in the upcoming months and years, to not let them overtake our institution without fighting the good fight, for our colleagues, and our students.

## A PETITION IN SUPPORT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S SENATE

We, the undersigned, state our support for the existing policies and procedures of the Columbia University Senate, including the process by which amendments may be made to the Senate's governing documents, including its by-laws.

The Senate By-Laws set forth that the Committee on Senate Structure and Operations "shall observe and review the operations and effectiveness of the University Senate and make recommendations for the improvement of the structure and operations of the Senate, through statutory amendment and otherwise." *The By-Laws, Statutes, and Rules of the Columbia University Senate* Sec. 4 (k)(vii) (2020). We support this Committee's responsibility and role in considering amendments to improve the functioning and structure of the Senate.

We express our concern that [a petition](#) has been circulated within Columbia that seeks to undermine the well-functioning process by which changes to the Senate's procedures and structure take place. In the name of "best practices of corporate governance", the petition demands that the Senate take action on several proposed amendments. The authors of the petition [profess](#) expertise in corporate governance, but have no expertise in non-profit governance matters. We urge concern toward efforts to import the best-practices of the for-profit business world into the university setting, a context in which principles of shared governance, transparency, and measures of excellence and success are quite different from, if not in opposition to, the principles that inform for-profit corporate governance.

While Sec. 1 (m) of the Senate's By-Laws allows for the placement of a matter on the appropriate Senate Committee's agenda by petition, the [petition now-circulating](#) fails to meet the requirements of Sec. 1 (m), and suffers a number of other deficiencies.

First, the petition fails to identify whether its signatories amount to 150 members of the University community who are entitled to vote for members of the Senate, as required by the By-Laws.

Second, the petition seeks to subvert the normal procedures already being pursued by the Committee on Senate Structure and Operations. The petition's drafters appear to be aware of confidential deliberations from the Senate Structure and Operations Committee as it has been considering amendments related to term limits, which may appear on the Senate Plenary's Agenda on October 25, 2024. The petition seeks to accomplish an end-run around that process by making an 11th hour demand that the Senate take up a set of other measures without the benefit of full and careful consideration by the appropriate Committee.

Third, the petition rests its demands on a set of claims that are either unsubstantiated or are demonstrably false. The petition essentially recites talking points drawn from social media that advance a political agenda, rather than address actual deficiencies in the Senate.

Fourth, the petition fails to acknowledge that limits on the terms that can be served by Chair of the Executive Committee were adopted by the Senate in 2020, and that the Senate is currently considering an amendment that has progressed through proper channels, that would clarify the application of those existing term limits.

For this reason, we assert our confidence in the existing deliberations and processes of the University Senate, including the integrity of the Committee process.

Signed,

(Please add your name [here](#))

1. Aliaa	Abdelhakim	MD PhD, Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology
2. Nasr	Abdo	Lecturer of Arabic
3. Nadia	Abu El-Haj	Ann Olin Whitney Professor, Department of Anthropology
4. Lila	Abu-Lughod	Joseph L. Battenwieser Professor of Social Science
5. Abdu	Abushaban	Staff
6. Vanessa	Agard-Jones	Anthropology
7. Samara	Ahmed	SIPA 202
8. Manan	Ahmed	Associate Professor of History
9. Angela	Aidala	Research Scientist, Sociomedical Sciences Professor, Sociology
10. Mashura	Akilova	Senior Lecturer in the Discipline of Social Work
11. Qais	Al-Awqati	Professor of Medicine; Professor of Physiology & Cellular Biophysics
12. Haj Amin	al-Husseini	Professor of Palestine Studies
13. Alexander	Alberro	Professor of Art History
14. Joseph	Albernaz	Assistant Professor of English and Comparative Literature
15. Ibraheem	Aljayeh	Business '25
16. Jafari Sinclair	Allen	Professor of African American and African Diaspora Studies
17. Maryam	Alwan	GS '25
18. Virginia	Ambeliotis	BC '19
19. Stefan	Andriopoulos	Professor of German
20. Muzna	Ansari	BC '10
21. Asim	Ansari	Professor, Columbia Business School
22. Hadeel	Assali	Lecturer in Earth and Environmental Sciences
23. Aly	Azhar	SIPA '20
24. Zainab	Bahrani	Edith Porada Professor of Art History and Archaeology
25. Taylor	Banning	Student, CSSW
26. Nico	Baumbach	Associate Professor of Film and Media Studies
27. Kadambari	Baxi	Professor of Practice in Architecture
28. Debbie	Becher	Associate Professor of Sociology, Barnard College
29. Naor	Ben-Yehoyada	Associate Professor, Anthropology
30. Courtney	Bender	Tremaine Professor of Religion
31. Helen	Benedict	Professor of Journalism
32. Nina	Berman	Professor of Journalism
33. Susan	Bernofsky	Professor of Writing, School of the Arts
34. Elizabeth	Bernstein	Professor of Sociology and Professor and Chair of WGSS
35. Rym	Bettaieb	Senior Lecturer
36. Lutfur	Bhuiya	Staff
37. Grace	Bickers	CC '14, Religion '26
38. Nathan	Blackwell	GSAS '28
39. Alfred	Blair	CC '85
40. Zoe	Boff	CC' 83



