



**Universidad de Puerto
Recinto Universitario de Mayagüez
English Department
Mayagüez, Puerto Rico
Encuesta a Unidades Administrativas y de Servicios
March 4, 2006**

Prepared by Beth L. Virtanen, PhD

Interim Director

and

Judith Casey, ED. D.

Department Planning Coordinator

Table of Contents

Administrative Assessment Plan	1
Appendix A: Sector Analysis of Faculty Capability and Preference for Teaching	6
Linguistics	7
Writing	13
Literature	14
ESL	16b
Appendix B: Faculty Assessments	17
Faculty Output Survey	18
Faculty Satisfaction Survey	19
Appendix C: Student Assessments	20
Student Orientation and Advising Survey	21
Appendix D: Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Surveys	22
Instructions for Administrative Satisfaction Forms	23
Department Director and Associate Director	24
Administrative Coordinators	26
Course Coordinators	28
Committee and Sector Chairs	30
University Committee Representatives	32
Department Staff	34
Appendix E: Scheduling Assessment	36
Analysis of Department Course Scheduling Practices	37
Appendix F: Graduate Program Assessment	38
Graduate Assessment Report	39



**Universidad de Puerto Rico
Recinto Universitario de Mayagüez
English Department
Mayagüez, Puerto Rico**



Encuesta a Unidades Administrativas y de Servicios

March 4, 2006

A. La *misión institucional* de nuestro Recinto es la siguiente:

- Formar ciudadanos educados, cultos, capaces de pensar críticamente y preparados profesionalmente en los campos de las ciencias agrícolas, la ingeniería, las ciencias naturales, las humanidades, las artes y la administración de empresas, de manera que puedan contribuir al desarrollo educativo, cultural, social, tecnológico y económico de Puerto Rico y del ámbito internacional en un ambiente democrático de colaboración y de solidaridad.
- Fomentar la labor creativa, y la investigación básica y aplicada de manera que atienda las necesidades de la sociedad, tanto local como internacional, en cooperación con el entorno, a fin de preservar, transmitir y adelantar el conocimiento.
- Proveer un servicio de excelencia que contribuya al desarrollo sustentable y balanceado de nuestra sociedad.
- Divulgar el conocimiento de manera que sea accesible a todos.

B. La *misión de la unidad*, que es cónsona con la misión institucional, es la siguiente:

The English Department, which exists in the academic environment in which English is a second language, addresses the needs of all students who enter the UPR-Mayagüez. It directs its efforts toward the development of educated, responsible, and cultured citizens and professionals in all areas as well as in fields related to English Studies, primarily those involved with the study of Linguistics and Literature. Graduates of departmental programs will be qualified to contribute in an effective manner to the social, cultural, and economic development of Puerto Rico and the world at large. The English Department focuses its efforts and initiatives equally in three fundamental areas: instruction, research, and service to the university community.

C. Esta ***misión*** es conocida, entendida, revisada y aceptada por los miembros de esta unidad. La última ***revisión*** se completó en March 3, 2006.

D. Las ***responsabilidades*** y ***deberes*** oficiales de nuestra unidad son los siguientes:

1. to address the needs of all students who enter UPRM in providing education in English
2. to develop educated, responsible, and cultured citizens and professionals in English education, linguistics, and literature
3. to develop graduates qualified to contribute in an effective manner to the social, cultural, and economic development of Puerto Rico and the world at large
4. to focus in three areas of instruction, research, and service

E. Nuestra ***clientela*** principal (a quienes principalmente ofrecemos nuestros servicios) está compuesta por

1. Students
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Alumni
5. Visitors

F. Los ***servicios*** principales que ofrece nuestra unidad a estos clientes o usuarios son los siguientes:

1. Efficient scheduling and assigning of classes for faculty productivity
2. Reasonable information of career and further education for graduating students of both master's and bachelor's programs
3. Efficient and effective academic counseling and orientation
4. Support in locating opportunities for university and community service
5. Dissemination of information regarding persons with disabilities
6. Recognition of faculty outputs by departmental awards

G. Para ***medir y evaluar*** el nivel de satisfacción, eficiencia y efectividad de nuestra unidad en las funciones y servicios que se ofrecen, se han establecido los siguientes mecanismos

1. Noting of student complaint of lack of availability of courses and overlap of schedule conflicts with departmental courses and of faculty satisfaction regarding course assignment and scheduling
2. Informal observation of use of binders containing opportunities for students in teaching, further education, and scholarship
3. Questionnaires on student satisfaction with advising and orientation
4. Records of faculty committee assignments, professional development plans and other contributions to the community (personnel files)
5. Track feedback on workshops on the Bill of Rights for persons with disabilities with followup forms
6. Track faculty output across years to demonstrate fluctuations and their causes

