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A quick question to start...

- How many have a system for evaluating the quality of assessment plans at their institution?
- How many are currently planning to start such a process at their institution?
- How many don’t have such a process, but want it?
- Did I miss anyone?
What is Meta-assessment at SHSU?

- Formal process for evaluating the quality and maturity of annual programmatic assessment plans

- Utilizes a common rubric that is applicable to all programmatic assessment plans

- Similar to the type of evaluation we will experience with SACSCOC CS 3.3.1
How is it being used?

- Formative feedback is provided to units for use in improving assessment plans

- Summative results used by colleges and university to determine existing weaknesses and to track improvement over multiple years

- Results are also used to direct resources and training, as necessary, to address identified weaknesses
Our rubric needed to...

- Be detailed and easy to use
- Match the structure of our assessment database, the OATDB
- Work for both academic and non-academic units
Structure of OATDB (Online Assessment Tracking Database)

- Goals
- Objectives
- Indicators/Criterion (for Learning Objectives)
- KPIs (for Performance Objectives)
- Findings/Results
- Actions
- Plan for Continuous Improvement elements
  - Part 1: Progress update on the previous cycle’s PCI
  - Part 2: New PCI
Structure of the rubric (Handout)

- Naturally, elements match those of the OATDB

- Each element can be scored as “Developing,” “Acceptable,” or “Exemplary”
  - Check boxes available under each area to allow for greater granularity
  - Comments section provided for each element for qualitative feedback

- Each plan is also given an overall rating of “Developing,” “Acceptable,” or “Exemplary”
Meta-assessment Rubric Location

http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/resources.html
Pilot implementation of Meta-assessment

- Office Pilot in Spring 2013
  - Wanted to test the rubric and process

- Following success of initial office pilot, proposal to the Provost and Academic Deans for a larger pilot
  - Importance of buy-in from academic leadership

- Sought nominees to serve as part of an ad-hoc Meta-assessment group
  - Two nominees sought from the seven academic colleges

- Targeted degree program units first
  - Within our Division (Academic Affairs) – So low hanging fruit
  - Would help identify weaknesses within SACSCOC CS 3.3.1.1 prior to our 5th Year Interim Report, due in March 2015
Methodology

- Group discussion to develop format for the review
  - Decided that each assessment plan would be reviewed by two reviewers
    - First rater from inside the College, the second rater from outside the College
  - Blind review process was designed to protect the anonymity of each of the reviewers and make for a more fair, unbiased evaluation

- Multiple norming sessions to familiarize Meta-assessment group with the rubric and process
Evaluation took place November 2013 – January 2014

134 total assessment plans reviewed from 7 academic colleges
- Three plans were used for group norming
- Remaining 131 assessment plans were reviewed twice (for a total of 262 completed reviews)
  - Roughly 18 assessment plans per reviewer
How are we distributing and using our results

- University-wide data has been collected and is being analyzed by the Assessment Office
  - Will serve as baseline for future improvements
  - Will guide for where we devote training and resources for assessment improvement

- Completed rubrics and data sets are provided to each of the Colleges for analysis
  - Using a common report template the Colleges will complete analysis reports of their data by end of Spring 2014

- College-level reports will be combined into an institutional analysis report for the University’s executive leadership
Challenges faced implementing Meta-assessment

- Fear of judgment or retribution
  - General fear of judgment or retribution by colleagues
  - Fear of how “outside review” would be perceived by units

- Inconsistency in the evaluations
  - Despite blind review, some inconsistencies were still seen
    - 48 of 1,179 (roughly 4%) pairings were “inconsistent,” meaning one reviewer rated an element “Developing” while another rated it “Exemplary”
    - 38 times the First Rater gave the inconsistent element the higher ranking
    - First Rater vs. Second Rater averages were “consistently inconsistent”
First Rater vs. Second Rater Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>PCI Update</th>
<th>New PCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>16.15%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td>14.17%</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
<td>28.68%</td>
<td>44.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td>14.17%</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
<td>28.68%</td>
<td>44.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>62.31%</td>
<td>59.69%</td>
<td>58.59%</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td>56.69%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>61.42%</td>
<td>54.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>52.34%</td>
<td>59.69%</td>
<td>58.59%</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td>56.69%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>61.42%</td>
<td>54.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>21.54%</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>41.09%</td>
<td>28.35%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
<td>30.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, second raters were more critical in their evaluation of each assessment element.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, was it successful?

- Overall, yes! Although there is room for improvement with regards to norming, rater reliability, and perceptions of fear and retribution
  - Fear of retribution can be eliminated through greater education and giving ownership of the process to the Colleges
  - Reliability can be improved through more norming and practice
Next steps for Meta-assessment at SHSU

- Formalize ad-hoc Meta-assessment group in a formal Assessment Liaisons committee
  - Will serve as contacts with the Colleges
  - Will advise and assist with academic assessment related matters

- Fully implement Meta-assessment within the Colleges
  - College liaisons, under the guidance and assistance of the Assessment Office, implement Meta-assessment within their areas and report back the results.
    - Sample of evaluations will be scored by the Assessment Office to ensure evaluations are accurate and reliable
Next steps for Meta-assessment at SHSU, ctd.

- Roll out Meta-assessment pilots for the remaining Divisions
  - Starting with Student Services, and working out from there
  - Following successful pilots, assessment liaisons within each Division implement Meta-assessment within their areas and report back the results
    - Sample of evaluations will be scored by the Assessment Office to ensure evaluations are accurate and reliable

- Institute a parallel Assessment Liaisons committee for non-academic Divisions
Questions?
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