

**MA IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES (SPANISH PROGRAM)
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Master of Arts in Foreign Languages and Cultures (Spanish program) prepares students for success in the fields of Spanish/ Latin American literatures, and Spanish Applied Linguistics/ Pedagogy. It serves a dual mission: first, it provides a solid foundation at an advanced level for students wishing to pursue a Ph.D. program in Spanish or Latin American literatures, Hispanic Studies, or Spanish Applied Linguistics by increasing their knowledge of literature, culture, language, and Second-Language Acquisition methodology, and by developing their oral and writing skills in Spanish, their critical and integrative thinking skills, and their ability to effect disciplinary research. Second, for students wishing to become effective high school or college teachers, the program provides a theoretical foundation and practical application of Spanish linguistics and foreign language pedagogy, as well as in the use of technology in the foreign language classroom. In addition, the program may also prepare students for careers outside the academic world wherever superior analytical and communication skills in Spanish and knowledge of literary/cultural traditions are essential.

II. PROGRAM LEARNING GOALS AND OUTCOMES

A. Learning Goals

1. Students will demonstrate a broad critical and integrative knowledge of Spanish and Latin American literature, literary theory, disciplinary research methodology, and Applied Linguistics/ Spanish pedagogy.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct critical thinking of literature and other artistic expressions such as film, in a cultural context.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct disciplinary research.
4. Students will demonstrate the potential for developing original research in the discipline.
5. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their acquired knowledge in Spanish at an Advanced/ Superior (Near-Native) level.
6. Students will demonstrate the ability to teach Spanish at various skill levels.

These goals tie in with WSU's Learning goals, as follows:

Program Learning Goals Correspondence to WSU 6

	Critical/ Creative Thinking	Quant & Symbolic Reasoning	Info Fluency	Comm	Self & Society	Specialty
Knowledge	X		X		X	X
Critical Thinking	X		X		X	X
Disciplinary Research	X	X	X		X	X
Creative Thinking	X				X	X
Communication	X	X	X	X	X	X
Teaching Ability	X	X	X	X	X	X
WSU 6	100%	50%	83%	33%	100%	100%

B. Outcomes

1. Students will be prepared for success in Ph.D. programs in Spanish; or for success in other areas of advanced graduate education.
2. Students will be prepared for teaching careers as instructors in community colleges or universities. (In the case of students who have earned their Teaching Certificates at the undergraduate level awarded by the college of Education, completion of the MA will increase their knowledge and preparedness to teach Spanish at the K-12 level, and increase their chances for promotion.)
3. Students will be prepared for careers outside academia that require advanced analytical and communication skills.

III. METHODS

The assessment of student performance regarding of all learning goals and specific outcomes will be carried out as follows:

A. Methods for Assessment of Learning Goals

1. Evaluation of **sample coursework** produced by the student during each semester, based on a “**Critical and Integrative Thinking**” rubric (Appendix A). This rubric specifically addresses elements related to learning goals 1-5. Each semester, one graduate seminar will be chosen to conduct this assessment, and the instructor will apply it to the students’ final research papers. The results will be added to an individual table tracking every student’s performance in the four semesters of the program, and this data will be part of their annual review. By tracking individual performance across time, in different subject matters, and by different faculty members, we hope to provide a fair assessment of student progress.

Student Name	Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating					
	Course / Year/ Semester					
Rubric Dimension	Span 557	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X		AVG
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3		
Thesis/ Question						
Context						
Own Perspective						
Supporting Data						
Other Views						
Conclusions						
Avg. per semester						
Mean						

2. A second grid resulting from a summary evaluation of sample course work by 25% of students per course, per semester, will evaluate overall performance in each dimension, and provide a mean for the individual grid above. All Spanish Section faculty members will meet to conduct the review, at the end of each semester. Each sample will be evaluated by each faculty member; the results will be tallied, and an average result incorporated into the grid for every rubric dimension. The result per semester will produce a **mean** or average to compare with individual performance.

3.

