University Senate Plenary

April 10, 2026

UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate

Proposed: April 10, 2026

Adopted:

University Senate

Friday, April 10, 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 February 27, 2026
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions
5. New business:
   a. Resolutions:
      i. Resolution to Establish the Title and Track of Professor of Instruction (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)
      ii. Supplementary Resolution to Establish the Title and Track of Professor of Instruction (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)
   b. Committee reports and updates:
      i. Letter regarding Concern with the Report of the Investigation into the Circumstances that Allowed Robert Hadden to Abuse Patients (Commission on the Status of Women, External Relations and Research Policy)
      ii. Statement on Expansion of the Undergraduate Population (Campus Planning and Physical Development, Education, Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure, Libraries and Digital Resources, Student Affairs)
6. Adjourn

University Senate | Parliamentary Procedure Quick Guide

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.
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.

University Senate

Proposed: April 10, 2026

Adopted:

Minutes of the Meeting of February 27th, 2026

81 out of 109 Senators were present.

Senator Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S), Executive Committee Chair, called the University Senate to order at 1:20 p.m. Sen. D'Armiento welcomed Senators and guests to the sixth Plenary of the 2025-2026 session. Sen. D'Armiento reminded attendees of the Parliamentary procedures.

Senators adopted the agenda for the Plenary.

Senators then adopted the minutes of the February 6, 2026 Plenary.

Updates from President Shipman

President Claire Shipman began her remarks by addressing the detention and release of student Ellie Aghayeva, reiterating her February 26th statement that she is relieved and grateful to all who worked to get her home. She also reiterated some details about the event. President Shipman stated that Department of Homeland Security (DHS) agents identified themselves as police officers looking for a missing person and were buzzed in by the building attendant, where they gained access to the apartment through the same misrepresentation. She clarified that DHS is aware that their agents are not permitted to enter Columbia buildings without a judicial warrant. Shortly after, Public Safety was called, and an officer requested that the agents provide a judicial warrant. The agents declined and threatened to handcuff Ellie Aghayeva. Finally, President Shipman stated that immediately upon Ellie Aghayeva's detention, the University began coordination with state and local governments to secure her release.

President Shipman stated that the federal agents violated legal and ethical standards, and that she was troubled by the doxing and social media discussion regarding public safety officers. Additionally, as a result of this incident, she stated she would be working to improve Public Safety trainings, create more building signage, and increase hours for residential and vehicle patrols. Finally, she stated that there would be an additional webinar with immigration attorney Dan Berger that day at 3:00 p.m.

Senator Greg Freyer (TTOT, SPH) commended the President on her thoughtful and vital public statements.

Senator Ulrich Hengst (Ten., P&S) asked if the University was considering legal action given that federal agents unlawfully entered the building. President Shipman stated that while the agents used subterfuge, she cannot say for certain they did so unlawfully. She stated the current plans are to continue restating to the public the details of the incident.

Senator Heidi Allen (Ten., SSW). stated that she had written to facilities about the risk of buildings with antiquated intercom systems and no cameras. President Shipman thanked her for her points.

Senator Jackie Dugard (TTOT, SS) asked for more details as to the specific information provided to building superintendents. President Shipman said most important was telling the story and emphasizing that there should be more scrutiny of those identifying themselves as police officers.

President Shipman was asked if the same legal support would be available to students who have been detained due to pro-Palestine advocacy. President Shipman stated that in every case when a student has been detained, they have worked behind the scenes to determine what was needed. Some students already have legal support, and each case is slightly different, so she stated she could not elaborate.

Senator Melinda Aquino (Admin. Staff: Morningside-Lamont) asked what if any messaging has gone to non-affiliates in university-owned mixed buildings. President Shipman said she was not aware of any communication to non-affiliates and would get back to her. Sen. Aquino also stated that she had met with international students and leadership, and she was concerned that students, particularly international students who come from more authoritarian communities, may fear telling a uniformed official not to enter a space, particularly in a moment of increased vulnerability. Senator Aquino said that know your rights trainings would be helpful. President Shipman agreed this was important, and that a protocol card or separate kind of webinar for scenario planning could be valuable as well.

