

Student Learning Outcome 1

Advanced students in the Lamar University B. A. in English program will demonstrate the ability to write purposefully within the discipline for an educated audience.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
Student Learning Outcome 1 for BA in English Using department adopted rubrics based on inter-rater reliability, faculty assess, either at the end of the term or the beginning of the following term, selected essays and projects (such as oral presentations or multimodal presentations, as might be more appropriate in online classes) from advanced courses at the 3000 and 4000 level. Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. Direct - Assignment <i>Advanced Expository Writing: ENGL 3326</i> Target We expect that Instructors will rate at least 80% of the research papers from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric. Result: Target mostly met	MET Summary For ENGL 4310, the written project used for assessment was the unit plan for an assignment that students submitted with their capstone. The instructor technically assessed part of the assignment because the other portion of the assignment asked students to collect assignments they were interested in teaching. What the instructor assessed was their original material, omitting the collected assignments. Also included in SLO 1 is the midterm exam assignment for 4312, and while the project for assessment is not a wholly research based piece, it does illustrate "the ability to write purposefully within the discipline for an educated audience" via students' explanations of how grammar and syntax work in text passages. The written project for the ENGL 3340 final exam, as seen in the "Mythology Final" document, is a more traditional research based piece, and it exemplifies work earning high scores on the rubric for SLO 1. The exemplary essay included for ENGL 4332: Topics in Non-Traditional Literature (document entitled "Western Research Psychopath") also illustrates high scoring work in the rubric for SLO 1. For all of the following courses, rubrics are provided scoring work on the provided scale of 1-4. ENGL 4310: Teaching of Writing ENGL 3340: Mythology ENGL 4312: Studies in Language and Linguistics (document 09121704) ENGL 3392: African American Literature (document 09121703) ENGL 4326: American Literary Renaissance--1820-1860 ENGL 4332: Topics in Non-Traditional Literature *Please note that assessments are also included in this batch of documents for our department's ENGL 3310 and 3311 (Technical and Professional Writing) courses in the form of both a spreadsheet and a pdf. This data was compiled by the department's Technical and Professional Writing committee. Currently these courses are assessed a bit differently according to core SLO rubrics, and so their results are slightly different and not included officially with the other rubric results. However, since these courses are offered at the 3000 level and are also taken by many of our minors and students in other disciplines, it seemed appropriate	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move benchmark from "80% of the research papers from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric" to "85% of the research papers from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric." Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

to offer that data here. The "critical thinking" is one metric in which students' work did not meet a target of at least 80% or above scoring proficient or higher.

[09121703.PDF](#)

[09121704.PDF](#)

[2026 Curriculum Meeting Analysis \(1\).docx](#)

[3310_3311_202590_assessment.pdf](#)

[3310_3311_202590_assessment\(Table 1\).csv](#)

[4310_2025_assessment.doc](#)

[4310_capstone.pdf](#)

[4326-01 BA Summary Rubrics 2025 2026 \(1\) \(1\).doc](#)

[BA Summary Rubrics Spring 2026 Smith 3340.doc](#)

[ENGL+4312+Midterm+Andrea+Stansbury.pdf](#)

[ENGL+4312+Midterm+Prompts.pdf](#)

[ENGL+4312+Midterm+Prompts+completed1.pdf](#)

[Laura Dumin AI Talk Flyer.jpg](#)

[Mythology final \(3\).pdf](#)

[Sanderson summar BA 4344 & 4332 \).doc](#)

[western research psychopath.pdf](#)

Analysis

The target of "80% of the research papers from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric" was met, and therefore we should consider moving the benchmark rather than necessarily revising assignments, as the assignments for assessment are diverse and do not represent one common assignment across courses.

Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. Indirect - Course Evaluation <i>Am Lit Renaissance 1820-1860: ENGL 4326</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	MET Summary As previously stated, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 1 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Analysis As previously stated, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 1 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark.	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move the 70% benchmark to 80%. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026
--	--	---

Student Learning Outcome 2

Advanced students in the Lamar University B. A. in English program will demonstrate considerable skill in focused literary or rhetorical criticism.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
Student Learning Outcome 2 BA in English Using department adopted rubrics based on inter-rater reliability, faculty assess, either at the end of the term or the beginning of the following term, selected essays and projects (such as oral presentations or multimodal presentations, as might be more appropriate in online classes) from advanced courses at the 3000 and 4000 level. Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. Direct - Assignment	MET Summary For all of the following courses, rubrics are provided scoring work on the provided scale of 1-4. ENGL 3340: Mythology ENGL 4312: Studies in Language and Linguistics ENGL 3392: African American Literature ENGL 4326: American Literary Renaissance--1820-1860 ENGL 4332: Topics in Non-Traditional Literature Rubrics indicate that the target was met regarding demonstrating "considerable skill in focused literary or rhetorical criticism." Representative successful essays include a ENGL 3340 Mythology final, an essay from ENGL 4332 ("Western Research Psychopath") and five exemplary rated final essay exams from ENGL 4312: Studies in Language and Linguistics. The prompt for the essay exam was the following: ENGL 4312: Final Exam Prompt:	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move benchmark from 80% to 85% and discuss increased rigor in assessed assignments for SLO 2. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

<i>Studies in Romantic Literature: ENGL 4392</i> Target Target: 80% of work assessed will meet either Proficient or Exemplary status in the department adopted rubric.	For this final exam, please compose a 2-3 page (double spaced) reflective analysis in which you respond to the following questions. Wherever you refer to a specific reading, please provide the author and title: 1) What are some interesting insights you have gained through our readings regarding research methods in linguistics and ways of discovering valuable data to make conclusions about how language works in our society? 2) How (if at all) has this course changed the way you view American English in light of learning about its origins? 3) Though we did not focus as heavily on the conventions of formal American English grammar, what do you think is the value of studying and revisiting formal grammar conventions in an upper division course? 4326-01 BA Summary Rubrics 2025 2026 (1) (1).doc Assessment ENGL 3392 Spring 2026.doc BA Summary Rubrics Spring 2026 Smith 3340 (1).doc ENGL 4312 Assessment SLO2.pdf ENGL-4312+Final+Exam.pdf Final+Exam (2).pdf Final+Exam+Essay+Andrea+Stansbury.pdf Lang&Lit+-+final+exam.pdf linguistics+final+exam.pdf Mythology final (3) (1).pdf Sanderson summar BA 4344 & 4332).doc western research psychopath.pdf Analysis Given that 80% of the student work assessed met the target according to the department's adopted rubrics, it seems that two possible actions can be taken to indicate continuous improvement. One is to move the benchmark to 85%, as this is at least the second year in a row that the target for this SLO benchmark has been met. The other is to consider revising existing assessed assignment instructions to require more rhetorical/literary/linguistic analysis via a longer page count or more required sources. Faculty will discuss possible changes in Fall 2026.	
Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course	MET Summary Student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move target from 70% to 80%. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. Indirect - Course Evaluation <i>Studies Language & Linguistics: ENGL 4312</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Analysis As previously stated, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark.	
---	--	--

Student Learning Outcome 3

Advanced students in the Lamar University B. A. in English program will demonstrate considerable skill in integrating research into critical essays.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
Student Learning Outcome 5 BA in English Using department adopted rubrics based on inter-rater reliability, faculty assess, either at the end of the term or the beginning of the following term, selected essays and projects (such as oral presentations or multimodal presentations, as might be more appropriate in online classes) from advanced courses at the 3000 and 4000 level. Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. Direct - Assignment <i>Special Topic: Write Workshop: ENGL 4344</i> Target We expect that 70% of the writing samples will be judged proficient in style, audience, and awareness of the genre. We expect that 65% will be proficient in maturity and completeness. **This result is in reference to	MET Summary Courses assessed for SLO 3 are as follows: ENGL 3392 (pdf 09121703) ENGL 4310 ENGL 4332 ENGL 4326 ENGL 3340 ENGL 4312 *Though the heading of this page was erroneously put in as SLO 5, it is SLO 3 that is being assessed, as evidenced by the attached documentation. The capstone project in 4310 was assessed--the instructions are included as an attachment. A representative proficient/exemplary essay from 4332 and 3340 (a final exam) also included. For ENGL 4312, five exemplary final research essays are included. Students in ENGL 4312 were given the following guidance for the final research essay: Final Essay: This essay should be 6-7 pages in MLA format (not counting the works cited page) and utilize 10-15 academic sources that explore an aspect of American English and grammar. A list of possible topics will be distributed the first week of class. (40% of total course grade) Although you might use other topics of interest that stem from our readings,	Modify Policies / Procedures IN PROGRESS Collaboration among faculty will help to define shared standards for MLA convention mastery, research and synthesis and will likely help to alleviate some of the wide discrepancy in assessment scores. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

