

Faculty Council Committee on Teaching and Learning, FY26 Annual Report

5-27-2026

Committee Chair: Deborah Garrity

Vice Chair: Robin Rothfeder

Membership:

- ☐ Deborah Garrity, CNS, *Chair*
- ☐ Robin Rothfeder, WCNR, *Vice Chair*
- ☐ Maite, Correa, CLA
- ☐ Kari Cowden, WSCOE
- ☐ Rob Sica, University Libraries
- ☐ Lumina Albert, COB
- ☐ Suellen Melzer, COA
- ☐ John Michael, CVMBS
- ☐ Sean Bryan, CoNTTF
- ☐ Carmen Rivera, Assistant VP for Student Affairs
- ☐ Toni Zimmerman, UDTS, CHHS
- ☐ Sue Doe, TILT
- ☐ Melinda Smith, Office of Provost
- ☐ Katie Pettijohn, Office of the Registrar, *ex officio*
- ☐ Carmen Rivera, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, *ex officio (subbing for Jody Donovan)*
- ☐ Reece Jones Kloberdanz, Undergraduate Student Rep
- ☐ Zoe D'Agostino, Graduate Student Rep

Part year:

- ☐ Jody Donovan, VP for Student Affairs, *ex officio (on semester at sea)*
- ☐ Meena Balgopal, UDTS
- ☐ Nancy Levinger, UDTS
- ☐ James Folkestad, UDTS

CoTL worked on six different topics in FY2026. These include:

1. Revision of the criteria for selection of University Distinguished Teaching Scholars (UDTS), including a scoring rubric
2. Review of the Faculty Student Mentoring framework, also called the Faculty Student Success Framework (FSSF).
3. Invite discussion and give or receive feedback to/from Amy Taylor, the inaugural Senior Director of the new CSU Accessibility Center
4. Consider whether the use and practices of the student course survey can be improved or increased.
5. Create a policy to enable academic credit for college-level learning acquired through military training, education and experience.
6. Advocate that student participation in the National Marrow Donor Program be added to the CSU list of university-sanctioned absences.

The next sections describe the impetus, actions, outcomes and future goals for each topic.

1. Revision of the criteria for selection of University Distinguished Teaching Scholars (UDTS), including a scoring rubric

- a. **Impetus:** The criteria for selection as a UDTS need to align with faculty manual section E.2.2.7.1, which was updated a year or so ago to indicate that contract and continuing, as well as tenureline faculty, are eligible for the UDTS designation. The criteria should be structured such that contract and continuing faculty have reasonable opportunity to win this designation, given their teaching-intensive effort distribution. The incumbent UDTS members are in strong support of contract and continuing candidates as future UDTS. The incumbent UDTS wanted opportunity to work collaboratively with CoTL to draft revised nomination criteria.
- b. **Actions:**
 - i. CoTL, worked collaboratively with the incumbent UDTS members to revise the nomination criteria and package requirements. The result is a set of five nomination criteria that emphasize candidates should demonstrate sustained impact over a decade or more, as well as contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarly contributions to program development, innovative teaching practices, curriculum development, leadership in symposia on teaching and learning, etc.
 - ii. Our intention with the revised nomination criteria is to include a broad variety of accomplishments, impact and leadership that collectively encompass the contributions of both tenureline and continuing/contract faculty and reflect their knowledge of the discipline.
 - iii. The description of the nomination packet was also modified slightly: it consists of six items, including a short proposal.
 - iv. At the request of Faculty Council Executive Committee, CoTL also created a rubric to clarify how criteria should be scored by reviewers evaluating diverse candidates.
- c. **Outcome/status:** These revisions were submitted to faculty council for general feedback. However, Faculty Council Chair Andrew Norton advised CoTL that the revised UDTS Nomination Criteria and Rubric should be considered part of CoTL's operating procedures. Therefore, these documents do not need to proceed through faculty council for formal approval. The revised UDTS Nomination Criteria with Rubric were therefore submitted by email to VPFA Melinda Smith on 4/7/2026.

i. Appendix 1: UDTs Revised Nomination Criteria and Rubric – March 2026 final draft.

- d. **Related activity:** CoTL sent a motion to faculty council to update section **E.2.2.7.2** *The criteria for selection is excellence in teaching and scholarship of learning and teaching*. However, faculty council executive committee sent this motion back to CoTL, noting overlap between language in sections **C.2.1.9.5.I** and **E.2.2.7.2**. Both state that “The criterion for selection is outstanding teaching.” After discussion, CoTL elected to not pursue this motion further. We suggest that after a year or two of applying (socializing) the new criteria, that the pathway to amendment of the faculty manual will be less contentious.
- e. **Future goal:** CoTL may elect to re-submit an amendment to the faculty manual as described above.

2. Review of the Faculty Student Mentoring framework, also called the Faculty Student Success Framework (FSSF).

a. Impetus: The Advising Student Success Working Group in 2022 developed the Faculty Student Mentoring framework <https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2025/05/FCTF-Faculty-Student-Mentoring-Report-Final.pdf>. Next, faculty council created the Task Force on Faculty Student Mentoring. That group generated a Report which recommends a Faculty Student Success Framework (FSSF). The FSSF proposes a comprehensive advising/mentoring model that would support undergraduate (UG) students over four years at CSU, with specific advising roles elucidated for ASCs and specific mentoring roles elucidated for faculty.

