

**Institutional
Continuous Improvement Report
Academic Programs
Administrative Units
Student Support Units
2020-21**

Prepared by:

Dr. Noreen Gaubatz

Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Winthrop University

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Assessment Committees.....	1
Assessment Timelines.....	1
Participation Rates.....	2
Rubric Dimensions	3
Average Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units.....	5
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units.....	6
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Academic Programs.....	8
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Administrative Units.....	10
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Student Support Units.....	12
Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan	14
Outcome Alignment with University Level Competencies (ULCs).....	15
Summary.....	16

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 (currently Department of Institutional Effectiveness).

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 (currently Department of Institutional Effectiveness) 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. The *Assessment Policy – Academic, Administrative, and Student Support Units* guides the institutional assessment process.

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 units to align their operational/program outcomes with the University’s strategic goals and to align their student learning outcomes with the University Level Competencies (ULCs), areas 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 Rubric. The rubric provides specific feedback to improve the quality and to 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:** 2020-21 CIRs and 2021-22 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 15:** 2020-21 CIRs and 2021-22 CIPs for academic and student supports units submitted to Blackboard (student support units) and OARS (academic programs).

- **September – October:** All Assessment Committee members (Academic, Administrative, Student Support) conducted quality reviews and completed Continuous Improvement Rubrics, which were returned to the respective units.

Participation Rates

One hundred and twelve programs/units were responsible for developing, implementing, and reporting on their continuous improvement process in 2020-21. **Table 1** provides the participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2020-21 CIR and 2021-22 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2020-21 CIR and 2021-22 CIP).

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

Academic Colleges	# of Programs	2020-21 CIR Participation Rate	2021-22 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	29	97%	100%
College of Business Administration	6	50%	0%
College of Education	19	100%	79%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	18	94%	39%
Overall	72	93%	71%

*Note: Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 99%; Overall 2019-20 CIR participation rate: 97%
 Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 77%; Overall 2020-21 CIP participation rate: 86%

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

Administrative/Student Support Divisions	# of Units	2020-21 CIR Participation Rate	2021-22 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	88%	75%
Access and Enrollment Management	2	100%	100%
Athletics	3	67%	33%
Finance and Business	7	57%	57%
Human Resources	1	100%	100%
Office of the President	2	50%	50%
Student Affairs	11	82%	73%
University Advancement	1	100%	0%
University College	5	100%	80%
Overall	40	80%	68%

*Note: Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 76%; Overall 2019-20 CIR participation rate: 85%
 Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 74%; Overall 2020-21 CIP participation rate: 80%

Rubric Dimensions

A Continuous Improvement Rubric is used to assess each Continuous Improvement Report (CIR). 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 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the average rating compared to the prior year.

Table 3: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Averages 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)						
Rubric Dimension	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.6	194	3.7	204	3.5	198
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.5	321	3.6	338	3.5	337
Student Learning Outcomes	3.2	339	3.3	353	3.2	341
Summary Statement	2.1	94	2.2	102	2.1	113
Activities	2.2	189	2.6	200	2.9	195
Assessment Methods	3.2	484	3.1	510	3.4	495
Assessment Results	2.6	481	2.7	506	2.6	492
Documentation	3.0	98	3.0	102	2.9	99
Action Plans	2.5	97	2.7	102	2.7	98

Green indicates a higher average rating compared to the prior year.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2020-21 data indicate an increase in the average rubric rating for two of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2019-20. Areas of *improvement* include **activities and assessment methods**. Considering the average for five of the rubric dimensions reflects less than a “maturing” rating (3) in 2020-21, *areas for continued improvement* include **summary statement, activities, assessment results, documentation, 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 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing a higher percent of a 4-rating compared to the prior year.

