

**Academic Program**  
**Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**  
College of Arts and Sciences  
The University of New Mexico

---

**A. College, Department and Date**

1. College: Arts & Sciences
2. Department: Foreign Languages and Literatures
3. Date: 11 December 2017

**B. Academic Program of Study**

M.A. in Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies/Classics Concentration

**C. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan**

Lorenzo F. Garcia Jr. (lfgarci@unm.edu), Osman Umurhan (umurhan@unm.edu)

**D. Broad Program Goals & Measurable Student Learning Outcomes**

**1. Broad Program Learning Goals for this Degree/Certificate Program**

- A. Students will provide nuanced and sophisticated discussions of literary and cultural works.
- B. Students will conduct independent research in their field.
- C. Students will be knowledgeable about the literary and cultural productions of communities in their areas of primary study in the past and present.
- D. Students will be familiar with several major tendencies in critical and theoretical analysis.
- E. Students will find and evaluate career and post-graduate opportunities that their degree makes possible.

**2. List of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for this Degree/Certificate Program [Your program should have at least 3 and these should be aligned with the program Goals (as indicated by A, B, C, etc.) and UNM's broad learning goals]**

**A.1.** Students can analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge       Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**A.2.** Students can incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge       Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**A.3.** Students can read and understand writing in either Greek or Latin on an advanced level.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge       Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**B.1.** Students can develop and delimit a research question and conduct a systematic investigation of the question.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge       Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**B.2.** Students can evaluate their findings.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge       Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**C.1.** Students can identify the significant literary and cultural productions of communities associated with their area of study in the past and present.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge      \_\_\_ Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**C.2.** Students can situate works within their historical, cultural and discursive context.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge      \_\_\_ Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**C.3.** Students can distinguish the characteristics of different schools and movements within a community's production and in relation to neighboring communities or trends.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge      \_\_\_ Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**D.1.** Students can demonstrate familiarity with several major movements and schools of critical theory and identify their principle theorists.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge      \_\_\_ Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**D.2.** Students can read and understand works that engage with contemporary theory and cultural artifacts.

UNM Goals ( Knowledge      \_\_\_ Skills      \_\_\_ Responsibility)

**E.1.** Students know how to search and apply for professional opportunities or advanced study related to the M.A. in their area of concentration.

UNM Goals ( \_\_\_ Knowledge       Skills       Responsibility)

**E.2.** Students participate in professional activities such as colloquia, conferences and meetings.

UNM Goals ( \_\_\_ Knowledge       Skills       Responsibility)

**E. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan**

All programs are expected to measure some outcomes and report annually and to measure all program outcomes at least once over a three-year review cycle.

**1. Timeline for Assessment**

*In the table below, briefly describe the timeframe over which your unit will conduct the assessment of learning outcomes selected for the three-year plan. List when outcomes will be*

*assessed and which semester/year the results will be discussed and used to improve student learning (e.g., discussed with program faculty, interdepartmental faculty, advisory boards, students, etc.)*

Year/Semester	Assessment Activities
Year 1, Fall	Assessment of SLOs C.1, C.2, C.3, D.1 (Plan 1), D.2 (Plan 1), E.1 of students planning to graduate in following spring semester (thesis proposal, reading list, oral exam, compilation of materials for application to Ph.D. programs or job openings)
Year 1, Spring	Assessment of SLOs A.1, A.2, A.3, B.1, B.2, D. 1 (Plan 2), D.2 (Plan 2), E.2 of students planning to graduate in current semester (thesis defense/written examination, performance in Greek and Latin coursework, participation in Classics conference [CAMWS])
Year 2, Fall	Assessment of SLOs C.1, C.2, C.3, D.1 (Plan 1), D.2 (Plan 1), E.1 of students planning to graduate in following spring semester (thesis proposal, reading list, oral exam, compilation of materials for application to Ph.D. programs or job openings)
Year 2, Spring	Assessment of SLOs A.1, A.2, A.3, B.1, B.2, D. 1 (Plan 2), D.2 (Plan 2), E.2 of students planning to graduate in current semester (thesis defense/written examination, performance in Greek and Latin coursework, participation in Classics conference [CAMWS])
Year 3, Fall	Assessment of SLOs C.1, C.2, C.3, D.1 (Plan 1), D.2 (Plan 1), E.1 of students planning to graduate in following spring semester (thesis proposal, reading list, oral exam, compilation of materials for application to Ph.D. programs or job openings)
Year 3, Spring	Assessment of SLOs A.1, A.2, A.3, B.1, B.2, D. 1 (Plan 2), D.2 (Plan 2), E.2 of students planning to graduate in current semester (thesis defense/written examination, performance in Greek and Latin coursework, participation in Classics conference [CAMWS])

**\*Please note:** Classics faculty assess all SLOs each year for our graduating MA students, but we report on a 3-year cycle in order to achieve a representative sample of students (we graduate approximately 2-3 students each year) by which we can make an informed assessment of our program's success or weaknesses. At the end of a 3-year cycle we plan to use the data collected from that cycle to make appropriate changes to our program or our assessment tools, as necessary, for the next 3-year cycle.

