

**Faculty Senate President's Annual Report  
Academic Year 2015-2016  
Prepared for the June 3, 2016 Meeting of the Board of Trustees**

Arthur C. Jones

In this final year of my two-year term as Faculty Senate President, we continued to organize the work of the Senate around our guiding theme, “Transcending Our Silos.” Key to the successes we achieved was the active involvement of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We continued our efforts to increase the overall level of active engagement on the part of faculty senators, and we continued to make substantial progress in transforming the culture of the Senate. At the beginning of my presidency, I outlined five subthemes to guide our work, and we tracked our progress through the perspective provided by each of these subthemes: 1) Stepping Up to Shared Governance and Faculty-Staff-Student Collaboration; 2) Championing Safety, Access, and an Actively Inclusive Campus Culture; 3) Exploring Global Models of Community Engagement, Civic Responsibility, and Public Good; 4) Visioning New Channels for Encouraging and Supporting Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research; and 5) Forging Communication Across Faculty Senate Administrations.

**1. Stepping Up to Shared Governance and Faculty-Staff-Student Collaboration**

Input from the Faculty Senate on the Initial Draft of *DU Impact 2025*

During Fall Quarter 2015 we prioritized the task of providing collective input to Chancellor Chopp and Provost Kvistad on the draft strategic plan. At the first Faculty Senate meeting in September we organized a series of structured discussions of the plan, using a World Café-style model for engaged community dialogue. During the session, all senators rotated at timed intervals to four different tables, each of which was facilitated by a faculty member who invited discussions around one of four foci: 1) the contours of the “transformative directions,” 2) goals outlined in the draft plan, 3) the “tone” of the document, and 4) “What’s missing?” Facilitators prepared notes summarizing the discussions, and a final, synthesized report was sent to the Chancellor and Provost, which in turn provided the basis for a lively dialogue, both at a special Senate meeting (re-purposed from the already scheduled “Chancellor Roundtable”) at the end of October. The Chancellor thanked the Senate for its input, pointing to some specific examples of helpful input that was new and unexpected. (This included the consensus from the

Senate that the plan should incorporate a more substantive commitment to students' moral and character development).

### A Developmental Faculty Performance Review Initiative

The collaborative work with the Office of the Provost and Board of Trustees last academic year in finalizing the new Appointments, Promotion Tenure document ([http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/apt\\_jan16\\_2015.pdf](http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/apt_jan16_2015.pdf)) was pivotal in establishing a collaborative process that could be continued this year in developing a new initiative on faculty reviews and evaluation. The work on this new initiative was led by an ad hoc "Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee," chaired by Professor Charles ("Chip") Reichardt and Associate Professor Kate Willink. Formed at the end of Spring Quarter 2014, the committee was charged with the task of investigating the issue of post-tenure review and coming back to the Senate with a recommendation concerning what, if any, framework should be adopted for a set of guidelines and policies for post-tenure review at the University of Denver.

Over the course of a year and a half, the committee conducted a review of policies at peer institutions, organized interviews with selected trustees, senior administrators and unit deans at DU, did a survey of all DU faculty to learn about their experiences with performance reviews, and reviewed existing research on the purposes and effectiveness of various kinds of faculty performance reviews. At the January, 2016 meeting of the Board of Trustees' Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC), the co-chairs of the committee summarized the findings from its investigations and provided a preliminary draft of proposed recommendations planned for presentation to the Faculty Senate for a first reading and discussion at the Senate's February meeting. The most salient aspect of the committee's preliminary recommendations was a proposal to re-frame the task to focus more broadly on faculty development and performance review rather than more narrowly on post-tenure review. Based on its comprehensive internal and external investigations, the committee argued that this new broadened framework would accomplish several desired outcomes:

- 1) It would serve as a model regionally and nationally for how to optimize faculty performance over a lifetime.
- 2) With the implementation of *DU Impact 2025*, a holistic, intentionally expanded review process would be vital.
- 3) It would optimize faculty performance over a career so that we can develop faculty more effectively and get more out of review processes.
- 4) It would create a DU culture of excellence that meets institutional needs and optimizes faculty members' abilities and aspirations.
- 5) The proposed professional development approach, which would apply to all tenure-track, teaching-track, and tenured faculty, would include *support* and *accountability* for the estimated 3-5 percent of underperforming faculty but would also do much more; it would *maximize* the performance of the other 95-97 percent.

