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| **University Assessment Committee**Meeting Date: Jan. 25, 2021 | Time: 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.Room: Zoom | GVLEFT |

**2020-21 UAC Members**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies (1)**   Peter Wampler, Honors (20-23)**College of Community & Public Service (2)**   **Scott Berlin, School of Social Work (18-21)**   **Allison Adams (21-21)****College of Education (2)**   Wei Gu, Teaching & Learning (18-21)   **Greg Warsen, Ed. Lead. & Counseling (19-22)****College of Health Professions (2)**   Denise Ludwig, Communication Sciences (19-22)   **Libby MacQuillan, Allied Health Sciences (18-21)****College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (11)**   **Richard Besel, Communications (20-23)**   **Jon Hasenbank, Mathematics (19-22)****Julie Henderleiter, Chemistry (18-21) chair**   **Mike Henshaw, Biology (19-22)****David Laughlin, Movement Science (20-23)****Keith Oliver, Physics (20-23) Zsuzsanna Palmer, Writing (21-23)**   Janel Pettes Guikema, Modern Lang & Lit (20-22)   **Carolyn Shapiro-Shapin, History (20-23)** **recording**    **Al Sheffield; Music, Theatre, and Dance (19-22)**  **Fang (Faye) Yang, Communications (18-21)**(bold, in attendance; *italics, notified absence*) | **Kirkhof College of Nursing (1)**   **Sue Harrington, College of Nursing (18-21)****Padnos College of Engineering and Computing (2)**   **Greg Schymik, Computing & Info Systems (19-22)**   **Sung-Hwan Joo, School of Engineering (20-23)****Seidman College of Business (2)****Sonia Dalmia, Economics (20-23)**  Anne Sergeant, School of Accounting (18-21) **Service Unit Representatives (6)**   **Colleen Lindsay-Bailey, Housing & Res. Life (20-23)** **Colin DeKuiper, PCEC Advising (20-21)** Breeann Gorham, CCHP Advising (20-21)   Susan Mendoza, OURS (18-21)   **Betty Schaner, Assistant Dean, CLAS (19-22)**   **Kate Stoetzner, Padnos International Center (19-22)****University Libraries Representative (1)**   **Scarlet Galvan, University Libraries (20-23)****Student Senate Representatives (2) (1-year terms)**   **Undergraduate: Nick Raak**   Graduate: *TBD****Ex Officio* (Office of the Provost)*:***  **Chris Plouff, AVP for SPAA Taylor Boyd, SPAA Assessment Specialist** **Anca Enache, Graduate Assistant** |

**Agenda:**

1. Arrivals and pre-meeting review of the Minutes (3:00 – 3:05).
 **Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.**
2. Approval of minutes from 11/30/2020 (attachment)
	1. Greg Warsen moved to approve; Sue Harrington seconded. Approved by voice vote.
3. Report from the Chair
	1. Membership changes (welcome Sonia, Tina taking leave of absence)
	2. Reminder of meeting schedule for Winter, 2021: Jan. 25; Feb. 8, 22; March 8, 22; April 5, 19
		1. Lighter load predicted for Winter
	3. Fall, 2020 review status
		1. Looking to complete reviews by Valentine’s Day
	4. Plans for seriously delinquent units
		1. Henderleiter, Boyd and Plouff developed a plan to deal with units that have not done anything since 2018 to develop a plan moving forward. Want a plan in place for Fall 2021.
	5. Draft, Winter 2021 reviews and chair updates (column R)
		1. Winter 2021 – requested that committee members please try to log in
		2. Will do assessments but not strategic plans
		3. There is a column for departments with a need for followup.
	6. Team adjustments for Winter, 2021 (Team 0 needs additional reviewer)
		1. Shapiro-Shapin will join from Team 2
	7. Midterm report from UAS has been submitted and will be circulated.
4. Report from the Provost’s Office
	1. Plouff
		1. Provost’s office is moving forward on University Development’s draft versions Mission, Vision and Values work based on huddles. This will go out to Deans and leadership in other divisions for feedback. Strategy development will begin in February.
	2. Boyd
		1. Unit level data can be run through Gen Ed reports to assist departments with reporting. Enache will run some of these reports.
5. New business
	1. Discussion: how UAC will review and provide feedback on Self-study reports; what role is most beneficial? (prompts listed below agenda for easy referral as needed)
		1. What does meaningful feedback look like?
		2. Is it best for UAC to read and comment on entire Self-study or on a portion of the Self-study?
		3. What is the best structure for the reviews/what do our programmers need to set up in GVAdvance?

