

University Senate Plenary

February 6, 2026



University Senate

Proposed: February 6, 2026

Adopted: February 6, 2026

University Senate

Friday, February 6, 2026 at 1:15 p.m., via Zoom

[Registration required](#)

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

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of December 12, 2025
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions
5. New business:
 - a. Resolutions:
 - i. Resolution to Approve an Academic Program Leading to the Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience (Teachers College) (Education)
 - b. Committee reports and updates:
 - i. Introduction of a proposal for a Professor of Instruction Track (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)
 - ii. Campus climate: Gym access and dining hall initiatives (Student Affairs)
 - iii. An update from the Rules of University Conduct Committee
 - iv. Forum on University Governance (External Relations and Research Policy)
6. Any other business
7. Adjourn

University Senate | Parliamentary Procedure Quick Guide: February 6, 2026

1. **Quorum:** Half of all sitting Senators (typically 90 to 111 senators). The online list of participants is the basis for determining a quorum. (A Senator may ask for an aural quorum call during the meeting—so stay awake and don't walk away.) If you are not speaking, please try to be muted at most times.
2. **Signing in.** Please rename yourself when you enter the meeting by putting "Sen" in front of your name. This helps everyone identify you as a Senator during the meeting.
3. **Voting**
 - 3.1. Only Senators present may vote. "Present" means on the online list of participants during the vote.
 - 3.2. **How to vote:** Generally you vote by raising your virtual hand.
 - 3.3. **Confidential votes:** Occasionally Senators request a confidential ballot. If this happens, please make sure you have access to your CU email account so you can vote.
 - 3.4. **Default:** A motion passes if more Senators vote for than against it. (This always applies to amendments to motions even if the main motion requires a super-majority.)
 - 3.5. **Exceptions**
 - 3.5.1. **Parliamentary exceptions:** 2/3 vote required for certain motions. The motion passes only if twice as many Senators vote for as vote against it. This includes:
 - Previous question (close debate and vote)
 - Suspend the rules (allow something normally not allowed)
 - Change the order of business
 - Limit or extend debate
 - 3.5.2. **University Senate exceptions:** Several kinds of actions require at least 3/5 of all Senators to vote in favor. None of these are on the agenda for this meeting.
4. **Debate**
 - 4.1. Only Senators can speak, with limited exceptions (officers of schools or committee members presenting reports)
 - 4.2. You ask to speak by raising your virtual hand. You may speak only when the chair calls upon you. Remember to unmute yourself. Please lower your virtual hand and mute yourself when you are finished.
 - 4.3. **Germane:** Speak only about the merits of the motion on the floor
 - 4.4. **Courteous:** Never speak ill of another Senator
 - 4.5. **Brief:** No more than 10 minutes without permission of the Senate (2/3 vote)
 - 4.6. **Engaged:** No reading from lengthy documents without permission (2/3 vote)

4.7. Don't hog the floor: Don't speak more than twice on same motion without permission (2/3 vote)

5. Amendment Rules

5.1. Must be germane to the main motion

5.2. Cannot just reverse the main motion

5.3. Can be amended only once (no amendments to amendments of amendments)

5.4. Must be voted on before the main motion. (To postpone a vote on an amendment, you must postpone the vote on the main motion)

6. Some privileged and incidental motions: Almost always in order.

6.1. Point of order: To point out that the rules are not being followed. Chair rules on it immediately.

Chair's decision may be appealed. Appeal is decided by majority vote—ties go to the chair.

6.2. Point of privilege (personal or general): To point out an urgent condition preventing one or more Senators from fully participating. Chair rules on it immediately and acts.

6.3. Call for the order of the day: If the Senate is not following its agenda. Chair rules immediately.

6.4. Adjourn. To close the meeting.

Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 2025

79 out of 107 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 fourth Plenary of the 2025-2026 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 November 21, 2025 Plenary.

Senator Mahmood Mamdani (Ten., A&S/SS) stated that he wanted to get a sense of the administration’s understanding of where the University is currently, noting the concerns of students after a period of intense fragmentation. Sen. Mamdani asked Sen. D’Armiento about the initiatives the Senate is working on to bring the community together. Sen. D’Armiento thanked Sen. Mamdani for his comments and noted that she believed that the University Senate is moving toward greater interaction with the President and she hoped that President Shipman could speak to this.

Updates from President Shipman

President Claire Shipman began her remarks by thanking the University Senate and the deep sense of responsibility the Senate feels toward the institution, noting that the year has been challenging in many ways. She stated that she feels hopeful about progress being made when everyone leads with transparency, respect, and a commitment toward the greater good of the University. President Shipman stated that working through difficult issues is likely what it means to be a great institution. President Shipman stated that Senator Peter Coleman (Ten., TC) has been leading an effort to [document the things that are working](#)

[well to bridge divisions](#) as the University begins to move forward and encouraged community members to send information to Sen. Coleman to support his efforts. President Shipman also noted that there was progress on making [buildings no longer swipe-access-only](#), noting that there are further discussions about when and how to make campus fully reopen. She stated the other major aspect she has been working on is the quality-of-life concerns for undergraduate and graduate students, noting that she has been meeting with a number of students over the semester. President Shipman stated that some groups of students were deeply concerned along the lines of what concerns Sen. Mamdani had raised, while other students were focused on the lack of space that has also hindered the ability for students to have a social life. She noted that library and dining hall space were two particular space issues being discussed. President Shipman stated there were various groups and committees involving students, staff, faculty, and alumni being put together in order to best address these issues. She stated that these efforts would gather data in the first few months of the 2026 year to move forward on these issues. President Shipman stated that the other major focus has been on watching what is happening in Washington D.C. and how the government responds to the [indirect cost model proposals](#). She stated that the administration is working with the Deans with regards to [upcoming limits to federal loans imposed on students](#), noting that the administration is working on finding on alternative lenders and that they expect to be working on this for the rest of the year given the potential impact it will have on a number of Schools. President Shipman stated that the [Provost's Advisory Committee on Academic Freedom](#) has been excellent in handling a lot of the issues that have surfaced and that they will have a robust set of recommendations to give to Provost Olinto soon. She stated that faculty had raised concerns that the agreement with the government would stifle the faculty's speech and create a chilling effect on speech in the classroom. President Shipman stated that the international students continue to be afraid to take leadership roles on controversial things because they are worried they will be targeted online or by the government. She stated that the administration is trying to support these students but that there are certain things outside the campus that the administration cannot control. President Shipman stated that she has been trying to understand what type of support is most critical for students at this time and enable them more able to have a voice. She stated that a lot of the work she has done with students has been done behind-the-scenes. President Shipman stated that her main goal the last few months has been to listen to what the community thinks that it needs, noting that a big plan from the central administration may not be the most effective path forward. She stated that an organically grown plan will be more likely to succeed.

Senator David Lurie (Ten., A&S/HUM) asked about the [matter he raised at the previous plenary](#), noting that the policy to require faculty to get permission to post on their doors remains in effect ([University Posting Policy](#)). He noted that the [Spectator published an article](#) on this. Sen. Lurie asked President Shipman if she has had a chance to follow up on this, noting concern about the policy and the process by which the policy was implemented without consultation or notification. President Shipman responded that she thought that the policy had been clarified. She stated that this policy had gone through the [Administrative Policy Advisory Council](#) (APAC) that has around 30 members. President Shipman stated that this Council has representatives from across the University, including the University Senate, and that the policy had been decided before the 2025-26 school year began. Sen. D'Armiento responded that this council is not a policy-making body and had been formed by the Administration without University Senate involvement. President Shipman stated that there needs to be a procedure to ensure that the Senate or other communities are not surprised by the administration and she agreed that more consultation is needed on policies.

Senator Kim Phillips-Fein (Ten., A&S/SS) raised a concern from a constituent regarding a disciplinary situation of a senior in the School of General Studies who was suspended in the middle of the fall for the rest of the academic year, noting that the offense was sharing their ID with another student who had previously participated in protests and was currently suspended. Sen. Phillips-Fein stated that the constituent noted that there were no protests ongoing when the ID was shared and there were no issues reported with the suspended student being on campus. She stated that, despite no issues reported, the student, who is an international student, has been suspended for the remainder of the academic year, raising financial, career, educational, and, most importantly, visa issues. Sen. Phillips-Fein asked if President Shipman had any reflections on this sanction and how the severity of such a sanction might affect campus culture. President Shipman responded that she is not involved in the disciplinary process or sanctioning and that, in her role, she believes it is important to leave that work to the respective faculty committees. She stated that she believes that there is a sense of trying to sanction while also educate, which is critical, but that she does not believe it is her role to weigh in on individual cases.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) stated that she was saddened by the harsh punishment of students that Sen. Phillips-Fein had just shared. Sen. Bernofsky asked President Shipman about the Columbia Board of Trustees, noting that the current Board has 24 members, significantly less than other peer

institutions, and has a higher percentage of members from the financial sector in comparison to academic and the public sphere than other peer universities. Sen. Bernofsky noted that the Columbia Board of Trustees has no elected members, which is also different from other peer institutions. She added that the Columbia Board of Trustees provides less transparency, refusing to hold open meetings with students and staff. Sen. Bernofsky stated that the [Columbia University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors \(AAUP\)](#) has called for [reform of the Board of Trustees](#) with specific points of critique and improvement and asked President Shipman if she had seen these suggestions and had any thoughts on the matter. President Shipman stated that the size of the Board of Trustees is designated in the University Statutes and that many public universities have larger boards due to their duties as a public institution. She stated that the Board of Trustees has been looking at itself deeply over the past few months with a recognition that there should be more transparency and access to the Board of Trustees but that there is currently a lot of engagement, even if this is not obvious to groups of faculty and students. President Shipman stated that there has been a tradition of having Senate members at Board of Trustees meetings. She stated that she has seen the AAUP recommendations but had not read it in detail, noting that she could not really weigh in on specific aspects but that this was part of a larger conversation about the atmosphere on campus and rebuilding trust. Sen. Bernofsky responded that it was in response to the [Robert Hadden case](#) that the question of the fiduciary responsibility of the Board of Trustees has gained importance. President Shipman responded that she understood.

Senator Gregory Mann (Ten., A&S/SS) asked for clarification of President Shipman's ability to offer clemency for students facing discipline, asking if President Shipman would consider doing so to boost morale on campus for students. Sen. Mann asked about the [freezing of salaries that was previously discussed at the last plenary](#), noting that, this week, the faculty in the Arts & Sciences received a letter saying that their salaries would increase. He thanked the administration for this work. Sen. Mann stated that his constituents have raised concern that the Columbia health insurance monopoly has been given to United Healthcare and that co-pays have gone up 33 percent. He stated that people are struggling to cover costs for their whole families and are opting for lower-tier options that are insufficient. Sen. Mann asked what the point was of giving a monopoly to United Healthcare if the faculty cannot benefit from integration of the economy of scale. He also asked about United Healthcare Medicare being defined as no longer in-network, meaning that active faculty members will lose access to their doctors in January and were unaware of this during open enrollment. Sen. Mann stated that these faculty thought that they were

signing up for one type of healthcare and then found out upon going to the doctor that they are actually losing healthcare. He noted that these issues were important for faculty that are considering retirement in the near future and that it would increase morale to know that the administration has the backs of faculty in these negotiations. President Shipman responded that she did not know that level of detail regarding the health insurance issues but understood the concern. She stated that she would raise the issue with HR, noting that getting more information to the community would be helpful. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Senate [Budget Committee](#) has been attempting to raise these issues with the administration. She stated that the Senate has questioned why United Healthcare was the company chosen and has proposed a review of these systems, including why premiums have increase by 20 percent. Sen. D'Armiento clarified that the Senate only consults the administration regarding the budget and had warned the administration around these issues and that United Healthcare has been a big issue for many community members and patients. She stated that NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital has not come to an agreement with United Healthcare, which would create a problem for Columbia physicians who are employed by the hospital but fall under United Healthcare coverage. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Senate has been pushing HR on this issue. President Shipman stated that she would raise the issue to get further clarification.