41. John	Bohn	Staff
42. Celeste	Brewer	Staff
43. Melanie	Brewster	Professor of psychology and education
44. Allegra	Brown	CC '05
45. Matthew	Buckingham	Professor of Professional Practice, Visual Arts, School of the Arts
46. Ted	Byfield	CC '89
47. K.	C.	GSAS '01
48. Victoria	Cadostin	BC '23
49. Gaia	Caramazza	CJS '24
50. Carolyn	Cargile	Lecturer in Discipline
51. Taylor	Carman	Professor of Philosophy
52. Jo Ann	Cavallo	Professor of Italian
53. Zeynep	Celik Alexander	Associate Professor, Department of Art History and Archaeology
54. Hannah	Chazin	Assistant Professor of Anthropology
55. Amy	Chazkel	Associate Professor of History
56. Sajjad	Chowdhry	SIPA '04
57. Laura	Ciolkowski	CC '88
58. Jean	Cohen	Professor of Political Science
59. Sarah	Coker	CSSW '25
60. Jessica	Collins	Associate Professor of Philosophy
61. Jonathan	Crary	Meyer Schapiro Professor of Modern Art and Theory
62. Zoe	Crossland	Professor of Anthropology
63. Chris	Cynn	GSAS '05
64. Lila	Davachi	Professor of Psychology
65. Jenny	Davidson	Professor of English and Comparative Literature
66. Sarah	Desoky	SEAS '00
67. Hilary	Devaney	SOA '22
68. Raghav	Dhall	Earth and Environmental Engineering '25
69. Tiffany	Dimm	CC '21
70. Thomas	Dodman	Associate Professor of French
71. Paula	Drewes	Student CSSW '25
72. Brent	Edwards	Peng Family Professor of English and Comparative Literature
73. Marwa	Elshakry	Associate Professor of History
74. Jeffrey	Fagan	Professor of Law
75. Laura	Fair	Professor, A&S
76. Catherine	Fennell	Associate Professor of Anthropology
77. Katherine	Franke	James L. Dohr Professor of Law
78. Greg	Freyer	PhD, Professor of Environmental Health Sciences
79. Dani	Friedrich	Associate Professor of Curriculum
80. Victoria	Frye	Professor of Social Work