- I. The FSSF recommends the implementation of a four-year comprehensive advising/mentoring model involving both ASC/advisors and faculty.
- II. Goals: 1) reiterate mentoring as a professional role for all faculty, 2) recognize and reward effective mentoring, 3) provide a framework or resources to enable professional growth around mentoring.
- III. CoTL was charged by Dr. Smith with reviewing and commenting on this document.

b. Actions: CoTL hosted Lisa Dysleski, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Success and Planning, and Louise Allen, Director for Office of Undergraduate

Research and Artistry at the Nov 17, 2025 meeting, where we jointly discussed the FSSS.

- c. **Outcomes:** CoTL generally favored the FSSF. We contributed several comments which pertain to strengths and weaknesses of the FSSF, as well as our questions about how it may be operationalized, and its boundaries and components. These comments are captured in the November 17 minutes.
 - I. CoTL voted to endorse the FSSF.
 - II. *Appendix 2: The CoTL November 17th minutes include detailed comments on the FSSF.*

3. Invite discussion and give or receive feedback to/from Amy Taylor, the inaugural Senior Director of the new CSU Accessibility Center

- a. **Impetus:** Amy Taylor stepped into her new position as Senior Director effective Oct. 13, 2025. Student accommodations and accessibility are important topics on campus.
- b. **Action:**
 - i. CoTL hosted Amy in our December 1st meeting. We asked about her ideas and what kind of feedback from faculty would be helpful to her.
 - ii. In the CoTL December 15th meeting, we followed up by discussing what if any action items emerged from the prior meeting.
- c. **Outcomes:** The consensus of the Dec. 15th meeting was that we should give Amy and the new accessibility center some time to plan and act, based on their vision, before CoTL acts. Our other takeaways are as follows:
 - i. A compilation of best practices for managing Accommodations and Accessibility, especially with large classrooms, would be helpful. Amy may already be planning to address this, so we should wait and let her take the lead for now.
 - ii. CoTL can, however, contribute via advocacy for funding and staffing for the Accessibility Center, given the expectations the campus is placing on it. If the Interim Provost visits CoTL later this semester, we can advocate this with her.
 - 1. Alongside, there is a deep question of how CSU will support and commit to universal design more generally.
 - iii. At present there exists a somewhat adversarial dynamic between instructors and students, arising in part because of uncertainty of who has what responsibilities, and how to handle it when students do not engage sufficiently/are disorganized/are late with requests, etc.
 - iv. In response to discussion around 'do faculty understand and commit to universal design and upgrading courses to meet Accommodations

and Accessibility standards', the point was raised 'what is the department-level commitment to asking their instructors to do this' and 'what is the department recognition, eg on annual reviews, if they step up or don't?'

- v. Faculty consternation: Discussion noted that there is consternation among the faculty about Accommodations and Accessibility – not necessarily pushback on the legitimacy of this need but acknowledging that it is increasingly demanding to do a good job meeting it in all facets. On the other hand, we may yet need more socialization about the imperative to implement these practices. Not all understand.
 - vi. Faculty stress: Discussion noted that there are increasing levels of depression, anxiety and stress for faculty. Challenges with Accommodations and Accessibility tend to add to that because there are not enough resources to handle this efficiently. → this is another advocacy point to raise with the interim provost.
 - vii. Universal design: Referring overall to the challenges that Accommodations and Accessibility bring for professors, is it not the case that universal design is a major remedy for our system? General response from CoTL that universal design goes a long, long way, but we still need resources and professional development to help faculty operationalize this goal.
 - viii. Main conclusion/action item: CoTL will hang back to let Amy and the Accessibility launch their vision; and, we will be prepared to advocate with the upper administration about the need to fund and support this effort.
- d. **Future goal:** CoTL might wish to reconnect with Amy in a future year to determine whether we may align with her initiatives or otherwise facilitate communication across campus.

4. **Consider whether the use and practices of the student course survey can be improved or increased.**

- a. **Impetus:** In 2018-2019, after 5 years of work, a new student course survey instrument was released. The goal was to provide both formative and summative information that faculty could use in their classroom towards improving their classes. Despite a concentrated effort to re-frame student course evaluations in ways that reduce bias and provide actionable feedback to the instructor, and a new vendor to administer them, students provide feedback via student course evaluations at a very low rate, and few faculty use the tool.

b. **Actions:** The committee discussed the student course survey at length. We landed with two key questions:

1. Is student course survey useful to faculty?
2. Is student course survey useful (directly or indirectly) to students?

Discussion takeaways included:

- i. Students misunderstand the primary intent of the course surveys, which is to provide constructive feedback to the instructor. Students may instead be expecting that 1) they should have access to the comments as guidance to future students contemplating enrolling in the class, or 2) as a way to rate the professor (i.e. a customer satisfaction survey.)
- ii. Student and faculty users may or may not be aware of the potential for bias in surveys (e.g. the tendency for dissatisfied students to respond vehemently whereas the full class – which may be far more positive - does not always respond.) See also: [Gendered Language in Teaching Evaluations](#)
- iii. Despite the language in Faculty Manual section I.8, instructors may also lack clarity on the intended use for the course survey comments, as well as whether Department Chairs (supervisors) have access to it.
 1. Is the intent to encourage instructor reflection and adjustment, without judgment
 2. Is the intent to assess faculty performance, or
 3. How do we balance students as recipients of instruction versus acknowledging that students are not experts on pedagogical practices, course design or grading.
 4. Faculty manual section I.8: The Student Course Survey is designed to provide formative feedback to course instructors and is to be used for course improvement. If used for teaching mentoring or as part of the evaluation of teaching, the student course surveys must be used only in conjunction with other sources of evidence (see section E.12.1). Thus, these surveys may not be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for an instructor's teaching effectiveness and must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools (as mentioned in E.12.1). The use of student course survey feedback as a stand-alone tool is not an acceptable means of evaluating the quality of teaching, and

departments are required to use multiple sources of evidence in assessing teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1).

