



UNIVERSITY *of* MARYLAND
BALTIMORE

Best Practices in Assessment Group

Karen D Matthews, DM, MPA
Gregory Spengler, MPA

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning,
& Assessment (IESPA)

March 4, 2025

Meeting Objectives

Updates and
Announcements

MSCHE Self-Study Status
Other

Discuss

Site Visit Preparation: Role for BPAG & Assessment
Community

Incorporate

Sharing of Best Practices on BPAG Agenda

Information Sharing

- MSICHE Status
- Other - All





MSCHE Update

[2025-middle-states-self-study-report](#)



Self-Study
Status



Site Visit
(April 6-9,
2025)



Next Steps

BPAG, ILO and APAIR References in Self-Study

Page 11 - Executive Summary – Institutional Effectiveness Institutional Priority – ILOs, APAIR, BPAG

Page 14 - Executive Summary – Educational Effectiveness Assessment – Documentation and standardization of assessment activities

Page 37 - Standard II – Ethics and Integrity – ILOs, APAIR

Page 48 - Standard III – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience – ILOs, SLOs, APAIR call-out.

Page 67 - Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment (EEA) – ILOs

Page 68 - Standard V – EEA - Integration of University Processes Supporting Institutional Effectiveness diagram

Page 69 - Standard V – EEA – APAIR, Accreditation and Assessment Unit, BPAG

Page 74 - Standard V – EEA – Opportunities for Improvement – Promote APAIR reporting system among administrators for increased data transparency

Page 90 - Standard VI – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement – Evaluation and assessment activities undertaken on a regular basis

Page 91 - Standard VI – Opportunities for Improvement – Coordinate assessment activities by developing centralized method for administering and analyzing assessments (AdPAIR)

Institutional Effectiveness Institutional Priority – p.11

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Since MSCHE reaffirmed UMB's accreditation in 2016, UMB has implemented a standardized, Universitywide program to evaluate and improve academic assessment and reporting and establish institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) applicable to all students, regardless of program or degree level.

To operationalize this, UMB's Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning, and Assessment established the first Best Practices in Assessment Group (BPAG) and developed the Academic Program Assessment and Improvement Report (APAIR) system to facilitate the documentation of assessment activities at the school and program level. The University is continually enhancing its culture of assessment by continuing to educate the UMB community about BPAG, APAIR, and ILOs. In addition, across non-academic areas, there is a focus on ensuring the highest quality of services and efficiency of operations through the application of best-in-class user satisfaction measurement practices and cost modeling techniques.

Educational Effectiveness Assessment – p.14

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

The section discusses how the University uses assessment of student learning and achievement to demonstrate that its students accomplish program, degree, and institutional educational goals. It demonstrates how uniformly strong assessment practices throughout each school collectively reinforce UMB's culture of assessment. The chapter notes improvements in teaching and student achievement that have been made as a result of interpreting data, and how actions taken since the last site visit improving documentation and standardization

of assessment activities strengthen the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of UMB's institutional effectiveness processes. The chapter identifies opportunities for the University to provide support to accurately assess student achievement and communicate results; increase data transparency by regularly sharing results with key stakeholders; offer and expand resources offered by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning; and provide centralized support through the Office of the Provost to complement school-based efforts.

Standard II – Ethics and Integrity – p.37

IESPA publishes information on program retention (progression) and graduation rates, professional licensing exam pass rates, and accreditation information for UMB programs. IESPA and the Center for Information Technology Services (CITS) developed an Academic Program Assessment and Improvement Report (APAIR), which publishes the institutional learning outcomes and makes periodic assessment reporting presentations.

Standard II – Ethics and Integrity

*Criterion 8a: An accredited institution demonstrates compliance with all applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements to include reporting regarding the full **disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments**, graduation, retention, certification and licensure or licensing board pass rates.*

Question: How are institution-wide assessments and attainment of institutional learning outcomes communicated to campus stakeholders?