H. Para *mejorar continuamente* los servicios, procesos y funciones de nuestra unidad, se utilizan los resultados obtenidos en esas mediciones en la toma de decisiones presupuestarias y operacionales. Entre las *acciones concretas* que se toman al identificar deficiencias y debilidades están las siguientes:

1. Assessment of the Graduate Program (Graduate Program Assessment Report, 2005)
2. Sector (ESL, Linguistics, Literature) analysis of faculty capability and preference in teaching
3. Faculty Output Survey
4. Faculty Satisfaction Survey
5. Student Orientation and Advising Survey
6. Analysis of Department Course Scheduling Practices
7. Administration Satisfaction Assessment Survey

I. Las evaluaciones realizadas en nuestra unidad han identificado las siguientes *fortalezas*:

1. Productive Sector Committees (Data Report of Faculty Preference in Course Scheduling)
2. Untapped faculty preparation and ability that can be utilized through offering additional degree configurations (Graduate Program Assessment Report)
3. Consistent output by all faculty, concentrates in the various areas of research, teaching and service, but varied by faculty preference and terminal degree (Faculty Output Survey)

J. Las evaluaciones realizadas en nuestra unidad han identificado las siguientes *debilidades (oportunidades para mejorar)*:

1. Weak course scheduling practices with conflicts that make student course selection unnecessarily difficult (Informal Record and Analysis of Student Scheduling Difficulties, Fall 2005)
2. Underutilized faculty talent (Graduate Program Assessment Report, 2005)
3. Lack of continuity in advising of undergraduate students (Student Orientation and Advising Survey)
4. Lack of continuity in advising for graduate students (Graduate Program Assessment Report, 2005)
5. Need for information on faculty development and funding opportunities from PR and the US sources

K. Para *sostener y mejorar* estas *fortalezas*, y para *corregir y mejorar* estas *debilidades*, se tomarán las siguientes acciones y medidas concretas:

1. Develop a faculty recruitment plan based on the projected schedule and maximum utilization of current faculty expertise
2. Develop additional degree programs that draw on new configurations of current courses offerings in order to enhance faculty outputs in scholarship and teaching and to enhance student recruiting opportunities
3. Revise advising and orientation system to provide for added continuity, enhanced student support, and early warning of at-risk status of students
4. Subscribe (department) to journals and chronicles that locate opportunities for professional development and private granting sources
5. Create junior faculty mentoring system to insure knowledge transmission from existing to new faculty members to enhance new faculty outputs
6. Request removal of barriers to access for students with disabilities

L. Como *evidencia* de este *proceso de mejoramiento continuo*, nuestra unidad mantiene en archivo los siguientes documentos:

1. Assessment Report, 2005
2. Graduate Program Assessment Report, 2005
3. Faculty Satisfaction Survey Results
4. Faculty Output Survey Results
5. Student Orientation and Advising Survey Results
6. Services to Students with Disabilities Assessment Report
7. Administration Satisfaction Survey Report

M. La información contenida en este documento ha sido *discutida y compartida* con el personal de esta unidad, habiéndose completado este proceso en March 2006.

N. La *próxima revisión* de todos los puntos y asuntos aquí incluidos está pautada para May 30, 2007.

Beth L. Virtanen, PhD
Director

Appendix A:

Sector Analysis of Faculty Capability and Preference for Teaching in Linguistics, Literature and Writing

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

(Please note: All ratings are based on self-report. In many cases, respondents left blanks in the table under "Qualification." I have interpreted these responses as "not qualified" [NQ] when that seemed appropriate (based on my knowledge of the professor. Otherwise (i.e., when I couldn't make a good guess), I left the spaces blank.)

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
<i>Undergraduate Courses</i>					
3225	Introduction to Linguistics	Baker Gonzalez	Q	E	4
		Blau	Q	E	1
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	E	4
		Leder	Q	E	4
		Morales	Q	E	5
		Pratt	Q	E	5
		Smyrniou	Q	E	5
3227	Phonetics of English	Baker Gonzalez	Q	E	4
		Blau	Q	NE	1
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	E	4
		Leder	Q	E	3
		Morales	Q	NE	5
		Pratt	Q	E	5
		Smyrniou	NQ	E	?
4026	Sociolinguistics	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	5
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	E	2

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
4028	Research and Writing in Lg. and Lx.	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ	E	1
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	4
		Leder	Q	NE	4
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q	?	1
		Smyrniou	NQ		
4047	English Phonology	Baker Gonzalez	NQ (?)		
		Blau	Q	NE	1
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q		3
		Leder	Q		3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	NQ		
4075	Psycholinguistics	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	2
		Leder	Q	NE	4
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q	E	4-5
		Smyrniou	Q	E	1-2
4125	Introduction to Semantics	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	3
		Leder	Q	E	5
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	NQ		

