

**Institutional
Continuous Improvement Report
Academic Programs
Administrative Units
Student Support Units
2019-20**

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. 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 Rubrics. 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:** 2019-20 CIRs and 2020-21 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 15:** 2019-20 CIRs and 2020-21 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 in the 2019-20 Assessment Cycle

One hundred and twelve programs/units were responsible for developing, implementing, and reporting on their continuous improvement process in 2019-20. **Table 1** provides the participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2019-20 CIR and 2020-21 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2019-20 CIR and 2020-21 CIP).

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

Academic Colleges	# of Programs	2019-20 CIR Participation Rate	2020-21 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	29	97%	97%
College of Business Administration	6	100%	0%
College of Education	18	100%	100%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	18	94%	83%
Overall	71	97%	86%

*Note: Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 99%
 Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 77%

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

Administrative/Student Support Divisions	# of Units	2019-20 CIR Participation Rate	2020-21 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	88%	88%
Access and Enrollment Management	2	100%	100%
Athletics	3	100%	100%
Finance and Business	8	63%	38%
Human Resources	1	0%	0%
President’s Office	2	50%	50%
Student Affairs	11	100%	100%
University Advancement	1	100%	100%
University College	5	100%	100%
Overall	41	85%	80%

*Note: Overall 2018-19 CIR participation rate: 76%
 Overall 2019-20 CIP participation rate: 74%

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, 2018-19, and 2019-20 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the average score across the three years.

Table 3: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Averages 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)						
Rubric Dimension	2017-18		2018-19		2019-20	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.4	214	3.6	194	3.7	204
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.0	358	3.5	321	3.6	338
Student Learning Outcomes	3.1	343	3.2	339	3.3	353
Summary Statement	1.8	66	2.1	94	2.2	102
Activities	2.5	173	2.2	189	2.6	200
Assessment Methods	3.2	535	3.2	484	3.1	510
Assessment Results	2.6	409	2.6	481	2.7	506
Documentation	2.8	106	3.0	98	3.0	102
Action Plans	2.4	107	2.5	97	2.7	102

Green indicates a higher average across the three years.

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 eight of the nine rubric dimensions across the three years. Areas of particular *improvement* across the three years include **operational/program outcomes, summary statement, mission statement, and action plans**. Considering the average for four of the rubric dimensions reflects less than a “maturing” rating (3) in 2019-20, *areas for continued 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, 2018-19, and 2019-20 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating across the three years.

Table 4: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20

	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2017-18									2018-19									2019-20								
	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%	20	9%	80	37%	112	52%	214	4	2%	9	5%	44	23%	137	71%	194	4	2%	10	5%	37	18%	153	75%	204
Operational/Prog Outcomes	22	6%	86	24%	125	35%	125	35%	358	2	1%	28	9%	96	30%	195	61%	321	3	1%	14	4%	99	29%	222	66%	338
Student Learning Outcomes	36	10%	56	16%	104	30%	147	43%	343	41	12%	37	11%	74	22%	187	55%	339	39	11%	25	7%	68	19%	221	63%	353
Summary Statement	33	50%	19	29%	11	17%	3	5%	66	24	26%	48	51%	14	15%	8	9%	94	21	21%	45	44%	31	30%	5	5%	102
Activities	29	17%	52	30%	66	38%	26	15%	173	66	35%	47	25%	41	22%	35	19%	189	38	19%	52	26%	66	33%	44	22%	200
Assessment Methods	15	3%	82	15%	238	44%	200	37%	535	10	2%	61	13%	249	51%	164	34%	484	14	3%	68	13%	257	50%	171	34%	510
Assessment Results	81	20%	80	20%	155	38%	93	23%	409	133	28%	66	14%	146	30%	136	28%	481	129	25%	64	13%	161	32%	152	30%	506
Documentation	11	10%	28	26%	38	36%	29	27%	106	16	16%	20	20%	14	14%	48	49%	98	20	20%	14	14%	19	19%	49	48%	102
Action Plans	25	23%	24	22%	50	47%	8	7%	107	15	15%	30	31%	40	41%	12	12%	97	13	13%	25	25%	48	47%	16	16%	102

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating across the three years.

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 across the three years. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, operational/program/student learning outcomes, and documentation**. In comparison to these results, **activities, assessment results, and action plans** display a much *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first year to the third year. Summary statement and documentation showed an improvement in year two, but dropped in year three.

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 (29 programs), College of Business Administration (6 programs), College of Education (18 programs), and College of Visual and Performing Arts (18 programs).