81. Aubrey	Gabel	Assistant Professor, French
82. Gabrielle	Gabrielle	VP&S '25
83. Theodore	Gehr	SIPA '90
84. Abosede	George	Associate Professor of History
85. Keith	Gessen	Professor of journalism
86. Ralph	Ghoche	Assistant Professor, Architecture, Barnard College
87. Tim	Gilboy	SEAS '15
88. Eileen	Gillooly	Executive Director, Heyman Center for the Humanities and Society of Fellows; Adjunct Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature and the Institute for Research on Women and Gender Fred and Fannie Mack professor of the humanities
89. Lydia	Goehr	
90. Devon	Golaszewski	GSAS '20
91. Bette	Gordon	Professor of Film/ School of the Arts
92. Eva	Gordon	Practicum Instructor
93. Aliya	Govindraj	BC '25
94. Farah	Griffin	William B Transform Professor of English and African American Studies
95. Nora	Gross	Assistant Professor of Education, Barnard College
96. Frank	Guridy	Dr. Kenneth and Kareitha Forde Professor of African American & African Diaspora Studies
97. Delcine	Hackley	CSSW '25
98. Lilia	Hadjiivanova	Staff
99. David	Hadu	Professor of Journalism
100. Jack	Halberstam	The David Feinson Professor of the Humanities
101. Sarah	Haley	Associate Professor of History and Gender Studies
102. Kim	Hall	Lucyle Hook Professor of English
103. Wael	Hallaq	Avalon Foundation Professor in the Humanities
104. Hilary	Hallett	Professor of History
105. Ross	Hamilton	Professor and Chair, Department of English, Barnard
106. Michael	Harris	Professor of Mathematics
107. Matthew	Hart	Professor of English and Comparative Literature and former University Senator
108. Shaheen	Hasan	SIPA '11
109. Abdalla	Hassan	Journalism '97
110. Katie	Heins	LMSW, Associate in Psychiatric Social Work
111. Ferg	Hendry	CSSW '25
112. Kit	Hermanson	GSAS, Religion '25
113. Sara	Hijer	Student MPH '26
114. Marianne	Hirsch	William Peterfield Trent Professor Emerita
115. Jennifer	Hirsch	Professor of Sociomedical Sciences
116. Jean	Howard	George Delacorte Professor Emerita in the Humanities
117. Andreas	Huyssen	Villard Professor Emeritus of German and Comparative Literature
118. Andreas	Huyssen	Villard Professor Emeritus of German and Comparative

Literature

119.	Marilyn	Ivy	Associate Professor of Anthropology
120.	Esther	Jackson	Staff
121.	Muhsin	Jassim al-Musawi	Humanities Professor
122.	Cameron	Jones	CC '26
123.	Rebecca	Jordan-Young	Ann Whitney Olin Professor of WGSS, Barnard
124.	Laureline	Josset	Associate Research Scientist
125.	Tom	Kalin	Professor of Professional Practice, Film
126.	Faria	Kamal	Assistant Professor, CUMC
127.	Sabreena	Karim	CC '04
128.	Rebecca	Kennison	Staff
129.	Rashid	Khalidi	Edward Said Professor Emeritus
130.	Mahmoud	Khalil	MPA '25
131.	Zeinab	Khalil	CLS '22
132.	Salman	Khan	Assistant Professor of Medicine
133.	Zainab	Khan	CSSW '24
134.	Rola	Kyayyat	Adjunct Assistant Professor, School of the Arts
135.	Mana	Kia	Associate Professor, MESAAS
136.	Darcy	Krasne	Lecturer in Classics
137.	Paul	Kreitman	Associate Professor of 20th Century Japanese History
138.	Sarika	Kumar	BC '16
139.	Laura	Kurgan	Professor, GSAPP
140.	Maria	Kuzina	GS '22
141.	Christoper	Landry	Vagelos CPS, '19; Psychiatry Residency, CUIMC, '23; Public Psychiatry Fellowship, '24
142.	Jennifer	Lena	Associate Professor of Arts Administration
143.	Maya	Lerman	CC'27
144.	Arthur	Lerner-Lam	Lamont Research Professor
145.	Elizabeth Wolder	Levin	Barnard '69; GSAS '77 and '86
146.	Natasha	Lightfoot	Associate Professor, History
147.	Sam	Lipsyte	Professor, School of the Arts
148.	Ruthnaomi	Liquisa	CSSW '25
149.	Lydia	Liu	Wun Tsun Tam Professor in the Humanities
150.	David	Lurie	Associate Prof. of Japanese History and Literature
151.	Khadeeja	Majoka	GSAS '26
152.	Daniel	Malinsky	Assistant Professor of Biostatistics
153.	Mahmood	Mamdani	Herbert Lehman Professor of Government, Dept of Anthropology
154.	Gregory	Mann	Professor, History Dept.
155.	Aisha	Mansoor	Bridge to PhD '26
156.	Ellen	Marakowitz	Senior Lecturer, MA Director, Anthropology
157.	Reinhold	Martin	Professor of Architecture
158.	Connor	Martini	GSAS '27
159.	Cella	Masso-Rivetti	GSAS '27
160.	Ann	McCann Oakley	Staff
161.	Mary	McLeod	Professor of Architecture
162.	Alberto	Medina	Professor, LAIC