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
4205	Morphology and Syntax	Baker Gonzalez	Q	E	1
		Blau	NQ (out of date)	E	1
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	4
		Leder	Q	E	5
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	E	1
4206	The Structure of English	Baker Gonzalez	Q	E	5
		Blau	Q	E	3
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	3
		Leder	Q	NE	4
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	?	?
4208	The History of The English Language	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	NQ		
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	NQ		
5009	Contrastive Grammar	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	E	3
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q		3
		Leder	Q		3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q		3
		Smyrniou	?	E	

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
5010	Perspectives on Teaching ESL	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	E	4
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	2
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q	?	3
		Smyrniou	Q	?	?
5025	Current Approaches in Linguistic Theory	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	5
		Leder	Q	NE	5
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	?	E	?

<i>Graduate Courses</i>					
6006	Research Methods	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	years ago	
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	4
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	E	4
6008	Bilingualism	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	?	2
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	5
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	E	4

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
6010	TESL Materials and Testing	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	E	3
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	2
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q		4
		Smyrniou	NQ		
6016	Topics in Sociolinguistics	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	5
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	NQ		
		Smyrniou	Q	E	1
6018	Topics in Psycholinguistics	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	NQ		
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	2
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q		4
		Smyrniou	Q	E	1

Compiled Table of Linguistics Courses and Professor's Qualifications, Experience, and Interest

Course #	Course Name	Professor	Qualification	Experience	Interest level
6020	Second Language Acquisition	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	E	3
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	4
		Leder	Q	NE	4
		Morales	Q	NE	4
		Pratt	Q	E	5
		Smyrniou	Q	E	5
6028	Psycholinguistics and the Reading Process	Baker Gonzalez	NQ		
		Blau	Q	E	4-5
		Dayton			
		Fleck	Q	NE	1
		Leder	Q	NE	3
		Morales	NQ		
		Pratt	Q		5
		Smyrniou	Q	E	4

Ratings compiled by Nevin Leder, Coordinator of the Linguistics Sector.

Professors Course Preferences and Teaching Experience in Writing Track
(revised 2006)

Course	Have Taught	Can teach but have not	Want to teach	Do not Want to Teach
Tech writing	S. Mongar R. Knight J. Geliga B. Virtanen Pratt S. Rios	Rodriguez Griggs	S. Mongar B. Virtanen S. Rios Pratt Knight	Griggs
Advanced Tech writing		B. Virtanen	B. Virtanen	S. Mongar Griggs
Creative Writing	S. Mongar B. Virtanen	L. Flores	S. Mongar B. Virtanen L.Flores	Griggs
Writing for Comm. Media	J. Geliga A. Rodriguez	S. Mongar Griggs	J. Geliga A. Rodriguez Griggs	
Rhetoric		Virtanen D. Ortiz		S. Mongar
Expository Writing	A. Rodriguez B. Virtanen Griggs Pratt	S. Mongar	Virtanen Griggs Pratt	S. Mongar. Rodriguez
Writing for the Web		L. Flores Griggs	L. Flores Griggs	
Professional Editing		A. Rodriguez Griggs	A. Rodriguez B. Virtanen	
Feature Writing		J. Geliga S. Mongar Griggs	Mongar Griggs	
Persuasive Writing		A. Rodriguez J. Geliga Pratt Griggs	Virtanen Griggs Pratt	
Media Literacy	A. Rodriguez	J. Geliga	A. Rodriguez	
Intro to Comm		A. Rodriguez Griggs	A. Rodriguez	
Group Communication		A. Rodriguez J. Geliga Mongar Pratt	A. Rodriguez	
Research in Writing and Comm		J. Geliga A. Rodriguez Pratt Griggs	Virtanen Pratt	
Non-fiction Writing		S. Mongar Griggs Pratt	S. Mongar Griggs	

Department of English: Literature Sector

Areas of Expertise

Professor ==>	Nandita Batra	Kathleen Ferracane	Leonardo Flores	Nicholas Haydock	Jose Irizarry	Mary Leonard	Darnyd Ortiz	Ismael Rivera	Linc Rod
1	19th C. British (Romantic & Victorian)	Caribbean Literature	Modern and Contemporary Poetry	Medieval, Chaucer	Literary Renaissances since 1797	Film & Media	Drama	17th Century English	Carib Litera
2	Gender Studies	Early American Literature	New Media Writing	15th C. British	US Minority Lit. (Latino, Native)	Modernism & Postmodernism	Short Fiction	18th Century English	Wom Litera
3	20th C. British, American &	Shakespeare	20th Century American	Literary Criticism & Theory	African American Lit. 1700-1930s	20th C. Literature	Composition & Rhetoric	Shakespeare	Minor Litera
4	16th C. British, including		Literary Criticism and Theory	Film	Literary & Cultural Theory and	Drama, Performance	Teaching of Literature	English Renaissance	Poetr
5	Literary Theory		Modernism & Postmodernism	Medievalism	Early 20th Century American Lit.	The Novel	Teaching of Writing		Creat Writi
6	Gothic Literature		Popular Culture Studies:	Ancient Literatures	Autobiography				
7	English Novel		Science Fiction & Fantasy	Postmodern Literature	Travel Literature				
8	Teaching Literature		The Novel	Romance & Early Novel	Narrative Theory				
9	Advanced Composition: Editing &			Shakespeare					
10				Renaissance & 17th C. British					

