

MEETING OF APRIL 27, 2018

In President Bollinger's absence, Executive Committee chair Sharyn O'Halloran called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 104 Jerome Greene. Fifty-eight of 99 senators were present during the meeting.

Minutes and agenda. The Senate approved the minutes of March 30, 2018, and the agenda without corrections.

Executive Committee chair's remarks.

Tributes to two Senate stalwarts. Sen. O'Halloran mentioned two colleagues whose main roles in the Senate were now coming to an end. The first, Howard Jacobson, was stepping down as Senate parliamentarian. Mr. Jacobson, CC 1964, Law '67, spent a decade in the law firm Kaye Scholer but returned to Columbia in 1979 to spend the rest of his career in the General Counsel's office. For most of that time, she said, Mr. Jacobson was immersed in the work of the Senate, serving long stints on the Rules and Structure and Operations committees and becoming parliamentarian in the 1990s. Sen. O'Halloran said that when the going gets tough, the Senate gets procedural, and that's when Mr. Jacobson's expertise and calm demeanor were indispensable. Some of the contentious issues that challenged the Senate during Mr. Jacobson's time included the return of ROTC to the Columbia campus, as well as sexual assault policy. Sen. O'Halloran thanked Mr. Jacobson for his contributions to the Senate. There was applause.

Sen. O'Halloran then called attention to a longtime senator, Samuel Silverstein (Ten., P&S), who was stepping down after 15 years in the Senate. He came to Columbia in 1984, and in 2003 added Senate service to his full-time duties as a Principal Investigator and chair of the Physiology Department. As chair of the Senate Libraries Committee, he championed the Libraries through bad years and good. He has also worked to broaden science education, founding the Columbia University Summer Research Program for Science Teachers. He has received the Mayor's Award for Public Understanding of Science. He has also sought middle ground and offered thoughtful amendments and valuable criticism on Senate issues ranging from the return of ROTC to the 2007 campus visit of Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Last December, Sen. O'Halloran said, Sen. Silverstein took Columbia to task for what he considered its ineffective opposition to the Republican tax reform bill. Sen. O'Halloran mentioned Sen. Silverstein's devotion to exploration of Antarctica, which earned him an award from the National Geographic Society, and his tireless insistence on the need for a setting in Manhattanville where scientists and other academics could meet, make friends, and inspire each other intellectually. There was applause.

Remarks from SAC vice chair Izzet Kebudi on an incident of bigotry (SEAS Undergrad). Sen. Kebudi said the leadership of SAC wanted to respond to some racist social-media posts and bigoted spam emails that were recently distributed among the student body at Barnard and some

parts of the Columbia campus. These messages targeted students based on their identity or religious background, discouraging them from running for student government offices. Sen. Kebudi said messages of this kind are fundamentally undemocratic. All Columbia students should feel sufficiently comfortable and empowered to seek campus office. He said many members of student government, regardless of their race or ethnicity, have devoted many hours to the work of benefiting marginalized communities and students on campus. Sen. Kebudi said a student doesn't have to be a member of a certain community to work closely with members of that community to effect positive change at Columbia. Some of the offensive posts called out Jewish students with anti-Semitic slurs, referring to them as snakes. Prejudiced assumptions led some of the students targeted in these posts to be misidentified by sexuality and ethnicity.

Sen. Kebudi said the Columbia community should take an active role in noticing hate, calling it out, and explaining why it's wrong through dialogue. He said that other communities might not have been targeted in recent weeks, but any community could be attacked, for hate is not exclusively focused on any single community. It can manifest itself in any community, and the only way to defeat it is to fight it in a truly inclusionary spirit.

Sen. Kebudi invited fellow senators, at this last plenary of the academic year, to continue to stand against hate on campus, no matter what group is targeted. There was applause.

Appeal from Suzanne Goldberg, Executive Vice President for University Life. EVP Goldberg associated herself with Sen. Kebudi's statement. She said her own statement was simply a reminder to students present to take the Student Well-Being Survey that her office had sent out, and to encourage others to do so before the close of the survey on April 30. She said the survey was an attempt to put some hard data behind the problems and stressors—as well as the sources of a sense of wellness—in students' lives. It also asked what kinds of incidents of sexual misconduct are occurring. She said the survey's response rate has varied, with some CUMC schools above 45%, but some Morningside schools in the teens or low 20s. She said the per-school completion rates for the surveys would be posted later that day.