Senator Eli Baum (Stu., CC) stated that he wanted to ask about similar concerns as Sen. Bernofsky regarding the Columbia Board of Trustees. He stated that he had [previously raised concerns](#) about Trustee Shoshana Shendelman remaining on the Board of Trustees despite the [FDA finding her guilty of tampering with medical data in order to get a pediatric drug approved and being removed from her company as a result](#). Sen. Baum stated that, since his previous comments, he had realized that Trustee Shendelman's company Applied Therapeutics had been made with Columbia licensing, patents, and personnel. He added that the [public licensing agreement for Applied Therapeutics](#) states that the "Company and its Affiliates shall ensure that research, development, manufacturing and marketing [...] complies with all government regulations" as well as outlined requirements for transparency. Sen. Baum stated that he understood he may not have all the details given that not everything is in the public records and that he planned to follow up with General Counsel but asked President Shipman if there has been any discussion of Trustee Shendelman's company paying damages to Columbia for potentially having breached a contract with the University and how President Shipman views a conflict of interest between a Trustee's company and the University. President Shipman responded that in her role currently that she is not in the position to comment on individual Board of Trustees member but that she feels these concerns reflect the lack of trust

among the Columbia community over the difficult few years the University has had. She stated that she knows that there is an effort to make sure that all the members of the Board of Trustees are held to the highest standards. President Shipman stated that Sen. Baum was probably correct to reach out to General Counsel or the Board of Trustees directly. Sen. D'Armiento responded that Sen. Baum can reach out to the [External Relations and Research Policy Committee](#) with his concerns as well.

Senator Helen Han Wei Luo (Stu., GSAS/HUM) stated that she has heard from many students that they appreciate the return to campus but alarmed by the extension of policies on campus that imply that Columbia continues to exist in a state of crisis and urgency. She stated that one issue has been the [changes to the University Statutes](#) that the [Student Affairs Committee](#) had to update the student community about in October, specifically regarding the Rules of University Conduct. Sen. Luo stated that these changes essentially give the Rules Administrator unilateral control over access to evidence relating to a defendant's case, allow individuals found not responsible for actions have disciplinary records marked on their permanent record, and that charges can be brought about by the Rules Administrator without prior complaint. Sen. Luo stated that, if the Student Affairs Committee's interpretation is correct, these changes are extraordinary and that a comparison to legal matters would be if a prosecutor had full control over access to evidence and discovery, noting the shock that this would incur for lawyers to see such a system. She stated that this represented an unprecedented degree of control over the student body as a remnant of the recent crises at the University where the administration has emphasized the value of swift punishment rather than fair punishment. Sen. Luo stated that the current Statutes only ensure swift results, which she believed was not the same as fairness, arguing that the current Statutes encourage a lack of procedural fairness inconsistent with justice. Sen. Luo stated that Columbia has taken a fairly strong general position that protest is not permissible on campus. She stated that the administration has told student leadership that their interpretation of the Statute changes is incorrect and that they have been awaiting clarification over the past few months that has not occurred yet. Sen. Luo stated that she felt it was long overdue that the administration gives a defense for the changes that they made without the consultation and input of the Senate. President Shipman asked Sen. Luo if there had not been any clarification given to student leadership about some of the Statute changes. Sen. Luo responded that there has not been any clarification given to the general student body yet even though she has been told something will be forthcoming. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Senate had been told that the Rules Administrator Wawro was going to clarify and correct certain aspects of the policy change to the community but that this has not occurred yet.

President Shipman responded that she would work on getting this information clarified. She agreed with Sen. Luo that the goal should not only be to move swiftly but that the institution has to balance the length of time of disciplinary proceedings having been an enormous issue in the past. President Shipman stated that she will work with Provost Olinto to try to get more student input on this issue.

Sen. Mamdani noted that Columbia's Task Force on Antisemitism had issued what was described as their [final report](#) and though he had not yet read the full report, he had followed the work of the Task Force closely over the past two years. Sen. Mamdani stated that he wanted to draw two lessons from its work in order to look toward the future of the University. He stated that the first lesson regards the appointment of the Task Force, noting that the manner of appointing a task force from the top-down has disadvantages and that any such body should have broad representation from key constituencies and include different perspectives. He suggested, therefore, a bottom-up constitution of any similar task force in the future. Sen. Mamdani stated that the second lesson regards the audience of the Task Force. He questioned why the Task Force was focused only on antisemitism and noted that the formation of the Task Force prompted other community members to ask why an anti-Islamophobia Task Force was not formed or other committees on other forms of discrimination. Sen. Mamdani stated that, in relation to his scholarship on colonialism, this tactic is referred to as divide-and-rule. He explained that in British colonial history different constituencies within a community were set apart in order to encourage these groups to view the other as a competitor, resulting in a fragmented society. Sen. Mamdani expressed hope that this period of the University's history can end and recommended that there not be any more task forces dedicated to a specific form of discrimination to the exclusion of others. He proposed a general anti-discrimination task force, which could serve as a healing measure for the University. He noted that the University should not participate in a "divide-and-rule" strategy. President Shipman thanked Sen. Mamdani for his thoughts and stated she would come to him for guidance with his permission.

Senator Azzurra Cottarelli (Research Officers - Professional) stated that she had noticed in previous plenaries regarding concerns of quality-of-life for students and faculty but not for research scientists. She stated that, in conversation with her fellow research officers, many have expressed concern over feeling disposable to the University. Sen. Cottarelli asked that research officers not be considered an afterthought when it comes to discussions of quality-of-life issues, salary increases, and benefit premiums. She noted that the research officers also have families that they have to provide for, alongside the faculty. President

Shipman thanked Sen. Cottarelli for her comments and agreed that the administration needs to see where the needs of the research officers are different from other communities.

Senator Eden Kaduri (Stu., SIPA) asked about the implementation of the agreement with the federal government and how the community can access information about the process, specifically regarding changes to educational programs involving the Middle East. President Shipman responded that there is an [implementation website](#) where updates on the resolution are provided. She stated that Columbia has currently offered the government the same admissions data the University offered last year and that there were no plans to offer any more data in the next few months. President Shipman stated that there was nothing outstanding in the agreement that has not been done, noting that a number of the professorships that had been proposed were moving forward to her knowledge. She stated that there were a number of exciting things in the works regarding international affairs. President Shipman stated that the faculty across the University have been instrumental in guiding the University.

Chair's Report and Questions

Sen. D'Armiento began her remarks by congratulating Senator Daniel Savin (Research Officers – Professional), Senior Research Scientist in the Astrophysics Lab for being awarded the [2026 Laboratory Astrophysics Prize](#) by The Laboratory Astrophysics Division of the American Astronomical Society, noting that this is the highest honor from the Laboratory Astrophysics Division given to Sen. Savin for his [contributions](#) within X-ray astrophysics and early universe star formation research, as well as his extensive contributions to the astrophysics lab community. Sen. D'Armiento also congratulated Senator Elisa Konofagou (Ten., SEAS), Robert and Margaret Hariri Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Professor of Radiology, for being [named a Fellow of the National Academy of Inventors](#) alongside Professor Emeritus of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Louis Brus. Sen. D'Armiento highlighted Sen. Konofagou's [work designing and developing ultrasound-based technologies](#) for drug delivery and therapeutics, translating research into products and services to help improve healthcare and lives. Sen. D'Armiento then stated that she wanted to provide an update on the recent Board of Trustees meeting, noting that the Senate emphasized the continued benefit of engaging in shared governance. She noted that the Senate also spoke about the challenges that Senators have been hearing from their constituencies and that the administration also shared many of these concerns with the Trustees. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the topics discussed included: constraints on space, research infrastructure, academic freedom, concerns for

international faculty and students, the need to keep up with emergent technologies and how it relates to research strategies, and the pressures on outdated infrastructure within the University. She added that, from these conversations, leadership has committed to come together to identify ways in which everyone can prioritize and strengthen the University's mission under difficult financial times. Sen. D'Armiento stated that some of the Senate leaders will discuss with President Shipman the financial constraints before beginning to work on solutions within the Senate committees. She added that President Shipman has committed to engaging with Senators broadly in order to form a committee to discuss the potential of undergraduate expansion. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she did believe there was a commitment from the Board of Trustees to work together on these issues. She added that, in the spring semester, the Senate will resume the process of providing nominations to the open Senate-consulted seats on the Board of Trustees, noting that the Senate consults and provides recommendations for six seats on the Board of Trustees. Sen. D'Armiento stated that there are four open seats on the Board currently, two of which are Senate-consulted seats. She noted that, as previously stated in the plenary, there were many concerns raised around media leaks regarding the ongoing search for the University President. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Trustees had extended the timeline for the Presidential search and that she looked forward to being consulted by the Presidential Search Committees as outlined in the University Statutes.

Resolution to Approve an Updated Columbia University Institutional Policy on Misconduct in Research (External Relations and Research Policy)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced a resolution to approve an [updated Columbia University Institutional Policy on misconduct in research](#) coming from the External Relations and Research Policy Committee. Sen. D'Armiento introduced Naomi Schrag, committee member and Vice President for Research Compliance, Training, and Policy in the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research and the University's Research Integrity Officer, to lead the discussion on the resolution. Sen. D'Armiento turned the meeting over to Senator John Santelli (Ten., SPH), Co-Chair of the External Relations and Research Policy Committee and Research Policy Professor of Population and Family Health and Pediatrics.

Sen. Santelli stated that the federal government has a policy on fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism that is collectively called "research misconduct" and that Columbia had previously adopted a policy in 2006. He stated that the proposed changes had been well-considered even though there were not many major changes. Sen. Santelli stated some of the changes bring the University in line with the living federal

mandate around research misconduct. Sen. Santelli stated that, early in his career, he was the victim of plagiarism at the U.S. Public Health Service that was shocking to him, hoping that other researchers hopefully did not have to share his experience and that these regulations might help to stop that from happening. Sen. Santelli thanked EVP Schrag in her work to [track the changes of the policy](#), as well as the summary of [seven key takeaways](#) in the revised policy.

EVP Schrag began a presentation of the revised policy as [outlined in the plenary packet](#). She stated that, while research misconduct allegations are rare at the University, any allegations are governed by the University-wide policy and any additional requirements by the funder. EVP Schrag stated that, since 2006, there has been a single policy passed by the University Senate that followed developments in federal regulations in 2000 and 2005. She stated that most of the University's research funders have adopted similar guidelines with minor changes here and there. EVP Schrag stated that the definition of research misconduct has a very limited definition as outlined in the policy. She stated that, by definition, research misconduct does not include honest error, differences in opinion on how to interpret results, or authorship disputes. EVP Schrag stated that there was a [specific set of steps and committees](#) at the University that ensure proper investigation of any complaints and if there is any determination of findings of research misconduct. She stated that these charges are among the most serious in the research committee and that, therefore, the University handles these allegations in a very structured way. EVP Schrag stated that, in 2024, the HHS Office of Research Integrity issued revised research misconduct regulations, the first revision since 2005. She stated that these changes codified many practices that had already been in place and clarified many issues, as well as providing new definitions. EVP Schrag stated that the University worked on revising their policies alongside the federal government's revisions. She noted in particular the change to formalize the role of the Research Integrity Officer at Columbia, which has existed in practice since 2006 but will now be formalized. EVP Schrag then reviewed the remaining main changes, as noted in the plenary materials. She stated that there are updates on these policies on the [Research Misconduct website](#) for the community to review.

Sen. Bernofsky asked why there is now a statute of limitations on research misconduct and whether the new policy would apply to the entire Columbia community, including the members of the Board of Trustees. EVP Schrag stated that the statute of limitations has been in the regulations since HHS has published the regulations, noting that there were two exceptions to the statute of limitations. She stated

that these exceptions are if the individual accused of misconduct continues to cite the data that is alleged to be falsified in later publications or reports and if there is a public health or safety risk involved in the alleged misconduct. EVP Schrag stated that the policy is limited to research conducted at Columbia under the auspices of Columbia University, regardless of who conducted that research. Sen. Santelli responded that the policy covers research that is funded by the Public Health Service as well. Sen. D'Armiento asked for clarification for collaborative projects that take place partially outside of the University in collaboration with Columbia researchers. EVP Schrag responded that those examples would still fall under the regulation of Columbia's policy since Columbia researchers are overseeing the work.

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

Resolution to Approve an Academic Program Leading to the Ph.D. in Technology, Media, and Learning (Teachers College) (Education)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced the [resolution to approve a Ph.D. in Technology, Media, and Learning at Teachers College](#) coming from the [Education Committee](#). Sen. D'Armiento welcomed Nathan Holbert and Ioana Literat, Professors of Communication, Media and Learning Technology Design, to speak about the proposed academic program. Sen. D'Armiento noted that Senator Alan Yang (TTOT, SIPA), Senior Lecturer in the Discipline of International and Public Affairs, headed the subcommittee reviewing the degree and would also speak. Sen. D'Armiento turned the meeting over to Senator Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM), Edward V. Zegarelli Professor of Dental Medicine and Co-Chair of the Education Committee.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn reviewed the [purpose for the proposed academic program](#), as outlined in the plenary packet, and discussed the process by which a new academic program is reviewed by the Education Committee. She stated that the Education Committee created a subcommittee headed by Sen. Yang.

