

Minutes of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting, March 30th 2016

12-1, Faculty Room, 207 Low Library

A. Welcome and introduction from EVP David Madigan, with brief updates:

- (i) Junior faculty mentoring: much activity had taken place on this issue, with JFAB's significant involvement. A formal mentoring policy was now in place, and Susan Drange had addressed chairs on this issue at the recent Chairs' meeting (March 29th, 2016).
- (ii) Campus climate issues: while diversity was being addressed in terms of student (undergraduate and graduate) and faculty populations, more could yet be done to promote community inclusiveness on campus. As one initiative towards this end, a student forum was to be held later in the Spring term 2016 to improve understanding of the issues underlying the ongoing need for enhanced inclusiveness.
- (iii) The Task Force on Global Education had moved towards completion of a major report on the global aspects of Columbia education. Professor Rosalind Morris had led the Task Force's activities, and was congratulated on her excellent service in this role.

B. Updates from the Policy and Planning Committee, from the current chair, Professor David Schiminovich:

- (i) A Uris committee had been formed to investigate space-use in Uris in anticipation of A&S acquisition of the space after the departure of the Business School for Manhattanville.
- (ii) Policy items on which the PPC had been recently or soon would be working included (a) assessment of the GSAS proposal for revising the MAO pass-through of revenues; (b) compensation for departmental chairs and directors of graduate and undergraduate studies; (c) the Arts and Sciences space policy; (d) adjunct salary rates; (e) in matters of faculty hiring, consideration of the Timely Replacement Policy; (f) internal review of the procedures of the tenure and promotion process within Arts and Sciences; (g) selection of candidates

for various Arts and Sciences committees (PTC, etc.); and (h) pre-planning for the upcoming IBS process.

- (iii) Academic governance of Institutes and Centers. This issue was taken up by the PPC as a result of concerns recently aroused by the non-reappointment of the director of the Institute for Religion, Culture and Public Life (IRCPL), apparently because of differences of vision between the director and the Institute's donor, who was also a Trustee of the University. As background, Professor Schiminovich explained that there were fourteen Institutes at Columbia (four in the Humanities, ten in the Social Sciences, none in the Sciences); of these, five had existed for fifty years or more, and four had been created in the last twenty years. There were many more Centers in the Arts and Sciences. In light of the governance issues that had arisen concerning IRCPL, the PPC had formulated a statement – *not a formal policy recommendation* – as to best practices in the stewardship of Institutes. Professor Schiminovich read out that statement, the four main points of which pertained to (a) the principles of directorship of Institutes; (b) the relationship between donors and Institutes; (c) the need for bylaws for Institutes, with Provostial approval of those bylaws; and (d) best practices for Trustee involvement in Institutions.

In the ensuing discussion, questions and responses included:

- Where would the PPC statement go for display (Professor Elizabeth Blackmar)? Professor Schiminovich replied that this issue had yet to be decided; hence the follow-up query about whether the issuance of the statement could be shared with the Provost's office.
- If there was a significant problem prompting the draft PPC statement, the Senate Education committee would be ready to look into the matter (Professor James Applegate).
- Should Centers be subjected to the same kind of specific PPC statement as Institutes (Professor Michael Cole)? Professor Schiminovich replied that this question had yet to be taken up by the PPC.

- (iv) The next Arts and Sciences meeting was announced for April 27th, when President Bollinger was due to attend. In preparation for that meeting, a two-hour Faculty forum was announced for April 14th, and the PPC was also due to meet with President Bollinger in the week of April 4th. Key topics for the Faculty meeting attended by President Bollinger would include Arts and Sciences priorities, especially in the areas of strategic planning and fundraising campaigns.

C. Report from Professor Rosalind Morris on the work of the EPPC Task Force on Global Education in the Arts and Sciences:

After thanking by name those who had served on the Task Force, Professor Morris outlined three themes that were central to its activities: (a) education abroad and the concept of the Global; (b) Morningside campus in relation to education abroad: the extent to which education abroad challenged educational offerings and resources on the Morningside campus; and (c) mitigating inequalities that potentially arose through education abroad: availability of financial aid was a crucial factor, especially in the summer, to prevent global possibilities from being available only to those who could afford them.

The Task Force was set to deliver an extensive report of its findings. One main finding was that, despite significant emphasis on global initiatives in the last decade or so, Columbia had not yet moved into the top forty institutions in terms of global educational activity. Institutional tracking of student movement abroad was poorly done; hence Columbia might appear to be doing less well than its peers in the global sphere. Key areas in need of attention included:

- (i) Information, communication, and data: better infrastructure was needed to improve documentation of, preparation for, and the spread of information about travel abroad, especially on matters of funding sources, gaining visas, health insurance, etc.
- (ii) Logistical support at faculty level: infrastructure was needed to assist Faculty in identifying and thinking through possibilities for leading study abroad programs.
- (iii) Organizational priorities: two key areas of concern were (a) the impact that teaching-abroad initiatives had on regular programming on the Morningside campus, and (b) teaching the core curriculum overseas. Faculty involvement overseas meant a reduction in faculty involvement on Morningside: gains overseas risked incurring losses at the home base, and significant resources would be needed to ensure that this weighing of priorities would not negatively affect Morningside operations. A threshold had been reached: without an infusion of new resources, activities abroad would not be sustainable without loss to the home operations. The Task Force found that core instruction, especially in Literature Humanities and Contemporary Civilization, was best conducted on the Morningside campus. Without financial aid for summer overseas opportunities, there was significant risk that summer global initiatives would exacerbate

student inequality of resources; hence summer funding was an important priority.

- (iv) Graduate education: an important desideratum was the setting-up of an office to support the activities specifically of graduate students, many of whom had particular travel-abroad agendas and research-based needs. While the Office of Global Programs served the interests of undergraduates, graduate students had specialist needs that warranted attention from a different, dedicated office – an OGP for graduate students.
- (v) Policy and governance: key issues in this category were (a) financial aid for undergraduates not just in Columbia College but also in General Studies; (b) enhanced research opportunities for overseas study; (c) 1-for-1 substitution for instructional faculty, whereby a faculty absence from the Morningside campus would be compensated for in like terms; (d) hence adequate support for visiting faculty who would replace regular Columbia faculty on overseas assignments; and (e) *the establishing of a standing committee to oversee and coordinate these various categories of global activity.*

Professor Morris invited feedback on these various points before the Task Force's report was filed. In the ensuing discussion, she was asked about the involvement of the Office of Global Affairs in the Task Force's enquiries (Professor Susan Boynton). Conversations had been held with OGP, but problems had arisen in accessing some OGP data. Then the next round of Mellon funding for overseas programming: would there be greater faculty involvement in the planning and execution of the Mellon grant process (Professor Boynton)? The need for transparency in the process was affirmed. Then (Professor Shahid Naeem): what benchmarks were in place for progress in global initiatives in the next five- or ten-year cycle? Were longer-term guidelines in place that would be reflected in the Task Force's report? Professor Morris replied that no targets as such were in place; but few enhancements could be projected without serious additional investment in global operations and in the protection of current functioning on the Morningside campus.

The meeting was adjourned by Professor Schiminovich at 12.57.