IESPA Website: [institutional-learning-outcomes](https://www.iespa.org/institutional-learning-outcomes)

Standard III – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience – p.48

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

Discipline-specific external professional accreditation activities are supplemented by internal institutional-level academic program reviews on a seven-year cycle. The academic program review schedule for the period starting fall 2023 to fall 2033 is published on the Office of the Provost webpage.

“ APAIR is a significant tool for achieving institutional effectiveness. ”

In addition, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning, and Assessment (IESPA) has developed an academic program assessment and improvement report (APAIR) to document assessment activities at the school and program level to further advance UMB’s culture of assessment. Beginning with the 2023-2024 academic year, all academic programs are expected to prepare and submit an annual program review. Through the APAIR process, faculty and program directors identify institutional learning outcomes, student learning outcomes, program performance indicators, and program operation goals relevant to each degree or certificate program and define the milestones or metrics to evaluate each of those goals. APAIR is a significant tool for achieving institutional effectiveness.

Standard III – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Criterion 8: An accredited institution demonstrates periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs providing student learning opportunities.

Question: APAIR is described as a tool used by faculty and program directors to identify institutional learning outcomes, student learning outcomes, program performance indicators, and program operation goals relevant to each degree or certificate program and define the milestones or metrics to evaluate each of those goals. **What are examples (evidence) of how APAIR has been used to improve institutional and student learning outcomes and improve measurable performance for specific degree programs?**

Std V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment – pp.66-67

UMB's degree and certificate programs have clearly stated educational goals against which their administrators evaluate program effectiveness. The educational goals incorporate a broad range of experiences, both on and off campus, to support robust learning environments. To link program-level goals with UMB's broader mission, administrators also map these educational goals to the University's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). UMB's primary entry-into-practice programs are accredited by national accrediting organizations, and their educational goals and objectives must be in compliance with the standards of their respective accrediting bodies.⁵⁰

Lastly, UMB has established that graduates, regardless of their chosen program of study, should emerge from their programs well-prepared across several ILOs, including community engagement; cultural competence and equity, diversity, and inclusion integration; ethics; integrity; global engagement and learning; interprofessional institutional learning; and leadership. These ILOs embody the essence of a UMB education and are intrinsic to its mission: To improve the human condition and serve the public good of Maryland and society at-large through education, research, clinical care, and service.



Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment p.68

Integration of University Processes Supporting Institutional Effectiveness Through Planning, Evaluation, Reporting, and Assessment

Icon	Explanation
	Information System Repository
	Communicates with other UMB systems: e.g., Enterprise Risk Management (ERM); Budget Funding Request System (BFRS); Strategic Plan Information Mgmt System (SPIMS)
	Reporting Timeline
	Tracks and Data Reported
	Key Contributors

Std V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment – p.69

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning, and Assessment (IESPA) provides guidance to those making decisions or establishing policies in support of fulfilling UMB's goals, one of which is Student Growth and Success, the strategic plan theme most closely aligned with educational effectiveness. To accomplish this mission, IESPA collects, reports, and presents outcomes data, conducts policy analysis, designs and administers surveys, facilitates strategic planning, supports enterprise risk management efforts, and coordinates University accreditation, assessment, and evaluation activities. As expected, IESPA plays a central role in

the University's internal approach by administering the Academic Program Assessment and Improvement Report (APAIR) program. Each of UMB's educational programs is responsible for uploading annual program effectiveness data into the electronic APAIR reporting system. Reporting forms ask for explicit program goals and corresponding outcome data. Examples of APAIR data are available in the evidence inventory. Once programs upload their data into the APAIR system, IESPA or the Best Practices in Assessment Group (BPAG) reviews the information, tracks performance, and recommends strategies for improvement, as needed.

Std V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment – pp.69,73

APAIR data also is available through a web portal for program directors and other administrators to review. This outward-facing presentation allows for visibility, accountability, and transparency. The APAIR dashboard also facilitates ongoing communication of assessment outcomes to relevant stakeholders at each school. This internal level of oversight ensures that UMB can monitor program effectiveness and provide corrective guidance to the extent needed by program directors and other administrators.