Sen. Yang stated that this Ph.D. program provides a research-focused counterpart to an existing Ed.D. program at Teachers College that instead focuses on applied research and practice. He stated that this program focuses on theory-building and contributing foundational knowledge around cognitive, social, and cultural dimensions of learning with technology. Sen. Yang stated that the curriculum emphasizes

theoretical work and methodological training in both established and emergent methodologies. He stated that the program requires the completion of 75 credits and that the program directors expect most applicants will have a prior MA degree, noting that they will accept up to 30 credits from previous graduate work. Sen. Yang stated that the expectation is to enroll 2-3 students per year for the first few years, reaching a steady state of about five students per year by year five of the program. He reviewed some of the questions that the subcommittee raised regarding curriculum and opportunities for collaboration across the University, noting that the Education Committee discussed and approved the proposal at their most recent meeting.

Senator Brent Stockwell (Ten., A&S/NS) asked about the [length of the oral defense](#) of the dissertation being 15-20 minutes, noting that this was a much shorter presentation time than what he was used to. Professor Literat thanked Sen. Yang and the subcommittee for their work and responded to Sen. Stockwell by stating this was the typical oral defense length for the field and at Teachers College, noting that the oral defense would be allowed to be optionally-public as well.

There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The resolution passed 66-0-1 (in favor-opposed-abstention).

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting and wished everyone a happy holiday season.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

University Senate

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEADING TO THE
Ph.D. IN EDUCATIONAL NEUROSCIENCE
(Teachers College)**

WHEREAS there is an emerging interest in understanding the neurobiological processes underpinning cognition and behavior; and

WHEREAS there is increasing demand from students to engage in scientific inquiry into the areas of learning across the lifespan; and

WHEREAS recent and continuing technological advances in brain imaging and research methods for neurosciences allow investigators to look in greater details than ever before at the neurobiological processes of development, learning, memory as well as other cognitive processes and behavior; and

WHEREAS the proposed program will require 150 weeks of full-time study and the completion of 75 credits, with up to 30 transfer credits accepted from previous graduate work (e.g. graduates of the extant Master of Science program in Neuroscience and Education (Teachers College)); and

WHEREAS the program expects to admit one to two students per year and to reach a steady state of five to ten students by year five; and

WHEREAS collaborative interactions with the world-renowned PhD program in Neurobiology and Behavior (Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons) that currently includes more than 150 mentors, may provide additional cross-campus cooperation; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the establishment of the Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience; and

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

Proponent: Education Committee



PROPOSAL FOR A NEW DEGREE, NEW DEGREE FROM AN EXISTING TRACK, NEW CERTIFICATE, OR NEW CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (CPA) PROGRAM

Please insert the requested information in the table below:

Degree:	Doctor of Philosophy
Program Name:	Educational Neuroscience
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:	
Sponsoring School(s):	Teachers College
Proposed Start Date:	Fall 2025
Name and Email Address of the Primary Contact Person for this Proposal:	Karen Froud kf2119@tc.columbia.edu
Date of Proposal Submission:	January 16, 2024

DESCRIPTION OF THE 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 proposed Ph.D. program in Educational Neuroscience is designed to forge deep and innovative connections between theoretical frameworks derived from educational and pedagogical practice, and neuroscientific experimentation and evidence. Its primary purpose is to explore and understand the neurobiological underpinnings of learning and cognition and how these insights can be applied to learning and educational contexts. The target audience includes individuals interested in the intersection of neuroscience and education, particularly those aspiring to pursue careers in academia, research, or specialized educational settings. We anticipate that the proposed program will serve students with the following kinds of backgrounds:

- Students with prior background and/or experience in the neurosciences, who wish to obtain expertise and experience in the real-world application and translation of scientific research
- Teachers and educators working with people across the lifespan, from early childhood through adult
- Special needs educators and clinicians, for example who have an interest in developmental disorders like ADHD, dyslexia, autism
- Professionals working with those who have brain injuries, neuromuscular diseases, or stroke sequelae, such as speech-language pathologists, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, neuropsychologists
- Educational policy-makers including school principals, school board officials, and lobbyists who understand the role of neuroscience for informing pedagogical methods and outcomes
- Parents, caregivers, and paraprofessionals for those with developmental or acquired disorders

The proposed Ph.D. program in Educational Neuroscience will be offered through the Department of Biobehavioral Sciences at Teachers College, where the field of educational neuroscience actually originated in the 1970s. The proposed program is research-intensive, requiring in-person attendance with full-time engagement required. A hands-on, experiential learning approach is emphasized through a combination of lectures, seminars, laboratory work, and supervised research. By fostering an environment where students can engage deeply with theoretical and practical aspects of educational neuroscience, we aim to prepare researchers who can address fundamental questions about how the brain learns and how educational practices can be optimized to promote learning.

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?

Our proposed PhD program aims to clarify and streamline existing processes. At present, students wishing to pursue avenues for doctoral research in educational neuroscience must follow a complex and hybrid pathway, representing a series of collaborations across departments and programs. For example, doctoral students in this field have graduated by undertaking research training in

laboratories in the Biobehavioral Sciences Department while being registered for doctoral studies in other programs, such as Cognitive Studies & Education, Developmental Psychology, Curriculum and Teaching, or Communication Sciences & Disorders. Hence, the proposed doctoral program does not duplicate or replace any existing program, but will serve the purpose of consolidating and formalizing the current process and will efficiently integrate existing faculty engagement and research training.

2) Need

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

The introduction of the doctoral program in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College responds to an emerging national interest in understanding the neurobiological processes underpinning cognition and behavior, as well as educational policy and practice. Correspondingly, there is an increased demand by students to engage in scientific inquiry into the areas of learning across the lifespan, processes of development and skill acquisition in children and adults, and protocols for educational assessment and intervention in multiple cognitive domains. Recent and continuing technological advances in brain imaging and research methods for the neurosciences allow us to look in greater detail than ever before at the neurobiological processes that underpin development, learning, memory, as well as other cognitive processes and behaviors.

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

Anecdotally, every year multiple students request access to doctoral training in educational neurosciences. Many of these are graduates of the extant Master's program in Neuroscience & Education at TC. The current director of this program, Prof. Karen Froud, reports that 6-10 students in each master's level graduating class submit inquiries about continuing their training to doctoral level each year. Interest has also been indicated from students at CU and Barnard. Each year a handful of requests come from students outside the CU community, approximately 2-3 per year. Some of these requests result in recruitment to doctoral training in other programs of the college, as described above, with students specifically aiming to gain research training in applied educational aspects of neuroscience.

To formalize this anecdotal evidence of demand for the proposed program, a survey was circulated in summer 2022 to 85 current students, of whom 17 responded (20%). Asked if they had interest in a PhD program in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College, responses from this small sample were *all positive* but interacted strongly with issues of funding. Regardless of funding status, 3 of 17 respondents indicated that they would wish to engage in such a program; 13 indicated that they would or probably would if funding was available, and 1 indicated that they would most likely be interested if fully funded but would still strongly consider if partially funded. The survey was also circulated to 357 graduates of TC's M.S. program in Neuroscience & Education from 2007 to 2021, 50 of whom responded (a 14% response rate). When sampled alumni were asked, "would the PhD program in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College have been appealing to you on graduation?" 64% (32 respondents) indicated "Yes, definitely if fully funded"; 14% (7 respondents) indicated that they loved the idea of the PhD, but that it was not necessary to their current practice; and 12% (6 respondents) indicated that it might be appealing if fully funded.

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

Not applicable. However, the overall goal of the program is to prepare graduate students to become

future leaders in neuroscience and education research by providing integrated training in neuroscience and the learning sciences. Employment needs of future researchers have informed the structure of the proposed program, for example by incorporating hands-on experiences in laboratories employing different methodologies, training in grant writing, and opportunities to engage in research dissemination in professional contexts.

D) What other institutions in the metropolitan area and in the Northeast offer similar programs?

- **Columbia University** is home to the world-renowned doctoral program in Neurobiology and Behavior, that currently includes more than 150 mentors. In our discussions with the directors of the program, Daphna Shohamy and Carol Ann Mason, we discovered that they would welcome a Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College as a complementary offering in a highly relevant and in-demand applied domain. The proposed program could directly feed into the Zuckerman Institute's program for Presidential Scholars in Society and Neuroscience, and would provide opportunities to build the kind of trans-campus cooperation that has been a hallmark of neurosciences at Columbia. A strong letter of support for our proposed program from Dr. Shohamy and Dr. Mason is attached at the end of this application.

Only three other programs (Vanderbilt, Harvard, and Gallaudet) around the country offer Ph.D. training in this discipline, but none of these would be considered direct competitors, for various reasons:

- **Vanderbilt University** offers a high-profile Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience and they are world leaders in the field. Their Ph.D. takes a minimum of 5 years to complete and students are rigorously trained in areas of education (e.g., reading, mathematics, or psychosocial development) and in specific research methodologies (e.g., neuroimaging or genetics). The program is part of the Vanderbilt Neuroscience Graduate Program, and students have access to outstanding resources.
- **Gallaudet University** has offered a Ph.D. Program in Educational Neuroscience since 2013. The program is housed at Gallaudet's National Science Foundation Science of Learning Center, Visual Language and Visual Learning. Students have access to an in-house, research-dedicated neuroimaging facility in the Brain and Language Laboratory for Neuroimaging, and the doctoral training provided is rigorous and highly-structured. Students attending Gallaudet are required to be fluent in American Sign Language.

With respect to both of these programs we note that they have situated education within a neuroscience program, whereas our proposed program situates neuroscience directly within the largest and oldest graduate school of education in the nation, meaning that the applied domains of neuroscientific research are centered in a way that is not possible elsewhere. Studying in a school of education provides collaborative opportunities that permit a more comprehensive understanding of how brain research relates to education, as well as offering opportunities for students to network with educators and researchers in the field of education - invaluable for understanding how educational neuroscience can be applied in real-world situations. There also exist geographical advantages conferred by our location in New York City, allowing for unique educational experiences and a wide range of research training opportunities.

- **Harvard University** offers a concentration in "Mind, Brain, and Education" as one pathway through doctoral-level training at their graduate School of Education. Again, this is a rigorous program offered at a top-tier institution, with outstanding resources. However, we note that the Mind, Brain, Education program at Harvard is an interdisciplinary program that students must carve out for

themselves; lacking a specific structure, students may find it difficult to navigate. Our proposed program takes a different approach.

Aside from Vanderbilt, Gallaudet, and Harvard, *no other institutions* in the United States offer specific doctoral level training in Educational Neuroscience. The University of Alabama, and Sierra University, both offer an Ed.D program in educational psychology that can include some optional neuroscience coursework. Butler University and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln offer certificate programs. A handful of foreign universities offer some educational neuroscience programming, notably University College London, that has a Center for Educational Neuroscience; and Cambridge University, with the Centre for Neuroscience in Education.

Given this paucity of programming, the proposed Ph.D. program offers a unique opportunity to establish TC and Columbia as leaders in this still-nascent field. Additionally, Teachers College has a well-established history of innovation at this intersection exemplified through the success of our Master of Science degree in Neuroscience & Education.

3) Curriculum

A) Provide a brief summary of the program, in the form of a one-paragraph catalogue or website description.

The Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College underscores our enduring commitment to exploring the connections between neuroscience, cognition, and educational theory. In response to the growing national interest in comprehending the neurobiological foundations of cognition and learning, this distinctive program provides research training with a particular emphasis on the applications of neuroscientific research to educational contexts. Students acquire robust theoretical foundations in neuroscience, while gaining hands-on experience in laboratory research and engagement with diverse educational domains. Graduates of the program are equipped with the theoretical and experimental skills essential for conceptualizing, designing, and executing research programs at the intersections of neuroscience and education, and are well-prepared to assume leadership roles across academic, research, and educational settings.

