Committee on Teaching and Learning
Annual Report
2022-2023 Academic year

Committee Membership
Lumina Albert (COB), *Shawn Archibeque (Chair, COAS), Cayla Bellamy (co chair, CLA), Jess Ellis Hagman (CNS), Director of Academics (ASCSU), Jody Donovan (Dean of Students, ex officio), Sue Doe (Chair, Faculty Council, ex officio), * Katy Little and Allison Penfield (co-Director, TILT, ex officio), Joshua Schaeffer (CVMBS), * Katie Rischeil (Registrar’s Office, ex officio), * Seth Davis (WCNR), Dan Baker (COE), Kristy Lueshen (CSU Libraries). Leslie Stone-Roy (Committee on Non-tenure Track Faculty), *Susan James (VPFA, ex officio), *James Folkestad (CHHS), Thomas Siller (VPUA, ex officio).

Major CoTL Activities:
1. Student Bereavement Policy
   a. Proposal to add Student Bereavement Policy to Catalog - discussed 2 versions
   b. Cayla moved to accept Option #2 with the edits made, James Folkestad seconded.
   c. Unanimously passed
   d. Shawn will pass this on to Faculty Council Executive Committee to be reviewed prior to Faculty Council
   e. Jody Donovan and Jennifer Van Norman, Director of Student Case Management & Referral Coordination will attend the Faculty Council meeting to answer questions if/when it is on the agenda

2. Discussion of campus assessment Stephanie Foster.
   a. From IRPE
   b. Would like to get started with some systematic learning outcomes assessment
   c. Involved in study for HLC accreditation
   d. Working on gathering stories to contribute to learning assessment
   e. Working on AUCC Learning Assessment
   f. Putting together team to help with that assessment
   g. Would like ideas of who would be interesting in working with Stephanie moving forward
   h. Working with Dan Beachy-Quick and Kelly Bradbury on a few projects

3. Game Day Parking for Athletic Events: - Steve Cottingham and Matt Klein
   In 2012 when stadium was brought to campus, there were discussions with various committees about how to handle the parking.
   i. We (CSU Athletics) have preference for Saturday Afternoon games
   ii. For Friday games, no requests for classes to have impact; for late Friday games, requests parking to be cleared by 3pm.
   iii. Provost Office ask Deans to provide list of faculty/students that have need to be on campus. Athletics has never said no to a request for individuals to be provided parking through this process.
   b. There are some CSU lots that are not utilized for game day
c. Would like to make sure work is impacted as little as possible. If departments need passes, they are working hard to accommodate all those requests.

d. Freshman student parking is coordinated through parking services and housing and dining.

e. Took guidance from other institutions with similar events/impact

f. Suggestion: Can we centralize the request process that doesn't require department chain of command approval; Response: to engage the provost office.

g. Discussion: athletic parking revenue have impact to the overall parking costs to academic year parking passes

h. Discussion: Impacts of Friday afternoon games, students needing to miss class to re-park their cars, staff feeling they cannot be on campus.

i. Athletics providing different parking options/timing for staff and students, requesting fans arrive later

j. Agreed that communication is key.

4. Bereavement policy feedback

a. Meeting a few weeks ago with executive committee

b. Reconsider phrasing around 5-day leave - reasoning for requesting 5-days if students are working with case management, does providing a limit provide a sense of uncaring. Also, clarify if the 5-days being consecutive or can they be disbursed. What if a student had to travel long distances to go home, would 5 days be enough time?

c. 5-days was taken from the faculty/staff policy

d. Would more than 5 days sink a student academically

e. Suggesting students go through this process if requesting more leave needed than outlined as in the syllabus

f. Should an "up to 5-day" baseline be provided unless Student Case Management advocates for additional.

g. Meet with Student Case Management to see if this is too big of an ask for them to take on, if there workload cannot accommodate the requirement to meet with case management

h. Jody: Case Management wants to see these students and provide support to students experiencing trauma/loss

i. Make up working being not possible - is that at the whim of the faculty

j. Add clarifying language regarding collaborative and laboratory projects. . . phrasing that some academic experiences cannot be replicated

k. More specific notes coming from the committee

l. Will need to go back to executive committee, October agenda was shared on Friday. This will miss the October meeting so plan for November.

