

University Senate Plenary

May 2, 2025



PROPOSED AGENDA

University Senate

Friday, May 2, 2025 at 1:15 p.m.

Miller Theatre, 2960 Broadway, New York

Registration required

After registering you will receive a confirmation email.

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of March 7 and April 2, 2025
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions:
 - a. Commission on Health Sciences Proposal
5. New business:
 - a. Resolutions:
 - i. Resolution to Approve an Academic Program Leading to the Master of Science in Oral Sciences (College of Dental Medicine)
 - ii. Resolution to Endorse the Statement of Concern (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)
 - iii. Resolution to Endorse the Statement on Mahmoud Khalil and Mohsen Mahdawi (Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Commission on Diversity, Commission on the Status of Women)
 - b. Committee Reports and Updates:
 - i. Annual Report of the Student Affairs Committee
 - ii. Update from the Rules of University Conduct Committee
6. Adjourn

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

Minutes of the Meeting of March 7, 2025

82 out of 109 Senators were present.

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

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

Senators then adopted the [minutes](#) of the February 7, 2025 Plenary.

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

Updates from President Armstrong

President Armstrong began her updates by acknowledging that Columbia is in a time of extreme uncertainty and challenge. She stated that, since she started in her role, she has had an unwavering commitment to furthering the mission of the University and combatting discrimination, especially antisemitism. President Armstrong stated that she had been working with the [Task Force on Antisemitism](#) to implement their recommendations. She stated that the administration has worked with people from multiple different viewpoints in order to adopt policies that will move the university forward. President Armstrong stated that her administration had put up a [website](#) that listed the information that community members would need to understand the progress being made by the University. She stated that the campus restrictions to CUID-holders and guests was one of the steps taken.

President Armstrong thanked the Rules Administrator and [Rules Administrator Office](#) for the work that they have done, noting that the staff has increased in these offices likely twentyfold in the last few months. President Armstrong stated that she wanted to make sure that discipline was being applied fairly and in accordance with the rule of law and that the administration feels very strongly about adhering to those principles. She stated that she feels very strongly about the campus being able to focus on the academic mission of the university so that every student here can have the best possible experience they can ever have. President Armstrong stated that the administration is working on implementing training on a wide variety of issues, including antisemitism, Islamophobia, anti-Palestinian bias, and other forms of hatred. She stated that the administration has rolled out new processes to these ends. President Armstrong stated

that the Columbia community has spent an extraordinary amount of time listening to each other and that, at certain times, the community has been better about doing this than others. She stated that the administration understands that the community is facing challenges on how the community is seen within the community and by the world.

President Armstrong acknowledged the recent [message from the federal government](#) announcing the pausing of funding across many agencies. She stated that there is a general belief that higher education needs to improve and that she is going to work diligently to get through the difficulties of the current moment. She added that the University would continue to make sure that all students can benefit from the incredible resources and benefits of the institution, while not taking away from the work that needs to be done to combat antisemitism, anti-Muslim bias, and other issues. President Armstrong stated that the University will implement its rules and stay true to its mission. She added that she comes to this work with the understanding of how important Columbia is to the world. President Armstrong ended by saying that the people in the room attending the University Senate plenary are Columbia. She added that everyone needed to come together, understand what shared governance really means, to put aside any personal issues, to put Columbia first, and to think for the students of Columbia every day.

President Armstrong then left the meeting, and Sen. D'Armiento asked Senate members to send any questions for President Armstrong to Sen. D'Armiento, who will pass them along. As President Armstrong was leaving the meeting, Senator Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., LAW) asked if the University was planning to challenge the funding pause in court. President Armstrong responded that she needed to leave and to send questions to Sen. D'Armiento for her to follow-up.

Chair's Report and Questions

Sen. D'Armiento began her report by addressing the great anxiety and uncertainty given the country's future and that she felt it was not the moment to shy away from addressing the issues that Columbia faces. Sen. D'Armiento thanked all the members of the University Senate for dedicating all of their time, energy, and integrity toward the Senate and the Columbia community. She stated that she was aware that the University might be receiving visits in the coming weeks from the federal government and that she wishes to reassure all members of the community that these visits are an opportunity for the world to learn about Columbia University, including its excellence in teaching, research, and patient care. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she stands proudly behind the University's mission, academic values, students, faculty, and staff.

Sen. D'Armiento stated that the [Rules Committee](#) is working on issues relating to identification during protests as well as a policy regarding doxxing, which has been an issue for the past year. She added that there are draft policies that are currently in the Senate and will likely be discussed at the next Plenary.

Sen. Gordon raised his concern again, stating that the federal government's announcement to pause \$400 million due to alleged Title VI violations was unprecedented. He noted that the immediate suspension of

these funds without any findings was significant and asked whether Columbia planned to file a lawsuit for a restraining order in order to restore the flow of funds back to the University, noting again the unprecedented nature of this announcement. Sen. D'Armiento responded that she did not have an answer because the announcement just happened. Sen. Gordon asked if there had not been advanced planning around this scenario before today. Sen. D'Armiento responded that there had been advanced planning but that she didn't have an answer specifically for Sen. Gordon's question at this time.

Senator Brent Stockwell (Ten., A&S/NS) asked for clarification as to why the federal government stated that Columbia never responded to the [announcement of cancelations to the \\$51.4 million](#) in government contracts, which prompted further review of federal funding. Sen. D'Armiento responded that she did not believe that the University did not respond to the federal government given that many members of the administration had to turn over documents.

Senator Helen Han Wei Luo (Stu., GSAS/HUM) read a statement from the graduate student union: "After Barnard College broke its promise to the community by bringing NYPD onto campus, including the especially violent Strategic Response Group, the student workers of Columbia believe that it is absolutely necessary for all members of the community to come together to not only condemn these actions but demand the university take a stand against law enforcement officials being able to access campus grounds, surveil students, faculty, and staff, and endanger members of our community. In the current political climate, such a stand is more necessary than ever. The federal government, as mentioned, has threatened to arrest, imprison, deport protesters, revoke visas for political speech, and deport non-citizens. They have threatened our trans and international members. We are now hearing reports that artificial intelligence is being used to revoke visas of student workers for political speech. If the phrase 'all struggles are connected' has ever resonated, it should do so now. The duty of the university to protect free speech, to maintain academic integrity, and perhaps, most importantly, to be a progressive and principled force in the world have all come crashing together. And, instead of fulfilling these duties by fiercely defending free speech on campus and protecting our most vulnerable students and workers, Columbia has chosen deafening silence and repeated threats of unleashing NYPD on our students and workers in the name of preventing some nebulous so-called disruptions. By allowing the NYPD and potentially other law enforcement agencies such as ICE onto campus, the federal government has been allowed to enact bad-faith policies with little-to-no resistance from the Columbia administration. Indeed, it seems as if there may be a desire to support some of these efforts. Columbia was a sanctuary campus before; it is quite the opposite today. The student workers of Columbia condemn the university's actions in the harshest terms and calls on the Senate to do the same. Most importantly, we call on the Seante to immediately pass a resolution that takes the following actions: firstly, establishes Columbia University as a sanctuary campus, defined as a campus that will not allow ICE to enter campus and will refuse to share any information about students or workers to ICE; secondly, ensures that Columbia as a matter of policy will not allow the NYPD to step foot on campus grounds under any circumstances; thirdly, demands the university delete any and all records collected about students and workers related to their political activities, including presence at protests that has not been subpoenaed. As we all collectively struggle for a meaningful democratic shared

governance of the university, the student workers of Columbia believe it is important for the University Senate to take a stand on these matters through the passing of a sanctuary campus and no-NYPD resolution. We must make it clear to the administration that the campus community stands aligned in our condemnation of police forces being allowed entry to a place of learning and our workplace in order to harass, violate, and potentially deport our colleagues, students, friends, and classmates.”

Sen. Luo continued with her own remarks. She stated that she was disgusted by the decision-making that had occurred by the administrators at the university over the past few weeks, including the calling of a fake bomb threat against a group of peaceful protesters. Sen. Luo stated that the university has learned all the wrong lessons after April 2024, showing the cowardice of the administrative leaders. She asked the audience if they have noticed that President Armstrong has not been a part of any of the Senate conversations beginning last semester, leaving early in the meetings to avoid discussion. Sen. Luo mentioned the frequent discourse around the budget cuts and financial resources for the university. She stated that, if \$14 billion is not enough for the university to have a backbone, she believes that these are individuals who have no interest in having a backbone. Sen. Luo added that these individuals no longer feel ashamed in their actions to destroy the campus. Sen. D’Armiento responded that Columbia does not make any administrative decisions for Barnard College.

Senator Akash Kapoor (Stu., P&S) asked if funding cuts would affect central services on campus, such as health, dining, and emergency medical services. Sen. D’Armiento she can’t answer completely but that President Armstrong had stated that the University would be continuing its mission to serve students. She added that there had been plans in place before the recent announcement.

Sen. Gordon stated that he had received communication from a colleague who is an expert in the area that the immediate cancellation would violate the law. He added that, if the federal administration felt that Columbia had been found guilty of allowing harassment, the government would have to give Columbia a hearing and wait 30 days before cancelling the funds. Sen. D’Armiento responded there are lots of things happening every day. Sen. Gordon responded that the person he had communicated with was a former general counsel member for the Department of Health & Human Services under the Obama Administration. He added that, even then, the termination of funds cannot extend beyond the particular program or part thereof of which noncompliance of Title VI had been found. Sen. D’Armiento thanked Sen. Gordon for attempting to reassure everyone.

Protocol for Potential Visits to Campus by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)

Sen. D’Armiento introduced student the Co-Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of the Student Affairs Committee, Senator Maria Martinez (Stu., CC) and Senator Bruce Goumain (Stu., GS). Sen. Martinez stated that, following up from the conversation from the last Plenary, if there are any students who are at risk for deportation by ICE to reach out to the Senators if they need any support. She mentioned that there was a [website](#) with [ICE protocols](#) provided by Public Safety. Sen. Martinez added that any personal

questions can be directed to individual Senators and that further information for students would be coming out in the Student Affairs Committee newsletter coming out later.

Student Affairs Committee Update

Sen. Goumain stated that, last week, the Student Affairs Committee had concluded a poll on campus conditions and that the student Senators were committed to sharing the findings with the community. He added that the results of that poll would be going out in the Student Affairs Committee newsletter to students. Sen. Goumain stated that individual student Senators would have access to their school-specific data.

Sen. Goumain stated that the Senators are working on organizing a Town Hall that will be for all students, in order for students to provide input and decision-making. He added that the Town Hall would be next week and that the information would be provided in the newsletter.

