

Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the
College of Education

Please return the completed report back to the Office of Assessment
by **March 22, 2024.**

Meta-Assessment Analysis Report for the College of Education

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 (SACSCOC). 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 Education, 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 Education (COE) has an Assessment Committee, and the Committee comprises proportional representation of each COE academic department plus four members of the COE Accountability Team. Among other functions, the Committee is responsible for conducting meta-assessments of the annual assessment (what we call continuous improvement) plans.

Each plan is reviewed by two Committee members in January, and interrater reliability (IRR) is calculated for each pairing. Each review is conducted using Qualtrics where each Committee member uses a Qualtrics' version of the institutional meta-assessment rubric. In addition to the rating items on the institutional rubric, the COE rubric includes constructed-response items where reviewers are required to identify strengths of each section of a plan and, if areas for growth in a section are identified, the reviewer must provide at least one suggestion of how to address at least one area. These constructed-response items were changes in the COE process from previous years.

In AY 2021-2022, the review rotation was revised. Previously, the 3-year review rotation was not proportionate by year in terms of the number of plans to be reviewed and the workload to review those plans. Accordingly, each "unit" for which a plan is written was classified as either 1) administrative unit, 2) degree program, or 3) non-degree program. The revised review rotation comprised one-third of plans from each of the three classifications each year.

In AY 2022-2023, the protocol was revised again to eliminate the 3-year review rotation, and each plan is now reviewed annually so that faculty and staff have annual feedback on all plans with the expectation that each year's feedback will be used to improve the subsequent plan.

Table 1 shows the IRR for each plan that included two meta-assessments. Some plans had single meta-assessments due to unfulfilled Committee member assignments.

The IRR calculation was a simple percentage of agreement:

$$\frac{\text{Number of agreements}}{\text{Number of ratings}}$$

Two IRR calculations are reported in Table 1. The % *Exact Agreement* is the IRR where ratings were identical, and the % *Exact and +/- 1 Agreement* is the IRR where ratings were exact or varied by a single point through pairwise comparisons of 1-2 and 2-3.

In the aggregate, the % Exact Agreement was 16 (96 agreements of 600 ratings), and the % Exact and +/- 1 Agreement was 31 (185 agreements of 600 ratings).

Table 1*Interrater Reliability of Meta-Assessments*

Unit	Type	Rater n	% Exact Agreement	% Exact and +/- 1 Agreement*
Adult Education Certificate	Non-degree	2	38	50
Applied Behavior Analysis Minor	Non-degree	2	0	0
Center for Assessment, Research, & Educational Safety (CARES)	Administrative unit	1	n/a	n/a
Comparative and Global Education MED	Degree	2	13	25
Counseling MA	Degree	2	0	38
Counselor Education PhD	Degree	2	13	75
Counselor Education, Department of	Administrative unit	2	63	100
Curriculum and Instruction MED	Degree	2	25	100
Developmental Education Administration EDD	Degree	2	0	100
Digital Literacies Certificate	Non-degree	1	n/a	n/a
Dyslexia Certificate	Non-degree	2	88	100
Early Childhood Education Certificate	Non-degree	2	13	63
Early Childhood Special Education Certificate	Non-degree	2	63	75
Education BA/BS (Elementary EC-6)	Degree	2	25	50
Education BS (Middle Level 4- 8)	Degree	2	63	100

Unit	Type	Rater n	% Exact Agreement	% Exact and +/- 1 Agreement*
Education, College of	Administrative unit	2	75	100
Educational Leadership EDD	Degree	2	13	50
Educational Leadership, Department of	Administrative unit	2	0	100
Educational Technology Certificate	Non-degree	2	38	63
Educator Preparation Services	Administrative unit	2	13	75
Effective Online Instruction Certificate	Non-degree	2	25	50
Garrett Center for Transition and Disability Services	Administrative unit	1	n/a	n/a
Higher Education Administration MA/Academic Advising Certificate	Degree	2	75	100
Higher Education Leadership EDD	Degree	1	n/a	n/a
Human Services Minor	Non-degree	2	50	63
Instructional Systems Design and Technology EDD	Degree	2	88	88
Instructional Systems Design and Technology MED	Degree	2	88	100
Library Science and Technology, Department of	Administrative unit	2	25	63
Library Science MLS	Degree	2	0	13
Literacy EDD	Degree	1	n/a	n/a
Play Therapy Certificate	Non-degree	2	50	63
Reading/Language Arts MED	Degree	2	50	88
School Counseling MED	Degree	2	13	63

Unit	Type	Rater n	% Exact Agreement	% Exact and +/- 1 Agreement*
School Leadership MED (Principal Certification)	Degree	2	13	38
Secondary Education (SED)	Degree	2	13	100
Special Education MA (Low Incidence Disabilities and Autism)	Degree	2	38	63
Special Education MED (Educational Diagnostician)/Bilingual (Spanish) Educational Diagnostician Certificate/Special Education Transition Services Certificate	Degree	1	n/a	n/a
Special Education Minor	Non-degree	1	n/a	n/a
Superintendent Certification	Non-degree	1	n/a	n/a
Teaching and Learning MED	Degree	2	75	88
Teaching and Learning, School of	Administrative unit	2	63	75
TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) MED	Degree	1	n/a	n/a

*The percentage of agreement +/- 1 reflects exact agreement and agreement between raters with ratings 1) of only a 1-point difference (on the meta-assessment scale of 1-4) and 2) in the same rating cluster regarding whether benchmark was met (i.e., 1-2 and 3-4 with 3 being benchmark). This means that pairwise ratings of 2 and 3 were excluded from the agreement calculation.