Data from the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating across the three years.

Table 5: Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20

	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2017-18									2018-19									2019-20								
	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%	10	7%	51	38%	71	53%	134	2	1%	9	7%	29	22%	94	70%	134	0	0%	7	5%	28	20%	103	75%	138
Program Outcomes	22	11%	73	37%	49	25%	54	27%	198	0	0%	23	11%	53	26%	125	62%	201	1	1%	7	3%	56	27%	143	69%	207
Student Learning Outcomes	36	11%	56	17%	102	30%	141	42%	335	41	12%	37	11%	72	21%	185	55%	335	39	11%	25	7%	68	20%	213	62%	345
Summary Statement	33	50%	19	29%	11	17%	3	5%	66	18	28%	39	61%	6	9%	1	2%	64	8	12%	36	52%	23	33%	2	3%	69
Activities	28	21%	43	32%	46	35%	16	12%	133	62	48%	33	26%	24	19%	10	8%	129	29	21%	39	29%	51	38%	17	13%	136
Assessment Methods	3	1%	55	16%	150	45%	127	38%	335	3	1%	47	14%	184	55%	100	30%	334	5	1%	49	14%	198	57%	93	27%	345
Assessment Results	58	22%	58	22%	96	36%	56	21%	268	90	27%	52	16%	110	33%	79	24%	331	85	25%	44	13%	131	38%	82	24%	342
Documentation	10	15%	20	30%	26	39%	11	16%	67	14	21%	17	25%	9	13%	27	40%	67	16	23%	10	14%	14	20%	29	42%	69
Action Plans	23	34%	17	25%	24	36%	3	4%	67	13	19%	25	37%	24	36%	5	7%	67	10	14%	19	28%	30	43%	10	14%	69

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating across the three years.

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 across the three years. Of these six rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **program outcomes, documentation, mission statement, and student learning outcomes**. 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 third 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 (7 units), Athletics (2 units), Enrollment Management (2 units), Finance and Business (8 units), Human Resources (1 unit), Office of the President (2 units), and University Advancement (1 unit).

Data from the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating across the three years.

Table 6: Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20

Rubric Dimension	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2017-18									2018-19									2019-20								
	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	0	0%	8	19%	20	48%	14	33%	42	2	7%	0	0%	9	30%	19	63%	30	4	12%	3	9%	4	12%	23	68%	34
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	7	8%	46	55%	31	37%	84	2	3%	4	7%	24	40%	30	50%	60	1	1%	6	9%	22	33%	38	57%	67
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Summary Statement	-		-		-		-		0	3	20%	5	33%	3	20%	4	27%	15	6	35%	6	35%	4	24%	1	6%	17
Activities	1	5%	3	14%	10	48%	7	33%	21	3	10%	5	17%	7	23%	15	50%	30	7	21%	4	12%	6	18%	16	48%	33
Assessment Methods	6	6%	13	12%	43	41%	43	41%	105	6	8%	6	8%	25	33%	38	51%	75	5	6%	9	11%	26	31%	45	53%	85
Assessment Results	16	19%	16	19%	32	38%	20	24%	84	20	27%	8	11%	19	25%	28	37%	75	17	20%	13	15%	18	21%	36	43%	84
Documentation	1	5%	1	5%	6	30%	12	60%	20	2	13%	0	0%	2	13%	12	75%	16	2	12%	2	12%	0	0%	13	76%	17
Action Plans	2	10%	3	14%	13	62%	3	14%	21	2	13%	3	20%	5	33%	5	33%	15	1	6%	4	24%	7	41%	5	29%	17

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating across the three years.

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 across the three years. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **mission statement, operational outcomes, student outcomes, and assessment results**. In comparison to these results, **documentation and assessment methods** express a *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first to the third year. Activities and action plans showed an improvement in year two, but dropped in year three.

The summary statement was not a required component of the 2017-18 Continuous Improvement Reports. Additionally, 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 Athletics (1 unit), Academic Affairs (1 unit), Student Affairs (11 units), and University College (5 units).

Data from the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 reporting cycles are included, with green emphasis representing an increase in the frequency of a 4-rating across the three years.