During the accreditation self-study cycles of UMB's educational programs, administrators conduct thorough reviews of their respective assessment processes to ensure that they comply with published standards. They also provide evidence supporting continuous quality improvement. When program directors find shortcomings in their assessment processes, they seek input from key stakeholders, adjust those processes as needed, and monitor effectiveness over time.

Std V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment – p.74

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Provide support to accurately assess student achievement and communicate results to stakeholders. Assessment coordinators acknowledge the effort required for effective programs and educational excellence. Publicize to faculty, students, and other constituents information about UMB's academic programs and provide more insight into the internal reviews and quality improvement processes involved.

Periodically evaluate the institution's assessment processes to improve educational effectiveness and promote the APAIR reporting system among administrators for increased data transparency. Regularly share results with key stakeholders and standardize curriculum maps and educational information locations for each program to ensure compliance.

Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Criterion 2: An accredited institution demonstrates organized and systematic assessments ... evaluating the extent of student achievement of institutional and degree/program goals.

Question 1: Is there evidence of how program level educational goals are mapped to institutional learning outcomes (page 66)?

Question 2: How is the attainment of institutional learning outcomes across all programs determined (page 67)?

Question 3: Are there additional examples of APAIR data showing explicit program goals and corresponding outcome data (page 69)?

Question 4: How does the BPAG review APAIR information, track performance and recommend strategies for improvement (page 69)?

Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Question 5: How does the APAIR dashboard facilitate communication of assessment outcomes to relevant stakeholders at each school (page 69)?

Question 6: Are there examples of shortcomings in assessment processes found through reviews of assessment processes performed during accreditation self-study cycles (page 73)?

Question 7: What are strategies to provide more insight into internal reviews and quality improvement processes to stakeholders (page 74)?

Question 8: What are strategies to promote the APAIR reporting system among administrators for increased data transparency (page 74)?

Standard VI – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement – pp. 90-91

There are additional evaluation and assessment activities undertaken on a regular basis that seek to measure the success of UMB services and programs. As an example, the information technology services program's assessment activities include annual presentations to the president and the provost that include progress reports on goals and achievements, pending and planned projects, management of fiscal resources, and requests for funding priority initiatives, if needed. Various presentations during a fiscal year are made to deans and vice presidents to provide updates and receive their input and feedback regarding projects and proposed initiatives. Presentations regarding ways of being cost-efficient are also made to FMWG.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Enhance coordination of assessment activities in non-academic units by developing a centralized method for administering and analyzing assessments from various administrative areas. This approach will increase efficiency and provide better planning and management of assessment activities.

Standard VI – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Criterion 2: An accredited institution demonstrates clearly documented and communicated planning and improvement processes that provide for constituent participation and incorporate the use of assessment results.

Question 1: Are there strategies UMB could pursue to enhance coordination of assessment activities in non-academic units and develop a centralized method for administering and analyzing assessments from various administrative areas to increase efficiency and provide better planning and management of assessment activities (page 91)?

IESPA Focus through April 2025

- Preparation for Site Visit
 - Best Practices in Assessment Group needs / feedback
 - Speculate on Peer Evaluator expectations
 - Showcase assessment efforts and school/program readiness
 - Confirm UMB's assessment mission
 - Provide ways that IE initiatives are influencing assessment practices
 - Encourage successful sharing of assessment practices
 - Prepare senior leaders on institutional assessment practices
 - What would help inform your stakeholders of BPAG/IE initiatives?



Next BPAG Meeting

Tuesday, April 1, 2025

11:00AM



For Additional Information:

Review: the Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic
Planning, and Assessment website at

www.umaryland.edu/iespa

OR

Email: UMBassessment@umaryland.edu

Contacts:

Karen Matthews karen.matthews@umaryland.edu

Greg Spengler gspengler@umaryland.edu

Lauren Crum lcrum@umaryland.edu