Resolution to Rededicate Lerner Hall as a Student Space (Student Affairs, Campus Planning and Physical Development, Commission on Diversity)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced Sen. Martinez again to lead the discussion on the resolution and also introduced Julian Infante, non-Senator member of the Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee, and Nasser Odetallah, non-Senator member of the Commission on Diversity in order to help lead the discussion. Sen. Martinez introduced the [resolution to rededicate Lerner Hall as a student space](#), noting that this work was building off of the previous Senate vote in 2016.

Infante introduced himself and began giving background information to Lerner Hall, a central student hub for student life on campus. Infante stated that Lerner Hall was originally built for students and student groups to gather. He noted that, in recent years, there has been an allocation of space in Lerner Hall to administrative space, which was not the original intention of the building. Infante gave the reasons as to why Lerner Hall needed to be rededicated as a student space, noting enrollment, student demand, and lack of space on campus.

Odetallah introduced himself and began outlining the details of the Lerner Hall plan. He stated the main aspects of the proposed changes to Lerner Hall: a step-by-step rededication of Lerner Hall, starting from the 3rd floor and moving upward, a gradual phase-out of administrative offices, increased student awareness through visual and physical updates, and an eventual renovation of floors 1 and 2 to optimize student space in order to build toward a full student-dedicated space, available at all times.

Infante added that, while this change would be for all students, undergraduates have the most traffic through Lerner Hall. He added also that there was no intention to remove any administrative offices at Columbia, only to relocate them somewhere more ideal.

Odetallah explained that the rededication would be split into three phases: the first phase would encompass floors 3 and 4, and the second and third phases would include floors 5-8 and a renovation for floors 1 and 2. He ended the presentation by discussing some of the benefits of this rededication, including open up accessibility to campus spaces and improving community among students.

Sen. Martinez thanked Infante and Odetallah for their work. She also thanked a number of staff and administrators for contributing to the project. She then took questions.

Senator James Applegate (Ten., A&S/NS) stated that he was here when George Rupp was President of Columbia University and when Lerner Hall was built. He stated that the presentation given was exactly what Lerner Hall was originally intended for. He stated that Lerner Hall was not intended to be offices for administrators and that he felt it would be a benefit to Columbia for Lerner Hall to be rededicated.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) also expressed her support for the project, noting that she had taught at six institutions before coming to Columbia, with each institution having their own dedicated student space. She added that she felt that it was important for Columbia to also have this.

Senator Nachum Sicherman (Ten., BUS) said that the current proposal still had some discrimination against graduate students and that he would appreciate giving equal access to graduate students as to undergraduate students. Sen. Martinez responded that the reason that focusing on undergraduates is because the most likely demographic to use Lerner Hall would be the undergraduates and that she encourages similar spaces like this to be built for other students, including for graduate students at the medical campus. Infante added that graduate student groups can book space in Lerner Hall and that he continues to support that. Odetallah added that many of the administrative offices currently in Lerner Hall are only for Columbia College and SEAS undergraduate students and that opening up Lerner Hall would create more spaces for graduate students. He added that graduate students already have their own dedicated spaces in their respective schools that are tailored for them.

Sen. Applegate asked if the administration has given any indication if there are other spaces on campus for the administrators in Lerner Hall to move to. Odetallah responded that the group had worked with the administration to discuss where the Lerner Hall administrators would move to, which depended on which set of administrators were being discussed. Sen. Martinez added that the administration was currently undergoing an evaluation of space-usage by administrators, which would help guide the work on the project.

Senator Melinda Aquino (Admin. Staff, Morningside-Lamont-Manhattanville) thanked the presenters for the work they had done. She added that she was supportive increasing informal spaces on campus as they have been repurposed for administration. She added that an office like Multicultural Affairs was initiated out of student activism so that it would be accessible to every student as a resource. Sen. Aquino stated that the programs have been accessible to students and staff across the university and asked how the

presenters were defining administration. Sen. Martinez responded that she understood and appreciated the importance of offices like Multicultural Affairs and hoped that the evaluation of space being carried out by the administration currently would be useful and determining the best location for specific offices, including Multicultural Affairs.

There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The resolution passed 70-0-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Sen. D'Armiento noted that individuals at the Plenary were recording the Plenary against policy and asked them to stop.

Resolution to Adopt Statement on Upholding our Community Standards and Values (Executive)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced and read a [statement on upholding community standards and values](#) and then turned toward discussion from Senators.

Sen. Applegate began discussion on the resolution, stating that he supported the resolution. He stated that he sees himself as a member of the Columbia community first and a participant in discussing political topics second. Sen. Applegate stated that he believed that people's ideas are worthy of debating but that personal attacks are not appropriate.

Senator Lydia Goehr (Ten., A&S/HUM) stated that she was in support of the resolution but wondered what followed after passing the resolution and the follow-up that would happen if individuals violated the standards. Sen. D'Armiento responded that they are working with the Rules Committee and the administration to develop consequences for violation of these policies which were not yet ready.

Senator Ulrich Hengst (Ten., P&S) stated that, at the last Plenary, there had been a [resolution passed against antisemitism and other forms of hate](#), which he believed had not been heavily publicized. He asked, if this resolution was passed, what would be done to publicize it. Sen. D'Armiento responded that the Columbia Spectator had [reported](#) on the passage of the resolution. Sen. Hengst stated that the University Senate itself did not publicize the resolution enough. Sen. D'Armiento agreed that the Senate would like to be able to publicize more through getting a PR staff or support. She added that news agencies sometimes pick up Senate activities and encouraged that to continue.

There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The resolution passed 66-0-4 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Elections Commission Update

Sen. D'Armiento then moved to approve the membership of the [Elections Commission](#). Sen. D'Armiento announced the membership verbally, given that the list was not included in the Plenary packet. Parliamentarian Dan O'Flaherty explained the process for selecting and approved the

membership of the Elections Commission. The members proposed for the Elections Commission were Sen. Aquino, Associate Dean of Multicultural Affairs for CC/SEAS Undergraduate Student Life, Dan O'Flaherty, Professor of Economics, Senator Ann Thornton, Vice Provost and University Librarian, Batya Tropper, student in the School of Law, and Senator William Turner, Associate Professor of Medicine and Assistant Dean for Student Affairs for the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Sen. D'Armiento and Parliamentarian O'Flaherty clarified audience questions about the selection of members for the Elections Commission and the roles the Elections Commission had in the Senate elections.

There was a motion which was seconded to approve the slate for the Elections Commission. The membership was approved 66-0-2 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

Minutes of the Meeting of April 4, 2025

93 out of 109 Senators were present.

Senator Jeanine D’Armiento (Ten., P&S), Executive Committee Chair, called the University Senate to order at 1:15pm. Sen. D’Armiento welcomed Senators and guests to the seventh Plenary of the 2024-2025 session. Sen. D’Armiento reminded attendees of the Parliamentary procedures and that recordings are not permitted in Plenary meetings.

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

Sen. D’Armiento then turned over the meeting to Acting University President Claire Shipman.

Updates from Acting President Shipman

Acting President Shipman introduced herself to the Columbia community and offered an explanation as to why she was serving as Acting President. Acting President Shipman acknowledged the anxiety of the university. She stated that the research community at the university was suffering with the budget cuts, noting that the Columbia administration was working hard to restore funding and provide support in the meantime for affected labs. Acting President Shipman stated that the university was looking for alternative sources of funding as well and would communicate more about their efforts in the near future.

Acting President Shipman acknowledged the deep uncertainty and fear that international students and scholars were feeling. She added that international students and scholars added to Columbia’s intellectual expansiveness and were invaluable members of the community. Acting President Shipman stated that no member of the leadership team or Board of Trustees has ever notified ICE about any members of the Columbia community. Acting President Shipman stated that the administration is committed to supporting international students and that they have expanded the resources for the [International Students & Scholars Office](#) (ISSO). She added that the administration does not have ultimate authority and are committed to following the law.

Acting President Shipman then restated that her role as Acting President is only temporary and that she was asked to step in at a difficult moment in order to provide continuity and absorb some criticism. She added that the Board of Trustees is working on putting together a search committee for the next President and would offer more information soon. Acting President Shipman stated that she is committed to

navigating Columbia through the current moment to the best of her ability and will need support and advice from the community.

Acting President Shipman then left the meeting but added that she would hopefully be able to attend a townhall and the next Plenary to talk to the community. Sen. D'Armiento stated that questions for Acting President Shipman can be sent to her to be passed along.

Chair's Report and Questions

Sen. D'Armiento began her report by acknowledging the difficult circumstances that the university has found itself in since the last Plenary. She discussed that, at the March 7th, 2025 Plenary, the Senate had discussed [protocols around ICE](#) hoping to provide information for the community, with ICE presence confirmed near campus that evening. She stated that the next day SIPA student Mahmoud Khalil, a green card holder and permanent resident, was detained by ICE, the first in a series of similar detentions around the country. She also added that GSAPP student Ranjani Srinivasan and Columbia College student Yunseo Chung have been targeted by the government for deportation. Sen. D'Armiento added that, in many of these cases, the legal grounds for deportation are unclear and that there will be many legal challenges ahead. She also added that the University had released information about sanctions for participants in the Hamilton Hall takeover. Sen. D'Armiento stated that on March 15th, the University received a list of demands from the federal government, including demands for Columbia to change its shared governance, academic offerings, discipline processes, and campus access in order for the negotiation process to continue to restore the over \$400 million in proposed budget cuts. She added that the University responded on March 21st, agreeing in part to many of the demands. Sen. D'Armiento added that on March 28th, former Interim University President Katrina Armstrong stepped down from her position, resulting in another presidential change for the university. She added that, amidst all of these events, there has been a renewal of protesting on campus. Sen. D'Armiento acknowledged how difficult the previous months have been for the Columbia community, noting that that it would be near impossible to predict what the future would look like at Columbia. She added that she was committed to doing the difficult work to rebuild the Columbia community.

Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Executive Committee had released [The Sundial Report](#), a 335-page report providing a background summary and chronology of events from October 7th, 2023 through December 2024. She added that the Senate would discuss the report in more detail later in the plenary but to remind everyone that, on April 26th, 2024, the University Senate voted to [produce a report in partnership with the university administration](#) to understand the truth of the events unfolding on campus. She added that, in the months following that vote, the proposed independent review would not be possible and that Sen. D'Armiento [updated](#) the Senate on July 19th, 2024 that the original version of the report would not be able to move forward and that the Senate would produce its own version. Sen. D'Armiento added that, since then, she has provided a series of updates on the status of the report. She added that the report utilizes a multitude of documents and catalogues many events, some of which were known to the community and some of which were not known to the University community. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the creation of

the report was a massive undertaking and that it will take time for the Senate to go through the entirety of the report together, noting that many Senators had mentioned this year that they wanted to be able to critically reflect upon how Columbia was in its current state and that the report offers a crucial starting point to that project. Sen. D'Armiento added that, in order to take in all possible considerations, the Senate will be collecting feedback and corrections until May 1st, 2025 by emailing thesundialreport@columbia.edu.