B) 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 points required for graduation (e.g., 124 or 128), as well as the minimum number of points within the major or concentration. Also note that the minimum number of points is 30 for Master's programs, 20-24 for Certificate programs, and 12 for Certification of Professional Achievement (CPA) programs.

75 credits (including up to 30 points transfer credit)

Certification Examination and Qualifying Paper

The Certification Examination occurs at the end term of the Core Sequence (typically after the third or fourth semester of doctoral studies). The exam focuses on salient issues in educational neuroscience, critical reading, academic writing, and argument building. The certification exam is a 3-hour exam, taken in an exam setting provided by the Teachers College Office of Doctoral Studies. Students are presented with multiple questions from three major fields of knowledge within the discipline of Educational Neuroscience: Neuroscience of Language and Literacy; Neuroscience of Cognition and Learning; and Implications of Neuroscience for Educational / Social Policy. They answer a total of two questions of their choice but these must be selected from two of three domains.

After the examinations are returned, each examination is read by at least two members of the program faculty. Exams are rated as Pass, or Failure. Committee members meet to discuss and resolve any disagreements among the raters. Students who fail the Certification Exam are able to take the exam one additional time. If they fail a second time they may not continue in the program.

The second part of the Certification Exam is the Qualifying Paper. This usually takes place in the semester when students have accumulated roughly 60 credits. In consultation with the dissertation sponsor, students will write a literature review. This review of literature will be related to their dissertation research and demonstrate the capacity to identify, organize, interpret, and critique a range of scholarship, often leading to a proposed theoretical framework for the dissertation. The Qualifying Paper is read by two faculty members. Qualifying Papers are graded on a Pass/Fail basis.

Post-Certification Requirements

Ph.D. candidates must take a minimum of 12 additional points after meeting certification requirements, including the points enrolled during the semester in which certification occurs.

Dissertation Proposal

The student prepares a dissertation proposal according to the program requirements. Proposals may vary according to the nature of the study, theoretical perspective(s), and the method(s) of investigation used, but typically include statement of the research purpose, an analytic review of the literature, theoretical framing or conceptual framework, the problem or hypothesis, the research questions, data collection strategies and methods, and procedures for data analysis. In many cases the student will collect pilot data prior to the dissertation proposal hearing, and these data shall be included in the proposal and reported to provide “proof-of-concept” background to demonstrate the likely applicability of the proposed methods.

Doctoral dissertation proposals shall be examined via a hearing of not more than three faculty, all of whom must be members of the Teachers College specially approved faculty as described in the policies for the nomination and appointment of the defense committee. The sponsor of the dissertation must be an approved dissertation sponsor in the student's department/program. Ph.D. students are expected to defend the Ph.D. proposal by the 4th year.

IRB Review

After the successful Dissertation Proposal Hearing, the student applies for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.

Dissertation and Oral Defense

The dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the Ph.D. requirements is an extensive written document reporting an empirical investigation of an issue in educational neuroscience. The dissertation's contribution to the field must comprise a contribution to theoretical understanding, *and* empirical data that relate to an important subject in educational neuroscience.

The dissertation oral defense is conducted to determine the acceptability of the dissertation and to assess the need for any revisions prior to deposit. The oral defense is conducted by a final defense committee that is composed of five members, three of whom must be inside examiners (holding a formal appointment or approved as a dissertation sponsor in the doctoral candidate's home department or program), and two of whom must be outside examiners. The inside members must be GSAS approved sponsors. Any exceptions to this composition must be reviewed by the Dean of GSAS.

During the dissertation defense, questioning begins with the outside readers, followed by the

inside committee members (one of whom is the Dissertation Defense Moderator), and finally the sponsor. However, this order is rarely strictly maintained so that examiners can ask follow-up questions. Following questions and discussion, the student will be asked to allow the committee a period of privacy while they reach a decision with regard to the manuscript itself, the student's presentation of the study, and their response to their questions and comments.

The dissertation is evaluated on the basis of:

- the student's knowledge, analysis, and synthesis of relevant literature;
- the creative application of knowledge to the question under consideration;
- understanding of the relevant theoretical frameworks governing the field and methods of inquiry;
- evidence of skill in implementing brain imaging or other research techniques for collection and analysis of pertinent data;
- findings and conclusions that are solidly based on the data collected;
- and consideration of implications for practice and/or further research in educational, clinical or social domains, from a neuroscientific perspective.

The document must also be clearly organized and written in accordance with the accepted form for the type of research undertaken.

C) 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 Foundational Courses Minimum number of required credits = 18	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
Student must take all of these courses	TC	BBSN 4001	Foundations in Neuroscience 1: Anatomy & Physiology	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSN 4002	Foundations in Neuroscience 2: Systems Neuroscience	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSN 5003	Cognitive Neuroscience	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSN 5019	Human Functional Neuroanatomy	Partially online	3
	TC	BBSN 4005	Neuroscience Research Methods	Partially online	3
	TC	BBSN 5007	Neuroscience Applications to Education	Not at all online	3
REQUIRED Lab Experiences Minimum number of required credits = 12	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits

	TC	BBSN 6904	Research and independent study Minimum 3 credits x 4 semesters	Not at all online	12
REQUIRED Empirical Work towards the Dissertation Minimum number of required credits = 12	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
	TC	BBSN 6940/6941	Supervised Research Minimum 3 credits x 3 semesters	Not at all online	9
	TC	BBS 7500	BBS 7500 Dissertation Seminar	Not at all online	3
REQUIRED Experimental and Lab Methods Minimum number of selective credits = 6	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
Student must take two of these courses	TC	BBSN 5000	EEG Lab Methods	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSN 5022	Eye-tracking Lab Methods	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSR 5195	Advanced Applied Physiology Laboratory	Not at all online	3
REQUIRED Grant Writing/Academic Writing Minimum number of selective credits = 3	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
Student must take one of these courses	TC	BBS 6042	Grantwriting: From a Fundable Idea Through Review	Partially online	3
	TC	HBSS 6500	Research Grant Writing Health and Behavior Studies	Partially online	3
ELECTIVE COURSES Minimum number of selective credits = 12	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
Students will take elective courses within their own specialization area, reflecting their chosen research direction, to be selected under advisement with their sponsor. A minimum of 12 credits / 4 courses must be taken within the selected specialization. Examples of relevant coursework are as follows:					
	TC	BBSN 5010	Neuroscience of Reading	Not at all online	3

Student interest area: Neuroscience of Language & Literacy (12 credits required)	TC	BBS 4032	Neuroscience of Speech and Language	Not at all online	2
	TC	HUDK 5090	Psychology of Language & Reading	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5024	Language Development	Not at all online	3
	TC	HBSK 4074	Development of Reading Comprehension	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 6532	Seminar in reading/language arts and related research	Not at all online	3
	TC	A&HL 4030	Second Language Literacy Development	Not at all online	3
Student interest area: Neuroscience of Cognition & Learning (12 credits required)	TC	BBSN 5070	Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSN 5080	Social and Affective Neuroscience	Fully online	3
	TC	HUDK 4029	Human Cognition & Learning	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5011	Cognition of Social and Emotional Learning	Not at all online	3
Student interest area: Neuroscience Applications to Educational / Social Policy (12 credits required)	TC	BBSN 5152	Neuroscience, Ethics, and the Law	Fully online	3
	TC	BBSN 5193	Neuroscience of Adversity	Not at all online	3
	TC	EDPA 6013	Early Childhood Development and Education/ Integrating Research & Policy Perspectives	Not at all online	3
	TC	EDPA 4048	Education Policy Analysis and Implementation	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 4615	Young Children and Social Policy: Issues and Problems	Not at all online	3
BREADTH COURSES Minimum number of selective credits = 12	School	Course Number (indicate if course is NEW)	Course Title & Instructor	Indicate whether course is fully, partially, or not at all online	# of Credits
All doctoral students must take at least one course for a minimum of 3 points in each of the following four areas: Cognitive Basis of Behavior; Educational Contexts; measurement and Statistics; Coding and Programming. The courses must be other than courses required as part of the program core. Students should consult with their advisors about whether specific courses meet program requirements. Examples of suitable courses are included below, but students may also consult the TC course catalog for other examples. Courses used to fill the Breadth/Foundation course requirements may not be used to fulfill requirements in another area.					
Cognitive Basis of Behavior	TC	CCPX 5020	Cognition, Emotion, and Culture	Not at all online	3
	TC	HBSK 5096	Psychology of Memory	Not at all online	3

(Students must take at least one of these courses)	TC	HUDK 4015	Psychology of Thinking	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5024	Language Development	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5025	Spatial Thinking	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5030	Visual Explanations	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDK 5090	Psychology of Language and Reading	Not at all online	3
Educational Contexts (Students must take at least one of these courses)	TC	ORLD 4053	Facilitating Adult Learning	Not at all online	3
	TC	A&HF 4192	Ethics and Education	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 4052	Designing Curriculum and Instruction	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 4078	Curriculum and Teaching in Urban Areas	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 5037	Literacy, Culture, and the Teaching of Reading	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 4130	Critical Perspectives in Elementary Education	Not at all online	3
	TC	C&T 4145	Critical Perspectives in Secondary Education	Not at all online	3
Measurement & Statistics (Students must take at least one of these courses)	TC	HUDM 5059	Psychological Measurement	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 6051	Psychometric Theory	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 6055	Latent Structure Analysis	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 5122	Applied Regression Analysis (Advanced)	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 5123	Linear Models and Experimental Design (Advanced)	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 5126	Linear Models and Regression Analysis	Fully online OR Not at all online	3
Coding & Programming (Students must take at least one of these courses)	TC	MSTU 4031	Object-Oriented Theory and Programming	Not at all online	3
	TC	BBSR 5151	Introduction to the Analysis of Biomechanical Signals	Not at all online	3
	TC	HUDM 5026	Intro to Data Analysis in R	Fully online OR Not at all online	3

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

**Example pathways for students through the program 1:
Student with Masters in Neuroscience & Education**

A student who has already completed the extant M.S. degree in Neuroscience and Education at

Teachers College will be eligible to apply 30 credits from that experience to the requirements for the Ph.D., and will be required to complete 45 credits of graduate study plus all other program requirements as outlined above. Such a pathway through the program could proceed as follows:

Previously completed credits that can be applied to Ph.D. requirements:

BBSN 4001 Foundations in Neuroscience 1: Anatomy & Physiology	3
BBSN 4002 Foundations in Neuroscience 2: Systems	3
BBSN 4005 Neuroscience Research Methods	3
BBSN 5007 Neuroscience Applications to Education	3

[All of these are required for the M.S. degree, and would have been completed by this hypothetical applicant]

BBSN 5003 Cognitive Neuroscience	3
BBSN 5019 Human Functional Neuroanatomy	3

[These two courses are electives in the M.S. degree and, together with the 3 courses above, would meet the Foundational Courses requirement for the proposed Ph.D.]

BBSN 5000 EEG Lab Methods	3
BBSN 5022 Eye-tracking Lab Methods	3

[These two courses are also elective in the M.S. degree, and together would meet the Experimental and Lab Methods requirement for the proposed Ph.D.]

HUDM 5122 Applied Regression Analysis (Advanced)	3
A&HF 4192 Ethics and Education	3

[These two courses are commonly taken as breadth courses by students in the M.S. degree program]

Total previously-completed credits counted towards Ph.D. requirements: 30

Remaining credits required for the Ph.D.: 45

Ph.D. requirements met or partially met:

Neuroscience Foundational Courses	18/18 credits
Experimental and Lab Methods	6/6 credits
Breadth Requirement; Measurement & Statistics	3/3 credits
Breadth Requirement; Educational Contexts	3/3 credits

Given these 30 transfer credits, and assuming full time enrollment in the program, the pathway to the Ph.D. could be completed within a 3-year timeframe, as follows.

