

**Mt. San Antonio College**

**Assessment and Matriculation Committee Minutes**

**March 13, 2013 – 2:45–4:00 p.m.**

**Committee Members:**

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evelyn Hill-Enriquez      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Ocampo, Co-Chair    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle Dougherty |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Tsai     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hugh Griffith, Co-Chair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Donna Hutter       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deejay Santiago           | <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Mauch                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle Sampat    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Antoine Thomas |   |  |

Guests: Glenda Bro, Eric Kaljumagi

1. Minutes from the December 12, 2012 meeting were approved with revisions.
2. Spring Meeting Dates: J. Ocampo shared the Spring 2013 Committee meeting dates.
3. Test Approval Status: Full approval was recommended for the AWE, the DRP, and the ESL Computer Adaptive Placement. These tests are locally developed or locally managed. The Chancellor's Office usually accepts the recommendations of the consultants. Mt. SAC does not need to seek approval for the Compass Assessment used for placement into AMLA courses as it is on the state approved assessment list.
4. Assessment Data: J. Ocampo shared assessment data for Math, English, Reading, and AMLA courses. After the implementation of Multiple Measures in conjunction with the AWE, it appears as though the number of students placing into English 1A has increased. 10% of students are being placed into English 1A. Prior to the implementation of Multiple Measures, approximately 2% of students were placing into 1A. G. Bro shared that there was a concerted effort to train AWE Readers to score the tests consistently. Readers were retrained to consider skills required to enter the course rather than exit skills in order to place students more effectively. M. Tsai mentioned that some data has been analyzed in regards to success in English 1A courses. J. Ocampo confirmed that he had the results and wanted to share them with E. Hill-Enriquez as Lead AWE Facilitator prior to sharing them with the Committee.

Placement into Math 51 seemed to spike several years ago. This may be due to a change in Cut scores. E. Kaljumagi requested clarification as to the process for changing Cut scores on campus. The Math Department made that determination.

High school testing data was also shared for the AWE and Math placement assessments.

5. Math Update: The Math Department established new Cut scores for Calculus. In a year, the department will analyze data in regards to success rates for students placed into the course with the revised Cut score. J. Ocampo provided H. Griffith with a potential handout for students created by Assessment. This handout would be given to students to help them stay informed in regard to the math placement tests here at Mt. SAC. H.

Griffith will share this information with the Math Department. M. Sampat requested a copy of the handout for LAC Math Faculty.

6. English Update: In December, the English Department voted to approve the format of the AWE rubric. M. Dougherty shared that there was a revote at the last department meeting. One person requested to change their vote in support of the new rubric format. E. Kaljumagi questioned whether the new rubric would be a pilot or an immediate change. Historically, changes to the rubric have been made on an ongoing basis. J. Ocampo stated that the change would be permanent rather than piloted. He mentioned that the AWE Facilitators can consider the option of a pilot and make that determination or recommendation.

M. Dougherty shared that repetition on the original rubric was problematic. She shared that AWE Readers would focus on one word that would distract them and potentially impact placement. She reported that members of the English department felt that there was too much information in the previous rubric that was distracting to Readers. Readers had difficulty in placing students accurately between levels due to the ambiguity and repetition in the existing rubric.

G. Bro shared that as soon as they began the AWE rubric evaluation process, it was apparent to AMLA faculty that the information on the rubric needed to be placed on one page as it was easier to read and score papers without having to flip through multiple pages. M. Sampat questioned whether it was appropriate to change the rubric to make it easier for Readers or whether it was more important to ensure accurate placement. English and AMLA faculty responded that they felt a one page format served both purposes. Learning Assistance faculty are concerned that by shrinking the rubric to fit one page, valuable, research-based content is being lost. The existing rubric was created through research and discussion among representatives of each of the departments teaching writing. Based on this joint research and discussion, detailed criteria were included to provide depth for accurate placement. Learning Assistance faculty feel the proposed rubric has unclear criteria defining one placement from another. AMLA and English representatives shared that they have only approved the one page format, and the next step is to refine content. The AMLA department is currently working on the rubric language. The English department has begun a cursory review of the proposed rubric language. The Learning Assistance Faculty believe it is premature to accept a one page format and restructuring of the rubric.

E. Kaljumagi noted that the fact that the grant money is involved does not change the process. Assessment and Matriculation must review the rubric in detail. Most senators in Academic Senate care about the process. Assessment and Matriculation must review the rubric, ask for clarification, attempt to gain consensus, or in the event consensus is not reached, provide detailed information regarding the points of disagreement.

M. Dougherty noted that Learning Assistance faculty refused to participate in the meetings. M. Sampat clarified that Learning Assistance faculty participated in the first 2 of the 4 meetings. G. Bro asserted that members of Learning Assistance attended only one meeting. M. Sampat reiterated that two meetings were attended by Learning Assistance faculty. At the first meeting there was discussion about the current rubric. At the second meeting, a new format was proposed jointly by AMLA and the English department. Learning Assistance faculty missed the next meeting due to outside obligations. The final meeting was not attended by Learning Assistance faculty because they felt their concerns were not being addressed and that the proposed rubric would continue to be supported with or without their involvement.

E. Kaljumagi clarified that Assessment and Matriculation will be able to review the content of the proposed rubric prior to a vote by the Committee. The goal is to have a quality placement instrument. The content of the

rubric is the purview of the faculty. The Committee can recommend the rubric go back to the AWE Facilitators for the content to be modified by the faculty.

7. Counseling Update: DegreeWorks has been implemented. Feedback is being elicited.
8. Learning Assistance Update: M. Sampat shared Learning Assistance faculty concern over the timeline imposed by the AWE Grant. They feel the process has been driven by the timeline proposed in the Basic Skills Grant which was developed without any consultation or research supporting the need for revisions to the rubric. Changes made to the rubric with the intention of placing more students into higher level courses may not be in the students' best interests. Course repetition mandates now limit students to 3 attempts at any course. It is more important than ever to ensure accurate placement. Inflating placement into a course may hinder rather than promote student success.
9. Continuing Ed Updates (ESL/ABE): None