## 2. How will learning outcomes be assessed?

### A. What:

- i. *For each SLO, briefly describe the means of assessment, i.e., what samples of evidence of learning will be gathered or measures used to assess students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes in the three-year plan?*

**(A.1)** At the end of their course of study, M.A. students under Plan I complete an oral exam, an oral defense of their thesis proposals, a written MA thesis, and an oral defense of the thesis project. At the end of their course of study, M.A. students under Plan II complete an oral exam, a 4-hour written exam, and a research paper. The majority of students in the program choose Plan I.

Plan I students: Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm through evaluation of student performance both during oral exam and a student's written thesis project.

Plan II students: Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm through evaluation of students' performance during the oral exam, on the 4-hour written examination, and on the research paper.

**(A.2)** At the end of their course of study, M.A. students under Plan I complete an oral exam, an oral defense of their thesis proposals, a written MA thesis, and an oral defense of the thesis project. At the end of their course of study, M.A. students under Plan II complete an oral exam, a 4-hour written exam, and a research paper. The majority of students in the program choose Plan I.

Plan I students: Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works through evaluation of student performance both during Oral Exam and a student's written Thesis project.

Plan II students: Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works through evaluation of student performance during the oral exam, on the 4-hour written examination, and on the research paper.

**(A.3)** For both Plan I and Plan II students, Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to read and understand writing in either Greek or Latin on an advanced level through student performance during both the Greek and Latin seminars of their final semester of study.

**(B.1)** Classics faculty **directly** evaluate our students' ability to develop and delimit research questions and conduct systematic investigation of a question through assessment of student performance in both the oral examination and written assignments (thesis, Plan II research paper) by making use of an evaluation tool focused on skills B.1 and ranking

performance of skills on a 1-5 scale where 5 corresponds to excellence (see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(B.2)** Classics faculty **directly** evaluate our students' ability to assess their findings in their research through assessment of student performance in both the oral examination and written assignments (thesis, Plan II research paper) by making use of an evaluation tool focused on skills B.2 and ranking performance of skills on a 1-5 scale where 5 corresponds to excellence (see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(C.1)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to identify significant literary and cultural productions of communities associated with their area of study in the past and present through evaluation of student's proposed reading list and performance during the oral examination. Faculty evaluation is recording on an assessment tool (please see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(C.2)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to situate works within their historical, cultural and discursive context through assessment of proposed reading lists and performance during the oral examinations. Faculty evaluation is recording on an assessment tool (please see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(C.3)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to distinguish the characteristics of different schools and movements within a community's production and in relation to neighboring communities or trends through evaluation of student's proposed reading list and performance during the oral examination. Faculty evaluation is recording on an assessment tool (please see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(D.1)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to demonstrate familiarity with several major movements and schools of critical theory and identify their principal theorists through evaluation of student's proposed M.A. thesis proposal and oral examination (Plan I) and research paper and written examination (Plan II). Faculty evaluation is recording on an assessment tool (please see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(D.2)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to read and understand works that engage with contemporary theory and cultural artifacts through evaluation of student's proposed M.A. thesis proposal and oral examination (Plan I) and research paper and written examination (Plan II). Faculty evaluation is recording on an assessment tool (please see Addendum 1 below for evaluation tool).

**(E.1)** Classics faculty **indirectly** measure our students' abilities to search and apply for professional opportunities or advanced study related to the M.A. in their area of concentration through assessment of the post-graduation success of our M.A. graduates. Classics faculty have made efforts to keep in touch with our alumni and track their success by periodic updates. Please see Addendum 3 below for evaluation tool.

**(E.2)** Classics faculty **indirectly** measure our students' participate in professional activities such as colloquia, conferences and meetings through assessment of student reporting of professional activities on their curriculum vitae. Please see Addendum 3 below for evaluation tool.

- ii. *Indicate whether each measure is **direct** or **indirect**. If you are unsure, contact [assessmentas@unm.edu](mailto:assessmentas@unm.edu) for clarification. You should have **both direct and indirect measures** and at least **half of the assessment methods/measures program wide will be direct measures of student learning**.*

**(A.1) Plan I students:** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm through evaluation of student performance both during oral exam and a student's written thesis project.

**(A.1) Plan II students:** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm through evaluation of students' performance during the oral exam, on the 4-hour written examination, and on the research paper.

**(A.2) Plan I students:** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works through evaluation of student performance both during Oral Exam and a student's written Thesis project.

