



WINTHROP UNIVERSITY

**Institutional
Continuous Improvement Report**

Academic Programs

Administrative Units

Student Support Units

2022-23

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 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports (CIRs), with student support units submitting 94% and administrative units submitting 76% of expected 2022-23 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 2022-23 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 96 submitted reports.

The 2022-23 aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” for four of the nine rubric dimensions. Three of the nine rubric dimensions report an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2021-22.

Academic units showed 2022-23 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2021-22) in the areas of mission statements, student learning outcomes, and documentation. Three areas, however, were not addressed in approximately one-fifth to one-third of CIRs (i.e., summary statements, assessment results, action plans).

Administrative units displayed 2022-23 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2021-22) in the areas of operational outcomes, summary statements, activities, assessment results, documentation, and action plans.

Student support units reported 2022-23 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2021-22) in the areas of operational outcomes, activities, and action plans. Two areas, however, were not addressed in approximately one-fifth to one-quarter of CIRs (i.e., summary statements, assessment results).

All institutional units align their operational/program outcomes with the five **Strategic Goals of the Winthrop Plan**. Although all goals are supported, 64% 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, 58% of outcomes support ULC 1 (Critical Thinking) or ULC 4 (Communication).

After six 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 (10 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, 2023:** 2022-23 CIRs and 2023-24 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 15, 2023:** 2022-23 CIRs and 2023-24 CIPs for academic and student supports units submitted to Blackboard (student support units) and OARS (academic programs).

- September – October 2023:** 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 seven programs/units were responsible for developing, implementing, and reporting on their continuous improvement process in 2022-23. **Table 1** provides participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2022-23 CIR and 2023-24 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2022-23 CIR and 2023-24 CIP).

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

Academic College	# of Programs	2022-23 CIR Participation Rate	2023-24 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	30	100%	100%
College of Business Administration	7	29%	0%
College of Education	17	100%	100%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	15	100%	33%
Overall	69	93%	75%

***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%
 Overall 2021-22 CIR participation rate: 93%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 71%

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

Administrative Division	# of Units	2022-23 CIR Participation Rate	2023-24 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	88%	88%
Athletics	3	67%	67%
Enrollment Management and Marketing	3	100%	100%
Finance and Business	6	67%	50%
Human Resources	1	0%	0%
Office of the President	1	100%	0%
Student Affairs	10	90%	90%
University Advancement	1	100%	100%
University College	5	100%	80%
Overall	38	84%	76%

***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%
 Overall 2021-22 CIR participation rate: 86%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 89%

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 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 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 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)						
Rubric Dimension	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.5	198	3.6	198	3.8	176
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.5	337	3.5	328	3.6	296
Student Learning Outcomes	3.2	341	3.2	342	3.4	282
Summary Statement	2.1	113	2.4	99	2.5	87
Activities	2.9	195	2.8	193	2.7	162
Assessment Methods	3.4	495	3.2	495	3.2	440
Assessment Results	2.6	492	2.6	492	2.7	434
Documentation	2.9	99	2.6	99	2.8	88
Action Plans	2.7	98	2.5	98	2.6	88

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 2022-23 data indicate an increase in the average rubric rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2021-22. Areas of *improvement* include **mission statement, operational/program outcomes, student learning outcomes, summary statement, assessment results, documentation, and action plans**. Considering the average for five of the rubric dimensions reflects less than a “maturing” rating (3) in 2022-23, *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 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 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 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 4: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23

	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2020-21									2021-22									2022-23								
	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	16	8%	12	6%	19	10%	151	76%	198	12	6%	9	5%	17	9%	160	81%	198	4	2%	9	5%	9	5%	154	88%	176
Operational/Prog Outcomes	6	2%	19	6%	83	25%	221	67%	329	14	4%	17	5%	84	26%	213	65%	328	8	3%	14	5%	81	27%	193	65%	296
Student Learning Outcomes	48	14%	32	9%	62	18%	199	58%	341	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	197	58%	342	26	9%	20	7%	60	21%	176	62%	282
Summary Statement	21	21%	32	32%	34	34%	12	12%	99	29	29%	15	15%	40	40%	15	15%	99	20	23%	18	21%	38	44%	11	13%	87
Activities	25	13%	55	28%	58	30%	57	29%	195	28	15%	48	25%	50	26%	67	35%	193	21	13%	50	31%	43	27%	48	30%	162
Assessment Methods	6	1%	62	13%	257	52%	169	34%	494	12	2%	56	11%	253	51%	174	35%	495	13	3%	47	11%	238	54%	142	32%	440
Assessment Results	153	31%	51	10%	125	26%	161	33%	490	159	32%	45	9%	124	25%	164	33%	492	116	27%	48	11%	131	30%	139	32%	434
Documentation	21	21%	13	13%	18	18%	47	47%	99	27	27%	20	20%	21	21%	31	31%	99	12	14%	28	32%	18	20%	30	34%	88
Action Plans	20	20%	12	12%	47	48%	19	19%	98	20	20%	21	21%	41	42%	16	16%	98	14	16%	20	23%	43	49%	12	14%	88