25% Sample Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating

Rubric Dimension	Course / Year/ Semester					
	Span 557	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3	2010-1	2010-3
Thesis/ Question						

Context						
Own Perspective						
Supporting Data						
Other Views						
Conclusions						
Mean						

4. Copies of the **TA coordinator teaching evaluation** after each visit, and copies of students' evaluations of courses taught by TA. This addresses goal 6 - Teaching Abilities.

5. Copies of the "**Graduate Student Annual Review**" provided to each student at the end of their second and fourth semester; continued participation in the second year of the program and reappointment to a Teaching Assistantship depends on satisfactory performance in this review. In that review, we include information pertaining to the student's cumulative record, including the summary of scores from the "Critical and Integrative Thinking" rubric; progress since last review; a qualitative assessment by faculty of progress in research and teaching; a statement as to the rate of progress, i.e., satisfactory or unsatisfactory; and a summary of expectations for the next review period.

In extraordinary cases of performance below expectation at the end of any semester, the student will meet with the Graduate Advisor and the Teaching Assistants Coordinator, in the presence of the Department's Chair, to address changes and expectations for the coming semester, and a written memo summarizing the discussion/ agreements will be placed in the student's file, and incorporated into the Annual Review.

Students who engage in academically inappropriate behavior (such as Plagiarism, or Sexual Harassment), or who are academically deficient (falling below a 3.0 GPA), will be terminated from the program.

6. A **thesis or research paper** requirement that demonstrates the student's command of literary movements and/or critical theories as well as literary analysis methodology, and that the MA committee qualifies as "publishable." All Spanish faculty members are part of the MA committee for each student. They must all approve the thesis or research paper before the student is allowed to request the oral exam date. The final deadline for submission of the thesis or research paper is March 1st for students finishing in the spring semester, and October 1st for students finishing in December. Faculty members will provide feedback on these essays to the student who will then rewrite and resubmit a week before the oral exam. Any lingering questions of the thesis or research paper are asked during the first part of the oral exam. Faculty members will rate the exam according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale:
 - Pass with distinction: 5*
 - Pass: 3-4*
 - Low Pass: 1 -2*
 - No Pass: 0*

7. **Three written examinations** related to their literary studies (literary analysis, literary history, thematic); and **one written exam on pedagogy** that includes both theoretical components and their application. Each written exam is read by all committee members, but the faculty member who wrote that particular exam will rate the same according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale:
 - Pass with distinction: 5*
 - Pass: 3-4*
 - Low Pass: 1 -2*
 - No Pass: 0*

If a student does pass an exam but faculty members have some questions, they are presented to the student in the first part of the oral exam. Students receiving a “No Pass” grade are allowed to repeat the written exam in the same area but with a different question, once. If the student fails the exam two times, the committee will meet to discuss if the student should be asked to repeat the course related to the area being examined, or be allowed to take the exam in a different area, or be terminated from the program. (We have never had a case like this, but we would take all necessary steps to ensure that fairness to the student prevails, and to allow him or her to complete this requirement successfully, and long as we are not compromising the integrity and quality of the program.)

8. A **comprehensive oral examination** required of all MA students at the end of their coursework. This exam consists of three parts: questions regarding the thesis or research paper; questions regarding the written examinations; questions regarding all areas of the Reading List. The Reading List covers Spanish Literature from the Middle Ages to Contemporary literature; Latin American literature from Colonial times to the present; and Pedagogy.

In the oral exam, students are assessed according to the breadth of their knowledge and effectiveness of presentation. All Spanish faculty members ask questions specific to their areas of expertise and make independent judgments on performance to assure the reliability of the oral examination assessment. All committee members vote to pass the student, or not, with a majority of 3 out of 5 needed for a pass. As with the research paper and written exams, the student will be assessed according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale, to be awarded by the examining committee at the end of the exam, with the student outside the room:

Pass with distinction: 5

Pass: 3-4

Low Pass: 1 -2

No Pass: 0

Once all the results are compiled in the MA Evaluation Form (Appendix B), the results will be tallied to obtain a final rating for the student’s performance in the program. The student’s file will include a memo regarding this assessment, and the student will be advised of the result, and may include it in his/her resume.