The discussion and feedback provided by FEAC members in January provided helpful input as the committee proceeded to draft a formal proposal, which was subsequently presented for discussion in FEAC *and* in the Faculty Senate. The proposal sketched out a general framework for a new policy on faculty development and evaluation *and* recommended the formation of a Faculty Senate implementation committee that would work in collaboration with trustees and senior administration over the next year to flesh out the details for implementing the new framework. A second reading and discussion in the Faculty Senate in early April concluded with overwhelmingly strong support for a finalized version of the proposed framework. The vote was 41 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The framework that was approved is attached as Appendix 1 to this report**

#### Faculty Participation on University and Board of Trustees Committees

Another opportunity for shared governance has been provided by continued conversations between Faculty Senate leaders and the Provost and Chancellor concerning the appointment of faculty members to university-wide committees. While faculty members serve actively on both Board of Trustee committees and other university committees, there is considerable untapped talent among the faculty, and we look forward to further conversations aimed at incorporating an increasingly diverse array of faculty talent in the conceptualization and implementation of university-wide initiatives.

A preliminary discussion this year with Board of Trustees Chair Doug Scrivner helped to raise some important, additional questions about the specific roles of faculty members on Board committees (e.g., Are they full committee *members*, with fiduciary responsibilities, or simply *representatives* charged with representing the voice of the faculty? Are there role conflicts? . . .) Faculty roles on these committees are variably not clearly outlined in existing governance documents *or* are outlined in contradictory ways in different documents, *or* are not outlined at all. Mr. Scrivner and the new Faculty Senate President, Dr. Kate Willink, will continue to discuss these issues in the fall before bringing the conversation forward to both the Board of Trustees and Faculty Senate.

#### Drafting a University of Denver Freedom of Expression Statement

Given the politically charged events occurring on campuses around the country, the need for an official university statement on freedom of expression is clear. Senior administrators, trustees and faculty leaders all agree that it is appropriate that the faculty take the lead in drafting such a statement. Early in the academic year, Sturm College of Law Professor Alan Chen, a nationally recognized expert on free speech issues, agreed to chair an ad hoc committee formed by the Faculty Senate that is tasked with preparing an initial draft. However, Prof. Chen's numerous other commitments precluded his beginning the work until the late in the spring quarter. In the last two weeks, Prof. Chen has been in

touch with members of the committee, and he expects the committee to begin working in earnest during Fall Quarter, 2016. Once the draft is prepared, there will be an opportunity to get input from senior administrators and FEAC as the draft is refined and prepared for approval by both the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees.

### Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative

For most of the past year the Faculty Senate Student Relations Committee, chaired by Teaching Associate Professor John Tiedemann, has been working actively on a learning environments initiative designed to provide opportunities for faculty members to expand and deepen their capacity for teaching within an Inclusive Excellence framework. This work has required active collaboration with multiple university constituencies, including a cadre of students, the Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Academic Programs, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and the Office of Teaching and Learning. A finalized version of the initiative was approved by unanimous vote at the final Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year in late May

Included in the Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative will be a push to follow up on the pilot we launched last academic year to incorporate questions about diversity and inclusion into academic course evaluations (see [http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/annualreport2014\\_2015.pdf](http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/annualreport2014_2015.pdf), P. 3). **A copy of the approved initiative is attached as Appendix 2 to this report.**

### Ad Hoc Committee on Divestment

The Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Divestment was initially established by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate in the fall, as a positive response to students who approached the Senate seeking to work on a joint student-faculty committee to explore the merits of recommending that the university divest from financial investments in fossil fuels. Eventually it became clear that the committee, chaired by Prof. Darrin Hicks, needed to be comprised exclusively of faculty members, since the goals of the students (*recommending* divestment) and the charge by the Senate to the committee (*exploring* the feasibility of recommending divestment) were incompatible. The students who had been on the committee, most of whom were also members of the *Divest DU* movement, were wished well as they continued to work separately in their engagements with the administration and Board of Trustees.