Senator Stuart Firestein (Ten., A&S/NS) mentioned public safety officers who are members of immigrant communities are also at risk. President Shipman agreed this was an important consideration.

Senator Eli Baum (Stu., CC) asked about Jay Lefkowitz, a lawyer for the University who negotiated the Resolution Agreement with the Federal Government. Sen. Baum stated that a recent article in Spectator states that Mr. Lefkowitz represented Jeffrey Epstein, attended his dinner parties and flew in his private helicopter. Sen. Baum wondered why the University began associating with him and whether that

involvement is ongoing, as it could be a potential conflict of interest in negotiations with the Federal Government. President Shipman stated that every case of involvement between Columbia community members and Jeffrey Epstein is being carefully considered. She confirmed that Mr. Lefkowitz remains an adjunct professor at Columbia Law School and still represents the University, but that any conflict of interest would be determined by legal experts. Sen. Baum emphasized that Mr. Lefkowitz had had a social relationship with Epstein, not just a professional one.

Senator Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/HUM) stated that he appreciated the administration's statements, but he also noted there were dozens or hundreds of community members outside the administration who also worked to secure Ellie's Aghayeva's release. Sen. Slaughter also stated his concern that current protocols do not reflect the best guidance from community organizers who have been warning about these law enforcement tactics since Mahmoud Khalil was arrested, and he emphasized that this expertise should be used by the administration. President Shipman said she would be grateful to begin working together on that.

Senator Simon Ogundare (Stu., P&S) stated that students have seen continuous postponement of the Hadden report's release and that he understands that the Office of General Counsel has had some communication with the law firm. Sen. Ogundare asked if there was any explanation for the delays. President Shipman affirmed that the report will be released but explained that she is absolutely certain no one had been given any information on the timeline and no explanation for the delay. She acknowledged the depth of concern in the community and stated the independent investigation is operating independently.

Senator Helen Han Wei Luo (Stu., GSAS/HUM) stated that following Ellie Aghayeva's arrest, student groups called for the University to declare itself a sanctuary campus. Sen. Luo then asked why that has not happened and if it was prohibited by the Trump agreement. President Shipman stated that her understanding is that the sanctuary campus designation is not a legal term and would not offer any increased protection to the community, even if it was not prohibited by the agreement with the federal government.

Senator Michael Thaddeus (Ten., A&S/NS) thanked President Shipman for her contribution to shared governance and asked about reports that the Resolution Monitor in Columbia's agreement with the Federal Government has been replaced and with someone who is understood to be more partisan. Sen. Thaddeus asked for clarification on the logistic reasons that required a replacement. President Shipman stated that there was an inability to come to an agreement with the last monitor regarding billing structure and

projected costs. She stated the administration is very comfortable with the new monitor and that the priority in determining a new monitor was finding someone who understood the narrow scope of the agreement, which they achieved.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) stated her concern that improving trainings for building staff would not be sufficient to prevent violent outbursts from ICE agents. She suggested that some kind of on-campus housing might be provided for those students who are afraid of imminent danger from federal agents, as was initially requested by Mahmoud Khalil before his apprehension. President Shipman agreed that this was a great suggestion.

Chair's Report and Questions

Sen. D'Armiento began by thanking everyone who worked for the release of Ellie Aghayeva and stated that questions about safety and protection in Columbia housing for international students could be addressed to Vice Provost Ushma Neil and Senior Vice Provost Miguel Urquiola, who would be available to answer questions after the Plenary. Additionally, she stated that as everyone celebrates Ellie Aghayeva's release, at least four Columbia students have been detained by ICE, and not all have been released.

Sen. D'Armiento also reminded Senators that the upcoming Forums on University Governance hosted by the External Relations and Research Policy Committee would be held in March. She noted that she and Senator Holger Klein, the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee, had received a copy of the finalized Review of the University Senate, but had not yet been given authority to share it publicly.

