

Student Affairs Committee

Annual Report for 2010–2011

April 29, 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction

Acknowledgements.....	2
Letter from the Chair.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4

Improving the Student Experience

Graduate Student Center.....	5
Vagelos Center Design.....	6
Facilities Fees.....	7
Intercampus Shuttle.....	8
CUIT Student Developer Initiative.....	9

Major Issues of University Policy

Morningside Smoking Ban.....	10
Teaching Excellence.....	11
Senate Confidentiality Policy.....	12
Relationships with the Armed Forces.....	13

Maintaining Excellence and Professionalism

Our Culture.....	18
Professional Development.....	19
Board of Visitors.....	21

Appendix

Appendix I: Reports Referenced.....	23
Appendix II: Media Coverage.....	24

Student Affairs Committee
University Senate
2010-2011

Chair

Tao Tan, College '07, Business '11

Executive Committee of SAC

Alex Frouman, College '12
Jose Robledo, General Studies '12
K. Scott Saverance, SIPA '11
Andrew Springer, Journalism '11
Liya Yu, PhD (Social Sciences)

Social Chair

Esteban Reichberg, Architecture '11

Members

Timothy Lam, College '11
Kenneth Durell, College '12
Tim Qin, Engineering '13
Sara Snedeker, Barnard '12
Vikey Suwanprutsachati, Cont. Ed. '11
Shukree Tilghman, Arts '11
Zeeshan Ott, Social Work '11
Dustin Bowler, Dental Medicine '12
Adil Ahamed, Business '12
Ruairidh MacLeod, PhD (TC)
Ron Mazor, College '09, Law '12
Elizabeth Inkellis, P&S '11
Ryan Close, Public Health '11, P&S '12
Mollie Finkel, Nursing '12
U-In Lee, Public Health '11
Paul Brenner, PhD (Engineering)
Mi Wang, PhD (Natural Sciences)
Eszter Polonyi, PhD (Humanities)
Erica Richmond, UTS '13

Staff

Dylan Lonergan, College '13
Richard Sun, College '13
Melanie Brisbon, Journalism '11

Senate Program Officer

Justine Blau, Arts '91

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the many individuals who have assisted the Student Affairs Committee in its initiatives and activities this past year. A comprehensive accounting would be impossible to present in this limited context. Nonetheless, we wish to acknowledge just a few of the students, faculty, administration, staff, and others who have been exceptional.

From the senior governance and leadership of the University, we thank in particular Trustees **Bill Campbell**, **Lisa Carnoy**, **Richard Witten**, and **Michael Rothfeld**, who were instrumental in inspiring the Student Affairs Committee to present a reasoned and reasonable student perspective on the major issues of the year.

We thank President **Lee Bollinger**, for encouraging the grassroots processes the Student Affairs Committee has sought to cultivate and operate, and for his support for the participative Senate processes under which we all operate.

We thank Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Senate and the George Blumenthal Professor of Political Economy and Professor of International and Public Affairs and the Director of the Advanced Policy and Economic Analysis Program and the Associate Director of the Applied Statistics Center **Sharyn Lee O'Halloran** for skillfully conducting the important processes of University governance and championing students as both partners and leaders in these processes.

Among the senior administration, we acknowledge with thanks the advice and guidance over the year provided by Provost **Claude Steele**, Vice Provost **Roxie Smith**, Senior Executive Vice President **Robert Kasdin**, Chief of Staff to the President **Susan Glancy**, and Deputy Vice President of Arts and Sciences **Sue Mescher**. Their institutional knowledge, insight, and wisdom have in many cases opened doors we did not even know existed. And we in particular also thank their assistants **Caroline Stern**, **Pamela Rogers**, and **Amanda Riego** for their forbearance, patience, and graciousness!

Among the deans, we thank Dean Emeritus of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences **Henry Pinkham**, and Acting Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences **Carlos Alonso** for their substantial support in improving the educational environment for graduate students. We thank Dean of Columbia College **Michele Moody-Adams** for her support of student involvement on the issues of military engagement. Finally, we thank Dean of Columbia Business School **R. Glenn Hubbard** for supporting the leadership and professional development initiatives undertaken by the Student Affairs Committee.

Among our many partners on the faculty, we wish to acknowledge in particular Vice Dean and Dr. Edwin S. Robinson Professor of Dentistry (and, by parliamentary tradition as the longest-serving member, Mother of the Senate) **Letty Moss-Salentijn**, Professor of Astronomy **Jim Applegate**, and John C. Dalton Professor of Physiology and Cellular Biophysics **Samuel Silverstein** for their active partnership with students on many of the key issues of this Senate term.

Acknowledgements (Continued)

We've been privileged to work with many talented student leaders as well, and single out **Learned Foote**, President of Columbia College Student Council, **Kristy Riggs**, Vice Chair of the Graduate School Advisory Council, and **Melissa Im**, President of the Ivy Council, for their cooperation and that of their councils on some of our key initiatives.

We thank our devoted staff **Richard Sun**, Chief of Staff, **Dylan Lonergan**, Legislative Assistant and Chief of Staff, and **Melanie Brisbon**, Communications Assistant for their dedication and service to the Student Affairs Committee and wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

Finally, we acknowledge with our deepest gratitude the important roles played by the Senate office, **Justine Blau**, **Tom Mathewson**, and **Jessica Raimi**. From meetings to minutes, from quips to quibbles, to Mosaic counsel on the most complex intricacies of policy, they have provided the entire gamut of support and encouragement—and have done it with patience, good humor, and constant smiles. None of our activities this year would have been possible without them.

Letter from the Chair

Dear colleagues,

This has been a fruitful and productive year for the Student Affairs Committee and for the University Senate as a whole. We tackled issues of wide-ranging import, and on the issue of ROTC, sought to definitely address questions that had been open for decades.

The Student Affairs Committee represents all 30,000 students from all of Columbia's nineteen constituent and affiliated schools, and is *primus inter pares* of all of this University's student representative organizations. In the past year, we've built a culture of credence, collaboration, communication, and continuity in operating not as "student leaders of the University," but as "University leaders who happen to be students."

We've built and strengthened relationships externally, placed a significant focus on professional development with the goal of making Senate service the highlight of our Columbia experiences, and took the lead on many of the weighty issues that have come before the Senate. In all things, we've sought to both stimulate and reflect the vigor and the life of the University Senate.