Resolutions

Resolution Concerning Summer Powers. Sen. O'Halloran explained that the resolution, approved at the end of every Senate year, empowers the Senate Executive Committee to represent the Senate in all matters within its jurisdiction from the last plenary in the spring to the first one in the fall. The resolution was moved, seconded, and unanimously adopted.

Resolution to Establish a Program Leading to an M.D./M.A. in Biomedical Informatics (P&S and GSAS) (Education Committee). Sen. Irving Herman (Ten., SEAS) presented the program. He said the proposal would combine two degrees so that students would work toward their M.D.'s for three years, then do the course work for the M.A. in Biomedical Informatics in the fourth year, and in the fifth year they would finish their MD studies and complete their research topic in their M.A. program. There are currently separate degrees in each discipline. Sen. Herman said this integrated structure would also benefit the students in both programs.

Sen. Herman said six of the 30 credits in the M.A. program are also counted toward the M.D. Students can apply to the M.A. program in the fall of their third year of medical school. About five M.D. students a year have expressed interest in the joint program.

Sen. Herman said no additional University resources are required for the joint program, and there are only three other programs like it in the country—at the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School at NJIT, at Vanderbilt, and at Stanford.

Sen. Herman said the master's year is self-funding. The subcommittee that reviewed the proposal for Education—Sens. Samuel Silverstein and Luna Koizumi (Stu., SPS)—expressed concern about this feature, noting that students will already be deeply in debt. But they recognized that this is standard operating procedure in the University, and that students enrolled in two stand-alone programs would also have to pay for both.

Sen. Herman said the proposal had the unanimous support of the Education Committee. He said Prof. Carol Friedman of Biomedical Informatics would run the program. She was not present at the meeting, but department chair George Hripcsak was present to answer questions. There were no questions.

The Senate then unanimously approved the resolution to establish the joint program.

Resolution to Adopt a Revised Policy on Romantic and Sexual Relationships between Faculty/Staff and Undergraduate Students (Student Affairs, Commission on the Status of Women, Faculty Affairs). Sen. Kebudi, a member of a joint subcommittee that developed the present resolution, offered a student perspective. He said the main reason why students support the proposal is the inherent power dynamic in relationships between professors or teaching assistants or staff and undergraduate students. He believed that the proposed policy barring such relationships addresses the issue perfectly. He noted that at the very end of the resolution there was provision for exceptions in special situations. He said the Student Affairs Committee, which represents all of Columbia's schools, held several discussions on the issue, and felt comfortable moving forward with the resolution.

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S), chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, and also a member of the subcommittee that drafted the proposed policy, invited questions.

Sen. June Cross (Ten., Journalism) asked if the problems identified in the resolution are mainly concerned with student-faculty relationships or with problems among students.

Sen. Suzanne Goldberg said that data on student sexual misconduct has been published for the last three years in an annual report on gender-based misconduct prevention and response, which is on the Sexual Respect website. Her office was also moving toward publishing more robust data for the entire university on both students and others.

Sen. Cross asked if the Senate was offering a policy for a problem that has not been measured.

Sen. O'Halloran said this is not a made-up problem, and Columbia is now the only member of its peer group that does not have a policy like the one now before the Senate.

Sen. Kebudi said the present proposal is not mainly addressing sexual harassment. It is focused on the power dynamic between undergraduates and faculty and the problems that can result, which can be related to but are not the same as sexual harassment.

Sen. D'Armiento said Columbia does not need a new policy disapproving of sexual harassment.

Sen. Andreas Hielscher (Ten., SEAS) asked for data on relationships between faculty and undergrads. How many of these are there? How many are coercive or abusive?

Sen. Goldberg said the University does not now collect data on consensual relationships between faculty and students at any level.

Sen. D'Armiento repeated that the present resolution had nothing to do with sexual assault or harassment. And there is no data on the number of consensual relationships between undergraduates and faculty. She said the impetus for the present policy came from the students.

Sen. Goldberg said there are data on relationships that students have reported as coercive or as harassing, but there has been no attempt to seek data on consensual relationships between students and faculty members, or even on students' consensual romantic relationships in general.

Sen. Kebudi asked to refocus the conversation on the subject of the present resolution.

Sen. Anne Taylor asked how the resolution interacts with what in New York State is called the age of legal consent.

Sen. Kebudi said there was no interaction at all between these topics. The question, again, is not about whether a student is old enough to have a consensual relationship, but about the power dynamic in a relationship between a student and a faculty member.

Sen. Taylor said she understood that point, but asked if the policy would ban an arrangement that is legally permissible.

Sen. O'Halloran said many workplaces prohibit all romantic relationships, so that's not extraordinary. She repeated that many peer institutions already have policies like this.