- iv. Thus, there exists a “cultural mismatch” between the university, faculty and the students, about whether surveys are meant to 1) assess faculty effectiveness in ways that may impact annual reviews or promotion, 2) provide feedback to individual faculty to assist in their professional development, 3) provide useful feedback to students. These are all different aims.
- v. From the perspective of CSU, it is important to demonstrate that regular feedback is sought and dispersed, and to have consistency across the university about how it is used.
- vi. In practice, some instructors are frustrated with the instrument and the rate of responses, and set up their own surveys, which pull better responses.
- vii. The faculty manual section I.8 closes with “The Committee on Teaching and Learning is responsible for making recommendations regarding the survey instrument and its use, as well as additional forms of evidence to be used in assessing teaching effectiveness. Changes to the Student Course Survey shall be approved by Faculty Council.”

c. Outcomes

- 1. To encourage greater use and awareness of the student Course Survey Instrument by faculty and by departments, CoTL drafted a Teaching Tip entitled “Get the Most Out of Your Student Course Surveys”. The TILT Teaching Excellence Network (TEN) shared this tip around campus by email in the first week of May, 2026.
 - I. *Appendix 3: “Get the Most Out of Your Student Course Surveys” Teaching Tip, May 4 2026.*
- 2. To encourage greater use and awareness of the student Course Survey Instrument by faculty and by departments, CoTL drafted new language for the instructions that students receive when taking the survey, to clarify the intended use of the information being sought and who will be able to see the results.
 - I. *The new lead-in language is this: Thank you for taking the time to complete the CSU course survey. Your responses are anonymous and are read carefully. The survey asks about your overall experience with the learning environment in this course this semester. Your thoughtful and constructive feedback—both what supported your*

learning and what could be improved—helps the instructor shape how this course is taught in the future and can benefit future students.

This survey takes approximately 5–10 minutes to complete. Your responses will be shared only with the instructor or other designated departmental representatives after the course end date.

Reflect on your personal experience..... (continue as above).

- II. CoTL submitted a motion to Faculty Council presenting the new language. Faculty council voted to approve the new language.
- III. We sent the revised language to Sue Doe, Director of TILT, who worked with Nolan Smith to implement it in the surveys.
- IV. The corrected language has been posted to the course survey intro, but after course surveys were completed in Spring 2026. Hence Fall 2026 is the first response data to be considered as an outcome from this change.
- V. *Appendix 4: Motion to review introductory instructions to the student course survey*

- d. **Future goal:** CoTL may opt to take additional proactive steps to evaluate the efficacy of the student course survey in the future, such as running a campus-wide survey.

5. Create a policy to enable academic credit for college-level learning acquired through military training, education and experience.

- a. **Impetus:** The CSU catalog currently does not have an explicit policy allowing us to accept academic credit for college-level learning acquired through military training, education and experience.
- b. **Actions:** The Committee on Teaching and Learning therefore prepared the attached motion on Prior Learning Assessment for Military Training and Experience, which we submitted to faculty council on May 14, 2026.
- c. **Outcome:** Faculty Council Chair Andrew Norton indicated by email that the motion will be considered in fall 2026.
- d. **Future goal:** Interact with faculty council to encourage passing the Motion in Fall 2026.
 - i. *Appendix 5: Motion to create a policy for Prior Learning Assessment for Military Training and Experience.*

6. **Advocate that student participation in the National Marrow Donor Program be added to the CSU list of university-sanctioned absences.**

- a. **Impetus:** The National Marrow Donor Program is a global leader in bone marrow & blood stem cell transplant, driving life-saving research. Representatives of the (NMPD)(<https://www.nmdp.org/>) met with CoTL to present a request that CSU amend our university excused absence policy to count participation in NMPD as an excused absence. Among the representatives were CSU students whose lives had been saved by a bone marrow transplant, who are now advocates for the organization.
- b. **Actions:** CoTL was impressed by their professional and compelling presentation, and by the fact that a few hours of time donated by a rare, genetically-matched donor student could literally save a life. We are in strong support of the request, which aligns with our Principles of Community (Rams take care of Rams) and broadens it (Rams take care of All).
- c. **Outcomes:** CoTL drafted a Motion to faculty council to amend CSU's list of university sanctioned excused absences to include participation in the National Marrow Donor Program, or other accredited organizations for bone marrow, stem cell or organ transplant. It was submitted to Andrew Norton on 5-27-2026.
- d. **Future Goal:** Interact with faculty council to encourage passing the Motion in Fall 2026.
 - i. *Appendix 6: Motion to amend university excused absence policy*

7.