**Discussion of how to review self-studies**

* Deans will be reading these reports over the summer.
* Last semester, the suggestion was that UAC focus on Student Centered Outcomes but should we also focus on whole plan.
* Hasenbank noted that we need to understand the timeline for reviews. Self-studies are due in June and colleges are supposed to do alignment over the summer.
* Plouff noted that University level strategies will be presented to the Board in early fall for November. College strategies will be developed in the Fall, as well. Units would work on plans in Winter of 2022.
* Dalmia – Seidman has College level plans rather than Unit plans.
* Henderleiter asked what the committee sees as the right amount of review. Next winter will be lighter because of the suspension of reviews during the pandemic. Self-studies are being written this semester.
* Schymik – We can only look at whether the units looked at what we said during the assessment. We need to better understand the real purpose of the reflection. The timing suggests that our feedback would not make as much sense.
* Harrington – Can we assist with the writing process in the form of webinars, etc. rather than assessment?
* Warsen – Shares Schymik’s concerns with the purpose of such assessment.
* Galvan - We can offer resources and support rather than commentary for its own sake.
* Palmer – We can give an optional early draft date and provide feedback.
* Plouff – His understanding is that UAC would only look at the one question on assessment concerning outcomes and believes that this would be valuable in assessing reporting on 5 years of outcome.
* Hasenbank – We would be reviewing results of Self-studies in Fall. There are differences among colleges. It would be worthwhile to review the one question. We are checking for truth in reporting.
* Henderleiter – as the UAC, helping the units look at what they have been assessing and to support their good work and assist in places where assistance with strategies is needed. Resources are there and Deans have reached out with questions.
* Dalmia – What about programs with external accreditation? Could these units just do a reflection on their exiting assessment process for external review? Workload would be reduced by not having to report in multiple formats. This shift would contribute to continuous improvement.
* Plouff -- we only need a regular review process for HLC and we determine what that process is. We need internal review in addition to external review.
* Henderleiter – UAC did not want to determine whether external reviewers had student learning objectives.
* Hasenbank – Posted URL: <https://www.gvsu.edu/uac/uac-policy-documents-27.htm> Policy on UAC website.
* Henderleiter – SWS uploads single reports rather than filling in all boxes for all objectives.
* Warsen – supports Dalmia’s insights for streamlining work.
* Discussion about purpose of UAC feedback and timelines for doing so: If W22 units do strategic planning, Self Study feedback should be posted by end of F21.
* Plouff shares that his understanding has been that UAC would provide feedback only on the question directly related to assessment reporting.
* Suggestion to have feedback from UAC focus on squaring the units’ reflection with feedback from UAC reviews over the years. Point out mismatches. Provide feedback to support effective practices during next strategic planning cycle.
* Suggestion to have UAC provide feedback on Self Study reports only if requested from the unit or from the Dean after the Dean reviews the reports over the summer. Essentially the Dean “refers” the unit to UAC.
	+ Follow-up discussion: Deans may not know what UAC is looking for. There may be inconsistencies between colleges if we rely on colleges to refer certain Self Studies to UAC.
		- What is the best structure for the reviews/what do our programmers need to set up in GVAdvance? Prompt we are responding to for SS reads: “After reviewing the assessment of the Student Learning or Student Centered Outcomes, identify key areas (1 – 5) where students are excelling, and areas (1 – 5) that need improvement. For complex programs with many majors or emphases, more items can be included.
* The UAC’s feedback might focus on suggestions for the helping the unit use the GVAssess platform and other existing assessment structures to track their strengths and areas for improvement moving forward. Examples include encouraging units to add relevant outcomes, objectives, and measures related to those elements.
* Possibly also offering a sounding board for support.
* GVAdvance user interface for uploading feedback might be as simple as a single open textbox.
	+ UAC might develop internal prompts or structures for the feedback we provide, but keep a single open textbox for flexiblity.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:28 PM.**

* 1. Discuss whether UAC responsibilities need to be changed, as related to Strategic Planning (Suggest discussing this in Winter, 2021, AFTER Self-study review process is set).