Senator Gabriella Ramirez (Stu., SIPA) wanted to add more information about the detainment of SIPA student Mahmoud Khalil as the SIPA Senator. She expressed the deep frustration and concern from the SIPA community about the lack of response from the Columbia administration about Khalil's detainment. Sen. Ramirez added that in a few days it will have been one month since Khalil had been taken from his Columbia apartment and stripped of his due process rights and that the lack of acknowledgment has been disheartening to many SIPA students who knew Khalil. Sen. Ramirez added that many SIPA students are questioning how to consider Columbia a home given Khalil's detainment and Columbia's lack of response. She added that, since ICE has had a presence on campus, many members of the community feel a deep sense of fear, confusion, and anxiety. Sen. Ramirez added that many felt unsafe leaving their homes due to the threat of being detained by plainclothes officers which were unacceptable and needed to be addressed. She added that these concerns are also part of a larger set of concerns about free speech crackdowns nationwide, which has raised alarms from civil rights organizations, experts, and scholars nationwide. Sen. Ramirez added that Columbia has a commitment to make a strong stand supporting free speech and being a world leader in this moment.

Senator Jaxon Williams-Bellamy (Stu., LAW), Co-Chair of the Committee on the Rules of University Conduct, gave an update about the disciplinary treatment of the Columbia students involved in the demonstrations at Barnard College earlier that semester. Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the Rules Committee has advised the Rules Administrator to place these student cases under the [Rules of University Conduct](#), following the Statutes of the University. However, Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the Rules Administrator has signaled a desire to put the cases under CSSI instead. He acknowledged that there would be more difficulty gathering evidence at Barnard for violations under the Rules of University Conduct but that CSSI was still not the proper venue for a demonstration charge. Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the Rules Committee has been working with the administration to be able to bring the charges under the Rules of University Conduct. However, Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the Rules Administrator has decided to move forward with the charges being brought under CSSI. He stated that this was problematic for a few reasons. Sen. Williams-Bellamy first stated again that CSSI was not fit to evaluate charges regarding demonstration in order to fulfill Columbia's commitment to free speech. He said secondly that CSSI would face the same type of difficulties in gathering evidence as under the Rules of University Conduct and the only benefit of using CSSI is that there is less evidence required or less rigorous evidence required to find a student guilty of a violation. Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the Rules Committee believed that the decision to charge students under CSSI was an example of venue shopping, which is not

permitted by the University. He stated that any gaps in evidence-gathering were not an excuse to change venues and called upon the Rules Administrator to change his decision.

Senator Helen Han Wei Luo (Stu., GSAS/HUM) made a comment on a protest activity that had occurred that Wednesday where students had chained themselves to the St. Paul's Chapel gate that had been chained and locked for many months. She stated that these students were forcibly removed by NYPD, which resulted in students chaining themselves to the fences behind Earl Hall, where Public Safety exercised force and violence against them. Sen. Luo stated the University's communication around the demonstration cited violations to the Rules of University Conduct but did not specify which Rules had been broken. She stated that any Rules citing the blocking of access points could not reasonably be applied to this case because the gates students chained themselves to were not in use or the students had chained themselves to fences. Sen. Luo stated that Public Safety's use of force was not warranted to bring the situation under control. She added that the administration owed the community an explanation for the display of force and that there has been an erosion of trust between the administration and students. Sen. Luo stated that Acting President Shipman's absence at the Plenary was a continuation of a trend that showed disregard for shared governance and spoke to Acting President Shipman's priorities that have not inspired trust.

Senator Mahmood Mamdani (Ten., A&S/SS) made a comment on the University's [response](#) to the March 28th demands from the federal government. Sen. Mamdani stated that he particularly wanted to focus on the review of academic programs that relate to the Middle East, including the restructuring and joint appointments that the University promised. He added that the new Senior Vice Provost would have broad authority to review the [Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies](#) (MESAAS) Department and the [Center for Palestine Studies](#). Sen. Mamdani stated that the University's response claimed that the academic offerings were unbalanced and that the terms used to describe the changes were aligned with an academic receivership with one difference: the powers that would be arrogated to an external reviewer would now be under a permanent arrangement by the Provost's Office. He stated that this signaled an important change in academic oversight at Columbia, noting that never before has the University made changes to governance of departments without a proper review. Sen. Mamdani stated that this was a result of external pressure and would subvert academic freedom at the University. He stated that the administration is making the argument that internal policing of academic departments is less visible than external intervention, but Sen. Mamdani added that internal policing is ultimately more dangerous. He added that this change could lead to scientific research on climate change or public health being stopped by the University in the future out of concerns that the federal government doesn't like it and should be shut down to access federal funding in unrelated fields. Sen. Mamdani said that these decisions raise the important question of whether academic freedom within a university lies within the faculty or the administration. He asked what the role of peer review is under this new supervision and whether scholars can be vetoed because of the politics involved in their research. Sen. Mamdani ended by saying that the University is sacrificing nothing less than its integrity with their response to the federal administration.

Sen. D'Armiento said that the Senate is working hard to get details on what the process is for departmental oversight.

Senator Joseph Howley (Ten., A&S/HUM) wished to thank Acting President Shipman for speaking to the Senate and for addressing the question of future leadership and addressing the claim that any member of the Board of Trustees had been in contact with ICE. Sen. Howley stated that he would like to know whether any member of the Board of Trustees was in contact with any part of the federal government or DHS about students on campus to better address the concerns that had been raised.

Senator Greg Freyer (TTOT, SPH) stated that members of the Faculty Affairs Committee were asked to make a resolution ensuring that there would be a financial contract between peer institutions. He added that it was critical to stay united rather than fight each other. Sen. Freyer said that the Faculty Affairs Committee were working on bring forth an update for the next Plenary.

Senator Jalaj Mehta (Stu. (Undergraduate), SEAS) mentioned that he has served on the [Inclusive Public Safety Advisory Committee](#) (IPSAC), which recently had an emergency meeting during the chaining protest earlier in the week. He added that he intended to follow up with questions asked to Executive Vice President for University Facilities and Operations David Greenberg about the legality of the peace officers. Sen. Mehta was concerned that the peace officers were directly appointed by the NYPD Commissioner, citing state legislature. He added that the University had decided to work directly with NYPD to secure these peace officers and that IPSAC had not been made aware of such an agreement.

Senator Oscar Luckett (Stu., CC) stated that he had asked Executive Vice President Greenberg about the permission given through state law for the peace officers at the last Senate Town Hall and would like to follow up on those questions, given that Executive Vice President Greenberg has been absent from all of the previous emergency IPSAC meetings.

Senator Keith Gessen (TTOT, JOURN) stated that, in light of the Sundial Report and the Senate Town Halls, his impression is that the Senate is continuously ignored by the administration. He wanted to ask the Executive Committee on what levers the Senate has to enact the changes discussed, such as what Sen. Williams-Bellamy had previously discussed. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the full Senate members are aware of what requests have been ignored but not always what changes have been successful with the administration. She also added that various Senators have taken up different issues in order to obtain clarity, particularly around Public Safety, academic review, and the \$400 million cuts. Sen. D'Armiento stated that this was a time to give grace to the administration attempting to navigate returning federal funding to the university while also, as the Senate, holding strong to shared governance. She added that sometimes shared governance is not shown at the Plenary and that it is the Senate's role to get clarity on certain issues. Sen. D'Armiento acknowledged that there had never been a time with so many issues that the Senate was dealing with at the same time.

Sen. Mehta added that many of the members of the Rules Committee had been in direct conversation with the Rules Administrator to reassert their authority and the importance of the Rules of University Conduct. Sen. D'Armiento agreed with Sen. Mehta and vouched for the work being done.

Senator Henry Ginsberg (Ten., P&S) stated that his understanding was that there was no consultation between the Senate and the administration before the administration responded to the federal government's demands and that he believed this was a violation of shared governance By-Laws of Columbia University. He noted that Claire Shipman, in her role at the time as the Co-Chair of the Board of Trustees, was involved in agreeing to the federal government's demands. Sen. Ginsberg asked the question of where the University now was at with shared governance in light of the last few weeks. Sen. D'Armiento responded that it has only been a week since everything had taken place and that the Senate had not yet figured out how they can respond and that she agreed that it might appear to be a violation of shared governance. She also added that others might argue that the University was in a place of emergency and needed to act quickly but that the Senate Executive Committee had met around 10 times in the month of March and would normally have heard or been consulted with on some of these items.

Resolution to Approve an Academic Program Leading to a Master of Science in Biodiversity Data Analytics (School of Professional Studies and Arts & Sciences) (Education)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced the [proposal](#) for a new academic program leading to a Master of Science in Biodiversity Data Analytics between the School of Professional Studies and the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences that the Education Committee would be presenting on. Sen. D'Armiento introduced Senator James Applegate (Ten., A&S/NS), Co-Chair of the Education Committee, to lead the discussion, as well as Professor Maria Uriarte, Chair of the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Biology, Professor Viorel Popescu, Associate Research Scientist in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Biology, and Senator Ruth Defries (Ten., CS), University Professor, member of the Education Committee, the Denning Family Professor of Sustainable Development in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Biology, Chief Academic Office for the Columbia Climate School, and Co-Founding Dean Emerita of the Columbia Climate School.

Sen. Applegate stated that the Master of Science in Biodiversity Data Analytics is a 36-point degree that is a collaboration of the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Biology in the Arts & Sciences and the School of Professional Studies. He added that the program was a three-semester program, explaining that biodiversity data is the sophisticated way of accounting for the number of species that live in a specific environment, data is the way of counting, and analytics is how to handle the data. Sen. Applegate added that the field had gained importance because of the concern over the impact that humanity has over species other than its own. He stated that the program was fully online, with both advantages and disadvantages to this format. Sen. Applegate added that the students will come to Columbia in periods of 3-4 days and will meet each other and that the size of the program is around 30 students. Sen. Applegate also mentioned that for degree proposals like this, the Senate Education Committee forms a subcommittee that meets with the proposing academic departments to go through any

issues with the proposal and that the Education Committee was enthusiastic about this degree proposal in particular.

Professor Uriarte addressed concerns about potential overlap with other curriculum. She explained that many companies and organizations are increasingly required to disclose biodiversity data, showing the growing demand for knowledge given by this degree.

Sen. Ginsberg asked about the potential risk of the word “diversity” being included in the program title, given risk to other scientific programs that include words or fragments of words that are automatically flagged by the current federal government education reviews. Professor Uriarte responded that she understood Sen. Ginsberg’s concerns but, as far as she knows, the term “biodiversity” has not been targeted by the government yet.