Appendix 1

University Distinguished Teaching Scholars Revised Nomination Information and Rubric

Updated and approved by CoTL: 3-23-2026

The following information and guidelines are designed to assist in the development of nominations for University Distinguished Teaching Scholars.

Purposes, Mission, and Attributes of the University Distinguished Teaching Scholars

The purposes of establishing and maintaining the University Distinguished Teaching Scholars designation are:

- a. to confer honor upon faculty members for outstanding teaching and scholarship of teaching;
- b. to symbolize the continuing commitment of Colorado State University to the pursuit of excellence in teaching and learning.

The status of the University depends upon the stature of the faculty, and the University chooses through the University Distinguished Teaching Scholar designation to recognize mentors for emulation. To ensure the fulfillment of the intended purposes, the University relies upon the judgments of faculty and other members of the University community in the appointment process.

The mission of the University Distinguished Teaching Scholars is:

- To signal to the faculty the importance of quality teaching within the larger university mission of teaching, research, service, and engagement.
- To contribute to the creation of a culture where the scholarship of teaching and learning is valued and appreciated as an integral component of the research mission.
- To work toward continuous improvement in teaching across the university.
- To engage in leadership roles that contribute to and elevate the teaching mission of the university.

University Distinguished Teaching Scholars shall have records of performance ranking them among the most outstanding teachers and scholars of teaching at Colorado State University and beyond. They will have sustained, continuing, and cumulative accomplishments in teaching and the scholarship of education whose impact extends beyond their home unit. The Provost's Office will oversee the selection process in collaboration with the Committee on Teaching and Learning and the current UDTS.

Those faculty members designated as University Distinguished Teaching Scholars:

- May be identified by title in matters relating to the University and all academic settings;
- Will be identified by title in University publications;
- Will receive appropriate recognition at academic ceremonies;
- Will receive a special medallion suitable for wearing with academic regalia;
- Will receive a permanent base salary increment of \$7,500; and

- Will receive an annual \$2,500 operating account (for a minimum of three years) from their home College to enable them to pursue an instructional improvement/innovation project.

Faculty members receiving the title of University Distinguished Teaching Scholar will hold this title for the duration of their employment with Colorado State University, so long as they are in good standing.

Selection Criteria

Four primary selection criteria inform the selection of new University Distinguished Teaching Scholars. Items 1, 2 and 3 in the following list are necessary but not sufficient conditions for selection. Items 4 and 5 are primary selection criteria, either of which would be sufficient for selection, given demonstration of the three necessary criteria.

1. *Demonstration of excellent teaching.* A UDTs nomination must provide evidence that the candidate is a good teacher and that their teaching has resulted in student learning. Ideally, the nomination should provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of effective teaching and student learning.
2. *Evidence of sustained, broad impact.* Typically, “sustained impact” represents a body of work that spans a decade or more. The nomination should demonstrate that the candidate has advanced teaching and learning outside their own department or program over a substantial period of time. Some of this work may have occurred at another institution, although a significant portion of it should have occurred at CSU.
3. *Future scholarly contributions.* The nominee will identify a challenge or opportunity to increase educational impacts and propose a three-year instructional improvement/innovation project demonstrating its value to the college, university, and/or beyond. (Not to exceed three pages.)
4. *Substantial and sustained contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in and/or beyond the nominee’s discipline.* These contributions would likely include /one or more of the following: peer-reviewed scholarly articles and/or books; presentations at conferences (regional, national, international); development of novel instructional materials; leadership in TILT workshops; acquisition of competitive external funding in support of educational innovations; and/or other examples of discipline-informed applied scholarship.
5. *Sustained scholarly contributions to program development and/or innovative teaching practices beyond the nominee’s department or program.* These contributions might include innovative curriculum development that has a positive impact on the college, university, or discipline; participation in professional organization efforts to enhance learning and teaching in a discipline; leadership in symposia on teaching and learning; publication of open access and/or open education resource materials; development of instructional platforms that support teaching and learning.

Note: Nominees must not be in a transitional retirement appointment at the time of their nomination.

Nomination Materials

The nomination packet must include the following:

1. Nomination Letter: A cover letter addressing the Nominee's qualifications, summarizing their accomplishments, and indicating why they merit the title of University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, signed by the Nominator and approved by the respective Dean. (Not to exceed 1,000 words.)
2. Narrative Summary by the candidate: A reflective statement about teaching and scholarly philosophy, areas of emphasis, and accomplishments. (Not to exceed 1,000 words.)
3. List of evidence and accomplishments that address nomination criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 (Not to exceed 10 pages).
4. Statement of future scholarly contributions: The nominee will identify a challenge or opportunity to increase educational impacts and propose a three-year instructional improvement/innovation project demonstrating its value to the college, university, and/or beyond. (Not to exceed three pages.)
5. Letters of Support: Up to four letters of support from experts (colleagues, stakeholders, students, and other individuals). Letter writers should speak to sustained, continuing, and cumulative accomplishments in teaching and the scholarship of education whose impact extends beyond their home unit. (Not to exceed two pages per letter.)
6. Curriculum vitae: An abbreviated curriculum vitae (four pages or less). NIH, NSF or other standard format short bio sketches/CVs are acceptable.