9. Quantifiable data in the form of the **average GPA** of graduate students finishing the program that academic year. This average will in turn be broken down in a table, as follows:

Average GPA of Students Completing Program

	2005	2006	2007	2008
% of students GPA ranging from 3.9 to 4.0				
% of students GPA ranging from 3.5 to 3.8				
% of students GPA ranging from 3.0 to 3.4				

10. **Students End-of-Program Evaluation:** A written evaluation is filled by each student individually and anonymously during finals week of their last semester, after they have taken their oral exam (Appendix C). The questions address different aspects of the program and provide us with feedback that can be considered in order to improve the program. Basically, it gives the MA students the chance to evaluate both

components of their experience here, namely their work as students and their work as teachers, and allow them to indicate strengths and weaknesses, etc. Upon getting these, the Graduate Advisor summarizes the comments and submits a report to the Chair and the Spanish faculty members, and the section meets (annually) to discuss any recommendations and deliberate on whether we need to make any changes.

Students assessed are those completing their MA program, so the survey will be offered during the semester when the student(s) is expected to finish the program. In the past, students' suggestions from different versions of this survey have led to specific changes, such as reorganizing how many credits are required of first year students, when the ForL pedagogy courses are offered, providing special topics 2-credit seminars, changes in the reading list, and so forth.

Once we have this version in place, all potential changes will be discussed and approved by the section. The discussion will take place in May, after graduation, so all potential changes that are not of a programmatic scale that would need official approval from the various university committees, can be implemented for the next year. In the cases of those changes that do entail official action, the requests will go in by October 1st of the fall semester.

B. Methods for Assessment of Outcomes

1. **Success at doctoral level:** This outcome is assessed by keeping track of acceptance rates into doctoral programs of students choosing to pursue a PhD program immediately after completing the MA, or within a year of obtaining their degree.
2. **Success in teaching careers:** This outcome is assessed by our students' success in becoming employed in education related areas immediately after graduation. In 2006, of five students not choosing to pursue a PhD, but rather entering the Education job market, one is employed by the Spanish government as a teacher; one is teaching at the elementary level and has now decided to apply to an MA program in "Cultural Studies and Social Thought in Education"; one is teaching at Boise State University as an instructor; one is teaching Spanish at the high school level; and one is an instructor in our Spanish program at WSU. Reasons for not pursuing a PhD were a desire to travel and live abroad; student loan debts; a tempting job offer in the place she wanted to live in; wanting to teach and coach at the K-12 level (for which a PhD is unnecessary); marriage.
3. **Success in non-Education related careers:** This outcome is assessed by the success of our students in obtaining a job in business, publishing, government, not-for-profit fields, or other fields that are not related to teaching. The data reflects the number of students following this option, and the % of successful placement. We also track the career fields they entered, for future reference. For example, in 2006, the only student who chose not to pursue a PhD (though she was accepted into a doctoral program) or an Education related position is working as a Spanish/ English translator in a law firm in Houston, TX. Her reason for this choice was personal.

IV. RESULTS

- A. Regarding the **learning goals**, we produce several sets of data that are reviewed by the TA Coordinator and Graduate Advisor on a semester basis, and by all the Spanish Section faculty members on a yearly basis. Based on that data, we have observed the following preliminary results:

25% Sample	Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating Outcomes								
	Course / Year/ Semester								
Rubric Dimension	Span	Span	Span	Span					AVG

	557	55X	55X	55X				
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3				
Thesis/ Question								
Context								
Own Perspective								
Supporting Data								
Other Views								
Conclusions								

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Papers

	# of students	Pass with Distinction/ pts.	Pass/ Pts.	Low Pass/ Pts.	No Pass	AVG
Oral	4		3/ 9	1/ 1		2.8
Thesis/ RP	4		4/ 12			3
Lit. analysis	2*		2/ 3			3
History	4		4/ 12			3
Theme	4	1/ 5	3/ 9			3.5
Pedagogy	4	1/ 5	3/ 9			3.5
AVG		22%	66%	16%		3.13

