

Continuous Improvement Report

Academic Programs

Administrative Units

Student Support Units

2018-19

Prepared by:

Dr. Noreen Gaubatz

Director of Assessment

Winthrop University

Introduction

Historically, academic programs and select student support areas engaged regularly in an annual assessment process. These units identified student learning and programmatic outcomes, implemented assessment methods, and gathered and analyzed data. All completed assessment reports were submitted to the OARS software system, an institutional repository supported by AAAS.

In an effort to document continuous improvement efforts across the institution and to demonstrate compliance with SACSCOC requirements, the assessment process was expanded in 2017-18. With the approval of senior leadership, the Office of Assessment established the protocol for an annual institutional assessment process, including peer review to address quality and rigor of continuous improvement efforts. Based on the established annual assessment cycle for academic programs, a similar process for administrative and student support units was initiated. Key elements of this assessment process include identification of student learning/operational outcomes; activities; assessment methods; performance targets; data collection, analysis, and interpretation; and continuous improvement action plans for execution in the subsequent assessment cycle.

SACSCOC standards require that “an institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results” for educational programs, student support services, and administrative units (*The Principles of Accreditation*, standards 7.3 and 8.2). Additionally, this assessment initiative enables unit outcomes to align with the strategic goals of Winthrop University, an area of particular interest to senior leadership and the Board of Trustees.

Assessment Committees

Three Assessment Committees, established in 2017-18, provide a quality review of the Continuous Improvement Reports (CIR) and Continuous Improvement Plans (CIP), based on established criteria specified in the Continuous Improvement Rubrics. The rubric provides specific feedback to improve the quality and increase the rigor of each unit’s CIR and CIP. The Assessment Committees are comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators from across all colleges and divisions – Academic Assessment Committee (28 members), Administrative Assessment Committee (14 members), Student Support Assessment Committee (14 members). In preparation for the review process, committee members attend assessment training workshops in the spring semester and engage in a rubric norming session in the fall semester.

Assessment Timelines

- **September 1:** 2018-19 CIRs and 2019-20 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 1 – October 15:** Administrative Assessment Committee members conducted quality reviews and completed Continuous Improvement Rubrics, which were returned to the respective administrative units.
- **September 15:** 2018-19 CIRs and 2019-20 CIPs for academic and student supports units submitted to Blackboard (student support units) and OARS (academic programs).
- **September 15 – October 30:** Academic Assessment Committee members and Student Support Assessment Committee members conducted quality reviews and completed Continuous

Improvement Rubrics, which were returned to the respective academic programs or student support units.

Participation Rates in the 2018-19 Assessment Cycle

One hundred and eleven programs/units were responsible for developing, implementing, and reporting on their continuous improvement process in 2018-19. **Table 1** provides the participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2018-19 CIR and 2019-20 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2018-19 CIR and 2019-20 CIP).

Table 1. Participation Rates in the Continuous Improvement Process for Academic Programs

Academic Colleges	# of Programs	2018-19 CIR Participation Rate	2019-20 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	28	100%	100%
College of Business Administration	6	100%	17%
College of Education	17	100%	100%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	18	94%	39%
Overall	69	99%	77%

*Note: 2017-18 CIR participation rate: 99%

Table 2. Participation Rates in the Continuous Improvement Process for Administrative and Student Support Units

Administrative/Student Support Divisions	# of Units	2018-19 CIR Participation Rate	2019-20 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	88%	88%
Access and Enrollment Management	2	100%	100%
Athletics	3	0%	33%
Finance and Business	9	56%	56%
Human Resources	1	100%	100%
President's Office	2	100%	50%
Student Affairs	11	91%	82%
University Advancement	1	100%	100%
University College	5	80%	80%
Overall	42	76%	74%

*Note: 2017-18 CIR participation rate: 87%
2018-19 CIP participation rate: 87%

Rubric Dimensions

A Continuous Improvement Rubric is used to assess each Continuous Improvement Report. The rubric dimensions address the various components of the assessment cycle. Each of the rubric components is described below.