Please list your areas in order of degree of expertise.

Professor Qualifications and Willingness to Teach ESL Sector Courses

J. Baker	066 3101-3102	M. Ortiz	3101-3102 3201-3202 3103-3104 3211-3212
E. Blau	066 3101-3102	D. Ortiz	3211-3212
J. Casey	066 3101-3102 3201-3202 3103-3104	R. Lopez	3201-3202 3103-3104 3211-3212
L. Chott	3201-3202 3103-3104 3211-3212	G. Griggs	3101-3102 3201-3202 3103-3104 3211-3212
J. Lugo	3101-3102	M. Rivera	3101-3102
C. Mazak	066 3101-3102 3201-3202	R. Knight	3101-3102 3201-3202
B. Morales	066 3101-3102 3201-3202 3103-3104	L. Rodriguez	3201-3202 3103-3104 3211-3212
W. Morciglio	066 3101-3102 3201-3202 3103-3104	L. Flores	3103-3104 3211-3212
N. Tiru	3211-3212	M. Leonard	3211-3212
S. Mongar	3103-3104 3211-3212	K. Ferracane	3211-3212

Appendix B:

Faculty Assessments
by Output and Satisfaction

Faculty Satisfaction Survey

Please rate your responses to the questions below using the following scale:

Scale

1. Poor, 2. Fair, 3. Neutral, 4. Good, 5. Excellent, 6. Not Applicable

College of Arts and Sciences Support

1. Support for my teaching work from the College is ____.
2. Support for my professional development from the College is ____.
3. Support for my research work from the College is ____.
4. Support for my creative work from the College is ____.

Departmental Support

5. Support for my teaching work from the department is ____.
6. Support for my professional development from the department is ____.
7. Support for my research work from the department is ____.
8. Support for my creative work from the department is ____.

Administrative Support

9. Support for completing my paperwork for the personnel committee is ____.
10. Support for documentation for travel and scholarly activities is ____.
11. Support for developing grants is ____.
12. Support for professional membership activities is ____.

Recognition of Contributions

College of Arts and Sciences Recognition of Faculty Contribution

13. Recognition in Arts and Sciences for my work in teaching is ____.
14. Recognition in Arts and Sciences for my work in professional development is ____.
15. Recognition in Arts and Sciences for my work in research is ____.
16. Recognition in Arts and Sciences for my work in scholarly activity is ____.

Department of English Recognition of Faculty Contribution

17. Recognition in the department for my work in teaching is ____.
18. Recognition in the department for my work in professional development is ____.
19. Recognition in the department for my work in research in the department is ____.
20. Recognition in the department for my work in scholarly activity is ____.

This information is being gathered by the Assessment Committee as part of the department's MSCHE assessment plan development. Please return completed form to Interim Dept. Director, Dr. Beth Virtanen.

Appendix C: Student Assessments

Student Orientation and Advising Satisfaction Survey
 Department of English
 Spring Semester 2006

To better serve our students, the English Department is conducting an ongoing survey of student satisfaction. We are requesting that you rate the services you receive from your faculty advisor who serves on the department orientation committee.

This survey is anonymous, so please do not provide your name or student number.

Please rate the following questions on the following scale (use the bubble sheet to reply):

- a) highly satisfied b) satisfied c) unsatisfied d) very unsatisfied
1. How satisfied are you with your advisor's availability?
 2. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you spend with your advisor?
 3. How satisfied are you with the overall advising process?
 4. How satisfied are you with the information you receive from your advisor regarding your major?
 5. How satisfied are you with the information you receive regarding your program of study in the English Department?
 6. How satisfied are you with information you receive from you advisor regarding career opportunities in your field?
 7. How satisfied are you with you advisor's ability to understand your needs as a student?
 8. How satisfied are you with your advisor's knowledge of the advising process?
 9. How satisfied are you with the process of advising?
 10. How satisfied are you with your advisor's ability to help you solve problems?

In the space below, please make a suggestion for improving advising and the advising process.

11.

In the space below, note one outstanding feature of the advising and orientation process.

12.