Submission: The deadline is [ENTER DATE]. Submit the nomination packet electronically (PDF) to barb.gibbens@colostate.edu. The subject line should read UDTs Nomination – Last Name, First Name. No hard copies or late submissions will be accepted.

Reviewer Name: _____

Nominee: _____

Five categories are scored, for a total score of 120 points. For each category, please reference the Nomination Criteria for details and examples.

Domains	Score
<u>Demonstration of excellent teaching (20 points)</u> <i>Strengths:</i> <i>Weaknesses:</i>	
<u>Evidence of broad impact over at least a decade (20 points)</u> <i>Strengths:</i> <i>Weaknesses:</i>	
<u>Future scholarly contributions (project) (20 points)</u> <i>Strengths:</i> <i>Weaknesses:</i>	
<u>Substantial and sustained contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in and/or beyond the nominee's discipline.</u> AND/OR <u>Sustained scholarly contributions to program development and/or innovative teaching practices beyond the nominee's department, unit, or program (60 points combined score)</u> <i>Strengths:</i> <i>Weaknesses:</i>	
<i>Comments:</i>	

Appendix 2

November 17th – CoTL Minutes, including feedback on the Faculty Student Success Framework (Faculty Student Mentoring Report)

- **Introducing guests for today:**
- Brief discussion: accessing information on immigration-related requests. Make sure faculty know NOT to disclose that information. Any request should go through the Office of General Council. Jody and Sue James will put together a message that can Lisa Dysleski, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Success and Planning, and Louise Allen, Director for Office of Undergraduate Research and Artistry, be shared out with faculty.

Main Topic: Discuss task force report on Faculty Student Mentoring

- Background: The Advising Student Success Working Group proposed creating a framework or structure at CSU specifically designed to support faculty student mentoring at the undergraduate level. As a next step, faculty council created the Task Force on Faculty Student Mentoring. That group generated a Report which recommends a Faculty Student Success Framework (FSSF).
 - The FSSF proposes a comprehensive advising/mentoring model that would support undergraduate (UG) students over four years at CSU, with specific advising roles elucidated for ASCs and specific mentoring roles elucidated for faculty.
 - CoTL was asked to review this and potentially endorse it.
- *Notes from discussion on November 17, 2025: Discuss the strengths/weaknesses of the proposal, any concerns, any questions, or any recommendations:*
- Strength: In the “old model”, ASCs provided resources and coursework advising for first two years at CSU, then the faculty (in theory) provided career advice over the last two years. It was chunky. We like that the FSSF model is much more integrated with both professionals providing advising/mentoring over the whole time at CSU.
- Strength: The FSSF model describes clear distinctions on what benefits ASCs and faculty each contribute. Both are important but they are discrete efforts.
- Strength: The FSSF model provides a broad viewpoint on the types of activities considered under the umbrella of mentoring. See proposal page 8 for many examples.
- Recognition of need: CSU does not currently have a clear/explicit model of how faculty are rewarded during promotion or annual reviews for their efforts in UG mentoring, broadly defined (aka page 8 activities).

- Recognition that many faculty are already engaged in UG mentoring. Not new work.
- Lisa Dysleski shared that she investigated ways UG mentoring is recognized and supported at other institutions:
 - Those that do it well have an “ecosystem of mentoring” = a culture that understands the value of UG and what it’s for.
 - The Report suggests that CSU create a framework that functions similar to the Teaching Effectiveness Framework, but focused on UG mentoring.
- Strength: Framework could provide professional development for faculty on how to mentor UG well. It could define mini-credentials or criteria to measure efforts against.
- Strength: Framework could help departments/institution know how to reward this effort in a consistent manner.
- Comments from CoTL:
 - Creating “common language” for mentoring effectiveness is important. Such language can be used by faculty to describe their work in promotion packets is important. Helps create understanding/appreciation in review/promotion packets. Can align with Hanover report, and professional development efforts provided on campus. Could promote more equitable recognition of efforts from all faculty types.
 - Faculty who currently engage UG mentoring are already asking ‘how can we get credit for this work?’. There exists a need to answer this question.
 - We have seen the TEF be very effective at giving faculty a voice to describe their teaching accomplishments for promotion. However, presently it is challenging for young colleagues who have invested in extensive UG research mentoring to quantify this effort or demonstrate its impact. The FSSF could provide effective tools.
 - Faculty ask: Where is the place where mentoring efforts are articulated in the promotion packet/CV? Unclear; there is no defined section; maybe it integrated as part of teaching effectiveness, so far? The FSSF could facilitate the creation of new sections in the promotion forms that provide guidance on how to enter this information.
 - Presently there is no uniform discussion about UG mentoring and why it is valuable and needed on campus. Each unit has their own strategic goals and departments may or may not emphasize it, depending on culture or who is the department head. CSU could benefit by centering appreciation for UG mentoring work more

broadly/consistently. Discussion might translate to action if better reporting tools were available.