Sen. Goldberg said the University certainly has the authority to set policy for these issues. What she was hearing from the proponents of the present resolution was also an intention to create a clear statement of the University's values, with a recognition of some of the particular complications associated with the overwhelming majority of relationships that are likely to occur between a faculty member and an undergraduate student.

Sen. Goldberg said that if Sen. Taylor was asking the very technical question whether the University can lawfully enact a policy that prohibits faculty from engaging in consensual relationships with undergraduate students while the faculty are employed here, the answer is yes.

Sen. Eli Noam (Ten., Bus.) cited the expression “If you give a kid a hammer, the whole world looks like a nail.” At the moment, he said, there are committees with resolutions and the whole world and everyone who works here looks like another Harvey Weinstein.

Sen. Noam said he understood the issues involved—including the academic authority of the faculty member that is lost in a romantic relationship with an undergraduate student. But he said that in many situations there is no such authority to be lost. He also understood that some students away from home for the first time may be vulnerable and need protection. But these starting points don’t mean that what follows in the present resolution must be rubber-stamped.

Sen. Noam said the resolution has some real problems, the first of which is a kind of mission creep. The proponents assert a disparity of power between faculty and students—even if the faculty member is in the Medical School and the student is in Columbia College and they have nothing to do with each other. So there is the “dirty old man” scenario. But does it make sense to apply this to every officer of any kind on the campus? What is the relevant power disparity between the student and a librarian? Sen. Noam said it made little sense to extrapolate from a specific problem and to start painting with a broad brush.

Sen. Noam criticized the exemption provision in the policy, which he said seemed to allow a kind of license of romance if you jump through enough bureaucratic hoops, appealing to the offices of the provost and the general counsel. He asked what the point of the policy was. Columbia admits students and calls them women and men, not boys and girls. They should be able to make their own romantic choices through their freedom of association, their right to privacy. The University is in fact taking away their right to choose, saying it knows better about students’ choices. The policy Columbia already has states that the institutional response “shall keep the students’ educational aims and needs foremost.” He noted that the accused—the faculty or staff member— can be accused totally anonymously because of the current imperative that officers must report what they know or have heard. Sen. Noam said such a climate seemed better suited to the University of East Berlin. He said the rights of that accused person are also clearly secondary to the students’ educational aims and needs. Sen. Noam said he had total sympathy with the students’ needs, but there are also the needs of the accused in a situation where due process is critically important. His suspicion about the proposed policy was that due process was not in the cards. He concluded that he applauded the work and the goals of the committees that had brought the present resolution, but the document now before the Senate was flawed. He moved that the document be returned to the Executive Committee for more work.

Sen. D’Armiento stressed the point that the students brought the present issue to the Senate. She said the Commission on the Status of Women, which she chairs, had struggled with some of the points Sen. Noam had just outlined, particularly involving postdocs and other non-instructional officers. But she was at this meeting to support the students who had requested this policy.

Sen. Kebudi said he appreciated some of Sen. Noam’s points. He said the present resolution was not addressing situations like those that have involved Harvey Weinstein. He said it would misrepresent reality to compare all faculty to Harvey Weinstein. But he said a power imbalance is a core challenge to an educational institution like Columbia. He also understood the importance of the faculty perspective and the issues of due process for the accused. But the key

point was that this is an issue raised by the students, and it may be a particular challenge for faculty to see this issue from a student's perspective. The power imbalance of a romantic relationship with a faculty member is an extremely difficult situation for a student. That why the proponents were trying to make a particular statement. He said the exclusions and provisions for special situations were precisely to cover situations in which both parties in the relationship feel comfortable, and the special provisions provide a way for them to disclose their relationship and continue it—the clearest evidence that the student really is comfortable. But if the student is not comfortable for whatever reason—regardless of whether the faculty and the student are in unrelated schools—how will they defend themselves? The discomfort may not involve a sexual harassment issue. There can be a problem much earlier. After all, Columbia is an educational institution, and what if the student does not feel comfortable about his or her assessment? And faculty are interconnected. It is essential not to approach students in such situations in a patronizing way.

Sen. Noam said the approach of the proponents may be patronizing to fellow students.

Sen. Hielscher said he had had discussions with faculty members in the Engineering School as well as undergraduates and other students. But if there is no data, and no attempt to survey the relevant positions, is there any evidence that this is really perceived as a problem by students?