In addition to reviewing many of the published arguments for and against divestment, the faculty committee decided that one effective way for the committee to provide an education for both the Faculty Senate and the university community was to sponsor a debate on divestment by the DU Debate Team. Since committee chair Hicks is also the coach of the debate team, we had a unique opportunity to shape the event to serve a multi-layered purpose. In addition to helping faculty and other university constituencies understand varied perspectives surrounding a highly complex issue,

committee members were excited about supporting an engaged learning experience for a special group of undergraduate students. As expected, the event was extremely successful. The students performed at a high level, presenting compelling arguments both for and against divestment. (They were assigned randomly to the pro and con positions). **A written transcript of the debate is included as a separate document, along with this report. (When the video manager team provides a hyperlink that allows access to the video recording of the event, we will forward that as well).**

The committee convened during the week following the debate and had a lively discussion about next steps. While there was considerable disagreement on the committee, a majority of members voted to move forward with a resolution for the Faculty Senate that would include a *symbolic* recommendation for divestment on moral grounds, emphasizing the fact that there was insufficient information about the university's endowment to justify a more substantial recommendation on the issue. (Several committee members were particularly concerned about the fact that there is not enough information available currently to determine whether a decision to divest would impact negatively the institution's efforts to increase resources for financial aid). Despite disagreement on divestment, the committee voted unanimously to have the resolution put a *primary* emphasis on recommending *other*, publicly visible steps that DU can take to contribute to a national effort to combat climate change.

Shortly after the ad hoc committee meeting (but before discussion in the Faculty Senate), Doug Scrivner announced publicly the Board of Trustees' decision to launch a comprehensive, publicly visible exploration of all sides of the divestment issue, to be chaired by trustee Jim Griesemer, with the goal of assisting the Board in making a decision on divestment by January, 2017.

At the final Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year in late May, the divestment committee's finalized resolution was presented to the Faculty Senate for discussion and vote. (A special Senate meeting had been held the week before to provide the opportunity for a first reading and discussion on an initial draft of the resolution. After the meeting, the ad hoc committee drafted a revised version of the resolution that incorporated input from the discussion).

I had authorized placing the resolution on the agenda for the final meeting, primarily to bring closure to this piece of Faculty Senate business before passing the presidential gavel to my successor, Kate Willink. However, I remained ambivalent about the wisdom of moving forward with the resolution given the opportunity to study the issue further and to contribute in a more informed way to the Board's upcoming, organized public exploration in the fall. I decided to voice my ambivalence at the Senate meeting, and I welcomed a motion to delay a vote on the ad hoc committee's resolution. That motion was made, but a secret ballot vote to delay the vote was defeated, by a 68 percent majority (14 in support of delaying a vote on the resolution, 30 not in support of delaying a vote). Subsequently, after a discussion of the resolution, a secret ballot vote to support the ad hoc committee's resolution was approved by a 70 percent majority (32 Yes, 12 No, 2 abstentions).

**A copy of the resolution that passed in the Senate is attached as Appendix 3 to this report.** Hopefully the Board will focus particular attention on the portions of the resolution, beyond divestment, that garnered nearly unanimous support in both the first and second Faculty Senate readings and discussions.

## **2. Championing Safety, Access, and an Actively Inclusive Campus Culture**

As we channeled our efforts in Faculty Senate this year into a number of different initiatives, as outlined in this report, principles of Inclusive Excellence were brought into the center of all of our work. However, beyond the Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative described above, there are two other areas that we focused on this year that were specifically connected to the theme of safety and inclusivity: Title IX, and a new Faculty Hiring Guide.