- In STEM, lab members (grads, postdocs) are likely to be the direct mentors of UG. How do we capture/interpret that type of data or contribution, if it is an indirect contribution by a faculty member?
- It is difficult to quantify UG mentoring effort.
 - Some faculty are mentors in name only. That is not what we are trying to reward here.
 - Via collaboration with GCIM, CSU could create a tool to help evaluators understand the depth of faculty engagement with mentoring, e.g. a list of prompts evaluators use to discern whether the faculty member is engaged, effective, invested as a mentor. (Could link this tool to annual evaluations.)
- How do we operationalize the FSSF?
 - This is sort of a big piece because it likely will require additional resources.
 - Could it be wrapped into the oversight of TILT, as part of the Teaching Effectiveness Framework or BPIT, or as an expansion of what TILT already emphasizes?
 - Sue Doe (Director of TILT) says that conversations about integrating mentoring have surfaced among TILT and the Provost, and could be explored further.
 - However, we note that the TEF and FSSF components are distinct and do not necessarily align.
 - Sue James advocates that TILT should not (would not) take on FSSF activities without additional resources. General agreement from CoTL.
 - Are there other resources that already exist that could be leveraged?
 - The Graduate Center for Inclusive Mentoring runs 8 facilitated modules on aspects of mentoring graduate students. Could this content be adapted for UG? Or could the center offer content for UG mentoring? → We like that this provides a credential faculty can cite on their performance reviews.
 - Would a FSSF lead to increased student retention that eventually mitigates the cost of extra resources required to get the FSSF going?
- Clarity around rewards versus expectations: We should carefully consider whether UG mentoring will now be framed as an *expectation*, rather than a voluntary activity that deserves reward. Many continuing faculty have a

teaching assignment but no formal (separate) UG mentoring requirement. Presently they engage formal UG mentoring as an important, but voluntary, contribution.

- Supposing a faculty elected not to engage with formal mentoring activities with UG (e.g. honors thesis), would that count against them? For example, are they prohibited from receiving the highest performance rankings if they do not engage this piece?
- Boundaries and components: certain reports in the literature call for faculty mentors to engage with mentees as whole people, including asking them about their personal lives. However, that assumes a trusting relationship exists between mentee and mentor. That has to be intentionally built and it is a specialized sort of effort. Some (privileged) faculty may elect not to dive deeply into the personalized support piece; in contrast, other faculty groups frequently do dive deep in this area, noting that it matters. We observe a degree of cultural imbalance exists regarding this effort that potentially sets up an inequity in service that faculty provide. Hence, we should be careful about how we frame the expectations for faculty mentors [Note: this is a point of disagreement with Hanover executive summary.]
 - Coaching may be needed to teach faculty whether/how to engage the personal support piece.
 - Mentoring has many facets. Intellectual input is something reasonably measurable. However, it is harder to see how we can capture/quantify/articulate the “personal support” pieces of mentoring in a framework because they do not neatly fall into a category like project completion.
 - Do CCF engage this personal piece more extensively? Do faculty of color? This is likely.
 - Note: many faculty do have expertise at navigating boundary setting and engage it regularly; yet, faculty overall may be less familiar with it and have a level of discomfort about setting boundaries or moving into this personal space.
 - Importantly, though, it is an expectation of students today.
 - Mentor training needs to involve this boundary/personal piece. Some mentors might struggle with it. → Leads to a situation where certain faculty disproportionately provide this component, which they value but has a legitimate cost to them (a burden?). → If more faculty were trained to do this, and engaged it, that could better support cultural centers and faculty members of color who tend to have many

students asking for support. → Broader faculty participation in personal support can lead to student success. → We want it to lead to faculty success as well, and give appropriate recognition to all who are passionate about this part of mentoring. We need to recognize and align appropriate effort to faculty who are deeply committed to this. → Willingness to identify and reward such efforts is a major culture change but a needed one.

- The Report recommended changes to the faculty manual (fairly minor). Our comments:
 - There are a couple of typos.
 - The Report makes a distinction between what advising is and what mentoring is, and the term “advising/mentoring” is used in the faculty manual updates. However, we wonder when people see the term “advising/mentoring”, whether they interpret this to say that those two things are the same? Might need to call out the distinction or define the meaning of this term.
 - The description of mentoring and what it includes is missing some of the curricular or co-curricular examples described within the task force report. Can more examples be included?
 - How could the description capture cultural contributions (e.g. student of color prefers to request faculty of color to provide advising, to circumvent microaggressions)
 - Recommend adding the four bullets labeled psychological/emotional support, goal setting, career paths, academic subject knowledge and role model (see Hanover report page 11).

Appendix 3

Get the Most Out of Your Student Course Surveys

If you teach at CSU, you automatically receive a student course survey set up for each of your courses.

Why do we run these surveys? How can you get the most out of them? Who sees the results?

Read on to learn more about student course surveys and how to make them work for you.

What is the Student Course Survey?

- Each semester, instructors (both online and face-to-face/hybrid modalities) are required to conduct at least one student survey for every course they teach.
- The survey asks students to provide feedback about:
 - The percentage of time allocated to types of activities in the course, such as discussion, projects, homework, etc.
 - Specific topics and/or activities that impacted their growth the most
 - Strengths of the course
 - Aspects that, if improved, would make the classroom environment better
 - Specific comments students wish to share about the learning environment
 - The instructor's level of expectations and their feedback to students
- **Tip:** *Faculty or Departments may customize the survey by adding up to five additional questions per instructor per course.*

How is the survey implemented?

- The Student Course Survey is administered via the online Course Survey Tool administered by the University via Canvas.
- **Flexibility for your students:** *The survey may be taken either in or outside of class during the designated time-period that the survey tool is active.*
- Faculty or individuals designated by Department Code may access the survey results here: [Explore Course Surveys – TILT – Colorado State University](#).
- Survey FAQ: [Course Survey FAQ – TILT – Colorado State University](#)

How are the survey results used?

