

Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Minutes

Mar 5, 2025

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)

- **Members in Attendance:** add from sign-in sheet
- **Call to Order @ 2:01pm**
- **Attendance:** Pei-Fang Hung, Heather Barker, Sharlene Sayegh, Nana Suzumura-Smith, Victor Wang, Houn-Wei Tsai, Sonia Wilmarth, David Sheridan, Vas Narayanswami, Jun Yan, Emily Schryer, Daisy Alfaro, Tiffanie Graves, Jennifer Nolasco, Ga-Young Suh (Kelly), Andrew Paredes, Colleen Dunagan, Laura Vlad.
- **Not attended:** Alexandria Cordon, Karin Griffin, Kimberly Walters, Jody Cormack, Janaki Santhiveeran, Alejandra Priede, Hossein Sayadi,
- **Guest:** Dr. Anna Ortiz, Estella Chizhik
- **Approval of Agenda**
 - Motion to approve agenda second by committee and passed
- **Approval of the Minutes from February 19**
 - Correct typo in Pei-Fang's name.
 - Motion to approve agenda second by committee and passed
- **Council Announcements**
 - Spring 2025 IPAC Meeting Dates: 3/19, 4/16, 4/30 (Zoom), 5/7
- **New Council Business**
 - Teacher Education MOU presentation (2:05 time certain)
 - Introductions of Committee members and representatives from College of Education
 - **Presentation:** Review of the Program Review Report and MOU for Department of Teacher Education Summary led by Interim Vice Provost of Academic Programs Dr. Pei-Fang Hung.
 - Listing of degrees (credential programs not under review)
 - Commendations: student enrollment is strong overall, DEI initiatives ensure equitable and inclusive enrollments while also incorporating culturally-inclusive pedagogies, high-impact practices are incorporated across degrees and are embedded via PLOs, diverse instructional modalities are used to engage adult learners by allowing for work-life balance, Time to Degree is impressive with 80% graduating in two years, Teacher education department has no significant DFW rates, Assessment process addresses at least 1 PLO in each program during period of review and programs are regularly assessed indirectly, Student engagement is strong with benchmark surveys showing high satisfaction and appreciation of the cohort model.
 - **No concerns in this review**
 - **Opportunities:** Faculty numbers show decline in Tenure /Tenure track faculty since last review with particular concern in Curriculum and

Instruction and Early Childhood Education because only two Tenure track faculty members teach in the programs while Dual language Development has only one, Student enrollment and retention shows a decline in enrollment largely due to suspension of admissions which then reopened in 2025 and have determined that curriculum updates and strategic recruitment initiatives are needed, Transition to stand-alone degree programs is recommended, Student Success is exception with 100% graduation rate, but there is room for improvement in the rate in Early Childhood Education which dropped to under 70% for 3 of 5 years of review period with some issues in persistence due to dropping out due to financial challenges, health, and person difficulties so suggesting is to provide resources, Comprehensive exam is taking some students longer to pass.

- **Recommendations:** Continue the comprehensive assessment plan, develop a faculty hiring plan, develop and implement a strategy to strengthen persistence in graduate degree programs, continue to support under represented student groups and 1st Gen students through targeted resources, create collaborative opportunities for faculty between programs, continue to monitor if recent changes in instructional modalities have positive and/or negative impacts on student success (especially for minoritized groups).

▪ **Comments from College of Education Representatives:**

- Assessment process was beneficial to new Chair Estella Chizhik offering thanks to external reviewer and commending faculty for the work that they do. Commendations and recommendations make sense for the college.
- Dean Ortiz – since 2008 the college has gone through challenges due to the retirement of tenured faculty, which cannot be replaced quickly. Commendation to faculty who have continued to move the program forward. Recognition of the online format's viability for working adults. Recognizes the importance hiring additional faculty for the dual Language development program, which is a critical program. Appreciates the recognition of the need for tenure track faculty in that area as the program supports K-12 dual-language teacher needs.

