

Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Minutes
May 1, 2024
2:00–4:00 p.m.
LIB-201

Please notify the Co-Chairs if you are unable to attend.
(Erlyana.Erlyana@csulb.edu and Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu)

- **Call to Order: 2:04pm**
- **Attendance:** Erlyana Erlyana (Co-Chair), Adam Kahn (Co-Chair), Sharlene Sayegh, Heather Barker, Alexandria Cordon, Michael Fender, Bruno Pernet, Sonia Wilmarth, David Sheridan, Colleen Dunagan, Nana Suzumura-Smith, Jody Cormack, Karin Griffin, Emily Schrger, Kimberly Walters, Hossein Sayadi
- **Not attended:** Alysa Turkowitz, Suh Ga Young, Juan Apitz, Houg-Wei Tsai, Jun Yan, Yu Ding, Nielan Barnes
- **Approval of Agenda:** Motion to approve agenda by Bruno second by Sharlene agenda approved.
- **Approval of the March 20 and April 17 Minutes:** Motion to approve minutes from March 20th and April 17th by Sharlene second by Michael minutes approved.

- **Council Announcements**
 - Have a great Summer!!!

- **New Council Business**
 - Organizational meeting for 2024-2025
 - Sharlene was asked to moderate and take nominations for the IPAC 2024 - 2025 steering committee positions of Co-Chairs, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
 - Nominations for Co-Chair: Erlyana nominated Adam for co-chair. Adam Nominated Erlyana for co-chair.
 - Nominations for Vice Chair: Adam nominated Heather for vice-chair.
 - Nominations for Secretary: Erlyana nominated Alexandria Cordon for secretary.
 - Jody motioned to approve committee positions as a slate. Motion seconded by Bruno. IPAC steering committee positions were approved as a slate.
 - Fall 2024 – Spring 2025 IPAC positions.
 - Co-Chairs: Erlyana Erlyana & Adam Kahn
 - Vice-Chair: Heather Barker
 - Secretary: Alexandria Cordon
 - Subcommittee assignment discussion
 - Adam explained that some people will be moved from PASC to IASC due to change of council. This assignment will be made closer to the fall. New members will be contacted to ask of their assessment experience and then could be placed on IASC.
 - Subcommittee placement and moving from previous assignments will be a choice to all members for this upcoming year only. The reason that next

(2025- 2026) year reassignment within subcommittee will occur is because next year will be a larger rotation of new members. And IASC will always need to have members on it that have assessment experience and/or complete OPIE learning experience.

- **Council Adjournment: 2:11pm**
- **Sub-Committee Meetings**
 - *Program Assessment Subcommittee*
 - Wrap up and next steps.
 - Reviewed the works accomplished in AY 23/24
 - Discussed PASC membership in AY 24/25
 - Will consult with the steering committee
 - Plan the works need to be done in AY 24/25
 - Reach out to the remaining colleges: COB, COE, CNSM, and CED
 - Continue works on Canvas – Outcomes module
 - Train on Nuventive
 - Provide overview and welcome to the new IPAC members from CLA
 - *Institutional Assessment Subcommittee*
 - Discussion of Oral Communication report/findings
 - Sharlene review report from communications rubric of speech competition
 - She explained here method of collecting, analyzing, and reviewing the data.
 - She discussed the unproportional ratio of graduate vs. ungraduated students in research speech competition.
 - The graduate data was a subsidy of data because this Oral communications rubric this is more focused on undergraduates at the time if graduation.
 - She recommended that the committee establish benchmarks to go along with the rubrics such as success rate 70% or higher.
 - Heather asked if there are any ither institutional benchmarks to align with to these core competencies.
 - Sharlene answered that it would be best to look for complementary benchmarks like licensure exam, or certification. It will not be a 1;1 correlation at the campus level for benchmarks on these core competency areas.
 - Sharlene added into the report from Heather’s suggestion about the findings that this report comes from a group of self-selected students participating in the speech competition .
 - She highlighted graduate student have an outlier in this rubric as not doing well overall. The one skill graduate student exceled in was listening and transitional responses that connect the conversation.