Sen. Luo asked if the online nature of this program is usual for Columbia or a new development. Professor Uriarte responded that some of the courses are currently offered in-person but, given the nature of the courses involving heavy data analytics, the professor would still be able to be present if the class was online. She added that the campus visits would help the students know each other and keep the students engaged.

There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The resolution passed 77-0-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Resolution Addressing Current Events: The Sundial Report

Sen. D’Armiento apologized for accidentally going out of order on the agenda. She gave an overview again of the timeline and purpose of The Sundial Report. Sen. D’Armiento thanked the individuals who helped write the report, noting the enormous amount of work needed to create. She stated that there is a dedicated email address for giving feedback and corrections for The Sundial Report (thesundialreport@columbia.edu) up until May 1st, 2025. Sen. D’Armiento added that any input will be reviewed by the Executive Committee for incorporation and that the Executive Committee reserves the right to publish any of the comments submitted. Sen. D’Armiento then took questions.

Senator Andrew Marks (Ten., P&S) began by stating that The Sundial Report fails to represent the best of what Columbia has to offer and was actually the worst effort. He stated that the report was crafted in secrecy by a hired writer and never shared with the Senate as a whole, making the document a missed opportunity to create a historic document that involved high-minded objective scholars. Sen. Marks stated that report failed to be a Cox Commission Report and was written with a clear agenda. He added that the Senate was never allowed to read the report despite it being published under the name of the Senate. Sen. Marks stated that only a handful of the Executive Committee members were allowed to read it, only for a short time while being watched, which was not a good setting for careful editing and feedback that would be required. He added that nobody should be happy with The Sundial Report and its contents unless they

no longer care about facts nor the truth. Sen. Marks ended by saying that the Senate should reject The Sundial Report and instead have the University commission a panel of true scholars to conduct a fact-based investigation that everyone can be proud of.

Sen. D'Armiento responded to Sen. Marks's criticism. She first stated that she had hoped that Sen. Marks had taken the time made available to him to read The Sundial Report, noting that the Executive Committee had access to view the report for months. Sen. D'Armiento responded secondly that the assumption that there were no scholars involved in the writing of the report was incorrect. She added that in the July 19th, 2024 Plenary, Sen. D'Armiento had asked for volunteers to help write the report and that many had responded to volunteer. She continued, stating that the Executive Committee had voted, out of concern of the increased doxxing, to conceal the identities of the writers for their safety. Sen. Marks said that he still stood by his comments.

Senator Lydia Goehr (Ten., A&S/HUM) commented that it was not up to Sen. D'Armiento to defend the report but rather up to Sen. Marks to present a list of facts that he claims are false and to prove that the report was not written by experts and scholars. Sen. Goehr asked Sen. Marks to sustain his criticism with facts itself given how severe the accusations were, noting that nothing that Sen. Marks said was consistent with what Sen. Goehr knew to be the case about how the report was written.

Sen. Marks stated that he wished to respond to Sen. Goehr. He stated that The Sundial Report was publicly available and that people could read it to draw their own conclusions. Sen. Marks stated that it was a fact that the report was not made available to entire Senate before publication and was only given to the Executive Committee. Sen. Goehr responded that Sen. Marks's last comment was not true that the report was only made available to the Executive Committee and that many Senate members were asked if they wanted access to the report. Sen. D'Armiento added that this offer was made available to all current Senators on February 7th, 2025. Sen. Goehr said that this was not the time to go back-and-forth. Sen. Marks said that Sen. Goehr made accusations that he would like to respond to. Sen. Goehr stated that Sen. Marks similarly has made accusations. Sen. Marks continued, stating that what he was told was that the Executive Committee members could go to the office to read the report and read it while being observed, without being mentioned that it was made available widely to the Senate. Sen. Marks stated that he felt this was disingenuous and misleading. He added that he did go through the report very carefully and made many notations where there were inaccuracies, giving his comments to the Senate staff. He expressed that members of the Senate should ask the Senate staff for the comments he made in writing on the copy of the report that he viewed. Sen. Marks stated that he made 50 or more comments where there were inaccuracies. Sen. Goehr stated that Sen. Marks's comments would be incorporated if they turned out to be correct. Sen. D'Armiento responded that Sen. Marks's comments were read through in their entirety and that Sen. Marks did not leave 50 comments but less, all of which were reviewed, compared to source data, and corrected when appropriate. Sen. D'Armiento stated that sharing the report with such a large number of Senators automatically would have made the report publicly released, which was why the Executive Committee spent many months reviewing the document carefully. She also added that the

Executive Committee encouraged comments once the document was released. Sen. D'Armiento restated again that she made the announcement several times at Plenaries for anyone to reach out if they wanted to read the report and that all those who chose to do so were monitored by a staff member for confidentiality purposes.

Senator Howard Worman (Ten., P&S) stated that he agreed with Sen. Marks. Sen. Worman added that he was the Co-Chair of the External Relations and Research Policy Committee and that he only found out from media. He felt that key people on the Senate were left out in the making of the report and that he objected to the style and tone of The Sundial Report. Sen. Worman stated that he felt that there was an agenda behind the report and that the full Senate could have done much better. He stated that he felt that the situation was horrible and that he again agreed with Sen. Marks. Sen. D'Armiento responded that the resolution had been passed on April 26th, 2024 giving the Executive Committee the oversight of the writing of this report and that it was the Senate's vote to make this report. She added that there is now a month by which everyone on the Senate can give feedback for revisions and that everyone should take that seriously.

Senator Brent Stockwell (Ten., A&S/NS) appreciated the discussion given how contentious the discussion was around the report. Sen. Stockwell then motioned under Section 1.j. of the By-Laws to withdraw The Sundial Report so that a new report could be written analogous to the Cox Commission Report and reviewed by the full Senate at a Plenary before being published. Sen. D'Armiento responded that until July 2024, the Senate had full intentions of having a report similar to the Cox Commission Report but that the administration decided not to collaborate with the Senate or provide resources. On July 19th, 2024, the Senate decided to move forward with the report with volunteers from the Senate and the staff to help write the report. Sen. D'Armiento added that it was decided that she would not reveal the names of those who wrote the report. She added that the majority of the chronology in the report is based on the media and that, if any Senators felt that things were missing that they should email the Senate with that information so that corrections can be made.

Senator Janie Weiss (Admin. Staff, CUIMC) asked how Senators were chosen to be able to view the report. Sen. D'Armiento responded that all Senators were notified and just needed to email request to be able to see it. Sen. Weiss asked if Sen. Marks received follow-up to the comments he left on the draft of the report. Sen. D'Armiento responded that he was not notified on the status of each comment he had left but that he had many weeks to review the report after his comments were reviewed to check for any potential changes.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) moved to table Sen. Stockwell's motion. She also stated that she wished she had taken more time to read the whole report before it was published but that the report was made available to all Senators before publication. Sen. Bernofsky added that the parts she had read she was impressed with, including the level of documentation of everything. She stated that the accusations that the report is not scholarly to be inaccurate. She ended by encouraging everyone to read the document for themselves.

Sen. Luo mentioned that Sens. Marks and Worman had made the claim that the report contained falsehoods but that the bulk of the report contained a detailed, documented chronology and that she felt this would not change by the hiring of any outside scholars to commission a new report. She stated that the judgments on the report are not relevant if the bulk of the report is based on evidence.

Sen. Ginsberg asked about whether there was one person who put together the report with a bias and storyline in mind, as he interpreted Sen. Marks's criticism to allege. Sen. D'Armiento responded that initially hired a reporter to gather facts and do interviews and that many scholars contributed to the writing that the staff then put together in a back-and-forth process. She added the reporter was contacted again towards the end of the process to write the report and that the reporter did contribute some writing. Sen. D'Armiento added that several members of staff had to re-check each source after revisions were made. Sen. Ginsberg asked if the reporter was someone who would cover this in a newspaper. Sen. D'Armiento added that the Senate hired a freelance reporter. Sen. Ginsberg clarified that the reporter from *The New York Times* extracted various parts of the report to tell a specific story.

Senator Christopher Brown (Ten., A&S/SS) commented his disappointment that the Board of Trustees did not offer support for an independent report like the one issued by the Cox Commission. He stated that the Trustees had authorized and funded the Cox Commission Report and that part of the problem is that nobody is doing a report outside of the Senate. Sen. Brown asked Sen. D'Armiento to share a little but about the conversation that she had in July with the Board of Trustees and whether the Trustees had expressed any interest since then in supporting an independent report. Sen. Brown added that he had worked on an independent report previously and that they are enormously expensive and would require the Board of Trustees to help fund.

Sen. D'Armiento responded by saying that she had been called into a meeting by the Office of the General Counsel and Chief of Staff to the President Susan Glancy that there would no administrative support for the report. Sen. D'Armiento added that she was not told directly by President Shafik this decision. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Executive Committee discussed trying to fundraise in order to get the funding to do a report akin to the Cox Commission Report because they believed in an independent report being made. She added that, at the following July 19th, 2024 Plenary, the Senate voted to move forward with their own version of the report and that she took volunteers for writing the report at that time. Sen. D'Armiento stated that there were even Senators who reached out at that time not to volunteer as writers but to request to see the report when it was finished, which was granted to them when the draft was finished. She stated that there was one error, which was that there was supposed to be an email sent to all Senators the previous Tuesday notifying them in anticipation of The Sundial Report being published but that the staff had accidentally not sent out the email. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Executive Committee did receive the email right before the report was published but that the email did not get sent to the rest of the Senate mistakenly.

Senator Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., LAW) stated that, if the Office of General Counsel was involved in the decision to refuse supporting the creation of the report, there were probably legal considerations that caused the administration to take a more cautious approach to sponsoring a definitive version of facts that would then be used in discovery of litigation. Sen. Gordon mentioned that he had read the report in the Senate office and left notes about what he felt was a bias and contentious tone to the Executive Summary of The Sundial Report. He added that he felt that the report should not go out in the form that he read it and that he was concerned about it. Sen. D'Armiento responded that Sen. Gordon's comments were critical in revising the entire document, including removing all commentary in the chronology. She added that, after receiving Sen. Gordon's comments, the Executive Committee went to people who never had seen the report before in order to look for areas of bias. Sen. D'Armiento did have a lawyer and another legal colleague be able to read the report for legal concerns.

