University Assessment Committee   Time: 3:05 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Date: October 14, 2024   Room: Zoom

GRAND VALLEY
STATE UNIVERSITY

Visitors please request a Zoom link from uac@gvsu.edu

2024-25 UAC Members

Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies (1)	**Kirkhof College of Nursing (1)**
Andrew Schlewitz, Area & Global Studies (24-27)	**Julie Bekius, College of Nursing (24-27)**
College of Computing (1)	**Padnos College of Engineering (1)**
Greg Schymik, Computing Info Systems (22-25)	**Nabeeh Kandalaft, Comp. & Electrical (22-25)**
College of Education & Community Innovation (2)	**Seidman College of Business (2)**
Raymond Higbea, Comm Leader & Devel (23-26)	**Suzeanne Benet, Marketing (24-26)**
Wei Gu, Teaching & Learning (24-27)	Joe Little, Marketing (24-27) (return W25)
College of Health Professions (2)	**Service Unit Representatives (6)**
Libby MacQuillan, Sch. Interdisc. Health (24-27)	**Colleen Bailey, Housing & Res. Life (23-26)**
Azizur Molla, Sch. Interdisc. Health (Fall 2024)	**Melissa Baker-Boosamra, Student Life (24-27)**
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (11)	*Brian Bossick, Counseling Ctr (22-25)*
Richard Besel, Communications (23-26)	**Kate Harmon, AVP Student Affairs (24-27)**
Charles Ham, Classics (23-26)	Susan Mendoza, CUSE (24-27)
Jon Hasenbank, Mathematics (23-26)	**Mike Messner, Director SSP, SASC (24-27)**
Julie Henderleiter, Chemistry (24-27) chair	**University Libraries Representative (1)**
Zsuzsanna Palmer, Writing (23-26) (sabbatical)	*unfilled position*
Christine Smith, Psychology (22-25)	**Student Senate Representatives (2) (1-year term)**
unfilled position	Undergraduate: *TBD*
unfilled position	Graduate: *TBD*
unfilled position	
unfilled position	*Ex Officio* **(Office of the Provost)***:*
unfilled position	**Sean Lancaster, AVP for SPAA**
	Phuong Vo, Assessment and Accreditation Specialist
(bold, in attendance; *italics, notified absence*)	**Ruth Yeboah, Graduate Assistant**

Agenda:

1) Arrivals and pre-meeting review of the Minutes (3:00 – 3:05). Minutes taken via Zoom.

2) Approval of minutes from 10/7/2024 (attachment)
   a) Minutes were approved with one clarification.

3) Report from the Chair
   a) Henderleiter announced that late assessment plans will be reviewed next semester.
   b) Committee members were encouraged to consider nominating a vice chair for the upcoming term.

4) Report from the Provost's Office
   a) Lancaster discussed January 10th assessment conference and the partnership with the FTLC.
   b) The Occupational Safety and Health Management program visit resulted in a positive exit report. The final accreditation decision will be made in the future.

5) New Business <mark>**Committee discussion is in bold to help distinguish discussion from prompts**</mark>.
   a) Discussion, Process 2 reporting
      i) Frequency of executive summaries due to UAC, annual or biennial like other programs.

ii) Procedure for renewal of Process 2. Programs have a wide range in the frequency of external accrediting body visits and frequency of reporting to external accreditors. Programs may report to external accreditors/site visits every 2 – 10 years. What policy does UAC want to set to manage this? Initially, UAC planned to ask programs to reapply for Process 2 the semester after an external review. Is this tenable? Is that what UAC wishes to enforce?

- **UAC needs to confirm a process for how often programs with external accreditation should come back to report their continued accreditation status.**
- **UAC discussed the process of accreditation and its implications, with Benet suggesting a formal mechanism for notifying changes in accreditation status.**
- **Schymik suggested that programs should submit an updated plan every cycle. Hasenbank suggested incorporating an annual report from approved programs into UAC's existing reporting process.**
- **MacQuillan proposed a 5-year cycle for reviewing accreditation standards.**
- **Henderleiter will draft a memo outlining this process for UAC to review.**