*Second FL option= one less MA exam Rating: Pass with distinction: 5
 Pass: 3-4
 Low Pass: 1-2
 No Pass: 0

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Paper PER STUDENT

	Oral	RP	Lit. An	History	Theme	Pedagogy	AVG
Bonds	2.8	3	3	3	3	5	3.3
López	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Rincón	2	3	*	3	3	3	2.8
Serna	3.4	3	*	3	5	3	3.48
Avg. all	2.8	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.13

Average GPA of Students Completing Program

	2005- 4	2006- 6	2007- 6	2008- 6	2008- 1	2009- 4
AVG GPA	3.93	3.9	3.91			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.9 to 4.0	75% (3)	83% (5)	83% (5)			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.5 to 3.8	25% (1)	17% (1)	17% (1)			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.0 to 3.4	-	-	-			

- B. Regarding **outcomes**, given that our program is small with 4-8 students finishing per year, we have been able to provide close mentoring and keep track of students' immediate acceptance into graduate programs or job positions, as shown in the grids included in section III. We are extremely active in helping them obtain their goals by advising them as to potential graduate programs in their areas of interest, providing assistance in the form of recommendations and/or scholarship money to help defray doctoral program application's costs; alerting them to job positions, and other. The following tables trace our rate of success placing students in their three potential routes immediately after completing the MA: further graduate studies; Education-related position, non-Education related position. Obtaining any pertinent data after years after graduation would largely depend on the good will of our graduates, and could result in incomplete data so we will not keep specific track of this information for statistics

purposes. We do keep in touch with many MAs through our website's alumni site, concurrent attendance at professional conferences, occasional visits, etc.

PhD Programs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students applying to PhD	# of students accepted	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	4 (100%)	4	100%
2006	6	3 (50%)	3	100%
2007	6	2 (33%)	2	100%
2008	6			
2009				

Education Jobs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students applying to jobs in Education	# of students placed	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006	6	3 (50%)	3	100%
2007	6	4 (66%)	4	100%
2008	6			
2009				

Non-Education Jobs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students applying to non-Education jobs	# of students placed	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006	6	1* (16%)	1*	100% (Translation)
2007	6	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008	6			n/a
2009				n/a

*Student also applied to doctoral program and was accepted, but decided to enter job market instead.

V. DISCUSSION AND NEXT STEPS:

The “Critical and Integrative Thinking” rubric used to assess students coursework each semester ensures that we will have a basis for gauging each student’s progress during their participation in the program. At the same time, a cumulative grid using data from these rubrics, will provide a basis for comparison on a year by year basis, enhancing our ability to assess students’ progress, and develop corrective strategies when necessary.

The “2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Papers,” is preliminary in nature, as the assessment system was a work in progress at the time when those students were evaluated. However, we find it valuable as a point of departure, in order to establish a tentative basis for comparison with 2008 results, when the system will be in place. So, based on those very preliminary results, we can state that most (66%) rank as “Pass” even when their GPAs were very good, which does point out that the “Pass with Distinction” rank is not being abused but, on the contrary, being preserved for those truly outstanding cases.

The “Average GPA of Students Completing Program” is another source for historical comparison, and reflects stability for the last two years. The fact that the highest percentage (83%) of our students has obtained excellent grades in courses ranging from Medieval

Spanish Literature to the Use of Technology in the Foreign Language Classroom speaks to the quality of their intellect and to their wide-range abilities as scholars and teachers.

The “End-of-Program Survey” provides the Spanish Program faculty members with very specific information that will be discussed and considered by all, once we get them back before the end of this current semester (Spring 08).

Regarding percentages of students choosing to pursue further graduate education or enter the job market tracked in the Outcomes Tables, they will oscillate depending of the students themselves. We do get a wide variety of national and international, minority or non minority students, with diverse personal responsibilities and a similar diversity of goals. Our aim is to facilitate those goals and enable students to succeed in the step they choose to take after completing the program. We believe we have an outstanding record of having been able to do that.