During this year as SAC Chair, I could not be more proud of the accomplishments and contributions of my colleagues. Our goal has always been to leave the student experience better than where we found it. It has been our privilege to be part of the University Senate. I remain, with great respect,

Yours sincerely,



Tao Tan, CC '07, Business '11
Chair, Student Affairs Committee of 2010-2011



Executive Summary

The Student Affairs Committee members played leading roles in almost every major initiative of the University Senate and of University governance as a whole. The agenda of the University Senate's 2010-2011 legislative session, and the speed and thoroughness of execution of major initiatives, reflected the dedication, drive, energy, and commitment of its student members.

The Student Affairs Committee set about achieving three objectives this year:

- Develop and win support for initiatives to **improve the student experience, student life, and quality of education.**
- Play a leading role in addressing **major issues of University policy.**
- Set and maintain high professional standards to **ensure the continued professionalism, efficiency, and effectiveness** of the Student Affairs Committee throughout this year, and in the years to come.

The Student Affairs Committee opened the year by advocating for a **Graduate Student Center**, for which funds were allocated in January. A follow-up on this ensured that the new Vagelos Medical and Graduate Education Building would include **space for graduate, as well as medical students.** Efforts of the Student Affairs Committee also resulted in enhancements to PhD funding packages, including **elimination of facilities fees** for certain students. Advocacy by members of the Student Affairs Committee resulted in restructuring the schedule of the **intercampus shuttle** to increase its frequency, accessibility, and usability. Finally, we worked to create a **CUIT student developer initiative** to harness the vast untapped reserve of computer science talent.

In the questions of major University policy that arose this year, the Student Affairs Committee played a leading and critical role. Students were instrumental in negotiating a workable compromise on a **Morningside smoking ban**, and bringing the efforts on the long-awaited **Senate confidentiality policy** to a successful conclusion.

On the major policy question of the year, reassessing the **Reserve Officers Training Corps** and addressing broader questions of **Columbia University's relationships with the Armed Forces**, students took the lead and worked with faculty and administrative leaders in formulating a deliberative and participative process that has led the nation in its comprehensiveness, breadth, and transparency. We have endorsed an invitation for ROTC to return after 42 years, and led the Columbia community in taking the first step toward our shared future.

On an internal basis, the Student Affairs Committee prioritized its members' professional skills, team dynamics, and institutional knowledge. We have committed to building a **culture based on credence, collaboration, communication, and continuity.** The establishment of a **Board of Visitors** ensures a continued perspective, and continuity of the high standards of professionalism, effectiveness, efficiency that characterized the Student Affairs Committee this year.

Graduate Student Center

Members of the Student Affairs Committee, in partnership with the University Senate Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee and the Graduate School Advisory Council, wrote a report on a proposed Graduate Student Center following a presentation by then-Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Henry Pinkham.

The full 62-page report, titled “Interdisciplinary Interaction in an Academic Community: An Interim Graduate Student Center as a Priority for Columbia University”, comprised the following sections:

- **Mandate and Purpose:** A discussion of the specific mandate statutorily accorded to the University Senate and its committees to study the issue.
- **Academic and Institutional Perspectives:** A view of the increasing importance of interdisciplinary interactions in academic research and scholarship, and the general trend and direction in which top universities have been moving.
- **Faculty Perspectives:** A collection of statements from prominent faculty leaders, including Professors Ken Jackson, Pierre Force, Elizabeth Blackmar, and Jean Howard, on the importance of such a Center for Columbia’s graduate population.
- **Student Perspectives:** An analysis of the GSAC’s most recent quality of life survey regarding work space and community, and a comparable study of graduate student centers at all of our peer schools.
- **Review of a Proposed Graduate Student Center:** An assessment of every departmental lounge and reading room at the Morningside and Medical campuses, as well as the Graduate Faculties Lounge in 301 Philosophy, followed by a survey of available space primarily from the four vacated science libraries and hypothetical configurations that may be appropriate for the spaces.
- **Appendices:** Photographs of every departmental lounge and reading room, a case study of the Judith Lee Stronach Center, and floor plans of available spaces.

The report concluded with a proposed recommendation endorsing the report and respectfully requesting the President and Trustees consider the creation of a center. The University Senate unanimously approved the recommendation on September 24, 2010. On September 25, 2010, the report, recommendation, and an explanatory letter were delivered to President Lee Bollinger, Provost Claude Steele, Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences Nicholas Dirks, and Senior Executive Vice President Robert Kasdin.

On January 20, 2011, Acting Dean Carlos Alonso announced that \$2.2 million in funding had been set aside for “the financing of a graduate student center in the Morningside campus open to all post-baccalaureate students.”

Initiative Leaders:

Tao Tan, College ’07, Business ’11

Mi Wang, PhD Candidate (Natural Sciences)

Liya Yu, PhD Candidate (Social Sciences)

Vagelos Center Design

On September 27, 2010, Columbia University received a generous \$50 million donation to the Columbia University Medical Center from P. Roy Vagelos, MD '51 and Chairman Emeritus of Merck & Co., and his wife, Diana Vagelos, Barnard '55. The gift was made to support the construction of a new Medical and Graduate Education Building, which will be built on the medical center campus, and named after the donors.

The Campus Revitalization Committee at the Medical Center put together a series of focus groups to discuss possible configurations of the new building. GSAS students at the Medical Center requested that, in addition for lounges and social spaces for medical students, a facility for graduate students also be incorporated in the new building, but met resistance from the administration.

Following the success of the Student Affairs Committee in advocating for a Graduate Student Center on the Morningside campus through the commissioning of its report and supporting recommendation, SAC members, particularly Mi Wang, supported the efforts of the Medical Center's GSAS-affiliated student government, the Graduate Student Organization, with guidance on how to best frame their case.

We advised of the need for interdisciplinary interaction between biomedical sciences as the primary purpose of the lounge, stressed that the graduate students need a sense of community at CUMC, and pointed out various ways that the room can be used to facilitate academic exchange and enhance social interactions.

We also advised that a survey be conducted among the students to support their claims in a more quantitative way and worked with the Graduate Student Organization on other advocacy efforts. The report has been used as a guide book throughout this process.