Senator Greg Mann (Ten., A&S/SS) asked about the newly created SIPA undergraduate major in global affairs, stating that he was interested in hearing from the Education Committee regarding this proposal. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Education Committee had just received this proposal and will report to the Senate soon. She also referred Sen. Mann to a document on the Senate website summarizing the Senate's authority over educational programs.

Senator John Santelli (Ten., SPH), External Relations and Research Policy Committee Co-Chair, stated that he appreciated the notice about the upcoming forum and emphasized that the finalized Review of the Senate would be helpful in preparation for the Forum. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she would push for the release of the report.

A commented was made regarding the SIPA major, mentioning that there was an agreement that pre-dated 1997 for the Education Committee to refrain from reviewing undergraduate majors. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the committee will discuss this but that there is a document online that outlines the Senate's statutory oversight over educational programming in general that can be reviewed.

Senator Julie Crawford (Ten., A&S/HUM), Education Committee Co-Chair, stated both that a subcommittee has been convened to read the proposal for the major and that the entire committee has been reviewing the process of proposal submission to ensure clear procedures and create effective rubrics for program proposals.

Discussion of Professor of Instruction proposal (Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure)

Sen. D'Armiento summarized the Senate's previous discussion of the proposal and gave the floor to Senator Sarah Hansen (TTOT, A&S/NS). Sen Hansen stated that the proposal was reproduced in full in the last plenary packet, and that there is a form for comments currently open. She stated that the current proposal may not be perfect but, importantly, recognizes lecturers' critical role in the University community, and that this discussion will inform the Faculty Affairs Committee's drafting of a resolution for vote in the next plenary. Sen. D'Armiento stated that she has seen broad support for the proposal. Sen. D'Armiento briefly summarized past Senate action in 1987, 1994, and 2006 to modify titles, which were written to anticipate possible unintended effects of the new titles. She stated the goal was to draft this resolution similarly.

Sen. Freyer described how his committee had met with Vice Provost Eugenia Lean, to consider all the suggestions received. He agreed recognition for non-tenured faculty has been long overdue and the proposal is vital. Sen. Freyer further stated that he hopes this new title will create more consistency in terms of how off-track faculty are treated across departments.

Sen. Slaughter emphasized his support for the proposal and the recognition it would provide to lecturer colleagues, who are a critical part of the University's mission. He also stated his feeling that the resolution should include more than just a title change, including better support for academic freedom for those with one-year contracts, as well as a commitment to the tenured faculty as a foundation of the University to prevent an explosion of off-track hiring.

Sen. Jackie Dugard (TTOT, A&S/NS) stated that her constituency is very much in favor of the proposal, even as community members want to see more details as well as implementation of the recommendations mentioned by Sen. Slaughter.

Senator Babi Kruchin (TTOT, SPS) stated there is great excitement at SPS for the proposal as well.

Senator Amir Ziv (TTOT, Bus.) also stated his support for the proposal. Senator Ziv made two recommendations. First, he proposed seeking more input from the instructor community in the development of criteria for review and promotion. Second, he stated that the planned capstone title Teaching Professor with Distinction is confusing and could be replaced with the title of University Professor of Instruction to parallel the existing University Professor title.

Senator Gerard Ateshian, (Ten., A&S/NS) speaking as chair of Tenured Faculty Caucus, stated that a town hall meeting indicated strong sentiment in favor of the proposal. However, he listed a few concerns he heard from constituents, including that there is no preamble with justifications for the proposal, that there is no description of how this title will be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook, and that it is not clear if this title confers voting privileges in faculty meetings.

Senator Ben Orlove (Ten., SIPA) stated that he had heard from several lecturers that they are interested in the ability to serve as Principal Investigators on grants, and that raising money for grants without this is extremely cumbersome.

Senator Heidi Allen (Ten., SSW) stated that she is interested in including privileges that would make this proposal more than a title change, and that the changes to promotion structures in this proposal are welcome. She stated that her constituency would want to see lecturers given the ability to serve as Principal Investigators on grants.

Senator Daniel Savin (Research Officers – Professional) stated that he supports this proposal, and both professorial titles and the ability to have 9 months of salary with 12 months of benefits is something the Research Officers constituency has been advocating for attaining themselves. This would make more money available to support group members and improve institutional memory.