163.	Francesca	Meninger	CCSW '25
164.	Christia	Mercer	Gustave M. Berne Professor of Philosophy
165.	Nara	Milanich	Professor of History, Barnard
166.	Timothy	Mitchell	William B. Ransford Professor of Middle Eastern Studies
167.	Ciamac	Moallemi	Professor of Business
168.	D. Max	Moerman	Professor and Chair, AMEC, Barnard
169.	Naeem	Mohaiemen	Associate Professor of Visual Arts
170.	Rosalind	Morris	Professor of Anthropology
171.	Lambda	Moses	Staff
172.	Yves	Moussallam	Assistant Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences
173.	Debashree	Mukherjee	Associate Professor, MESAAS
174.	Bahia	Munem	Lecturer
175.	Diana	Nabulsi	SIPA '20
176.	Andrew J.	Nathan	Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science
177.	Frederick	Neuhouser	Professor of Philosophy
178.	Lena	Newman	Staff
179.	Robert	Newton	Lecturer, Sustainability Science, SPS
180.	Mae	Ngai	Lung Family Professor of Asian American Studies and Professor of History
181.	Youssef	Nouhi	Senior Lecturer, MEASAS
182.	Russell	O'Rourke	Lecturer in Music
183.	Ben	Orlove	Professor of International and Public Affairs
184.	Jackie	Orr	Adjunct professor, WGSS, Barnard
185.	Tim	Paine	Associate in Computer Science
186.	Deborah	Paredes	Associate Professor and Chair, School of the Arts Writing Program
187.	Jesse	Pearce	Barnard '24
188.	John	Pemberton	Associate Professor, Anthropology
189.	Hiram	Perez	GSAS '02
190.	Gregory	Pflugfelder	Associate Professor of History
191.	Kim	Phillips-Fein	Robert Gardiner-Kenneth T. Jackson Professor of History
192.	James	Piacentini	Adjunct Assistant Professor of Urban Planning
193.	Sheldon	Pollock	Raghunathan Professor Emeritus FBA
194.	Kathryn	Pope	Staff
195.	Elizabeth	Povinelli	Franz Boas Professor, Anthropology & ISSG
196.	Herbert	Quester	CC '85
197.	Sophie	Queuniet	Senior Lecturer in French
198.	Nikhil	Raghuram	Staff
199.	Rebecca	Ramaswamy	CLS '15
200.	Anupama	Rao	Professor, History and MESAAS; Director, Institute for Comparative Literature and Society
201.	Elizabeth	Ray	CC '15
202.	Shana L.	Redmond	Professor of English and Comparative Literature and the Center for the Study of Ethnicity & Race
203.	Bruce	Robbins	Old Dominion Foundation Professor in the Humanities



204.	Adelina	Rolea	GSAS '27
205.	David	Rosner	Ronald Lauterstein Professor of Public Health and Professor of
206.	Lindy	Roy	GSAPP '90
207.	Emily	Runde	Staff
208.	George	Saliba	Prof. Emeritus
209.	Layla	Saliba	Social Work '25
210.	Nadia	Sariahmed	Core Lecturer
211.	Alec	Schachner	CC '08
212.	Joerg	Schaefer	Joerg Schaefer Lamont Professor
213.	James	Schamus	Professor of Professional Practice, School of the Arts
214.	Sharon	Schwartz	Professor of Epidemiology
215.	David	Scott	Professor of Anthropology
216.	Sarita	See	CC '21
217.	Samah	Selim	GSAS '97
218.	Joseph	Serritello	School of Nursing '13
219.	Bruce	Shapiro	Adjunct Professor of Journalism and Executive Director, Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma
220.	Fadi	Shuman	GS '26
221.	Anooradha	Siddiqi	Barnard College Department of Architecture
222.	Shelly	Silver	Professor of Professional Practice, School of the Arts
223.	Rasa	Siniakovas	CSSW '24
224.	Samuel	Skippon	Lecturer in French
225.	Joseph	Slaughter	Assoc. Prof. of English and Comparative Literature, Director Institute for the Study of Human Rights
226.	Bennett	Slibeck	GSAS '26; CC '21
227.	Pamela	Smith	Seth Low Professor of History
228.	Alisa	Solomon	Professor, School of Journalism
229.	Gayatri Chakravorty	Spivak	University Professor
230.	Elsa	Stamatopoulou	Director, Indigenous Peoples' Rights Program, Institute for the Study of Human Rights
231.	Alan	Stewart	Professor of English and Comparative Literature
232.	Natasha	Stovall	BC '93
233.	Flora	Sugarman	Social Work '25
234.	Ezra	Susser	Professor of Epidemiology and Psychiatry
235.	Neferti	Tadiar	Professor of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
236.	Erhan	Tamur	Lecturer, Department of History of Art, University of York
237.	Marco	Tedesco	Lamont Research Professor
238.	Yannik	Thiem	Associate Professor of Religion
239.	Kendall	Thomas	Nash Professor of Law
240.	Kimberly	Traube	CC '04, SOA '14
241.	Lisa	Trever	Associate Professor
242.	Blake	Turner	Associate Professor of Social Science (in Psychiatry) at CUMC
243.	Gray	Tuttle	Leila Hadley Luce Professor of Modern Tibet
244.	Marc	Van De Mieroop	Professor of History