Table 4: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21

	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2018-19									2019-20									2020-21								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	4	2%	9	5%	44	23%	137	71%	194	4	2%	10	5%	37	18%	153	75%	204	16	8%	12	6%	19	10%	151	76%	198
Operational/Prog Outcomes	2	1%	28	9%	96	30%	195	61%	321	3	1%	14	4%	99	29%	222	66%	338	6	2%	19	6%	83	25%	221	67%	329
Student Learning Outcomes	41	12%	37	11%	74	22%	187	55%	339	39	11%	25	7%	68	19%	221	63%	353	48	14%	32	9%	62	18%	199	58%	341
Summary Statement	24	26%	48	51%	14	15%	8	9%	94	21	21%	45	44%	31	30%	5	5%	102	21	21%	32	32%	34	34%	12	12%	99
Activities	66	35%	47	25%	41	22%	35	19%	189	38	19%	52	26%	66	33%	44	22%	200	25	13%	55	28%	58	30%	57	29%	195
Assessment Methods	10	2%	61	13%	249	51%	164	34%	484	14	3%	68	13%	257	50%	171	34%	510	6	1%	62	13%	257	52%	169	34%	494
Assessment Results	133	28%	66	14%	146	30%	136	28%	481	129	25%	64	13%	161	32%	152	30%	506	153	31%	51	10%	125	26%	161	33%	490
Documentation	16	16%	20	20%	14	14%	48	49%	98	20	20%	14	14%	19	19%	49	48%	102	21	21%	13	13%	18	18%	47	47%	99
Action Plans	15	15%	30	31%	40	41%	12	12%	97	13	13%	25	25%	48	47%	16	16%	102	20	20%	12	12%	47	48%	19	19%	98

Green indicates a higher percent of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating compared to the prior year.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2020-21 data denote an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for six of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2019-20. Of these six rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **summary statement and activities**. In comparison to these results, **mission statement, operational/programmatic outcomes, assessment results, and action plans** display a *smaller percentage point increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating compared to 2019-20. Student learning outcomes is of concern, as it dropped 5 percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21.

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 of 29 programs submitted a report)
- College of Business Administration (3 of 6 programs submitted a report)
- College of Education (19 of 19 programs submitted a report)
- College of Visual and Performing Arts (17 of 18 programs submitted a report)

Data from the 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing a higher percent of a 4-rating compared to the prior year.

Table 5: Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21

	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2018-19									2019-20									2020-21								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	2	1%	9	7%	29	22%	94	70%	134	0	0%	7	5%	28	20%	103	75%	138	14	10%	9	7%	16	12%	95	71%	134
Program Outcomes	0	0%	23	11%	53	26%	125	62%	201	1	1%	7	3%	56	27%	143	69%	207	5	2%	14	7%	46	23%	136	68%	201
Student Learning Outcomes	41	12%	37	11%	72	21%	185	55%	335	39	11%	25	7%	68	20%	213	62%	345	48	14%	32	10%	62	19%	193	58%	335
Summary Statement	18	28%	39	61%	6	9%	1	2%	64	8	12%	36	52%	23	33%	2	3%	69	13	19%	27	40%	25	37%	2	3%	67
Activities	62	48%	33	26%	24	19%	10	8%	129	29	21%	39	29%	51	38%	17	13%	136	21	16%	42	32%	44	33%	26	20%	133
Assessment Methods	3	1%	47	14%	184	55%	100	30%	334	5	1%	49	14%	198	57%	93	27%	345	2	1%	47	14%	201	60%	85	25%	335
Assessment Results	90	27%	52	16%	110	33%	79	24%	331	85	25%	44	13%	131	38%	82	24%	342	112	34%	43	13%	91	27%	88	26%	334
Documentation	14	21%	17	25%	9	13%	27	40%	67	16	23%	10	14%	14	20%	29	42%	69	20	30%	9	13%	11	16%	27	40%	67
Action Plans	13	19%	25	37%	24	36%	5	7%	67	10	14%	19	28%	30	43%	10	14%	69	20	30%	7	10%	28	42%	12	18%	67

Green indicates a higher percent of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating compared to the prior year.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2020-21 data reveal an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for three of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2019-20. Of these three rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **activities**. In comparison to these results, **assessment results and action plans** show a *smaller percentage point increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating compared to 2019-20. Student learning outcomes is of concern, as it dropped 4 percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21.