Semester 1 (Fall) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 5080 Social and Affective Neuroscience [Elective: 1/4]	3	No	No

HUDM 5026 Intro to Data Analysis in R [Breadth: Programming]	3	No	No
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 2 (Spring) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study	3	No	No
BBSN 5070 Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience [Elective: 2/4]	3	No	No
BBS 6042 Grantwriting: From a Fundable Idea Through Review	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 3 (Summer) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6940 Supervised Research	3	No	No
BBSN 5010 Neuroscience of Reading [Elective: 3/4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	6		
Semester 4 (Fall) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study	3	No	No
HUDK 5024 Language Development [Elective: 4/4]	3	No	No
CCPX 5020 Cognition, Emotion, and Culture [Breadth: Cognitive Bases]	3	No	No
Certification Exam / Qualifying Paper			
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 5 (Spring) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6941 Supervised Research	3	No	No
BBS 6042 Grantwriting: From a Fundable Idea Through Review	3	No	No
BBS 7500 Dissertation Seminar	3	No	Yes (all prior degree requirements must be met before registering for departmental Dissertation Seminar)
Proposal defense			
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 6 (Summer) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites

BBSN 6940 Supervised Research	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 7 (Fall) Year 3			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBS 8900 Departmental Dissertation Advisement	0	No	Yes (Successful proposal hearing and all prior degree requirements)
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	0		
Semester 8 (Spring) Year 3			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
TI 8900 Dissertation defense	0	No	Yes (Can only be taken in the semester of dissertation defense; all other degree requirements must be met)
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	0		

Total previously-completed credits counted towards Ph.D. requirements:

30

Total Credits

75

**Example pathways for students through the program 2:
Student from Non-Educational Neuroscience Background**

Students who do not enter the Ph.D. directly from the current M.S. program in Neuroscience & Education may already have a master's degree or may come from a suitable undergraduate program. Assuming full time enrollment in the program and zero transfer (or previously-completed) credits, the pathway to the Ph.D. could be completed within a 5-year timeframe, as follows.

Semester 1 (Fall) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 4001 Foundations in Neuroscience 1: Anatomy & Physiology [Foundational 1/6]	3	No	No
BBSN 4005 Neuroscience Research Methods [Foundational 2/6]	3	No	No
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study [Lab Experience 1/4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 2 (Spring) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 4002 Foundations in Neuroscience 2: Systems [Foundational 3/6]	3	No	Yes (BBSN 4001)

BBSN 5003 Cognitive Neuroscience [Foundational 4/6]	3	No	No
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study [Lab Experience 2/4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 3 (Summer) Year 1			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 5000 EEG Lab Methods [Experimental & Lab Methods 1/2]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 4 (Fall) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
HUDM 4122 Probability and Statistical Inference [Breadth 1/4: Measurement/Stats]	3	No	No
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study [Lab Experience 3/4]	3	No	No
HUDK 4029 Human Cognition & Learning [Elective 1/4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 5 (Spring) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 5019 Human Functional Neuroanatomy [Foundational 5/6]	3	No	No
BBSN 5007 Neuroscience Applications to Education [Foundational 6/6]	3	No	No
BBSN 6904 Research and Independent Study [Lab Experience 4/4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 6 (Summer) Year 2			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 5022 Eye-tracking Lab Methods [Experimental & Lab Methods 2/2]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 7 (Fall) Year 3			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6940 Supervised Research	3	No	No
BBSN 5070 Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience [Elective 2/4]	3	No	No
C&T 4052 Designing Curriculum and Instruction [Breadth 2/4: Educational Contexts]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 8 (Spring) Year 3			

Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6941 Supervised Research	3	No	No
BBS 6042 Grantwriting: From a Fundable Idea Through Review	3	No	No
HUDK 4029 Human Cognition and Learning [Breadth 3/4: Cognitive Bases]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 9 (Fall) Year 4			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 6940 Supervised Research	3	No	No
BBSN 5080 Social and Affective Neuroscience [Elective 3/4]	3	No	No
HUDM 5026 Intro to Data Analysis in R [Breadth 4/4: Coding & Programming]	3	No	No
Certification Exam/Qualifying paper			
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	9		
Semester 11 (Spring) Year 4			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBS 7500 Dissertation Seminar	3	No	Yes (all prior degree requirements must be met before registering for departmental Dissertation Seminar)
Proposal defense			
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 12 (Summer) Year 4			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBSN 5010 Neuroscience of Reading [Elective 4 of 4]	3	No	No
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 13 (Fall) Year 5			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites
BBS 8900 Departmental Dissertation Advisement	3	No	Yes (Successful proposal hearing and all prior degree requirements)
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	3		
Semester 14 (Spring) Year 5			
Course Number & Title	Credits	New?	Prerequisites

TI 8900 Dissertation Defense	0	No	Yes (Can only be taken in the semester of dissertation defense; all other degree requirements must be met)
TOTAL CREDITS FOR SEMESTER:	0		

Total Credits

75

- E) 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.**

Fall semester – 15 weeks

Spring semester – 15 weeks

Summer Session A or B – 6 weeks

Typical number of weeks per year = 36

- F) 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 terms, 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.**

Fall and spring semesters – 10; 10 semester x 15 weeks = 150 weeks

Summer sessions – 3; 3 sessions x 6 weeks = 18 weeks

Typical number of weeks to complete the program = 168 Weeks

- G) 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.**

Not applicable.

- H) 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.**

Not applicable. No additional courses are planned.

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

Courses may apply to the Master of Science in Neuroscience and Education.

4) Library Resources

- A) 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 below.**

The Gottesman Libraries at Teachers College have been consulted, and they already provide a comprehensive array of library resources and support services relevant to educational neuroscience. As part of the wider CU Library system, students will have full access to databases including CLIO, PubMed, PsycINFO, and ERIC. TC maintains current subscriptions to key journals including *Neuroscience and Education*, *Mind, Brain, and Education*, and *Journal of Educational Neuroscience*. Electronic access to relevant books and e-books via platforms like Springer, Wiley, and Oxford University Press is available.

To facilitate student research, the Gottesman Libraries offers instructional sessions on literature searching, citation management tools, and database navigation. One-on-one research consultations are also available with subject librarians to assist students in navigating relevant literature.

5) Faculty

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

Karen Froud, Associate Professor of Neuroscience & Education – 25% FTE

- 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 new faculty will be required.

6) Students

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

- i. Masters degree in a relevant field: education, neuroscience, or one of the related disciplines
- ii. Three strong letters of recommendation from scholars
- iii. Personal statement
- iv. Writing sample

Applicants for admission will be considered holistically and will take account of three main criteria: academic performance to date; potential for contributing to research and scholarship; and persistence in and commitment to educational success. These criteria can be evaluated in many ways and will include review of multiple indicators, including but not limited to GPA, written communication skills, progression of academic performance over time, research activities on and off campus, relevant work experience, scholarly engagement beyond coursework, indices of leadership, evidence of persistence and commitment, community engagement or service, educational, geographical, and cultural background. Applicants should have engaged with a potential advisor during the course of their admissions review.

- 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.**

Anticipated admission rates and cohort sizes are as follows:

Year 1: 1-2 students

Year 2: 0-1 students (total 1-3)

Year 3: 0-2 students (total 1-5)

Year 4: 0-1 students (total 1-6)

Year 5: 0-2 students (total 1-7, given 5-year time to completion for first cohort; 2-6 students would represent “steady state”, dependent on available support).

- 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.**

Not applicable.

- D) Describe the types of positions for which the program will qualify its students.**

The Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience will foster a unique skill set that combines advanced analytical techniques with a deep understanding of the cognitive and neural processes underlying learning and education. Graduates are therefore poised to make significant contributions to policy, research, and practice in the evolving field of educational neuroscience. Hence, graduates of the Ph.D. program would be equipped to pursue academic positions in both education and neuroscience departments, direct research focused on improving educational outcomes for diverse populations, become high-level policy advisors, hold key administrative and leadership posts in state education systems, lead evaluations of educational interventions or curricula, specialize in program development and implementation in educational domains, or work in industry positions operating at the intersections of scientific research and educational applications. However, we anticipate the majority becoming academic scholars and researchers.

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

Not applicable.

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

- 8) Finances**

- A) Provide an estimate of the new revenues the program will generate in each of its first three years, and when it will reach steady state if that will occur in a later year. In the case of a dual degree program, indicate how those revenues will be shared.**

No additional revenue.

- B) Provide an estimate of the expenses the program will require in each of its first three years, and when it will reach steady state if that will occur in a later year. Include a breakdown of those expenses by type, using the following categories: 1) new faculty; 2) additional administrative personnel; 3) on-line systems and technical support, when appropriate; and 4) other OTPS expenses.**

No additional costs.

- C) Show the net surplus or deficit produced by the program in each of its first three years, and when it will reach steady state if that will occur in a later year.**

Not applicable.

9) 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.**

Annual reviews of Ph.D. students and candidates will be conducted each year; these reviews will allow for reflection on both individual students and on the program itself. Outcomes will be assessed through analyses of the indicators mentioned below in the Evaluation Plan. Annual reviews, including a student self-assessment, with each student will provide an opportunity for program faculty to ensure that students are showing progress in their ability to generate new knowledge and they are making timely progress toward the degree. In cases where there is concern about adequate progress, the advisor/sponsor (with consultation from the rest of the program faculty) will provide feedback and recommendation for goals to be accomplished for the upcoming year, including specific deadlines for goals to be accomplished.

The Department of Biobehavioral Sciences (BBS) regularly conducts programmatic review discussions with program faculty, program directors and the department chair. Program directors maintain responsibility for conducting program-level assessments based on the mission and goals of the program, student enrollments, retention, graduation rates, and alumni job placements. The Department Chair conducts yearly evaluations with Program Directors to consider whether programmatic goals are being met and to discuss timely interventions and strategic adjustments as needed. Based on the data and evaluation, we will work as a faculty group to set realistic goals that align with the overall objectives of the program. If needed, specific action plans can be developed that outline the steps, resources, and timeline needed to achieve identified goals. Such planning will account of the resources, budget, and personnel available. The identified strategies will be implemented, and progress will continue to be monitored iteratively. This may include modifying or enhancing existing programming, introducing new initiatives, or working with specific students on an individual basis.

Since the program goals delineated below are clearly defined and measurable, we will be able to assess the effectiveness of the program in achieving its goals and objectives. In our evaluation process, ongoing assessment will ensure that the program is continuously improving. We will incorporate feedback from students and faculty to ensure that the program is meeting needs and expectations, and to identify areas for improvement. Since ongoing monitoring and mentoring of students to achieve their goals is already part of our purview at the doctoral level, we are well-placed to maintain program quality.

- B) Include a learning outcomes and assessment plan for the proposed program, using the below template. Examples can be found here:**

<http://academicprograms.columbia.edu/assessment-student-learning>

Program Goals for Student Learning	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).
<p>Goal 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of content in the field of neuroscience</p>	<p>Measure 1: Percentage of students who maintain a B or higher grade in the Foundational Coursework Sequence Criterion: 100% of Ph.D. Students will maintain a B or higher grade in the Foundational Coursework sequence Measure 2: Percentage of students who successfully defend a dissertation that contributes knowledge to the field of study. Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. students will successfully defend the doctoral dissertation</p>
<p>Goal 2: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the use of theory from their research focus, and apply it to research in the field of educational neuroscience</p>	<p>Measure 1: Percentage of students who satisfactorily completed the Certification Examination by demonstrating their content knowledge in two of three major disciplinary domains. Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. students will satisfactorily complete the Certification Examination with a rating of “Pass” or higher Measure 2: Percentage of students who satisfactorily completed the Certification Examination by demonstrating their content knowledge in two of three major disciplinary domains. Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. students will satisfactorily complete the Comprehensive Examination with a rating of “Pass” or higher. Measure 3: Percentage of students who successfully defend a dissertation that contributes knowledge to the field of study. Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. students will successfully defend the doctoral dissertation</p>
<p>Goal 3: Students will make research and/or professional contributions during their program</p>	<p>Measure 1: Percentage of students who, prior to graduation, have contributed to one or more of the following research and professional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Publication of a manuscript for a peer reviewed or professional journal; this may be singly or jointly authored ● Conference presentation, also singly or jointly authored ● Leadership of a graduate-professional association

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in review of manuscripts or conference proposals • Application for grant funding from federal and/or foundational funding sources <p>Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. graduates will engage in one or more of the above research and/or professional activities prior to graduation</p>
<p>Goal 4: Students will engage in scientific communication and/or pedagogy within their discipline, in support of their home program and community</p>	<p>Measure 1: Percentage of students who, prior to graduation, have contributed to one or more of the following:</p> <p>Course assistantship or independent teaching of a course in the M.S. Program in Neuroscience & Education</p> <p>Volunteer outreach work in support of scientific communication, such as Brain Awareness Week, Columbia University Neuroscience Outreach, Saturday Science, or other relevant programs</p> <p>Utilization of technology, such as social media, podcasts, videos, to communicate scientific work to a wider audience</p> <p>Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. graduates will engage in one or more of the above outreach or communication activities prior to graduation</p>
<p>Goal 5: Students will complete all course and dissertation requirements within a reasonable time-to-degree</p>	<p>Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. students will complete the Ph.D. degree requirements within 5 years of matriculation</p>
<p>Goal 6: Upon graduation, alumni will be gainfully employed as faculty, researchers, postdocs, industry professionals, or in other positions reflecting their expertise and level of training</p>	<p>Criterion: 90% of Ph.D. graduates will be employed in a field-related position</p>

10) External Review for NEW Master’s and Doctoral Programs.

