



WINTHROP UNIVERSITY

**Institutional
Continuous Improvement Report**

Academic Programs

Administrative Units

Student Support Units

2021-22

Prepared by:

Dr. Noreen Gaubatz

Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	2
Assessment Committees.....	2
Assessment Timelines.....	2
Participation Rates.....	3
Rubric Dimensions	4
Average Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units	6
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units	7
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Academic Programs.....	9
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Administrative Units.....	11
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Student Support Units.....	13
Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan	15
Outcome Alignment with University Level Competencies (ULCs).....	16

Executive Summary

Participation rates have been improving over the past few years. Academic units submitted 93% of their 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports (CIRs), with student support units submitting 87% and administrative units submitting 86% of expected 2021-22 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.

All 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports submitted by institutional units were reviewed for **quality of the assessment work** by the appropriate Assessment Committee (i.e., Academic, Administrative, Student Support). 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 2021-22 aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” for four of the nine rubric dimensions. Four of the nine rubric dimensions report an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2020-21.

Academic units showed 2021-22 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of mission statements, summary statements, activities, assessment methods, and assessment results. Four areas, however, were not addressed in approximately one-quarter to one-third of CIRs (i.e., summary statements, assessment results, documentation, action plans).

Administrative units displayed 2021-22 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of mission statements and action plans. Summary statements, however, were not addressed in approximately one-quarter of CIRs.

Student support units reported 2021-22 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings) in the areas of mission statements, summary statements, activities, assessment methods, and action plans. Three areas, however, were not addressed in approximately one-quarter to one-third of CIRs (i.e., summary statements, assessment results, documentation).

All institutional units align their operational/program outcomes with the five **Strategic Goals of the Winthrop Plan**. Although all goals are supported, 67% 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, 61% of outcomes support ULC 1 (Critical Thinking) or ULC 4 (Communication).

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

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 operational outcomes; student learning outcomes, if applicable; 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) submitted by academic, administrative, and student support units, 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, 2022:** 2021-22 CIRs and 2022-23 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 15, 2022:** 2021-22 CIRs and 2022-23 CIPs for academic and student supports units submitted to Blackboard (student support units) and OARS (academic programs).

- September – October 2022:** All Assessment Committee members (i.e., Academic, Administrative, Student Support) conducted quality reviews and completed Continuous Improvement Rubrics, which were returned to the respective units.

Participation Rates

One hundred and nine programs/units were responsible for developing, implementing, and reporting on their continuous improvement process in 2021-22. **Table 1** provides participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2021-22 CIR and 2022-23 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2021-22 CIR and 2022-23 CIP).

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

Academic College	# of Programs	2021-22 CIR Participation Rate	2022-23 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	31	100%	100%
College of Business Administration	8	38%	0%
College of Education	18	100%	78%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	16	100%	44%
Overall	73	93%	71%

***Note:** Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 99%; Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 97%
 Overall 2019-20 CIR participation rate: 77%; Overall 2020-21 CIP participation rate: 86%
 Overall 2020-21 CIR participation rate: 93%; Overall 2021-22 CIP participation rate: 71%

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

Administrative Division	# of Units	2021-22 CIR Participation Rate	2022-23 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	100%	100%
Athletics	3	100%	67%
Enrollment Management and Marketing	2	100%	100%
Finance and Business	6	83%	100%
Human Resources	1	0%	0%
Office of the President	2	100%	100%
Student Affairs	10	90%	90%
University Advancement	1	0%	0%
University College	3	67%	100%
Overall	36	86%	89%

***Note:** Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 76%; Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 85%
 Overall 2019-20 CIR participation rate: 74%; Overall 2020-21 CIP participation rate: 80%
 Overall 2020-21 CIR participation rate: 80%; Overall 2021-22 CIP participation rate: 68%

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: (1) clarity and (2) 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 the student learning outcomes: (1) measurable and observable, (2) alignment with unit mission, (3) curriculum map, (4) level of challenge, and (5) 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: (1) measurable, (2) alignment with unit mission, (3) significance of outcomes, and (4) 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: (1) 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: (1) alignment with previous year's action plans and (2) 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: (1) relationship between methods and outcomes, (2) data collection process, (3) multiplicity of assessment measures, (4) types of assessment measures, and (5) 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: (1) presentation of results, (2) comparison to historical data, (3) attainment of targets, (4) sharing of results, and (5) 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: (1) 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: (1) 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 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 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 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)						
Rubric Dimension	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.7	204	3.5	198	3.6	198
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.6	338	3.5	337	3.5	328
Student Learning Outcomes	3.3	353	3.2	341	3.2	342
Summary Statement	2.2	102	2.1	113	2.4	99
Activities	2.6	200	2.9	195	2.8	193
Assessment Methods	3.1	510	3.4	495	3.2	495
Assessment Results	2.7	506	2.6	492	2.6	492
Documentation	3.0	102	2.9	99	2.6	99
Action Plans	2.7	102	2.7	98	2.5	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 2021-22 data indicate an increase in the average rubric rating for two of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2020-21. Areas of *improvement* include **mission statement** and **summary statement**. Considering the average for five of the rubric dimensions reflects less than a “maturing” rating (3) in 2021-22, *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 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percent of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year. Red emphasis identifies dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 4: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22