b) At our 9/23 meeting, a question came up about asking programs to report all SLOs/SCOs. UAC stepped back from this in terms of reporting when the new process was designed. The new process focuses on a "2+" model for reporting. Discussion about this decision, as the university resumes assessment planning and reporting, is meaningful. Some things to consider include:
   i) Will programs benefit from being asked for a comprehensive list of SLOs/SCOs? Will UAC benefit?
   ii) Should UAC suggest a range for a "desired" number of SLOs/SCOs for programs? What is a reasonable range?
   iii) Should programs provide some sort of assessment calendar for all SLOs/SCOs? How far into the future should such a calendar extend? Do programs have to commit to this calendar?
   iv) Is there a concern about programs reporting the same SLOs/SCOs for many cycles? Is this acceptable if the program is making progress towards a benchmark or threshold? What if a program notes that progress is satisfactory, but the program continues to assess the same SLOs/SCOs repeatedly? Is this a concern? What is a meaningful response from UAC if this is a concern?
   (1) **UAC discussed whether programs should be asked to provide a comprehensive list of SLOs and SCOs, and if they should commit to an assessment calendar.**
   - **Schymik suggested that programs should have 4 to 10 objectives to measure, and that they should be involved in coaching and providing resources to help programs improve.**
   - **Hasenbank suggested that the number of outcomes can vary across all programs, as they are diverse and have interpreted the directive from UAC in different ways.**
   - **Programs should think about meaningful student learning outcomes and student-centered outcomes, without mandating a specific number or sequence. UAC can assist in this process.**
   - **Programs should communicate active assessment processes and adjustments over time.**
   - **UAC agreed that the new assessment process should be more dynamic and action research-based, allowing programs to retire assessments and move on to more productive ones.**
   - **Hasenbank highlighted the challenge of different units having varying levels of granularity or generality in writing their outcomes.**
   - **Henderleiter noted that some programs took a focused approach to their student learning outcomes, assessing them multiple times to identify and fix issues.**
   - **UAC recognizes the need for qualitative and quantitative approaches to assessment.**
   - **Programs should not be limited to a specific number of student learning outcomes.**
   - **Programs should be encouraged to think about the kinds of things their graduates should know and be able to do when they graduate.**
   - **There was also a discussion about the concern of programs reporting the same SLOs or SCOs for many cycles, and the need for a meaningful response from UAC.**

- **UAC discussed the importance of using assessment to show what's working well and what areas need improvement and using assessment results to advocate for resources.**
  - (2) **The significant labor involved in external accreditation processes and the complication of involving interdisciplinary faculty in the assessment process was noted.**
  - (3) **The committee discussed the need for UAS to revisit the University Assessment Council's (UAC) core responsibilities, as UAC is no longer involved in strategic planning.**
  - (4) **The committee agreed to provide feedback to the administration to support ongoing accreditation standards.**
  - (5) **Further discussion is warranted before setting policy.**

  c) Reporting schedule
  - i) UAC has traditionally kept to a 2-year cycle for reporting, so ¼ of university programs report each academic semester. Is there a reason to change this?
  - ii) How does UAC want to schedule reporting? Co-curricular has requested reporting due July 1—most of these programs do not follow academic calendar. Does UAC then spread out academic programs to balance the workload? Will Process 2 programs and programs that report fully be spread between fall and winter, or is there another distribution that makes sense?
  - iii) When should the first assessment reports be due? Options include:
    - (1) First set of reports due at the end of Winter 2025 semester (reports submitted by May 15 or July 1, 2025) for review in Fall 2025
    - (2) First set of report due at the end of Fall 2025 semester (reports submitted by Jan. 15, 2026) for review in Winter 2026
      - **A quarterly schedule would allow for more effective feedback and reflection. UAC will continue with this model. Program will still be encouraged to enter reporting annually.**
      - **August 1 and January 21 were set as due dates for assessment reports (and new plans?). This gives programs time to prepare materials after finals, if desired, and provides UAC time to request late materials and programs time to respond before UAC begins its review work in Fall and Winter.**
      - **Harmon raised a concern about the effectiveness of the feedback provided by the committee, questioning whether it is being used to positively impact the programs. Lancaster mentioned that his office is evaluating the committee's work.**
      - **GVAssess functionality remains problematic. Lancaster noted that GrayDI would not impact learning outcomes. The possibility of using Blackboard for assessment plans, rubrics, and feedback was raised as an alternative to the current GVAssess system.**
      - **UAC will confirm reporting timeline at the November 4th meeting.**

6) Adjourn to small groups
  a) Small groups did not meet.

7) Adjournment
  a) The meeting was adjourned around 4:30 pm.

Fall Meeting Schedule-Full Committee Meetings
~~September 9~~
~~September 23~~
~~October 7~~
~~October 14~~
November 4
November 18
December 2