In February 2011, the Campus Revitalization Committee officially endorsed and approved the graduate students' request to incorporate a graduate student lounge in the Vagelos Medical and Graduate Education Building.

Initiative Leaders:

Mi Wang, PhD Candidate (Natural Sciences)

Facilities Fees

Facilities fees for Morningside campus students have grown significantly over the years, outpacing both tuition increases and inflation by several orders of magnitude. The Student Affairs Committee undertook a study of the fee increases, unveiling the following per-semester fee levels over the years:

<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>	<i>2010-2011</i>
\$130	\$178	\$236	\$288	\$349	\$352

For reference, a growth from \$130 per semester to \$352 per semester over 5 years represents a 22.04% compound annual growth rate, which far outstrips average annual inflation of 2.5-3% over the last five years.

The Student Affairs Committee, with the Graduate School Advisory Council, worked with the Office of the Provost to generate ideas on cost-neutral ways to reduce the fee burden for graduate students on limited stipend incomes. A proposal was crafted and delivered to the Office of the Provost on August 4, 2010 on the following lines:

- Presently, facilities fees are deducted on a post-tax basis after stipends are disbursed to graduate students.
- Instead, deduct facilities fees on pre-tax basis by transferring funds internally and disburse proportionally smaller stipend increases to graduate students.
- The value of the tax shield is dependent individual tax rate. For a graduate student with a \$23,500 stipend with no other income, this translates into an additional \$50-\$100 per year, thus representing a 7%-14% discount on facilities fees.

This proposal was incorporated into the wide-reaching enhancements to graduate education announced by Acting Dean Carlos Alonso on January 20, 2010. Under this new plan, in addition to pre-tax deductions:

- GSAS will assume over a two-year period all facilities fees.
- GSAS students will receive steady increased in the basis stipend rate.
- GSAS students will receive five summers of guaranteed stipend support.

The plan was funded by a reallocation of resources and a reduction in intake for the PhD programs. Thus, facilities fees have been effectively eliminated for PhD students.

Initiative Leaders:

Eszter Polonyi, PhD Candidate (Humanities)

Mi Wang, PhD Candidate (Natural Sciences)

Liya Yu, PhD Candidate (Social Sciences)

Tao Tan, College '07, Business '11

Intercampus Shuttle

Columbia University's two Manhattan campuses, Morningside and Medical Center (CUMC), are physically separated by approximately 2.8 miles, with an intercampus shuttle service connecting the two campuses. In recent years, the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of most academic fields requires a greater degree of interaction between the two campuses. However, the quality of the intercampus shuttle service has consistently failed to address these needs.

Mi Wang conducted a survey on the intercampus shuttle among GSAS students at CUMC in September 2010. The results suggested that there is a high demand for a shuttle service for educational purposes, but the needs are poorly met with the current service. Working with the Senate Education Committee and Dr. Letty Moss-Salentijn, we met with Executive Vice President for Student and Administrative Services Jeff Scott in December 2011, where initial concerns were communicated.

The survey was then extended the survey to all other schools at CUMC with the help from all the CUMC-affiliated Senators. The survey revealed:

- 31% of respondents go to the Morningside campus least 3-4 times per week for classes, seminars, libraries, etc.
- 35% of the respondents find the shuttle "almost never" useful, and 20% of the students find the shuttle only useful for 10%-20% of the time.
- 67% of the respondents reported that the shuttle is not frequent enough.
- 42% of students expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of regular intervals.

Mi Wang and Dr. Samuel Silverstein authored a report on the intercampus shuttle service that presented the results of the survey in detail and recommended a new schedule with direct trips between two campuses at fixed intervals.

Following its endorsement by both the Education and Student Affairs Committees, Dr. Letty Moss-Salentijn presented the report to the Office of Transportation Services. Working with Executive Director Miguel Pagan, we helped work out a new schedule based on the report's key findings and recommendations. The new schedule incorporates student preferences including fixed intervals and shorter trips.

Following a process of fine-tuning the schedule, and addressing any budgetary needs, the new schedule will be put out to bid in late April 2011, with implementation in Fall 2011.

Initiative Leaders:

Mi Wang, PhD Candidate (Natural Sciences)
Dustin Bowler, Dental Medicine '12
Mollie Finkel, Nursing '12
Elizabeth Inkellis, Physicians & Surgeons '11
U-In Lee, Public Health '11

CUIT Student Developer Initiative

Columbia University Information Technology (CUIT) is the technology umbrella organization that encompasses all campuses and level of technology with its jurisdiction. Currently, this organization lacks a defined means by which students, who comprise the vast majority of users, can voice needs or concerns directly. Moreover, as past events have indicated, CUIT has at times had a differing conception from the student body about what technology projects warrant the greatest priority and attention.

Unfortunately, in the current framework, no defined liaison or relationship exists to provide this integral connection; at best, students are only able to serve in CUIT office positions (*e.g.*, printer repair) under both work-study and casual employment options, as well as being occasionally called upon for larger coding or programming projects.

Kenny Durell set out to harness the vast reserve of computer science talent within the student body for the benefit of students, programmers and non-programmers alike, as well as CUIT administrators and staff, by the creation of an official CUIT student developer position. By compensating technologically-inclined students for providing input directly about the most pressing technology needs from the student perspective through developing CUIT-sanctioned applications, a better balance between actual student technology desires reaching fruition and CUIT's maintenance and other developing priorities, can be achieved.

This initiative is still in its nascent stages but has received considerable interest from various offices at CUIT. The final form of the position requires further discussion, such as on copyright and other issues. Two possibilities include a traditional student job posting, and an independent idea submission and proposal grant process.

An existing Columbia organization, the Application Development Initiative (ADI), a union of Columbia computer programmers, has expressed its support. Many ADI members are interested in not only serving as student developers but also exploring options of publicized CUIT grants or similar ventures for utilizing student knowledge and contributions to address overflow of CUIT programming or development jobs.

To provide a more comprehensive assessment of the need for such a compensated developer position, a student survey related to this decision will be administered by the beginning of the next academic year as a means of gauging overall student interest and input in the venture as well. Discussions between CUIT, ADI, and members of the Student Affairs Committee have continued in the interim about the final form of this student developer concept. We expect a mutual agreement to be reached by Fall 2011 semester.