- ***Use them to improve your course:*** A primary purpose of the Student Course Survey is to provide feedback to course instructors that they can use for course improvement.
- The faculty manual (section I.8) mandates that the Student Course Survey *not* be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for an instructor's teaching effectiveness. Instead, the survey must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools (as mentioned in E.12.1).
- The use of student course survey feedback as a stand-alone tool is not an acceptable means of evaluating the quality of teaching, and departments are required to use multiple sources of evidence in assessing teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1).

Who sees the survey results, and when?

- The course instructor will receive access to digital copies of the survey report after the course is completed.
- If permitted by department code, the survey report can be shared with designated departmental representatives. In this case, the results of the survey report should be used only in the context of a comprehensive assessment, by which faculty are provided an opportunity to reflect upon student feedback and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1).

How do the student course surveys benefit you as an instructor?

- An automated course survey gives you ***fast, consistent student feedback***—without creating or managing your own survey.
- Use the custom questions to get relevant ***feedback on new things*** you have tried in your course.
- Written ***comments remain private*** to the instructor unless a department has explicitly authorized access.
- Consider the survey results as a ***diagnostic snapshot or a conversation starter*** about where to focus next with your course improvements.

With best wishes,

The Faculty Council Committee on Teaching and Learning

Appendix 4 Motion to amend the introductory instructions on the student course surveys

MEMO

April 6, 2026

FROM: The Committee on Teaching and Learning (CoTL), Chaired by Debbie Garrity
TO: Drs. Mendy Smith, Andrew Norton, Sue Doe, and Michael Galchinsky
RE: A suggestion to revise the introductory statement on student course surveys

CoTL would like to encourage more faculty and students to use the student course surveys. One suggestion arising from our discussion on this topic was that we revise the brief introductory statement students read before taking the student course survey. Our suggested change would help the students understand why the survey is important, how it will be used, and who will see the results. The new introductory statement would not affect the survey questions themselves.

The current lead-in to the student course survey is as follows: [View Survey Questions – TILT – Colorado State University](#)

The new CSU course survey assesses your overall experience of the learning environment in this course, this semester.
Reflect on your personal experience of the learning environment - not how you perceive others experienced it or what your classmates told you they experienced.

A revised lead-in could be this:

Thank you for taking the time to complete the CSU course survey. Your responses are anonymous and are read carefully. The survey asks about your overall experience with the learning environment in this course this semester. Your thoughtful and constructive feedback—both what supported your learning and what could be improved—helps the instructor shape how this course is taught in the future and can benefit future students.

This survey takes approximately 5–10 minutes to complete. Your responses will be shared only with the instructor or other designated departmental representatives after the course end date.

Reflect on your personal experience..... (continue as above).

Appendix 5 – Motion to create a policy for Prior Learning Assessment for Military Training and Experience.

Memorandum to Faculty Council

Date: 5-14-26

To: Dr. Andrew Norton, Chair of Faculty Council.

From: CoTL

Re: C.R.S. 23-5-145 Military Transfer Credit

Motion:

Formalize the current catalog statement on military transfer credit into approved university policy in accordance with Colorado law, C.R.S. 23-5-145. Incorporate the following policy into the Administrative Professional and Faculty Manual and publish this policy in the [CSU Policy Library](#):

Prior Learning Assessment for Military Training and Experience

I. Purpose

Colorado State University affirms the value of college-level learning acquired through military education, training, and experience. This policy establishes the framework for awarding academic credit for such learning and ensures compliance with state law requiring the adoption, publication, and implementation of a prior learning assessment policy.

II. Policy Statement

The University may award academic credit for military service school coursework that carries a baccalaureate-level credit recommendation in the most current edition of the Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, published by the American Council on Education (ACE).

Students seeking academic credit under this policy must submit official military transcripts to the Office of the Registrar. Acceptable transcripts include, but are not limited to:

- Sailor/Marine American Council on Education Registry Transcript (SMARTS)
- Army/American Council on Education Registry Transcript (AARTS)
- Joint Service Transcript (JST)
- Coast Guard Institute Registered Transcript

The Office of the Registrar, under guidance from teaching departments, shall evaluate submitted documentation to determine eligibility for the awarding of academic credit in accordance with ACE recommendations and University policy.

Rationale:

Fall 2025 CDHE Transfer Audit Finding: While CSU does have military credit information posted on multiple registrar and catalog websites, CSU does not have a formal PLA policy although such policy was approved by their governing board in accordance with Colorado Statute.

Current Catalog Statement to be updated:

Service Schools and Courses of the Armed Services

Credit may be allowed for transfer from service schools carrying a baccalaureate credit recommendation in the latest *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services* prepared by the American Council on Education (ACE). Students must submit SMARTS (Sailor/Marine American Council on Education Registry Transcript), AARTS (Army/American Council on Education Registry Transcript), JST—Joint Service Transcript, or Coast Guard Institute Registered Transcript to the Office of the Registrar to have the information evaluated for eligibility and to receive credit. Individual academic departments determine whether those courses clear specific major curriculum requirements or may be used as elective credit within the program of study. Visit the **Office of the Registrar** for further information.