APPENDIX A

**Guide to Rating Graduate
Critical & Integrative Thinking
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
Washington State University**

Name: _____ Course/ Semester: _____

Type of text evaluated: _____

For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by:

- a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score; use only .5 increments

Note: A score of 4 represents competency for a graduate student in our program.

1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the thesis, question, or issue (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not attempt to or fails to identify thesis and/or issues; goals or objectives are vague or incomplete. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarizes issue, though some aspects are too general, incorrect or confused. Key details are missing or glossed over. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identifies the thesis/ research question/ issue • Goals/ objectives are clear 	
<p>Comments:</p>					

2. Identifies and considers the influence of **context** * and **assumptions**. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative thinking; Self in Society)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	
<p>Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides some recognition of context and consideration of assumptions and their implications, but in a limited way. 		<p>Context and assumptions are identified and considered, including integral relationships essential to analyzing the topic, with a clear sense of connections.</p>	

Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgment or questioning of own biases or other's assumptions.	• Analysis includes some outside verification, but primarily relies on established authorities.	• Identifies influence of context and questions pre-established assumptions.
Comments:		

Contexts may include:

Cultural/social Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude/ beliefs Educational Schooling, formal training Literary History/ Genre/ Style Political Organizational or governmental	Scientific Conceptual, basic science, scientific method Economic Trade, business concerns costs Ethical Values Personal Experience Personal observation, informal character
--	--

3. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Self in Society)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration. Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one's own. Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis. Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic. 		<p>Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently. Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially. Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition. Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources. Clearly presents and justifies own view or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.
Comments:				

4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate **supporting evidence/ body of knowledge**. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Information Literacy; Symbolic Reasoning; Specialty/ Disciplinary Knowledge)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills. Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments. Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence. <p>Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need. Use of evidence is qualified and selective. Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate. Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed. Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources. Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Evidence is sufficient and well utilized. Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias. Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact. Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course or personal interests.
Comments:				

5. Integrates issue using OTHER (disciplinary/ theoretical) **perspectives and positions**. (Learning goals: Disciplinary Knowledge; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspectives. Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated. Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas. Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them. Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views. No evidence of reflection or self-assessment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis. Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way. Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily. Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing. Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses theoretical perspectives and additional positions drawn from disciplinary appropriate theories. Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others. Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing. Evidence of reflection and self-assessment.
Comments:				

6. Identifies and assesses **conclusions, implications, and consequences**. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Symbolic Reasoning; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority. 		<p>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance. Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed, and consider ambiguities.
Comments:				

7. **Communicates effectively.** (Learning goals: Communication; Information Literacy; Specialty/
Disciplinary Knowledge)

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In many places, language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate. Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting. Few sources are cited or used correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice. Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent. Most sources are cited and used correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent. Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience. Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Consistent use of appropriate format. Few problems with other components of presentation. All sources are cited and used correctly according to disciplinary standards. 		
<p>Comments:</p>				

Overall Rating

	Criteria	Score
1.	Identify problem, question, or issue	
2.	Consider context and assumptions	
3.	Develop own position or hypothesis	
4.	Present and analyze supporting data	
5.	Integrate other perspectives	
6.	Identify conclusions and implications	
7.	Communicate effectively	
<p>Comments:</p>		

APPENDIX B

MA EXAMS/ RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION (May 2007 graduates)

EVALUATORS

Angela Bonds:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass	Low Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (2.8)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis			Pass			Pass (3)
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme			Pass			Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass w/ D		Pass w/ D (5)
						Pass (3.3)

Sonia López:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis					Pass	Pass (3)
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme		Pass				Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (3)

Miguel Rincón:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Low Pass	No Pass	Pass	Low Pass	Low Pass (2)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis						*
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme					Pass	Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (2.8)

Iñigo Serna:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass w/ D	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3.4)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis						*
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme					Pass w/ D	Pass w/ D (5)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (3.48)

*Second Language= one less MA exam (Lit Analysis)