### Title IX

With the appointment of Jean McAllister as Title IX Coordinator, the Faculty Senate has an opportunity to support actively the efforts of the Title IX office to prevent and respond effectively to incidents of sexual harassment and sexual assault on campus, and to build a welcoming, safe, and equitable campus environment for all students, staff and faculty members, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation.

At the October meeting of the Faculty Senate, Ms. McAllister outlined the recent changes in the Title IX program that resulted in part from feedback from the DU community and in part from an audit by a national firm. She described for senators some of the complex new policies and procedures she is working to implement on campus. At the end of her presentation she put out a call for senators who might be interested in serving as Faculty Senate representatives to the Campus-wide Gender Equity Task Force. After the meeting, Greg Ungar, Assistant Professor of Theatre, expressed a strong interest. I appointed Greg to serve in that role, and he has joined the task force. We look forward to receiving reports back from him. Additionally, discussions are ongoing with Ms. McAllister and the Office of Human Resources about how we might best design a comprehensive training program for faculty focused on Title IX issues.

### Faculty Hiring Guide

With principles of Inclusive Excellence infused throughout the new university strategic plan, the Chancellor has made clear that it is imperative that we work to increase the diversity of our faculty. Earlier this year, incoming Faculty Senate President Kate Willink and I were both invited to serve as Faculty Senate representatives on a Faculty Hiring Guide Committee chaired by Frank Tuitt, Senior

Advisor to the Chancellor and Provost on Diversity and Inclusion. The committee was tasked with finalizing a draft of a new faculty hiring guide that outlines specific procedures for conducting effective faculty searches. One of the goals of the new guide is to assist faculty search committees in maximizing the chances of increasing compositional diversity in the population of new faculty hires at the university. A working draft of the new faculty hiring guide is nearing completion. One of the reasons for inviting Senate leaders into active participation in the drafting process is to ensure inclusion of the framework for faculty searches passed last academic year in the Faculty Senate. The resolution advocates for the establishment of a new norm for faculty searches, notably a strong commitment to maximizing the chances that each pool of finalists brought to campus to interview for new faculty positions will include at least one candidate who broadens compositional diversity of the hiring discipline involved (see [http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/annualreport2014\\_2015.pdf](http://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/annualreport2014_2015.pdf), P. 4). As this becomes a normative institutional practice, the goals of increased faculty diversity are automatically advanced.

It is clear that even without the new hiring guide, units around campus are already increasing their efforts to conduct searches that draw from diverse pools of highly qualified candidates. The new guide is designed to formalize and systematize those efforts.

### **3 & 4. Exploring Global Models of Community Engagement, Civic Responsibility, and Public Good; Visioning New Channels for Encouraging and Supporting Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research**

Members of the Faculty Senate were pleased that these important subthemes of the Senate's strategic goals for the last two years were so well paralleled in *DU Impact 2025*. Senate leaders are eager to support the implementation efforts that will begin in earnest in the fall.

The Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee, currently chaired by Teresa ("Tess") Bruce, Associate Visiting Professor of the Practice of Law, has been encouraged by faculty proposals for internal grants that are focused on interdisciplinary projects that also advance the public good. It appears that the whole university community is slowly moving towards some of the new models of research, scholarship and creative works that are envisioned as part of DU's future.

### **5. Forging Communication Across Faculty Senate Administrations**

With active support from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, President-Elect Kate Willink and I worked closely together this year on all of the Senate's initiatives. Additionally, I was able to consult past presidents at key points throughout the year to get their perspectives on issues that the Senate has faced over the last decade. As Dr. Willink begins her term as President, and brings in a new set of initiatives, focused particularly on issues of shared governance, she is well prepared for a virtually seamless transition into her new leadership role. In turn, she is committed to ensuring continuity as she prepares in two years to pass the presidential gavel to her successor.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS and MOTIONS**

from the

Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee

*(Approved by the Faculty Senate, April 1, 2016)*

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) committee was charged with “determining whether changes in performance review policies and procedures for tenured faculty are required and, if so, to recommend to the Senate what those changes should look like.”