1. The **mission statement** concisely describes the unit's purpose, primary functions, and constituencies served (i.e., who is the unit, what does the unit do, how does the unit do it, whom does the unit serve). The rubric assesses the following aspects of the mission statement: clarity and alignment with university mission.
2. **Student learning outcomes** (SLOs) clearly state the expected knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that students are expected to acquire and reliably demonstrate by the end of the educational experience. The rubric assesses the following aspects of student learning outcomes: measurable and observable, alignment with unit mission, curriculum map, level of challenge, and number of student learning outcomes.
3. **Program outcomes** address important academic programmatic aspects, aside from student learning, particularly as they pertain to the quality and productivity of the program. Similarly, **operational outcomes** are specific statements, generally process-oriented, that address the administrative or student support units' performance, particularly in regard to operations, programs, and services. The rubric assesses the following aspects of the program/operational outcomes: measurable, alignment with unit mission, significance of outcomes, and number of outcomes.
4. The **summary statement of assessment-based accomplishments and improvements** highlights the impact of engaging in data-informed actions on student learning and/or unit performance. The rubric assesses the following aspect of the summary statement: evidence of impact.
5. **Activities** describe the actions taken in support of attaining the desired outcomes. The rubric assesses the following aspects of the activities: alignment with previous year's action plans and assessment context.
6. **Assessment methods** are the strategies, techniques, tools, and instruments used for collecting information to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are attained. The rubric assesses the following aspects of the assessment methods: relationship between methods and outcomes, data collection process, multiplicity of assessment measures, types of assessment measures, and specificity of targets.
7. **Assessment results** are the findings gathered from executing the activities. Analysis of the data/information determines the extent to which the desired outcomes have been realized. The rubric assesses the following aspects of the assessment results: presentation of results, comparison to historical data, attainment of targets, sharing of results, and interpretation of results.
8. **Documentation** includes the materials/documents that provide evidence of the assessment methods used and the assessment results attained. The rubric assesses the following aspect of the documentation: appropriate documentation.

9. ***Continuous improvement action plans*** describe the data-informed activities to be undertaken in the subsequent year to enhance student learning and/or unit performance. The rubric assesses the following aspect of the continuous improvement action plan: alignment with results and outcomes.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

All Institutional Units – Average of Rubric Ratings

All institutional Continuous Improvement Reports are assessed on nine dimensions within the Continuous Improvement Rubric. **Table 3** indicates the average rating (4-point rating scale) across each rubric dimension for all reporting institutional units (academic, administrative, and student support).

Data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the average from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Table 3. All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Averages 2017-18 vs 2018-19

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)				
Rubric Dimension	2017-18		2018-19	
	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.4	214	3.6	194
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.0	358	3.5	321
Student Learning Outcomes	3.1	343	3.2	339
Summary Statement	1.8	66	2.1	94
Activities	2.5	173	2.2	189
Assessment Methods	3.2	535	3.2	484
Assessment Results	2.6	409	2.6	481
Documentation	2.8	106	3.0	98
Action Plans	2.4	107	2.5	97

Green indicates a higher average for 2018-19 than for 2017-18.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

The data indicate an increase in the average rubric rating for six of the nine rubric dimensions from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle. Areas of particular *strength* include **mission statement, operational/program/student learning outcomes, and assessment methods**. Considering the average for four of the rubric dimensions reflects the “developing” rating, *areas for improvement* include **summary statement, activities, assessment results, and action plans**.

All Institutional Units – Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings

All institutional Continuous Improvement Reports are assessed on nine dimensions within the Continuous Improvement Rubric. **Table 4** summarizes the frequency distribution of ratings (4-point rating scale) across each rubric dimension for all reporting institutional units (academic, administrative, and student support).