SLO 5 and not 3, but Watermark will not let me make that change.

here are six possible topics for your final essay in the course. These ideas are meant as springboards, and your particular point of view and thesis based on your own reading will take shape over time:

- The history and place of diagramming sentences in the teaching of grammar
- The development of dialects
- Dialect in the American South
- Perspectives regarding AAVE--African American Vernacular English (and in particular the evolution of terms associated with AAVE)
- The teaching of grammar in American schools in the twentieth century
- How various understandings of grammar and usage have shaped pedagogy

Results indicate that while four of the 6 assessed courses/assignments presented proficient or exemplary written products, two courses-ENGL 3392 and ENGL 3340--noted deficiencies in student work in the rubric areas of research quality, synthesis, or mastery of MLA conventions significant enough to lower that *course's* proficiency level for those assignments to below or almost below the 70% benchmark.

[09121703 \(1\).PDF](#)

[4310 2025 assessment.doc](#)

[4310 capstone.pdf](#)

[4326-01 BA Summary Rubrics 2025 2026 \(1\).doc](#)

[BA Summary Rubrics Spring 2026 Smith 3340 \(1\).doc](#)

[Dialects.pdf](#)

[ENGL 4312 Assessment SLO3.pdf](#)

[ENGL+4312+Final+Essay+\(1\).pdf](#)

[Lang&Lit+-+essay+.pdf](#)

[Lara+Linguistic+Final+Essay.pdf](#)

[LinguisticEssay.pdf](#)

[Mythology final \(3\) \(1\).pdf](#)

[Sanderson summar BA 4344 & 4332 \).doc](#)

[western research psychopath.pdf](#)

Analysis

For ENGL 3392, 58% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric.

For ENGL 4312, 100% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric.

For ENGL 4236, 86% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric.

For ENGL 4310, 91% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric.

	For ENGL 4332, 83% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric. For ENGL 3340, 73% of student writing samples were judged as a 3 or 4 on the SLO 3 rubric. Overall, across all 6 courses assessed for SLO 3, 81.833% of student work was assessed at a 3 or 4 in the rubric areas including quality, synthesis, or mastery of MLA conventions. Due to some discrepancy and wide range in these scores, faculty might discuss new ways to increase rigor in MLA convention mastery and ability to synthesize in research based essays.	
Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. Indirect - Course Evaluation <i>Special Topics: Rhetoric: ENGL 4346</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	MET Summary Student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 3 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Analysis As stated before, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Actions may include composing more specific survey questions to give to students in courses where this is an SLO. Or the benchmark can be moved to 75% or 80%.	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Revise benchmark up by 5 or 10% or compose two new evaluation questions relevant to the SLO. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

Student Learning Outcome 4

Advanced students in the Lamar University B. A. in English program will demonstrate considerable skill in critical thinking, as evidenced by a writing project.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
Student Learning Outcome 4 BA in English Using the 4 Point Critical Thinking Value Rubric, instructors will assess selected written projects from advanced courses to determine proficiency. Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE	MET Summary The course chosen for this student learning outcome assessment was ENGL 4312, as it utilized the critical thinking outcome and value rubric. The attachments under "results" are (1) the discussion prompt, (2) six sample student responses, and (3) the filled our rubric indicating that all 17 students produced discussions in response to the prompt	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Raise benchmark to 85% high milestone or above in the critical thinking value rubric. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR.

Direct - Assignment

Spec Topic Non-Traditional Lit: ENGL 4332

Target

We expect that Instructors will rate at least 80% of the written projects from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric.

that were deemed either "capstone" level (16 of them) or high "milestone" level (1 of them).