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.*

Proposed Program Reviewers:

- **John Gabrieli** – director of the Athinoula A. Martinos Imaging Center at the McGovern Institute. He is an Investigator at the Institute, with faculty appointments in the Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences and the Institute for Medical Engineering & Science, where he holds the Grover Hermann Professorship. <https://gablab.mit.edu/john-gabrieli/>
- **Usha Goswami** - Professor of Cognitive Developmental Neuroscience; Director, Centre for Neuroscience in Education; Fellow, St John's College, Cambridge. <https://neuroscience.cam.ac.uk/member/ucg10/>
- **Chloe Marshall** - Professor in Psychology, Language and Education at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London; Director of the Program in Educational Neuroscience. <https://profiles.ucl.ac.uk/14497>
- **David Poeppel** – Professor of Psychology and Neural Science, New York University; Co-Director, Center for Language, Music, and Emotion, Max Planck Institute; Director and CEO, Ernst Strüngmann Institute for Neuroscience. <https://as.nyu.edu/faculty/david-poeppel.html>
- **Franck Ramus** – Faculty and Director of Research, Laboratoire de Sciences Cognitives et Psycholinguistique, École Normale Supérieure, Paris. <https://lscp.dec.ens.fr/fr/member/663/franck-ramus>

ATTACHMENT: Letter of support from Daphna Shohamy (Director and CEO of Columbia's Zuckerman Institute) and Carol Ann Mason (Chair of Interschool Planning, Zuckerman Institute)

COLUMBIA | Zuckerman Institute
MORTIMER B. ZUCKERMAN MIND BRAIN BEHAVIOR INSTITUTE

July 28, 2022

Karen Froud, Ph.D.
Program Director, Neuroscience & Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Dear Professor Froud,

Thank you for sharing with us the outline of the proposed new Ph.D. program at Teachers College, to be offered in the field of Educational Neuroscience.


We have considered the program structure and offerings, as well as the objectives of the program, the students it will likely serve, and the quality of the proposed research training. The current Master of Science program in Neuroscience & Education at TC provides a valuable substrate for the proposed Ph.D., and we support the development of the Ph.D. program as a timely and needed step. Indeed, Teachers College is uniquely well-positioned to offer an applied neuroscience program of this nature.


Given our respective positions as Zuckerman Institute Chair of Interschool Planning (and former co-director of the Neurobiology & Behavior graduate program), and Associate Director of the Zuckerman Institute, we are well-placed to evaluate whether your proposed Ph.D. program would constitute a direct overlap with our doctoral programs in related domains. To the contrary, we believe that the proposed program would be complementary to our current offerings and would provide many opportunities for cross-talk and collaboration between our programs.

The Doctoral Program in Neurobiology and Behavior currently includes more than 150 mentors, across Columbia's campuses, and administering such a large program means that we have a good sense of the directions for research that are valued by students. We have observed an increasing interest in our entering PhD students who focus on the basic science of, for example, cognition and brain imaging, to relate their work to topics such as the effect of technology on children's brain health and thus would benefit from your program's activities. In turn, your students could benefit from our courses, seminar series, and faculty advisement. A Ph.D. in Educational Neuroscience at Teachers College would also be consistent with the values and goals of other various initiatives in neuroscience at Columbia. For example, your TC program could directly feed into the program for Presidential Scholars in Society and Neuroscience; could support a pathway forward for graduates from the newly-proposed undergraduate program in Cognitive Neuroscience at Barnard and Columbia; and would provide opportunities to build the kind of trans-campus cooperation that has been a hallmark of neurosciences at Columbia and our philosophy at the Zuckerman Institute.

We therefore offer our support of this program proposal, and we look forward to the many opportunities for collaboration and excellence in research training that it will provide.

Best regards,


Daphna Shohamy, PhD
Associate Director, Zuckerman Institute


Carol Ann Mason, PhD
Chair of Interschool Planning, Zuckerman Institute

Proposal for a Professor of Instruction Track Spring 2026

The Lecturer-in-Discipline community has long been a critical part of Columbia University, actively contributing to teaching, advising and administrative efforts across campus. To recognize the crucial contributions of this group, the Office of the Provost has proposed for the review of the Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee a **three-tiered Professor of Instruction track that includes Assistant, Associate and Professor of Instruction ranks for current and future faculty in renewable, non-tenure-eligible positions.**

The current Lecturer-in-Discipline (LiD) structure at Columbia is a two-tiered track with progression from the LiD rank to the Senior Lecturer-in-Discipline (SLiD) rank.¹ Reviews occur in year 1 of counted service (Confirming Review), 3 (Developmental Review), 5 (Critical Review), and 7 (Major Review), when the promotion to SLiD in year 8 is possible, though not guaranteed. The Major Review is followed by continuing reviews, usually at four-year intervals.

The new proposed **Professor of Instruction** track remains non-tenure-track faculty appointment with a renewable stated term. What is new is that it would be comprised of the following three tiers:

- **Assistant Professor of Instruction:** Entry-level, requires PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JDs), a minimum of seven years of teaching before qualifying for a major review to be considered for promotion to the next rank of Associate Professor of Instruction. The major review for promotion must take place by the 8th year of service.
- **Associate Professor of Instruction:** Requires PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JDs), a minimum of eight years of teaching, and if the individual is an external hire, the passing of the major review must occur before the end of the first year of appointment.
- **Professor of Instruction:** Requires PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JDs), a minimum of 12 years of teaching, substantial evidence of not just pedagogical excellence but also academic leadership, and if the individual is an external hire, the passing of the major review must occur before the end of the first year of appointment.

¹ An “Associate in Discipline” title exists but is only used for those hired without PhDs and is not a formal part of the current promotional ladder for LiDs.

Reviews and Promotions: Prior to a major review in year 8 and promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction, Assistant Professors of Instruction are expected to be reviewed within years 1 of counted service (Confirming Review), 3 (Developmental Review), and 5 (Critical Review), just as LiDs currently are expected to complete.

Promotion criteria: Metrics for **promotion** of Professor of Instruction from one rank to the next are defined at the school level. Evidence of excellence in teaching, recognition in pedagogical expertise and promise and future trajectory, both in the classroom and as an academic leader, are typical metrics for evaluation. Faculty on this track are expected to pursue professional development and move from Assistant Professor of Instruction to Associate Professor of Instruction; schools are expected to support the professional development of faculty on this track. Should an individual not pass the major review for promotion, the school is expected to issue a letter of nonrenewal with a one-year notice period.

There is no absolute requirement for the progression from Associate Professor of Instruction to Professor of Instruction, though we highly recommend that schools provide the resources for professional development so that individuals can pass that promotional review.

In addition to the substantive reviews that are held to determine promotion to a higher rank, schools will continue to conduct **continuing reviews** at 5-year intervals (with either a recommendation for an additional term, or a recommendation for non-renewal) to ensure on-going pedagogical excellence. Review criteria for continuing reviews are determined at the school-level. If the review for promotion from Associate Professor of Instruction to Professor of Instruction occurs before five years pass after the promotion from Assistant Professor of Instruction to Associate Professor of Instruction, the review would count as a continuing review as well and there would be no need for another continuing review for another five years (assuming the promotion to Professor of Instruction is successful).

As this remains a non-tenure-track instructional appointment with a stated term, should the individual not pass the Confirming Review, Developmental Review, Critical Review, Major Review, or any continuing reviews, they would receive a letter of nonrenewal. Per the Faculty Handbook, a full-time nontenured faculty member whose appointment will not be renewed beyond its stated term is entitled to clear and unambiguous notice of nonrenewal in writing. The notice

must be given in advance of the expiration of their appointment along the lines stipulated in the [Faculty Handbook](#). The sole exception is when an Associate Professor of Instruction does not pass the promotional review to Professor of Instruction. In such cases, they can be permitted to remain at the Associate tier and continue to be evaluated with continuing reviews. However, we strongly encourage Schools to continue to support their pedagogical development so that they can move along the promotional ladder successfully.

Current full-time LiDs and SLiDs with renewable appointments who have been hired through an open search with full clearance will have the option of remaining in the LiD/SLiD track or transitioning to the Professor of Instruction track with their Dean's approval.² LiDs/SLiDs will have until the end of the following academic year, once the announcement of the new track is made, to decide whether to move. If they do transition, they would be appointed on a January 1 or July 1 appointment date. The transition from the lecturer structure to the Professor of Instruction track would be along the following lines: current LiDs would transfer to Assistant Professor of Instruction, while Senior LiDs would transfer to either the Associate or Full Professor of Instruction depending on years of experience and on meeting the qualitative metrics of the specific rank. For distinctions between the LiD/SLiD track and the Professor of Instruction track, please see appendix A. One notable difference, for example, is that the LiD/SLiD track allows for LiDs to pass a major review and not be promoted. For Assistant Professors of Instruction, if one passes the Major Review by year 8, one must be promoted.

New Special Instructional Faculty hires holding a PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JDs) with renewable appointments would generally be hired into the Professor of Instruction track at the appropriate rank. Those who are hired at the Associate and Full Professor of Instruction ranks would have to undergo an immediate "major" or advanced review at least by the end of the first year of their appointment.

Once the new track is established, the **Teaching Professor** title that was proposed by the Provost Office in 2023, and then, proposed and adopted by the Senate on November 17, 2023, would be changed to **Teaching Professor with Distinction**. This title would not be part of the promotional

² The request for the transfer will need to be submitted to the Dean's office, and once the Dean's approval is granted, submitted to the Provost Office for final approval.

track but would be an exceptional honor conferred by Schools to truly extraordinary and highly experienced members of the full-time non-tenure-track teaching faculty who are at the rank of Senior Lecturer in Discipline or Professor of Instruction. Its new name is meant to capture the exceptional honor of the title. The Office of the Provost recommends that Schools utilize a formal nomination process for the Teaching Professor with Distinction title that relies upon detailed dossiers with external recommendations, teaching awards, student letters, and faculty review. Schools should cap this number at 5% of their full faculty. Faculty who have already been nominated and selected for the current Teaching Professor title, would be automatically transferred to the new title of Teaching Professor of Distinction.