▪ **Comments from Council Members COED representatives:**

- Question about why students need to take more units than required by the program in order to graduate.
 - Dean Ortiz – thinks what is happening in early childhood education is that students enter with a lot of units already and that adds to total units completed here.
 - Dr. Hung – some students join program with a post-bacc certificate. Additionally, many school districts set unit criteria/thresholds for movement to next salary level.
- What kinds of courses do they take when taking additional units here? Related to the program they need?

- Dean Ortiz – they can apply 12 units from teaching credential program to MA programs. Definitely aligned with their program
 - Chair Estella Chizhik – can enter with other certificate/authorization programs and/or add those to their degree as completing MA.
- **Committee discussion of comments on MOU:**
 - Short discussion about when need for additional tenure track should fall under Concerns vs. Opportunities – determination made based on how the program is running.
 - Did not review each comment.
- Debrief on IPAC charges
 - Reorientation of committee and review of what committee has accomplished thus far, led by Dr. Hung and Director Sayegh.
 - Powerpoint presentation of charge of committee and the review process.
 - PS 22-19 Policy on Institutional Assessment and Program Review adopted October 3, 2022. The most recent policy that reflects revisions leading to structure of IPAC.
 - Used to have two separate policies: one on assessment and one on program review, and these were combined in the vision.
 - IPAC meeting logistics: 1st and 3rd Wednesday of each month from 2-4pm. 1st part is for whole council business, announcements, and approval of MOU/Program Reviews. 2nd part is subcommittee meetings.
 - Responsibility of co-chairs IPAC to write year end report.
 - Representatives: all colleges have two except for CLA which has four and have representation from other constituencies on campus such as the library and CPACE.
 - Half of each college assigned to IASC (Institutional assessment) and half to PASC (Annual program assessment).
 - Program Review Policy
 - Program review systematic, ongoing, self-reflective assessment of alignment with institutional strategic plan and is conducted by academic programs for their improvement. Includes summary and evaluation of equity-minded and inclusive practice enabled and advanced by the unit. Includes
 - Happens every 7 years unless it is a new program or if it is an established accredited program but the cycle may not exceed 10 years. When warranted the review cycle maybe extended or reduced via conversation with Academic Affairs. An MOU is draft by the Provost and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Coordinator of Program Review.
 - Self study – External review – MOU – IPAC review
 - University Program Review Committee
 - Team that participates as fly on the wall during the review process and would have access to all materials

- In old process this team would draft the self study report and present to PARC for review/approval, and once approved the MOU would be drafted. This process has been modified in the new policy that is currently under operation.
- IPAC's role in Program Review
 - Whole IPAC participates in program review of degree programs, academic support units, and non-degree academic programs
 - No more UPRC
 - Program review report drafted by Vice Provost academic programs and coordinator for program review and assessment
 - IPAC members vote on final combined report/MOU.
- Annual Assessment
 - Assessment is process by which programs and institutions articulate what students should learn and analyze the extent and equity of learning.
 - Assessment activities should meet professional recognized standards of best practice, including direct and indirect assessment of student learning, critical reflection of results, and implementation of relevant changes to close loops and improve student learning
 - Direct – artifacts produced by students to assess learning
 - Indirect – student experience via surveys and focus groups
 - Results of assessment activities
 - Say what you will assess, assess it, and then analyze what findings mean and how will address opportunities for improvement in student learning.
 - No relationship to personnel actions.
 - Annual assessment report
 - Annual report submitted to Division of Academic Affairs and College Dean or designee.
 - Annual report includes assessment of program learning outcomes for degree programs and academic support units, as directly the program's assessment plan.
- Program Assessment Subcommittee (PASC)
 - Primary responsibility: faculty college liaisons for assessment
 - Member are resources for faculty in completing and analyzing program-level annual assessment.
 - Members provide assessment support to their colleges.
 - Work with college assessment coordinators or associate dean
 - Engage in outreach to department chairs and assessment committees in college to provide support
 - Provide contextual information from colleges to IPAC about state of assessment and other college issues.
 - Facilitate implementation of Nuventive – the Assessment Management System - if not trained yet, can refer to OPIE
 - Members are NOT responsible for assessment in departments.