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.

Data from the Qualtrics' form are exported then merged into summary documents (see Appendix A). All reviewer input is presented in bold text following each item.

These summary documents are shared with each plan's lead author and unit leaders. On a broader scope, these plans now serve as our quality assurance system's primary annual deliverable (another procedural change from previous years). Authors are expected to include feedback, especially that are areas for growth, in the upcoming plan's outcomes and indicators then revisit progress made toward those areas in that plan's results the following year.

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?

Myriad changes have occurred and are occurring in the COE quality assurance system due to key personnel changes. Accordingly, no units are suggested as exemplary models because the protocol for preparing and using these plans is new and evolving. One primary matter to be addressed over the next year is data quality. Some plans are high-quality in terms of how faculty collaborated on data review, made data-driven decisions, and tracked those decisions over time. However, some data on which this occurred were weak. While the process was commendable, it was implemented with data of limited utility, and highlighting the process without revealing limited data is complicated.

The primary general strength of these plans has not yet been realized given the retooled quality assurance system. However, these plans, as mentioned earlier, are now our quality assurance system's primary deliverable, and strides, albeit slow, are underway to educator faculty and staff on that and facilitate their understanding of potential utility.

One quality assurance system structural adjustment that we expect will provide value to the plans is a tiered monitoring approach to be implemented in AY 2024-2025. As presented in Figure 1, embedded in a tier is the monitoring of performance (achievement of benchmarks) of the prior tier. AY 2024-2025 plans will reflect this through one performance objective in Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans that is dedicated to the monitoring of sub-units meeting benchmarks. Note: Figure 1 is an excerpt from the COE's Accountability Handbook.

Figure 1*Tiered Monitoring Approach*

Section 4: Observed Areas for Improvement within College Assessment Plans

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

Area 1: Data Quality

For teacher certification programs, assessments were evaluated within the last 2 years by a quality review process required for national accreditation. However, assessments for non-certification programs have not been analyzed through a comparable process.

Areas 2 and 3: Completeness of Assessment Plans; Indicators

Many faculty and staff were not aware these plans existed, and collaborations on data review and decision-making were not reflected in the plans cohesively. Essentially, data review and decision-making processes were somewhat fragmented. Sound examples exist of collaborative exercises with data, and we have these plans. Unfortunately, prior to this year, these two did not always intersect. Forging the intersection is an adjustment made that will be reflected more cohesively over time.

Area 3: Meta-Assessment Training

The overall low and plan-level varying IRR results reveal the need for greater training on conducting the meta-assessments. This will be implemented for the next review cycle with assistance from Office of Assessment staff.

Section 5: Strategies Needed to Address Identified Areas for Improvement

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

Strategy 1: Improve Data Quality

Addressing data quality will involve numerous people and time. Prior to AY 2023-2024, accountability staff discussed indicators in all plans with lead authors. At the fall 2023 Data Day (annual COE function), faculty and staff teams confirmed or adjusted the indicators reported in plans for AY 2023-2024. This will be repeated in fall 2024 as the effort was not fulfilled completely.

Strategy 2: Address Completeness of Plans

Like addressing data quality, ensuring completeness then quality of the assessment plans will take time. At the fall 2023 Data Day, the [COE Continuous Improvement Plan Workbook](#) was emphasized to faculty and staff. It debuted in October 2022 as a guide. Its function will be elevated this year so that faculty and staff understand it is to be used in preparing plans. An analysis of this year's plans shows that it was not used by all teams who prepared plans. The Workbook will continue to evolve annually as reviews of plans reveal areas where faculty and staff need additional support or guidance.

Strategy 3: Intentional Selection of Indicators

Beginning with AY 2023-2024, emphasis was placed on the intentional selection of indicators in each plan, even if that resulted in every prior indicator being eliminated. For some time, the plans had little utility, thus little value, in COE, and effort contributed to the plans was for compliance only. Therefore, indicators and most of the text in one year's plan was simply copied to the next year's plan. Now that the plans serve as our primary quality assurance system deliverable, progress away from the "copy and paste" approach of old is being made.

Strategy 4: Enhance Meta-Assessment Training

IRR results revealed that greater preparation for conducting meta-assessments is needed.

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.

Strategy 1: Improve Data Quality

The Assessment Committee will determine a protocol for ensuring data quality for all measures still unreviewed once indicators for all plans are solidified.

Strategy 2: Address Completeness of Plans

In consultation with unit leaders, templates for plans will be developed. These will include—within reason—common goals, learning or performance objectives, etc. The Workbook has been expanded to include prompts and examples, and these will be used in AY 2024-2025.

Strategy 3: Intentional Selection of Indicators

Accountability Team members continue to engage with program and units leads regarding indicators and how to select meaningful indicators that will be used for multiple cycles. Progress was made for AY 2023-2024 plans and will continue.

Strategy 4: Enhance Meta-Assessment Training

Staff from the Office of Assessment will be solicited to assist in training Assessment Committee members on how to conduct the meta-assessments.