Sen. Sonya Nanda (Stu., Bus.), a Student Affairs Committee co-chair, said this issue had been discussed at length by student senators. It was also fully vetted in discussions with the senators' constituents. She said multiple undergraduate students councils have talked about this and have supported the measure. Sen. Nanda also offered her own sentiments, based on five years in the business world. She noted that Columbia is also a business in certain respects. In her business experience, romantic relationships among employees were prohibited, with an important provision for disclosure and exceptions. The proposed policy for Columbia—including the exceptions policy—is not seriously different from that of any other business or corporation. She added that the fact that Columbia is one of the last among its peers to adopt such a policy adds to the urgency of the need to make a meaningful statement.

Sen. Hielscher said that he and Sen. Nanda did not agree about the number of romantic relationships of all kinds that might exhibit a power imbalance like the one under discussion. He noted that the recent visit to the U.S. from French president Emanuel Macron. He's 40, his wife is 65, and she was his teacher in high school. An 18-year-old student can give his or her kidney away, gamble, get full body tattoos, and make all kinds of silly decisions. New York has a divorce rate of 50%. Should marriage be outlawed?

Sen. Nanda said the proposed policy would not stop people from making such decisions. But it provides a setting for formalizing a particular decision, as in any other corporations in which one is an employee.

Sen. Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM) spoke as co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. She said FAC supported the proposal, but in a split vote: 10-6, with one abstention. The no votes were closely aligned with Sen. Noam's arguments, based on a desire to support the students but also some serious concerns. She asked FAC member Michael Rosen (Ten., P&S) to speak.

Sen. Rosen recalled an old Russian saying: “Words are like birds; once uttered they fly off and take on a meaning all their own.” He said the Senate had heard wonderful and important sentiments during the present discussion, but the words in the proposed resolution didn’t do them justice. He said that until they do, the resolution needs more work. At present, he (and some of his colleagues on Faculty Affairs) found the resolution very difficult to support. The problem is most clearly evident in the document’s final paragraph, which he considered a flat-out Orwellian statement, making Provost John Coatsworth the head of the sex police, empowered to give everybody a get-out-of-jail-free card if they ask for it the right way. Sen. Rosen said the Senate was not ready to vote on this resolution.

Sen. Joseph Ulichny (NT, A&S/Pure Sciences) asked what the consequences of the proposed policy would be for an undergraduate TA in an undergraduate chemistry class. Would the policy prohibit the undergraduate TA from dating another undergrad?

Sen. O’Halloran said that understanding was correct: the TA could not date an undergrad.

Sen. D’Armiento said the prohibition might be lifted if the couple talked to Provost Coatsworth.

Sen. Ulichny asked whether he would have to ask any TA joining his teaching team whether he or she was dating another student.

Sen. D’Armiento said there are always nuances to consider, and Senate committees had discussed a number of them. The bottom line for the Commission on the Status of Women was that the students unanimously request the proposed policy, and are deeply concerned about the power dynamic. She added that it was the Commission that sought a provision for exceptions.

Sen. Kebudi said it was not right to say that what the proponents were doing was patronizing. He stressed that the resolution received the unanimous support of the Student Affairs Committee. The subcommittee also sought opinions from undergraduates and student councils. He had multiple conversations in his school—SEAS—and did not hear any arguments against the resolution. He said the proponents were not patronizing, but were reflecting student opinion.

Sen. Noam said that, with all due respect, this is not a decision to be made by majority vote. Even if 99 percent of people agreed with the resolution, that would entitle them to constrain the romantic choices of the other 1 percent.

Sen. D’Armiento said no one is interested in constraining people’s relationships. The goal is to establish a policy. She said someone had put it well that this resolution commits the University to taking an institutional stand on this issue.

Sen. Susan McGregor (NT, Journalism) recalled that the Senate had passed a statement on academic freedom a few months earlier, a principle that was clearly distinct from that of freedom of expression. The academic freedom statement essentially acknowledged the fact that Columbia as an academic institution has priorities that may involve curtailing—or perhaps adjusting—our behaviors that affect other parts of our lives. U.S. citizens have freedom of expression, but

Columbia chooses as a community to communicate with each other in a particular way in an academic setting for the sake of academic ends.

Sen. McGregor said her perspective on the present resolution was analogous. She said she found herself hard-pressed to understand how permitting relationships between undergraduates and faculty or staff furthers the mission of this university. For her the real challenge is, What purpose does allowing these relationships serve? What advantage does Columbia gain as an academic and educational institution by refusing to have a procedure to govern these situations? She also noted that on various procedural questions involving anonymous reporting in recent years, the Faculty Affairs Committee—of which she is a member—had reached conclusions that it felt comfortable with. She was optimistic that reporting on questions involving relationships between undergraduates and faculty could be handled in similarly satisfactory ways.