Appendix D:

Administrative Satisfaction
Assessment Surveys

Instructions

1. Please do not fill in your name—the survey is anonymous
2. Remove the sticky note with your name before returning
3. Please use n/a for questions that do not apply
4. Please use the bubble sheet for answers to numbers 1-25, but respond on the question sheet for the write-in answers
5. Please take the time to write in answers on the back of the sheet
6. Please return both sheets of your completed forms to Dr. Beth Virtanen, Interim Director, by Friday, March 10th if possible and by Tuesday the 14th of March at the latest.

Instructions

1. Please do not fill in your name—the survey is anonymous
2. Remove the sticky note with your name before returning
3. Please use n/a for questions that do not apply
4. Please use the bubble sheet for answers to numbers 1-25, but respond on the question sheet for the write-in answers
5. Please take the time to write in answers on the back of the sheet
6. Please return both sheets of your completed forms to Dr. Beth Virtanen, Interim Director, by Friday, March 10th if possible and by Tuesday the 14th of March at the latest.

Instructions

1. Please do not fill in your name—the survey is anonymous
2. Remove the sticky note with your name before returning
3. Please use n/a for questions that do not apply
4. Please use the bubble sheet for answers to numbers 1-25, but respond on the question sheet for the write-in answers
5. Please take the time to write in answers on the back of the sheet
6. Please return both sheets of your completed forms to Dr. Beth Virtanen, Interim Director, by Friday, March 10th if possible and by Tuesday the 14th of March at the latest.

Instructions

1. Please do not fill in your name—the survey is anonymous
2. Remove the sticky note with your name before returning
3. Please use n/a for questions that do not apply
4. Please use the bubble sheet for answers to numbers 1-25, but respond on the question sheet for the write-in answers
5. Please take the time to write in answers on the back of the sheet
6. Please return both sheets of your completed forms to Dr. Beth Virtanen, Interim Director, by Friday, March 10th if possible and by Tuesday the 14th of March at the latest.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—
Administrative Coordinators (Dept. Director and Assoc. Director)

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—
Administrative Coordinators (Writing Center, GTA Ed., Tech., Lab)

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—
Course Coordinators

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—
Committee & Sector Chairs

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—
University Committee Members

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Administrative Satisfaction Assessment Survey—Department Staff

Conditions of work: a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

1. Your job duties are clear
2. Your job duties are fair and equitable
3. You are happy with your position
4. You have opportunity to discuss problems when they arise
5. Resolution of problems occurs in a reasonable time
6. You have opportunity to review your duties with your director
7. You can discuss your performance goals with your director
8. You feel comfortable in the workplace environment
9. Miscommunications are quickly corrected in the workplace
10. You feel that you are a part of the administrative team

Conditions of treatment by others

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

11. Colleagues treat me with respect
12. Students treat me with respect
13. Faculty treat me with respect
14. Administrators treat me with respect
15. Visitors treat me with respect

Value of work you do a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

16. Students value the work I do
17. Faculty value the work I do
18. Colleagues value the work I do
19. Administrators value the work I do
20. Visitors value the work I do

Satisfactory performance

a) always, b) sometimes, c) rarely, d) never e) n/a

21. Colleagues are pleased with my performance
22. Students are pleased with my performance
23. Faculty are pleased with my performance
24. Administrators are pleased with my performance
25. Visitors are pleased with my performance

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

26. Please make suggestions for changes that would help you improve your job performance

27. Please note specific aspects of current practice that help you to do your job well.

Appendix E:
Scheduling Assessment

Analysis of Department Course Scheduling

December 23, 2005

Throughout the scheduling period, I had recorded in a list the number of times students complained about the scheduling practices and course offerings.

Conflicting Times

They reported that the courses they needed in the department conflicted with other courses in the department that they needed in terms of meeting times. I heard this complaint 54 times that I noted from department majors. This indicates that there is a need to ensure that major classes that are only offered one section per semester are offered often enough in rotation and at times that do not conflict with other major courses to meet student needs.

Not Offered

Students also complained that the courses they needed to graduate were not available in the current semester and that it was likely that their graduation would be delayed because of the problem. While the reason was not documented by students via their transcripts, their complaint raises questions about the scheduling of core courses in the department.

Graduate Student Prerequisites

Graduate students assigned prerequisites as condition of entry into the program often found that the courses they needed were either unavailable or full. Fifteen students noted this as a current and ongoing problem. The problem requires a rethinking of scheduling of core courses.

Graduate Courses

Many graduate students wishing to take topics courses could not do so because the topics course currently offered had the same number of a course the students already had taken even though there is no relationship between the content of the previous and the desired course. Thus, the sequencing and offering of topics courses and their affixed numbering need to be carefully rethought and continuously monitored.