The question was raised as to why the title was specific to instruction when lecturers also conduct important research.

Sen. D'Armiento stated that Eugenia Lean from the provosts' office would be available to answer questions as well.

Senator Lydia Goehr (Ten., A&S/HUM) expressed her support for the proposal and commented that additional subsidiary efforts could be worked out in the future.

Sen. D'Armiento emphasized that the Faculty Affairs Committee was working on drafting a resolution on this proposal, ideally with a vote to be conducted at the next plenary. Sen. Hansen expressed her thanks for the serious discussion on behalf of a community who has been working at the University for decades.

Hadden Epstein Statement (Commission on the Status of Women, Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure, Student Affairs)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced the discussion by stating that the same 5 committees co-sponsoring this statement had co-sponsored the 2023 resolution calling for an independent investigation into the Hadden matter. Sen. D'Armiento turned the floor over to Commission on the Status of Women Co-Chair Professor Susan Witte (Ten., SSW).

Co-Chair Witte started by thanking the non-senators present in the audience for their attendance. She stated she has not seen the update alluded to by President Shipman and thanked the co-sponsoring committees for their support. Sen. Witte then read the statement in full.

Sen. D'Armiento invited questions or comments. Sen. Goehr stated that certain people are stepping down from administrative roles because of their involvement with Epstein, and asked how much of a penalty this is if they are still permitted to teach, conduct research, and are considered members of the University community in good standing. President Shipman stated that she does not have much more to add and referred Sen. Goehr to previous statements made on this matter, emphasizing that careful review is required to determine the appropriate response in each case. She added that institutions see individuals in leadership roles as being held to a higher standard.

Sen. Hengst asked if those higher standards should be applied to those with the title of University Professor and reminded President Shipman that she can speak on this as she is not a part of any decision-making around who is given that title. President Shipman reiterated that the situation is complex and referred the Senator to earlier statements.

Sen. Santelli stated his support for Co-Chair Witte's statement, and that the students have eloquently described the corrosive effect this issue and particularly the perception of a cover-up have had on institutional trust at the medical center. Sen D'Armiento thanked all co-sponsoring the committees for discussing the consequences of this issue on all members of the medical center.

Senator Oren Pizmony-Levy (Ten., TC) proposed that the statement could be adapted into a resolution that could be voted on by the entire University Senate to amplify and publicize the Senate's interest in the well-being of women and students. Sen D'Armiento stated that while the Senate does not generally draft a resolution on the plenary floor, she would welcome a drafted resolution's introduction at the next plenary meeting.

Statement on Hadden Report Delays (Student Affairs Committee)

Sen. Luo also stated she had also not seen the most updated statement from the administration on the Hadden Report and read out the following statement, which was drafted the week prior.

Sen. Elizabeth Adeoye (Stu., CC) thanked the Student Affairs Committee's leadership and stated that many students are concerned about the delays in the report's release. She also stated that students have been contacted by many survivors who were not reached out to by the investigators, and that members of the administration and Board of Trustees may never hear their stories. As such, she explained that students would present anonymous court testimony from the survivors of Hadden's abuse, and she paused to mention that these stories contain detailed descriptions of sexual assault for sensitive viewers. Senators Baum, and Liane Bdair (Stu., CC), read from the statements (see here).

Sen. D'Armiento thanked the students for bringing these statements to the agenda and assured them that the Senate was vigorously pursuing the release of the report. Student senators emphasized that these were only a small sample of publicly available statements, and that they hoped the statements illustrated the importance of preventing any further delays in accountability.

Sen. Ogundare stated that student calls for accountability can come at great personal risk. Having reviewed the update released by the University, he raised concerns that the update fails to recognize that the survivors of Hadden's abuse are the most qualified witnesses, and that many survivors have reached out to students saying they were not interviewed in the investigation. Sen. Ogundare also mentioned that

Medical Center students who are working in the hospital where Hadden perpetrated his abuse have been unfairly given the sole responsibility for advocating for accountability.

