

Mt. San Antonio College

Assessment and Matriculation Committee Minutes

May 29, 2013 – 2:45–4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Donna Necke |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deejay Santiago | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Mauch | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle Sampat |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Antoine Thomas | | |

Guests: Pam Arterburn, Tom Edson, Sun Ezzell, Beta Meyer

1. Minutes from the April 10, 2013 and April 24, 2013 were approved with revisions.
2. Chemistry Test: Mt. SAC submitted validation data of the 1997 version of the Chemistry Placement test to the Chancellor's Office for the critical mass approval. Critical mass is a collective effort by at least 6 colleges using the same placement test to seek test instrument approval. There are 2 versions of the test used by colleges applying for critical mass approval this round. The Chancellor's Office categorized our submission as a locally managed test rather than critical mass because only 3 colleges use the 1997 form and did not approve it. J. Ocampo asked the Committee and the Chemistry Department to ask the Chancellor's Office to take our submission off the table as we did not submit it as a locally managed test. If the state approves the 2006 version as critical mass, we can use that version. The Chemistry department is willing to use the 2006 version. If the 2006 version is not approved, then we can collect more data and submit the 1997 version for approval as a locally managed placement.
3. High School Faculty/Counselor Conference (September): We offered the Conference in December. It might have better turn out in September. The Committee proposed September 27, 2013. Members will share the date with department faculty and bring back alternative suggestions if needed.
4. Committee Review (Name Change?): SB 1456 has changed Matriculation to "Student Success." Statewide, Committees are changing their name to align with the state. After some discussion, the Committee determined to keep the name "Assessment and Matriculation Committee." Based on changes taking place under SB 1456, the Committee will review our Purpose and Function statement and update on an ongoing basis. T. Edson suggested considering separating Function 5 into 2 separate items. T. Edson noted the purpose of this Committee is to make recommendations to SP&S. Therefore, the Committee may want to include "Recommend parameters and guidelines" rather than "Provide parameters and guidelines". J. Ocampo shared

that departments own placements and the cut scores for placements. Historically, reporting to SP&S has been informational. T. Edson agreed that departments have purview over their assessment tools. All faculty have an interest in the placement of students. The process needs to be transparent. B. Meyer shared that faculty recommendations that are thoroughly vetted are generally accepted by the faculty at large at Academic Senate. Also, there are so many mandates coming from the state, we need to collect data and maintain transparency. T. Edson shared that Committees are able to write the Purpose and Function, and then Senate approves the suggested changes.

T. Edson also shared that there is some concern about filling Membership seats in Assessment and Matriculation. He suggested an addition of an "At-Large" faculty member who could come from any department on campus. E. Hill-Enriquez shared that AMLA will have a representative on Assessment and Matriculation for the next three years. M. Sampat recommended adding a member of the Chemistry department and a Dean or Associate Dean from Instruction in addition to the member from Learning Assistance who was approved last year. Further discussion will take place at the next meeting.

5. AWE Rubric: The Academic Senate passed a Motion to devise a formal Pilot study to evaluate the effectiveness and validity of the proposed AWE rubric revision. J. Ocampo shared that the Chancellor's Office approved the AWE as a living document. It can be changed at will. P. Arterburn asked M. Tsai how research is generally conducted. M. Tsai shared that the AWE is a holistic tool. It is more complex. M. Tsai noted that the revised version of the rubric could be tested on a smaller sample size of students. If desired, we'd also look at success in placed courses. Depending on the goal(s) and scope of the study, length of the Pilot could be a few months to several years.

J. Ocampo asked whether there was a problem with the way we have been conducting research on the AWE. Historically, changes to the rubric have been made, we have implemented them, and then researched the impacts. J. Ocampo shared that the revision is a change in format but not in content. J. Ocampo proposed implementing the change, as has been done in the past, and then continuing to collect data. B. Meyer noted that this would be a Study rather than a Pilot. If multiple changes are implemented, it is difficult to determine what is impacting placement. E. Hill Enriquez noted that many changes were made on the Rubric. P. Arterburn expressed concern about the design of a Pilot. M. Tsai recommended using the revised rubric for one month in the summer as a Pilot. The campus can examine placement rates over the summer, and then follow students over the course of several semesters to collect success and completion data. T. Mauch shared that the students taking assessments in the summer may be different from the regular student population being tested. M. Tsai noted that inter-rater reliability must also be established with the revised rubrics. A study from Florida was cited which suggests readers meeting regularly to norm and build consensus about how and why they rate and place students into certain courses to increase rating accuracy. It was a long-term process for that college in the study. E. Hill-Enriquez shared that Facilitators do norm at the

start of every AWE reading session. P. Arterburn shared that Readers would need to be trained on the revised rubric. B. Meyer said that the same Readers could not be used in both groups. Also, we'd need to look at whether or not Multiple Measures are used for the placement.

M. Sampat suggested forming a larger, more inclusive group to meet over the summer and design the AWE revision Pilot. The group could include managers from relevant areas, additional faculty from relevant departments, and additional counselors. M. Tsai noted that Barbara McNiece Stallard is interested in participating in the development of the Pilot. Several Committee members and guests shared that they would be available to meet over the summer. J. Ocampo recommended meeting on June 13, 2013 to finalize the Committee purpose, function, and membership as well as to continue discussing the Pilot. He also suggested bringing dates and times for a summer meeting to develop the Pilot.