



<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>
English, Bachelor of Arts	27 May 2026
<b>Report Completed By</b>	<b>Report Contributors</b>
Doug Eskew, Professor, Department of English and World Languages; Director, English Program	Audrey Taylor, Assistant Professor, Department of English and World Languages
<b>Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals</b>	
The Bachelor of Arts in English program teaches students to read, write, and think with precision and imagination. Students learn to close read a variety of texts, from poetry and news to film and social media, as they attend to social, historical, aesthetic, and cultural contexts. Throughout the program, students develop analytical and expressive skills that lead to meaningful lives, careers, and social action.	

### Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2025-2026 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessment cycles or other data.

<b>A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2025-2026 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.</b>
<p>The 2024-25 assessment cycle evaluated the SLO "Utilize innovative creative, technological, and literacy skills to foster career and community growth." Peer reviewer feedback on that cycle identified three significant concerns: (1) the SLO was ill-defined and lacked discipline-specific focus; (2) the assessment rubric was not attached to the report; and (3) the closing-the-loop narrative lacked sufficient detail about planned changes and their expected impact on student learning. These findings prompted a comprehensive revision of the program's Student Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>In AY 2025-26, the English program implemented a new set of five SLOs, approved by the CAP Board in fall 2024 and effective beginning with this cycle:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognize historical and cultural contexts of diverse literary traditions.</li> <li>2. Demonstrate understanding of current issues in English Studies.</li> <li>3. Apply rhetorical, literary, and critical theories to analyze various texts.</li> <li>4. Evaluate and conduct research.</li> <li>5. Construct persuasive and coherent arguments.</li> </ol>
<b>B. In which prior academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s) this year?</b>
Spring 2025 (AY 2024-25). This was the final assessment cycle under the program's previous SLO framework.

**C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle?**

The peer reviewer identified three recommendations:

1. Clearly define SLOs and align them more specifically with the discipline of English studies.
2. Attach the rubric used for assessment to the submitted report.
3. Strengthen the closing-the-loop narrative with explicit detail about planned changes and their expected impact on student learning.

**D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?**

In fall 2024, the English program curriculum committee undertook a full revision of the program's SLOs. The new five-SLO framework is more clearly defined, discipline-specific, and aligned with contemporary English studies pedagogy. Each SLO is accompanied by a detailed rubric with three criteria scored on a 1-4 scale, with descriptors at each performance level.

The revised SLOs and rubrics were approved by the CAP Board in fall 2024 and took effect in AY 2025-26. Beginning with this cycle, the rubrics used for scoring are attached to the assessment report as required. The program also committed to having core literature faculty serve as reviewers and teach the gateway and capstone courses that serve as assessment sites.

**E. How did the change(s) implemented impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?**

AY 2025-26 is the first year the new SLOs and rubrics are in use. Assessment data from this cycle (see Table II) provides the first baseline measures under the new framework. The increased specificity of the SLOs and rubrics is designed to yield more actionable data, better identify areas for curricular attention, and provide clearer guidance for both instructors and students about the program's learning expectations. Results from this first cycle will serve as the baseline against which future cycles are compared.

**Comments on Table I Closing the Loop Below**

The revision of the program's SLO framework represents the most substantive structural response to peer reviewer feedback in the program's recent assessment history. The new SLOs directly address each of the three concerns raised in the prior review cycle: they are clearly defined and discipline-specific; their accompanying rubrics are attached to this report; and this closing-the-loop narrative provides explicit documentation of the changes made and their intended impact. The program looks forward to a more productive and revealing assessment cycle under the new framework.

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2025-26

1. Include information to share assessment processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Copy this table for each assessed outcome.