Appendix F:
Graduate Program Assessment

**English Department
Graduate Program Assessment Report 2004-2005**

Prepared by

The Graduate Committee

Members:

Eileen Blau

Judith Casey

Elizabeth Dayton

Catherine Fleck

Jocelyn Géliga

Betsy Morales

Ellen Pratt

Beth Virtanen, Coord.

Billy Woodall

Presented to

Beth L. Virtanen, PhD

Interim Director

October 29, 2005

Table of Contents

I. FACULTY EVALUATION	4
A. Profile of Professor	4
1. Degree type and area	4
2. Years of service	5
3. Areas of graduate teaching	5
4. Numbers of graduate theses supervised	5
5. Membership on graduate committees	5
B. General Evaluation of the Program	6
1. Perceptions of program's mission	6
2. Ambiguity of mission statement	7
3. Recommended improvements in the graduate program	7
C. Evaluation of Program Requirements	8
1. Evaluation of core courses	8
2. Evaluation of elective courses	10
3. Suggested additional courses	11
4. Evaluation of the thesis option	11
5. Evaluation of the comprehensive exam	11
6. Perceptions of entering graduate students rated by admission requirements	12
7. Perceptions of departing students rated by graduation requirements	12
D. Evaluation of Research in Graduate Program	13
1. Evaluation of promotion of student research by program	13
2. Evaluation of intersection of faculty research interest and program	13
3. Extra-department research activities provided students by faculty	14
E. Evaluation of Program Administration	14
1. Effectiveness of Graduate Committee	14
2. Suggested improvements to the Graduate Committee	15
3. Effectiveness of admissions process	15
4. Evaluation of the registration process	16
5. Evaluation of facilities	17
6. Evaluation of recruiting process	18
F. Discussion of Results	18
1. Programmatic Issues	18
2. Graduate Faculty Issues	19
3. Graduate Student Issues	19
II. FORMER STUDENT EVALUATION	20
A. Introduction	20
B. Reasons for Entering Program and Career Paths upon Graduation	20
C. Opinions about the Content of the Program	20

D. Participation in and Evaluation of Teaching Assistantship	23
E. Representative Responses to Open-Ended Survey Items: General Evaluative Comments about the Graduate Program	23
F. Representative Responses to Open-Ended Survey Items: Additional Recommendations	24
G. Discussion of the Results	25
1. Programmatic Issues	25
2. Faculty Issues	25
3. Graduate Student Issues	25
III. CURRENT STUDENT ASSESSMENT	26
A. Introduction	26
B. Findings to Survey Questions	26
1. Thesis/Comprehensive Exams	26
2. Courses	29
3. Research	32
4. Mission	34
5. Faculty Guidance	35
6. Evaluative Responses about the Program in general	37
C. Discussion of Results	39
1. Programmatic Issues	39
2. Graduate Faculty Issues	39
3. Graduate Student Issues	40
IV. REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS	41
A. Recommendations for Program Development and Curricular Revision	41
B. Recommendations for Graduate Faculty Involvement and Participation in the Program	43
C. Recommendations for Student Recruitment, Retention, and Training	44
D. Recommendations for Ongoing Assessment Measures	46
Appendix A: Questionnaire for Current Students in MAEE	47
Appendix B: MAEE Thesis Data	60

I. FACULTY EVALUATION

Graduate subcommittee: Faculty Evaluation of Graduate Program

Report authors: Drs. B. Woodall and D. Ortiz

Date completed: October 25, 2005

In the second semester of the 2004-2005 academic year, a survey was administered to all members of the faculty of the Department of English. The survey contained thirty-three questions regarding all aspects of the Master of Arts in English Education Program administered by the Department of English. Of the forty-five members of the faculty in the department, only eleven completed and returned the instrument. The results of the survey are presented below.

A. Profile of Professor (selected items)

The profile of a professor in the Department of English is broad and multifaceted as faculty in the program have varying expertise to meet the wide range of functions within the department.

1) Degree type and area

The faculty responding to the survey collectively possessed seven (7) PhDs, including five (6) in Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy and two (2) in Literature. One (1) respondent possessed an Ed. D., one (1) obtained the status of ABD, and two (2) possessed Master's Degrees, one in English Education and one in English as a Second Language. For visual representation see Table 1 below:

Degree	Area
PhD	Linguistics
PhD	Linguistics
PhD	Second Language Acquisition
PhD	Rhetoric
PhD	Pedagogy
PhD	Literature
PhD	Literature
Ed. D	Education
ABD	?
Master of Arts	English Education
Master of Arts	English as a Second Language

Table 1. Respondents by degree by area

2) Years of service

Similar to the broad range of expertise is the variation of years in the program. Of the eleven (11) respondents, four (4) have one to five years of experience, two (2) have six to ten years, two (2) have eleven to fifteen years, and three (3) have sixteen or more years of service. For illustration, see Table 2 below:

Years of service	Number of respondents
1 to 5	4
6 to 10	2
11 to 15	2
16 or more	3

Table 2. Number of respondents by years of service

3) Areas of graduate teaching

The eleven respondents had a range of teaching experience in the program. Four (4) had never taught in the program; one (1) taught in Literature, and six (6) taught in the linguistics and pedagogy area. See Table 3 below.