Initiative Leaders:

Kenny Durell, College '12

Morningside Smoking Ban

In 2008, a Tobacco Work Group was instituted by Scott Wright, Vice President for Student Auxiliary & Business Services to investigate Columbia's tobacco policy on the Morningside campus. The Work Group was headed by Michael McNeil, Director of the Alice! Health Promotion Program, and conducted a survey with low response rate and issued a recommendation for a full campus ban.

The Senate External Relations Committee recommended that the Work Group take a more inclusive approach toward gauging campus opinion, and include more student representation. The reconstituted Work Group conducted a scientific poll of students on campus that indicated a small margin support for a campus-wide ban on smoking while Columbia College students in particular opposed a campus-wide ban.

The Work Group then discussed a variety of options, including a smoke-free "campus core," designated smoking areas, a consistent distance rule (20 feet from buildings), and regulated smoking hours. The Work Group voted to recommend a consistent distance rule, without specifying the distance itself. For more details, please see "Tobacco Work Group Final Report".

Scott Wright submitted an Executive Summary of the Work Group's final report to the Senate External Relations Committee. The summary stated the "Work Group recommends the Morningside Campus adopt a 'consistent distance rule' specifying smoking is only permitted when a person is a minimum of 50 feet away from all buildings." The Senate wrote a resolution that was tabled at the November 2010 plenary.

Members of the Student Affairs Committee opposed a 50-foot consistent distance rule as well as a full ban for several reasons. Students felt it was unenforceable and as such was bad policy. A 50-foot rule would have created a *de facto* ban on the northeastern corner of campus and as such was an irresponsible implementation of a consistent distance rule. Esteban Reichberg produced maps of campus under the 50-foot and 20-foot rules, definitively showing that a 20-foot policy was wiser.

The Student Affairs Committee made this case to the Executive Committee of the Senate and Alex Frouman negotiated on behalf of the Executive Committee on a 20-foot policy instead of a 50-foot policy with Scott Wright and Michael McNeil.

The Senate then voted 31-13-2 to approve resolution for a 20-foot ban at its December 2010 plenary. Scott Wright's office led the implementation of the policy by updating the various campus guidelines and handbooks to reflect a 20 foot consistent distance rule preventing smoking within 20 feet of buildings on the Morningside Campus.

Initiative Leaders:

Alex Frouman, College '12

Esteban Reichberg, Architecture '11

Teaching Excellence

All of the sixteen constituent schools of Columbia University administer course evaluations to students at the end of the semester, but only seven of these schools make some or all of this information available to students. There are several independent student-run course review systems, such as CULPA for undergraduates, and CBS Professor Reviews for the Business School. However, these sites are entirely user-driven and do not present a common framework for evaluation. There is a desire among students to see the results of Columbia's structured evaluations.

This information would allow students to make more educated decisions about which courses to take and would promote accountability between faculty and students. Furthermore, not only do several Columbia schools make this information available, but also an increasing number of peer schools, including Yale and Princeton. We believe that reaffirming its commitment to teaching excellence in this way is an institutional priority for Columbia University.

The Student Affairs Committee worked with the Education Committee as well as the academic leadership of the various schools to gauge support and attitudes toward, as well as challenges and concerns about open course evaluations. The Student Affairs Committee worked with undergraduates in Columbia College to review the policies of the Columbia schools and the undergraduate schools of the Ivy League. This report made clear that there is a trend towards open evaluations at both Columbia schools and Columbia's peer schools.

For more details, please see "Columbia University Review of Course Evaluation Systems".

The Student Affairs Committee expects to work further with the Education Committee on broader initiatives to uphold teaching excellence, maximize student satisfaction, and improve the Columbia educational experience, which will include open course evaluations. These are positive pedagogical principles, and would continue to promote teaching excellence, a long and proud hallmark of a Columbia education. Over the next year, the Student Affairs Committee will work closely with the Education Committee, the deans, and other academic and administrative leaders to continue the implementation of these initiatives.

Initiative Leaders:

Alex Frouman, College '12

Kenny Durell, College '12

Senate Confidentiality Policy

During fall 2010, the Structure and Operations Committee, chaired by Ron Mazor, decided to revisit the University Senate's confidentiality guidelines, with an eye towards updating and revising them into a more modern and useful form.

Over the fall semester, S&O constituted a subcommittee of its members to work on revising the guidelines. The subcommittee worked with a desire to strike a balance between the Senate's need to remain an open and transparent body while still providing a measure of discretion and insulation for committee participants.

The major proposed changes to the confidentiality guidelines consisted of:

- A uniform 50-year buffer for the release of confidential material, in keeping with the policy in place regarding confidentiality for matters involving the Trustees
- A policy for governing inter-committee and inter-senator requests for confidential information
- A policy to govern scholarly requests for confidential information by non-senators (including an appeals process in the event of a rejection of a request)

In establishing a 50-year period of confidentiality, S&O has sought to ensure that committees of the Senate enjoy a similar level of confidentiality as is extended to the Trustees, and that members of the administration and others should not be concerned about disparate levels of confidentiality when engaging with the University Senate. Additionally, the Committee has sought to provide ways for senators and unaffiliated individuals to seek confidential information, at the discretion of the Senate and conditioned by the existence of a legitimate purpose.

In mid-December, revised confidentiality guidelines were circulated to the various committees for revision and discussion. The Structure and Operations Committee remained open to comment and edits throughout the spring 2011 term.

In the spirit of openness and transparency, members of the Student Affairs Committee presented a key edit, to permit the advance designation of a series of meetings, as opposed on a case-by-case basis, to be open. This provision would allow SAC to keep its meetings open to the student body, excepting occasional executive sessions, into perpetuity.

S&O presented the confidentiality guidelines to the floor of the Senate for discussion, review, and a vote on the April 29, 2011 plenary meeting.