Sen. McGregor said she didn't see how it was possible to accuse only one person of a consensual relationship. To suggest that a consensual relationship between a faculty member and a student is ongoing implies the responsibility of both parties. She said this important point is not fully acknowledged in the present policy document. Sen. McGregor said this fact is essential in distinguishing between this policy and a policy on harassment or assault: if both parties are responsible for the relationship, some of the concerns about false accusations may be less important. She said people understand general that the incidence of false reports is much lower than that of failures to report genuine problems. Anyone making an unfounded accusation of a consensual relationship would be necessarily impugning both parties—an undergraduate and a faculty member or teaching assistant. She said this issue deserves consideration as well.

Sen. James Applegate (Ten., A&S/Pure Sciences) said he was one of the FAC members who voted against the proposed resolution. His main reason was that the situations involving problematic power dynamics between a faculty member and a student are already against the rules, which prohibit relationships between faculty and students in which the faculty member exercises academic authority over the student. He noted that these rules are not taken as seriously or enforced as they should be. But they are in place. The problem is that the University doesn't do what it already says it is going to do. The difference between the present resolution and the actual current policy involve relationships where the faculty member and student met socially, and will never see one another in a classroom or in a laboratory or a library. In such cases the "power imbalance" simply does not exist. If someone insists on seeing all relationships as power relationships, as some people do, that's more a statement about that person than about relationships. Sen. Applegate considered this a dehumanized and impoverished view of human life, which he did not care to be governed by.

Sen. Applegate said his main concern was that the present resolution was largely a distraction. He said a lot of noise is made about it. But the actual value-added, in his view, is to condemn relationships that are not problematic, and the real problem with it, in addition to the objections about due process and related issues raised by Sen. Noam and others (with which he mainly agreed) was that it doesn't do the difficult work of solving the real problems he had mentioned.

Sen. D'Armiento said the proposed policy does differ from the previous policy, adopted in March 2012. That policy prohibited only relationships in which the faculty member has

academic authority of some kind over the student. The present policy bans *all* relationships between faculty and undergraduates.

Sen. Applegate said the proposed policy is fixing situations that are not problematic and not fixing situations that are. Sen. D'Armiento repeated that the proposal addresses a situation that students perceive as a problem.

Sen. O'Halloran said one concern about the current policy is that it does not cover all of the types of academic authority that a professor can exercise over a student. For example, it does not mention awards nominations. The new proposal provides a way to draw a bright line that prevents any possibility of an abuse of academic authority. It also actually protects the faculty member as well as the student.

Sen. Kebudi agreed.

Sen. D'Armiento said the proponents were prepared to say more about their decision to focus exclusively on undergraduates in the present resolution.

Sen. Shelley Saltzman (NT, SPS) thought it would be obvious that awards nominations would be one kind of academic authority a professor might have over a students.

Sen. O'Halloran said it was possible that the professor and/or the student might not know in advance that the professor would be on an awards committee in which the student was under consideration, or that the student would be doing an honors thesis that would be reviewed by the professor. So there are numerous unanticipated scenarios that could take place. But the answer to the question of what's right for the institution and its mission, what provides adequate protections for both the student as well as the faculty, what allows the institution to have consistent, enforceable policies.

Sen. D'Armiento said the goal of the present proposal was to empower undergraduates to be able to hold onto this policy in any situation that may be not necessarily as clearly consensual as the faculty member may think. She said proponents of the present resolution have thought and talked a lot about the faculty. But the truth of the matter is that if an undergraduate has this policy in place, he or she is very much protected if something happens. There will have to be additional recommendations about graduate students, but these exclusively concern undergrads.

Provost Coatsworth said it is factually incorrect to say that Columbia doesn't have adequate, even enthusiastic and in some cases draconian enforcement of existing rules. It is impossible to read *The New York Times* without understanding this. And what appears in the *Times* is only the tip of the iceberg of what comes through his office. The provost said Columbia has a very strong policy. It has tripled the number of people who are enforcing it, including professional investigators. When the University determines that someone is responsible for violating the policy, that person suffers serious sanctions. He said he wanted to clear up the current myth that the current policy was not being enforced. It is being enforced, and the process is painful, as he can attest from experience.

Sen. Silverstein suggested that the problem was that there was no way of requiring that the 1 percent of romantic relationships that are genuinely consensual and without academic conflicts of interest be recorded someplace. Ninety-nine percent of those relationships may be legitimately prohibited, but there are bound to be a few genuinely consensual relationships between faculty and students. Shouldn't those be recorded?

