Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the

College of Arts & Media

Please return the completed report back to the Office of Assessment

by **March 22, 2024**.

Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the College of Arts & Media

Assessment is an important best-practice in higher education that helps programs determine whether key objectives are being met, identify areas for improvement, and develop actions to improve program effectiveness. Additionally, meaningful, and effective assessment is the corner stone of many discipline-specific accreditations, as well as our university's regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges, and Schools Commission on Colleges. 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.

Meta-assessment serves two important roles for the College and the University. First, it provides valuable feedback to units regarding ways in which they may continue to improve their annual assessment processes. Second, it provides College and University leaders with a way to observe the overall quality of assessment processes for their units. The purpose of this report is to detail the Meta-assessment process utilized by the College of Arts & Media, the College's plan for distributing the completed Meta-assessment rubrics to their departments and programs, the assessment strengths observed within the reviewed assessment plans, the areas for improvement of assessment practices, the strategies for implementing those improvements, and the training or resources needed to implement those strategies.

Section 1: Description of Meta-assessment Methodology Employed by the College

Detail the College's Meta-assessment methodology and process. Include a description of who was involved (e.g., a committee of senior faculty or college administrators), your methodology for evaluating unit-level assessment plans, steps for ensuring reliability, and your timeline.

The College of Arts and Media (CAM) has an appointed committee of faculty and staff to evaluate Anthology submissions. This committee includes a CAM Associate Dean, Chairs/Directors from each CAM unit, and about 20 faculty from each unit involved in submitting goals, KPIs, and other associated documentation for its departmental assessment. A comprehensive list of the faculty that were involved is included in Appendix A. The college's assessment review for the 2022-2023 academic year was reviewed and monitored by Associate Dean Michael Henderson, and Dean's staff member, Megan Hobbs-Barrett for completion.

The CAM assessment committee used the previously established CAM review cycle. CAM assessment committee members evaluated programs in cycle *A* and administrative units in *Z*. A list of the review evaluation cycle is included in Appendix A for reference.

CAM assessment chairs removed reviewer identifiers from feedback rubrics before they were forwarded to chairs. For 2022-2023, the university's meta-assessment rubric was expanded to a four-item scale with *Developing, Minimally Compliant, Good* and *Exemplary* labels. CAM converted the four labels into a numeric format (1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively) and required that disparate evaluations (e.g., 1&3, 1&4, and 2&4) receive an additional review. The spreadsheet that was created will be submitted with this report to provide an overview of rubric scoring.

The college has set internal deadlines for submission and review to meet the University deadlines. The internal review timeline was established to allow faculty committee members time to review, gather, and provide formative feedback for the assessment during the summer, a slower academic time. CAM requests that all departments submit all anthology elements in DRAFT format by early June to allow the committee time to review and assess fellow programs. This earlier deadline also enables reviewers to take feedback from rubrics and make suggested changes or provide additional information for clarity and information. Meta-assessment Rubrics with feedback from college assessment members were shared after departmental submission, which enabled departments, informed with formative feedback, to revise their assessment submissions and complete their 2022-2023 Anthology assessment before the University's August 1 deadline.

The timeline is as follows:

- **May 2023** *(CAM deadline)* **– Calibration meetings for college committee**
  - Individual Unit assessment meetings were conducted to review assessment completion timeline and needed college resources.
- **May 31, 2023** *(CAM deadline)* – Unit submission deadline for ALL Anthology elements (Draft version) Meta Assessment rubrics and assignments distributed to Units by CAM office
  - **August 1, 2023** – *(University deadline)* for entering Findings and Results (CAM entry of ALL elements completed)
    - Actions, Updates, Update to Previous PCI and New PCI
    - CAM Chairs will review for completion.
  - **September 1, 2023** – *(University deadline)* for entering Actions and Plan for Continuous Improvement elements.
  - Committee members complete two evaluations using Meta-assessment rubric for programs not within their department.
- **September 1, 2023** *(CAM deadline)* – Units submit Meta Assessments to CAM office.
- **September 15,2023** *(CAM deadline)* – Chairs and committee members receive formative feedback from Meta-assessment rubrics.
- September 15-October 1 -- Departments revise Anthology submission elements based on the feedback provided in the rubrics
  - **October 1, 2023** – *(University deadline)* assessment period closed for entry

CAM will keep the established timelines that precede those of the University, thus allowing for review and sharing of formative feedback for all components and allowing for revision and final submission that the review and feedback informs.

After submitting all elements during August, CAM assessment chairs reviewed the submission for clarity, grammatical correctness, and overall completeness. All aspects of all programs and administrative units are reviewed for completion, regardless of internal program evaluation.

The CAM assessment committee will set a Fall 2023 meeting to discuss and debrief the 2022-2023 assessment process and discuss planning for the current 2023-2024 cycle, with the December 1 deadline for Goals, Objectives, Indicators, Criterion, KPIs and Target completion.