Appendix A

Table 1: Lecturer in Discipline/ Senior Lecturer in Discipline Track

LiD/SLiD Track	Typical Time in Rank	Review Schedule	Promotion Outcome	Appointment Terms
Lecturer- in-Discipline (LiD)	~7 years before Major Review	Year 1: Confirming Year 3 (or 2 in the A&S): Developmental Year 5: Critical Year 7: Major Review	May pass major review but promotion not guaranteed	Non-tenure-track appointment with stated term; renewable based on reviews
Senior Lecturer- in-Discipline (SLiD)	Indefinite; continuing reviews at 4- or 5-year intervals depending on School	Reviews every 4 years post-Major Review, or every 5 years in the A&S	Remain SLiD after promotion; no further promotion required	Non-tenure-track appointment with stated term; renewable with ongoing reviews

Table 2: Professor of Instruction Track

PoI Track	Typical Time in Rank	Review Schedule	Promotion Outcome	Appointment Terms
Assistant Professor of Instruction	~7 years before Major Review	Year 1: Confirming Year 3: Developmental Year 5: Critical By Year 8: Major Review	Must pass major review to be promoted; if not, receive letter of nonrenewal	Non-tenure-track appointment with stated term; failure to pass any review triggers nonrenewal with notice as specified in the faculty handbook
Associate Professor of Instruction	Minimum 4 years before next promotion consideration	Immediate Major Review within 1st year of appointment (if hired at this rank). Reviewed every 5 years (with 6th year as terminal year). For those individuals who do not pass the review, notice of non-renewal needs to be consistent with the schedule specified in the faculty handbook.	Promotion to Full is recommended but not required; failing reviews leads to nonrenewal	Non-tenure-track appointment; renewable with ongoing successful reviews
Professor of Instruction	Indefinite with continuing reviews at 5- year intervals	Immediate Major Review within 1st year of appointment (if hired at this rank). Reviewed every 5 years (with 6th year as terminal year) For those individuals who do not pass the review, notice of non-renewal needs to be consistent with the schedule specified in the faculty handbook.	No further mandatory promotion; failure of any review leads to nonrenewal	Non-tenure-track appointment; renewable with continued demonstrated excellence

Table 3: Track Comparison

LiD vs. PoI	Lecturer in Discipline/ Senior Lecturer in Discipline Track	Professor of Instruction Track
Rank	Lecturer-in-Discipline (LiD) → Senior Lecturer-in-Discipline (SLiD)	Assistant Professor of Instruction → Associate Professor of Instruction → Professor of Instruction
Typical Time in Rank	~7 years before major review for LiD; SLiD indefinite with 4-year reviews	Assistant: ~7 years before major review; Associate: ~4 years before next review; Professor: indefinite with ongoing reviews
Review Schedule	Year 1: Confirming Year 3 (or 2 in A&S): Developmental Year 5: Critical Year 7: Major Review then every 4 years (or 5 in the A&S)	Year 1: Confirming Year 3: Developmental Year 5: Critical by Year 8: Major Review (Assistant → Associate); then every 5 years
Promotion Outcome	Can pass major review but not be promoted (depends on school)	Must pass major review → mandatory promotion; failure at the major review = nonrenewal
Post- Major Review	SLiDs reviewed every 4 years; remain at rank indefinitely	Associates reviewed every 5 years; can be considered for Full but not required
Appointment Terms	Non-tenure-track appointment with stated term; renewable based on reviews	Non-tenure-track appointment with stated term; failure to pass any review triggers letter of nonrenewal with notice as specified in faculty handbook
Path for Existing Faculty	N/A (current structure)	Current LiDs → Assistant PoI Current SLiDs → Associate or Full PoI (based on experience & metrics)
Exceptional Honor	Teaching Professor (capped at 5% of faculty; formal nomination required)	Teaching Professor with Distinction (capped at 5% of faculty; formal nomination required)



Program Launch



Student Affairs Committee of the
University Senate

Graduate Co-Chair Matthew Beck ('28 SEAS)

Undergraduate Co-Chair Huda Paracha ('26
Barnard)

Vice Chair Helen Han Wei Luo ('27 GSAS)



**Meet
Wellhub**
your new wellbeing partner

A Columbia subsidized, subscription-based service offering memberships to gyms and other fitness providers nationwide, all on one platform.


With affordable to luxury pricing options (including a free digital tier!), this partnership offers students flexibility to meet their fitness and wellbeing needs, both near campus and elsewhere.




A Solution to the *Dodge Problem*

Dodge was built in 1974 for a student population of 15,000, which has now more than doubled.

The result is frequent complaints regarding congestion, equipment maintenance, and space of facilities


2017 data shows just 45% satisfaction rate, 2015 data at 40% satisfaction.





←  r/columbia · 1y ago  

GYM RANT

It's been said before, but I think it can't be said enough - Dodge is horrifically packed at all times and that needs to be changed. It needs an expansion, or we need another gym to offload the traffic into.



 r/columbia 3y Join 

Let's talk about Dodge






[columbia is hard](#)


I go to LifeTime Fitness. Have been going there during my entire time at CU. Today, god knows why, I went to Dodge.


This place stinks! Quite literally and figuratively.

Why?! I just don't understand why this place is so gross and outdated. Exercise is so important to maintain a good balance and, for some like myself, for their mental health.



It's like the admin is setting us up for failure.



 85   26   12



 ago

Dude once I saw Yale's gym I started crying of jealousy, and I dont even approach gyms in general lmao

 43 



Pictured: equipment maintenance issues, height restrictions on lower floor

From left to right: pull-up machine, leg press, elliptical, arm press, treadmill, hip abductor machine, main entrance door, and height clearing on lower level cardio machines. All pictures taken Jan 28, 2026

What does Wellhub offer?

- Free premium apps
- Affordable access to local gyms
- Options for premier gyms and specialty fitness classes

Fitness.
Mindfulness.
Nutrition. Sleep.



All in one app.

Free Digital Tier

Access to 10 premium apps including



ifeel
Therapy and Mental Health



Meditopia
Meditation and Sleep



MyFitnessPal
Nutrition



Maya
Healthy habits & special care



Mobills
Financial Health



Sleep Cycle
Meditation and Sleep • Healthy habits &...



Fabulous
Healthy habits & special care

Starter Tier

\$8.39/month, (\$7.40/month with 12 month commitment)

Access to 51 premium apps, gym access across NYC and nationwide



Headspace
Meditation and Sleep



Strava
To work out at the gym • Fitness



Lifesum
Health & Special Care • Healthy habits &...



Zumba - Dance Fitness Workout
Fitness



Erakulis by CR7
To work out at the gym • Fitness • ...



Fastic
Healthy habits & special care • Nutrition



EveryDollar
Financial Health



NYSC - Astoria 🌿 3.6 mi
Free weights • Running on Treadmill



PureGym - 54th 3.7 mi
Free weights • Running on Treadmill



Crunch Fitness - Inwood 4.2 mi
Cardio-entraînement • Entraînement de...



24 Hour Fitness - ... 4.3 mi
Cycle • Workout • Free weights • Indoor...



Sweat To Change 5.1 mi
HIIT • Burn



Crunch Fitness - North... 5.2 mi
Free weights • Strength & Conditioning...



Crunch Fitness - ... 5.6 mi
HIIT • Cardio Burn • Boot Camp • Indoor...

Starter+ Tier



Four 30 minute rides per month

Gyms Near Morningside



*NYSC - 94th & Broadway
NYSC - 91st & 3rd
NYSC 145th & Frederick
Douglass*



*PureGym - 94th & Broadway
NYSC - 91st & 3rd
NYSC 145th & Frederick
Douglass
(previously Blink)*

***\$18.99/month,
(\$16.70/month with 12
month commitment)***

*Access to 55
premium apps,
gym access
across NYC
including near
Morningside
campus, and
nationwide.*



Create a routine that motivates you. Wellhub's network includes 20,000+ popular gyms and studios in the US like Life Time, Crunch, Barry's, Anytime Fitness, and F45.

Don't have time to hit the gym? Wellhub's premium app library allows you to stay consistent wherever you go with favorites like Strava, MyFitnessPal, Headspace, Apple Fitness+, and more!

Starter	Starter+	Basic	Bronze	Silver	Titanium	Gold	Platinum	Diamond
\$8.39	\$18.99	\$37.99	\$64.99	\$109.99	\$159.99	\$214.99	\$289.99	\$344.99
+1.6k gyms & studios 49 wellbeing apps	+4k gyms & studios 52 wellness apps	+5.1k gyms & studios 57 wellness apps	+7k gyms & studios 58 wellness apps	+11.9k gyms & studios 59 wellbeing apps	+13.1k gyms & studios 59 wellness apps	+17.3k gyms & studios 59 wellness apps	+19.1k gyms & studios 59 wellness apps	+20k gyms & studios 59 wellness apps
Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:	Popular options include:
headspace KEEP CALM FOR YOUR MIND STRAVA 	LA FITNESS anytime fitness blink	MyFitnessPal Apple Fitness+ BARRY'S ^x	UFC GYM Trainiac campGladiaTOR	the Dan method BASECAMP FITNESS SUPPLY	LIFETIME FITNESS SULCYCLE TITLE BOXING CLUB	F45 Orangetheory FITNESS [solidcore]	PVLVE NIKE STUDIOS STRETCH LAB	SLT DANCEB'DY SHEPPARD METHOD <small>(FITNESS)</small>

*Pricing and apps/gyms per plan is subject to change, and is dependent on specific gym location.



Visit wellhub.com or scan the QR code to download the Wellhub app to get started.



All-in-one access to fitness & wellness.

Aetna Reimbursement

Students on Columbia Health Insurance are able to claim reimbursement for gym memberships



Weight Loss/Fitness Program Reimbursement Request

For internal purposes only: HLRR

Submit Claims To:
Aetna
PO Box 981106
El Paso, TX 79998-1106

Failure to complete form in full may cause delay in payment.

Member Instructions:

1. Complete Parts 1 & 2 in full.
2. Attach receipts for all expenses incurred and dates attended for Weight Loss/Fitness Club reimbursement.
3. You must meet the requirements described in your school's Plan Design and Benefits Summary available at AetnaStudentHealth.com.

WELLNESS BENEFITS	Student Health Services Member Responsibility for Cost-Sharing	Participating Provider Member Responsibility for Cost-Sharing	Non-Participating Provider Member Responsibility for Cost-Sharing	Limits
Exercise Facility Reimbursement	Not Applicable	Up to \$200 per six (6) month period; up to an additional \$100 per six (6) month period for Spouse/Partner		
<p>Reimbursement is limited to actual workout visits. We do not reimburse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memberships in tennis clubs, country clubs, weight loss clinics, spas or any other similar facilities; • Lifetime memberships; • Equipment, clothing, vitamins or other services that may be offered by the facility (e.g., massages, etc.); or • Services that are amenities, such as a gym, that are included in Your rent or homeowners association fees. <p>In order to be eligible for reimbursement, You must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be an active member of the exercise facility, and • Complete 50 visits in a six (6)-month period. 				

Reimbursements are up to \$200 for every 6 month period, provided that you document 50 workout visits per six month period. Wellhub has assured they can provide necessary information to students for reimbursement, but we cannot guarantee reimbursements will be approved at this time.




Thank you to President Shipman, Dr. Melanie Bernitz and University Life for their partnership and support in bringing this student initiative to life.



Graduate Co-Chair Matthew Beck ('28 SEAS)
Undergraduate Co-Chair Huda Paracha ('26 Barnard)
Vice Chair Helen Han Wei Luo ('27 GSAS)



SAC Dining Reform Initiative



February 2026

Motivations



1. Dining halls are exceedingly overcrowded and operating over capacity
2. In Fall 2025, graduate students lost access to the main dining halls on campus (John Jay, JJ's Place, and Ferris Booth)
3. In Fall 2025, students on the medical campus lost access to 50 Haven dining hall
4. The November 1st threat of pulling SNAP benefits due to government shutdown opened conversations about food insecurity on campus.
 - a. SAC wrote a letter that was sent sponsored by the Executive Committee to President Shipman on November 7th with support from the Alumni Relations Committee, Commission on the Status of Women, External Relations and Research Policy Committee, Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee with suggestions on how to support students on campus who are food insecure.
5. SAC conducted a campus climate poll with over 3800 respondents with one of the main topics being food insecurity.
6. Continued campus gate closures have only made it more difficult for students to have access to affordable and accessible food choice while on campus, isolating students from affiliate campuses.
7. Spectator article about undergraduate population expansion have increased concerns with current dining offerings.

Review of Dining Options on Campus

Graduate students have far inferior dining options compared to undergraduate students

Dining “styles” on campus

- **All-you-can-eat:** JJ’s, John Jay, Ferris
- **Grab-and-go:** Chef Don’s Pi, Chef Mike’s Subs
- **Vending Machines**
- **Cafés:** Joe’s Coffee



★ Open to grad and undergrad ★ Open to undergrad only ■ Not on dining plan

Review of Dining Options Within Gates

Undergraduate:

- JJ's, John Jay, Hewitt



Graduate:

- Chef Dons, Chef Mike's, Faculty House, Fac Shack (Food Truck), Johnny's (Food Truck)




Significant decrease in quality and variety of food for undergraduate students and graduate students

Dining Hall Congestion

Approximately 6,500 - 7,500 students are enrolled in dining plans, while Columbia Dining Facilities can only accommodate 4,000 students

Seat to Student Ratio in Columbia Dining Halls



Dining Hall # of Seats


- JJ's, John Jay, Ferris: 697
- Grace Dodge: 264

Total: 961

Max # of students: 3,844


Often over capacity (106-158%): Causes students to spend money off-campus rather than go to the dining halls

Meal Plan Enrollment



- **Undergraduate dining participation, according to our survey, is 87.7%**
- **Graduate student dining participation is 3.3%**
- 65.5% of graduate students are interested in an affordable meal plan
 - 45.98% say the meal plan is too expensive
 - 39.3% unaware graduate students can get a meal plan

Meal Plan Enrollment



Dining Facilities can accommodate only 4,000 students, however we estimate up to 15,000 students would need affordable meal plans

- Undergraduate dining participation, according to our survey, is 87.7%
- **Graduate student unweighted population 3.25%**
- **65.5%** of graduate students are interested in an affordable meal plan
 - 45.98% say the meal plan is too expensive
 - 39.3% unaware graduate students can get a meal plan

Dining Hall Congestion

In the news...