Senator Oren Pizmony-Levy (Ten., TC) said that he agreed with what Sens. Marks, Worman, and Stockwell had said earlier and that he seconded Sen. Stockwell's proposition to withdraw the report. Sen. Pizmony-Levy stated that he had read the report earlier in the week and concerns that Sen. D'Armiento had personally selected the writers for The Sundial Report. Sen. D'Armiento responded that she did not select the writers and that they volunteered themselves. She clarified that she had a meeting where the individuals that volunteered to write the report selected which sections of the report they wished to write. Sen. Pizmony-Levy stated that, although the report was written by a collective, there was a sense that the report was written with a singular voice. Sen. Pizmony-Levy said that, while the Senate does not know the authors of the report, he wished to know the authors' positionality on the matters contained in the report and what they think about protests and the conflict that brought about the report. Sen. Pizmony-Levy stated that, additionally, the Methodology section of The Sundial Report was poorly written, making it hard to trust the sources and unclear where the conclusions came from. Sen. D'Armiento responded that she understood Sen. Pizmony-Levy's concerns and encouraged him to send the comments to the email on the website so that his concerns can be addressed.

Senator Andrew Einstein (Ten., P&S) stated that he agreed with Sen. Pizmony-Levy's comments and that the report was being scrutinized by Columbia's detractors in Washington D.C. and that he was concerned about the tone of the report considering the federal funding threats against the university. Sen. Einstein stated that The Sundial Report's first page references a resolution but that there was no resolution that specifically addressed this report but rather to do a report in general. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Senate resolution gave the Executive Committee the authority to oversee the report. Sen. D'Armiento added that the lawyer that reviewed the report is a Columbia lawyer.

Sen. Williams-Bellamy commented that updates about the report were given several times at Plenaries over the past few months and that everyone on the Executive Committee had several opportunities to read the report, which went through multiple rounds of review and editing. He added that there was a lot of process that went into the report and that the report was difficult to read because of the truth laid out regarding the shortcomings of the University over the past year-and-a-half. Sen. Williams-Bellamy added

that, just because there is criticism of Columbia coming from the federal government, doesn't mean that there shouldn't be a critical look at the events that had transpired at Columbia and how the University can be improved. He added that many wish that they could have done a Cox Commission Report but that the Cox Commission Report had a great deal of institutional support that the Senate did not receive last year.

Provost Angela Olinto clarified that she was a member of the Executive Committee and did not see the report before it was released. Sen. D'Armiento responded that both the President and Provost did not see The Sundial Report given that the administration had indicated a desire to not participate in the creation of the report.

Sen. Stockwell brought up voting on the motion that he proposed earlier in the meeting. Sen. D'Armiento responded that the Senate Parliamentarian had notified her that Sen. Stockwell's motion had to go to the committee under Section 1.j. Sen. Stockwell asked that requested the vote happen in the Plenary given the urgency of the matter and the report already being published. Senate Parliamentarian Dan O'Flaherty clarified that a proposal raised on the floor should go to the appropriate committee automatically. Sen. Stockwell that The Sundial Report's reliance on *The Columbia Spectator* was problematic because students who are reporters know other students and will then be biased. He added that he believed that there should be an independent report of faculty that can bring the Senate together. Sen. D'Armiento responded that much of the reliance on *The Columbia Spectator* was because of the videos and data that they reported but also because the University would not allow outside press on campus all year.

Sen. Freyer agreed with what Sen. Williams-Bellamy said about the Executive Committee having access to the report before its publication. He added that it was a critical document that allows everyone to look at where the University did wrong and how to do better.

Sen. Luo stated that she agreed with supporting the report and that disagreement with the content of the report is not the same as accusations of its bias. She added that doubting the credibility of journalistic sources is another very serious accusation. Sen. D'Armiento stated that any concerns should be sent in so that any mistakes can be reviewed.

Sen. Applegate stated that he had read the report before it was published and that he felt that there was a clear bias in the first 40 pages and that the report was very favorable to the student protesters. He added that this would color how people read the chronology, not only biasing what is left in the report but also what is left out. Sen. Applegate stated that he felt that there were many mistakes made by President Shafik's administration and that they would have their own version of the story. He stated that he sees no reason why the Board of Trustees would not support a report similar to the Cox Commission Report to help the community move on from these issues. He ended by stating that there needs to be a look at the bias of the first 40 pages and the glorification of protesting in addition to the administration's mistakes.

Sen. D'Armiento stated again that all comments submitted to the email would be taken into consideration and encouraged everyone to do so.

Elections Commission Update on the University Senate Officer Elections Spring 2025

Sen. D'Armiento passed over the meeting to Provost Olinto. Provost Olinto stated that it would be best for Elections Commission to give a presentation before discussion. Provost Olinto introduced School of Law student Batya Tropper, Chair of the Elections Commission, to lead the presentation of the [report of the Elections Commission](#).

Tropper began going over the presentation. Tropper went through the [presentation](#) which detailed the ambiguity in the By-Laws about whether the term limits put in place on December 11th, 2020, which limited the Chair of the Executive Committee to three-terms, would be applied to include Sen. D'Armiento's first term as Chair of the Executive Committee (2019-2021), thus rendering her ineligible to run again according to the challenge filed against her candidacy for Chair. Tropper explained that the By-Laws were ambiguous and that the Elections Commission would like the Senate to vote to offer guidance on the interpretation of the By-Laws before they make their final ruling on the challenge. Tropper went over the process and arguments on both ends for the interpretation of the By-Laws. Tropper asked that the Senate consider voting on a [prepared motion](#) in order to best resolve the ambiguity.

The motion was seconded and then discussion was opened on the motion.

Sen. Bernofsky proposed that the motion be voted on through a secret ballot, given that members of the Senate have felt surveilled and monitored in the past and given the politicized nature of the topic. The motion was seconded. The motion for a secret ballot was passed 67-3-7 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Sen. Marks thanked the Elections Commission for their work, as well as Sen. D'Armiento for her term as Chair for the past three terms. He stated that the Senate is a fork in the road, a choice between transparency, collaboration, and healing versus a continuation of divisiveness, rancor, and opacity. Sen. Marks stated that the By-Laws are clear that the Chair can only serve three terms, unless the first term was a partial term, which was not the case with Sen. D'Armiento. He stated an example that, if the Senate had passed a rule to dictate that all Senators must notify Public Safety if they see ICE on campus but the Chair of the Executive Committee decided not to follow that rule because they were Chair were the rule was passed, this would lead to chaos in Sen. Marks's opinion. Sen. Marks continued that the Senate is under scrutiny right now and that the Senate can choose to follow its own rules or follow the approach of those who have threatened the university, attacked its students, deported students, trashed the research enterprise, and threatened academic freedom. He stated that the Senate can choose the MAGA way and put aside clearly written term limit, proving that the Senate is no better than the people attempting to destroy Columbia. He ended by asking the Senate to pick a better path.

Sen. Stockwell asked the Parliamentarian O’Flaherty why the motion from the Elections Commission can be introduced and not the motion that Sen. Stockwell had introduced earlier at the Plenary. Parliamentarian O’Flaherty stated that the current motion did come from committee and that was why it could be voted on. Sen. Stockwell responded that the current motion was only introduced in the Plenary. Parliamentarian O’Flaherty responded that it came from a committee and that was the difference. Sen. Stockwell said that it didn’t seem right to him.

Sen. Stockwell continued, stating the By-Laws are clear that no Chair should be elected to the office more than three times. He stated that the language is clear and that there was no clear intention in the original amendment to not include previous terms. Sen. Stockwell stated that the Structure and Operations Committee attempted to clarify this issue previously but that the full Senate never voted on the issue. He said that it would not be appropriate to have the same group that will vote on this motion to be able to vote for the Chair of the Executive Committee. Sen. Stockwell added that the By-Laws are there to stop the Senate for continuously voting in the same person as Chair and that the term limits cannot be voted to be ignored, thus rendering them useless.

Sen. Williams-Bellamy began his comments by stating that this is a clear matter of textual analysis and interpretation. He thanked Sen. Stockwell for pointing out the specific language in the By-Laws and added that it would have been nonsensical for the original amendment to include provisions about the previous Chair elections. Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that, were the By-Laws amendment to apply to previous elections, it would have deemed some of the Chair elections of the past illegitimate. He stated that provisions of these types are not typically applied retroactively because it creates issues and imposes unfair limits and disadvantages to those who made the decision under one set of incentives and circumstances to a new set of incentives that didn’t apply when they made that decision. Sen. Williams-Bellamy noted also that, since the passage of the By-Laws, Sen. D’Armiento has only won two Chair elections and therefore can be elected again from a clear reading of the text. Tropper clarified that she interpreted the By-Laws to say that the Chair can only be elected for three consecutive terms and not three terms overall.

Sen. Gordon stated that the issue is simple and that he questioned whether the Elections Commission is the best way to move forward on issues like this in the future. He stated that there was a discussion among the Senate last fall, as Sen. Stockwell had mentioned, that determined to allow a person to run for a fourth term would require a supermajority Senate vote. Sen. Gordon said that this was a policy matter and that it would be odd to say that the Senate had a policy that applied to everyone except the current Chair. He said that, excluding an amendment similarly worded to the 21st Amendment, the interpretation is clear. Sen. Gordon said the reference to Robert’s Rules of Order was extraneous and created confusion and that this process calls into question of the Senate to govern itself moving forward.

Sen. Weiss stated that she ran on a platform of trying to put in term limits for all Senators. She stated that she was in favor of term limits in this case and putting even more limits moving forward.

Senator Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/HUM) stated that he also believed that this was a simple matter but that he saw it differently than how Sen. Gordon sees the issue. He stated that democracy is allergic to ex post facto laws and that the founding fathers, includes James Madison, spoke against ex post facto laws such as in Federalist Papers: No. 44. Sen. Slaughter stated it is a basic principle of fairness but also a principle used in how the University operates. He stated that, as an example, students are not asked to adhere to graduation requirements that change once they enter the University because they only have to adhere to the compact of the catalogue that was in place at the time of their admissions. Sen. Slaughter stated that a party cannot be altered by one party unilaterally and that someone cannot be punished for a crime that wasn't a crime at the activity. He added that the Senate has adhered to this principle numerous times over the past year, voting multiple times with a large majority against punishments handed out to students and student groups given ex post facto by senior administrators. Sen. Slaughter stated that the Columbia administration acknowledged that retroactive punishment was untenable and worked with the Senate to avoid doing so in the future. He added that term limits work similarly and that the first term of Sen. D'Armiento should not be counted against her. Sen. Slaughter said that he is for term limits on every position on the Senate, including his own. He stated that, if this conversation as really about term limits, then the Senate would also be discussing term limits for Sen. D'Armiento's opponent, Sen. Applegate, who Sen. Slaughter stated has served for more than 20 years on the Senate. Sen. Slaughter stated that, if the Senate today voted to restrict membership to three- or four-term limits or even something extraordinary like term-term limits, Sen. Slaughter would defend Sen. Applegate's ability to run for ten more terms, as the rule should not be applied retroactively. He ended by saying that laws and rules are future-oriented unless they specifically state otherwise.

Senator Sarah Hansen (TTOT, A&S/NS) moved that the Senate go to a vote on the proposal, which was seconded. The motion to move to a vote was passed 55-12-5 (in favor-opposed-abstained), meeting the two-thirds requirement to force movement to vote on a motion.