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 of 7 units submitted a report)
- Access and Enrollment Management (2 of 2 units submitted a report)
- Athletics (2 of 2 units submitted a report)
- Finance and Business (4 of 7 units submitted a report)
- Human Resources (1 of 1 unit submitted a report)
- Office of the President (1 of 2 units submitted a report)
- University Advancement (1 of 1 unit submitted a report)

Data from the 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing a higher percent of a 4-rating compared to the prior year.

Table 6: Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21

	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2018-19									2019-20									2020-21								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	2	7%	0	0%	9	30%	19	63%	30	4	12%	3	9%	4	12%	23	68%	34	2	6%	3	9%	2	6%	27	79%	34
Operational Outcomes	2	3%	4	7%	24	40%	30	50%	60	1	1%	6	9%	22	33%	38	57%	67	1	1%	2	3%	19	28%	46	68%	68
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Summary Statement	3	20%	5	33%	3	20%	4	27%	15	6	35%	6	35%	4	24%	1	6%	17	4	24%	4	24%	3	18%	6	35%	17
Activities	3	10%	5	17%	7	23%	15	50%	30	7	21%	4	12%	6	18%	16	48%	33	2	6%	6	18%	5	15%	20	61%	33
Assessment Methods	6	8%	6	8%	25	33%	38	51%	75	5	6%	9	11%	26	31%	45	53%	85	2	2%	6	7%	25	29%	52	61%	85
Assessment Results	20	27%	8	11%	19	25%	28	37%	75	17	20%	13	15%	18	21%	36	43%	84	20	24%	6	7%	16	19%	42	50%	84
Documentation	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%	12	75%	16	2	12%	2	12%	0	0%	13	76%	17	1	6%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	17
Action Plans	2	13%	3	20%	5	33%	5	33%	15	1	6%	4	24%	7	41%	5	29%	17	0	0%	3	19%	7	44%	6	38%	16

Green indicates a higher percent of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating compared to the prior year.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2020-21 data suggest an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2019-20. Of these seven rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, operational outcomes, summary statement, and activities**. In comparison to these results, **assessment methods, assessment results, and action plans** express a *smaller percentage point increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating compared to 2019-20.

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:

- Academic Affairs (1 of 1 unit submitted a report)
- Athletics (0 of 1 unit submitted a report)
- Student Affairs (9 of 11 units submitted a report)
- University College (5 of 5 units submitted a report)

Data from the 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing a higher percent of a 4-rating compared to the prior year.

Table 7: Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21

	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2018-19									2019-20									2020-21								
	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N	1		2		3		4		N
Rubric Dimension	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Mission Statement	0	0%	0	0%	6	20%	24	80%	30	0	0%	0	0%	5	16%	27	84%	32	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	29	97%	30
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	1	2%	19	32%	40	67%	60	1	2%	1	2%	21	33%	41	64%	64	0	0%	3	5%	18	30%	39	65%	60
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
Summary Statement	3	20%	4	27%	5	33%	3	20%	15	7	44%	3	19%	4	25%	2	13%	16	4	27%	1	7%	6	40%	4	27%	15
Activities	1	3%	9	30%	10	33%	10	33%	30	2	6%	9	29%	9	29%	11	35%	31	2	7%	7	24%	9	31%	11	38%	29
Assessment Methods	1	1%	8	11%	40	53%	26	35%	75	4	5%	10	13%	33	41%	33	41%	80	2	3%	9	12%	31	42%	32	43%	74
Assessment Results	23	31%	6	8%	17	23%	29	39%	75	27	34%	7	9%	12	15%	34	43%	80	21	29%	2	3%	18	25%	31	43%	72
Documentation	0	0%	3	20%	3	20%	9	60%	15	2	13%	2	13%	5	31%	7	44%	16	0	0%	3	20%	4	27%	8	53%	15
Action Plans	0	0%	2	13%	11	73%	2	13%	15	2	13%	2	13%	11	69%	1	6%	16	0	0%	2	13%	12	80%	1	7%	15

Green indicates a higher percent of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating compared to the prior year.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2020-21 data show an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2019-20. Of these seven rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, summary statement, and documentation**. In comparison to these results, **operational outcomes, activities, assessment methods, and action plans** suggest a *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating compared to 2019-20.

