

Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the College of
Fine Arts and Mass Communication

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.

The 2012-2013 meta-assessment evaluations of OATDB submissions for each department program were shared with Department Chairs in April and May during Chairs meeting with email follow-ups. Summary information was converted to numeric terms and discussed over a period of weeks.

Early April-Blank rubrics distributed to chairs at Chairs meeting for their information

Mid April-Developing, Acceptable, and Exemplary ratings converted to 1, 2, and 3
Numeric data helped identify strongest and weakest components for the college.

Individual departmental data, without analysis or averages, was also shared.

College-level data explained, suggested as a model for departmental analysis

Spreadsheets forwarded to department for their use.

Late April-completed dual evaluations (rubrics) for programs forwarded to the chairs.

Feedback was requested from the chairs to inform preparation for next chairs meeting.

Mid May-Aggregated College data reviewed/explained with chairs in greater detail

Components, w/ averages, arranged in order, weakest to strongest, to suggest priorities

Discussed future departments meetings with Brian Miller & Michael Henderson

Late May/Early June-Chairs/faculty member met with Brian Miller & Michael Henderson
 Support session to discuss evaluations of programs, and departments response
 Clarified definitions of terminology, reviewed components and OATDB submissions/evaluations
 Shared college's analysis of departmental averages based on college analysis model
 Identified hierarchy of strength/weakness of each component based on college analysis model
 Departments to revise and complete current OATDB submissions over summer

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

Please describe the process by which feedback was collected from the College on the meta-assessment process. Provide any suggestions for the improvement of the meta-assessment rubric and process.

Meta-assessment process was discussed at all meetings with chairs involving meta-assessment
 Summary of College report template shared, departments invited to share comments in writing

Some chairs felt uninformed about the process.
 Process seemed out of sequence – new rubric was imposed after submission
 Suggest-rubric should be collaboratively-created shared with chairs before submission

RUBRIC

Might be helpful if elements in rubric were demarcated
 Avoid combining elements into one check box
 Consider revising rubric with focus on tracing specific elements from DEV to ACPT to EXMP

TRAINING

Identify/contact new chairs and/or (or faculty newly assigned to prepare OATDB submission)
 Create a dynamic toolkit for new chairs (or faculty assigned to prepare OATDB submission)
 Provide brief examples (identifiers removed) of both strong and weak specific responses
 Provide templates/boilerplates as possible (not only) way to approach submission/rubric
 Provide keywords that help define components and clarify rubric
 Provide flowchart-like guide to assessment process
 Provide information/support/training in multiple formats.
 Possible training formats: large/small groups one-on-one training, on-line training, download
 Evaluations should be done by small trained group (Accountability office) for consistency

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?

See attachments.

(The tabs in the attached spreadsheet include numeric conversion that facilitated averages at the college, department, and program level. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers - except for

MCOM, which was an “anchor” evaluation - the numeric information clearly indicates the comparable strength or weakness of the entry for each components – this is determined at the college, department, and program levels.)

For the college, the last four components were the weakest areas. After sharing the analysis of the college averages as a model process for the departments to apply, the college duplicated the process on each department to provide more specific information at the departmental level.

Art and Mass Communication are units that could be generally recommended as exemplary models for other departments in our college.

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?

See attachments.

(The tabs in the attached spreadsheet include numeric conversion that facilitated averages at the college, department, and program level. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers - except for MCOM, which was an “anchor” evaluation - the numeric information clearly indicates the comparable strength or weakness of the entry for each components – this is determined at the college, department, and program levels.)

For the college, the last four components were the weakest areas. After sharing the analysis of the college averages as a model process for the departments to apply, the college duplicated the process on each department to provide more specific information at the departmental level.

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.

Meeting individually with each department chair and/or faculty designated to work on OATDB submission to discuss review, analyze, and determine plan for addressing weakest components.

- Identified hierarchy of strength/weakness of each component based on college analysis model
- Departments to revise and complete current OATDB submissions over summer with support.
- Support from college and Office of Accountability and Accredibility

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.

TRAINING

Identify/contact new chairs and/or (or faculty newly assigned to prepare OATDB submission)

Create a dynamic toolkit for new chairs (or faculty assigned to prepare OATDB submission)

Provide brief examples (identifiers removed) of both strong and weak specific responses

Provide templates/boilerplates as possible (not only) way to approach submission/rubric

Provide keywords that help define components and clarify rubric

Provide flowchart-like guide to assessment process

Provide information/support/training in multiple formats.

Possible training formats: large/small groups one-on-one training, on-line training, download

Evaluations should be done by small trained group (Accountability office) for consistency

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.

Those involved in Meta-assessment within the college would likely include those who have been suggested and/or involved in OATDB submissions and/or this spring's meetings related to meta-assessment: faculty identified within each department, department chairs, college representatives of the university meta-assessment committee, and an associate dean.

There is a potential for concern regarding evaluations of a department being conducted by individuals in another department in the college. Following the submission and review of these reports by each college, a meeting of the meta-assessment may be helpful to discuss the information, feedback, and suggestions contained in those reports. Without such a meeting, in terms of a "plan," a college committee could be convened, with some level of training provided to evaluators to address reliability. Ideally, to allow for improved submissions, 2013-2014 OATDB submissions could be reviewed before the final versions are "locked". This review could occur early in the fall, but questions of who should review, training, and timeline should perhaps be considered at the university level to provide guidance to the colleges.

The college will build on the process established this spring, which included collecting the review/evaluation results and converting to numeric terms (if needed) to help identify strengths and areas for improvement at the college, department, and program level. Following a review of the results and feedback by individual(s), a meeting or meetings with those involved with

department OATDB submissions will be scheduled to improvement continuous improvement efforts.

Appendix A

(See Attached File)