**(A.2) Plan II students:** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works through evaluation of student performance during the oral exam, on the 4-hour written examination, and on the research paper.

**(A.3)** For both Plan I and Plan II students, Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' ability to read and understand writing in either Greek or Latin on an advanced level through student performance during both the Greek and Latin seminars of their final semester of study.

**(B.1)** Classics faculty **directly** evaluate our students' ability to develop and delimit a research questions and conduct systematic investigation of a question through assessment of student performance in both the oral examination and written assignments (thesis, Plan II research paper).

**(B.2)** Classics faculty **directly** evaluate our students' ability to assess their findings in their research through assessment of student performance in both the oral examination and written assignments (thesis, Plan II research paper).

**(C.1)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to identify significant literary and cultural productions of communities associated with their area of study in the past and present through evaluation of student's proposed reading list and performance during the oral examination.

**(C.2)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to situate works within their historical, cultural and discursive context through assessment of proposed reading lists and performance during the oral examinations.

**(C.3)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to distinguish the characteristics of different schools and movements within a community's production and in relation to neighboring communities or trends through evaluation of student's proposed reading list and performance during the oral examination.

**(D.1)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to demonstrate familiarity with several major movements and schools of critical theory and identify their principal theorists through evaluation of student's proposed M.A. thesis proposal and oral examination (Plan I) and research paper and written examination (Plan II).

**(D.2)** Classics faculty **directly** measure our students' abilities to read and understand works that engage with contemporary theory and cultural artifacts through evaluation of student's proposed M.A. thesis proposal and oral examination (Plan I) and research paper and written examination (Plan II).

**(E.1)** Classics faculty **indirectly** measure our students' abilities to search and apply for professional opportunities or advanced study related to the M.A. in their area of concentration through assessment of the post-graduation success of our M.A. graduates.

**(E.2)** Classics faculty **indirectly** measure our students' participate in professional activities such as colloquia, conferences and meetings through assessment of student reporting of professional activities on their on the curriculum vitae.

*iii. Briefly describe the **criteria for success** related to each direct or indirect measures of assessment. What is the program's performance target (e.g., is an "acceptable or better" performance by 60% of students on a given measure acceptable to the program faculty)? If scoring rubrics are used to define qualitative criteria and measure performance, include them as appendices.*

**(A.1)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(A.2)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(A.3)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(B.1)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(B.2)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(C.1)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of "3" or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of "4.5" or above.

**(C.2)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of “3” or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of “4.5” or above.

**(C.3)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of “3” or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of “4.5” or above.

**(D.1)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of “3” or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of “4.5” or above.

**(D.2)** In overall averaging of scores on skills (in a range of 1-5), 100% of graduating M.A. students will receive a score of “3” or above and 80% of graduating M.A. students will receive an average of “4.5” or above.

**(E.1)** We aim to place our M.A. graduates either in Ph.D. programs for advanced study in Classical Studies (or a related field) or placement in a professional career in Classical Studies (or a related field) after their graduation. Classics faculty determine an 80% placement rate as a benchmark of success. Scoring takes place by a simple YES/NO indication of placement of M.A. graduate students after graduation from our program.

**(E.2)** We aim to prepare our M.A. graduates for placement either in Ph.D. programs for advanced study in Classical Studies (or a related field) or placement in a professional career in Classical Studies (or a related field) after their graduation. Participation in professional activities, such as attendance and presentation of original research at professional conferences and colloquia constitute an important part of this training. Classics faculty determine an 80% participation rate of our students in professional activities (such as presentation of original research at a professional conference or colloquium) as a benchmark of success. Scoring takes place by a simple YES/NO indication of whether our graduate students have participated in at least one professional conference or colloquium by the time of their graduation, as reported in graduating students’ CVs.

B. Who: State explicitly whether the program’s assessment will include evidence from all students in the program or a sample. Address the validity of any proposed sample of students. Please note that you are recommended to sample all students in your program; however, sampling approx. 20% of the student population is acceptable if the course’s total student population (or student enrollment) exceeds 99 in an academic year. A valid explanation should be provided for samples that are less than 20% of the total student population.

The MA program in CL/CS-Classics typically has 1-3 graduates per year. All graduating M.A. students will undergo assessment at the time of the oral exam and completion of master’s thesis (Plan I) or completion of the oral exam, 4-hour written examination, and research paper (Plan II).

**3. What is the unit's process to analyze/interpret assessment data and use results to improve student learning?**

*Briefly describe:*

1. *who will participate in the assessment process (the gathering of evidence, the analysis/interpretation, recommendations).*

Members of a student's committee on studies will score performance of SLOs. The CLCS/Classics Graduate Advisor will be responsible for collating and analyzing data resulting from scoring. Classics faculty will meet as a whole to interpret results and determine whether the program is meeting its performance benchmarks. The Classics faculty will also discuss any necessary modifications to the program assessment/tools, program curriculum, or pedagogy, and will communicate the findings of those discussions to the Graduate Committee and then to the FLL faculty.