President Shipman thanked the students and acknowledged that the University did not act quickly enough to address the heinous crimes perpetrated by Hadden. She reiterated that she is not aware of any specific details regarding who was or was not interviewed by the independent investigator.

Declaration by the Committee on the Rules of University Conduct (Rules of University Conduct)

Sen. D'Armiento introduced the item by stating that Chapter 44 of the University Statutes was updated by the Board of the Trustees over the summer and removed authority over the Rules of University Conduct from the Rules Committee of the Senate, instead assigning it to the Provost. She then gave the floor to Senator Marc Younker (Stu., School of Law), Co-Chair of the Rules of University Conduct Committee.

Sen. Younker thanked members of the Student Affairs Committee and read out the statement.

Sen. D'Armiento asked for a motion to suspend the rules to allow a non-senator, a representative from the Office of the Provost s' office, to speak. The motion passed.

Carrie Marlin, Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Planning, offered a clarifying point that the Provost's Advisory Committee on Conduct and Accountability was convened by Provost Olinto and EVP Melanie Bernitz to advise on disciplinary processes across the University. She emphasized that Provost Olinto welcomes the recommendations of the Rules Committee.

Sen. Bdair stated her concern that as a member of the Rules Committee, she does not understand the rationale for the Advisory Committee, as the Rules Committee already had the capacity to advise the Provost on disciplinary procedures.

Sen. Dugard asked why the Rules Committee mandate was bypassed in this way. President Shipman stated that the Advisory Committee's intent was to look across a wider range of disciplinary processes and that there is confusion around the differences between them.

Sen. Bernofsky reiterated the question and stated that President Shipman's response did not explain why the Board of Trustees decided to unilaterally remove the statutory authority of the Rules Committee.

President Shipman stated that it was her understanding that the Board perceived substantial risk to the institution and referred Senators to earlier statements she had made on the matter.

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

University Senate

Proposed: April 10, 2026

Adopted:_____

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE TITLE AND TRACK OF PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION

WHEREAS legitimate programmatic needs continue to exist across the University for renewable full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions and service; and

WHEREAS the Lecturer-in-Discipline community has long been a critical part of Columbia University, actively contributing to teaching, advising, and administrative efforts; and

WHEREAS the Office of the Provost, recognizing the crucial academic contributions of this group, has sought review by the University Senate of a proposal for the creation of a new three-tiered Professor of Instruction title and track that includes Assistant, Associate and Professor of Instruction ranks for current and future faculty in renewable, non-tenure-eligible positions; and

WHEREAS this new title and track signify the high value the University places on its teaching mission and the role of the current Lecturer-in-Discipline faculty in fulfilling it;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the establishment of the Professor of Instruction title and track as a non-tenure-track faculty appointment with a renewable stated term comprised of the following three tiers:

- **Assistant Professor of Instruction:** Entry-level, requires PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JD), 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 eighth year of service.
- **Associate Professor of Instruction:** Requires PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JD), 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., JD), a minimum of twelve 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.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that prior to a major review in year eight 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 Lecturers-in-Discipline currently are expected to complete in schools such as Arts and Sciences; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that 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 standard 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 within the period of notice commensurate with the years of service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is no absolute requirement for progression from Associate Professor of Instruction to Professor of Instruction; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in addition to the substantive reviews that are held to determine promotion to a higher rank, schools will continue to conduct continuing reviews at five-year intervals (with either a recommendation for an additional term, or a recommendation for non-renewal) to ensure ongoing 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); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this remain 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 as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook. The sole exception being when an Associate Professor of Instruction does not pass the promotional review to [Full] Professor of Instruction. In such cases, they can be permitted to remain at the Associate tier and continue to be evaluated with continuing reviews; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that current qualified full-time Lecturers-in-Discipline and Senior Lecturers-in-Discipline with renewable appointments who have been hired through an open search with full clearance have the option of remaining in the Lecturer-in-Discipline/Senior Lecturer-in-Discipline track or transitioning to the Professor of Instruction track with their Dean's approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the total number of faculty appointments of Professors of Instruction, Professors of Practice, and Full-Time Special Instructional Faculty shall not exceed 30 percent of the total number of the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty in the Fu Foundation School of Engineering