Appendix 6 – Motion to amend university excused absence policy

Memorandum to Faculty Council

Date: 5-27-2026

To: Dr. Andrew Norton, Chair of Faculty Council.

From: Committee on Teaching and Learning (CoTL), Deborah Garrity, Chair

Motion: Amend CSU's list of university sanctioned excused absences to include participation in the National Marrow Donor Program, or other accredited organizations for bone marrow, stem cell or organ transplant.

Colleagues,

The National Marrow Donor Program is a global leader in bone marrow & blood stem cell transplant, driving life-saving research. CoTL met last week with representatives of the (NMPD)(<https://www.nmdp.org/>) to discuss their request that CSU amend our university excused absence policy to count participation in NMPD as an excused absence. Among the representatives were CSU students whose lives had been saved by a bone marrow transplant, who are now advocates for the organization. CoTL was impressed by their professional and compelling presentation, and by the fact that a few hours of time donated by a rare, genetically-matched donor student could literally save a life. We are in strong support of the request, which aligns with our Principles of Community (Rams take care of Rams) and broadens it (Rams take care of All).

The information below may assist in the decision about this request.

Background: The National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP) is a nonprofit organization that runs a large registry of volunteer donors and cord blood units to help patients find matches for bone marrow or blood stem cell transplants. It works by connecting patients with life-threatening diseases (like leukemia) to compatible donors and coordinating the transplant process, providing support and research to improve outcomes. Matches are challenging because donors and patients must have very similar genetic markers which are inherited and highly variable, so finding two unrelated people who match closely is difficult. College-age students are particularly sought as donors because they have more robust and active stem cells that lead to better patient survival.

Process: CSU student Adelle Ferris founded the NMPD chapter at CSU three years ago. So far, her team has registered over 2,567 students, making CSU the #1 school in the nation for the highest number of newly swabbed students in 2024-2025. Of these, 12 students

have been called to donate. Once identified, donors are on a quick timeline to respond given imminent patient needs. In addition to flexible prep work (20-30 hours over 4-6 weeks), they ultimately make a 3-day trip to provide the donation. This trip is not flexible and little advance notice is possible. Students may need to miss class during this period. *Adelle notes that the fear of having to miss class without a make-up option is one of the biggest barriers to registration with NMPD.*

Peer Institutions: Texas A&M recently amended its policies to count donor participation as excused, as follows: <https://student-rules.tamu.edu/rule07/>

Excused absence - 7.2.2.10 Required pre-donation and donation activities for a student selected as a donor of a transplant such as bone marrow, stem cells (Peripheral Blood Stem Cell Donation), and organs, provided that it cannot be rescheduled.

Rule 7 – Attendance – Texas A&M Student Rules

We have used the Texas A&M language as a protocol in our motion to faculty council.

Impact of adopting bone marrow donation as a university-sanctioned absence:

- A bone marrow donation by a student can save a life.
- Although many students register with NMPD, only a small fraction of them ever get called as bone marrow donors (at CSU in three years: 12 out of 2567 registered – about 0.5 percent.) Thus, the rescheduling load for instructors to accommodate this additional type of excused absence is relatively minor.
- By including NMPD as a CSU commitment with absence privileges, we
 - recognize and elevate the importance of donating, encouraging more people to participate with NMPD
 - give emerging adults (our students) the power to help others
 - respond positively to a student-driven request and affirm the professional, informative way that they brought this request forward
 - elevate CSU as one of only a couple universities in the nation to join the NMPD initiative and others aimed at bone marrow, organ or stem cell donations.

MOTION: Amend the Faculty Manual Section I.14.4 Class Attendance Regulations as follows: black = our current language; red = suggested additions

Note: A duplicate policy is also described in the CSU Academics and Standards Policies section on Class Attendance Regulations: <https://catalog.colostate.edu/general-catalog/academic-standards/academic-policies/>

I.14.4 Class Attendance Regulations (last revised June 21, 2011)

Instructors and departments are responsible for establishing attendance policies for classes and examinations. These policies must accommodate student participation in University-sanctioned extracurricular/co-curricular activities. Students must inform their instructors prior to the anticipated absence and take the initiative to make up missed work in a timely fashion. Instructors must make reasonable efforts to enable students to make up work which must be accomplished under the instructor's supervision (e.g., examinations, laboratories). In the event of a conflict in regard to this policy, individuals may appeal using established University procedures. For the purposes of this regulation, University-sanctioned activities include competitions, events and professional meetings in which students are officially representing the institution. Appropriate sanctioned activities include:

- a. Intercollegiate athletics; b. Collegiate club sports and competitions;*
- c. Conferences and workshops recognized by the University not related to academics;*
- d. Commitments on behalf of the University (ASCSU, band, etc.), **required pre-donation and donation activities for a student selected as a donor of a transplant such as bone marrow (the National Marrow Donor Program), stems cells or organs, provided it cannot be rescheduled; and***
- e. Professional activities recognized by the University related to academics.*

Department heads or their designated representatives must approve sanctioned professional and departmental activities. Other sanctioned activities must be approved by the appropriate program director on record with the Division of Student Affairs or the Department of Athletics.

Next steps: CoTL Chair Debbie Garrity and the student advocates for NMPD are available to meet with faculty council or other interested parties to explain the request or share additional information.

Thank you for your consideration.