The TFPR Committee investigated DU’s perceived needs and studied other institutions’ polices for the management of faculty (whether or not under the guise of post-tenure review). The TFPR Committee recommends a developmental approach to support excellence in the performance of all faculty members and urges the University to provide increased resources for faculty development.

Wishing to encourage and facilitate the professional development of all DU faculty members for their own, their students’, and the University’s benefit, the TFPR Committee forwards the following recommendations and motions to the Faculty Senate. These recommendations and motions reflect the distillation of both what we believe to be the best practices elsewhere and procedures already in place in some academic units at DU. The TFPR committee recognizes that changing DU’s faculty evaluation culture is both a systemic and individual endeavor and attention to both is merited.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review committee recommends that the Faculty Senate establish “Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development” instead of policies and procedures for anything titled “Post Tenure Review.”
2. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review committee recommends that Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development be established that provide equal opportunities for the professional development of all faculty members (and not just of tenure-line faculty).
3. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the following three motions.



## **MOTIONS**

1. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development" Committee to recommend to the Faculty Senate policies and procedures for the implementation of Professional Development Discussions (PDDs) as outlined in Section 1 below.
2. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development" Committee to recommend to the Faculty Senate policies and procedures for the implementation of Job Responsibility Discussions (JRDs) as outlined in Section 2 below.
3. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee moves that the Faculty Senate establish a "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development" Committee to recommend to the Faculty Senate policies and procedures for the implementation of Peer-to-Peer Conversations (PPCs) as outlined in Section 3 below.

### **SECTION 1: Professional Development Discussions (PDDs)**

Faculty members can sometimes benefit from professional development opportunities. A Professional Development Discussion (PDD) is a discussion between a faculty member and the administrative head of his or her academic unit to explore professional development opportunities. A PDD may be initiated in three ways.

Option 1A: A faculty member may request a PDD with the administrative head of his or her academic unit for the purpose of requesting resources for professional development. Any proposed changes in professional development activities and resources would be negotiated to the satisfaction of both the faculty member and the administrative head.

Option 1B: The administrative head of an academic unit may request a PDD with a faculty member for the purpose of proposing professional development activities and resources. Any proposed changes in professional development activities and resources would be negotiated to the satisfaction of both the faculty member and administrative head.

Option 1C: Following three consecutive years of annual reviews that have explicitly labeled a faculty member's performance unsatisfactory, the administrative head of the academic unit may require that a faculty member engage in a PDD. In the discussion with the faculty member, the administrative head may either negotiate or mandate that the faculty member participate in specified professional development activities. If the

faculty member objects to mandated professional development activities, the faculty member may file a grievance following the grievance procedures of the University.

## **SECTION 2: Job Responsibility Discussions (JRDs)**

The interests and abilities of faculty members can change as they progress through their careers. Correspondingly, the needs of an academic department can change after a faculty member is hired. As a result, it can be beneficial to both faculty members and academic units to alter the job responsibilities of faculty members as both faculty members and academic units proceed along their corresponding paths. A Job Responsibility Discussion (JRD) is a discussion between a faculty member and the administrative head of his or her academic unit to explore a shift in the faculty member's job responsibilities. A JRD may be initiated in three ways.

Option 2A: A faculty member may request a JRD with the administrative head of his or her academic unit. Any proposed changes in the faculty member's job responsibilities would be negotiated to the satisfaction of both parties (and approved by the Dean).

Option 2C: Following three consecutive years of annual reviews that have explicitly labeled a faculty member's performance unsatisfactory, the administrative head of the academic unit may require the faculty member to meet to engage in a JRD. In discussion with the faculty member, the administrative head may either negotiate or mandate a change in job responsibilities (which must be approved by the Dean). If the faculty member objects to mandated changes in professional responsibilities, the faculty member may file a grievance following the grievance procedures of the University.