The prompt for this discussion is as follows:

Patrick Hartwell's "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar" is actually kind of a fun text for anyone who has wondered where our current notions about the place of grammar in teaching and society come from. He was primarily focusing on this issue regarding grammar in the U.S., as he taught at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP). As with our other article for this week, he also specifies four guiding questions for his text:

- Why is the grammar issue so important?
Why has it been the dominant focus of composition research for the last seventy-five years?
2. What definitions of the word grammar are needed to articulate the grammar issue intelligibly?
3. What do findings in cognate disciplines suggest about the value of formal grammar instruction?
4. What is our theory of language, and what does it predict about the value of formal grammar instruction?(This question-"what does our theory of language predict?"-seems a much more powerful question than "what does educational research tell us?") (108)

For this post, please take just one of his questions outlined above and explain in a paragraph how Hartwell answers it in his article. How does this particular discussion offer you new insights into how grammar functions, how we talk about it, and how we teach it

[09131700.PDF](#)

[09131701.PDF](#)

[09131702.PDF](#)

Analysis

All 17 students earned either a 3 or 4 on the critical thinking value rubric, with their responses, some of which are attached here, indicating that they understood Hartwell's complex presentation of multiple grammars and were able to articulate it in light of their own observations. Therefore, collectively students' performance on this task illustrated that all 100% of responses met the benchmark, with 94.1% earning a 4. These are much shorter assignments than essays used to gauge students' understanding and retention of each required reading's theoretical presentation of linguistic history or grammar. Because this is generally offered as an 8 week online course, increasing rigor by demanding lengthier

	responses is not feasible. However, the benchmark can be moved to require 85% proficiency for the 2026-2027 academic year.	
Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. <i>Special Topic: Write Workshop: ENGL 4344</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	MET Summary Student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. Analysis As stated before, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Actions may include composing more specific survey questions to give to students in courses where this is an SLO. Or the benchmark can be moved to 75% or 80%.	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Raise benchmark to 80% agree or strongly agree. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

Student Learning Outcome 5

Applies to students taking writing courses In sample proposals, essays, stories, or poems, advanced students in the B. A. in English program will demonstrate a high-level of proficiency in the use of literary or rhetorical techniques associated with the genre.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
SLO 3 For BA in English Using department adopted rubrics based on inter-rater reliability, faculty assess, either at the end of the term or the beginning of the following term, selected essays and projects (such as oral presentations or multimodal presentations, as might be more appropriate in online classes) from advanced courses at the 3000 and 4000 level. Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR.	MET Summary The target was met in ENGL 4310 for the capstone project that was assessed. Additionally, the target was met in ENGL 3350: Poetry Workshop. Individual detailed rubrics for final poetry portfolios consisting of seven initial drafts and five final drafts that are turned in as a final portfolio. Those individual rubrics are attached under "Result Files," and along with that, five exemplary poems from those same students are included (though student names have been removed). For ENGL 4344, Fiction Writing Workshop, results in several areas did not quite meet the benchmark. 4310 2025 assessment.doc 4310 capstone.pdf Casey.doc Cast Away.doc Mai.doc	Gather Additional Data IN PROGRESS For the 2026-2027 academic year, instructors of courses assessed for SLO 5 should consider perhaps gathering more data by looking at a larger body of work from students or using a different second indirect measure. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

Academic Writing: ENGL 4342 Target Proficiency is determined by four-point rubrics appropriate to each student learning outcome. Proficiency is defined as a 3 out of 4 on the four-point rubric.	McCorvy.doc Memory's merry-go-round.doc Myers.doc Pilgrim.doc Sanderson summar BA 4344 & 4332).doc Storm Weather.doc Unrecognizable.doc Young2.doc Analysis As stated in the previous section, the target was met in ENGL 4310 for the capstone project that was assessed. Additionally, the target was met in ENGL 3350: Poetry Workshop. Individual detailed rubrics for final poetry portfolios consisting of seven initial drafts and five final drafts that are turned in as a final portfolio. Those individual rubrics are attached under "Result Files," and along with that, five exemplary poems from those same students are included (though student names have been removed). For ENGL 4344, Fiction Writing Workshop, results in several areas did not quite meet the benchmark. More specifically, we see the following: Completeness: 66.7 proficient or exemplary Maturity: 50% proficient or exemplary Style: 83% proficient or exemplary Audience and Purpose: 83% proficient or exemplary Awareness of Form and Craft: 83% proficient or exemplary Because two out of the three courses assessed met the target, overall we will designate this target as met, leaving individual instructors to consider means of raising scores in these areas, as each course, though writing intensive, focuses on a different genre (fiction, poetry, writing with pedagogical purposes).	
Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. Indirect - Course Evaluation	MET Summary Student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. Analysis As stated before, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Actions may include composing more specific survey	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Consider moving benchmark up to 75% or 80% agree or strongly agree. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

