Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Minutes
Fall 2026

4 November, 2026
2:00–4:00 p.m.
LIB-201
Co-Chairs
(Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu) & (David.Sheridan@csulb.edu)

Today's meeting convened by Adam Kahn

- **Call to Order: 2:00pm**

- **Attendance:** Kevin Avila, Erin Biolchino, Alexandria Cordon, Jody Cormack, , Michael Fender, Tiffanie Graves, Karin Griffin, Pei-Fang Hung, Adam Kahn, Jessica McBride, Mia McNutt, Vas Narayanswami, Jonathan Phan, Sharlene Sayegh, Lei Sun, Sarah Taylor, Kimberly Walters, Victor Wang, Sonia Wilmarth.

- **Absent:** Colleen Dunagan, Neda Karami, Jennifer Nolasco, Xin Qin, Hong -Wei Tsai, Laura Vlad

- **Approval of Agenda:** Motion to approve agenda by Kim, second by Michael . Agenda approved.

- **Council Announcements**
  Fall IPAC Meetings: (*3 meetings left, including today*);
  November 4th and 18th; December 2nd
  - Adam noted that the first IPAC meeting in Spring 2027 will be in February

- **Survey Results, Department Responses (**Sharlene Sayegh)
  - Sharlene shared departmental responses for providing supporting artifacts for the review of Institutional Assessment and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
  - Departmental participation and response rates increased compared to previous assessment cycles.
  - This framework helps departments identify and demonstrate how their work aligns with the institution's learning outcomes.

- **Survey Results, QR reasoning** (Sharlene Sayegh)
  - Sharlene presented the Qualtrics survey results related to councils capacity for assessment that will be completed this year.
  - The quantitative rubric may remain largely unchanged, with rubric components selected based on the types of artifacts being evaluated. The council will

determine which rubric criteria are applicable after reviewing the artifacts submitted.
    - Assessments will be conducted collectively by the council this year, with members working together to refine both rubric and complete the assessment process. assessment work will be assigned based assessment strengths and disciplinary knowledge.

- **Rubric Discussion and Sub-Committee Breakouts** (Adam Kahn & Sharlene Sayegh) Council did not break into subcommittee groups this discussion occurred as a whole council.

Global Learning Rubric Discussion

- The council discussed the use of the AAC&U Global Learning VALUE Rubric as the foundation for this year's assessment rubric.
- Members emphasized the importance of assessing global citizenship, global awareness, and perspective-taking as central components of the Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO).
- Discussion focused on how the current year's ILO aligns with last year's rubric and whether elements from the previous assessment could be incorporated into the revised rubric.
- Members noted that the final criteria of the AAC&U rubric appeared most closely aligned with the current ILO and may serve as the primary focus areas for assessment.
- The council considered combining some rubric categories, particularly the first two or three criteria, while maintaining distinct criteria for areas most relevant to this year's assessment goals.
- It was noted that the AAC&U rubric is intended to be adapted to fit institutional needs and that rubric language can be revised to better reflect campus priorities.
- Discussion included how Bloom's Taxonomy is reflected in the rubric, with higher performance levels representing increasingly sophisticated demonstrations of learning.
- Concerns were raised regarding the highest-level criterion related to taking action, as opportunities to demonstrate this skill may be limited primarily to capstone or applied learning experiences.
- Members agreed that language refinements should occur after determining which rubric criteria will be retained for assessment.
- Perspective-taking was identified as an important criterion and one that connected strongly to previous assessment work.
- The council discussed maintaining consistency and parallel structure across rubric categories and performance levels.
- Members reviewed lessons learned from last year's rubric implementation and emphasized balancing clarity with the complexity of assessing global learning.
- Jody suggested sharing draft rubrics with faculty to gather feedback regarding expected levels of student performance and skill development.

- The council agreed to continue refining the rubric by first determining the most relevant criteria and then revising language as needed.

Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Discussion

- Sharlene presented an overview of courses identified across multiple colleges that incorporate quantitative reasoning and discussed the wide range of artifacts that may be submitted for assessment.
- Members noted that quantitative reasoning is demonstrated differently across disciplines, including mathematics, engineering, business, social sciences, education, communication studies, and the arts.
- Discussion focused on whether quantitative reasoning should emphasize calculation, interpretation, application, analysis, communication, or a combination of these skills.
- Several members noted that calculations are often completed through software programs rather than by hand, making interpretation and application of results equally important components of quantitative reasoning.
- The council explored the possibility of consolidating rubric categories into broader areas such as:
    - Interpretation, application, and analysis
    - Communication and representation
    - Assumptions and limitations
- Members discussed the distinction between performing calculations and interpreting data, recognizing that artifacts from some disciplines may require one skill more than the other.
- Concerns were raised regarding the ability to verify calculations when underlying datasets or answer keys are unavailable.
- The group emphasized that quantitative reasoning extends beyond mathematical calculations and includes critical evaluation of data, charts, graphs, and statistical information encountered in academic and public contexts.
- Sharlene highlighted that the diversity of submitted artifacts will likely influence how the rubric is ultimately structured and applied.
- members supported a "wait-and-see" approach, recommending that rubric revisions occur after reviewing actual artifacts from departments.
- The council discussed seeking feedback from faculty with expertise in mathematics and quantitative literacy, including individuals in mathematics education, to help refine the rubric.
- Members agreed that reviewing sample artifacts before making substantial rubric revisions would help ensure that assessment criteria are applicable across disciplines.

- **Council Adjournment: 3:30pm**

Next council meeting: (Wednesday, 18 November)