## **SECTION 3: Peer-to-Peer Conversations (PPC)**

Peers can often offer valuable insights into a faculty member's past performance and blueprint for future work in the areas of scholarly/creative, teaching, and service contributions. A Peer-to-Peer Conversation (PPC) is designed to provide such collegial feedback. PPCs are also intended to encourage a culture of faculty collaboration, interdisciplinary exchange (when appropriate), and intentional faculty development over a faculty member's career. The conversation in a PPC is to remain confidential and may not provide input into personnel decisions including decisions about pay or job responsibilities. Each academic unit is required to establish policies and procedures for its PPCs.

## APPENDIX 2

### The Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative

*(Revised May 10, 2016; Approved by the Faculty Senate on May 20, 2016)*

#### *About the Initiative*

The Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative is the result of the Senate Student Relations Committee's year-long conversation about how DU faculty can take a leading role in responding proactively and productively to one of the most significant questions facing our campus and American higher education today: How do we foster a truly inclusive educational experience, one wherein all students feel equally welcome and empowered to learn?

That this is a crucial question for American higher education generally and for DU specifically is amply demonstrated by recent events: Across the country, university students from historically marginalized communities have been voicing a powerful call for transformative institutional change. That call can be heard here at DU, too, as the recent campus climate report and public testimony from DU students readily attest. By adopting the Initiative, the Senate seeks to insure that faculty take a leadership role in responding to this historic call for change.

Indeed, the Senate believes that DU's response to this call *must* be led, first and foremost, by faculty. In our classrooms, in our labs, in our studios, in the field, and elsewhere, it is we, the University faculty, who create the environments wherein student learning takes place; it therefore we who are best positioned to lead the way in making positive change.

To that end, the Senate has invited collaboration from the offices of Diversity and Inclusion, Teaching and Learning, Campus Life and Inclusive Excellence, and Undergraduate Programs to develop an infrastructure to provide participating faculty with the resources we need to develop and realize our vision of an inclusive learning environment. Realizing that vision is central to the University's future.

*DU IMPACT 2025*, the University's strategic plan, "outlines a vision of a modern urban global university dedicated to the public good—an institution that cultivates an *inclusive community* [emphasis added] to prepare students to lead lives of impact and benefits Denver and society through its research, teaching and service" (p. viii). To cultivate an inclusive community, the plan promises students "a deep and meaningful engagement with diversity," in which they "will have the opportunity to engage in meaningful experiences that cultivate an understanding and appreciation for the range of diverse individuals and perspectives that exists on our campus, in our nation's communities and around the world" (p. viii).

The Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative enables us to powerfully affirm — to our students, our colleagues, and the broader community — the faculty's commitment to fulfilling that promise.

*Statement of Commitment from University of Denver Faculty Senate*

The University of Denver Faculty Senate is committed to helping faculty across campus to create inclusive learning environments in all the spaces in which they teach and to helping to create a more inclusive campus overall. To these ends, the Senate encourages faculty to help students to understand the ethical and social contexts in which their learning takes place; to reflect in their annual reviews upon their efforts to create a more inclusive learning environment in their courses; to include in their syllabi a statement on inclusivity;<sup>1</sup> to support their unit's efforts to assess inclusivity; and to engage, during the next two academic years, in one or more of the faculty development opportunities listed below.

The Senate also charges the Student Relations Committee with inviting student leaders and interested faculty to an annual Conversation about Inclusive Learning Environments during the winter term and to reporting on that conversation at a Senate meeting in the spring.

**INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS INITIATIVE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

1. Take part in an **Inclusivity Institute**, sponsored by the Office of Diversity & Inclusion, on designing and teaching inclusive courses.
2. Take part in at least two of the workshops in the year-long **Inclusive Pedagogies Practicum** offered by the Office of Diversity & Inclusion.
3. Take part in one of the **Inclusivity and Universal Design** offerings sponsored by the Office of Teaching and Learning.
4. **Partner with a faculty colleague** to visit one another's classrooms and provide feedback.
5. Teach a **community-based/service-learning** class that foregrounds issues of diversity and inclusivity in the wider world.
6. Dedicate at least one class period to a **lecture or activity** showing the value of inclusivity to learning and scholarship, particularly in my field.
7. Dedicate at least one class period to hosting a course-appropriate **guest practitioner/speaker** to discuss the work that he or she has done around issues of inclusivity in their field.
8. Participate in a **conference** on inclusivity in higher education.
9. Undertake and share the results of a **research project** on inclusivity on campus.
10. Present on inclusive pedagogy at the **Diversity Summit** or other appropriate campus forum.
11. Organize a **student-centered event** related to inclusivity (e.g., a public lecture or discussion or an exhibition of student work).

### APPENDIX 3

#### Faculty Senate Divestment Sub-Committee Resolution

*(Revised May 16, 2016; Approved by the Faculty Senate on May 20, 2016)*

The majority of the Faculty Senate Divestment Committee members recommend the University of Denver divest from fossil fuels. Because neither our committee nor the Faculty Senate control University investments, we realize our recommendation is symbolic.

Our decision to support divestment is rooted in the University's commitment to social justice, which also requires a comprehensive response to the climate crisis. Climate change disproportionately affects poor nations (most of whom contributed little to current atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations); and in the future, we can expect droughts, storms, and coastal inundation associated with climate change to affect poor communities around the world far more than it will affect the wealthy.

All members of the committee agree divestment is only one of a number of responses to the global climate crisis, and we believe the University should proceed aggressively to confront that crisis. In addition to divestment, there is much we can do. Should the University decide to divest, divestment alone would be an incomplete response to the climate crisis.

**First**, University investments do have ethical implications. Accordingly, we recommend that DU follow MIT's example and create an Ethics Advisory Council reporting to the Chancellor. As with MIT's Council, DU's should be representative of the entire community (see *REPORT OF THE MIT CLIMATE CHANGE CONVERSATION COMMITTEE*: June 2015, 13-14).

**Second**, DU should increase its efforts to reduce its own carbon footprint. Because DU is committed to carbon neutrality by 2050 and has exceeded its projected progress toward that goal, reducing its carbon emissions to date by roughly 27% from 2006 levels (<http://magazine.du.edu/campus-community/du-reduces-carbon-footprint-27-percent/>), DU should revise its carbon neutrality target from 2050 to 2040. Achieving carbon neutrality in 24 years would require the University to engage in aggressive, cost-effective steps to do its part to confront the climate crisis.

**Third**, as a private university, DU is uniquely positioned to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the transition to a low carbon economy. Accordingly, DU should explicitly commit to allocating money saved through energy and water conservation projects to a "revolving fund" designed to cost-effectively achieve carbon neutrality.

**Fourth**, a "just transition" to a clean energy future requires that we not only divest from fossil fuels but also *reinvest* in renewable energy technologies and the training of displaced workers for the new economy. The rise of Denver, its university, and the entire Rocky Mountain West was powered by the

labor of workers in coal mining, hard rock mining, and other extractive industries. DU should create tuition-aid scholarships for extractive industry workers and their descendants so that they can be educated and trained in renewable energy technologies.

**Fifth**, consistent with Impact 2025, DU should establish an interdisciplinary center for climate change solutions designed both to help the University achieve its carbon neutrality goal and to help others in the broader community achieve their carbon reduction goals.

**Sixth**, inevitably, many of the problems of mitigating climate change and adapting to its effects will fall on future generations. Accordingly, DU should follow through in its 2007 commitment to “integrate sustainability into the curriculum and make it part of the educational experience.” (<http://www.presidentsclimatecommitment.org/>).

**Seventh**, in keeping with a individual sense of commitment and maintain logical consistency to these ideas, each member of the DU faculty should consider reviewing their own personal investment portfolio, whether held by TIAA-CREF or another investment firm. In addition, the DU faculty should collectively engage in discussion with TIAA-CREF with the intent of making more investment choices available that reflect our commitment to socially and environmentally responsible portfolios.