Rubric Dimension	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2019-20								2020-21								2021-22										
	1	2	3	4	N	1	2	3	4	N	1	2	3	4	N	1	2	3	4	N							
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	
Mission Statement	4	2%	10	5%	37	18%	153	75%	204	16	8%	12	6%	19	10%	151	76%	198	12	6%	9	5%	17	9%	160	81%	198
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3	1%	14	4%	99	29%	222	66%	338	6	2%	19	6%	83	25%	221	67%	329	14	4%	17	5%	84	26%	213	65%	328
Student Learning Outcomes	39	11%	25	7%	68	19%	221	63%	353	48	14%	32	9%	62	18%	199	58%	341	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	197	58%	342
Summary Statement	21	21%	45	44%	31	30%	5	5%	102	21	21%	32	32%	34	34%	12	12%	99	29	29%	15	15%	40	40%	15	15%	99
Activities	38	19%	52	26%	66	33%	44	22%	200	25	13%	55	28%	58	30%	57	29%	195	28	15%	48	25%	50	26%	67	35%	193
Assessment Methods	14	3%	68	13%	257	50%	171	34%	510	6	1%	62	13%	257	52%	169	34%	494	12	2%	56	11%	253	51%	174	35%	495
Assessment Results	129	25%	64	13%	161	32%	152	30%	506	153	31%	51	10%	125	26%	161	33%	490	159	32%	45	9%	124	25%	164	33%	492
Documentation	20	20%	14	14%	19	19%	49	48%	102	21	21%	13	13%	18	18%	47	47%	99	27	27%	20	20%	21	21%	31	31%	99
Action Plans	13	13%	25	25%	48	47%	16	16%	102	20	20%	12	12%	47	48%	19	19%	98	20	20%	21	21%	41	42%	16	16%	98

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2021-22 data denote an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for four of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2020-21. Of these four rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement** and **activities**. **Student learning outcomes** is of concern, as the “4 – Exemplary” rating dropped 5 percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21 and did not increase in 2021-22. Three dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-quarter to one-third (27% - 32% range) of 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement**, **assessment results**, and **documentation**.

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 (31 programs)
- College of Business Administration (3 programs)
- College of Education (18 programs)
- College of Visual and Performing Arts (16 programs)

Data from the 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percent of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year. Red emphasis identifies dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 5: Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22

	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2019-20									2020-21									2021-22								
	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%	7	5%	28	20%	103	75%	138	14	10%	9	7%	16	12%	95	71%	134	8	6%	9	7%	16	12%	103	76%	136
Program Outcomes	1	1%	7	3%	56	27%	143	69%	207	5	2%	14	7%	46	23%	136	68%	201	12	6%	13	6%	45	22%	134	66%	204
Student Learning Outcomes	39	11%	25	7%	68	20%	213	62%	345	48	14%	32	10%	62	19%	193	58%	335	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	195	57%	340
Summary Statement	8	12%	36	52%	23	33%	2	3%	69	13	19%	27	40%	25	37%	2	3%	67	19	28%	13	19%	30	44%	6	9%	68
Activities	29	21%	39	29%	51	38%	17	13%	136	21	16%	42	32%	44	33%	26	20%	133	20	15%	37	28%	35	26%	41	31%	133
Assessment Methods	5	1%	49	14%	198	57%	93	27%	345	2	1%	47	14%	201	60%	85	25%	335	3	1%	38	11%	209	61%	90	26%	340
Assessment Results	85	25%	44	13%	131	38%	82	24%	342	112	34%	43	13%	91	27%	88	26%	334	120	36%	32	9%	86	26%	99	29%	337
Documentation	16	23%	10	14%	14	20%	29	42%	69	20	30%	9	13%	11	16%	27	40%	67	22	32%	14	21%	17	25%	15	22%	68
Action Plans	10	14%	19	28%	30	43%	10	14%	69	20	30%	7	10%	28	42%	12	18%	67	18	27%	15	22%	26	39%	8	12%	67

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2021-22 data reveal an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for five of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2020-21. Of these five rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement**, **summary statement**, and **activities**. **Student learning outcomes** is of concern, as the “4 – Exemplary” rating dropped 4 percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21 and another percentage point in 2021-22. Four dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-quarter to one-third (27% - 36% range) of 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement**, **assessment results**, **documentation**, and **action plans**.