2. *the process for consideration of the implications of assessment for change:*
  - a. *to assessment mechanisms themselves,*
  - b. *to curriculum design,*
  - c. *to pedagogy**...in the interest of improving student learning.*

CLCS/Classics faculty will file regular program reports following our 3-year reporting cycle and will reconsider our program assessment plan every two cycles. Any proposed changes to the assessment mechanisms themselves will first be discussed among Classics faculty, and then submitted to the departmental Committee on Graduate Studies, composed of faculty representing each of the graduate programs in the department. The report will contain the raw data of results for SLOs, discussion of areas of achievement and areas of weakness, and a plan for modifications of the program or assessment tools, where needed. The Committee on Graduate Studies will consider the report in connection with the reports of the other graduate programs in the department (M.A. in Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies, M.A. in German, M.A. in French, and Ph.D. in French Studies) and provide an overall evaluation of graduate learning outcomes to the FLL faculty in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting.

Proposed changes to curriculum design will follow the same procedure of discussion among Classics faculty first, who will propose changes to FLL Graduate Committee, which, in turn, will propose changes to the FLL faculty at large during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The faculty will discuss proposed changes, and, if approved, curriculum changes will be followed up by both Classics faculty and the current FLL Director of Graduate Studies. Curriculum changes will be submitted to the College of A&S Curriculum Committee for consideration and approval.

Proposed changes to pedagogy come about firstly through discussion among Classics faculty during our 3-year assessment review meeting when we go over the data from our complete 3-year assessment cycle. Should Classics faculty note trends in decline in our SLOs, one element in the investigation into potential issues in our program will include examination of student evaluations in relevant courses. Should student evaluations suggest problems in pedagogy, Classics faculty will arrange for peer faculty teaching evaluations. Enrollment in College of A&S or other relevant pedagogical seminars may also be required of program faculty.

*3. How, when, and to whom will recommendations be communicated?*

All evaluations will take place as part of the program's regular 3-year assessment cycle and will be discussed first among Classics faculty. Results of discussion among Classics faculty will be reported to the FLL Graduate Committee. If necessary, the Graduate Committee will communicate further discussion with the entire FLL faculty which will approve of further decisions.

**Addendum 1 – Assessment instruments**

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Plan I / II \_\_\_\_\_

Semester of Graduation \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment of Outcomes A-D:

**A.1: Student can analyze literary and cultural texts through the lens of a theoretical paradigm.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**A.2: Students can incorporate theoretical frameworks into their written and oral discussions of literary works.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**B.1: Students can develop and delimit a research question and conduct a systematic investigation of the question.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**B.2: Students can evaluate their findings.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**C.1.: Students can identify the significant literary and cultural productions of communities associated with their area of study in the past and present.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**C.2.: Students can situate works within their historical, cultural and discursive context.**

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

**C.3.: Students can distinguish the characteristics of different schools and movements within a community’s production and in relation to neighboring communities or trends.**

Poor Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

**D.1.: Students can demonstrate familiarity with several major movements and schools of critical theory and identify their principal theorists.**

Poor Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

**D.2.: Students can read and understand works that engage with contemporary theory and cultural artifacts.**

Poor Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Addendum 2—Assessment of Language Skills**

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Plan I / II \_\_\_\_\_

Semester of Graduation \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment of Outcomes

**A.3: Students can read and understand writing in either Greek or Latin on an advanced level.**

A.3: Ancient Greek

Instructor of students final seminar in ancient Greek: \_\_\_\_\_

**Student can read and understand writing in Greek at an advanced level.**

Poor Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

A.3: Latin

Instructor of students final seminar in Latin: \_\_\_\_\_

**Student can read and understand writing in Latin at an advanced level.**

Poor Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Addendum 3—Assessment of Professional Skills**

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Plan I / II \_\_\_\_\_

Semester of Graduation \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment of Outcomes

**E.1.: Students know how to search and apply for professional opportunities or advanced study related to the M.A. in their area of concentration**

Student has submitted an abstract to at least one professional conference, submitted an application to at least one Ph.D. program, or submitted an application for at least 1 job.

YES

NO

**E.2.: Students participate in professional activities such as colloquia, conferences and meetings.**

Student has presented at least 1 paper at a professional conference.

YES

NO

**E.3.: Students prepare professional documents, including a CV, to market themselves to graduate schools or for job searches.**

Student has compiled a professional curriculum vitae for the purpose of advanced study or for applying for jobs.

YES

NO

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_