Sen. O'Halloran said that was exactly the kind of disclosure that was laid out in the protocol for exceptions at the very end of the present proposal, on page 4. Such information could be provided publicly, on a website, though that didn't seem appropriate. Instead, the disclosure could be made to a supervisor—a chair, a dean, or the provost.

Sen. O'Halloran said that in some settings the approach is prohibition unless the relationship is disclosed. In other settings the policy is zero tolerance for such relationships.

Sen. Julia Hirschberg (Ten., SEAS), a professor of computer science, offered strong support for the proposal and the students who requested it. She recalled having the same feelings as an undergraduate that current students are reporting now. She said the concern needn't be about faculty who directly advise you; it might involve any faculty member who approaches you. She said her own students also find it difficult to deal with such situations because they don't know what kind of power a faculty member may eventually or currently have over them. She urged senators to vote for the proposed resolution.

Sen. O'Halloran agreed with Sen. Hirschberg's assessment. Only someone who has been in the student's situation really understands the difficulty of these encounters, when the student doesn't want to upset someone, and has to try to wiggle out of the situation without making the faculty member angry because the student knows the faculty member will be grading their exam. Sen. O'Halloran said these difficult situations are pervasive. She regretted that she didn't have data, but there are lots of data from experience. She said these phenomena are real, and persistent, with serious effects on the quality of education of Columbia students, and students shouldn't have to worry about such things. She said that if someone is really serious about having a relationship, talking to the Provost should be the least of their worries.

Sen. Kebudi said he was open to talking more, but he also thought it might be time to end the present conversation.

Sen. O'Halloran asked for a motion to end debate.

Sen. Lisa Rosen-Metsch (Dean, GS; Admin.) said she could think of a few instances of General Studies students who are married to faculty.

Sen. O'Halloran said such examples tend to come from General Studies, where many students are adults. She mentioned the example of a 40-year-old female vet who wants to date the 27-year-old male professor. Having exceptions for such situations would be valuable, but disclosure is absolutely necessary.

Sen. Rosen-Metsch said GS had a professor whose partner wanted to enroll as a GS student.

Sen. O'Halloran said this would be another obvious case for routine disclosure. Such cases don't reflect negatively on anyone. It's just a fairly common situation, like that of a married couple who are hired into the same department.

Sen. Taylor said she sympathized with the principle of the resolution, but suggested that the framing of the policy should focus on the disclosure instead of on a broad prohibition of relationships. She said she still struggled with the idea that Columbia students may have the right to vote and to fight our wars on foreign soil—but not to have a romantic relationship.

Sen. O'Halloran said 18-year-olds are not allowed to drink. Sen. Taylor said that may be true of New York State, but not in others. She repeated that since the relationships in question are truly consensual, perhaps the policy should focus on a few steps people can take to disclose them.

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health), a member of Faculty Affairs and of the subcommittee presenting the present resolution, said that students wonder whether a relationship with their professor can be truly consensual in a situation where the professor has so much power over them. Sen. Freyer said that's why students are uncomfortable and that's what they're asking for protection from.

Sen. D'Armiento noted that faculty senators are saying they want students to have freedom, but students are telling the Senate that they voted unanimously for the present proposal. That request is what guided the Commission on the Status of Women to its present position.

Sen. Nanda moved to call the question.

Sen. Noam offered a point of procedure. He said he had already made a motion to send the resolution back to the Executive Committee to work on some of the problems raised at the present meeting.

Sen. O'Halloran asked if Sen. Noam was moving to table the resolution.

Sen. Noam said he was moving to return the resolution for redrafting.

Sen. O'Halloran said she had called the question previously.

Sen. Noam said he had made his motion when he spoke for the first time.

Mr. Jacobson, the parliamentarian, said that when someone calls the question and receives a second, the motion is not debatable, and stops any amendment. A motion to call the question requires a two-thirds vote, and cuts off debate.

Sen. Noam replied that he said specifically when he first addressed the body that he wanted to make a motion to send the resolution back to the Executive Committee.

Sen. D'Armiento asked if Sen. Noam wanted modifications to the last paragraph—the exceptions procedure—or to the whole resolution.

Sen. Noam said he wanted to return the whole document for redrafting.

Sen. O'Halloran asked again if Sen. Noam was tabling the resolution.

Mr. Jacobson and Sen. O'Halloran asked Sen. Noam what his intention was.

Mr. Jacobson asked if Sen. Noam was postponing the resolution to a date certain.

