University Assessment Committee Time: 3:05 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Meeting Date: September 11, 2023   Room: JHZ3068

![Grand Valley State University logo]

2023-24 UAC Members

Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies (1)	**Padnos College of Engineering and Computing (2)**
unfilled position	Nabeeh Kandalaft, School of Engineering (22-25)
College of Education & Community Innovation (2)	**Greg Schymik, Computing & Info Systems (22-25)**
Raymond Higbea, Comm Leader & Devel (23-26)	**Seidman College of Business (2)**
Wei Gu, Teaching & Learning (21-24)	**Joe Little, Marketing (21-24)**
College of Health Professions (2)	*unfilled position*
Libby MacQuillan, Sch. Interdisc. Health (21-24)	**Service Unit Representatives (6)**
Martina Reinhold, Physician Assist. Stu. (22-25)	**Andy Beachnau, AVP Student Affairs (22-25)**
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (11)	**Brian Bossick, Career Devel. Services (22-25)**
Dan Adrian, Statistics (23-24)	*Colleen Bailey, Housing & Res. Life (23-26)*
Richard Besel, Communications (23-26)	*Susan Mendoza, CUSE (21-24)*
Charles Ham, Classics (23-26)	**Mike Messner, Director SSP, SASC (21-24)**
Jon Hasenbank, Mathematics (23-26)	*unfilled position*
Julie Henderleiter, Chemistry (21-24) chair	**University Libraries Representative (1)**
Zsuzsanna Palmer, Writing (23-26)	*unfilled position*
Christine Smith, Psychology (22-25)	**Student Senate Representatives (2) (1-year terms)**
unfilled position	Undergraduate: *TBD*
unfilled position	Graduate: *TBD*
unfilled position	
unfilled position	***Ex Officio* (Office of the Provost)***:
Kirkhof College of Nursing (1)	**Sean Lancaster, AVP for SPAA**
Sylvia Mupepi, College of Nursing (21-24)	**Phuong Vo, Assessment and Accreditation Specialist**
	Cathy Wilson, Graduate Assistant
(bold, in attendance; *italics, notified absence*)	

Agenda:

1) Arrivals and pre-meeting review of the Minutes (3:00 – 3:05). Need a volunteer to take minutes.
    a) Ham volunteered to take minutes.
2) Approval of minutes from 4/17/2023 (attachment)
    a) Mupepi moved; Schymik seconded. Approved unanimously.
3) Report from the Chair
    a) Meet and greet, new and returning members
    b) We will vote in New Business for meeting format (in person or hybrid)
    c) Summer outreach to Co-curricular and Service Units
        i) Henderleiter: more outreach will be useful.
    d) Update on GVAssess
        i) Henderleiter: Not a lot of work has been done on GVAssess, but with GVPlan being rolled out, attention should turn to GVAssess.
    e) Charges from UAS
        i) Henderleiter: no new charges; reviewed current charges of UAC; stressed the need to encourage programs to create and submit their assessment plans, either to GVAssess, if it's ready, or to UAC using an electronic form by January or, at latest, May.
    f) Past UAC policy about externally accredited programs and reporting requirements (attachment)

      i)   Henderleiter: UAC already has a policy on the books of not accepting reports submitted for external accreditation. Since some current members were not on the committee when said policy was created, we need to revisit it.

   g) Henderleiter reviewed Fall 2023 task list, set at 4/17/23 meeting:

      i)   Finish carrying through team work.

      ii)   handbook re: retiring the policy of demanding accreditation needs to be voted on if we want to remove it. See above.

      iii) We will tell UAS that we will be working to get university back on track.

      iv) Make sure associations/corrections are correct for externally accredited programs.

      v)   Assure that messaging is on point, from UAC members to university and on UAC website (https://www.gvsu.edu/uac/).

      vi) Careful look at website to determine if changes have been made (some work begun Summer 23).

      vii) CLAS has 5 (now 4) open seats – please recruit peers.

          (1) Henderleiter noted that CECI is now down to two members.