Initiative Leaders:

Ron Mazor, College '09, Law '12

Relationships with the Armed Forces

Columbia University's relationships with the Armed Forces of the United States of America have been a signature issue this year for the Student Affairs Committee. We began the process early, noting signals from Federal lawmakers as early as summer 2010 that the repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" law—on which opposition to the Reserve Officers Training Corps was focused in 2005—was imminent. The leadership of SAC engaged in informal conversations over the summer with key stakeholders, including faculty and administrative leaders, over what a Senate process could and should look like. The early agreements-in-principle were:

- Such a process should be owned and driven by the students.
- Clarified mandate of the Senate as the appropriate forum for such deliberations.
- Objectivity and non-partisanship throughout the opinion-gathering process.
- A comprehensive process including many mechanisms for gathering opinions.
- Defined scope of question to be restricted to ROTC and its place at Columbia.
- Timeline triggered by the legislative repeal of DADT.

In the interim, members of SAC sought to address the legitimate concerns and needs of Columbia students who are already part of ROTC programs hosted at Fordham University and Manhattan College. In October 2010, members of SAC championed a proposal by cadets in these programs to conduct—as a free service to the University—a twice-weekly ceremony honoring the flag of the United States. Our members structured language that welcomed all students to participate in such ceremonies, but also requested sensitivity to our community by, for example, excluding loud music or other noises. The first regular color guard ceremony in forty years on Columbia's campus was conducted on Veterans Day, November 11, 2010.

DADT was legislatively repealed on Saturday, December 18, 2010. On Monday, December 20, 2010, an independent Task Force on Military Engagement was jointly commissioned by the Student Affairs and Executive Committees, to comprise five students and four faculty members, with both a student and a faculty co-chair. Ron Mazor served as the student co-chair and Roosevelt Montás served as the faculty co-chair.

Over the next few weeks, the Task Force assembled a broad and comprehensive process that included:

- **Three public hearings**, hosted in turn by Sharyn O'Halloran, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, Michele M. Moody-Adams, Dean of Columbia College, and Claude M. Steele, Provost open to all members of the Columbia community to express their thoughts and opinions.
- **A student survey** of Columbia College, the undergraduate program at the Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of General Studies, Barnard College, and the School of International and Public Affairs—

Relationships with the Armed Forces (Continued)

schools that have participated in ROTC in the last five years—assembling a picture of student opinion on ROTC and related concerns.

- **An e-mail alias** set up to collect and publish statements from all members of the community, while reserving to all submitters the right to redact names and statements.

Following the conclusion of these processes, the Task Force published its final report on March 4, 2011. The 228-page report comprised the following sections:

- **Description of ROTC:** Describes the Reserve Officers Training Corps program in detail, including its tuition benefits, service obligations, course content, and associated programming.
- **History of ROTC and Military Engagement at Columbia:** Provides an overview of Columbia’s military history, starting in 1754. Includes development of ROTC and its predecessor, the Naval Midshipmen’s School, at Columbia. Provides detailed overview of major policy actions since 1968 including 1969 Mansfield Commission, 1976 Tien Special Committee, and 2005 ROTC Task Force.
- **Description of Process:** Describes the process and mechanisms conducted by the Task Force in the spring 2011 semester.
- **Major Findings – Survey:** General information about survey results (with detailed school-by-school breakdowns in the appendix.)
- **Major Findings – Issue Summaries:** General summaries of major issues raised during the hearings and in e-mails, including discrimination, views of the military, opportunity and diversity, financial considerations, and intellectual diversity and academic freedom.
- **Current Military Engagement at Columbia:** A description of current programs Columbia University has with the military, including the Yellow Ribbon tuition benefits program for veterans, existing on-campus military recruiting, joint academic programs, and military research.
- **ROTC at Peer Schools:** A survey of other schools in the Ivy League and their working relationships (or lack thereof) with the Reserve Officers Training Corps.
- **Statement of the Task Force:** A unanimous statement of findings and recommendations from the Task Force (see below).
- **Appendices:** Describes structure and questions of the survey, detailed school-by-school results, e-mailed statements received from students, faculty, staff, and alumni, and transcripts from the three hearings in full.

The report concluded with the following unanimous findings and recommendations:

- Our current relationships with the military enrich the Columbia community.
- Columbia’s relationship with ROTC is an issue of concern and the matter should be addressed formally by the University Senate at present.

Relationships with the Armed Forces (Continued)

- Columbia should actively support the endeavors of individual students to participate in ROTC programs, whether on- or off-campus.
- If ROTC is to return to Columbia, the faculty and Deans must retain full jurisdiction over questions of academic credit, appointments, and governance.
- Columbia's non-discrimination policy is deeply important to Columbia's identity and expresses shared values of fostering a tolerant and open community.

For more details, please see the "Report of the Task Force on Military Engagement".

Following the publication of the report, members of SAC, working with the Executive Committee, and with the advice, counsel, input, and guidance of all major stakeholders, including faculty and administrative leaders, the Office of Public Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel, drafted legislative action to endorse opportunities for Columbia University to explore deepening and formalizing its relationship with the Armed Forces of the United States, including the programs of the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

The "Resolution on Columbia University's Relationships with the Armed Forces of the United States of America contained the crucial operative clause:

"...Columbia University welcomes the opportunity to explore mutually beneficial relationships with the Armed Forces of the United States, including participation in the programs of the Reserve Officers Training Corps."

The resolution gained the endorsement and benefitted from the advice and insight of the Executive Committee (by a 9-0 vote), the Student Affairs Committee (17-5-1 vote), the Faculty Affairs Committee (8-1 vote), and the Education Committee (10-5 vote) ahead of its vote on April 1, 2011. The resolution in the Senate plenary passed by a 51-17-1 vote.

The Student Affairs Committee and its members were instrumental in conducting a sometimes difficult and emotionally charged process fraught with the weight of history, with a punctilio of civility.

In contrast to the tightly controlled, centrally organized processes at our peer schools (where students, to the extent they are involved at all, are often handpicked observers), the students were the driving force. In the media, "Columbia's process of dealing with the ROTC question has been one of the most public—and publicized. Students watching from other campuses have lauded the process at Columbia for its transparency."¹

¹ Berrett, Dan. "Roadblocks for ROTC?" InsideHigherEd.com.
http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/02/24/rotc_s_return_to_campus_not_yet_certain (February 24, 2011).

Relationships with the Armed Forces (Continued)

The Student Affairs Committee has led the way in definitively addressing this decades-old question and is proud to have played a part in healing long-standing wounds, putting behind us a painful disagreement of our divided past, and moving the University community, together, forward toward our shared future.

