



WINTHROP UNIVERSITY

**Institutional
Continuous Improvement Report
Academic Programs
Administrative Units
Student Support Units
2023-24**

Prepared by:

Dr. KB Gwebu

Director, Office of Assessment

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Assessment Committees.....	3
Assessment Timelines.....	3
Participation Rates.....	4
Rubric Dimensions.....	5
Average Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units.....	7
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – All Institutional Units.....	8
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Academic Programs.....	10
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Administrative Units.....	12
Frequency Distribution of Rubric Ratings – Student Support Units.....	14
Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan.....	16
Outcome Alignment with University Level Competencies (ULCs).....	17

Executive Summary

Participation rates have been consistent over the past few years. Academic units submitted 90% (62/69) of 2023-24 Continuous Improvement Reports (CIRs), with student support units submitting 81% (13/16) and administrative units submitting 64% (14/22) of the expected 2023-24 CIRs. Responsibility for the 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 2023-24 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 88 submitted reports.

The 2023-24 aggregate **institutional data** indicate an average rubric rating of “3 – Maturing” for five of the nine rubric dimensions. Eight of the nine rubric dimensions report an increase in the percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2022-23.

Academic units showed 2023-24 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2022-23) in the areas of **program outcomes, student learning outcomes, summary statements, activities, methods, assessment results, documentation, and action plans**. Despite these increases, **summary statements, action plans, and documentation** remain the dimensions with the lowest proportion of “4 – Exemplary” ratings across rubric dimensions.

Administrative units displayed 2023-24 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2022-23) in the areas of **mission statement, operational outcomes, activities, methods, assessment results, documentation, and action plans**. Despite these increases, **student learning outcomes, summary statements, assessment results, and action plans** remain the dimensions with the lowest proportion of “4 – Exemplary” ratings across rubric dimensions.

Student support units reported 2023-24 improvement (i.e., an increase in the percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings compared to 2022-23) in the areas of **operational outcomes, summary statements, activities, assessment methods, assessment results, and documentation**. Despite these increases, **student learning outcomes, summary statements, documentation, and action plans** remain the dimensions with the lowest proportion of “4 – Exemplary” ratings across rubric dimensions.

All institutional units align their operational/program outcomes with the five **Strategic Goals of the Winthrop Plan**. Although all goals are supported, 69% 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 seven 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 are 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 (within the 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, 2024:** 2023-24 CIRs and 2024-25 CIPs for administrative units submitted to Blackboard.
- **September 15, 2024:** 2023-24 CIRs and 2024-25 CIPs for academic and student support units submitted to Blackboard (student support units) and OARS (academic programs).

- September – October 2024:** 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 2023-24. **Table 1** provides participation rates for academic programs (i.e., submission of a 2023-24 CIR and 2024-25 CIP). **Table 2** indicates participation rates for administrative and student support units (i.e., submission of a 2023-24 CIR and 2024-25 CIP).

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

Academic College	# of Programs	2023-24 CIR Participation Rate	2023-24 CIP Participation Rate
College of Arts and Sciences	30	90%	87%
College of Business and Technology	6	83%	0%
College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences	18	100%	95%
College of Visual and Performing Arts	15	80%	27%
Overall	69	90%	69%

***Note:** Overall 2020-21 CIR participation rate: 93%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 71%
 Overall 2021-22 CIR participation rate: 93%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 71%
 Overall 2022-23 CIR participation rate: 93%; Overall 2024-25 CIP participation rate: 75%

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

Administrative Division	# of Units	2023-24 CIR Participation Rate	2024-25 CIP Participation Rate
Academic Affairs	8	100%	100%
Athletics	3	67%	67%
Enrollment Management and Marketing	3	100%	100%
Finance and Business	7	0%	0%
Human Resources	1	0%	0%
Office of the President	1	100%	100%
Student Affairs	10	90%	90%
University Advancement	1	100%	100%
University College	5	60%	60%
Overall	38	68%	68%

***Note:** Overall 2020-21 CIR participation rate: 80%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 68%
 Overall 2021-22 CIR participation rate: 86%; Overall 2022-23 CIP participation rate: 89%
 Overall 2022-23 CIR participation rate: 84%; Overall 2023-24 CIP participation rate: 76%

