

Mt. San Antonio College

Assessment and Matriculation Committee Minutes

April 24, 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

Guests: Pam Arterburn, Kristina Allende

1. Minutes from the March 27, 2013 minutes were approved with revisions. Minutes from April 10, 2013 will be reviewed at the next meeting as there was insufficient time to review the minutes prior to the committee meeting.
 2. AWE Rubric: J. Ocampo shared that he is aware of an upcoming resolution that will be before the Academic Senate. He feels that much of what Assessment and Matriculation does is research and research-based and that the resolution calls into question the functioning of the Committee. J. Ocampo and H. Griffith responded to the upcoming motion with points of clarification. These points of clarification will be given to Eric Kaljumagi. J. Ocampo asked the Committee whether they would support the responses. M. Sampat noted that she believed the intent of the motion coming before the Academic Senate the next day was to encourage Committee dialogue and response. M. Sampat suggested that, if the Committee wanted to forward J. Ocampo's responses, they should engage in a discussion on each item so it is a Committee response. Other committee members expressed agreement with J. Ocampo's responses and indicated that they would support them. A. Thomas clarified the language of the motion. He specifically pointed out the second Whereas in the motion, noting that the Academic Senate has designated the Assessment and Matriculation Committee to review and make recommendations regarding assessment to the Academic Senate.
- K. Allende shared that discussion between departments has been attempted and has failed. She noted that changes are made to Cut Scores by the Math Department, and no Senate approval has been needed to institute those changes. The AWE was created by departments and faculty. The rubric revision is under the purview of faculty. Any decisions made by departments and faculty should be honored. There is a perception that Learning Assistance faculty are attempting to tell other departments what to do. M. Sampat pointed out that, in the past, departments had worked together toward consensus. This process is breaking down. Questions are seen as arguments rather than sincere requests to engage in critical discourse. J. Ocampo

shared that he believes the Director of Assessment works on process rather than content. Faculty determines content. Changes made are sent to the Academic Senate on an informational basis. Academic Senate never approved changes to the AWE rubric in the past, so they should not have to approve them now. M. Sampat agreed that content is at the purview of discipline faculty, and that this Committee should not impinge on faculty's right to determine curriculum. However, it is her belief that it is within the purview of the Committee to request clarification regarding content if it is unclear. This Committee has been tasked with reviewing and making recommendations regarding assessment, and it should be within its scope to look at content and refer to discipline faculty for clarification if needed.

A suggestion was made to leave the LERN 81 part of the rubric intact. AMLA and English could adopt the new rubric and placement into LERN 81 could be made with the existing rubric. M. Sampat shared that she felt Learning Assistance faculty believed in the process that facilitated the creation of the existing rubric. Writing faculty worked together in a collegial manner to research and develop the existing rubric. Using the new format with a part of the old format may not serve students well. Faculty members from all the involved disciplines want to make sure that students are successful. English and AMLA, within their departments had engaged in a thoughtful process that established rationale supporting the rubric reformatting. Learning Assistance faculty felt there was never an opportunity for departments or department representatives to discuss the rationale in depth between and among departments. This is where Learning Assistance felt the process broke down.

It was noted that LAC faculty stopped attending the rubric revision meetings. It was also noted that emotions seemed to be coloring this process and stopping it from going forward. M. Sampat shared that it was not LAC Faculty's intent to stymie a process or use the motion as an obstruction. Learning Assistance faculty hoped that Matriculation could continue the discussion and inquiry. As a research-based, representative, Senate committee tasked with making recommendations regarding assessment, it seemed appropriate for Matriculation to continue to engage in collegial discussion and inquiry.

Pam Arterburn shared an analysis of the existing rubric and pointed out perceived redundancy and repetition. She underscored the English Department's concern that students are being incorrectly placed. If a student is placed too low, they may have difficulty getting the next course in the sequence. This is an underlying concern of the English department. Far fewer students place into English 1A at Mt. SAC than any other California Community College. Anecdotal evidence was shared regarding students' placement into lower level classes when they were clearly able to be successful in a higher level class. The revised rubric is intended to place students accurately. The original reason the rubric was created with such detail, was to allow anyone on campus to become a Reader. Over time, it became clear that writing faculty needed to be Readers. Therefore, the depth of information contained in the existing rubric was no longer needed. It was shared that Readers are looking at the proposed rubric and giving positive feedback. M. Tsai shared that faculty should determine the content of the rubric.

Discussion among faculty should be about the alignment of items from one placement to another. Also, the ability of Readers to use the instrument effectively is paramount. M. Tsai shared that if Readers are supporting the new format as being more effective, then that should be given consideration. Data will be collected once the rubric is in use to determine student success rates and satisfaction with placements as it always has been. J. Ocampo noted that Readers are giving overwhelmingly positive feedback in regards to the new format.

M. Dougherty motioned to support J.Ocampo's clarifications to the Academic Senate Motion. 7 members of the Committee voted in support and 2 voted against. The motion to carry the responses forward was approved by a majority vote.