5. Motion on Student Bereavement

a. Proposed language for Student Bereavement

b. Discussion:
c. "student is responsible to discuss with faculty amount of excused bereavement" added
d. written agreement between student and faculty
e. Discussion around 5-day limit
f. Decided to keep 5-day limit in
g. Reasoning:
h. University give 5 days to faculty members
i. To keep them from missing too much learning time in the classroom
j. University will require 5 days but professor can do more
k. Movement:
l. Motion to move forward with revised bereavement policy: Cayla Bellamy
m. Seconded by Joshua Schaeffer

6. **Students with invisible disabilities/head injuries / discussion on inclusive learning**
   a. Justin Dove, Jason Vanrossum, Sarah Beetch visiting
   a. SDC cannot approve a lot of accommodations because of compliance reasons
   b. Some inclusive measures suggested:
   c. Make materials available; share in PDF format
d. Consistency with Canvas shells/modules
e. Communicate attendance policy, able to take breaks, etc.
   i. Concise, bulleted lists; summaries; color contrasts
f. Optional methods to present or do group-work; extra time to respond/present
g. Flexibility in dropping assignments/assessments or multiple attempts
h. Time estimates on exams/assignments
i. Consider what the classroom routine is; let them know if changes will occur
j. Repeating/rephrasing/responses from students
k. Repeat a question that other students say
l. Lights bothersome; allow students to wear sunglasses, hats, bring fidgets, allow students to sit in front/back as necessary
m. Other issues:
   n. Faculty say they have been told not to do that
   o. In-person attendance decreases when videos are available
   p. It is difficult for students to advocate for themselves and self-identify as needing accommodations
   q. Suggestions:
   r. Non-tenure track folk - FTE changes from semester-to-semester; can we pay them to make resources for improved inclusivity when they have those openings?
s. Require faculty in department to attend one of TILT's inclusive pedagogy courses.

7. **AUCC changes**
   Feedback from group on guidance committee focused on AUCC 3E to 1C. A few years ago, there was concern from the student population about heinous events on campus. Students pushed for mandatory core curriculum on DEIJ aspects. Shawn is representing us on this as far as guidelines for what will become 1C. (Some courses will transfer, some won't.) Discussion, comments, thoughts?
   a. Link: AUCC 3E; 1C
   b. Coming up with a rubric of what to consider when look at adding these classes to 1C.
   c. Description of 3E/1C seems to be the same now, but we are coming up with new
language. Shawn shared his screen with the new proposed language and asked whether the language was specific enough.

d. What are GT Pathways? (Core curriculum we have to follow from the Dept of Higher Ed. so we have standardization across the state.)

e. Similar to what 3E used to be edits in red on Shawn's screen. Focus on making sure all students have some training in DEIJ. Transfer students-if had something that qualified for 3E before, it probably would still work for this. Are we missing anything? Anything anyone feels strongly about? What should be included in these discussions? Early on, there was suggestion that every language course would add diversity, but the committee thought the spirit of 1C wouldn't be met through learning a language.

f. The two docs Shawn shared weren't emailed out to the group because they are still works in progress, but want COTL feedback.

g. Building off the description—not always a dive into a single culture/area (like language) but promotes contrast, discussion, thinking across (not siloed).

h. Shawn asks we keep thinking about this and if you have suggestions, please share with him and he'll make sure they get presented to the group working on this.

i. Reaccreditation 3.B.-CSU working on HLC assurance argument. COTL has been asked to find identifying evidence for this.

j. Katy and Ali are leading this workgroup to create this narrative. Sue Doe, Brad Goetz, Andrew Norton and Andrea Duffy are part of this workgroup. Laura J. wants to collect powerful pieces of evidence for last 10 years to show we meet these reaccreditation points. Doesn't have to be exhaustive—can be high-level benchmarking. If you have thoughts on evidence for 3.B, reach out to Katy and Ali.

k. Comments/thoughts?

l. One highlight would be changes in general catalog for teaching effectiveness assessment (approved assessment of what is happening in the classroom, course survey changes.) Some will also pertain to changes to AUCC that we just discussed.

m. To clarify—are you looking for course/program-based evidence? Giving Laura as much as we can, and she can decide what she wants to use. (Robin will send Ali a few items.)

8. Testing center and SDC

A. The Testing Center was discontinued during the COVID pandemic. Much of its various services have been decentralized through different tools used by different departments/colleges for specific tasks and needs.

B. The main concern being raised is on-campus makeup exams, especially for very large undergraduate lectures. This is an ongoing need not fully met through the decentralized tools mentioned above. The question being posed is, could we find a way for the SDC, which still has its own testing center, to facilitate make-up exams for non-disability related needs?

C. As it is, the SDC is at or beyond capacity just meeting disability-related needs. Staffing capacity and space/time constrains would both need to be addressed to serve additional students.

i. The Clockwork scheduling/database system would not work for non-disability related purposes. A new tool/software would be needed here.
Currently there is one staff person managing all testing activities (~10k exams per year). Additional staffing would be essential if the SDC were to expand its testing services, as well as additional space for testing.

D. Thoughts/Questions/Comments
i. Did the Testing Center have notice/timing requirements?
   a. No exact answer, but a policy in this regard would probably be needed as well.
ii. It would be important that students with accommodations be served first and receive priority – there are some concerns about how added demand might impact the primary population SDC serves.
iii. What if the student who needs a make-up is also disabled? How do we make sure they don’t have to jump through even more hoops?
iv. The Testing Center (which was under a student-funded model) was eliminated mostly for funding reasons, and SDC is already under-funded. But, could this provide the justification behind an ask for additional support?
v. Sometimes students with accommodations prefer to use the same testing center/facility as everyone else, in addition to proctoring other types of tests (e.g. GMAT, LSAT). So maybe there should be an ask around larger testing support for all of these purposes (looking at all testing holistically).