- There is a learning community PASC members can join to learn about how to be member at IASC.
 - Subcommittee has been meeting with colleges and departments to provide guidance and support on assessment.
- PASC is about dialogue between people in subcommittee and those in the colleges/departments who are working on assessment. Goal is to reduce fear and anxiety around the requirement of annual assessment and self-studies, so that Chair or Assessment coordinators in departments are not left doing it alone and thus create a healthier assessment culture.
 - Idea that there needs to be some clear organization at the level of college office to coordinate with PASC members.
- Institutional Assessment
 - Conducted by members of institutional assessment subcommittee (IASC) of the IPAC.
 - Institutional assessment focuses on university strategic plan, campus defined graduation requirements, and assessment for institutional accreditation including WSCUS core competencies
 - Five WSCUS core competencies: written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information literacy
 - Primary responsibility of IASC is university institutional assessment
 - Conduct assessment for the institutional outcomes and to do that they build rubrics
 - CSULB IOs include
 - Foundation knowledge
 - Disciplinary knowledge
 - Human diversity
 - Global diversity
 - Critical thinking and life-long learning
 - Well-being and sustainability
 - Use rubrics to score artifacts from at least 5% of students in courses with PLOs and assignments related to at least 2 institutional outcomes per year. Construct and norm rubrics for IOs. Identify senior-level courses in the majors that address IOs and core competencies and develop an assessment plan for these courses.
 - IASC works with Director Institutional Assessment to engage in assessment of Divisional contributions to institutional outcomes, strategic plan/Beach 2030, campus specific graduation requirements, other aspects of institutional culture as defined by USCUC accreditation requirements.
 - Comments from subcommittee
 - We don't have models for how to conduct a committee of this nature from institutions of our size and scope.

- Key is our we being self-reflective – that is what WSCUC is focused on, which is reflected in their standards on institutional effectiveness.
 - They asked us to have more regular institutional assessment.
 - Noted concern about assessing institutional bias and equity.
- IASC has some clear touch points that can use to form a structure that will make it possible for it to continue to go forward even if new asks come along.
- We did receive a 10-year renewal of accreditation without a check-in requirement, which is impressive. Important to acknowledge this success.
- We are at midpoint of our WSCUC accreditation.
- Expression of appreciation for being part of the council because CPACE sometimes feel very separate from rest of university, so being included is valued and supports understanding of structures and processes between CPACE and rest of university. Importance of knowing what students need to know in order to enter university courses—value of working on IASC and being in collaboration with colleagues around rubric construction.
- Office of Program & Institutional Effectiveness (OPIE)
 - In Academic Affairs and promotes education effectiveness through Annual institutional assessment (of ILO and GELO), periodic program review, annual assessment
 - OPIE Team: five members
 - Vice provost academic programs
 - Director of institutional assessment & ALO
 - Coordinator of program review
 - Coordinator of assessment
 - Data and program analyst
- Question from Committee
 - Who is responsible to maintaining a culture of assessment continuously so that it is not something that gets taken up only when assessment is due?
 - Ultimately, a culture of assessment needs to be maintained at the department level.
 - Goal is for PASC to develop an infrastructure to support the ongoing nature of assessment culture.
 - Suggestion is to embed assessment into strategic planning and to assess at least two PLOs each year.
 - Integrate into department retreat.

- Needs to incorporate all faculty within the department as a culture even when you have a committee or coordinator leading effort.
 - Need to have flexibility in structure at department level.
 - Importance to make case for why it is in their best interests, point out how they can use assessment to show how SPOT evals are not the only way to show the success of their teaching and evidence of learning outcomes.
 - Design graduate program supports this culture by providing rubric for them to fill out and coaching them on how they can use assessment to support them when being evaluated.
- While assessment culture is the goal, assessment is still part of compliance.
- **Council Adjournment @ 3:52pm**
- **Sub-Committee Meetings – postponed due to lack of time**
 - *Program Assessment Subcommittee* (Co-Chair: Erlyana Erlyana)
 - Discuss PASC members' meeting with Department Chair
 - Nuventive reviews
 - *Institutional Assessment Subcommittee* (Co-Chair: Adam Kahn)
 - Written communication rubric discussion
 - Subcommittee adjournmen