During Spring 2024, the CAM assessment committee will review and build on submissions and procedures implemented in previous cycles, continue to facilitate more discrete evaluation information, and help identify strengths and areas for improvement in all programs and administrative units.

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 evaluation cycle for CAM established reviews of Academic Programs is on a two-year ("AB") cycle, while reviews of administrative units is on a three-year ("XYZ") cycle. In all instances, it is required that all CAM entries be completed in draft form for all academic programs and administrative units by early June. Per CAM's evaluation cycle, the 2022-2023 Anthology assessment designated as "B" and "X" in the cycle were assessed by the CAM assessment committee.

Department Chairs/Directors assigned individual faculty reviewers within their departments to the respective fellow programs, and a list of assignments is documented for review (see below).

Art	
Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**
Arts and Media, College	Dept of Dance
Dance BFA	Mass Comm BA
Music BA	Artist Diploma Certificate

Dance	
Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**
Music (Center for Early Music Ed.)	Mass Comm BA
Art BFA (Photo)	Theatre BFA
Art and Social Practice (MFA)	

Mass Communication	
Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**
Music (Center for Early Music Ed.)	Dept of Art
Art BA	Art and Social Practice (MFA)
Artist Diploma Certificate	Music BA

Music	
Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**
Dept of Dance	Dept of Art
Art BA	Art BFA (Studio Art)
Theatre BFA	Art (CARE)

Theatre & Musical Theatre	
Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**
Arts and Media, College	Art (CARE)

Art BFA (Photo)	Art BFA (Studio Art)
Dance BFA	

Each program/unit was to be reviewed by two different faculty from different departments. Once faculty completed meta-assessment rubrics, they were submitted to Megan Hobbs-Barrett (Dean's office); the names of the reviewers were not included with the rubrics or provided with the completed rubrics to the individual departments. One disinterested central party facilitates this process and assists with the discrete evaluation process.

The completed rubrics were provided to the Department Chair/Director and the department assessment chair to facilitate the dissemination of information. All rubrics were saved on the assessment T: drive, which is accessible by all CAM assessment members. These evaluations, completed in September, are formative rather than summative, allowing departments to consider the assessments by the CAM assessment committee and revise their draft submissions before the University deadlines of August 1 and September 1.

Section 3: 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?

Based on the meta-assessment completed by the CAM assessment committee, a spreadsheet was created to show overall results. The four-item scale included *Developing, Minimally Compliant, Good* and *Exemplary* labels. CAM converted the four labels into a numeric format (1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively) and required that disparate evaluations (e.g., 1&3, 1&4, and 2&4) receive an additional review. The spreadsheet is the result of conversions of ratings that facilitated numeric averages at the college and program levels. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers, the numeric information clearly indicated the comparable strengths and weakness of the entry for each component.

From a college average perspective, the general trends observed in the 2022-2023 were that overall *Goals* articulated by departments were the strongest component of the assessment.

Dance MFA and *Mass Communication, Dept. of* could be generally recommended as exemplary models to other departments in our college. The goals stated in these assessments are broad statements that support the mission of their respective department or program. The goals guide the objectives, indicators, and key performance indicators. With the ever-changing climate of higher education, our departments must review plans to ensure they provide clear direction for the assessment.

Section 4: 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 struggling with?

Based on the meta-assessment completed by the CAM assessment committee, a spreadsheet was created to show overall results. The four-item scale included *Developing*, *Minimally Compliant*, *Good*, and *Exemplary* labels. CAM converted the four labels into a numeric format (1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively) and required that disparate evaluations (e.g., 1&3, 1&4, and 2&4) receive an additional review. The spreadsheet is the result of conversions of ratings that facilitated numeric averages at the college and program levels. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers, the numeric information clearly indicated the comparable strengths and weakness of the entry for each component.

From a college average perspective, the general trends observed in the 2022-2023 were that overall *Indicators and Findings/Results* articulated by departments were the weakest components of the assessment. It appears departments are struggling with articulating Indicators and Findings/Results. Future meetings of the CAM assessment team will include the discussion of strategies to properly compile findings and results, as these should be gathered throughout the academic year to make the reporting process easy for the team member compiling the data. Discussion about key elements of successful Indicators will also be shared with CAM assessment team members. Unfortunately, it appears that incomplete assessment rubrics may have attributed to some lower component scores.

The *MCOM Sports Media* minor and *Music's Performers Certificate* both had very weak assessment, which appears to be due to the length of time the programs have been in existence. It will be recommended that the departments establish clear goals, objectives, and indicators in December for the upcoming review period to provide meaningful growth in these programs.

In three instances, (Art BA, Art and Social Practice MFA, and Theatre BFA) the overall scores from the two reviewers were disparate. A third reviewer was assigned and in each instance their score fell between the two disparate scores. The comments provided by the reviewers will provide useful feedback that will be shared with assessors.

