

Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the College of
Education

Please return the completed report back to the Office of Academic

Planning and Assessment by **May 30, 2014.**

Section 1: Purpose and Introduction

Meta-assessment is an important tool for helping ensure that all programs at Sam Houston State University are engaging in a meaningful and effective continuous improvement assessment process. Continuous improvement assessment is an important best-practice in higher education as it helps programs determine whether key objectives are being met, identify areas for improvement, and develop actions for implementing changes that will have a positive effect on the student learning environment. Meaningful and effective assessment is also the corner stone of many discipline-specific accreditations, as well as University accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.

In Fall 2013, the Director of Assessment formed an ad-hoc committee of faculty and College administrators from the Colleges of Business Administration, Criminal Justice, Education, Fine Arts and Mass Communication, Health Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Sciences. Using a locally developed rubric (Appendix A) the ad-hoc Meta-assessment Committee evaluated 2012-2013 assessment plans for the 135 academic degree programs documented within the Online Assessment Tracking Database. Each unit assessment plan was independently evaluated by two anonymous reviewers; one from within and one from outside the College from which the assessment plan originated.

The results from the meta-assessment review have been used in multiple ways. First, completed rubrics were distributed to the departments and programs to serve as formative feedback for use in continually improving unit-level assessment plans. Second, college-level data were analyzed by the College to identify the general strengths and weaknesses within their units' annual assessment processes. This information has been used by the College to determine what training, resources, and strategies are necessary to address any general weaknesses identified within its units' annual programmatic assessment efforts. A summary of the College's findings are provided within this report.

Section 2: Plan for Distributing Completed Rubrics to Units

Detail the College's plan for sharing the completed meta-assessment rubrics with its departments and programs.

Within the College of Education, the Meta-Assessment Review process for reviewing the 2012-2013 program assessment plans and the rubric were introduced to the college leadership team at a regularly scheduled meeting on February 13, 2014. Subsequently the rubric template was distributed to program representatives within each department by the chairpersons, so that the rubric could be used to guide the refinement of OAT DB entries across the college.

When the Meta- Assessment results were distributed to the colleges, the completed rubrics and comments of the reviewers were sent to the appropriate department chair for distribution and planning within departments. In each department, chairpersons provided formative feedback to program coordinators and provided guidance, as needed. Since assessment experts within the college routinely recommend that professional practice in educational assessment requires familiarity with an evaluative rubric prior to development of a product, great care was taken by the administration and the chairs to convey that this particular feedback process was designed to be collaborative, with the understanding that no negative consequences would accrue within the college.

Section 3: Feedback and Suggestions for Improvement of the Meta-assessment Rubric and Process

Analysis of COE meta-assessment results was in planning for targeted improvement of assessment within the college. That analysis yielded interesting information which will inform program coordinators and chairs. Several observations follow:

- In the Overall category, 11 of 21 programs had matching scores on the rubrics, as scored by two reviewers.
- In the Overall category, of the 10 scorings that did not match, 8 differed by just one level.
- In the Overall category, 5 of 21 scores assigned by the internal reviewers were higher than the score of the outside reviewer. A higher rating was assigned by the external reviewer in 6 of 21 scorings.
- The category with the highest scorer agreement was “Plan for Continuous Improvement Update” at $r = 0.66$.

Suggestions for improvement of the rubric and the University process include the following:

- Include an “Introduction to Assessment at SHSU” in the New Faculty Orientation agenda, so that the expectation for program assessment is conveyed upon entry.
- Prior to initiating the cycle of assessment for 2014-2015, provide information and explanation to enlist the ongoing support of the Council of Academic Deans, the Council of Academic Associate Deans, the Council of Chairs, the Graduate Council, and the Faculty Senate.
- Provide exemplars with annotation on the University website or the T drive.
- Offer assessment training within the Talent Management system, with required attendance for new administrators and availability for those that seek additional training. This provides a supportive opportunity professional development to be assigned by a Dean or chair when appropriate.

The data generated by the college’s analysis of the meta-assessment results is attached.

Section 4: Observed Strengths within College Assessment Plans

Detail the general strengths identified by the College after reviewing its units’ assessment plans. What general aspects of the annual assessment processes are units mastering? Are there any units that you would recommend serve as exemplary models?

Review of the Meta-assessment data indicates that within the College of Education, the aspects of the process that occur early in the academic year were ranked more highly by the reviewers. As the assessment processes, strategic planning, and annual documentation of goals, objectives and indicators has been institutionalized, those elements of the process have become more familiar across the programs. In addition, those elements also may be easily rolled from year to

year with minimum editing required. Overall and in individual categories, highest scores were assigned for Goals, Objectives, and Indicators.

It should be noted that in most areas of education, goal setting, development of objectives and identification of appropriate indicators of success are routine practice in classrooms and schools. Thus, almost every faculty member within the college has expertise and experience in completing these tasks.

