

Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Agenda

October 2, 2024

2:00–4:00 p.m.

LIB-201

Co-Chairs

([Erlyana.Erlyana@csulb.edu](mailto:Erlyana.Erlyana@csulb.edu) and [Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu](mailto:Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu))

- **Call to Order: 2:03**
- **Attendance:** Adam Kahn (Co-Chair), Erlyana Erlyana (co-Chair), Pei-Fang Hung, Heather Barker, Alexandria Cordon, David Sheridan, Sharlene Sayegh, Ga Young Suh Colleen Dunagan, Kimberly Walters, Nana Suzumura-Smith, Victor Wang, Houng-Wei Tsai, Jun Yan, Karin Griffin, Jennifer Nalasco, Janaki Santhiveeran, Vas Narayanswami, Sonia Wilmarth, Jodi Cormack
- **Not attended:** Tiffanie Graves, Hossein Sayadi, Emily Schryer, Laura Vlad
- **Approval of Agenda:** motion to approve agenda by David, Second – Janaki. agenda approved
  
- **Council Announcements**
  - Remaining Fall 2024 IPAC Meeting Dates: 10/16, 11/6, 11/20, 12/4
  - Spring 2025 IPAC Meeting Dates: 2/5, 2/19, 3/5, 3/19, 4/16, 5/7
  - Upcoming business
    - CNSM Advising MOU presentation October 16 voting on History MOU
  
- **New Council Business**
  - Summary of feedback on Nuventive workshops (Sharlene and Pei-Fung)
  - Sharlene reviewed the technical aspects of Nuventive . Nuventive facilitates the input and analysis and longitudinal storage of institutional data. She further explains Nuventive will facilitate the storage and easy recollection being able to pull documents or program reviews of studies and Tableau program review data which is integrated into the entire system. It also provides longitudinal storage of the data for institutional assessment specifically regarding strategic planning with our strategic priorities within Beach 2030. Assessment programing in one general location.
  - Sharlene has been hosting Nuventive workshops for department assessment coordinators 2 workshops provided in the spring 4 scheduled in the Fall.
  - for the workshops Over 100 participates over 32 programs across all of our colleges
  - Pei-Fang: shared all programs and departments have easy access to the data of assessment and self-study. Submission of the report is also straight forward.
  - Assessment documents are also saved to be reviewed in perpetuity.
  - Positive feedback for the Nuventive program. There is learning needed to understand the program. Departments are in support of the transition to the program.
  - Annual assessment helps to support the 7-year program review.
  - More workshop will conitue to be offered
  - Sharlene introduced clearing up misconception of Nuventive and what Nuventive can do: It serves as a repository for access to long term data. Data and annual assessment documents can be found quickly when leadership in a department

change by changing access to the Nuventive program for new leadership and staff.

- Nuventive can also facilitate quick assessment with aligning to PLOs, accreditation standards.
- Nuventive also assists with OPIE feedback can be provided quickly to programs and department about assessment.
- Nuventive does not have a rubric or create rubrics.it cannot import student artifacts to store the material to access it later. This would occur by having a canvas page or share points for student artifacts
- Nuventive is not an inputting tool for assessment committees either
- Sharlene then reviewed how we would use it: It is an assessment management tool for OPIE on an administration level and department coordinators see only departments data only.
- Sharlene reviewed the different levels of access to Nuventive.
- Karin asked if there is another product that could do the other things we wish it could do on an IASC committee level. Sharlene answered no and she looked at many others to do those tasks.
- Nuventive is the the most flexible with largest reach.
- Sharlene and Pei-Fang outline what PASC members' role in assessment within your departments and colleges. Pei-Fang said PASC members are there to support your college for doing assessment this doesn't mean that you're being asked to write the reviews for those departments or units and if they have specific technical problems when they utilize tools and you should not be tasked to problem solve
- Next Nuventive workshop is October 21<sup>st</sup> Monday 10am – 11:30am November 19<sup>th</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> floor library.
- Just a little over half of the programs have signed up so far but Sharlene would like to have up to 80% o department participation
- Heather mentioned not all faculty know how important is to insert the learning outcomes. she added since we do have it centralized in curriculum it seems like something that should automatically show up as soon as I have my course scheduled and it's populated in my canvas dashboard. She asked is there mechanism like that in the pipeline?
- Coleen added that some faculty challenge standardized learning outcomes. That they do not exist but they do.
- Sharlene says that the developers of each program would need to communicate with each other to set this up with learning outcomes.
- Coleen explains ATS is entering outcomes manually in Canvas.
- Janaki explained her experience with PLO finding PLO and working with department on this.
- Sharlene points out that we could do a better job automating our current systems. But not everyone even uses Canvas. She points out that there are systemic issues outside of the technology to address around PLO in canvas and syllabus.

- **Council Adjournment: Motion to adjourn large council meeting by Sharlene second Janaki – Motion approved 2:47**
  
- **Sub-Committee Meetings**
  - *Program Assessment Subcommittee*
    - Subcommittee overview and review of goals and work
    - Best practices in working with colleges
    - Examples of annual assessments
    - Subcommittee adjournment
  - *Institutional Assessment Subcommittee*
    - Written communication rubric discussion
    - Our subcommittee's homework is to fill this blank rubric. This is something that we did last year also. It will be an editable document in a shared document also
    - Category D had been written in form AACU Value rubric
    - Sharlene explained how the criteria was created she said- the criteria are our expectations for achievement because written communication is one of the institutional outcomes that is connected to our general education outcomes and particularly our Golden 4. We are using the same outcomes as the general education outcomes.
    - The other rubric the subcommittee will be working on is social justice and equity and so Sharlene explained we can create our own outcomes out of that although we might build from some of the ethnic studies general education outcomes for for some of that but we have more flexibility with outcomes that aren't linked to the social justice and diversity rubric
    - The GE learning outcomes for written communication and so GEEK, which is the General Education Evaluation Committee which reports to IPAC. Geek is evaluating written communication this year as well, but Geek is looking at students in the first year
    - Teh committee began to discuss possible change to the rubric like combining A and G
    - For C employs a writing process that includes invention, drafting and revision. We can't assess that because we're only looking at final submissions. We're not doing scaffold assessment we're doing a final summative assessment not from
    - Below are the comments made about the A & G criteria:
      - A Only about argument the other is interpretation of documents that you are using.
      - Can also add F to A& G or keep sources in a separate criterion completely.
      - Also consider that in your field you are a subject matter expert when we begin evaluating work within these criteria.
      - Kim added reviewing manuscript and make a note of citation, evidence and argument of other people's sources.
    - The subcommittee will talk about the Rubric on November 6<sup>th</sup>

- For Category B Sharlene points out that it's important that our expertise will be important to provide a guidepost for our colleagues.
- Adam asked for discipline specific written communication, are we going to be sure we have an artifact from every college. Sharlene says we will cross that bridge when we get to it. Pei-Fang and Sharlene will be outreaching to the college soon.
- The committee agreed expectations of not using deficit language is a good practice when drafting the rubric.
- The subcommittee will review the rubric again at the council meeting on November 6<sup>th</sup> so provide feedback on the blank rubric on the ShareFile by Tuesday night November 5<sup>th</sup>
- Subcommittee adjournment 3:30pm