Number of faculty	Area of instruction
6	Linguistics and/or pedagogy
1	Literature
4	No courses

Table 3. Area of instruction by number of faculty

4) Numbers of graduate theses supervised

The range of experience in oversight of graduate student theses suggests an imbalance in the distribution of this facet of workload. One (1) respondent has overseen ten theses, two (2) faculty oversaw one, and the majority of respondents, eight (8), have not overseen a thesis. For illustration see Table 4 below:

Number of theses directed	Number of respondents
10	1
1	2
0	8

Table 4. Number of theses directed by number of respondents

5) Membership on graduate committees

Like other areas of workload, there is variation among duties related to serving as readers on thesis and comprehensive exam committees. Of the eleven respondents, one (1) served

as a reader on more than thirty committees, five (5) served as readers on one to five committees, two (2) served as readers on six to ten committees, two (2) served on no committees, and one (1) served as a reader on a comprehensive exam committee. For illustration, see Table 5 below:

Type of committee	Number of committees	Number of respondents
Thesis	30+	1
Thesis	6-10	2
Thesis	1-5	5
Comprehensive exam	1	1
None	None	2

Table 5. Respondents by committee type and number

B. General Evaluation of the Program

The mission and the mission statement as well as needed improvements to the program are addressed in this section.

When the graduate program was created in 1979, it expressed 5 goals:

1. To raise the level of English skills of the Puerto Rican student.
2. To increase the supply of exceptionally well-trained English teachers, creating a corps of such teachers who will be able to direct other teachers and the system in general towards solutions toward specific problems.
3. To provide a basis for cooperative effort between the University of Puerto Rico and the Department of Public Instruction.
4. To further improve undergraduate education at RUM by the presence of the graduate program.
5. To increase the fund of theoretical and empirical knowledge of language analysis and language acquisition in the Puerto Rican context.

1) Perceptions of the program's mission

In regard to faculty impressions of the graduate program's mission, four (4) respondents replied to the question; seven (7) did not. They indicated that the mission of the program is too broad to be effectively addressed. They suggested, however, that it prepared people for careers in teaching and that it was designed to improve teaching and learning, and to foster research related to language in Puerto Rico. Faculty also commented that the program gave students a strong background in theory that is applied in the classroom. The individual items addressing perceptions of the program's mission are presented below, not marked by respondent:

- covers literature, linguistics and TESOL too broadly
- designed to prepare people for teaching careers
- designed to improve teaching and learning in Puerto Rico
- fosters research related to language in Puerto Rico
- gives teachers a strong background in theory that is applied in the classroom

- is too broad because it was designed to keep everyone happy by including all three areas of literature, linguistics, and TESOL

2) Ambiguity of mission statement

In their responses, department faculty members were of two extremes. Some noted that the mission statement was ambiguous as it was unclear to whom the document referred, graduate students or students in general. In addition, they questioned whether the mission prompted our graduate students to develop leadership qualities they might put to use in the direction of their colleagues at secondary institutions. This opinion was echoed in comments surrounding the title of the program which was MA in English Education because the TESOL title was used by Inter American University at San Germán. Criticism also reflects a lack of a practicum which would be mandatory in a TESOL Program and the lack of literature offerings that would be expected in a literature curriculum.

On the other hand, others felt that the mission adequately represented the goals of the program and that there was an impact on the teaching of English in Puerto Rico as a result of the program. The MAEE has been credited by the faculty with increasing the numbers of faculty holding the PhD. The program is seen as generally effective in meeting its objectives of training teachers whose primary goals are to teach in Puerto Rico. According to one respondent, however, the program could better meet its objectives of educating teachers by the inclusion of more pedagogy courses. Table 6 illustrates the findings.

Number of responses	Type of response
5	Too ambiguous or unfocused
2	Generally effective
1	Weak in fostering leadership
1	Results too unclear to tell
1	Increased PhD holding faculty

Table 6. Number of responses by type

3) Recommended improvements in the graduate program

Several specific areas of recommended improvements are in evidence in faculty responses. The faculty indicates agreement in the need to enhance the number of pedagogy courses in the program, to enforce or raise standards in the program, to develop a clearer focus for the program, to define a literature program separate from the MAEE, and to seek TESOL Certification for the program.