An exemplary model among COE programs are 1) Interdisciplinary Studies BA, BS (Elementary EC-6), and 2) Secondary Education (SED).

Section 5: Observed Weaknesses within College Assessment Plans

Detail the general weaknesses identified by the College after reviewing its units' assessment plans. What general aspects of the annual assessment process are units specifically struggling with?

Lower scores were assigned to the categories that require analysis of performance, access to data, knowledge of assessment and using results to inform planning. The combined rater mean score for Actions was .88 and 1.05 was the combined rater mean for the Current Plan for Continuous Improvement category.

Several ideas emerged from the review of these data, as follows:

- Examination of key assessment outcomes and action planning for continuous improvement are routinely conducted in fall and spring during Data Day activities. Since most programs within the college are involved in national accreditation and state accountability reporting, the process of collaborative review of assessment data and planning are integral to practice within the college. However, adding the element of documentation within the OAT DB system has not occurred.
- Typically, completion of the OAT DB assessment entries is delegated to the program coordinator who completes these items as a solitary activity. Working to integrate these activities, and coherent scheduling would likely make a great difference in the quality of documentation efforts.

Section 6: Strategies Needed to Address Identified Weaknesses

Detail the College's strategies for addressing the general weaknesses identified after reviewing its units' assessment plans.

- In accredited programs, assessment outcomes are tracked for every student on at least six assessments. These data are routinely reviewed and reported, and planning for continuous improvement is conducted by program faculty. The college leadership team will work within departments to integrate these activities with documentation for regional accreditation, and to conduct planning events with program faculty that will yield the information needed for entry in OAT DB.
- It is important to note that building awareness among faculty and department leaders is critical. Despite repeated discussion and data review events each semester, there is a need to increase awareness that program-level student outcome data for the preceding year is posted on the COE Accreditation Website by October 1 each year.

- Clarity is needed about selecting a reporting period for each assessment that is based on the most current data available, appropriate for the assessment schedule, and also useful for program planning. For example, Teacher Work Sample scores for each year are provided on the website, by program, as soon as the spring semester concludes, so goal setting related to TWS data outcomes may be drawn from results in the current academic year, if the OAT DB deadline is August 1. In contrast, to develop goals, objectives, and indicators related to TExES pass rate data, results from the previous academic year must be used, because pass rate data is not published by the state until the academic year concludes on August 31. Thus one indicator would reflect results from 2013-2014 and the next might reflect results from 2012-2013.
- Leaders within the college believe that coordinated planning and collaborative development within programs for the “Actions” and “Planning for Continuous Improvement” sections will result in improved results and authenticity in strategic planning. The planned adoption by the University of an improved assessment management system will facilitate this effort.

Section 7: Training and Resources Needed to Implement the College’s Improvement Strategy

Detail the types of training and resources that would assist the College with implementing its improvement strategies.

There is a perception that a disconnect exists related to the calendar of OAT DB entry windows, strategic planning and the availability of relevant data for COE assessments. Clear communication about reporting periods and planning cycles is needed, both from the Office of Academic Assessment and Planning and within the individual programs. Possibly generating input from the meta assessment committee or a separate advisory group could facilitate resolution of this situation.

Section 8: Proposed Plan for Implementing Meta-assessment Within the College

Outline the College’s proposed plan for implementing Meta-assessment with the College during the Fall 2014 semester. Include a basic description of who will be involved (e.g., a committee of senior faculty or college administrators), your proposed methodology for evaluating unit assessment plans, steps for ensuring reliability, and a basic timeline. Additionally, describe how the College will utilize meta-assessment results to continue to improve assessment efforts of its units.

A workshop is planned to support faculty and administrators who are responsible for OAT DB entries. This session, held early in the academic year should provide:

- 1) a clear and coherent schedule for data entry that allows coordination of national and regional accreditation documentation,
- 2) opportunity for participants to evaluate an exemplar and a non-exemplar using the rubric,
- 3) collaborative activity using current educator preparation outcome data that yields entries for OAT DB and,
- 4) sharing of exemplars from within and outside the college.

With changing leadership in the college, it is not yet clear how roles of key individuals may evolve. The planned workshop could be hosted by the Associate Dean for Accreditation, the Center for Assessment and Accreditation or another leadership entity within the college. At this juncture, it seems advisable to provide the workshop described above, to coordinate activities that will involve program faculty in use of the rubric to evaluate the previous year entries for their program, distribute 2014-15 entries by program, to appropriate program faculty in early Fall, and to consider involving faculty in cross-program evaluation of 2013-14 entries using the rubric at a Fall Data Day or similar event, with debriefing to assure calibration in scoring,

Appendix A-Analysis of 2014 COE Meta-Assessment Review

(See Attached File)