Provost Olinto reread the motion to be voted on, and the secret ballot was sent out. The motion to interpret the By-Laws to consider only elections for Chair held after December 11, 2020 was passed 52-19-3 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

May 2, 2025

**Proposal to Create a Commission on the Status of Health Sciences
as a Subcommittee of the Executive Committee
April 25, 2025**

I. Purpose and Mandate

The Commission on the Status of Health Sciences at Columbia University shall be charged by the Executive Committee of the University Senate to inquire into the consequences of the sudden loss of federal funding. This loss significantly affects all aspects of Health Sciences across the University. It is important to understand all near-, medium, and long-term implications of the loss of this funding, including but not limited to education, research, personnel, training, and patient care. These losses are concentrated at the Columbia University Irving Medical Center (CUIMC) but affect many other parts of the University as well.

The results of the Commission's studies and recommendations will be presented to the Executive Committee and the University Senate for discussion and implementation. The Commission shall provide an initial report by December 31, 2025 and shall complete its work no later than December 31, 2026, unless the Executive Committee approves extensions.

II. Overview of Health Sciences Senate Representation on the University Senate

The University Senate includes 43 tenured officers of instruction, 17 tenure-track and off-track (TTOT) officers of instruction, and 23 students from across Columbia. Of these, 13 (30%) of the tenured officers of instruction, 4 (24%) of the TTOT, and 4 (17%) of the students are from CUIMC. In addition, several members of the University Senate from Columbia schools beyond CUIMC work with and/or hold appointments in the Health Sciences.

III. Membership of the Commission

The Commission shall consist of thirteen (13) members appointed by the Executive Committee and apportioned as follows: 4 tenured officers of instruction from CUIMC, 1 tenured officer of instruction from outside of CUIMC, 3 TTOT from CUIMC, 1 TTOT from outside of CUIMC, 1 officer of research from CUIMC, 1 officer of research from outside of CUIMC, 1 student from CUIMC, and 1 student from outside of CUIMC. Of these 13 members, the majority shall be University Senators. Members of the Commission shall be selected so as to fully represent the Health Sciences across the University. In addition, the Executive Committee may invite a number of non-voting observers as needed to best address all issues considered.

University Senate

Proposed: May 2, 2025

Adopted: May 2, 2025

By unanimous acclaim

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM
LEADING TO THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ORAL SCIENCES**

College of Dental Medicine

WHEREAS the persistence of oral health diseases has revealed an urgent need to bolster the educational infrastructure to ensure the requisite scientific underpinnings to further knowledge and discovery in oral health sciences; and

WHEREAS the College of Dental Medicine has proposed a new program to address this need to provide graduate-level training in the biomedical sciences of oral health, and current laboratory methods and procedures, the Master of Science degree in Oral Sciences; and

WHEREAS the careers for which the program will qualify its graduates include academia, public health organizations, research institutes, and dentistry, and the degree can serve as a stepping stone to further education; and

WHEREAS the program would require 48 weeks of full-time study and completion of 30 credits; and

WHEREAS the program would expect to enroll 10 to 15 students per year when it reaches steady state, and to require no new courses or faculty; and

WHEREAS the University Senate Education Committee has favorably reviewed the program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approves the establishment of the Master of Science in Oral Sciences; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Education Committee will review the program five years after its launch, anticipated in Fall 2026.

Proponent: Education Committee



**Proposal for New Degree, New Degree from Existing Track, New Certificate, or
New Certification of Professional Achievement (CPA) Program**

Please insert the requested information in the table below:

Degree:	MS
Program Name:	Master's in Oral Sciences
If this program is currently a track in an existing program but has evolved as a stand-alone program, please indicate the program it's based on:	NA
Sponsoring School(s):	Columbia University College of Dental Medicine
Proposed Start Date:	7/1/26
Name and Email Address of the Primary Contact Person for this Proposal:	Michael Waring mww2101@cumc.columbia.edu
Date of Proposal Submission:	12/1/2024

Description of Proposed Program

Please complete the questions below and submit this document and the external reviewer list (if applicable) through the APAS system (<https://apas.provost.columbia.edu/>) to begin the review process. *Please note: Firefox is the recommended browser for APAS; functionality may be less optimal when using Internet Explorer or Chrome.*

1) Purpose

- A) Describe in 1-2 paragraphs the purpose of the proposed program, its target audience, its content, and its format/pedagogical approaches.

The Master's in Oral Science is designed to provide graduate level training in the biomedical sciences of oral health, and current laboratory methods and procedures. Graduates will learn how to conduct rigorous scientific studies, analyze data, and interpret findings. The program will combine didactic course work with lab experience culminating in a publishable research paper. Graduates can pursue roles in academia, research institutions, public health organizations or the degree can serve as a stepping-stone for further education, such as pursuing a Ph.D. Additionally, the scope of the curriculum can strengthen the candidacy of prospective dental school applicants.

The program will combine foundational sciences coursework from the DDS degree program and advanced foundational sciences coursework from the Postdoctoral programs.

DDS curriculum courses:

PATH 6371 Oral Pathology
ORBL 6110 Oral Histology
STOM 6904 Clinical Oral Pathology
INTC 6052 Cariology
TECH 4500 Data Science for Clinicians

These courses currently have 90 students enrolled and are taught in rooms that can accommodate far more students. We do not anticipate adding 10 – 15 more students will be a problem.

Postdoctoral program courses:

DNSC 9925 Oral Biology
EPID 6103 Intro to Bio Statistics
PDNT 9745 Scientific Writing
DNSC 9991 Thesis Seminar

These courses have enrollments for between 15 and 40 students.

In addition to the coursework listed above, students will become acquainted with ongoing research in the laboratories of CDM faculty involved in research on:

Biomaterials, Regenerative Biology, and Stem Cells

Biomaterials and Tumorigenesis

Microbial Pathogenesis/Microbiome

Neuroscience and Pain

Oropharyngeal Cancer

Pathobiology of Periodontal Disease

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

The following are ongoing programs in the College of Dental Medicine:

1. A four-year DDS curriculum (accredited by CODA) designed to train dental health care practitioners.
2. Two- to six-year postdoctoral study programs and residencies in 7 postdoctoral specialties.
3. Dual degrees with three other professional schools at Columbia University. Students must meet the admission requirements of both schools in order to participate in one of these programs.
 - a. Dual Degree with the Mailman School of Public Health (DDS/MPH)
 - b. Dual Degree with Teachers College (DDS/MA in Science and Dental Education)
 - c. Dual Degree with Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Science (DDS/PhD in Dental-Biomedical Engineering)
4. A two-and-a-half-year Advanced Standing Program for internationally trained dentists is designed for graduates of a recognized dental school outside of the United States who want to practice dentistry in the United States. This full-time program, accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) leads to the Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS) degree.

The proposed program is a free standing, one-year program that utilizes the strengths of the College of Dental Medicine's curricula for non-dentists who are interested in a career in dental research, prospective dental school applicants who wish to strengthen their candidacy for admission, or internationally trained dentists who seek admission into an Advanced Standing Program.

The program will not duplicate or replace any programs at CDM or the University.

2) Need

A) Why is the proposed program needed locally, statewide or nationally?

Laurie McCauley, D.D.S., Ph.D., nationally recognized in the field of oral sciences, provost and executive vice president for academic affairs at the University of Michigan recently commented on the need “to bolster and build our educational infrastructure to ensure we are training individuals with the scientific underpinnings to further our knowledge and discovery mission in oral health sciences. Although the number of schools and students in dentistry have increased over the past 20 years, the number of graduate programs and research degree candidates has not kept up. Without dedicated efforts to train the future scientific workforce, the gap between the evidence and its translation to clinical care will widen. To achieve optimal oral and overall health, the scientific workforce needs to be developed, nurtured, and supported to deploy the latest and best science and technology for the good of all people.”

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

Yes, especially during the application cycle for the Advanced Standing Program, which leads to a US DDS degree, a request for a program like this one comes from foreign-trained dentists who are U.S. citizens and Permanent Residents. In order to be able to practice in most of the US these dentists are required to enroll for 2-2.5 clinical academic years in a US dental school or 2-3 years in an Advanced General Dentistry Residency program. These programs are tuition-based and represent a significant investment. Unfortunately, the number of dentists who have been trained abroad vastly outnumbers the available positions in Advanced Standing Programs.

B)

The dental school accepts 15 students per year in its Advanced Standing Program.

As the below indicates it turns down hundreds of applicants each year many of which could benefit from the proposed program.

We have 15 positions available each year and we have received:

- 703 applications to the Class of 2027
- 754 applications to the Class of 2026
- 348 applications to the Class of 2025

The overall goal is strengthening the candidacy of prospective dental school applicants by providing background, expertise and current concepts of basic sciences as related to dentistry. The applicants are individuals who want to have the opportunity to practice dentistry in the U.S. and are willing to make the sacrifices that will allow them to fulfill their dreams. This is an opportunity for them to pursue the career for which they were originally educated. Places like Columbia, Harvard, Penn, UCONN and Michigan would think highly of applicants with this M.S. credential.

C) If the program is professionally oriented, have persons in the profession requested establishment of the program? A recent NIH report “Oral Health in American: Advances and Challenges” (2021) concluded that “to strengthen the oral health workforce we need to ensure a strong research enterprise dedicated to improving oral health”[and] improving access to oral

health care can be achieved by (...) providing educational opportunities that encourage inter-professional learning.”

- D) What other institutions in the New York metropolitan area and in the Northeast offer similar programs? Harvard, Rutgers

3) Curriculum

- A) Provide a brief summary of the program, in the form of a one-paragraph catalogue or website description.
- B) The Master’s in Oral Science is designed to provide graduate level training in the biomedical sciences of oral health, and current laboratory methods and procedures. Graduates will learn how to conduct rigorous scientific studies, analyze data, and interpret findings. The program will combine didactic course work with lab experience culminating in a publishable research paper. Graduates can pursue roles in academia, research institutions, public health organizations. Additionally, the degree can serve as a stepping stone for further education, such as pursuing a Ph.D. or as a way to strengthen the candidacy of prospective dental school applicants.

- C) Indicate the **minimum total number of credits** (or clock hours, as appropriate) required for completion of the program, as well as any other program requirements (e.g., final paper, field placement, capstone project). For Bachelor’s programs, please indicate both the total number of credits required for graduation (e.g., 124 or 128), as well as the minimum number of credits within the major or concentration. Also note that the **minimum number of credits is 30 for Master’s programs, 20-24 for Certificate programs, and 12 for Certification of Professional Achievement (CPA) programs.**

30

- D) Please use the table below to list the required, elective, and selective coursework. “Selective” coursework consists of a list of courses from which a student must select a minimum number of credits (but need not take all courses on the list).