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 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 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 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Average)						
Rubric Dimension	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Mission Statement	3.6	198	3.8	176	3.8	176
Operational/Prog Outcomes	3.5	328	3.6	296	3.7	209
Student Learning Outcomes	3.2	342	3.4	282	3.4	310
Summary Statement	2.4	99	2.5	87	2.7	85
Activities	2.8	193	2.7	162	2.9	167
Assessment Methods	3.2	495	3.2	440	3.4	439
Assessment Results	2.6	492	2.7	434	3.1	421
Documentation	2.6	99	2.8	88	3	88
Action Plans	2.5	98	2.6	88	2.8	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 2023-24 data indicate an increase in the average rubric rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2022-23. Areas of with the greatest improvement include **assessment results**, **documentation**, and **action plans**. Considering the average for three of the rubric dimensions reflects less than a “maturing” rating (3) in 2023-24, *areas for continued improvement* include **summary statement**, **activities**, 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 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percentage of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year.

Table 4: All Institutional Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

Rubric Dimension	All Institutional Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2021-22									2022-23									2023-24								
	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	12	6%	9	5%	17	9%	160	81%	198	4	2%	9	5%	9	5%	154	88%	176	2	1%	8	5%	15	9%	151	86%	176
Operational/Prog Outcomes	14	4%	17	5%	84	26%	213	65%	328	8	3%	14	5%	81	27%	193	65%	296	0	0%	6	3%	59	28%	144	69%	209
Student Learning Outcomes	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	197	58%	342	26	9%	20	7%	60	21%	176	62%	282	33	11%	14	5%	64	21%	199	64%	310
Summary Statement	29	29%	15	15%	40	40%	15	15%	99	20	23%	18	21%	38	44%	11	13%	87	12	14%	21	25%	38	45%	14	16%	85
Activities	28	15%	48	25%	50	26%	67	35%	193	21	13%	50	31%	43	27%	48	30%	162	17	10%	46	28%	40	24%	64	38%	167
Assessment Methods	12	2%	56	11%	253	51%	174	35%	495	13	3%	47	11%	238	54%	142	32%	440	3	0%	29	7%	205	47%	202	46%	439
Assessment Results	159	32%	45	9%	124	25%	164	33%	492	116	27%	48	11%	131	30%	139	32%	434	50	12%	59	14%	130	31%	182	43%	421
Documentation	27	27%	20	20%	21	21%	31	31%	99	12	14%	28	32%	18	20%	30	34%	88	11	13%	15	17%	29	33%	33	38%	88
Action Plans	20	20%	21	21%	41	42%	16	16%	98	14	16%	20	23%	43	49%	12	14%	88	11	13%	21	24%	34	39%	22	25%	88

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 2023-24 data denote an increase in the percent of “4 – Exemplary” rating for eight of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2022-23. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **methods**, **results**, and **action plans**. It is worth noting that, compared to previous assessment cycles, most reports addressed all rubric dimensions, as less than 14% of each rubric dimension received a rating of “1”. Despite these increases, **summary statements**, **action plans**, and **documentation** remain the dimensions with the lowest percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings.

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 and Technology (6 programs)
- College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences (18 programs)
- College of Visual and Performing Arts (15 programs)

Data from the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percentage of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year.

Table 5: Academic Programs – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