<b>A. Program SLO(s) assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>
Construct persuasive and coherent arguments.
<b>B. Semester and year this SLO was previously reported on before this cycle.</b>
This SLO was not previously reported on. SLO #5 is a new outcome effective AY 2025-26, following CAP Board approval in fall 2024. AY 2025-26 is the first assessment cycle for this SLO.
<b>C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO(s).</b>
Two faculty members reviewed final essays from ENG 201 (Introduction to Literary Studies, the program gateway course) and ENG 493 (Senior Seminar, the program capstone course) using the SLO #5 rubric. Each essay was scored independently on three criteria — articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis; argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose; persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence — rated on a 1-4 scale for a maximum total of 12. An average of the two faculty scores was calculated for each essay.  The rubric is attached, below.
<b>D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.</b>
ENG 201 (Introduction to Literary Studies, gateway course): 14 final essays reviewed. ENG 493 (Senior Seminar, capstone course): 11 final essays reviewed. Total N = approximately 25. ENG 201 essays assess students entering upper-division study; ENG 493 essays assess students completing the program, enabling a comparison of performance across program entry and exit.
<b>E. Explain the expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.</b>
A score of 2.5 or above (on a 4-point scale) on individual criteria indicates satisfactory achievement. A score of 3.5 or above indicates outstanding achievement.  At least 75% of students in each course are expected to score 2.5 or above on each criterion. Failure to meet this benchmark triggers a review of the English curriculum to address the identified deficiency.
<b>F. Provide Assessment results and number of students who met defined proficiency level.</b>
ENG 201 (Introduction to Literary Studies, N = 14): 14 of 14 students (100%) met the 2.5 threshold on all three criteria. Combined rater averages by criterion: C1 (Thesis) = 3.50; C2 (Argument Coherence) = 3.50; C3 (Audience and Evidence) = 3.36.

ENG 493 (Senior Seminar, N = 11): 10 of 11 students (91%) met the 2.5 threshold on all three criteria. Combined rater averages by criterion: C1 (Thesis) = 3.32; C2 (Argument Coherence) = 3.00; C3 (Audience and Evidence) = 3.09. One student did not meet the threshold on C3, with a combined average of 2.0.

**G. Describe what the results or trends indicate about student performance.**

Both assessment sites exceed the 75% program target, indicating that students across the English BA are developing competency in argument construction as defined by SLO #5. ENG 201 gateway students perform at a high level, with all criterion averages at or above 3.36, suggesting that students entering upper-division study are equipped to construct clear, rhetorically grounded arguments.

ENG 493 capstone students also perform well overall, though C2 (Argument Coherence) and C3 (Audience and Evidence) averages are modestly lower than those recorded for ENG 201. This pattern may reflect the more complex argumentative demands of senior-level research, where sustained coherence and evidence integration across longer projects pose greater challenges.

**H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for next AY (2026-2027?) which are informed by this assessment.**

Continue monitoring C2 (Argument Coherence) and C3 (Audience and Evidence) in ENG 493, as these criteria show slightly lower combined averages relative to ENG 201 and relative to C1. Faculty will discuss whether Senior Seminar scaffolding for evidence integration and audience awareness could be strengthened through additional assignment stages or modeling.

Prior to the next assessment cycle, raters will conduct a calibration session using anchor papers to reduce scoring variance, particularly on C3. Faculty will also revisit the rubric descriptors for the 1-point and 2-point bands to ensure shared understanding of the satisfactory threshold.

**Comments on Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

Two contextual notes.

First, the ENG 493 cohort is small (N = 11), which means a single student's scores can noticeably shift aggregate averages. Readers should interpret criterion averages for that course accordingly, and the program will continue to build longitudinal data across cycles before drawing firm conclusions about capstone-level trends.

Second, the one ENG 493 student who did not meet threshold on C3 (Audience and Evidence) was scored 3 by one rater and 1 by the other, producing a combined average of 2.0. The disagreement does not reflect ambiguity about that student's overall performance so much as it reveals that raters are currently applying the C3 descriptors differently at the lower end of the scale. That case will serve as an anchor paper in the calibration session planned before the next assessment cycle, and the program expects the session to meaningfully improve scoring consistency on C3.

Appendix A: SLO #5 Rubric

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Scorer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Construct coherent and persuasive arguments.**

1            2            3            4

Proficiency Levels	Not proficient		Proficient	
Articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis.				
Argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.				
Persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.				

Total: \_\_\_\_\_

**Articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis**

- 4 The paper demonstrates sophisticated abilities to articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis.
- 3 The paper demonstrates developing abilities to articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis.
- 2 The paper demonstrates underdeveloped abilities to articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis.
- 1 The paper fails to articulate a clear and rhetorically situated thesis.

**Argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.**

- 4 The paper demonstrates sophisticated abilities to argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.
- 3 The paper demonstrates developing abilities to argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.
- 2 The paper demonstrates underdeveloped abilities to argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.
- 1 The paper fails to argue with clarity, coherence, and purpose.

**Persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.**

- 4 The paper demonstrates sophisticated abilities to persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.
- 3 The paper demonstrates developing abilities to persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.
- 2 The paper demonstrates underdeveloped abilities to persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.
- 1 The paper fails to persuade a distinct audience through appeals and evidence.