Data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Table 4. All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18 vs 2018-19

Rubric Dimension	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																	
	2017-18									2018-19								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	
Mission Statement	2	1%	20	9%	80	37%	112	52%	214	4	2%	9	5%	44	23%	137	71%	194
Operational/Prog Outcomes	22	6%	86	24%	125	35%	125	35%	358	2	1%	28	9%	96	30%	195	61%	321
Student Learning Outcomes	36	10%	56	16%	104	30%	147	43%	343	41	12%	37	11%	74	22%	187	55%	339
Summary Statement	33	50%	19	29%	11	17%	3	5%	66	24	26%	48	51%	14	15%	8	9%	94
Activities	29	17%	52	30%	66	38%	26	15%	173	66	35%	47	25%	41	22%	35	19%	189
Assessment Methods	15	3%	82	15%	238	44%	200	37%	535	10	2%	61	13%	249	51%	164	34%	484
Assessment Results	81	20%	80	20%	155	38%	93	23%	409	133	28%	66	14%	146	30%	136	28%	481
Documentation	11	10%	28	26%	38	36%	29	27%	106	16	16%	20	20%	14	14%	48	49%	98
Action Plans	25	23%	24	22%	50	47%	8	7%	107	15	15%	30	31%	40	41%	12	12%	97

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating for 2018-19 than for 2017-18.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

The data denote an increase in the frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rating for eight of the nine rubric dimensions from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, operational/program/student learning outcomes, and documentation**. In comparison to these results, **summary statement, activities, assessment results, and action plan** display a much *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first year to the second year.

Academic Programs – Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings

All academic Continuous Improvement Reports are assessed on nine dimensions within the Continuous Improvement Rubric. **Table 5** summarizes the frequency distribution of ratings (4-point rating scale) across each rubric dimension for all reporting academic programs. These data reflect reports from College of Arts and Sciences (28 programs), College of Business Administration (6 programs), College of Education (17 programs), and College of Visual and Performing Arts (17 programs).

Data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Table 5. Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18 vs 2018-19

	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																	
	2017-18									2018-19								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	2	1%	10	7%	51	38%	71	53%	134	2	1%	9	7%	29	22%	94	70%	134
Program Outcomes	22	11%	73	37%	49	25%	54	27%	198	0	0%	23	11%	53	26%	125	62%	201
Student Learning Outcomes	36	11%	56	17%	102	30%	141	42%	335	41	12%	37	11%	72	21%	185	55%	335
Summary Statement	33	50%	19	29%	11	17%	3	5%	66	18	28%	39	61%	6	9%	1	2%	64
Activities	28	21%	43	32%	46	35%	16	12%	133	62	48%	33	26%	24	19%	10	8%	129
Assessment Methods	3	1%	55	16%	150	45%	127	38%	335	3	1%	47	14%	184	55%	100	30%	334
Assessment Results	58	22%	58	22%	96	36%	56	21%	268	90	27%	52	16%	110	33%	79	24%	331
Documentation	10	15%	20	30%	26	39%	11	16%	67	14	21%	17	25%	9	13%	27	40%	67
Action Plans	23	34%	17	25%	24	36%	3	4%	67	13	19%	25	37%	24	36%	5	7%	67

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating for 2018-19 than for 2017-18.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

The data reveal an increase in the frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rating for six of the nine rubric dimensions from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle. Of these six rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, program/student learning outcomes, and documentation**. In comparison to these results, **assessment results and action plans** show a much *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first year to the second year.

Administrative Units – Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings

All administrative Continuous Improvement Reports are assessed on nine dimensions within the Continuous Improvement Rubric. **Table 6** summarizes the frequency distribution of ratings (4-point rating scale) across each rubric dimension for all reporting administrative units. These data reflect reports from Academic Affairs (6 units), Enrollment Management (2 units), Finance and Business (5 units), Human Resources (1 unit), Office of the President (2 units), and University Advancement (1 unit).