Initiative Leaders:

Ron Mazor, College '09, Law '12

Mollie Finkel, Nursing '11, '12

K. Scott Saverance, SIPA '11

Tim Qin, Engineering '13

Alex Frouman, College '12

Jose Robledo, General Studies '12

Tao Tan, College '07, Business '11

Our Culture

Over the past year, we've sought to build a strong and sustainable culture that guides every initiative taken by the Student Affairs Committee or by the individual Senators. Our culture—the “four C’s”—defines our values, beliefs, approaches, sense of identity, and is a cornerstone of our success. A brief summary of our culture follows.

Credence

We strive to build **credence** with the governance and administrative authorities of Columbia University, with the faculty, and with other major stakeholders. We uphold the highest standards of professionalism at all times. This is not 1968. We strive to have an understanding of how Columbia University works. We will not pitch unrealistic or unachievable ideas. We have the best interests of Columbia University in the context and experience of our constituents at heart. Our goal is to leave the student experience in better shape than where we found it.

Collaboration

We strive to maximize **collaboration** with senior faculty and other Senate stakeholders. We believe that what is achieved is far more important than who is achieving it. We engage in coalition-building for everything. We work to increase interdependency with our faculty and administrative partners in the Senate.

Communication

We strive to be in constant **communication** with our constituents and their respective student councils. We work to clarify roles and responsibilities of our respective organizations in the Columbia University governing structure. Instead of asking them to come to us, we will go to them. Our overarching question is, “What can we do for you?”

Continuity

We strive to maintain **continuity** to maximize our long-term effectiveness and capacity to contribute. We coach and mentor each other, and derive as much satisfaction out of our colleagues' achievements as we do our own. Through the Board of Visitors, we have a mechanism for coaching, advice, guidance, and the onward passage of institutional knowledge. Our goal is for every year's Student Affairs Committee to land “ready to go”, rather than learn about this great and greatly complex University from scratch.

Initiative Leaders:

All members

Professional Development

Professional development is one of the most important elements of the 2010-2011 Student Affairs Committee. Our goal is for our members to recount their Senate service, not as an obligation or resume filler, but as the highlight of their Columbia careers. We achieve this by seeking to build skill sets and experiences that would benefit our members in whatever they choose to do in their lives and careers after school.

SAC held two off-site leadership retreats, at Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in September 2010, and at the Medical Center in January 2011. Our programs at these retreats have a tripartite mandate: to build professional skills (PS), to communicate institutional and issue knowledge (IK), and to promote team development (TD). Modules at each retreat were presented by members of SAC. A brief outline follows.

Fall 2010 Retreat (At LDEO)		Spring 2011 Retreat (At CUMC)	
Module Name	Category	Module Name	Category
Meaning of Leadership	PS/TD	Intro to CUMC/Major Issues	IK
Senate Introduction	IK	Presentation Skills	PS
Who's Who at Columbia	IK	Parliamentary Procedure	PS
Communications Strategy	PS	Tour of CUMC	IK
Negotiation Workshop	PS/TD	SAC and the Real World	PS
Case Study of Senate Process: Graduate Student Center	PS/IK	Leadership Styles	PS/TD
		ROTC Briefing	IK
		Intro to 360 Degree Feedback	PS/TD
		Group Procedures Workshop	TD

In February 2011, SAC also conducted a 360 feedback process, generously sponsored by Columbia Business School, where it is part of both the Core Curriculum and club officer training. 360 feedback is a mechanism wherein an individual selects a number of colleagues who then rate him or her based on targeted questions that assess strengths and weaknesses in decision-making, motivating self and others, influencing others, managing conflict, working in teams, and communication. Raters can also offer qualitative comments on what they do well, and how they can improve. All ratings are then averaged and presented anonymously to the candidate in a report, along with contextual information on how they perform relative to the rest of the group.

360 feedback is usually followed by a session with an executive coach, who helps the candidate process the feedback, and follows up with tips and best practices on how to address strengths and weaknesses. SAC partnered with the Columbia Coaching Certification Program at Teachers College to provide executive coaching sessions to its members following the 360 feedback process.

It is important to note that vital elements of a truly close-knit team dynamic are the personal and social interactions between its members. On January 29, 2011, following a

Professional Development (Continued)

highly competitive and contentious process, Esteban Reichberg was unanimously appointed Social Chair by acclamation. Detailed reports of the bi-weekly *computationes* led by the Social Chair are available on request.

In addition to coaching and mentoring, there is a pragmatic element to our program. We have approached professional skills this year as part of the “permanent platform” for the Student Affairs Committee, and view the opportunity to address major issues as an addition. We believe that by establishing a commitment to professional development so that our members count their Senate service as the highlight of their Columbia careers, and from which they build skill sets that could be used anywhere, we will ensure that all students Senators will have active record worthy of remembrance and a positive experience on the University Senate.

Initiative Leaders:

Tao Tan, College '07, Business '11

Adil Ahamed, Business '12

Dustin Bowler, Dental Medicine '12

Ruairidh MacLeod, PhD Candidate (Teachers College)

Esteban Reichberg, Architecture '11

Andrew Springer, Journalism '11

Board of Visitors

Key challenges that have plagued the Student Affairs Committee over the years have been the difficulties of maintaining continuity of priorities, bridging institutional knowledge, and upholding high standards of professionalism on a body with near-full turnover every two years. Communication between past and present leaders have been sporadic and based primarily on personal, not institutional, ties.

On September 10, 2010, the Student Affairs Committee passed the “Statutes as enacted in order to manage and create a Board of Visitors”, modeled closely on the similarly-named boards of many of Columbia’s schools. Members of the Board are drawn from those individuals who exemplified the highest ideals of leadership while at Columbia University, and who continue to achieve the highest levels of success within their chosen profession. The Board is self-perpetuating—though the sitting SAC nominates one of the three members elected per year in the same manner that the Senate nominates Trustees—and possesses a tripartite mandate:

- To support and assist the current members of the Student Affairs Committee on a non-executive advisory basis.
- To pass on institutional knowledge and, when necessary, facilitate introductions and relationships that have served student Senators well in the past.
- To serve as a development vehicle to support the activities of the Student Affairs Committee.