1. [1999 newspaper article](#) by the Spectator in relation to construction of Lerner
 - a. “CU has Enlargement, But Eagerly Waiting Enhancement”
2. [March 2022 Spectator article](#) on expansion
 - a. “Marred by politics, factions in expansion inquiry see different Columbias”
3. [February 2024 Spectator Article](#) on dining
 - a. “Columbia Dining adds five new dining halls, changes meal plan options following widespread student dissatisfaction”

Ferris Booth Commons

Current Seating Capacity ⓘ

158% Full



Open Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Open Saturday, 9:00 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Open Sunday, 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., 4:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Located on the 3rd floor of Alfred Lerner Hall, Ferris serves custom order omelettes, pasta, quesadillas, and salad, as well other daily offerings of pizza, soup, menu specials, and delectable desserts.

Review of Dining Options

Undergraduate students have 24/7 dining options, while graduate students have sparse options on nights and weekends.

Undergraduate:

- JJ's Place
 - Daily 12 pm - 10 am
- John Jay
 - Sun - Thurs 9:30 am - 9 pm
- Ferris Booth
 - Mon - Fri 7:30 am - 8 pm
 - Sat 9 am - 8pm
 - Sunday 10 am - 2 pm & 4 pm - 8 pm

Graduate:

- Chef Dons (Pizza)
 - Mon - Fri 8 am - 6 pm
- Chef Mike's (Subs)
 - Mon - Fri 10:30 am - 10 pm
 - Sat 11 am - 7 pm
- Faculty House
 - Mon - Thurs 11 am - 2:30 pm
- Fac Shack (Food Truck)
 - Mon - Thurs 12 pm - 8 pm
 - Sun 3 pm - 8pm
- Johnny's (Food Truck)
 - Hours day-to-day

Without heavy reliance on Barnard/TC, the dining facilities and hours cannot meet the need of our student population.

Meal Plan Costs

Undergraduate Meal Plans:

- First Year:
 - \$10.20 - \$13.82 per swipe
- Sophomore - Senior Students
 - \$10.37 - \$15.92 per swipe

Graduate:

- \$11 - \$13 per meal swipe

Single Meal Prices

- Breakfast: \$13.00
- Lunch: \$17.50
- Dinner: \$19.50
 - All-you-can-eat cannot be purchased by credit card

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Undergrad Meal Swipe	JJ's Place	\$ 10.20
Lunch	Undergrad Meal Swipe	John Jay's	\$ 10.20
Dinner	Undergrad Meal Swipe	Ferris Booth	\$ 10.20

total \$ 30.60

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Grad Student Meal Swipe	Chef Don's	\$ 11.00
Lunch	Grad Student Meal Swipe	Johnny's Food Truck	\$ 11.00
Dinner	Grad Student Meal Swipe	Chef Mike's	\$ 11.00

total \$ 33.00

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Starbucks 114th Street	Coffee and breakfast sandwich	\$ 12.10
Lunch	Famous Famiglia 111th Street	2 slices of Pizza	\$ 7.00
Dinner	Panda Express	Rice, Broccoli, and Beef	\$ 11.00

total \$ 30.10

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	New Absolute Bagels 108th Street	Bagel and Cream Cheese + Juice	\$ 9.00
Lunch	U Bar and Grill 118th & Amsterdam	Student Discount Lunch	\$ 5.00
Dinner	V & T Pizza 112th & Amsterdam	Chicken Parm Sandwich	\$ 14.00

total \$ 28.00

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Broadway Bagel 101st and Broadway	Bacon Egg and Cheese	\$ 7.50
Lunch	Chipotle 110th Street	Chicken Burrito	\$ 11.65
Dinner	Dig Inn 112th Street	Spicy Salmon Bowl	\$ 14.75

total \$ 33.90

Meal Plan Costs

Undergraduate Meal Plans:


- First Year:
 - \$10.20 - \$13.82 per swipe

Graduate meal plans cost more per swipe than undergraduate plans with lesser quantity, quality, and accessibility of food. Buying food on campus without a meal plan is not feasible.

- Lunch: \$11.65
- Dinner: \$19.50
 - All-you-can-eat cannot be purchased by credit card

Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Undergrad Meal Swipe	JJ's Place	\$ 10.20

Price Per Swipe Affordability for Graduate Students



Meal	Location	Item	Cost
Breakfast	Broadway Bagel 101st and Broadway	Bacon Egg and Cheese	\$ 7.50
Lunch	Chipotle 110th Street	Chicken Burrito	\$ 11.65
Dinner	Dig Inn 112th Street	Spicy Salmon Bowl	\$ 14.75

total \$ 33.90

Summary

- Dining locations are overcrowded, inaccessible to graduate students, and unaffordable.
- Options are minimal within Columbia gates, especially for graduate students.
- Significant decrease in quality and variety of food for undergraduate students and graduate students.
- Without heavy reliance on Barnard/TC, the dining facilities and hours cannot meet the need of our student population. Students are forced to not eat, go out to eat, or buy from vending machines.
- Students are routinely on campus for 12+ hour days and must pack (minimal fridge/microwave) 3 and/or skip/buy meals.
- We need to build more dining halls for students we are currently at 961 seats. We need a 4:1 student to seat ratio to be comparable to the next worst Ivy.
- Over 70% of students cannot afford the Columbia Dining Plan, the only students who have it are on financial aid
- Undergraduate students choose not to use their meal swipes, instead buying meals to avoid congestion
- The University Senate and the Spectator have been collaborating since at least 1999 to fix this issue, there is still progress needed to keep up with current population, let alone expansion

Short Term Solution

- Bring in food trucks on campus with tents/heaters for the winter months
 - Ex. Ohio State (food trucks), Rutgers (food trucks)
 - Ex. [Northeastern \(tents\)](#), [RIT \(tents\)](#)



Northeastern



RIT, COVID Solution



Rutgers

Short Term Solution

- Use similar method as [School of General Studies](#) to [partially subsidize dining plans](#)
 - Currently, dining receives no subsidy from Columbia, rather operating purely from price of meal plan

Pilot program to subsidize meal plans for select low-income GS students



FOOD INSECURITY

Food insecurity also disproportionately affects undergraduate non-dual degree students, according to the survey. Based on the data collected, administrators were able to examine the correlation between food security levels and GPA.

Food insecurity was one of the focal points of the 2018 General Studies student survey. From that data, administrators implemented a subsidized dining plan, which is currently offered to 1,234 General Studies students. According to the 2023 survey, 90 percent of respondents who are participants in the meal plan reported that it helps alleviate food insecurity.

Short Term Solution

- Partner with Grubhub or a similar service to allow students to use meal swipes in off-campus restaurants
 - Ex. NYU, The New School, Rutgers

GRUBHUB

Grubhub's Campus Dining feature allows you to order ahead from on-campus dining locations and pick up your food. You can use Dining Dollars & Meal Exchange on the Grubhub app. To download follow the steps below or scan the QR Code.

1. Download the Grubhub app & sign up
2. Go to My Grubhub > Settings > Campus Dining
3. Confirm your campus & add your campus card via single sign-on
4. Browse restaurants on campus and start ordering pickup!

Grubhub is accepted at the following locations: Upstein, Cafe 181, Crave NYU, Starbucks, Dunkin', Palladium, UHall Commons Café, Sidestein, Café 370, Jasper Kane Café, and Flavor Lab by NYU Eats.

NYU, Grubhub

Busch Campus

Busch Dining Hall (Busch Campus) - Meal Swipe eligible	▼
Gerlanda's Pizza and Cafe (Busch Campus)	▼
Harvest Juice Bar - Meal Swipe eligible	▼
Knight Wagon - Meal Swipe eligible	▼
Qdoba	▼
Panera Bread (Busch Campus)	▼
Starbucks Truck - Meal Swipe eligible	▼
Szechwan Ichiban	▼
Three Chilies Taco Truck - Meal Swipe eligible	▼
Woody's Cafe - Meal Swipe eligible	▼

Rutgers, single campus meal swipe access

Short Term Solution


- Restructure graduate meal plans (cheaper, more options)
 - Introduce cheaper grab and go meals that most students can afford
 - Would require meals to be \$5-\$7 range



Local restaurant with \$5 lunch student discount

Short Term Solution

- Renovate some academic areas to have communal kitchens, fridge and microwave, so graduate students can bring food from home.



Kitchens

Kitchen spaces can be found in a few areas around campus. These spaces are available to use to heat up or briefly store any food you may pack.

Manhattan

- Kimmel 7th Floor Kitchen - *Located in the lounge area, and includes a fridge and microwave*
- Lipton Commuter Den Kitchen - *Located in the rear of the den, and includes a fridge and microwave*
- Bobst Library Snack Lounge - *Located on the lower level 1, and includes microwaves*

Long Term Solutions

- Construct dining halls with ample seating
 - Consider student population in a 10+ year time horizon
 - Target 3:1 student to seat ratio
- Dining Hall Styles
 - Single meal “bowl” style
 - Traditional all-you-can-eat “college style”
 - “Food Court” style where restaurants come and build locations



Student Center Cafe - Rowan University
“Bowl” style



University of Delaware
“Food Court” style



Pier 57
“Food Court” style

Long Term Solutions

- Construct student led dining co-ops with focus on affordability (no staff funding)
 - Ex. UC Berkeley, Brown, Princeton



Princeton Two-Dickinson Co-Op

Funding Mechanisms

- Capturing even a fraction of the ~97% of graduate students currently off-plan generates new revenue

If ~30% of graduate students can be on a meal plan for \$5 a meal, Columbia could bring in upwards of \$8,775,000 of revenue per semester (15 meals per week)

- On-campus dining for clubs and events reduces reliance on costly third-party delivery
- Increased capacity shifts spending back on campus rather than off-campus restaurants

Unknown amounts of money are spend on third party app and/or delivery fees/tip for clubs to deliver food from off campus. Currently there is no club food service that charges less than UEM prices

Thank you!



Columbia University Senate Student Affairs Committee

Appendix



Columbia University Senate Student Affairs Committee

Dining Options at CUIMC

Faculty Club Café

****Cafe hours Monday - Friday- 8:30am-2pm**** (Cashless-
Accepting Credit Cards, Apple Pay)



We update our daily lunch menu each morning by 11 a.m. If you have any questions, email us at [✉ facultyclub@columbia.edu](mailto:facultyclub@columbia.edu).



Formerly a Barnes & Noble cafe and bookstore, and now decommissioned.

The restriction of faculty club hours to 2pm severely impacts access to affordable food options.

Dining Options at CUIMC



Ballroom Dining Hall (50 Haven Avenue)



Hilltop Perk (Hammer Health Sciences Center)

The 50 Haven Ballroom dining hall and the Hilltop Perk Cafe in HHSC have both remained closed since 2025.

Dining Options at CUIMC



The remaining dining options across CUIMC include food trucks, local restaurants, and the hospital cafeteria.

External Relations and Research Policy | Spring 2026 Forums on University Governance

January 27, 2026

The past few years has been a delicate time for Columbia University governance with multiple external stressors and rapid turnover in the office of the Columbia University President. Given attacks on the Columbia academic freedom and the values of the University, the failure of the University to effectively defend itself suggests a failure of governance at the highest levels. This failure can be traced to several sources including extraordinary historical circumstances and concerted federal attacks on academic freedom and independence, but also the structures and functioning of University governance structures.

Given these challenges, the University Senate Committee on External Relations and Research Policy voted today to convene two forums (uptown and downtown) to discuss university governance at Columbia. Key players in American university governance include the University Presidents and academic hierarchies (e.g., Provosts, Deans), Boards of Trustees who have fiduciary responsibility for universities, alumni of the universities, and university senates, often advisory bodies representing faculty, students, alumni, and staff.

The University-wide forum format is suggested to allow an objective legal and historical examination of models of American university governance and their application to Columbia. Speakers with expertise in University governance would be invited. A panel of faculty, students, and alumni would serve as reactors to the invited presentations.

Suggested dates are Thursday, March 26, and Monday, March 30. For one of the dates we request technology that would allow remote participation. Given that the majority of alumni are located outside of the Tri-State area, remote participation is critical to alumni participation. Given that the Board of Trustees is composed of alumni, they are central to the conversation about University governance.