- Sharlene mentioned providing a recommendation to graduate resource center of helping students with skill building in oral communication skills and connecting work in their graduate student research to the larger body of research in their field which was missing in most graduate student speeches at the competition.
- Karin validated that this was her experience also that this happened in Q&A of here room and in her experience in working with graduate students as a librarian also.
- Michael interjected with maybe they are more used to presenting within their field which would already have the understanding of overall research.
- Karin added though that on a larger level it is important to be able to speak to larger big picture and connecting the dot into the broad field of study.
- It is customary in masters work to connect research into larger field of the study.
- Jody added that the scoring rubrics as to do with the prompt. The students may have been focusing their presentation to the prompt and rubric that they would have been judged on.
- This point may be important to considered toward norming rubric in the future .
- Sharlene reviewed conclusions and recommendations for next cycle. She highlighted a low benchmark rating. Michael asked did we assess to harshly.
- Adam Asked how do we close the loop on oral communications on the graduate level. The recommendations could be for graduate resources center giving more workshops on oral communication skills and presentation.
- Another topic discussed was how do we engage in outreach at department level for assessing learning outcomes and annual assessment reports?
 - During annual reports in departments 2 learning outcomes could be chosen a year one would be core competencies.
- Adam suggested to ask them to reflect on how they are doing in this core competency, Sharlene suggested that it is better to give them more direction.
- Heather asked at what point does institutional assessment reach for data where is this coming from. Sharlene said about OPIE being a role in this. OPIE can support in look info at what departments worked on these core competencies and juxtapose it. show results in annual assessment.
- Next steps in this discussion are
 - This committee will focus on capstone in next oral communication assessment.
 - Determine benchmarks.
 - Engage in more norming sessions

- Recommend workshops for grad studies to build skills.
 - Schedule next assessment for 2029 5 years from now before accreditation.
- Discussion of Written Communication rubric (Sharlene)
 - Sharlene started by stating that we must use general education outcomes in the rubric.
 - Sharlene asked duplicates in criteria were combined.
 - A& G
 - E& F
 - For human diversity Adam asked how we would use the rubric and artifacts from outside of classroom like form reports.
 - Sharlene clarified that the rubrics used in classroom.
 - The written communication rubric will be tabled to IASC fall sessions along with human diversity rubric.
 - Jody mentioned the dean's meetings about annual report and seeing information in core competencies and reporting on data in these areas.
 - Heather asked about will reporting data closely related to Beach 2030 strategies.
 - Beach 2030 doing more reporting not assessment. Jody and Sharlene is encouraging zones to do some assessment.
 - Sharlene will be providing a template to beach 2030 to give to these areas. She added this template can go to the deans to draw out data from strategic plan reporting.
 - Another initiative is through Nuventive asking for report to have some longitudinal data so in 2027 for reporting. IPAC be able to pull this info that are overlapping and showing assessment aligning it with strategic planning and accreditation.
 - Jody added and we're going to be looking at diversity next year so not only will we create the rubric for diversity that we will look at and put out a call and say does your program have diversity goals. Additionally cataloging courses that has a diversity outcome.
 - This activity will be connecting catalogue with Institutional outcomes also.
 - The other thing we will be doing is to ask departments what in your department marketed or changed to respond to diversity and inclusion. For example, did you make changes are students signing up for class, if faculty changed were they retained, is satisfaction going up. We won't know what to ask unless progress is made and changes are sited. We would be doing this over time also to see those changes.
 - Adam asked about how WASC accreditation committee is selected? Sharlene answered with there are senate requirements for WASC committee representatives and that they can come from IASC. Additionally, during the accreditation process the team will always send items out for response and feedback. structure of

committee is from the senate. Senate would approve the committee members we are the body that puts forward who the slate would be.

- Jody highlighted in this discussion that we (IPAC) are the group changing assessment culture. Our campus is looking at institutional assessment and forward thinking of getting end of year reports keeping in mind these are critical pieces for assessment.
- Further in the discussion it was pointed the WASC recommendation for CSULB were on program review, unconscious bias and practice, data collection.
- Discussion centered around institutional should be intentional and we are focus and gather data that shows growth and assessment toward ILOs.
- Long Beach is leading in the model of institutional assessment and alignment
- PLO to SLO linkage to ILO is the hardest part. Pulling in artifacts to speak to the ILO and meeting the outcomes is key to make the link on the institutional level. Institutional assessment also considers that every office effect student experience including
- Karin highlighted the importance of the post-graduation by posing the question. what is it like one year out after graduation? She asked Jody and Sharlene would you report on that? Karin survey alumni that were transfer students. while she worked with Andrea Taylor.
- Alumni Survey that could be potentially used also are- HERA survey 1 yr. out 5 years out 10 years out.
- Jody also mentioned reviewing gainful employment data after graduation.
- Post graduate data could be important as part of WASC accreditation.
- Heather said how do we present quantitative and qualitative data that shows value as an institution. For example, being number 1 in social mobility and the economic impact report is capturing how the university is creating value.
- Sharlene pointed out the success statement in WASC accreditation work. It cites moving beyond being a success if students graduate? Student success has qualitative evidence also.
- Further discussion centered around being careful in not trying to rush student to the degree also and allowing them to have the time needed to learn and discover their major and working toward what they want to do after the degree.
- Sharlene ended the meeting by telling the group she really appreciated the diligence and commitment to improvement in this committee and on this campus.
- Adjourn 3:30pm