

Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC) Meeting Agenda

November 6, 2024

2:00–4:00 p.m. LIB-201

Co-Chairs

(Erlyana.Erlyana@csulb.edu and Adam.Kahn@csulb.edu)

- **Call to Order: 2:00pm**
- **Attendance:** Adam Kahn (Co-Chair), Erlyana Erlyana (co-Chair), Pei-Fang Hung, Heather Barker, Alexandria Cordon, Sharlene Sayegh, Ga Young Suh, Colleen Dunagan, Nana Suzumura-Smith, Victor Wang, Houng-Wei Tsai, Jennifer Nalasco, Janaki Santhiveeran, Sonia Wilmarth, Jodi Cormack, Hossein Sayadi, David Sheridan, Vas Narayanswami, Emily Schryer
- **Not attended:** Jun Yan, Kimberly Walters, Karin Griffin, Tiffanie Graves, Andrew Paredes, Laura Vlad
- **Approval of Agenda:** Motion to approve agenda Sharlene second Heather. Agenda approved
- **Approval of the Minutes from October 16** Motion to approve minutes Erlyana second by David. Minutes approved.

- **Council Announcements**
 - Fall 2024 IPAC Meeting Dates: 11/20, 12/4
 - Spring 2025 IPAC Meeting Dates: 2/5, 2/19, 3/5, 3/19, 4/16, 5/7

- **New Council Business**
 - HXDI MOU presentation (2:05 time certain)
 - college representatives did not attend the meeting. Motion to postpone HXDI MOU to next meeting by Sharlene. Second by Janaki Motion passes.
 - OPIE/IPAC Website Updates:
 - Pei-Fang presented on making updates to both websites she reviewed her plans with how website will be updated.
 - The objective of updating both websites are for
 - Easy access to the information at each website.
 - Ensure information is up to date and avoid duplication.
 - Minutes agenda reports and policy statement can become more organized.
 - MOU location in OPIE websites
 - As changes are made, approval will be sought through the academic senate and IPAC committee.
 - Pei-Fang answers. That this can align with other academic senate webpages and department webpages. As an example, the curriculum Educational Policy Council houses documents like policy statements, agenda, minutes, reports, etc. They're all organized related in terms of process and procedure, but the information like the curriculum handbook and is held in our curriculum office website.
 - Sharlene added that a lot of this is I started with the information we had originally when I came in the Senate site, that was the only site. And then

overtime I started to build a complementary site leading to what I wanted to be an assessment hub. A

- Sharlene noted for example MOU probably belongs in OPIE's website, not IPAC because while IPAC approves them, those are technically academic affairs documents.
- Jody said while working with others it will be good to find the resources that are a good tool to link to an email message to assist departments.
- Discussion transition to Nuventive role in resources however Nuventive is a repository for assessment reports. The only resource we have in Nuventive for assessment health is an assessment glossary that is also on our website.
- Emily asked who are the primary users of webpages? Pei-Fang answered that they are being underutilized at this time.
- Committee commented that anything that is a senate group and council we need to be as transparent as possible. So internal and external documents are very important in their use.
- Sharlene mentioned for the OPIE website resources for assessment are not just for chairs. Everyone engages in assessment on some level. OPIE is about institutional effectiveness, also asking all departments to do assessment and have resources available for that task.

- **Sub-Committee Meetings**

- *Program Assessment Subcommittee* (Co-Chair: Erlyana Erlyana)

- Annual Assessment Reports and Resources
- College visitation discussion

- *Institutional Assessment Subcommittee* (Co-Chair: Adam Kahn)

- Written communication rubric discussion
- Sharlene provided summary of rubric work up to this meeting
 - Remove C
 - Combine A, E, F
- Committee agreed to delete C.
- Heather asked if we can we title the areas such as. Titles below
 - A= Content development
 - B= Context (considerations of audience purpose and the circumstance)
 - D= control of syntax and mechanics
 - E= Sources ad evidence
 - F= Genera and disciplinary conventions
 - G= Comprehension and synthesis
- B&F go together heather suggest.
- Committee discussion centered on why some faculty might be nervous about the disciplinary issue. For example, within a discipline of study, how do we know if they use disciplinary convention? Evaluator may not know the writings disciplinary conventions.
- Therefore, the committee asked and discussed f rubric needs criteria in looking for in their disciplinary conventions
- Jody's feedback is to keep it as general as possible.

- Discussion began to consider whether to consider incorporating the GE Learning Outcomes
- Jennifer asked what do you hope they will do with the rubric? Is it more useful to review their rubrics for assignments instead?
- Adam suggests we should reverse the steps and gather artifacts first then create the rubric based on what we evaluate in writing.
- Sharlene answered that 5 colleges and 7 faculty are willing to provide assignments from last year to review for creating the rubric.
- Jody says that is norming and we should create rubric then look at those samples.
- Committee agree to add A & G combined.
 - Content development and comprehension and synthesis go together, one happens before the other.
- May combine E & F
- D is its own category
- Committee decided that for next meeting they will decide what the language the 4 is first then work across the rubric.
- Subcommittee adjournment: 3:46pm