

Mt. San Antonio College

Assessment and Matriculation Committee Approved Minutes

October 16, 2013 – 2:30–4:15 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"/> David Beydler | <input type="checkbox"/> Donna Necke |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deejay Santiago | <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Mauch | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle Sampat, Co-Chair |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antoine Thomas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nona Stokes | |

Guests: Sun Ezzell, Pam Arterburn, Beta Meyer, Barbara McNeice-Stallard

1. Minutes from September 25, 2013 were approved with minor revisions.
2. AWE Rubric Pilot Study Discussion: The Committee reviewed a Pilot Proposal drafted by Barbara McNeice-Stallard and Eric Kaljumagi. It was clarified that the facilitators and J. Ocampo had seen this proposal over the summer. As the proposal was examined, several changes were made.

According to the proposal, the Pilot will run from October through December. Preliminary placement data will be collected. In order to collect a large enough data set for analysis, the Revised Rubric will continue to be used after December. If the data indicates at any time that students are not being placed accurately, the new rubric could be revised. After data from spring is analyzed in Fall 2014, the Assessment and Matriculation Committee can recommend to continue the pilot. After analyzing data in Fall 2015, the Committee can adopt the Revised Rubric, modify the Revised Rubric, or revert to the 2012 version of the Rubric.

In terms of research questions, the pilot proposal asks whether students "...have a greater probability of failure in their writing course..." The Committee recommends rewording this in more positive terms: "What are the success rates or completion rates of students placed by the 2012 rubric and the New Rubric?" Also, the third research question is vague. How do we know that placement has improved? What are we measuring? The Committee recommended collecting data on success rates, completion rates, satisfaction surveys, and inter-reader reliability. This data will begin to be collected and analyzed in Spring 2014 and will continue to be collected and evaluated through the Fall 2015 semester and further if needed.

Inter-rater reliability was defined as the percentage of agreements in first and second readings and how many papers need a third reading. S. Ezzell asked for clarification in regards to how

Inter-rater reliability was defined. Is it agreement between two readers or is it the placements a reader makes when they read the first, second, or third times? J. Ocampo clarified that Inter-rater reliability is when two readers agree on a score. If they disagree, a third reader will read the paper and give a score. We have past data on Inter-rater reliability. It needs to be manually entered. It is important to ensure that the data is entered accurately. The group decided that Inter-rater data should be analyzed from the October to December 2013 period and compared with the same data from the past three years for the initial stage of the pilot.

The Assessment and Matriculation Committee unanimously approved the revised Rubric.

3. Math Update: D. Beydler shared that he did not have the opportunity to contact Learning Assistance faculty members in regards to the math placement preparation PowerPoint or workshops. He proposed creating a rough draft of a PowerPoint and then working with additional faculty to continue to develop the materials. It was clarified that the placement preparation would not consist of instruction. It would be an orientation to the assessment rather than explicit math preparation at this time. Though the content may overlap with the content in the AWE orientation PowerPoint, the group agreed that it would be beneficial to students to see this information multiple times. There was some discussion on the current materials available to students on the Assessment website as well as handouts available to students. M. Sampat recommended that the Committee spend some time familiarizing themselves with the Assessment materials at a subsequent meeting.

The purpose of test preparation is to inform students. After being placed into a course, students should feel confident that this is the course they need to succeed. Students should not feel they “failed” the placement if they placed into a lower level basic skills course. It was noted that studies have shown that students have a significantly lower chance of completing a college level course when they place several levels below college. M. Sampat noted that there are other factors that could be involved such as limited access to the next course in the sequence. S. Ezzell asked if there was a way to ensure that students in lower level courses could be guaranteed a spot in the next course in the sequence. B. Meyer noted that the Committee could make a recommendation to Academic Senate and offered to help faculty write a motion to create a taskforce to investigate this issue further. D. Beydler noted that the English and Math Pathways are a pilot of this process. However, Pathways involves a cohort of students who take the classes in sequence together. There are other options, such as reserving spots for a few students in a subsequent course, that could be explored if a taskforce was formed. M. Dougherty, D. Beydler, and M. Sampat will share this idea in their departments to see if there is interest in exploring this possibility further.

4. Continuing Ed Updates (ESL / ABE): D. Santiago reported that information is being collected for the ESL placements.

5. Learning Assistance Update: None
6. Counseling Update: None
7. English Update: M. Dougherty shared that the English department had the same concerns as expressed earlier by other faculty groups in regards to the IELTS testing.
8. AMLA Update: None