Rubric Dimension	Academic Programs - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2021-22									2022-23									2023-24								
	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	8	6%	9	7%	16	12%	103	76%	136	2	2%	9	8%	5	4%	96	86%	112	0	0%	8	6%	14	11%	102	82%	124
Program Outcomes	12	6%	13	6%	45	22%	134	66%	204	7	4%	12	7%	41	24%	108	64%	168	0	0%	4	4%	31	29%	70	67%	105*
Student Learning Outcomes	49	14%	31	9%	65	19%	195	57%	340	26	9%	20	7%	60	21%	174	62%	280	33	11%	14	4%	64	21%	199	64%	310
Summary Statement	19	28%	13	19%	30	44%	6	9%	68	15	27%	14	25%	26	47%	0	0%	55	10	17%	17	29%	27	46%	5	8%	59
Activities	20	15%	37	28%	35	26%	41	31%	133	16	16%	39	38%	30	29%	17	17%	102	16	13%	29	25%	33	28%	40	34%	118
Assessment Methods	3	1%	38	11%	209	61%	90	26%	340	3	1%	30	11%	188	67%	59	21%	280	1	0%	23	7%	168	54%	118	38%	310
Assessment Results	120	36%	32	9%	86	26%	99	29%	337	82	30%	31	11%	101	37%	61	22%	275	36	12%	46	16%	103	35%	109	37%	294
Documentation	22	32%	14	21%	17	25%	15	22%	68	10	18%	21	38%	12	21%	13	23%	56	9	15%	13	21%	22	36%	17	28%	61
Action Plans	18	27%	15	22%	26	39%	8	12%	67	11	20%	16	29%	28	50%	1	2%	56	10	16%	18	30%	23	38%	10	16%	61

*Program Outcomes were not submitted across CAS programs, hence the lower total number of Program Outcomes across academic units within 2023-24.

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 2023-24 data reveal an increase in the percentage of “4 – Exemplary” rating for eight of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2022-23. Of these eight rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **activities** and **assessment methods**. It is worth noting that, compared to previous assessment cycles, most reports addressed all rubric dimensions, as less than 17% of each rubric dimension received a rating of “1”. Despite these increases, **summary statements**, **action plans**, and **documentation** remain the dimensions with the lowest percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings.

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 (3 units)
- Office of the President (1 unit)
- University Advancement (1 unit)

Data from the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percentage of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year.

Table 6: Administrative Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

	Administrative Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2021-22									2022-23									2023-24								
	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	11%	0	0%	1	3%	31	86%	36	2	6%	0	0%	3	9%	31	84%	32	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	25	96%	26
Operational Outcomes	2	3%	3	4%	22	31%	45	63%	72	1	2%	1	2%	19	30%	45	67%	64	0	0%	2	4%	12	23%	38	73%	52
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%	0	0%	0
Summary Statement	5	28%	2	11%	7	39%	4	22%	18	2	13%	5	6%	5	31%	4	50%	16	1	5%	7	32%	5	23%	9	41%	22
Activities	5	15%	6	18%	8	24%	15	44%	34	1	3%	6	20%	6	20%	15	57%	30	1	4%	3	13%	3	13%	17	71%	24
Assessment Methods	4	4%	8	9%	24	27%	54	60%	90	2	3%	20	13%	20	25%	54	60%	80	2	3%	4	6%	15	23%	43	67%	64
Assessment Results	18	20%	9	10%	26	29%	37	41%	90	13	16%	15	9%	15	19%	37	56%	80	8	13%	6	9%	11	17%	39	61%	64
Documentation	2	11%	3	17%	2	11%	11	61%	18	0	0%	2	19%	2	13%	11	69%	16	0	0%	0	0%	4	29%	10	71%	14
Action Plans	1	6%	4	22%	6	33%	7	39%	18	1	6%	7	6%	7	44%	7	44%	16	1	7%	1	7%	3	21%	9	64%	14

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 2023-24 data reveal an increase in the percentage of “4 – Exemplary” rating for seven of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2022-23. Of these seven rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **activities**, **mission statement**, and **action plans**. It is worth noting that, compared to previous assessment cycles, most reports addressed all rubric dimensions, as less than 13% of each rubric dimension received a rating of “1”. Despite these increases, **student learning outcomes**, **summary statements**, **assessment results**, and **action plans** remain the dimensions with the lowest percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings.

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)
- Student Affairs (9 units)
- University College (3 units)

Data from the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 reporting cycles are included. Green emphasis represents dimensions with a higher percentage of 4-ratings (Exemplary) compared to the prior year.