E. To understand additional capacity needs and other impacts, and to inform any future decisions or requests, we first need to know the expected demand.
   i. Low-hanging fruit is to connect with the former Testing Center administrator (Paula) to learn about their historical service levels.
   ii. It was suggested that there could be a university-wide survey or other systematic data collection effort to assess what needs/demand would really be, as well as what additional space might be required. There will be follow up efforts along these lines for the spring semester.

9. Chat GPT
   a. Concern that students would use ChatGPT for homework assignments, writing papers, translation purposes, finding mistakes for coding, however, it isn't very good at math. Still learning about all the possibilities. Too early to make policy because it is morphing rapidly
   b. Sue Doe added link: https://wac.colostate.edu/repository/collections/ai-text-generators-and-teaching-writing-starting-points-for-inquiry/

   c.
   d. Questions:
   e. Cayla: Do we already have policies that might address this, from a conduct lens? Answer: Current Conduct Code covers this already (Plagiarism and Cheating), however, it's hard to discover if there's been cheating, although there are some tools being developed (however the tools are flawed)
   f. Robin: Large course is vulnerable to Chat GPT. The only assessment that is not vulnerable is iClicker engagement, so what changes should be made and how much should we trust students? Is it worth all the work to catch academic dishonesty? Answer: Worth experimenting/implementing with Chat GPT submissions into Turnitin to provide the types of cheating that may occur. But it is a lot of labor/time on behalf of faculty. Tips: Acknowledge that Chat GPT exists. Make it clear that submitting anything from that tool in this class will be considered academic dishonesty. This should prevent the majority of students from cheating.
   g. Lumina: Colleagues are implementing policies, encouraging faculty to put things on their syllabus articulating what is and isn't acceptable. Answer: Joseph is collecting a variety of syllabus statements and will post on the TILT website.
h. Sarah: What evidence will be needed for a conduct case? Answer: Suspicion—Conduct uses preponderance of the evidence.

i. Joseph shared two additional links:

10. Planned leave of absence

Gaye Digregorio suggested changes to the existing Planned Leave policy based on student experience and feedback (has already vetted these proposed changes with many offices and has been universally approved):
- Currently the timeframe is 2 semesters and would like to extend to 3 semesters
- Include 2nd bachelors students (hadn’t thought about including them originally)
- Extend the deadline for Planned Leave (move from the Thursday before classes to the Sunday before classes beginning)
  • Questions or Concerns?
  - Jody – supportive, will significantly help students
  - Katie – reason it is 11:59 p.m. on Sunday is because if it goes past Monday, it becomes a withdrawal rather than a planned leave.
  • Changing “University Withdrawal” to “Semester Withdrawal” to help students be more likely to return.
  • Need to take off the health fee portion to the word document.
  • Cayla Bellamy moves to take this on as a topic to facilitate it moving forward. Robin Rothfeder seconded the motion. Motion passes.

11. Leadership nominations and vote

Shawn Archibeque will be stepping down as Chair following this year
Lumina Albert is willing to join as Chair. Member vote in favor (unanimous).
Lumina nominates Cayla Bellamy as continued Co-Chair of COTL. Member vote in favor (unanimous).

12. CSU Health Network and Written Excuses

Laurel Halsey is present representing CSU Health Network to talk about healthcare needs of students and the documentation process. Single page summary of documentation instances as two primary instances:
- Accommodations needed when coursework or academic events are impacted.
- Sick / illness notices, COVID positive tests.

Concern is “after the fact” documentation of absences when course policies require health center documentation to excuse absences or allow for late coursework. CSU Health Center goal is to remove providers from this process.
- Retroactive excuses are problematic.
- Notes are not proactively given.
- Difficulties arise when students have not had appointments then later request illness documentation.
Unsure at the moment how to quantify this issue, but it seems pervasive and impactful to the Health Center’s capacity to care for students.

Goal is not necessarily a policy to be presented to Faculty Council but to clarify internal protocols for the Health Network.

Suggestion to potentially include syllabus template statements.

Also perhaps add a mechanism for documenting phone calls or telehealth visits to the Health Center to avoid students overwhelming the center when a visit is not necessary (self care at home, high contagion, etc.).

Concern that removal of the Health Center does not solve the issue of faculty implementing attendance policies and students needing documentation.

Intent is not to exclude care of persons with disabilities or those with invisible or longer term accommodations.

Potential for “recommended practices” document from COTL and Health Network.

Network is open to creating a draft of best practices.

Same policy for every student is not always equitable.

TILT can facilitate planning