Christopher Riano, GS ’07, served as its founding chairman. The first class of Visitors also included Adam Michaels, Business ’06, and Roosevelt Montás, CC ’95, MA ’96, PhD ’04. The Visitors were hosted on-campus for their inaugural annual meeting by the Student Affairs Committee on Sunday, December 5, 2010 for a day of frank and free discussion on major issues and ideas.

Visitors offer, jointly and severally, advice on request on matters of leadership, influence, Columbia’s institutional intricacies, and key leaders within the faculty and administration. They are regularly consulted by members of the Student Affairs Committee.

The Board of Visitors will ultimately grow to nine Visitors serving three-year terms, renewable once, with three elected per year.

The current seated Board is as follows.

Board of Visitors (Continued)

**Board of Visitors
for the Student Affairs Committee
of the University Senate
2010-2011**

Name	Senate	Board Term	Present Occupation
Christopher Riano, <i>Chair</i> GS '07	2005-07	2010-2013	Judicial Law Clerk <i>Circuit Court for Baltimore City</i>
Adam Michaels, <i>Vice Chair</i> Business '06	2004-06	2010-2013	Principal <i>Booz & Company</i>
Roosevelt Montás CC '95, MA '96, PhD '04	1999-03	2010-2013	Associate Dean, Core Curriculum <i>Columbia University</i>
Matan Ariel GS '06, Business '11	2003-05	2011-2014	MBA Candidate <i>Columbia University</i>
Justin White GS '05, Business '07	2001-03	2011-2014	Director, Business Development <i>SpeakerText</i>
Rebecca Baldwin Fuller Nursing '07	2004-06	2011-2014	Palliative Care Nurse Practitioner <i>George Washington University</i>
TBD		2012-2015	
TBD		2012-2015	
TBD		2012-2015	

Initiative Leaders:

Tao Tan, College '07, Business '11

Kenny Durell, College '12

Appendix I: Reports Referenced

The following is a listing of reports referenced in this document that have played a substantial role in advancing the preceding issues.

Reports principally associated with the Student Affairs Committee or its members

“Interdisciplinary Interaction in an Academic Community: An Interim Graduate Student Center as a Priority for Columbia University”, September 1, 2010

- Jointly commissioned by the Student Affairs and Campus Planning and Physical Development Committees
- Link:
http://www.columbia.edu/cu/senate/archives/reports_archive/10-11/grad_student_ctr_report_9-1-10.pdf

“Enhancing Intercampus Communication and Supporting Interdisciplinary Interactions: Report and Recommendation on the Intercampus Shuttle Service”, February 9, 2011

- Jointly commissioned by the Student Affairs and Education Committees
- Link:
http://www.columbia.edu/cu/senate/archives/reports_archive/10-11/intercampus_shuttle_2-9-11.pdf

“Report of the Task Force on Military Engagement”, March 4, 2011

- Commissioned by the Task Force on Military Engagement, an independent body in turn jointly commissioned by the Student Affairs and Executive Committees.
- Link:
<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/senate/militaryengagement/docs/20110304%20-%20TFMEReport.pdf>

Reports principally associated with other bodies

“Tobacco Work Group Final Report”, October, 2010

- Commissioned by the Tobacco Work Group, an independent body in turn commissioned by the Division of Student and Administrative Services.
- Link:
http://www.columbia.edu/cu/senate/archives/plenary/10-11/plenary_agenda_docs/tobacco_work_group_final_report_oct_2010.pdf

“Columbia University Review of Course Evaluation Systems”, March 6, 2011

- Commissioned by the Columbia College Student Council

Appendix II: Media Coverage

During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Student Affairs Committee and the University Senate received a good deal of coverage in both the local and national media.

Throughout the school year, the Senate dispersed a number of media releases which announced the Senate's major events and discussed overall views on key issues. A selection of coverage follows.

National Media

Grossman, Andrew. "Columbia Allows ROTC to March Back." *Wall Street Journal*, April 24, 2011.

Associated Press. "Columbia University votes to end 4-decade ROTC ban." *Wall Street Journal*, April 2, 2011.

Feuer, Alan. "Decades After Ban, Columbia Opens Door to R.O.T.C. Return." *New York Times*, April 1, 2011.

Barzun, Jacques. "Op-Ed: Columbia University's ROTC Shame." *Wall Street Journal*, March 10, 2011.

Seelye, Katharine. "Despite Obama's Call, No Rush in R.O.T.C.'s Return to Campus." *New York Times*, January 27, 2011.

Field, Kelly. "After Repeal of 'Don't Ask,' Elite Colleges Rethink ROTC." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 9, 2011.

Downs, Donald, and Ilia Murtazashvili. "Bridging the Gap Between the Military and Elite Campuses." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 9, 2011.

Lewin, Tamar, and Anemona Hartocollis. "Top Colleges Reconsider R.O.T.C. After 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Vote." *New York Times*, December 21, 2010.

Local Media

Rashid, Fahmida. "The Return of ROTC to Columbia." *Village Voice (New York)*, April 5, 2011.

Ferrari, Erica. "Four Decades Later, ROTC Could Return To Columbia University." NY1.com. http://www.nyl.com/content/top_stories/136713/four-decades-later--rotc-could-return-to-columbia-university. April 2, 2011.

Appendix II: Media Coverage (Continued)

Sheridan, Terry. "Columbia University Vote Clears Way For ROTC To Return To Campus For First Time Since 1960's." CBS New York. <http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2011/04/01/columbia-university-vote-clears-way-for-rotc-to-return-to-campus/>. April 1, 2011

Albrecht, Leslie. "Columbia University Welcomes ROTC Back." Manhattan Local News - DNAinfo.com. <http://www.dnainfo.com/20110401/upper-west-side/columbia-university-could-decide-rotc-question-friday>. April 1, 2011

Colvin, Jill. "Mayor Bloomberg Urges Columbia to Bring Back ROTC". Manhattan Local News - DNAinfo.com. <http://www.dnainfo.com/20110225/upper-west-side/mayor-bloomberg-urges-columbia-bring-back-rotc>. February 25, 2011

Albrecht, Leslie. "No Hecklers, Plenty of Passion at Columbia ROTC Hearing." Manhattan Local News - DNAinfo.com. <http://www.dnainfo.com/20110224/upper-west-side/no-hecklers-but-plenty-of-passion-at-columbia-rotc-hearing>. February 24, 2011.