Section 5: Strategies Needed to Address Identified Weaknesses
Detail the College's strategies for addressing the general weaknesses identified after reviewing its units' assessment plans.

Formative feedback that highlighted weaknesses, such as that contained in the evaluations by the CAM assessment committee of the 2022-23 draft entries, will continue to be shared with department chairs and all CAM assessment members in a department. The intention is those final revisions will provide improved feedback based on the focused discussion of weaker assessment areas. The college continues to experience a challenge with unfamiliarity with assessment terminology and component elements within Anthology. In follow-up meetings, department chairs and CAM assessment members will address the proper alignment of components. The CAM assessment chairs will encourage faculty to participate in training and refresher sessions presented by the Office of Assessment to improve familiarity and proficiency in the completion of Anthology components.

As the CAM committee faculty members can change, the Dean's office will continue to use Blackboard and the T: drive as a repository of CAM assessment information. The centralized location will help increase transparency in the process amongst all departments.

Section 6: Training/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.

Identify/contact faculty newly assigned to prepare Anthology submissions to make them aware of CAM processes, procedures, deadlines, and expectations.

Create/improve information for chairs and assessment team members.
- Continue to clarify definitions and terminology
- Continue to clarify and contextualize connection and sequence of components
  - Provide strong examples (with explanation of competency)
  - Provide weak examples
- Provide templates, when possible, to approach contribution/rubric
- Provide and review CAM internal assessment timeline
- Provide information/support/training to CAM chairs and assessment team members
  - Individual training/workshops will be offered in person, or online to review and evaluate Anthology submission
  - Newly assigned assessment team members will be offered individual training and feedback on their Anthology Reports
  - Assessments identified as developing or minimally compliant will be reviewed and assessors will be encouraged to take advantage of individual training/workshops
  - Assessors of programs selected for meta-assessment in 2023-24 will encouraged to take advantage of individual training/workshops

Appendix A

Department Reviewers

Department				
Art	**Dance**	**Mass Communication**	**Music**	**Theatre & Musical Theatre**
Edward Morin	Jennifer Pontius	Wojiech Lorenc	Scott Plugge	Tom Prior
Jody Wood	Andrew Noble	KiWon Seo	Debi Popham	Nic Graves
Rebecca Finley	Dionne Noble	Elisa Herrmann	Mario Aschauer	Aaron Brown
Chuck Drumm		Marcus Funk	Brian Gibbs	Kevin Crouch
Kate Borcherding		Jonathan Read	Kevin Clifton	Patrick Pearson
Emily Kim		Nam Kim		Vicky Lantz
Anthony Watkins				
Melissa Glasscock				
Emily Peacock				
Michael Henderson				

All Completed Meta-Assessment Rubrics
- sent in separate zip file
- includes overall evaluation summation spreadsheet

Assessment Program Schedule

2023-2024 Anthology Eval

Acad. Year	Cycle	Level Title-Academic Program-College Evaluation
AY23	B	Art BA
AY24	A	Art BFA (Gr Design)
AY24	A	Art BFA (Anim)
AY23	B	Art BFA (Photo)
AY23	B	Art BFA (Studio Art)
AY24	A	Art and Popular Culture Minor
AY23	B	Art and Social Practice MFA
AY23	B	Dance BFA
AY24	A	Dance MFA
AY23	B	Mass Comm BA
AY24	A	MCOM BFA (Film Prod)
AY24	A	MCOM MA (Emerging & Social Media)
AY24	A	MCOM MFA (Digital Media Prod)
AY24	A	Sports Media Minor
AY23	B	Music BA
AY24	A	Music BM
AY24	A	Music MA (Band Studies)
AY24	A	Music MM
AY23	B	Music Therapy BM
AY24	A	Performer's Certificate
AY23	B	Artist Diploma Certificate
AY25	B	Woodwind Performance Pedagogy
AY24	A	Musical Theatre BFA
AY23	B	Theatre BFA

2023-2024 Anthology Eval

Acad. Year	Cycle	Level Title-Administrative Unit-College Evaluation
AY24	Y	Art (University Art Galleries)
AY23	X	Art, Department Of
AY23	X	Art, (CARE)
AY23	X	Dance, Dept Of
AY25	Z	MCOM, Dept Of
AY25	Z	Music, School Of
AY23	X	Music (Cntr Erly Mus Res)
AY24	Y	Music (Cntr Mus Edu)
AY24	Y	Thtr/MThtr, Dept Of
AY23	X	Arts and Media, College

Academic Programs - AB (2 yr cycle)
Administrative Units - XYZ (3 yr cycle)

OAPA (Office of Academic Planning and Assessment) in Academic Affairs will be adding certificate programs to the process assessing academic programs. Departments will need to include these in their annual Anthology submissions of all programs and units (related performance objectives can be included in home unit).

CLEC review cycle for any submission may be changed - request initiated by chair.