***Standing Responsibilities (Faculty Handbook):*** *The UAC is responsible for:*

1. *Providing leadership and support to university constituents as they design and implement the five to six year self-study report and every two year student learning outcome assessment plan/report with strategic plan updates based on best practices.*
2. *Reviewing and providing feedback on assessment plans, reports, and self-studies submitted by all academic programs and most service units \**
3. *Providing instructions for reporting formats and schedules.*
4. *Providing feedback to Administration in support of ongoing accreditation standards as set forth by the Higher Learning Commission.*
5. *Conducting user training on the on-line system for reporting Assessment reviews/plans and Self-Study updates/reports.*
6. *Maintaining and updating the UAC website, Blackboard site, submission links as needed, and Assessment Report and Self-study (ARSS) automated timeline and notification system (4 month and 2 month notifications).*

*\* Service unit representatives are appointed to serve as the primary reviewer of reports submitted by service units.*

**Self-study prompts**

Reflections on Strategic Plan Findings: Strengths

What are some of the strengths (1 – 5) of the unit and where/how is the unit excelling? What improvements have been realized relative to implementation and accomplishment of the Strategic Plan?

Reflections on Strategic Plan Findings: Challenges

What are some of the challenges (1 – 5) the unit should address in the next Strategic Plan?

Reflections on Student Learning or Student Centered Outcomes

After reviewing the assessment of the Student Learning or Student Centered Outcomes, identify key areas (1 – 5) where students are excelling, and areas (1 – 5) that need improvement. For complex programs with many majors or emphases, more items can be included.

Reflections on Unit Stability

What are some key indicators (1 – 5) from the numeric metrics provided that favor the long-term stability of the unit? If there are any areas of concern that have arisen from the numeric metrics provided over the past 5-6 years, then how are they being addressed?

Reflections on Mission, Vision, Values

In light of the findings from the Strategic Planning process review, are the Mission, Vision, and Values for the unit still relevant and valid? If so, why? If not, why not?

Next Steps Toward Developing New Strategic Plan

The University is currently constructing its next Strategic Plan, which will likely ask Units and Colleges to support current Presidential Priorities (accessible at https://www.gvsu.edu/president/presidential-priorities-22.htm).

* Describe a few (1 – 5) things that need to be done to ensure that the next Strategic Plan meets the expectations of the units’ constituents and the mission of the University.
* Describe a few ways (1 – 5) that your unit can support current Presidential priorities.

**Team Assignments (Final)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team 0** | **Team 1** | **Team 2** | **Team 3** | **Team 4** | **Team 5** | **Team 6** |
| Julie Henderleiter-CLAS-CHMSusan Mendoza-OURS Carolyn Shapiro-Shapin-CLAS-HST | Sung Hwan Joo-PCEC-EGRAnne Sergeant-SCB-ACCTAl Sheffield-CLAS-MTDPeter Wampler-BCOIS-HON | Allison Adams-CCPS-HTMScott Berlin-CCPS-SOCRichard Besel-CLAS-COMGreg Warsen - COE-EDL | Sonia Dalmia-SCB-ECONDavid Laughlin-CLAS-MVTDenise Ludwig-CHP-CSCIKeith Oliver-CLAS-PHYGreg Schymik-PCEC-CIS | Scarlet Galvan-ULJon Hasenbank-CLAS-MTHMike Henshaw-CLAS-BIOFang (Faye) Yang-CLAS-COM | Wei Gu-COE-EDIJanel Pettes Guikema-CLAS-MLL Sue Harrington-KCN-NURLibby MacQuillan-CHP-AHSZsuzsanna Palmer – CLAS-WRT | Colleen Bailey-HousingColin DeKuiper- PCEC Anca Enache- Grad. Assist.Breeann Gorham - AdvisingBetty Schaner-CLAS-ADKate Stoetzner-PIC |