Rate for Oral Exams: Pass w/ Dist. 5
 Pass 3-4
 Low Pass 1-2
 No Pass 0

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Paper PER STUDENT

	Oral	RP	Lit. An	History	Theme	Pedagogy	AVG
Bonds	2.8	3	3	3	3	5	3.3
López	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Rincón	2	3	*	3	3	3	2.8
Serna	3.4	3	*	3	5	3	3.48
Avg. all	2.8	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.13

MA EXAMS/ RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION FORM (May 2008 graduates)

EVALUATORS

Black:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						
History	Pass w/ D					
Theme			Pass			
Pedagogy						
Mean						

Borges:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						
History						
Theme						
Pedagogy						
Mean						

Fernández:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						
History						
Theme						
Pedagogy						
Mean						

Hernández:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						
History						
Theme						
Pedagogy						
Mean						

Sánchez:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						*
History						
Theme			Pass			
Pedagogy						
Mean						

Valencia:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						**
History	Pass w/ D					
Theme			Pass			
Pedagogy						
Mean						

MA EXAMS/ RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION FORM (December 2008 graduate)

Owens:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral						
Thesis/ RP						
Lit. analysis						
History						
Theme						
Pedagogy						
Mean						

*Second Language= one less MA exam (Lit Analysis)

**Thesis option

Rate for Oral Exams:	Pass w/ Dist.	5
	Pass	3-4
	Low Pass	1-2
	No Pass	0

APPENDIX C

**MA IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES (SPANISH PROGRAM)
END-OF-PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY
2006-2007**

In your experience in our graduate program, about how often were you encouraged to do or did you do each of the following?					
		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never
1.	Encouraged to ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions				
2.	Make a class presentation				
3.	Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in				
4.	Work on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources				
5.	Encouraged to include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments				
6.	Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments				
7.	Encouraged to put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions				
8.	Receive feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)				
9.	Work harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations				
How much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?					
		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never

10	Examining in film and/or literature a particular idea, case or situation in depth and considering its components				
11	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in film and/or literature into new, more complex interpretations and relationships				
12	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods in film and/or literature				
13	Applying theories/concepts learned in courses to real life situations				

On a scale of 0-5, with 5 being *Always*, and 0 being *Never*, rate to what extent your experience in this program has contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas:

14	Acquiring job or work related knowledge or skills			
15	Writing clearly and effectively			
16	Speaking clearly and effectively			
17	Thinking critically and analytically			
18	Using computing and information technology			
19	Working effectively with others			
20	Learning effectively on your own			
21	Developing a personal and professional code of values and ethics			
22.	Select the response that best represents the extent to which your course assignments or examinations challenged you to do your best work.			
	5. Always			
	4. Very often			
	3. Often			
	2. Sometimes			
	1. Very little			
	0. Never			
23.	How would you evaluate your entire educational experience in this program?			
	5. Outstanding			
	4. Excellent			

	3. Good
	2. Fair
	1. Poor
	0. No opinion
24.	If you could start over again, would you attend this program?
	5. Definitely yes
	4. Probably yes
	3. Perhaps yes
	2. Perhaps no
	1. Probably no
	0. Definitely no

Select the response that best represents the quality of your relationships with people in this Department.

	0 - Unfriendly, Sense of Alienation, Unsupportive	1	2	3	4	5 - Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging
25.	Other Students					
26.	Faculty Members					
27.	Departmental Administrative Personnel and Offices					

On a scale of 0-5, with 5 being *Always*, and 0 being *Never*, rate the quality of academic advising you have received in the program.

28.	The amount of time provided to me to discuss my academic schedule and program of studies was ...			
29.	The quality of assistance provided to me in planning my academic schedule and program of studies was ...			
30.	The quality of assistance provided to me in clarifying my academic goals was ...			

Do you have any additional comments relating to academic advising you have received in the program?

Please indicate the strengths of this program.

Please indicate any weaknesses of this program.

Do you have any ideas for the improvement of this program?