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2022-23 data denote an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for three of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2021-22. Of these three rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement** and **student learning outcomes**. Two dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-quarter (23% - 27% range) of 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement** and **assessment results**.

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 (30 programs)
- College of Business Administration (2 programs)
- College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences (17 programs)
- College of Visual and Performing Arts (15 programs)

Data from the 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 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 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 5: Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23

	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2020-21									2021-22									2022-23								
	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	14	10%	9	7%	16	12%	95	71%	134	8	6%	9	7%	16	12%	103	76%	136	2	2%	9	8%	5	4%	96	86%	112
Program Outcomes	5	2%	14	7%	46	23%	136	68%	201	12	6%	13	6%	45	22%	134	66%	204	7	4%	12	7%	41	24%	108	64%	168
Student Learning Outcomes	48	14%	32	10%	62	19%	193	58%	335	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	195	57%	340	26	9%	20	7%	60	21%	174	62%	280
Summary Statement	13	19%	27	40%	25	37%	2	3%	67	19	28%	13	19%	30	44%	6	9%	68	15	27%	14	25%	26	47%	0	0%	55
Activities	21	16%	42	32%	44	33%	26	20%	133	20	15%	37	28%	35	26%	41	31%	133	16	16%	39	38%	30	29%	17	17%	102
Assessment Methods	2	1%	47	14%	201	60%	85	25%	335	3	1%	38	11%	209	61%	90	26%	340	3	1%	30	11%	188	67%	59	21%	280
Assessment Results	112	34%	43	13%	91	27%	88	26%	334	120	36%	32	9%	86	26%	99	29%	337	82	30%	31	11%	101	37%	61	22%	275
Documentation	20	30%	9	13%	11	16%	27	40%	67	22	32%	14	21%	17	25%	15	22%	68	10	18%	21	38%	12	21%	13	23%	56
Action Plans	20	30%	7	10%	28	42%	12	18%	67	18	27%	15	22%	26	39%	8	12%	67	11	20%	16	29%	28	50%	1	2%	56

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2022-23 data reveal an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for three of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2021-22. Of these three rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement** and **student learning outcomes**. Three dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-fifth to one-third (20% - 30% range) of 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement**, **assessment results**, and **action plans**. The decline in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings for **summary statement**, **activities**, and **action plans** within the 2022-23 data compared to the 2021-22 data is concerning.

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)
- Athletics (1 unit)
- Enrollment Management and Marketing (3 units)
- Finance and Business (4 units)
- Office of the President (1 unit)
- University Advancement (1 unit)

Data from the 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percent of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year.

Table 6: Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23

	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2020-21									2021-22									2022-23								
	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	6%	3	9%	2	6%	27	79%	34	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	31	86%	36	2	6%	0	0%	3	9%	27	84%	32
Operational Outcomes	1	1%	2	3%	19	28%	46	68%	68	2	3%	3	4%	22	31%	45	63%	72	1	2%	1	2%	19	30%	43	67%	64
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	4	24%	4	24%	3	18%	6	35%	17	5	28%	2	11%	7	39%	4	22%	18	2	13%	1	6%	5	31%	8	50%	16
Activities	2	6%	6	18%	5	15%	20	61%	33	5	15%	6	18%	8	24%	15	44%	34	1	3%	6	20%	6	20%	17	57%	30
Assessment Methods	2	2%	6	7%	25	29%	52	61%	85	4	4%	8	9%	24	27%	54	60%	90	2	3%	10	13%	20	25%	48	60%	80
Assessment Results	20	24%	6	7%	16	19%	42	50%	84	18	20%	9	10%	26	29%	37	41%	90	13	16%	7	9%	15	19%	45	56%	80
Documentation	1	6%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	17	2	11%	3	17%	2	11%	11	61%	18	0	0%	3	19%	2	13%	11	69%	16
Action Plans	0	0%	3	19%	7	44%	6	38%	16	1	6%	4	22%	6	33%	7	39%	18	1	6%	1	6%	7	44%	7	44%	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 2022-23 data suggest an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for six of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2021-22. Of these six rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **summary statement**, **activities**, and **assessment results**. Administrative units need to consider adding student learning outcomes, as appropriate, to their continuous improvement process.