Sen. Noam said he was postponing the resolution to the next Senate plenary subsequent to a potential redrafting by the Executive Committee.

Mr. Jacobson asked if Sen. Noam wanted to ask the Executive Committee to reconsider the resolution. He pointed out that Sen. Noam could not tell the Executive Committee what they will do with the resolution.

Sen. Noam agreed with Mr. Jacobson's account of his intention.

Mr. Jacobson determined that there was a second to Sen. Noam's motion.

Sen. O'Halloran asked the Senate to vote on Sen. Noam's motion.

Mr. Jacobson said the decision would be made by majority vote.

Sen. O'Halloran said the motion called for sending the resolution back to the Executive Committee to reconsider it, with the possibility of bringing it back to the next plenary.

Sen. O'Halloran said that if Sen. Noam's motion were not to pass, the Senate would go on to vote on the proposed resolution.

Mr. Jacobson put the motion to a vote.

Sen. O'Halloran announced the result: by show of hands, 17 were in favor, 28 opposed, with one abstention. She said the motion failed.

Sen. Nanda moved for a vote on the proposed resolution.

Sen. O'Halloran determined that there was a second, and that the Senate should vote. She explained that the Senate was now in the midst of a procedural motion, and no other questions could be considered. The result, by show of hands, was 28 in favor, 9 opposed, with 7 abstentions. Sen. O'Halloran said the motion had passed.

Sen. Ian Lipkin (Ten., Public Health) said he had voted for the resolution, but he had some concerns about how the resolution was addressed. He was unhappy about the comment during

the debate to the effect that it was OK for a 40-year-old woman to date a 27-year-old man. He said the comment was inappropriate and trivialized the whole process.

Sen. O'Halloran, who had made the comment, said she had been simply trying to offer an alternative to the typical power dynamic.

Sen. Lipkin reminded Sen. O'Halloran that she had given him the floor. He said that the point was made clearly that whenever there is a power dynamic there should be no option for any individual to have a romantic relationship, and the Provost had stated quite clearly that that restriction is enforced. Sen. Lipkin said he thought it was critically important to separate these two issues. The students were interested in ensuring that undergraduates are not in a situation where they might feel uncomfortable. Sen. Lipkin was sympathetic to that position. He said Sen. Metsch had mentioned appropriately that in the School of General Studies there are situations where people are already married, and so there has to be some sort of provision for them.

Sen. Lipkin said that if the group had started by following Sen. Taylor's suggestion, with the idea that there are relationships that are honest and sincere and precede any sort of academic relationship, and these need to be supported in some way with open disclosure, and *then* gone into the discussion of what it means to start a new relationship where you have undergraduates and others over whom you may at some point have authority, then the resolution might have gotten more votes. But Sen. Lipkin also said it's important to undertake such discussions without levity or hyperbole, and stay focused on the important issues.

Sen. O'Halloran thanked Sen. Lipkin for his remarks, and apologized for her own.

Committee Annual reports.

Alumni Relations. Committee co-chair Kurt Roeloffs gave a brief oral report and said the formal written report would be deferred till September. He said Alumni Relations this year continued to discuss career development, lifelong learning, entrepreneurship, and Global Centers in search of ways to create more alumni engagement and to leverage the alumni community, 320,000 strong. But the major focus, as it was the previous year, was on the CU there! initiative, which enables students during their breaks from school to connect with alumni through the various established alumni organizations, chapters and special interest groups (SIGs). CU there! was a strong success, with more than 3000 students signing up for dozens of activities. Now the committee is revising CU there! in order to deal with some problems that arose during the first summer. The main problem was that there was a high degree of registration but then a lot of fallout, or student no-shows, which were frustrating to alumni groups. Students were allowed to register far ahead of time for as many events as they wanted, and then many of them got busy with other activities. So the committee is now slowing the registration process down, and making sure that students are more committed to the event they sign up for. But there is an enormous amount of student interest again.

Sen. Roeloffs urged student senators to sign up for an activity, try it out, and provide feedback. He invited the other caucuses of the Senate to take a look at this program as a way for them to create more engagement with alumni. He suggested that faculty or researchers who are alumni might want to participate in one of these alumni events. He promised an update in September.

[Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee](#). Committee chair John Donaldson presented a written report, which is linked here.

Sen. Silverstein noted that the committee did not report on one issue on which it had done significant work—the subways. He said the 168th Street #1 train station will be closed for a year to renovate the elevators. That station had been slightly upgraded, but it was still an abomination. There is no ADA-accessible elevator service from the #1 train. For the largest hospital in Manhattan to be inaccessible to disabled people from one of its major trains is a disgrace.