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 (7 units)
- Athletics (2 units)
- Enrollment Management and Marketing (2 units)
- Finance and Business (5 units)
- Office of the President (2 units)

Data from the 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percent of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year. Red emphasis identifies dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 6: Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22

	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2019-20									2020-21									2021-22								
	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	12%	3	9%	4	12%	23	68%	34	2	6%	3	9%	2	6%	27	79%	34	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	31	86%	36
Operational Outcomes	1	1%	6	9%	22	33%	38	57%	67	1	1%	2	3%	19	28%	46	68%	68	2	3%	3	4%	22	31%	45	63%	72
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Summary Statement	6	35%	6	35%	4	24%	1	6%	17	4	24%	4	24%	3	18%	6	35%	17	5	28%	2	11%	7	39%	4	22%	18
Activities	7	21%	4	12%	6	18%	16	48%	33	2	6%	6	18%	5	15%	20	61%	33	5	15%	6	18%	8	24%	15	44%	34
Assessment Methods	5	6%	9	11%	26	31%	45	53%	85	2	2%	6	7%	25	29%	52	61%	85	4	4%	8	9%	24	27%	54	60%	90
Assessment Results	17	20%	13	15%	18	21%	36	43%	84	20	24%	6	7%	16	19%	42	50%	84	18	20%	9	10%	26	29%	37	41%	90
Documentation	2	12%	2	12%	0	0%	13	76%	17	1	6%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	17	2	11%	3	17%	2	11%	11	61%	18
Action Plans	1	6%	4	24%	7	41%	5	29%	17	0	0%	3	19%	7	44%	6	38%	16	1	6%	4	22%	6	33%	7	39%	18

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2021-22 data suggest an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for two of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2020-21. Of these two rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement**. One dimension, **summary statement**, remains a concern, as it was not addressed in approximately one-quarter (28%) of 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

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 unit)
- Athletics (1 unit)
- Student Affairs (9 units)
- University College (2 units)

Data from the 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percent of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year. Red emphasis identifies dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 7: Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22

	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2019-20									2020-21									2021-22								
	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%	5	16%	27	84%	32	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	29	97%	30	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	26
Operational Outcomes	1	2%	1	2%	21	33%	41	64%	64	0	0%	3	5%	18	30%	39	65%	60	0	0%	1	2%	17	33%	34	65%	52
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Summary Statement	7	44%	3	19%	4	25%	2	13%	16	4	27%	1	7%	6	40%	4	27%	15	5	38%	0	0%	3	23%	5	38%	13
Activities	2	6%	9	29%	9	29%	11	35%	31	2	7%	7	24%	9	31%	11	38%	29	3	12%	5	19%	7	27%	11	42%	26
Assessment Methods	4	5%	10	13%	33	41%	33	41%	80	2	3%	9	12%	31	42%	32	43%	74	5	8%	10	15%	20	31%	30	46%	65
Assessment Results	27	34%	7	9%	12	15%	34	43%	80	21	29%	2	3%	18	25%	31	43%	72	21	32%	4	6%	12	18%	28	43%	65
Documentation	2	13%	2	13%	5	31%	7	44%	16	0	0%	3	20%	4	27%	8	53%	15	3	23%	3	23%	2	15%	5	38%	13
Action Plans	2	13%	2	13%	11	69%	1	6%	16	0	0%	2	13%	12	80%	1	7%	15	1	8%	2	15%	9	69%	1	8%	13

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2021-22 data show an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for five of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2020-21. Of these five rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **summary statement**. Three dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-quarter to one-third (23% - 38% range) of 2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement**, **assessment results**, and **documentation**.

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 division/college that supported each institutional strategic goal in 2021-22.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan										
	2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports										
	Goal 1		Goal 2		Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Academic Affairs	13	27%	12	25%	6	13%	11	23%	6	13%	48
Athletics	4	31%	6	46%	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	13
College of Arts and Sciences	46	30%	59	38%	17	11%	23	15%	9	6%	154
College of Business Administration	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	4
College of Education	23	43%	26	48%	0	0%	4	7%	1	2%	54
College of Visual and Performing Arts	14	22%	29	45%	6	9%	14	22%	1	2%	64
Enrollment Management & Marketing	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%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Office of the President	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	6
Student Affairs	15	37%	14	34%	3	7%	8	20%	1	2%	41
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
University College	5	31%	3	19%	3	19%	3	19%	2	13%	16
TOTAL	128	31%	152	36%	38	9%	67	16%	34	8%	419

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 2021-22 data reveal that *two-thirds* (67%) of the operational and program outcomes from all institutional units support **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (36%) or **Goal 1** – Increase in Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (31%) of the Winthrop Plan. **Goal 4** – Facilities and Technology represents 16% of all outcomes; 9% 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 division/college that supported each University Level Competency (ULC) in 2021-22.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2021-22 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
College of Arts and Sciences	38	30%	26	20%	29	23%	34	27%	127
College of Business Administration	4	29%	3	21%	3	21%	4	29%	14
College of Education	9	23%	14	36%	6	15%	10	26%	39
College of Visual and Performing Arts	49	37%	14	11%	27	20%	42	32%	132
Finance and Business	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
University College	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
TOTAL	102	32%	57	18%	65	21%	90	29%	314

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 2021-22 data indicate that approximately *two-thirds* (61%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (32%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (29%). **ULC 3** – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 21% of all student learning outcomes, while 18% of all student learning outcomes align with **ULC 2** – Personal and Social Responsibility.