

Mt. San Antonio College

Assessment and Matriculation Committee Minutes

April 10, 2013 – 2:45–4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Evelyn Hill-Enriquez

Jim Ocampo, Co-Chair

Michelle Dougherty

Maria Tsai

Hugh Griffith, Co-Chair

Donna Necke

Deejay Santiago

Tom Mauch

Michelle Sampat

Antoine Thomas

Guest: Sun Ezzell

1. Minutes - March 27, 2013: Numerous suggestions were made via email. M. Sampat will incorporate these changes and bring them to the April 24, 2013 meeting for approval.
2. AWE Rubric: 9 Readers met and approved the proposed AWE Rubric format. AMLA faculty approved the rubric format and are currently finalizing content. The approved AMLA rubric will be sent to the English Department for further revision. The English Department will look at the content of the rubric on May 7th. English Department faculty will have approximately 2 to 3 weeks to review the content prior to their meeting. M. Sampat asked if the AMLA rubric will also be shared with Learning Assistance. The response was that, as Learning Assistance faculty had refused to participate in the AWE Rubric Revision Grant, the department was no longer being included in the process. M. Sampat expressed concern that her department would be unable to assess the Rubric being proposed if it was not shared with Learning Assistance. It was agreed that the rubric would be shared with both Learning Assistance and English.

Mediation Update: Mediation took place to address the AWE Rubric Revision Grant and process. Donna Burns and Eric Kaljumagi mediated. Pam Arterburn, Sun Ezzell, and Evelyn Hill-Enriquez attended the mediation. It was determined that there was an impasse. Departments will review the proposed rubric. A vote will take place in Matriculation. S. Ezzell noted that the process seems to have broken down in terms of the Rubric revision, developing a third prompt, and other AWE issues. She suggested considering convening a Leadership Team similar to that used by the Inland Area Writing Project that meets to have ongoing discussions about research, policies, and the bigger picture. M. Sampat noted how a larger team was convened to discuss the development of a Multiple Measures Inventory. This was effective in creating consensus. J. Ocampo said that faculty experts need to determine the tests and prompts they feel are appropriate. M. Sampat shared her opinion that content is and should definitely be at the purview of faculty. However, examining and reviewing documents for content and clarity and then requesting faculty to consider questions or suggestions is within the scope of the Committee.

J. Ocampo shared his opinion that changing the format does not change the content. The rubric content remains the same. M. Sampat noted that, in her opinion, content is being changed because of the change in format from multiple pages to a single page.

Several members shared that they felt a one page format was clearer for Readers.

M. Tsai noted that this is a data-driven committee. We need to continue to collect data so that we can evaluate the success of placement instruments and processes. If needed, Matriculation can request IT to establish an ARGOS report.

3. English Update: M. Dougherty shared that one English Department faculty member sent an email to 22 people around campus outlining his belief that the grant process was flawed. The English Department feels the email was inaccurate and grossly misrepresented the status of the rubric revision process. M. Sampat noted that the faculty member in question is a Director for the Academic Senate. Another Academic Senate Executive Board member asked for clarification about the process, and the resulting email is the source of this situation. M. Dougherty responded that the faculty member in question should have verified that the information was accurate and copied the people mentioned in the email so they would have been able to clarify as needed.