University Assessment Committee Time: 3:05 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Meeting Date: November 17, 2025 Room: Zoom

Zoom link: Please email uac@gvsu.edu for a link

2025-26 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)**
Semester substitute for F25 – TBA	**Padnos College of Engineering (1)**
College of Computing (1)	Nabeeh Kandalaft, Comp & Elec (25-28)*sab F25
Greg Schymik, Computing Info Systems (25-28)	*Sunghwan Joo, Mechanical F25*
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)**
College of Health Professions (2)	**Service Unit Representatives (6)**
Lori DeMott, Occupational Sci & Therapy (25-28)	Colleen Bailey, Housing & Res. Life (23-26)
Libby MacQuillan, Sch. Interdisc. Health (24-27)	**Melissa Baker-Boosamra, Student Life (24-27)**
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (11)	**Brian Bossick, Counseling Ctr (25-28)**
Richard Besel, Communications (23-26)	Kate Harmon, AVP Student Affairs (24-27)
Sera Choi, Communications (25-28)	**Susan Mendoza, CUSE (24-27)**
Charles Ham, Classics (23-26)	*Mike Messner, Director SSP, SASC (24-27)*
Jon Hasenbank, Mathematics (23-26) sab W26	**University Libraries Representative (1)**
Art Campbell, Music Theater Dance W26	**Delaney Jorgensen, University Libraries (25-28)**
Julie Henderleiter, Chemistry (24-27) chair	**Student Senate Representatives (2) (1-year term)**
Figen Mekik, Physics (25-28)	Undergraduate: *TBD*
Zsuzsanna Palmer, Writing (23-26)	Graduate: *TBD*
unfilled position	
unfilled position	*Ex Officio* **(Office of the Provost)***:*
unfilled position	Sean Lancaster, AVP for SPAA
unfilled position	**Phuong Vo, Assessment and Accreditation Specialist**
(bold, in attendance; *italics, notified absence*)	**Gideon Osei Bonsu, Graduate Assistant**

Agenda:
1) Arrivals and pre-meeting review of the Minutes (3:00 – 3:05). Minutes taken via Zoom, support from recording.
2) Approval of minutes from 11/3/2025 (attachment).
    a) The minutes were approved with no changes.
3) Report from the Chair
    a) Reminder – new chair election December 1, 2025. Richard Besel has expressed interest in serving.
    b) Progress on UAC website in CMS 5
        i) Gideon has framed out the new UAC website. He is working with Henderleiter to populate the site. The site may be live next semester. All the CMS 4 documents have been downloaded and saved to Bb if they are needed in the future.
        ii) Hasenbank noted that we need to check that the short URLs transfer over.
    c) Progress on GVAssess training videos/quick guides
        i) Henderleiter has drafted an outline and is working with Hasenbank and Vo to ensure it is correct.
        ii) The messages in the automatic communication system are being updated. UAC members may get communications as we test the system, please delete these messages.
        iii) Programs will be assigned to review cycles in GVAssess.

iv) UAC will need to update the review forms in the system; one will be needed for APs and one or two will be needed for AR review (regular and expedited processes).

v) Gideon is putting together a quick guide to help programs use the system.

vi) Benet requested an easy way for programs to check which review cycle they are in. This is posted on the UAC website, but may need to be easier to find.

d) Henderleiter attended the Nov. 14 ECS meeting, UAC now has a special charge, "Work with the Provost Office to see where and how the assessment data that programs collect and provide to UAC fits into a program health check process."

4) Report from the Provost's Office

a) HLC released new criteria to achieve accreditation, https://www.hlcommission.org/accreditation/policies/criteria/. There are now 4 criteria, not 5. UAC supports Criteria 3E, Assessment of Student Learning. HLC looks for programs that collect and use data for improvement. Once GVAssess is fully operational, it will be easier for programs, deans, HLC reviewers, to see how GVSU assesses and acts to improve student learning. Co-curricular programs are included in this category.

b) Criteria 3F is program review. UAC's work supports the program review process; the special charge will help the conversation.

c) Criteria 3G relates to Student Success Outcomes. Others on campus will look at employment, graduate school attendance of GVSU graduates.

d) Hasenbank noted that the new Action Items tool in GVAssess may be particularly helpful to show the status of action items, a report can be run to pull these.

e) Lancaster noted that GVSU is far ahead of other Michigan institutions in terms of having a system and program to collect assessment data.