<i>Teaching of Writing: ENGL 4310</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	questions to give to students in courses where this is an SLO. Or the benchmark can be moved to 75% or 80%.	
--	--	--

Student Learning Outcome 6

Students will effectively recognize implications of texts for contexts outside the explicit message, illustrate genre awareness, evaluate texts for scholarly significance using knowledge of analytical and interpretive strategies, and illustrate the ability to discuss texts as part of an ongoing scholarly conversation.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
SLO 6 for BA in English Faculty will use the four-point AACU "Reading Value Rubric." Faculty will also use, as an indirect measurement, either the results of student evaluations or a faculty designed survey given to students. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EXACT COURSE ASSESSED WILL DIFFER FROM ONE ACADEMIC YEAR TO THE NEXT. THE INDIRECT MEASURE AND DIRECT MEASURE MIGHT SPECIFY TWO DIFFERENT COURSES, OR MORE COURSES MAY BE ADDED TO THE ASSESSMENT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIR DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. MULTIPLE COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE ASSESSED ON THE SAME SLO, AND THE COURSE ORIGINALLY SPECIFIED IN THE 2024-5 PLAN MAY NOT BE TAUGHT THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. Direct - Assignment <i>Intro to the Profession: ENGL 4335</i> Target We expect that Instructors will rate at least 80% of the research papers from their classes at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each category of the rubric related to evidence of reading efficiency.	MET Summary The course chosen for this student learning outcome assessment was ENGL 4312, as it utilized the critical thinking outcome and value rubric. The attachments under "results" are six sample student responses and the filled our rubric indicating that all 17 students produced discussions in response to the prompt that were deemed "capstone" level. The prompt for this discussion is as follows: In "The Semantics, Sociolinguistics, and Origins of Double Modals in American English: New Insights from Social Media," the authors address the following research questions: (1) What is the inventory and frequency distribution of DMs on American social media? (2) What is the regional distribution of DMs, individually and in the aggregate, as used on American social media? Second, based on our empirical results, we consider three basic and open theoretical research questions related to the semantics, sociolinguistics, and history of DMs: (3) What are the semantic factors that constrain DM formation in American English? (4) What are the social and regional factors that condition variation in the use of DMs in American English? (5) What are the historical origins of DMs in American English? (2-3) Please choose <i>one</i> of their research questions and elaborate on their findings related to that question in a paragraph.	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move benchmark to 85% high milestone or above. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

	Also, in a separate paragraph, explain briefly how our use of social media can contribute to current linguistic research. How is it used in this research? How might it be used in future studies to tell us more about American English? Would you have any concerns (ethical ones, for example) about social media activity being used now or in the future as a tool for linguistic studies? All 17 students effectively earned a "capstone" rating for this discussion response. 09121702.PDF 09131703.PDF Analysis All 17 students earned either a 4 on the critical thinking value rubric, with their responses, some of which are attached here, indicating that they understood the complex connections among double modals, semantics, and sociolinguistics related to social media use. Therefore, collectively students' performance on this task illustrated that all 100% of responses met the benchmark, with 100% earning a 4. These are much shorter assignments than essays used to gauge students' understanding and retention of each required reading's theoretical presentation of linguistic history or grammar. Because this is generally offered as an 8 week online course, increasing rigor by demanding lengthier responses is not feasible. However, the benchmark can be moved to require 85% proficiency for the 2026-2027 academic year.	
Student Evaluation Questions The first student evaluation question is the following: "The course's assignments, readings, activities, and tests in this course matched what the course was trying to teach and helped me understand the subject." The desired target for this measure is that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. The second student evaluation question asks student to rate their level of agreement on the following statement: "The course helped students to understand the subject matter." The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree. Indirect - Course Evaluation <i>Shakespeare: ENGL 4340</i> Target The desired target for this measure is again that 70% of students will respond agree or strongly agree.	MET Summary Student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. Analysis As stated before, student evaluations from courses measured in outcome 2 indicate that 70% or above responded agree or strongly agree to both questions. That information is available elsewhere in Watermark. Actions may include composing more specific survey questions to give to students in courses where this is an SLO. Or the benchmark can be moved to 75% or 80%.	Revise Benchmark / Target IN PROGRESS Move benchmark up by 5 or 10% Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