and Applied Science and similarly across all academic departments in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences , not counting faculty appointments in the School of Professional Studies and the School of the Arts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that prior to making appointments in the Professor of Instruction track to new faculty within the School of the Arts, the School of Professional Studies, and the Professional Schools[1], not including the Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Science, further University Senate action is required in order to address historical exceptions that have been granted on a school-by-school basis without a comprehensive set of guidelines and policies, which are indispensable to maintaining the quality of the University's scholarly and research efforts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the proposal be forwarded to the University Trustees for appropriate action.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that upon Trustee action, the Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee will work together with the Office of the Provost to make the requisite revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

Proponent: Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

[1] The Faculty Handbook defines the professional faculties as: Architecture, Planning and Preservation, Business, Climate, Engineering and Applied Science, International and Public Affairs, Journalism, Law, and Social Work.

University Senate

Proposed: April 10, 2026

Adopted:_____

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION

TO ESTABLISH THE TITLE AND TRACK OF PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION

WHEREAS the Lecturer-in-Discipline community has long been a critical part of Columbia University, actively contributing to teaching, advising, and administrative efforts across campus; and

WHEREAS existing Senior Lecturers in Discipline who have spent more than ten years in the Lecturer-in-Discipline track have demonstrated through rigorous major and ongoing reviews their exceptional value to the university and fulfill a vital role as leaders in its educational mission; and

WHEREAS some existing Senior Lecturers in Discipline in this category may not hold a PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JD), making them ineligible for the Professor-of-Instruction title;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Senior Lecturers in Discipline not holding a PhD (or its professional equivalent e.g., JD) who were hired through an open search with full clearance and have served in the Lecturer-in-Discipline track for more than ten years as of the date of this resolution are eligible to apply for transition to the Professor-of-Instruction track at the rank of either Associate Professor of Instruction or Professor of Instruction as determined appropriate by their Department Chair and School Dean.

Proponent: Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Proposal for a Professor of Instruction Track

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 and SLiDs who hold a PhD or its professional equivalent immediately qualify to apply for transfer to the Professor of Instruction track. LiDs and SLiDs who do not hold a PhD (or its professional equivalent) and/or have accrued less than 10 years of teaching experience at Columbia can be considered for a future transfer into the new track if they obtain an EdD or PhD degree. Once the degree has been granted, such faculty may apply for the transfer into the new track. SLiDs who do not hold a PhD (or its professional equivalent), but have accrued 10+ years of teaching experience at Columbia may be considered for the transfer based on their years of experience and the professional development that has occurred over their years of dedicated service to the University.

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.

[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.

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 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: LiD/SLiD 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	**LiD/SLiD 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
Appoint-ment 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)

Exception-al Honor	Teaching Professor (capped at 5% of faculty; formal nomination required)	Teaching Professor with Distinction (capped at 5% of faculty; formal nomination required)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The University Senate

March 30, 2026

Dear President Shipman and Members of the Board of Trustees:

We write to express our serious concern with the March 10, 2026, Report of the Investigation into the Circumstances that Allowed Robert Hadden to Abuse Patients (Loughnane, Levy, and Carlson).

The report does document the horrific abuse perpetrated by Dr. Hadden and identifies procedural failures within clinical and administrative systems that allowed this misconduct to occur over many years. However, the report does not come close to addressing the role of institutional leadership in decisions after Hadden's arrest in 2012, which is central to the University Senate's responsibility for shared governance and institutional accountability. Furthermore, the report raises substantial unanswered questions regarding the independence and scope of the investigation. In particular, the report itself raises several issues that require clarification.