Table 7: Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20

	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2017-18									2018-19									2019-20								
	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%	2	5%	9	24%	27	71%	38	0	0%	0	0%	6	20%	24	80%	30	0	0%	0	0%	5	16%	27	84%	32
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	6	8%	30	39%	40	53%	76	0	0%	1	2%	19	32%	40	67%	60	1	2%	1	2%	21	33%	41	64%	64
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	6	75%	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6
Summary Statement	-		-		-		-		0	3	20%	4	27%	5	33%	3	20%	15	7	44%	3	19%	4	25%	2	13%	16
Activities	0	0%	6	32%	10	53%	3	16%	19	1	3%	9	30%	10	33%	10	33%	30	2	6%	9	29%	9	29%	11	35%	31
Assessment Methods	6	6%	14	15%	45	47%	30	32%	95	1	1%	8	11%	40	53%	26	35%	75	4	5%	10	13%	33	41%	33	41%	80
Assessment Results	7	12%	6	11%	27	47%	17	30%	57	23	31%	6	8%	17	23%	29	39%	75	27	34%	7	9%	12	15%	34	43%	80
Documentation	0	0%	7	37%	6	32%	6	32%	19	0	0%	3	20%	3	20%	9	60%	15	2	13%	2	13%	5	31%	7	44%	16
Action Plans	0	0%	4	21%	13	68%	2	11%	19	0	0%	2	13%	11	73%	2	13%	15	2	13%	2	13%	11	69%	1	6%	16

Green indicates a greater frequency of the “4 – Exemplary” rubric rating across the three years.

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 across the three years. Of these seven rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **activities, mission statement, and assessment results**. In comparison to these results, **assessment methods** suggest a much *smaller frequency increase* in the “4 – Exemplary” rating from the first to third year. Operational outcomes, documentation, and action plans showed an improvement in year two, but dropped in year three.

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 operational/program outcomes* by unit that supported each institutional strategic goal in 2019-20.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan										
	2019-20 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	2	25%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	8
College of Arts and Sciences	38	27%	52	36%	18	13%	22	15%	13	9%	143
College of Business Administration	5	25%	6	30%	5	25%	2	10%	2	10%	20
College of Education	28	53%	22	42%	0	0%	3	6%	0	0%	53
College of Visual and Performing Arts	20	35%	22	39%	4	7%	8	14%	3	5%	57
Enrollment Management	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	6
Finance and Business	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3	27%	7	64%	11
Office of the President	3	43%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	2	29%	7
Student Affairs	18	42%	15	35%	3	7%	6	14%	1	2%	43
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	100%	9
University College	13	52%	6	24%	2	8%	3	12%	1	4%	25
TOTAL	145	34%	141	33%	37	9%	55	13%	49	11%	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 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 (34%) or **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (33%) of the Winthrop Plan. **Goal 4** – Facilities and Technology represents 13% of all outcomes; 11% of all outcomes align with **Goal 5** – Financial Stability; and 9% 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 2019-20.

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

	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2019-20 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
College of Arts and Sciences	27	26%	23	22%	28	27%	27	26%	105
College of Business Administration	8	36%	4	18%	4	18%	6	27%	22
College of Education	12	31%	6	15%	9	23%	12	31%	39
College of Visual and Performing Arts	49	36%	17	12%	25	18%	47	34%	138
Finance and Business	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
University College	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	3
TOTAL	99	32%	50	16%	66	21%	93	30%	308

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 approximately *three-fifths* (62%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (32%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (30%). **ULC 3** – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 21% of all student learning outcomes, while 16% of all student learning outcomes align with **ULC 2** – Personal and Social Responsibility.

Summary

Participation rates are improving over the three years, however do not meet the SACSCOC requirement of 100% institutional compliance. Student support units submitted 100% of their 2019-20 CIRs, with academic units submitting 97% of their expected 2019-20 CIRs. The concern, therefore lies more heavily with administrative units, at a submission rate of 74%. 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 104 submitted reports.

The aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” (range of 3.0-3.7) for five of the nine rubric dimensions in 2019-20. Seven of the nine rubric dimensions report an increase in the frequency of “4 – Exemplary” ratings across the three years.

Academic units show improvement across the three assessment reporting cycles in the areas of mission statement, program/student learning outcomes, assessment results, documentation, and action plans. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include summary statement, activities, and assessment methods.

Administrative units display improvement across the three assessment reporting cycles in the areas of mission statement, operational outcomes, assessment methods, assessment results, and documentation. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include summary statement, activities, and action plans.

Student support units report improvement across the three assessment reporting cycles in the areas of mission statement, activities, assessment methods, and assessment results. Areas for improvement in upcoming reporting cycles include operational outcomes, summary statement, documentation, and action plans.

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