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 (5 units)

Data from the 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 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 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

Table 7: Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23

	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2020-21									2021-22									2022-23								
	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%	1	3%	29	97%	30	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	26	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	31	97%	32
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	3	5%	18	30%	39	65%	60	0	0%	1	2%	17	33%	34	65%	52	0	0%	1	2%	21	33%	42	66%	64
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Summary Statement	4	27%	1	7%	6	40%	4	27%	15	5	38%	0	0%	3	23%	5	38%	13	3	19%	3	19%	7	44%	3	19%	16
Activities	2	7%	7	24%	9	31%	11	38%	29	3	12%	5	19%	7	27%	11	42%	26	4	13%	5	17%	7	23%	14	47%	30
Assessment Methods	2	3%	9	12%	31	42%	32	43%	74	5	8%	10	15%	20	31%	30	46%	65	8	10%	7	9%	30	38%	35	44%	80
Assessment Results	21	29%	2	3%	18	25%	31	43%	72	21	32%	4	6%	12	18%	28	43%	65	21	27%	10	13%	15	19%	33	42%	79
Documentation	0	0%	3	20%	4	27%	8	53%	15	3	23%	3	23%	2	15%	5	38%	13	2	13%	4	25%	4	25%	6	38%	16
Action Plans	0	0%	2	13%	12	80%	1	7%	15	1	8%	2	15%	9	69%	1	8%	13	2	13%	2	13%	8	50%	4	25%	16

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

Red represents dimensions that were not addressed in 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports.

The rubric employs the following 4-point rating scale:

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

The 2022-23 data show an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for three of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2021-22. Of these three rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **action plans**. Two dimensions remain a concern, as they were not addressed in approximately one-fifth to one-quarter (19% - 27% range) of 2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports, including **summary statement** and **assessment results**.

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 2022-23.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan										
	2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports										
	Goal 1		Goal 2		Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Academic Affairs	13	26%	13	26%	6	12%	9	18%	9	18%	50
Athletics	4	44%	4	44%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	9
College of Arts and Sciences	36	27%	50	37%	17	13%	20	15%	12	9%	135
College of Business Administration	3	33%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	2	22%	9
College of Edu, Sport, & Hum Sci	12	35%	17	50%	0	0%	4	12%	1	3%	34
College of Visual and Performing Arts	23	32%	25	35%	3	4%	11	15%	9	13%	71
Enrollment Management & Marketing	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	10
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	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3
Student Affairs	16	37%	15	35%	2	5%	9	21%	1	2%	43
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
University College	17	55%	5	16%	4	13%	3	10%	2	6%	31
TOTAL	130	32%	133	32%	35	8%	61	15%	53	13%	412

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 2022-23 data reveal that *two-thirds* (64%) of the operational and program outcomes from all institutional units support **Goal 1** – Increase in Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (32%) or **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (32%) of the Winthrop Plan. **Goal 4** – Facilities and Technology represents 15% of all outcomes; 13% of all outcomes support **Goal 5** – Financial Stability; and 8% of all outcomes align with **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 division/college that supported each University Level Competency (ULC) in 2022-23.

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

	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2022-23 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Area									
College of Arts and Sciences	25	26%	25	26%	23	24%	23	24%	96
College of Business Administration	2	20%	3	30%	1	10%	4	40%	10
College of Edu, Sport, & Human Sci	7	39%	5	28%	2	11%	4	22%	18
College of Visual and Performing Arts	34	35%	10	10%	24	24%	30	31%	98
Finance and Business	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
TOTAL	69	31%	43	19%	50	22%	61	27%	223

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 2022-23 data indicate that a little over *one-half* (58%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (31%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (27%). **ULC 3** – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 22% of all student learning outcomes, while 19% of all student learning outcomes align with **ULC 2** – Personal and Social Responsibility.