REQUIRED COURSES		Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
Minimum number of required credits = <u>30</u>	School				
	CDM	PATH 6371	Oral Pathology	Not online	1
	CDM	ORBL 6110	Oral Histology	Not online	5

	CDM	DNSC 9925	Oral Biology	Not online	4
	CDM	EPIO6103P	Intro to Bio Statistics	Not online	3
	CDM	PDNT 9745	Scientific Writing	Not online	3
	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)		Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
	CDM	STOM6904	Clinical Oral Pathology	Not online	1
	CDM	INTC6052	Cariology	Not online	4
	CDM	TECH 4500	Data Science for Clinicians	Not online	3
	CDM		Thesis Seminar	Not online	6
ELECTIVE COURSES					
Minimum number of elective credits = _____	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits

(Please add new rows above as needed.)

- E) Provide a sample schedule showing the courses the students will take during each semester of the program. For elective or selective courses, simply enter “elective” or “selective.”

Semester 1 (indicate Summer Fall)			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
PATH 6371 Oral Pathology	1	no	no
ORBL 6110 Oral Histology	5	no	no
DNSC 9925 Oral Biology	4	no	no
EPIO6103P Intro to Bio Statistics	3	no	no
PDNT 9745 Scientific Writing	3	no	no
		no	no
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	16		
Semester 2 (Spring)			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
STOM6904 Clinical Oral Pathology	1	no	no

INTC6052 Cariology	4	no	no
TECH 4500 Data Science for Clinicians	3	no	no
Thesis Seminar	6	no	no
		no	no
		no	no
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	14		
Semester 3 (indicate Fall, Spring, or Summer)			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:			
Semester 4 (indicate Fall, Spring, or Summer)			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:			

(Repeat or extend table as needed for additional semesters.)

- F) Please provide the typical number of weeks in the Academic Year for this program, counting Fall and Spring semesters. Note that regulations define a “week” as any 7-day period in which ANY instructional activity occurs; this includes classes, discussion sections, labs, exam periods, and study periods. A single activity in a given week counts as a week of school. Virtually the only weeks not to be counted are orientation week and vacation weeks.

48

- G) Please also indicate the number of weeks IN TOTAL that it would take a typical full-time student to complete the program. For example, for a one-year MS program, which can typically be completed in Fall and Spring semesters, you would likely provide the same answer you gave immediately above (for weeks in the academic year). If a program requires 2 years of study, then you would multiply the number of weeks in the academic year by 2. If Summer terms are included, please include 6-10 weeks, as appropriate, for each Summer term.

48

- H) Does the proposed program rely to a significant extent on courses that are offered by other parts of the University? If so, identify those courses and confirm that you have discussed course availability and capacity with the unit in which those courses are housed.

No

- I) For any new courses to be developed for this program, provide a draft syllabus and include information on when the courses have been or will be approved by the appropriate Committee(s) on Instruction.

NA

- J) Indicate whether course credits earned in the proposed program can also be counted toward another degree or certificate.

Yes

- K) Please provide a proposed CIP code for the program. A full list of CIP codes can be found [here](#). Please choose the CIP code that most closely aligns with the program. For CIP codes that are defined as STEM, the University requires 75% or more of a program curriculum to be STEM-related, particularly as regards to required courses that all students need to take.

CIP CODE: 51.0599

4) Library Resources

Have you consulted with a library subject specialist about what library resources (e.g., books, databases, journals, streaming video or audio, data sets, etc.) or other support (research consultations, library instruction, etc.) you anticipate needing for this program? If yes, please list those resources expected.

The program is based on currently taught courses that have established library resources.

5) Faculty

- A) Provide the name of the program director and the percent of time this individual will dedicate to leadership of the program.

Dr. Moss-Salentijn will provide 20% of her time to academic oversight of the program and its contents. She will conduct and evaluate annual course content, faculty surveys and student evaluations. She will appoint and work with a Faculty Committee consisting of 7 members with a rotating membership of 3 years. This committee will supervise the appointments of research mentors, research assignments and progress of the enrolled students, as well as the quality and defense of their thesis.

Dr. Fine will extend his current administrative responsibilities for all the postdoctoral programs in the College of Dental Medicine (except the DDS degree program) to include the new Master's Degree program. He will oversee all administrative functions of the program (admissions, registration, tuition, student support).

- B) Indicate if the program will require the hiring of new faculty either at its inception or by the time it reaches steady state. If so, indicate the number of new faculty it will require, divided between full- and part-time, the subjects they will teach, and the year(s) of their initial appointment.

No

6) Students

- A) Describe the requirements for admission to the program.

Applicants must have a bachelor's degree from an accredited U.S. or Canadian college or university, or a professional degree in dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, or other relevant professional field that is the U.S. equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

Applicants must submit the following items as part of the admission process

- A completed online application, with the following supporting documents:
- Academic transcripts
- Personal statement
- Resume or curriculum vitae
- Two letters of recommendation

Applicants with a bachelor's degree from a school outside of the U.S. or Canada are required to submit a course-by-course evaluation from Educational Credential Evaluators (ECE) and official Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). The ECE evaluation must verify equivalency to a bachelor's degree from a regionally-accredited U.S. institution

- B) Provide the anticipated enrollments of students in the program's first five years, and ultimate enrollment once it reaches steady state. Indicate the number of years it will take to grow the program to its full size.

10-15

- C) If this is a dual-degree program, either between schools of the University or a joint program in collaboration with another institution, describe the support the students will receive from the participating schools or institutions and how the program will ensure that they have access to the courses and resources they will need to complete its requirements.

No

- D) Describe the types of jobs or careers for which the program will qualify its students.

Academia

Public Health

Research

Dentistry

7) Online Delivery. If the proposed program will have an on-line component, answer the following questions. NA

- A) Confirm whether the online and in-person programs will be identical with respect to content, admission criteria, student learning objectives, and assessment methods; and if not, indicate how they will differ.
- B) What percentage of the program will be offered online?
- C) Please describe:
- a. The on-line platform you will be using to teach this program;
 - b. Student support resources that will be available to the on-line students;
 - c. How you will authenticate the identity of the on-line students in the program.

8) Evaluation

- A) Describe how the quality of the program will be evaluated, including the frequency of the reviews and who will conduct them. Describe how student input will be obtained as part of the evaluation of the program.

The quality of the program is continuously monitored by the program director for ongoing planning, evaluation and improvement of the program. During monthly faculty meetings, program improvement measures are planned and presented to the faculty for discussion, after which they are implemented and evaluated. Students will meet with program directors each semesters for informal discussions and the MS Committee will elicit formal student reviews at the end of each semester.

- B) Include a learning outcomes and assessment plan for the proposed program, using the below template.

Program Learning Objectives (PLOs) for Students	Assessment of Learning Outcomes
Please list overall programmatic goals below.	Please indicate primary measures of student learning, which may include direct measures (e.g., coursework) and indirect measures (e.g., alumni outcomes).

PLO 1: 1.To produce competent researchers in the field of Oral Science that will be equipped to publish original research	Number of publications
PLO 2: To provide foundational academic research skills that will allow students to pursue PhD programs	PhD program acceptance rates.
PLO 3: To strengthen students' academic credentials for applying to dental school.	Dental school acceptance rates.
PLO 4: To produce competent researchers in the field of Oral Science that will be equipped to work in research labs.	Alumni employment rates
PLO 5:	

(You may add more rows to the table above as needed.)

9) External Review for NEW Master's and Doctoral Programs.

Dr. Kenneth Markowitz- Rutgers

Dr. Uri Hangorsky – University of Pennsylvania

Please provide the names of experts in the field of the program at institutions outside of New York State. Proposed reviewers should be specialists in the area of the program but should not have had an association with Columbia that would compromise the independence of their evaluations. NYSED considers that a conflict of interest exists if a proposed reviewer:

- has had an appointment at the University or is related to someone who has;
- was previously consulted about the development of the proposed program; or
- has a professional relationship with someone at the University such as collaborating on externally funded research and publications.

For new master's programs, the University must supply one external review; for doctoral programs, two external reviews are required. For this reason, please identify 3 potential reviewers for master's proposals, and 5 potential reviewers for doctoral proposals.

For each potential reviewer, include institutional affiliation, contact information and a link to the individual's website which lists his/her educational credential (including where his/her degrees were received) and employment history. If full information on degrees and employment cannot be viewed from the website, NYSED may require that we supply them with the individual's CV.

Please note that this requirement does not apply to new DUAL or JOINT degree programs, or to new BACHELOR's programs; we do not need to submit external reviews for these programs.

University Senate

Proposed: May 2, 2025

Adopted: May 2, 2025

47-3-0: In favor-opposed-abstained

RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE STATEMENT OF CONCERN

WHEREAS the Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee has written this statement to register its deep concern over the current state and future direction of Columbia University, an institution we all love, cherish and embody;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate endorse the aforementioned Statement of Concern.

Proponent: Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Statement of Concern

April 25, 2025

We write this statement to the Board of Trustees and Acting President Claire Shipman as faculty senators representing the tenured, tenure-track, and off-track faculty at Columbia University to register our deep concern over the current state and future direction of Columbia University, an institution we all love, cherish, and embody.

Our concerns arise from certain passages in the University's unsigned letter of March 21, 2025, written in response to a letter dated March 13, 2025, that made allegations about and demands of Columbia on behalf of the federal government. Columbia University's response seems to indicate an institutional willingness to acquiesce to alleged violations of Title VI and Title VII – seemingly repeating the Congressional hearings of April 17, 2024 – in an apparent effort to prevent further stoppages of already allocated federal funding. These acts by the government are in contravention of established procedural rules and safeguards and likely violate not only the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment but also Title VI itself. The federal demands also include changes to student disciplinary policies and procedures as well as to certain rules of university governance, campus security, and campus life that threaten to undermine two key principles and trusted values of our academic community, namely academic freedom and shared governance. Put simply, we do not believe that the Board of Trustees or the Acting President should assume singular authority and responsibility to make such changes without consultation with and possibly veto from faculty through established channels of shared governance. We direct your attention to the following passages of the Senate's Resolution (February 2, 2024) Reconfirming our Commitment to the Principles of Academic Freedom and Shared Governance):

- 8(a): Academic activities at Columbia are subject to review set by normal institutional processes in accordance with best professional practice.
- 8(e): University policy in general should arise from mechanisms of shared governance, and should not be set by, or in deference to, entities external to the institution or those mechanisms.
- The University Senate, as the representative body of all University constituencies and the statutory

policy-making body of the University concerning matters of academic freedom as provided by in the University Statutes §23(c), has an historic and vital role to play in convening and fostering further discussion, articulation, and/or ratification of principles around academic freedom and the rights and responsibilities that obtain to it.