4) Report from the Provost's Office

   a) Lancaster: GVPlan has been updated. It was built in-house by IT as part of GVAdvance for strategic planning 2016-21. Reach Higher (RH) 2025 introduced new language and so GVPlan was redesigned and molded around RH 2025. Next iteration of RH will be RH 2030. The latter will recycle language, commitments, etc. from RH 2025. First reporting due date for GVPlan is October 2nd. Four year HLC accreditation report was due June 5th. GVSU passed with flying colors. The next stage of HLC accreditation is the 10 year report, which will include a "quality initiative," in which GVSU will pick some outcome to focus on, likely an aspect of student success (e.g. retention).

   b) Beachnau moved to formally acknowledge appreciation for Lancaster's leadership on HLC report; Vo seconded. Approved unanimously.

5) New Business

   a) Vote on meeting format for 2023-2024.

      i)   Committee discussed whether to meet fully online, in hybrid format, or fully in-person. Several people noted that meeting in-person is not possible for some members (hard to get Allendale from GR; in Winter, it will be hard for those in Allendale to get to GR). It was noted that if we continue with hybrid format, we need to be in a room equipped for hybrid. It was noted that fully online is easier than battling with technology, but it was wondered whether Zoom format could discourage some from participating. Noted that small group work in a hybrid format would be difficult logistically.

      ii)   After discussion, Schymik moved to meet fully online (Zoom). Motion unanimously approved.

   b) Henderleiter reviewed charges for each team (see below). Members volunteered for teams (see Team Assignments below). Schymik requested that we get access to as much as possible from the archive of last year's work. Henderleiter will send materials from last year's work to the group, who will review the materials before next meeting.

      i)   **TEAM 1 – Online materials (3 members)**

          (1) Check in and advise GVAssess programmer with updates (request link from chair)

          (2) Design Google Form for implementation if the platform will NOT be ready for entering assessment plans by Nov. 1.

          (3) Help plan revisions to UAC website, replace/revise/add.

      ii)   **TEAM 2 – Externally Accredited Programs (4-5 members)**

          (1) Finalize criteria for reviewing programs to determine if their accrediting body's SLOs are comparable enough for exemption from regular UAC reporting. *HLC guidelines may be helpful:*
              4.B. The institution engages in ongoing assessment of student learning as part of its commitment to the educational outcomes of its students.

- *The institution has effective processes for assessment of student learning and for achievement of learning goals in academic and cocurricular offerings.*
- *The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.*

- *The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty, instructional and other relevant staff members.*

(2) Design the process for exemption approval. Can a small group of UAC members meet with Ext. Accred. programs and discuss—"show me where your Ext. Accred. Body asks for ___ and how you ___?" Or would a paper trail be easier—"upload ___ and tell UAC where to find ___"? What is the most efficient way to progress for programs and for UAC?

- Henderleiter: we need to think about the most time-efficient manner for externally accredited programs to get us their reports and for us us to process them. Schymik: we have to make reporting from externally accredited programs as consistent with the rest of the reporting as possible. We should be asking same questions of externally accredited programs that we ask of others. We need to make sure that what we are asking of externally accredited programs is not adding more work for them.

(3) Divide Exempt Programs into 4 groups for UAC review. Exempt programs will provide a 1-page executive-style summary (is this what we want) of assessment work to UAC on a 2-year cycle (focused on how assessment is going/any concerns).

(4) Ext. Accred. programs will re-apply for exemption the semester after they are reviewed by their accrediting bodies. UAC needs a schedule of when programs undergo review. Some are on 2-year cycles, some 5, some 7…etc.

- Messner asked about federally accredited programs, which occasioned a wider discussion of which programs we need reporting from. Lancaster: If the programs don't have GVSU students, we don't need reporting from them. Hasenbank: historically, UAC has agreed to review reports from Student Services programs but that this has been nased on informal agreements between Divisions.

iii) **TEAM 3 – Academic Programs (4-5 members)**

(1) Clarify assessment plan and reporting needs for programs and provide messaging to programs about entering assessment plans by ___ and communicate that reporting will resume in ___.