Data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Table 6. Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18 vs 2018-19

	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																	
	2017-18									2018-19								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	0	0%	8	19%	20	48%	14	33%	42	2	7%	0	0%	9	30%	19	63%	30
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	7	8%	46	55%	31	37%	84	2	3%	4	7%	24	40%	30	50%	60
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
Summary Statement	-		-		-		-		0	3	20%	5	33%	3	20%	4	27%	15
Activities	1	5%	3	14%	10	48%	7	33%	21	3	10%	5	17%	7	23%	15	50%	30
Assessment Methods	6	6%	13	12%	43	41%	43	41%	105	6	8%	6	8%	25	33%	38	51%	75
Assessment Results	16	19%	16	19%	32	38%	20	24%	84	20	27%	8	11%	19	25%	28	37%	75
Documentation	1	5%	1	5%	6	30%	12	60%	20	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%	12	75%	16
Action Plans	2	10%	3	14%	13	62%	3	14%	21	2	13%	3	20%	5	33%	5	33%	15

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating for 2018-19 than for 2017-18.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

The data suggest an increase in the frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rating for eight of the nine rubric dimensions from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, activities, documentation, and action plans**. In comparison to these results, **operational outcomes, assessment methods, and assessment results** express a *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first to the second year.

The summary statement was not a required component of the 2017-18 Continuous Improvement Reports. Note that the student learning outcome dimension has increased by 50%, but this only represents an “n” of 2.

Student Support Units – Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings

All student support Continuous Improvement Reports are assessed on nine dimensions within the Continuous Improvement Rubric. **Table 7** summarizes the frequency distribution of ratings (4-point rating scale) across each rubric dimension for all reporting student support units. These data reflect reports from Library (1 unit), Student Affairs (10 units), and University College (4 units).

Data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Table 7. Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18 vs 2018-19

Rubric Dimension	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																		
	2017-18									2018-19									
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	0	0%	2	5%	9	24%	27	71%	38	0	0%	0	0%	6	20%	24	80%	30	
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	6	8%	30	39%	40	53%	76	0	0%	1	2%	19	32%	40	67%	60	
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	6	75%	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	
Summary Statement	-		-		-		-		0	3	20%	4	27%	5	33%	3	20%	15	
Activities	0	0%	6	32%	10	53%	3	16%	19	1	3%	9	30%	10	33%	10	33%	30	
Assessment Methods	6	6%	14	15%	45	47%	30	32%	95	1	1%	8	11%	40	53%	26	35%	75	
Assessment Results	7	12%	6	11%	27	47%	17	30%	57	23	31%	6	8%	17	23%	29	39%	75	
Documentation	0	0%	7	37%	6	32%	6	32%	19	0	0%	3	20%	3	20%	9	60%	15	
Action Plans	0	0%	4	21%	13	68%	2	11%	19	0	0%	2	13%	11	73%	2	13%	15	

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating for 2018-19 than for 2017-18.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

- 1 = Beginning
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Maturing
- 4 = Exemplary

The data show an increase in the frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle. Of these seven rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **operational outcomes, activities, and documentation**. In comparison to these results, **mission statement, assessment methods, assessment results, and action plans** suggest a much *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first year to the second year.

The summary statement was not a required component of the 2017-18 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Operational/Program Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan

In the true spirit of institutional effectiveness, academic, administrative, and student support units align their operational and program outcomes with the goals of the Winthrop Plan, thus reflecting the institutional mission fulfillment status. **Table 8** summarizes the number of outcomes by unit that supports each institutional strategic goal.

Table 8. Institutional Strategic Goals Supported by Academic, Administrative, and Student Support Units

All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan											
2018-19 Continuous Improvement Reports											
Area	Goal 1		Goal 2		Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Academic Affairs	16	34%	12	26%	3	6%	10	21%	6	13%	47
College of Arts and Sciences	34	26%	45	35%	24	18%	21	16%	6	5%	130
College of Business Administration	5	28%	6	33%	3	17%	1	6%	3	17%	18
College of Education	23	50%	19	41%	0	0%	2	4%	2	4%	46
College of Visual and Performing Arts	15	31%	18	37%	3	6%	10	20%	3	6%	49
Enrollment Management	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	7
Finance and Business	3	23%	0	0%	2	15%	4	31%	4	31%	13
Human Resources	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	4
Office of the President	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	4
Student Affairs	17	40%	17	40%	2	4%	6	14%	1	2%	43
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
University College	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	15
TOTAL	132	35%	120	32%	42	11%	55	14%	31	8%	380

Goal 1 – Support inclusive excellence by expanding our impact on students and our communities through enrollment growth and increases in retention and graduation rates.