245.	Karen	Van Dyck	Kimon A. Doukas Professor, Classics
246.	Travis	Vidic	General Studies '20; African American Studies MA '21; Business School '26
247.	Anjali	Vishwanath	CSSW '25
248.	Dorothea	von Mücke	Gebhard Professor of German Language and Literature
249.	Stuart	Waldman	GSAS '65
250.	Lauren	Wansker	Staff
251.	Kelly	Ward	SIPA '19
252.	Matthew	Ware	Public Health '25
253.	Jennifer	Wenzel	Professor, English and Comp Lit and MESAAS
254.	Paige	West	Claire Tow Professor of Anthropology
255.	Madi	Whitman	Lecturer, Center for Science and Society and Anthropology
256.	Ovita	Williams	Staff
257.	Mabel	Wilson	Nancy and George Rupp Professor of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, a Professor in African American and African Diasporic Studies
258.	Gisela	Winckler	Lamont Research Professor
259.	Susan	Witte	Professor, School of Social Work
260.	Elwin	Wu	Professor of Social Work
261.	Tim	Wyman-McCarthy	Lecturer in Discipline, Institute for the Study of Human Rights
262.	Serdar	Yalcin	GSAS '14
263.	Homa	Zarghamee	Professor of Economics, Barnard
264.	Eliza	Zingesser	Associate Professor, Department of French
265.	Darla	Zohair	CC '03




---

## Senate Plenary | Comments

---

Tue, Dec 17, 2024 at 12:38 PM

  
Cc: University Senate <senate@columbia.edu>



Here you go:

*Please share anonymously for fear of additional doxing.*

As faculty members, we are deeply concerned about the recent breach of Senate norms, where an unauthorized video of the Senate meeting was posted online, misrepresented, and out of context, resulting in violent and abusive attacks on a student senator. Senate norms exist to ensure open, respectful dialogue, and this violation has not only harmed an individual but also undermined trust in Senate processes.

This incident reflects a growing environment of fear and repression on campus, silencing students and faculty alike on contentious issues like Israel and Gaza. Faculty, too, are increasingly wary of retaliation, creating a chilling effect that stifles open academic discourse and critical engagement.

The role of social media in amplifying this harassment has created a hostile environment, contradicting our university's values of inclusivity and mutual respect. As faculty, we must protect the rights of all community members to express their views, particularly on contentious issues, without fear of intimidation. I urge the Senate to reaffirm its commitment to the dignity and safety of all members and to address the harm caused by this incident.

*Please share anonymously for fear of additional doxing.*

I am deeply troubled by the recent doxing of a faculty member and Senator, Joseph Slaughter. A surreptitiously recorded lecture was taken out of context to falsely portray them as supporting terrorism. This attack was amplified by a right-wing newspaper, the Free Beacon, which spread lies about the faculty Senator and the Rules Committee process, claiming it undermines the student disciplinary process. This is categorically false. We have heard here in the Senate from a spectrum of Rules committee members about the process they undertook this Summer and continue to undertake in support of improving the Rules process. The Rules Committee is a diverse, collaborative body committed to maintaining transparent and fair guidelines that serve the entire university community.

Spreading misinformation about our processes undermines trust, erodes academic freedom, and fosters a hostile environment. Should any publication be allowed to spread lies about the integrity of our work? I urge the Senate to strongly condemn this attack, defend the integrity of our faculty and processes, and reaffirm our commitment to academic freedom and truth.

Best,





[Quoted text hidden]