(2) Reset the UAC review calendar, divide programs into 4 groups for UAC review.

(3) Work with Team 4 to devise UAC feedback forms. Do we want to construct short narratives documenting a few things done well and a few things that could be improved upon? Do we want check boxes, if so for what categories? The reports will be more narrative in nature as we move forward, with fewer proscribed text boxes. How can we best provide meaningful feedback?

(4) Work with Team 4 to devise feedback mechanism to UH (notification? UAC chair sends email?) and to Deans/Program Heads—might a semester summary of programs that reported (or not) along with a few comments showing strengths or concerns be helpful?

iv) **TEAM 4 – Co-curricular and Student Affairs Programs (4-5 members)**

(1) Clarify assessment plan and reporting needs for programs and provide messaging to programs about entering assessment plans by ___ and communicate that reporting will resume in ___.

(2) Reset the reporting calendar, divide programs into 4 groups for reporting and review.

(3) Work with Team 3 to devise UAC feedback forms. Do we want to construct short narratives documenting a few things done well and a few things that could be improved upon? Do we want check boxes, if so for what categories? The reports will be more narrative in nature as we move forward, with fewer proscribed text boxes. How can we best provide meaningful feedback?

(4) Work with Team 3 to devise feedback mechanism to UH (notification? UAC chair sends email?) and to Deans/Program Heads—might a semester summary of programs that reported (or not) along with a few comments showing strengths or concerns be helpful?

v) **Team 5 – Bylaws (3-4 members)**

(1) continue with bylaws revisions, what recommendations do we have to UAS about changes to our scope of work, membership needs, requests to UAS about committee structure.

(2) Are there changes to the committee structure that would help us complete our work—do we have appropriate representation from Service/Co-Curricular programs, Externally Accredited

programs, and Non-Externally Accredited programs so that the work for committee members is reasonable.

- Background: Hasenbank, who was UAC chair at the time, approached UAS in 2017 to increase number of committee members in order to reflect greater number of programs being assessed.
- Question now is whether, with the changes UAC has made to the process, we still need as many members on the committee and whether the composition of the committee needs to change.

(3) https://docs.google.com/document/d/1H8KSbshnobQO4RpaWj13bE82s_D9-JGz0I-G1oM9OC4/edit

c) Discussion of policy regarding reporting for externally accredited programs (attachment). Current policy is at odds with our revised process.

i) Henderleiter: we need to look at the policy and decide whether to repeal it wholesale or make adjustments to it. What do we keep, what do we get rid of? What do we change? If we simply repeal it, UAC says nothing. Beachnau asserts that committee should have something to say on the issue.

ii) Henderleiter: committee needs to take action on this policy by the end of the semester. Committee can spend some meeting time discussing it as a whole group or designate a couple of members to work together to draft a policy document.

iii) Henderleiter asked for comments and/or questions. Schymik: new/revised policy should not change much in spirit. We still want externally accredited programs to do what the policy, in essence, asks them to do: Do you have a plan? Are you executing the plan? What is the evidence? What have you learned and what do you need to change?

iv) Besel suggests Team 2 might take the lead on new policy document.

5) Schymik asks Henderleiter about actions. Henderleiter will pull all information she can for each of the teams and send it to them so that they can get up to speed. Henderleiter asks committee members, when they have time, to look at policy for externally accredited programs to prepare for future discussion. Henderleiter asks committee members to send links from Google Docs from last year's work if they can find them.

6) Adjourned: Higbea moved; Schymik seconded. 4:39 p.m.

Fall Meeting Schedule-Full Committee Meetings
~~September 11~~
September 25
October 9
October 30
November 13
November 27
December 4 (tentative)

Team Assignments

Team 1-Online	Team 2-Ext. Accred.	Team 3-Academic	Team 4-Co Curr.	Team 5-Bylaws
Hasenbank	Higbea	Besel	Messner	Bailey
Vo	Bossick	Smith	Beachnau	Palmer
Higbea	MacQuillan	Schymik	Gu	Ham
	Adrian	Wilson	Wilson	
	Little			
	Mupepi			
	Lancaster			