Goal 2 – Continually enhance the quality of the Winthrop experience for all students by promoting a culture of innovation, with an emphasis on global and community engagement.

Goal 3 – Attract and retain high quality and diverse faculty, staff, and administrators.

Goal 4 – Provide facilities, technology, and programs that support Winthrop students and the overall Winthrop experience.

Goal 5 – Ensure financial stability and sustainability.

The data reveal that approximately *two-thirds* (67%) of the operational and program outcomes from all institutional units support **Goal 1** – Increase in Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (35%) or **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (32%) of the Winthrop Plan. Goal 4 – Facilities and Technology represents 14% of all outcomes; 11% of all outcomes support Goal 3 – Quality and Diversity of Employees; and 8% of all outcomes align with Goal 5 – Financial Stability.

Student Learning Outcome Alignment with University Level Competencies (ULCs)

Academic, administrative, and student support units align their student learning outcomes with the University Level Competencies (ULCs), reflecting the institutional commitment to student learning.

Table 9 summarizes the number of student learning outcomes by unit that supports each University Level Competency (ULC).

Table 9. Institutional University Level Competencies (ULCs) Supported by Academic, Administrative, and Student Support Units

	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2018-19 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		
Area	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
College of Arts and Sciences	23	25%	21	23%	27	29%	21	23%	92
College of Business Administration	6	32%	4	21%	4	21%	5	26%	19
College of Education	7	35%	3	15%	1	5%	9	45%	20
College of Visual and Performing Arts	24	31%	10	13%	16	21%	27	35%	77
Finance and Business	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
University College	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
TOTAL	62	30%	38	18%	48	23%	62	30%	210

Competency 1 – Winthrop graduates think critically and solve problems.

Competency 2 – Winthrop graduates are personally and socially responsible.

Competency 3 – Winthrop graduates understand the interconnected nature of the world and the time in which they live.

Competency 4 – Winthrop graduates communicate effectively.

The data indicate that *three-fifths* (60%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (30%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (30%). ULC 3 – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 23% of all student learning outcomes, while 18% of all student learning outcomes align with ULC 2 – Personal and Social Responsibility.

Summary

Participation rates are less than desirable, considering that SACSCOC requires 100% institutional compliance. Academic units submitted 99% of their expected 2018-19 CIRs, thus the concern lies more heavily with administrative units and student support units, respective submission rates of 71% and 89%. Responsibility for submission of a Continuous Improvement Report (CIR) lies with the divisional vice presidents and the academic deans. The Office of Assessment and the divisional/college representatives to the institutional Assessment Committees assist all units, as requested, in their assessment efforts. Aside from SACSCOC accountability, assessment is a means to assure continuous improvement within the individual unit, thus contributing to unit and institutional effectiveness.

In addition to the submission of a CIR by each institutional unit, the appropriate Assessment Committee reviews the **quality of the assessment work**. The data presented throughout this report represent the dedicated work of the institutional assessment committees in applying the CIR Rubric to 100 submitted reports.

The aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” (range of 3.0-3.6) for five of the nine rubric dimensions. Eight of the nine rubric dimensions report an increase in the frequency of “4 – Exemplary” ratings from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle.

Academic units show improvement from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle in the areas of mission statement, program/student learning outcomes, and documentation. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include summary statements, activities, assessment results, and action plans.

Administrative units display improvement from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle in the areas of mission statement, activities, and action plans. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include summary statements and assessment results.

Student support units report improvement from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 reporting cycle in the areas of operational outcomes, activities, and documentation. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include student learning outcomes, summary statements, assessment methods, and action plans.

After two years of implementing an institution-wide assessment process, the data indicate that assessment efforts within academic, administrative, and student support units continue to advance.