While we are reassured somewhat by Acting President Shipman's message to the community of Mon. April 14 affirming her commitment to some of these principles, we recognize many of them still hang in the balance, and wish to remind you of the Senate's position on and interest in these matters.

Moreover, we are concerned about the Board of Trustees' recent decision to appoint one of their own members and co-chairs to serve as Acting President of the University following the departure of Katrina Armstrong as Interim President. In our opinion, the appointment of a co-chair of the Board of Trustees as Acting President removes one of the three key pillars of shared governance – namely, a president who provides independent academic leadership – that is essential to the function of our institution's shared governance structure. This appointment collapses the governance structure into only two pillars, the Board of Trustees and the University Senate.

In light of these concerns, and the extraordinary external pressures faced by our institution and the community of scholars and students, we ask the Board of Trustees and the Acting President of Columbia University to reaffirm their commitment to the principles of academic freedom and shared governance. More specifically, we ask the Board of Trustees and the Acting President to:

- (1) Preserve the core value of academic freedom with respect for established academic procedures concerning curriculum, appointments, policies, and reporting structures. The commitment to these principles has been fundamental to the success of American research universities being the best in the world.
- (2) Strengthen the role of faculty, students, and other members of the Columbia community in important decisions of the University by preserving the role and maintaining the autonomy of the Senate.
- (3) Affirm that no individual, organization, or entity outside the university proper shall determine the curriculum, appointments, policies, and reporting structures of our university.

- (4) Defend and protect international faculty, students, and scholars, and provide legal assistance to those affected by government overreach.
- (5) Most importantly, we urge the leadership not to enter into a consent agreement or similar judicially overseen arrangement with the federal government that would allow restructuring of the roles of students and faculty in our governance, interference with our presidential search process, disruption of academic freedom, or reporting of students charged with conduct violations to the government.

University Senate

Proposed: May 2, 2025

Adopted: May 2, 2025

46-3-1: In favor-opposed-abstained

**RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE STATEMENT ON
MAHMOUD KHALIL AND MOHSEN MAHDAWI**

WHEREAS the Student Affairs Committee has written this statement to voice its concern over the targeting of international students by federal agencies, particularly those from politically marginalized regions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate endorse the aforementioned Statement on Mahmoud Khalil and Mohsen Mahdawi.

Proponents:

Student Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee

Commission on Diversity

Commission on the Status of Women

Proposed: May 2, 2025

Adopted: May 2, 2025

46-3-1: In favor-opposed-abstained

Statement on Mahmoud Khalil and Mohsen Mahdawi

April 25, 2025

On Monday, April 14, 2025, **Mohsen Mahdawi**, a General Studies student and U.S. Green Card holder, was detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in Vermont while attending an appointment to complete his citizenship exam. Mr. Mahdawi is the second member of the Columbia community to be taken into federal custody in recent weeks. This follows the detainment without a warrant, on March 8, 2025, of **Mahmoud Khalil**, a recent School of International and Public Affairs alumnus and U.S. Green Card holder, in the lobby of his Columbia-owned residential building.

These incidents reflect a disturbing escalation in the targeting of international students by federal agencies, particularly those from politically marginalized regions. Several student groups and organizations on campus have published statements condemning the arrests, and we join these groups to voice our concern over these troubling events.

To be silent in the face of these detainments is a grave injustice to Mr. Mahdawi and Mr. Khalil, and a failure of responsibility to our international community of students and scholars who are integral to the intellectual and institutional life and mission of Columbia. The [University Mission Statement](#) expressly states that Columbia “seeks to attract a diverse and international faculty, staff, and student body, to support research and teaching on global issues, and to create academic relationships with many countries and regions.” To date both Mr. Mahdawi and Mr. Khalil have been denied due process. These students explicitly expressed their non-violent philosophy and were reliable mediators in de-escalating situations on campus. Detaining our students without due process compromises the safety and free speech rights of all in our community and is antithetical to the democratic principles upon which Columbia University must stand.

To silently stand aside while our students are wrongfully detained violates the trust of our campus community, undermines the fundamental principles of our [University Statutes](#), and betrays our international students, faculty, and staff. Therefore, we unequivocally denounce the federal agencies’ deployment of carceral measures without due process and the weaponization of law enforcement to intimidate our students and silence our community. We ask and expect Columbia University to join with our peer institutions in unequivocally rejecting federal violations of Constitutional rights and fundamental freedoms of members of campus communities, and to join with our peers in defending our universities and their members.

We reaffirm our commitment to engage respectfully across our differences and reaffirm our commitment to our inherently multifaceted and richly international University.

University Senate Student Affairs Committee

Student Affairs Committee Year Report

Plenary May 2, 2025

This academic year has been one of extraordinary challenge, change, and resilience. On behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, we would like to highlight the work we have accomplished, reflect on our shared efforts, and reaffirm our unwavering commitment to student inclusion, shared governance, and the values that define our University.

Achievements Over the Past Year

- The Student Affairs Committee has remained steadfast in advocating for the student body across all campuses. This year, our committee:
- Secured the rededication of Lerner Hall as a true student space, thanks to a historic resolution adopted in collaboration with Campus Planning and Physical Development and the Commission on Diversity
- Stood up regarding urgent concerns on due process, transparency, and student input in University decision-making, including public safety policies, space access, and academic freedom.
- Played a key role in the implementation and ongoing review of the Rules of University Conduct, hosting listening sessions and ensuring students are actively part of shaping campus policy

These efforts were rooted in crucial dialogue and guided by the belief that students must not only be heard but empowered as co-authors of our University's future.

Recommitment to Shared Governance

In times of institutional uncertainty and external pressure, the Student Affairs Committee has consistently upheld the Senate's founding principle of shared governance. We reiterate today: student perspectives must be integrated into every layer of University decision-making, not as symbolic gestures, but as partners with real influence and responsibility.

- We are grateful for the leadership of the Executive Committee and the Chair of the Executive Committee, whose consistent defense of academic freedom, freedom of speech, and inclusive governance has made clear that these are not abstract ideals but necessary foundations for institutional integrity
- We also thank the professors and administrators who, at critical moments, stood firmly for students' rights, for open debate, and for due process. Your courage helped preserve the University's commitment to its highest mission: the pursuit of knowledge in a space of freedom and safety for all.

Student Engagement

Given the Senate's unique position as a nexus linking all of Columbia's schools and affiliates, the Student Affairs Committee has sought to increase student awareness of Senate's work and provide a platform for the collective voice of all of our constituents. With new initiatives and modes of communication, student engagement with the Senate has exploded to new heights.

- Our monthly SAC newsletter keeps every student at Columbia and its affiliates informed of the Senate's current initiatives and other programs and events happening across the University.
- SAC has hosted several public town halls this year that have attracted students by the hundreds to hear from SAC leaders and give us questions and feedback about the current state of affairs at Columbia.
- New efforts to bring SAC into more direct partnerships with the leadership of each school's student council has resulted in greater coordination and collaboration amongst the different zones of student leadership at Columbia.

Items of Continuation

As we look ahead, the Committee remains focused on:

- Continued implementation of dedicated student spaces (notably for first-generation and low-income students)
- Supporting the newly launched Office of Institutional Equity and holding it accountable to its promise of inclusive, anti-discriminatory action while following due process.
- Monitoring campus access and public safety reforms to ensure they protect all students while respecting academic liberty and due process
- Collaborating on the University's reaccreditation process, ensuring the student experience is central to Columbia's mission.

Gratitude

We close by extending deep appreciation to the Columbia University Senate as a whole, to the Senate Office for their tireless behind-the-scenes work, and to every senator who has demonstrated a commitment to transparency, fairness, and the University's core values.

To our student members: your voice, advocacy, and courage have made this committee what it is. Your leadership matters. And to those continuing on: the work is not done.

Together, we renew our shared purpose: to ensure Columbia remains a place where student voices are not only heard, but respected and upheld in action.

Thank you.

Rules Committee Update on UJB Announcements
April 30, 2025

For the past half-century, the Committee on the Rules of University Conduct has aimed to ensure that everyone at Columbia is able to exercise their right to free speech and that alleged violations of the Rules are resolved in a manner that respects due process while protecting the essential functions of the University. In pursuit of these aims, the Committee has worked with each successive administration in Low Library as a partner in the stewardship of Columbia's expressive environment. It is because we fear this partnership is under threat that we issue this statement.

On March 21, 2025, in response to a letter from the federal government, the administration announced two significant changes to the University Judicial Board (UJB), whose mandate and membership are described in § 445(c) of the University Statutes. These changes involve removing students from UJB panels and placing the UJB under the purview of the Office of the Provost. Following this announcement, the Committee privately voiced its concern to the administration that, pursuant to § 452(c) of the University Statutes, any such restructuring of the UJB would need to be approved first by the University Senate and then by the Board of Trustees. The Committee was assured that this process would be followed. After the departure of Interim President Armstrong and the appointment of Acting President Shipman, however, the Committee was informed that no proposal would be brought to the Senate, no vote would be taken, and these reforms to the UJB would be effectuated by the Trustees alone.

This course of action troubles us greatly. The UJB is a direct result of the Rules of University Conduct. And the text of § 452(c) makes clear that “[a]ll changes in these Rules shall be passed by the University Senate for approval and acceptance by the Trustees in accordance with the Statutes of the University.” The only possible grounds on which the Trustees could unilaterally reconfigure the UJB, accordingly, are if (1) they believe their “reserve power” under § 23 and § 24 of the University Statutes authorizes them to do so; or if (2) they believe they are not bound to follow the Statutes. Yet the Trustees have not to our knowledge invoked their reserve power, which is never defined by the Statutes and which threatens to swallow them unless it is applied with scrupulous transparency and constraint. The proposition that the Trustees are not bound by the Statutes, meanwhile, is inconsistent with basic premises of shared governance and the internal rule of law.

The existence, structure, and powers of the UJB and the Senate as a whole, as specified in the University Statutes, grew out of an intense deliberative process undertaken by the administration, the Trustees, the faculty, and the student body in the wake of the 1968 disturbances. Although this framework may have flaws, it has served Columbia well for more than five decades. The Committee on the Rules of University Conduct has no objection to reassessing the design of the UJB or the Rules in light of current challenges; indeed, § 452(d) of the University Statutes *requires* that the Committee periodically “facilitate a public discussion, engaging faculty,

students, and staff, about whether revision of the Rules is merited.” What the Statutes plainly do not contemplate is revision by Trustee fiat.

The Committee therefore calls on the Trustees and the Acting President to draw on the experience and diverse viewpoints of the Committee in considering any reforms to the UJB, to participate in shared governance with the Senate more generally, and to work in good faith toward any desired revisions of the Rules following the procedures outlined in the University Statutes.

Signed,

The Committee on the Rules of University Conduct