5) New Business

a) Updates on AP, AR reviews from small groups.

i) Team 4 hopes to have reviews completed by Friday 11/21.

ii) Henderleiter noted that AR reviews can trickle into January, but the committee will want reviews completed before the next round of ARs come in for review. There are also a few more APs trickling in. Winter 2026 reviews have a larger proportion of programs approved for Expedited reviews.

iii) Benet asked about how programs receive feedback, Henderleiter explained the process used for chair review (team 5) and writing memos/emails to programs.

b) Discussion, format of UAC reviewer feedback in GVAssess (attachment).

i) Henderleiter showed the current review form and presented some areas that need to be edited or deleted. She noted that we might need separate review forms for regular and expedited ARs. "Closing the loop" language could be replaced with Action Items. The previous form did not break out measures by SLO, as the current internal review form does. The committee should decide if this level of detail is necessary or if a summary of all measures would be better.

ii) Benet commented that one section for comments on all measures would be fine, programs seemed to follow a pattern in their reporting, which would make it easier to have one section. What does HLC need?

iii) Lancaster noted that HLC would say to follow the process we created.

iv) Higbea agreed with Benet, programs followed enough of a pattern that combining feedback from several measures into one section would work.

v) Henderleiter noted that UAC reviewers could request items like rubrics, more information in one section.

vi) Hasenbank noted that the current review form shows all the drop-down boxes and then comments are added. There have been no complaints, so maintaining this format is simplest. UAC could have parts of the form being private (to UAC) if comments are meant to remain internal. But the second review process and chair review is meant to provide a uniform voice to comments, so private comments on the website have not been necessary.

vii) Hasenbank noted that the measures are built in the AP, so that level of review could go to the AP review form. Adding a separate review form for each SLO/SCO would be difficult for the database, so one section with all comments, as noted by Benet and Higbea, would be best. Programs will select the Sub-entities that are Ready for Review when they submit, so UAC should provide feedback based on what programs submit.

viii) UAC instructions should request that units submit Ready for Review forms for programs undergoing regular review separately from programs undergoing expedited review.

ix) Hasenbank noted it might be possible for UAC reviewers to link feedback to a specific Ready for Review form. This seems to be the easiest path forward.

x) Hasenbank asked if UAC should be able to select the tyle of review form-AP, regular AR, or expedited AR and how much the programs should be able to see of the form. Henderleiter noted that there needs to be a way to find the two types of AR reporting. Linking it to the Ready for Review form may be simplest. Hasenbank believes this would be easy to program, since the Ready for Review form asks programs if they are approved for Expedited review, so that functionality is already in the system.

xi) Henderleiter will mock up an AP review form and revisit the AR review form for discussion. Mendoza and Higbea agreed, suggesting that simpler is better.

xii) Palmer asked for clarification about the Action Items. Is this Action Items overall, or action items based on the previous assessment review. UAC will need to specify, since programs can identify action items as open, closed, etc. Benet also noted that there needs to be clarity about action items. UAC should ask "in response to your assessment results, are there action items that have been completed, are pending, etc." Hasenbank noted that Action Items are now part of the reporting process and that the review needs to help programs recognize the need to comment on action items that are existing, what happened that they are now closed, etc.

c) UAC's next meeting is December 1. The committee will vote in the new chair. This will be the last meeting of the year.

d) Henderleiter will draft the mid-year report to UAS, once there are directions. Rather than meet on December 8 (tentative), is the committee OK commenting on and approving the mid-year report via email? The committee agrees to this [NOTE—after this UAC meeting, the chair received access to the mid-year report template. The report is due by January 21. Proceeding as planned is fine.]

6) Adjourned full committee

7) Adjourned to review teams.

Fall Meeting Schedule-Full Committee Meetings

September 8	September 22	October 6	October 13-canceled
November 3	November 17	December 1	December 8 (tentative)