

Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the College of
Fine Arts and Mass Communication
(2015-16 CampusLabs Submission)

March 2017

Year 3
FAMC CLabs Evaluation Committee (FCLEC)
Assessment

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

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 Fine Arts and Mass Communication, 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.

FAMC CLABS EVALUATION COMMITTEE (FCLEC)

The continuing CLABS Evaluation Plan ("meta-assessment" plan) for FAMC was discussed in chairs meetings (Spring/June 2016). The FCLEC (FAMC CLABS Evaluation Committee, formerly FOEC), our college-level committee* created to evaluate CLABS submissions was comprised of department chairs and/or recommended faculty members who had been involved in CLABS submissions, and the two college representatives on the Spring 2014 University Meta-Assessment Committee (Michael Henderson-Art Chair, Brian Miller-FAMC Associate Dean).

*(2013-14: Edward Morin, Jennifer Pontius, Jean Bodon & Chris White, Scott Plugge, Penny Hasekoester & Tom Prior) (2014-15: Tony Watkins, Jennifer Pontius, Jean Bodon & Robin Johnson, Scott Plugge, Penny Hasekoester) (2015-16: Tony Watkins, Jennifer Pontius, Jean Bodon & Robin Johnson & Marcus Funk, Kevin Clifton, Kristina Hanssen)

EVALUATION PROCESS

Descriptive feedback (Exemplary, Acceptable, Developing - format established by the university) shared with departments was converted into a numeric format (1, 2, 3, respectively). Aside from that modification, the college evaluation process essentially mirrored the methods established for 2012-13 OATDB (Online Assessment Tracking Database) submissions by the APA (Academic Planning and Assessment) Office for the university-level Meta-Assessment committee: rubric-based evaluation completed by two evaluators, with disparate evaluations (1 exemplary and 1 developing) to receive additional review. Reviewer identifiers were removed from feedback forwarded to chairs.

MEASURES TO ASSURE RELIABILITY

In the spring of 2014, meetings with individual departments (chair and their suggested assessment representative) were held to clarify assessment terminology and to discuss the feedback received on 2012-13 OATDB submissions from the University Meta-Assessment committee. A standing FAMC OATDB Evaluation Committee (FOEC) initially established in May/June 2014 with representation from each department, is convened annually in June by the college. FOEC was renamed FCLEC (FAMC CampusLabs Evaluation Committee) to align with new assessment software program., To address reliability, all new delegates to the FCLEC receive training (assessment terminology, rubric components, connection and sequence of components) and participate in an evaluation “calibration” meeting as evaluations commence to discuss the coordination and consistency of evaluation and feedback.

TIMELINE

- Yr “0”-Evaluation of 2012-13 submissions by University Assessment Committee (2013-14)
 - Results shared with Chairs to prepare for FAMC evaluation of 2013-14 submissions
- Yr 1 – 2013-14 FOEC Formative Evaluation procedures and schedule established (Spr 2014)
 - FOEC evaluate drafts of OATDB academic program submissions (July 2014)
 - Chairs submit feedback-informed OATDB submissions by Univ schedule (Aug/Sept)
- Yr 2- 2014-15 FOEC Formative Evaluation procedures and schedule continued (Spr 2015)
 - FOEC evaluate drafts of OATDB academic program submissions (July 2015)
 - Chairs submit feedback-informed OATDB submissions by Univ schedule (Aug/Sept)
 - Evaluation of draft OATDB unit submissions requested but postponed to 2016
- Yr 3- 2015-16 FCLEC Formative Evaluation procedures and schedule continues (Spr 2016)
 - FCLEC evaluate drafts of CLABS academic program submissions (July 2016)
 - Chairs submit feedback-informed CLABS submissions by Univ schedule (Aug/Sept)
 - Evaluation (previously postponed) of draft CLABS unit submissions included 2016
- Yr 4- 2016-17 FCLEC Formative Evaluation procedures and schedule continues (Spr 2017)

PREPARATION FOR 2015-16 CLABS SUBMISSION

Late May/Early June 2016-Experience from previous summers was drawn upon heavily as college evaluation (meta-assessment) procedures became more institutionalized. FCLEC members were determined, new members were trained, and the calibration and procedures meeting scheduled. The following was derived from previous experience and/or those meetings:

- Alignment and clarification of CLABS assessment terminology and definitions
- Clarifying CLABS process for adding components and verifying
- Review of components and CLABS submissions/evaluations
- Sharing of college’s analysis of departmental averages based on college analysis model
- Identifying strength/weakness hierarchy of components based on college analysis model
- Facilitating formative feedback with timeline that avoids Aug-Sept time conflicts
- Revising and completing 2015-16 CLABS submissions (in Draft mode) by July 1, and considering formative feedback before submission of final version for Univ (Aug/Sept)

Mid June - Department chairs previously agreed and confirmed 1) they did NOT wish to be completing CLABS submissions in September due to numerous other tasks requiring their attention at the beginning of the semester, and 2) they would prefer receiving formative feedback that could be used BEFORE the final CLABS submissions were due. To those ends, the chairs agreed they would submit, in DRAFT mode, their COMPLETE submissions (including Actions and Plan for Continuous improvement) in CLABS well before the Aug 1 university deadline. Rubrics with feedback from the FCLEC were shared a week after departmental submission, which enabled departments, informed with formative feedback, to revise their submissions and complete their 2015-16 CLABS process by August 1. Per previous year's request from the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, draft CLABS unit submissions were included for the first time in the AY16 college evaluation process.

July 1* - Dept submission deadline to submit ALL 2015-16 CLABS elements (DRAFT version)
July 1-8 - FCLEC complete 2 evaluations per submission on departments other than their own
July 18 - Chairs and FCLEC members receive formative feedback on their program submissions
July 18 - Aug 1 - Depts discuss/revise submissions informed by FCLEC formative assessment
July 24 - Follow-up meeting with chairs to review/clarify components (i.e. Actions & PCI)
Aug 1 - University deadline for entering Findings and Results (FAMC entry of all elements)
Sep 1 - University deadline for entering Actions and Plan for Continuous Improvement Elements
Oct 1 - University deadline - 2015-16 Period Closed for Entry

*The college continued its established timelines that preceded those of the university, thus allowing for review and sharing of feedback for all components, and allowing for revision and final submission that would be informed by the review and feedback.

ANTICIPATION OF 2016-17 CampusLabs (CLABS) SUBMISSION

Sept 1, 2016 - CampusLabs open for entry for 2015-16
Sept 22, 2016 - Met w/ chairs to clarify/discuss assessment timeline (see attachment)
Dec 1, 2016 - Univ Deadline for Assessment Plan updated (earlier timeline)
July 2017 - College deadline for draft CampusLabs submission and evaluation by FCLEC
Aug 1, 2017 - Univ Deadline for entry of Findings and Results
Sept 5, 2017 - Univ Deadline for entry of Actions & Plan for Continuous Improvement elements

Spring 2017-The college will review and build on submissions and procedures implemented in previous years, which included collecting the review/evaluation results from the FCLEC and converting to numeric terms to help identify strengths and areas for improvement at the college, department, and program level. Meeting(s) with those involved with department CLABS submissions may be scheduled to consider revisions related to possible new objectives and continuous improvement efforts.

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 formative evaluation (“meta-assessment”) of the 2015-16 CLABS draft submissions (that included evaluation rubrics and comments completed by the FCLEC) were shared with Department Chairs in July 2016. Developing, Acceptable, and Exemplary ratings were converted by the Associate Dean for Assessment to 1, 2, and 3, which facilitated more discrete evaluation information.

Numeric summary information from the converted ratings was created and reviewed, and aggregated College data was captured. 2015-16 CLABS submissions were assessed by the FCLEC (see Section 1), and the rubric and the assessment and reporting processes for previous years OATDB submissions were essentially duplicated for 2015-16 CLABS submissions, as was the process of sharing the rubrics with the departments. In 2014, during meetings with individual departments, discussions focused on evaluation averages of the components, which were arranged in order for the department, weakest to strongest, revealing areas of strength and weakness, and suggesting priorities for future CLABS assessments.