External Campus Media

Merrigan, Tara, and Zoe Weinberg. "Columbia Senate Supports ROTC." *Harvard Crimson (Cambridge)*, April 4, 2011.

Luthra, Sahil. "Higher Ed Roundup: Columbia votes to reinstate ROTC." *Brown Daily Herald (Providence)*, April 4, 2011.

Huwa, Kyle. "Columbia Votes for ROTC Return." *Fiat Lux, from Stanford Review*. <http://blog.stanfordreview.org/2011/04/03/columbia-votes-for-rotc-return/>. April 3, 2011.

Carter, Autumn. "Stanford's ROTC Committee is Sleeping on the Job." *Fiat Lux, from Stanford Review*. <http://blog.stanfordreview.org/2011/02/08/stanfords-rotc-committee-is-sleeping-on-the-job/>. February 8, 2011.

Schindler, Max and Andrew Hu. "Ivies Reconsider ROTC After 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Repealed." *Cornell Daily Sun (Ithaca)*, January 25, 2011.

Columbia Campus Media

Roth, Sammy. "Candidates lay out priorities in USenate Student Affairs Committee chair race." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 26, 2011.

Roth, Sammy. "Following USenate vote, Columbia officially recognizes Navy ROTC program." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 22, 2011.

Appendix II: Media Coverage (Continued)

Roth, Sammy. "USenate may vote on confidentiality rules soon." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 20, 2011.

Greenbaum, Leah. "Report recommends scaling back fringe benefits." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 19, 2011.

Roche, Elisse. "USenate drafting resolution to make evaluations public." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 15, 2011.

Poliak, Shira, and Sammy Roth. "'Inside Job' sparks three separate reviews of disclosure policy." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 14, 2011.

Roth, Sammy. "USenate votes for ROTC's return." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, April 4, 2011.

Roth, Sammy. "Schools show varied support for ROTC return." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, March 7, 2011.

Roth, Sammy. "Opinions mixed at USenate's first ROTC town hall." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, February 10, 2011.

Jennifer, Fearon. "Where Do We Stand Now?" *The Eye, from Columbia Daily Spectator*, January 27, 2011.

Rau, Sonalee. "University to fund graduate student center." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, January 21, 2011.

Roth, Sammy. "USenate to hold town halls on ROTC, vote expected in April." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, January 20, 2011.

Tunnell, Amber. "USenate passes 20-foot smoking ban, discusses a full ban." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, December 7, 2011.

Greenbaum, Leah. "ROTC members raise flag, break ban." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, November 12, 2010.

Greenbaum, Leah. "Admins update USenate on Northwest progress, ROTC." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, October 25, 2011.

Neil, Emily and Rubii Pham. "Graduate students seek centralized space." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, October 5, 2010.

Appendix II: Media Coverage (Continued)

Tunnell, Amber. "Bollinger addresses USenate on M'ville progress." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, September 27, 2010.

Tunnell, Amber. "USenate members seek ROTC feedback despite 'don't ask, don't tell,' repeal delay." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, September 22, 2010.

Tunnell, Amber. "With expected repeal of 'don't ask, don't tell,' CU braces for ROTC debate." *Columbia Daily Spectator*, September 20, 2011.

Initiative Leaders:
Melanie Brisbon, Journalism '11

George the Second by the grace of God of Great Britain France
His Majesty shall come Greeting Whereas by several acts of the Governours Council
Province of New York and appropriated for the founding erecting and establishing a College in our
said Province And Whereas the Rector and inhabitants of the City of New York in Communion of the
said good design have sold a part a parcel of ground for that purpose of upwards of Three Thousand Pounds value
in the City of New York fronting easterly to Church Street between Barclay Street and Murray Street four hundred and
and thirty street to the South river And also a street from the middle of the said Land Easterly to the road
designed to convey the said Land in Fee to and for the use of a College intended and proposed to be Create
in our said Province And Whereas our Loving Subjects the Trustees appointed in and by an Act of the Govern
ment in Trustes the sum of three Thousand four hundred and forty three Pounds eighteen Shillings by way
offered and sold up by the said Rector and inhabitants of the City of New York in Communion of the said
Province have by their humble petition presented to our
Governour and Commander in Chief of our said Province of New York In Council prayed our Letters patent
on the said Lands and the more Effectually Governour Carrying on and Promoting the same and Instructing
Grant the Reasonable request and desire of our said Loving Subjects and to Encourage the said good design
as may be not only to the Inhabitants of our said Province of New York But to all our Colonies and Territories
of our special Grace Certain Knowledge and sweet motion by these presents will Grant Constitute and
New York in Communion of the Church of England as by Law established shall legally convey and a full
and made ^{in these our letters patent that these be directed and made} on the said Lands a College and other Buildings and Improvements for the use and conveniency of the
and Education of Youth in the Learned Languages and Liberal arts and Sciences And that in Consideration
in Communion of the Church of England as by Law Established the President of the said College for the time
of England as by ^{Law} Established And that the Governours of the said College and their Successors for ever shall be
and distinguished by the name of the Governours of the College of the Province of New York in the City of New York
College of the Province of New York in the City of New York in America one Body Corporate and politick
make Constitute declare and Create by these presents and that by that name they shall and may have perpetuall
Better Establishment of the said College Will Give Grant Ordain Constitute and appoint that in the said
name for the said Body Corporate and politick Consisting of the Governours of the College of the Province
perfect Creation of the said Corporation and Body politick consisting of the Governours of the College of the
Constitute assign Select and appoint by these presents the most Reverend Father in God our Trusty and well
Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being The Right Honorable Duke Earl of Halifax first Lord Commissioner
for the time being Our now Lieutenant Governour and Commander in chief of our said Province of New York and
Councilor of our said Province now and for the time being the Judges of our Supreme Court of Judicature of
and for the time being the Attorney General of our said Province now and for the time being the Speaker
Treasurer of our said Province now and for the time being the Mayor of our City of New York in our said Province
New York now and for the time being the Senior Minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in our
Church in our said City now and for the time being the Minister of the French Church in our said City now
City for the time being the President of the said College appointed by these Presents and the President of the
four other Persons who shall be called and named and are in