1. Independence and Scope of the Investigation

Although presented as an independent external review, the report notes that Columbia and New York Presbyterian each formed a special committee of the Boards of Trustees in connection with the investigation. Therefore, greater transparency is needed regarding the structure and scope of this review. Specifically:

- How and why was the law firm of Sidley Austin selected to conduct the investigation?
- What was the formal charge given to the investigators?
- What role, if any, did the Trustees, the Office of General Counsel, or senior administrators have in shaping the scope, conduct, or final report?
- Who served on the trustee committees referenced in the report? What, if any, prior relations existed among the law firm and the Trustees and former Trustees, and the Administration?
- What was the cost of generating this report?
- Who made the decision to restrict the scope of the investigation to events prior to 2012?

- Why was the period after 2012 excluded, when many of the most consequential institutional decisions occurred?

2. Institutional Leadership and Decision-Making

The report focuses primarily on clinical and procedural failures prior to 2012, including weaknesses in chaperone practices and reporting systems. Yet many of the most consequential decisions occurred after Dr. Hadden's arrest. These include reporting obligations, patient notification, and Hadden's employment status. Therefore, we seek clarification on the following:

- What was the involvement of the Trustees in 2012 after Chair Bill Cambell received the information?
- Why did the University hire a lawyer for Hadden and not report him to the Medical Board?
- Who made the decision to allow Hadden to remain on paid medical leave following his arrest?
- Why were patients who had been treated by Dr. Hadden not notified of his arrest until many years later?

The University Senate has repeatedly called for transparency and accountability in the institutional response to the Hadden case. Addressing these questions is essential to restoring trust in the University's commitment to patient safety, survivor support, and responsible governance. We respectfully request clarification from the Administration regarding these matters and welcome the opportunity to engage further with leadership on the issues raised in this report.

Sincerely,

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento, Chair, and Sen. Holger A. Klein, Vice Chair, Executive Committee, on behalf of Commission on the Status of Woman and External Relations and Research Policy Committee

Statement on Expansion of the Undergraduate Population

April 9, 2026

On March 11, 2026, Acting President Shipman and Provost Olinto announced, in a campus-wide email titled *Investing in the Undergraduate Experience*, a series of "essential investments…in the undergraduate student experience…these commitments will strengthen the academic and day-to-day experience of our students, from investment in additional faculty, academic and career advising, to student spaces, dining, libraries, health, and recreation facilities." Although we welcome thoughtful and sustainable quality of life improvements for the Columbia community, we are deeply concerned that the Administration announced these plans without meaningful consultation with the University Senate. Discussing the topic of expansion and the proposed details of this email would have greatly benefited from open criticism in a public forum such as Plenary, and more in-depth and collaborative conversations with specific Senate Committees who offer deep knowledge, experience, commitment, and diversity of perspective.

1. **Process: Insufficient consultation with the campus community, including the University Senate**

   - At the February 6, 2026, plenary, President Shipman expressed the University's hope of reaching a "consensus" on undergraduate expansion prior to the release of admissions decisions.
   - On February 18, 2026, Acting President Shipman and Senior Executive Vice President Kasdin informed University Senate leadership and representatives of key committees of their plans for expansion. University Senators provided comments and feedback, though there was limited time for their incorporation into the expansion proposal.
   - One week prior to the announcement of March 11, 2026, the University finalized decisions to expand undergraduate enrollment (575 undergraduates by 2029).
   - On March 11, 2026, the University publicly announced the expansion.

   The lack of meaningful consultation delegitimizes the process of expansion and raises concerns over extensive executive decision-making. The specialized knowledge of University Senate committees would facilitate a deeper understanding of community concerns associated with the proposed expansion. Providing a two-week notice of an expansion plan that had already been determined offered insufficient time for the feedback provided by the Senate to be incorporated.

2. **Planning: Absence of timelines and benchmarks necessary to accommodate expanded student populations**

   The March 11, 2026 announcement includes no long-term plans or goals for expansion in terms of improvements to space (classroom and other needs), physical infrastructure, or teaching needs, which are necessary for an increased student population.

