The Morningside campus has long been famed for its distinctive architecture—a reputation soon to be enhanced by the inclusion of a building by Spanish architect José Rafael Moneo. He was recently chosen to design the proposed new science building that is to occupy the space above Dodge Fitness Center, currently the site of tennis courts. Completion of the new building—the last major planned construction project for Columbia’s original campus—is expected by 2010.

In announcing the decision, President Lee C. Bollinger said, “After an extensive process and consultation with Mark Wigley, dean of the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, I have selected José Rafael Moneo as the architect for this project. The new science building will be anchored by interdisciplinary research in the areas of chemistry, biology, engineering and physics, and it will house research facilities, faculty offices and classrooms.”

The Pritzker prize-winning architect, who is also a Harvard professor, is best known for tackling difficult space problems. That skill will come in handy as he confronts the challenge of squeezing an interdisciplinary research facility into the small footprint available above the existing structure.

The design for an early project in his native Spain, the Bankinter Bank in Madrid’s Castellana, provided a first peek at Moneo’s building talents, which would later flower in buildings such as the Palau and Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona.

Columbia Resumes Debate on对学生性侵的法律和道德责任

Columbia launched a discussion on policy reform last week to address incidents of student sexual misconduct.

In April 1995, after long debate, the University Senate adopted a policy on student sexual misconduct at Columbia designed to raise awareness of the problem and to make it easier to pursue complaints through a special campus-wide disciplinary procedure.

A decade later, at this year’s first plenary on Sept. 16, Prof. Patricia Grieve (Spanish and Portuguese) presented the report of the Senate’s third task force on student sexual misconduct, identifying a number of the same policy problems that had troubled her predecessors.

Grieve said Columbia’s policy statement on sexual misconduct is confusing and also difficult to find. The most obvious needed change, she said, is to replace the terms “sexual misconduct” with “sexual assault.” She said the creation of oversight committees as part of the President’s Advisory Committee on Security, called for in the Senate’s last attempt to reform the policy in 2000, was never carried out. She said Columbia offers valuable programs in education and prevention, but they are not clearly communicated to students. She also expressed concern about the effects of sexual assault at Columbia continuing to be seriously underreported, and very few cases end up being adjudicated in the elaborate disciplinary procedures developed and revised laboriously by past Senate task forces.

Grieve called for a clearer presentation of those disciplinary procedures in a single statement, as well as for some changes. One change would require deans, who make the final decision on a hearing panel’s recommendations for disciplinary sanctions against a student found in violation of the policy, to communicate those decisions to the hearing panel from now on. Another change would move the administrator coordinating the disciplinary procedures away from education and programs, and into a new central office of judicial or student affairs.

As in 1995 and 2000, some senators at the meeting on Sept. 16 worried that the disciplinary procedures do not include sufficient protections for the rights of the accused. Such concerns led to intensive criticism of the Senate’s 2000 revision of the policy in national media, including a widely read characterizations of the policy as the basis of an ongoing problem in the campus.

The criticism led to what Grieve’s report characterized as “ad hoc” changes in the procedures, such as a provision for closed-circuit TV in the hearings to enable the accuser and the accused to see each other’s testimony without confronting each other directly.

Other senators were troubled that the new policy statement proposed by the task force, whose first sentencing, said that while the criminal implications of an incident of sexual assault should be made clear to students, “It isn’t an educational statement to start talking about the police and crimes and other options...We wanted to give as much information as possible in the policy itself while making it as friendly as possible.”

Sen. SamuelSilverstein (Th., C’93, M’95) disagreed. “No person reading these regulations should be in any way misled by the idea that what goes on in these hearings may not be ultimately subpoenaed and have criminal possibilities,” he said. “And therefore I think the most important thing—university administrative policy is a fool’s paradise.”

Grieve assured the Senate that both the policy, which has been adopted as an educational statement, and the new policy statement proposed by the task force, which addresses the educational and judicial aspects of the policy, work together to provide the best protection for the rights of the accused.
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