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 operational/program outcomes* by unit that supported each institutional strategic goal in 2020-21.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan										
	2020-21 Continuous Improvement Reports										
	Goal 1		Goal 2		Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Academic Affairs	13	29%	13	29%	4	9%	7	16%	8	18%	45
Athletics	1	14%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	2	29%	7
College of Arts and Sciences	36	25%	54	38%	14	10%	25	17%	15	10%	144
College of Business Administration	5	33%	4	27%	2	13%	1	7%	3	20%	15
College of Education	23	44%	24	46%	0	0%	4	8%	1	2%	52
College of Visual and Performing Arts	19	30%	26	41%	5	8%	10	16%	3	5%	63
Enrollment Management	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	7
Finance and Business	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	25%	9	75%	12
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	41%	15	37%	2	5%	6	15%	1	2%	41
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
University College	14	50%	5	19%	4	14%	3	11%	2	7%	28
TOTAL	135	32%	145	34%	36	8%	60	14%	51	12%	427

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 2020-21 data reveal that *two-thirds* (66%) of the operational and program outcomes from all institutional units support **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (34%) or **Goal 1** – Increase in Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (32%) of the Winthrop Plan. **Goal 4** – Facilities and Technology represents 14% of all outcomes; 12% of all outcomes align with **Goal 5** – Financial Stability; and 8% of all outcomes support **Goal 3** – Quality and Diversity of Employees.

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 supported each University Level Competency (ULC) in 2020-21.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2020-21 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
College of Arts and Sciences	27	28%	20	21%	23	24%	27	28%	97
College of Business Administration	7	33%	4	19%	4	19%	6	29%	21
College of Education	12	25%	18	38%	6	13%	12	25%	48
College of Visual and Performing Arts	54	36%	17	11%	28	19%	49	33%	148
Finance and Business	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Student Affairs	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
University College	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	3
TOTAL	104	33%	59	18%	61	19%	95	30%	319

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 2020-21 data indicate that approximately *two-thirds* (63%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (33%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (30%). **ULC 3** – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 19% of all student learning outcomes, while 18% of all student learning outcomes align with **ULC 2** – Personal and Social Responsibility.

Summary

Participation rates were improving over the past few years, but have declined in 2020-21. Academic units submitted 93% of their 2020-21 Continuous Improvement Reports (CIRs), with student support units submitting 83% and administrative units submitting 77% of their expected 2020-21 CIRs. Responsibility for submission of a CIR lies with the divisional vice presidents and the academic deans. The Department of Institutional Effectiveness and the divisional/college representatives to the institutional Assessment Committees assist all units, as requested, in their assessment efforts. Current participation rates do not meet the SACSCOC requirement of 100% institutional compliance. 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 99 submitted reports.

The aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” for four of the nine rubric dimensions in 2020-21, a drop from five dimensions in 2019-20. Six of the nine rubric dimensions in 2020-21 report an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2019-20.

Academic units showed 2020-21 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of activities, assessment results, and action plans. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include student learning outcomes, which dropped four percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21.

Administrative units displayed 2020-21 significant improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of mission statements, operational outcomes, summary statements, and activities. Areas for continued improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include documentation.

Student support units reported 2020-21 significant improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of mission statements, summary statements, and documentation. Areas for continued improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include activities and action plans.

All institutional units align their operational/program outcomes with the five **Strategic Goals of the Winthrop Plan**. Although all goals are supported, 66% of the outcomes support Goal 1 (Increase in Enrollment, Retention and Graduation) or Goal 2 (Enhancement of the Student Experience).

All institutional units align their student learning outcomes with the four **University Level Competencies** (ULCs). Although all ULCs are supported, 63% of outcomes support ULC 1 (Critical Thinking) or ULC 4 (Communication).

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