3. **Resources: Overcrowding of our campus is a persistent and is an unresolved problem**

   Expanding the undergraduate population over the next three years threatens the quality of the educational experience we offer to students. Currently:

- **Classrooms** are too few and are often inadequately maintained and configured, necessitating the rental of several additional classrooms each year.
- Regarding **housing**, students were relocated at short notice in late summer 2025 to accommodate the expanded incoming undergraduate class. In spring 2026, graduate students will be relocated as buildings are redesignated for undergraduates.
- **Dining hall** overcrowding has resulted in students regularly being unable to dine in a timely manner. We should note that graduate student access to dining has been curtailed this academic year.
- And our **libraries**, which are some of the central gathering points for study and intellectual collaboration, are overcrowded to the point of inhibiting research and learning.
- In addition, students, faculty, and staff *see* and regularly take note of the poor quality of the University's **physical infrastructure**–large and small.

Moreover, the March 11, 2026 announcement addresses undergraduate students only, with no mention of graduate students, 72 percent of the student population[1], omitting a constituency essential to Columbia's academic mission and disproportionately burdened by the current expansion. Providing timelines and benchmarks to first resolve these problems before considering expansion would be better received by the campus community. Failing to do so created unnecessary friction between the administration and students and thus pushes the issue of expansion down the road.

[1] https://opir.columbia.edu/sites/opir.columbia.edu/files/content/Statistical%20Abstract/opir_enrollment_history.pdf

4. **Teaching: Hiring additional instructors on an ad-hoc basis endangers the quality of instruction at Columbia**

   Both the March 11, 2026 announcement and a separate email to the Faculty of the Arts & Sciences fail to consider the extensive experience and expertise that current members of the Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Education Committee could provide vis-a-vis the key issues involving Tenure-Track faculty, lecturers, and instructors, educational program evaluation and instructional excellence. In sum, we fear that the quality of education in the Core, Columbia's hallmark, and other undergraduate courses, will be diminished and that the reputation of the University will be damaged.

In summary, it is our collective opinion that the University's efforts are insufficient to address the pressures and concerns we raise in this letter. There remains widespread criticism of and opposition to expansion plans amongst the campus body. In fact, an open letter from Undergraduate Student Council Leaders "in strong opposition to undergraduate expansion" has gathered nearly 1,400 signatures amongst students, faculty, and staff. Columbia needs a commitment to shared governance that gives each constituency a meaningful role. As such, expansion should be halted until clear guidelines for infrastructure improvement are created, with appropriate university-wide open consultation that is substantive and genuine rather than hasty and incomplete.

A summary of the consultation that the Administration reports occurred is listed at the bottom of this letter.

Respectfully,

Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee

Education Committee

Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure

Libraries and Digital Resources

Student Affairs Committee

CONSULTATION APPENDIX:

Consultation:

Below is the list of consultations the administration reports having occurred, with the Senate, A&S faculty, undergraduate student leaders, the College Board of Visitors, and the staff in departments who support our students and oversee their education. The administration reports these and more consultations will continue as the working group tasked with implementing the commitments made to enhancing the undergraduate student experience gets underway.

University Senate:

- Consulted with Senate leadership in the fall of 2025, and jointly determined an expansion committee would be formed
- Met with Expansion Committee
- Offered updates at recurring Executive Committee Meetings.

A&S Faculty:

- Discussion held at multiple A&S full faculty meetings
- 3 meetings with A&S Policy and Planning Committee (PPC)
- Provost Olinto responded to PPC's call for consideration of the instructional needs associated with expansion with the creation of the Committee on Undergraduate Enrollments and Instructional Needs, which issued a report that significantly informed the decisions made.

Students:

- 4 meetings with Undergraduate Student Council Presidents and VPs for Policy (CC, SEAS, GS).

Alumni leadership:

- 3 meetings with Columbia College Board of Visitors Expansion Committee
- 2 meetings of full College Board of Visitors.

Expert administrators and staff:

- Convened working group that included A&S, College, SEAS, Health, Registrar, and Facilities representation.
- Consulted widely with leaders and administrators representing the following departments:
    - Provost
    - Dean of A&S
    - Columbia College, Columbia Engineering, General Studies Deans
    - Facilities & Operations
    - Finance
    - Housing
    - Columbia Health
    - Dining
    - University Life
    - Athletics
    - Advising