In 2016, due to unfamiliarity with CampusLabs and related new terminology (i.e. “Closing Update”, Closing Summary), and the alignment of “Actions,” a meeting was held with chairs on July 25 to clarify and assist in their submissions. It will again be noted that the FCLEC evaluation in July was formative rather than summative, which allowed departments to consider the assessments by the FCLEC and revise their draft submissions previous to university’s submission deadlines of August 1 and September 1. A second followup meeting was held on Sept 25.

Feedback of four submissions from the APA office received on May 30, 2017 was “In general, our reviews were pretty in line with your team’s reviews, with a few spots where we were more critical.” Similar feedback from 2015 included suggestions for the FAMC committee 1) to “apply a slightly more critical eye in conducting their reviews” and 2) to “increase the volume of written feedback they provide the units they review. Especially when it comes to the overall comments. I would generally expect every rubric to have some comments throughout.” This information was shared with the FCLEC during the calibration meeting on July 1, 2016.

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?

See “CLabs Evaluation Feedback 2015-16 26Jul16.xlsx” attachment.

(The worksheets are the result of conversions of ratings that facilitated numeric averages at the college, department, and program level. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers, the numeric information clearly indicates the comparable strength or weakness of the entry for each components.)

From a college average perspective, the general trends observed in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 results continued in 2015-16, specifically, the first four components were the strongest areas (the last four components were the weakest areas). Generally, the departments continue to

demonstrate more strength in articulating goals, objectives, indicators, and criterion than in articulating findings/results and actions, and aligning them with previous and future plans for continuous improvement (“Closing Update” and Closing Summary”).

Art BFA and Mass Communication BA (not MA) are submissions that could again be generally recommended as exemplary models for other departments in our college.

Section 4: Observed Weaknesses within College Assessment Plan

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?

See “CLabs Evaluation Feedback 2015-16 26Jul16.xlsx” attachment.

(The worksheets are the result of conversions of ratings that facilitated numeric averages at the college, department, and program level. Based on the evaluation of two reviewers, the numeric information clearly indicates the comparable strength or weakness of the entry for each components.)

For the college, the last four components continue to be the weakest areas. Generally, the departments generally struggled with articulating findings/results and actions, and aligning them with previous and future plans for continuous improvement (“Closing Update” and Closing Summary”).

Regarding 2015-16 CLABS submissions, while there was generally a better understanding assessment terminology than previous years, it bears repeating that unfamiliarity with CampusLabs and related new terminology, specifically “Closing Update” and Closing Summary, and the alignment of “Actions” to those components was challenging, and was addressed in a follow-up meetings with department chairs on July 25 and Sept 25.

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, contained in the evaluations by the FCLEC of the 2015-16 draft submissions, will continue to be shared with department chairs, with the intention that the chair and/or department assessment team would complete the final versions of their 2015-16 submissions informed with feedback and discussion which focused on weaker areas. The challenging unfamiliarity with CampusLabs and related new terminology and the alignment of “Actions” to those components was addressed in a follow-up meeting with department chairs on July 25, and will continue to be topics of discussion with chairs, submitters, and evaluators.

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.

TRAINING/RESOURCE SUGGESTIONS

Identify/contact new chairs and/or faculty newly assigned to prepare CLABS submission

Create/improve toolkit for chairs, CLABS submitters, and FCLEC members

- Continue to clarify definitions of terminology; include keywords
- Continue to clarify and contextualize connection and sequence of components
 - Provide strong examples (with brief explanation)
 - Provide weak examples (with brief explanation)

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

Provide flowchart-like guide to assessment process (completed - July 2016)

Provide information/support/training in multiple formats

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

Evaluations to be completed by small university-level group (department chair suggestion)

Appendix A

(All Completed Meta-assessment Rubrics)

Appendix B

(OAT Evaluation Feedback 2015-16 24Jul15)

Appendix C

(memo re CampusLab Eval details Final 1Apr16)

Appendix D

(FAMC CLabs Eval Folup Mtng 25Jul16)

Appendix E

(Element Sequence CompusLabs Assessment 19Sep16)

Appendix F

(CLablsAssessmentPlanSUMmTimeline 22Sep16)