Sen. Silverstein said Campus Planning had also called attention this year to the 125th Street #1 train station, with its defective escalator. So far the University has given little sense of how it will respond to these problems, which will have an impact on anyone going to the Manhattanville campus or the Medical Center. He urged Campus Planning to press the University on these problems with some urgency in the coming year.

Sen. Donaldson agreed with Sen. Silverstein. He said the committee had had some trouble finding out who on campus is in direct contact with the MTA, but it would succeed eventually.

Commission on the Status of Women. Commission chair Jeanine D’Armiento said the Commission had handed out a single page. The statistics on the first half of the page were consistent with the data that the group had presented in its February 2 report to the Senate. Since that report the Commission has focused on presenting recommendations to the Medical Center based on those findings. The group recognizes that there have been numerous programs to support individual faculty in their efforts to advance their careers, but it also thinks that women would benefit particularly if there was a significant institutional change to improve the equity at the leadership level. She said this proposal was one item on a list of recommendations in the one-pager. Sen. D’Armiento was pleased to report that the Commission had recently met with Deans Lee Goldman and Anne Taylor of P&S, and was moving forward with discussions. Next year, in addition to following up on this work with the Medical Center, the Commission will move on to a pipeline study of the Law School.

[Student Affairs Committee](#). SAC co-chairs Sonya Nanda and Izzet Kebudi presented a written report, which is linked here. Sen. Nanda also thanked the faculty for a robust discussion on the resolution earlier in the meeting. She recognized that the resolution was controversial, and expressed appreciation for the Senate’s support on an issue students feel passionately about.

Sen. Nanda announced that she would be graduating and the other chairs—Sens. Kebudi and Josh Schenk—would not be on the Senate next year. She introduced Vice Chair Elect Indira Martinez, (Social Work) and announced next year’s co-chairs, Kira Dennis (Barnard) and Artrease Benoit (Business), who had had to leave the meeting.

Sen. Martinez expressed enthusiasm for the task of carrying on the work of this year’s leaders. She said she would be remiss if she failed to note the current student activism at Columbia. She affirmed SAC’s support for the recent vote in favor of a graduate student union. She stressed that

she saw this development as an opportunity to foster dialogue, not to shut it down. She said she had seen how successful collaborative effort has been during the present Senate session.

Sen. Noam praised Sen. Nanda—one of his own students—for her representation of the Business School student community. He said she would receive the Business School's award at graduation for student leadership and service.

[Education Committee.](#) This report was not presented.

Other reports

Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Investing annual update (Prof. Merritt Fox, chair). Prof. Fox said the ACSRI, established in 2000, advises the Trustees on ethical and social issues that arise in connection with their management of the University's endowment. The committee has twelve voting members: four students, four faculty and four alumni. Its homepage is on the University's Finance Gateway web page.

The ACSRI's main activities involve proxy votes and divestment proposals. Prof. Fox said the committee was now in the midst of proxy season. For proxy proposals, there tends to be a flavor of the day, and this year the theme is lobbying and political expenditures. The proposals call on corporations to report more than what the SEC requires them to report. In most cases the ACSRI advises the University to support these proposals. The other main proxy proposals this year relate to global warming and sustainability, typically asking corporations to report publicly on what they're doing to develop a sustainable footprint in their operations.

Divestment, the committee's other main focus, is considered an extraordinary remedy, but there are several industries on the University's divestment list: companies involved in the Sudan, tobacco companies, private prisons, and another industry added last year—thermal coal. Each year the committee reviews the list of companies that the ACSRI has advised the University to divest from or not purchase in each of these industries. It also reviews new divestment proposals, including one this year from the Roosevelt Institute, a student think tank, calling for divestment from any investment fund that itself has investments in thermal coal. The University has already divested from its *direct* holdings in thermal coal, but decided not to go forward with the new proposal, in part because it had already been considered just last year in connection with the larger thermal coal proposal and also because the dynamic nature of these funds makes it very difficult to impose such a prohibition. The only practical way to ban indirect investments is to announce that Columbia won't invest in any fund that in turn won't pledge never to invest in thermal coal.

[Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Annual Report 2017-2018](#) (EVP for University Life Suzanne Goldberg and Dennis Mitchell, Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, co-chairs). EVP Goldberg and Provost Mitchell presented the written report, which is linked here.

Adjournment. There being no further business, Sen. O'Halloran adjourned the meeting shortly before 3 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Tom Mathewson, Senate staff