Table 7: Student Support Units – Rubric Dimension Frequencies 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

	Student Support Units - Continuous Improvement Reports (Frequency)																										
	2021-22									2022-23									2023-24								
	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%	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	26	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	31	97%	32	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	12	86%	14
Operational Outcomes	0	0%	1	2%	17	33%	34	65%	52	0	0%	1	2%	21	33%	42	66%	64	0	0%	0	0%	16	31%	36	69%	52
Student Learning Outcomes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Summary Statement	5	38%	0	0%	3	23%	5	38%	13	3	19%	3	19%	7	44%	3	19%	16	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	4	31%	13
Activities	3	12%	5	19%	7	27%	11	42%	26	4	13%	5	17%	7	23%	14	47%	30	0	0%	4	16%	4	16%	17	68%	25
Assessment Methods	5	8%	10	15%	20	31%	30	46%	65	8	10%	7	9%	30	38%	35	44%	80	0	0%	2	3%	22	34%	41	63%	65
Assessment Results	21	32%	4	6%	12	18%	28	43%	65	21	27%	10	13%	15	19%	33	42%	79	6	10%	7	10%	16	25%	34	54%	63
Documentation	3	23%	3	23%	2	15%	5	38%	13	2	13%	4	25%	4	25%	6	38%	16	2	15%	2	15%	3	23%	6	46%	13
Action Plans	1	8%	2	15%	9	69%	1	8%	13	2	13%	2	13%	8	50%	4	25%	16	0	0%	2	15%	8	62%	3	23%	13

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 2023-24 data reveal an increase in the percentage of “4 – Exemplary” rating for six of the nine rubric dimensions compared to 2022-23. Of these six rubric dimensions, improvements were *greatest* in **activities**, **assessment methods**, and results. It is worth noting that, compared to previous assessment cycles, most reports addressed all rubric dimensions, as less than 15% of each rubric dimension received a rating of “1”. Despite these increases, **student learning outcomes**, **action plans**, **summary statements**, and **documentation** remain the dimensions with the lowest percentage of “4 – Exemplary” ratings.

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 2023-24.

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

Area	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with Winthrop Plan										
	2023-24 Continuous Improvement Reports										
	Goal 1		Goal 2		Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Academic Affairs	12	30%	10	25%	6	15%	7	18%	5	13%	40
Athletics	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	2	25%	8
College of Arts and Sciences	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
College of Business Administration	4	33%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%	2	17%	12
College of Edu, Sport, & Hum Sci	22	38%	27	47%	1	2%	7	12%	1	2%	58
College of Visual and Performing Arts	24	33%	24	33%	4	5%	13	18%	8	11%	73
Enrollment Management & Marketing	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	10
Finance and Business	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Human Resources	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Office of the President	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
Student Affairs	16	39%	14	34%	1	2%	8	20%	2	5%	41
University Advancement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
University College	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	13
TOTAL	95	36%	86	33%	16	6%	37	14%	28	11%	262

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 2023-24 data reveal that just over *two-thirds* (69%) of the operational and program outcomes from all institutional units support **Goal 1** – Increase in Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (36%) or **Goal 2** – Enhancement of the Student Experience (33%) of the Winthrop Plan. **Goal 4** – Facilities and Technology represents 14% of all outcomes; 11% of all outcomes support **Goal 5** – Financial Stability; and 6% 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 2023-24.

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

College	All Institutional Units - Outcome Alignment with ULCs								
	2023-24 Continuous Improvement Reports								
	ULC 1		ULC 2		ULC 3		ULC 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
College of Arts and Sciences	40	31%	29	22%	31	24%	30	23%	130
College of Business Administration	5	31%	4	25%	2	13%	5	31%	16
College of Edu, Sport, & Human Sci	16	29%	19	35%	11	20%	9	16%	55
College of Visual and Performing Arts	44	35%	12	10%	29	23%	40	32%	125
TOTAL	105	32%	64	20%	73	22%	84	26%	326

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 2023-24 data indicate that a little over *one-half* (58%) of institutional student learning outcomes support **ULC 1** – Critical Thinking (32%) or **ULC 4** – Communication (26%). **ULC 3** – Interconnected Nature of the World represents 22% of all student learning outcomes, while 20% of all student learning outcomes align with **ULC 2** – Personal and Social Responsibility.