Student Learning Outcome 7 (Only Applies to Teacher Certification)

Advanced students in the Lamar University B. A. in English program with teacher certification are expected to perform well both on the Lamar Local Subject Area Exam in English and on the state certification exam for English Language Arts and Reading 7-12 Context and rationale: Literature, writing, and language students expecting to teach must be approved for teacher certification in Texas. We expect that 80% of our students will pass the English Language Arts and Reading 7-12.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
ELAR 7-12 and Lamar Certification Exams English Language Arts and Reading 7-12 exam results. Direct - Exam (Certification or Licensure) Target We expect that 80% of our students will pass the English Language Arts and Reading 7-12.	NOT MET Summary Results are not completely conclusive. We await data on a retake, but do know that one student who took the test earlier in 2025 did not pass. We will therefore mark the target as "not met" for the time being. If we discover they have passed the exam, we will update the report with those results. Analysis As stated above, there is no quantifiable data or analysis to offer for this SLO, as we currently have so few certification students who have taken the test this academic year.	Gather Additional Data IN PROGRESS We have requested test result data and will update as it becomes available. Recommended Due Date: 12/31/2026

Assessment Report Summary

Assessment Report Summary

This assessment plan is the result of careful planning of which course outcomes matched which undergraduate level B.A. courses according to readings, focus, and assignments. The report illustrates that we are offering courses with the appropriate amount of rigor, and the assessed written products and student evaluation results are meeting targets. Essentially, suggested actions involve either minor revisions to assessment measures or moving benchmarks. Pages in the report particularly relevant to the undergraduate curriculum are 5-9, where core strengths in the offerings are noted as well areas in course content in which there is a gap--film, linguistics, and research methods.

Our advanced course committee has had in-depth conversations about next courses to propose for inclusion in our curriculum, and they include more of a focus on linguistics. Instead of having one course that is a variable topics course (ENGL 4312), we may opt to include one or more of the following in the next academic year if a course proposal is accepted:

- History of American English
- Comparative Linguistics
- Contrastive Linguistics
- Computational Linguistics (with a particular focus on AI)

We do have a critical theory course, though it was not in the rotation this academic year.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Because this assessment report summary report summary does not allow for attachments, please see the document entitled "English Graduate Curriculum Direct Gap Analysis & Meeting Guide," which has been placed in the batch of "results" attachments with Student Learning Outcome 1. This document was composed this academic year by our graduate program director, Dr. Amy Smith, and graduate assistant and MA student Claudia Cooper. The document provides an excellent wealth of planning information for our department and, in short, "This report compares our MA program's graduate curriculum against five peer English departments in Texas. The analysis reveals a program with solid traditional literary coverage but significant structural vulnerabilities and several areas where we trail peer institutions substantially."

This curriculum report in the attachment, which provides a comparison with peer institutions, is not intended as a means for Lamar to critique our department in light of other universities' offerings. Its purpose in this assessment report, however, is to showcase our

BA in English - BA-ENGL

efforts to see how in the next academic year we might revise some of our offerings or focuses through the curriculum committee in order to remain competitive with our peer institutions. It can be said, however, that this review, though unofficial, is largely positive in many metrics.

In an effort to kickstart our department's participation in the "AI in Every Program" initiative at Lamar, we invited Dr. Laura Dumin, Professor of Technical Writing and English and Campus AI Coordinator at the University of Central Oklahoma, to visit our department through various modalities in late April and early May and also to serve as the plenary speaker at the annual Undergraduate Research Expo (please see the attached flyer in the results attachments for Student Learning Outcome 1). Dr. Dumin spoke to our department's faculty via TEAMS for one hour, she participated in a lunch and learn with department faculty, and she also visited via TEAMS with our ENGL 3326 (Advanced Expository Writing) course students, fielding questions and offering insights on the impact of AI in our discipline. Her visit was of particular importance to our department because of her expertise on the current impact and relevance of AI tools in English pedagogy. Those who attended at least one of her talks were given new ways to think about the integration of AI in core, upper division, and graduate courses. These strategies will likely be reflected in the 2026-2026 assessments and beyond.