

Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2024
2:00–4:00 p.m.
LIB-201
Co-Chairs
(Erlyana.Erlyana@csulb.edu and Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu)

- **Call to Order:2pm**
- **Attendance:** Adam Kahn (Co-Chair), Erlyana Erlyana (co-Chair), Pei-Fang Hung, Heather Barker, Alexandria Cordon, David Sheridan, Colleen Dunagan, Emily Schryer, Kimberly Walters, Nana Suzumura-Smith, , Laura Vlad, Victor Wang, HOUNG-WEI Tsai, Jun Yan, Karin Griffin, Jennifer Nalasco, Janaki Santhiveeran, Vas Narayanswami, Sonia Wilmarth, Hossein Sayadi, Jodi Cormack
- **Not attended:** Tiffanie Graves, Sharlene Sayegh, Ga Young Suh
- **Approval of Agenda:** Motion to approve agenda Kim second by David- Agenda approved.
- **Approval of the Minutes from Sep 4:** Motion to approve minutes from September 4 by Jun Yan second by David minutes from September 4th approved.
- **Program Review (Time Certain)**
 - **History (2 PM) Jodie provided presentation on History MOU**
 - Self-study was done last year at the end of the year.
 - Just BA and MA will be reviewed. Jewish studies and single subject credential are not in this review.
 - The self-study was done in August 2023 and MOU created in September 2023
 - Department mentions how the retention data from college and IR data are not the same.
 - The history representative commented on the number of students admitted to MA program. 1st year retention rates 77 % are the lowest retention persistence rate for the master's degree. He mentioned that Eileen works with students to transition to graduate school, but students still leave the program.
 - History accepts ½ of graduate applications. History graduate program goal is to have 15 new students each year. Jodie will rereview the persistence and retention data and revise MOU. Jody says that she will also write into the MOU program addressing the issue so now on the record and filed with this Program review.
 - Discussion moved to faculty service requirements there is a lot of scholarly writing for history. Chair highlights the faculty service item in the program review it is important to see that it has been added to the report, because faculty give a lot of time to work.
 - The council discussed modifying the language in item 5 under opportunities to clarify this recommendation more.
 - Adam asked about history 301 class what the barrier was. The course was history class known to be very hard and challenging.
 - Move to approve MOU with discussed changes – Motion to approve MOU with changes David second Kim – motion approved
 - **ATLAS: Jodie provided presentation with report**
 - Focus on undergraduate advising in report 1st MOU in ATLAS.

- This program reviewer had a good and engaged external reviewer
- Overall, the health of ATLAS is doing well.
- The college has a lot of majors seeking, so ATLAS has a lot of roadmaps. This helps those students.
- ATLAS makes a large contribution to SOAR each year.
- Advisors practice a commitment to empathy and care intersectional identities thought about and diversity is made a priority.
- ATLAS uses of EAB for student success campaigns
- Concerns
- The report cited the split advising model with the colleges taking over advising at upper division level could improve. The issue is students are not leaving ATLAS for advising into their departments when they become upper division students
- Atlas is always impacted by entering student growth because ATLAS is a very large advising center.
- Assessment is needed in growth and specific data in assessment.
- Departments Comments and Discussion: Seiji, Tanisha, Braun
- The department began by noting the areas in recommendations where they have completed the recommendations. Jody said to note with her where you have made those changes and provide them in the annual report so we can mark it as done.
- The department has focused on assessment recommendations and to rereview the recommendations.
- Jodi says that she will change the assessment language
- For 11 departments ATLAS sees the entire student population from entry to graduation.. There are 27 majors ATLAS. They noted Psychology being a large college that ATLAS sees all students in.
- ATLAS representatives said students are contacted via advising campaigns due to the volume of students in ATLAS and the campaigns are focused on different types of student groups that need to be seen.
- The department addressed the number of students that make appointments each week, 400, just last week. However, students also cancel appointments on the day of the appointment or do not show up. Those appointment times can't be filled in after cancelation.
- Council asked about split advising model to cluster advising? Tanisha explained the nuisance of advising in CLA with a variety of options in majors' selection and a variety of options in class selections within each major.
- Therefore, all advisors in ATLAS must know advising information in specific majors for example, all advisors must know Psychology because it is a popular and large major.
- This may be why the cluster model has not worked, there is a high turnover of staff going to Community college after 2- 3 years. The cluster model can't be effective when there is a consistent new advising staff being trained and on boarded at ATLAS.
- Council asked if communication is consistent between ATLAS advisor to faculty advisor? Department said yes, Braun works closely with faculty to communicate and keep advising consistent along with road maps and communication with faculty advisor.

- Item 4 under recommendation was address in that changing to an advising leadership model where lead advisor is MPP level which then provides more growth within advising staff to keep moving up in Atlas instead of leaving the college. This would help in retention of staff.
- Daivid pointed out counseling ratio is very high Tanaisha point out that advising does need to grow and it is important to note that. Advising MPP leadership structure could help with that.
- Braun cites, it is an institutional dilemma as well as the department dilemma
- Adam asked Jody if MOU could be changed to explore MPP model.
- Seiji asked to modify item 4 with flexible and detailed language for advisor retention
- A suggestion was made to wait to vote to on mou after these revisions were made.
- It was suggested to continue to schedule more time for discussion MOUs.
- **Council Announcements**
 - Remaining Fall 2024 IPAC Meeting Dates: 10/2, 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
- **Council Adjournment: 3:39pm**