



Academic Program Assessment Report AY 2023-24	current assessment plan:	<a href="https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/results-and-reports/2014/plans/English52114.pdf">https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/results-and-reports/2014/plans/English52114.pdf</a>
English	prior assessment report:	<a href="https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/2022/english-ba-assessment-report-2022.pdf">https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/2022/english-ba-assessment-report-2022.pdf</a>

Report Completed By	Doug Eskew, Professor, Department of English and World Languages; Director, English Program; Assistant Chair, Department of English and World Languages	
Date Report Completed	26-May-24	
Assessment Contributors	Audrey Taylor, Assistant Professor, Department of English and World Languages	

Please describe this year's assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. (Separate sheet for each undergraduate major, stand-alone minor,	
Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals:	

#### I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes,

A. Your program SLOs are pasted here verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter info in columns B-H only for those assessed during this annual cycle.	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
Demonstrate and apply traditional and contemporary knowledge in cultural contexts.	New SLO, effective fall 2020; assessed, spring 2021.	Three faculty members reviewed ENG 201 and ENG 493 papers with rubric, rated on a scale 0-4.	29 student papers from English 201-Intro to Literary Theory student papers and 9 English 493-Senior Seminar were reviewed to assess student entering and completing the English program.	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 3 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of the ENG 493 students to score 3 or higher.	All ENG 201 students scored a 2 or higher, and 77% scored a 3 or higher. 88% of ENG 493 students scored 3 or higher.	The students starting and completing the program are meeting and exceeding expectations with the new department SLOs. There is also an indication of growth and progress with student performance when they exit the program.	We will continue to implement a new rotation for the new department SLOs, update the department curriculum map, and the proper success rate for our students.
Conduct, analyze, evaluate, and integrate academic research and theory.	New SLO, effective fall 2020; assessed, spring 2022.	Three faculty members reviewed ENG 201 and ENG 493 papers with rubric, rated on a scale 0-4.	16 student papers from English 201-Intro to Literary Theory student papers and 11 English 493-Senior Seminar were reviewed to assess student entering and completing the English program.	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 3 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of the ENG 493 students to score 3 or higher.	All ENG 201 students scored a 2 or higher, and 78% scored a 3 or higher. 90% of ENG 493 students scored 3 or higher.	The students starting and completing the program are meeting and exceeding expectations with the new department SLOs. There is also an indication of growth and progress with student performance when they exit the program. However, lower enrollment is a larger	We will continue to implement a new rotation for the new department SLOs, update the department curriculum map, and the proper success rate for our students.
Construct and deconstruct arguments using a range of rhetorical strategies.	New SLO, effective fall 2020; assessed, spring 2024.	Two faculty members reviewed ENG 201 and ENG 493 papers with rubric, rated on a scale 0-4.	25 student papers from English 201 Introduction to Literary Theory student papers and 7 English 493 Senior Seminar were reviewed to assess student entering and completing the English program.	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 3 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of the ENG 493 students to score 3 or higher.	96% ENG 201 students scored a 2 or higher, and 74% scored a 3 or higher. 50% of ENG 493 students scored 3 or higher.	Students beginning the program are and exceeding assessment scores beyond expectations. Students graduating the program underperformed well below expectations. See comment below.	Changes in student performance indicate good news: the new cohort is both larger and performing better than expectations. We are hopeful we can retain many of these students and help them grow intellectually and academically. See comment below
Utilize innovative creative, technological, and literacy skills to foster career and community growth.	New SLO, effective fall 2020; assessed, spring 2022.						

Comments on part I:	Several changes in the program are notable: reviews are both new their roles. One is a new assistant professor; the other is a senior professor who has not participated before in this assessment process. These two faculty members taught all four of the courses under review and are the program's core literature faculty. Previous assessments and course teaching were not preformed by core literature faculty. Our revised program ethos is a renewed focus on literature and literary analysis, as we broaden the scope of what counts as literature to include popular and genre fiction, as well as any relevant cultural text.
---------------------	--

#### II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the year cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan, as above.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Construct and deconstruct arguments using a range of rhetorical strategies.	SLO is new/updated, effective fall 2020. This first time it is being assessed.	Previous statements regarding improvements and changes were not enacted. New leadership and new core faculty are currently implementing the curricular changes mentioned in the last column H. Those changes should be completed by the end of summer 2024.	They were not acted upon. New leadership and faculty will make good on curricular changes.	As new leadership and faculty have been revising the curriculum, we have noted inconsistencies and ambiguities that do not serve faculty or students. We have also noted a focus away from English studies, which did not result in increased enrollments or success. We are rectifying these problems at this very moment.

Comments on part II:	New leadership and faculty disagree that the new SLOs increase rigor and ease of assessment. Indeed, the SLO we assessed is both ill-defined and lacking in focus for English studies. Our curriculum committee will revise these SLOs in the fall of 2024.
----------------------	---