Criticism surrounding the lack of focus rests on the need to define the program as an MAEE program that addresses the needs of current students, particularly those who teach in elementary and secondary classrooms who have need of greater emphasis on linguistics and pedagogy as well as to develop offerings in Young Adult Literature, Literacy, and Second Language Acquisition for children. Increased emphasis on research and theory is clear in the criticism as is the need to address the issue of Puerto Rico's

ESL student population and a greater recognition of the program that TESOL certification would allow. These findings are illustrated below in Table 7:

Number of occurrences	Type of improvement
1	Increase or enforce standards
1	Add practicum for language teaching
3	Create a literature degree
2	Improve and clarify focus
5	Add pedagogy courses (6-9 credits)
1	Expand current good work
1	Address needs of elementary teachers
1	Make program more flexible with 2-track
1	Develop research in PR language context
1	Create a strong ESL program
1	Obtain MA TESOL certification
1	Address student writing problems early
1	Increase offerings for secondary teachers, including Young Adult Literature, literacy, and SLA for children

Table 7. Types of improvement by number

C. Evaluation of Program Requirements

Program requirements were evaluated in terms of their usefulness and suggestions for modification were requested in the survey instrument. As well, the various courses in the graduate program were analyzed by respondents who were asked to provide feedback on individual courses, on the thesis and comprehensive exam options, on the graduate students' qualifications upon entry and exit of the program, and the relationship between the graduate program and the faculty member's own research agenda. The variation in numbers of comments in each table below reflects the fact that some respondents did not answer all questions and occasionally respondents provided more than one countable response.

1) Evaluations of core courses

a) 6009 Models for Teaching Literature was analyzed by respondents who recommended that the course should retain its pedagogical orientation and not be redesigned to be a course in literary criticism; nevertheless the course should provide a foundation in basic theoretical approaches to literature and pedagogy. The approach should provide a variety of activities to be used in the primary and secondary classroom that are based on theoretically and pedagogically sound methods. The perceived limitation of the course should be corrected by adding a course in literary criticism to the program. The variety and occurrences of responses are tabled below:

Number	Evaluative comment
6	Broad based course on practical teaching methods that are grounded in sound theory
2	Not based in literary criticism
2	Adds value to the degree
1	Should be complemented by a course in literary criticism

Table 8. Evaluative comments by number

b) 6010 Materials and Testing in ESL was analyzed and found in need of a more carefully defined focus. Faculty suggests that the limitations of the course could be overcome by splitting the course into two, one focusing on materials and the other on testing and evaluation. The responses are tabled below:

Number	Evaluative comment
5	Make two courses: ESL Materials and ESL Testing and Evaluation
2	Essential course
1	Need more emphasis on testing

Table 9. Evaluative comments by number

c) 6020: Second Language Acquisition is evaluated as a required course that is extremely useful because it provides a theoretical basis for understanding second language acquisition as its name implies. The course rates highly with faculty members.

Number	Evaluative comment
5	Essential and excellent
1	Foundational

Table 10. Evaluative comments by number

d) 6005: Foundations of English Education is evaluated nearly as positively as 6020 with the exception only that the focus might be too narrow for some students who are not planning to remain in Puerto Rico to apply their credential to their careers.

Number	Evaluative comment
4	Essential and excellent
1	Too narrow focus
1	Usefulness has declined

Table 11. Evaluative comment by number

2) Evaluations of elective courses

Item fourteen requested other comments on the courses, which resulted in a broad analysis by respondents of the course offerings. The results are presented below.

a) 5010 Perspectives in TESL has been criticized for not being clearly enough distinguished from 6010, nor do faculty feel it is rigorous enough as an advanced undergraduate course to meet the expectations of graduate coursework.

b) 5009 Contrastive Grammar is a course that is rarely taught; but faculty members believe it is important for our students to understand specific differences in the structures of English and Spanish. To enhance interest in the course, faculty members suggest that it might be taught more creatively than it has been in the past.

c) 5015 English and American Literary Criticism is criticized for not belonging in the current program and is recommended to be placed in a Master's in Literature program with a 6000-level number.

d) 5025 Current Approaches in Linguistic Theory demonstrates the fact that the original program was intended to do all things for all people, a comment that notes the impossibility of meeting goals that are too broadly construed.

e) 6006 Research Methods is determined to be an important course that should focus on a specific approach or method in order to meet the needs of the students who take it. It should include both quantitative and qualitative methods, and be more closely linked to students' interests in literature, linguistics, or writing.

f) 6016 Topics in Sociolinguistics is seen as very useful as an applied linguistics course.

g) 6028 Psycholinguistics and the Reading Process is determined a good course, but the respondent suggests that it should be re-titled as Reading in a Second Language to more accurately represent the course content.

h) 6030 Theory and Practice of Composition and 6040 Practice in the Teaching of Composition are questioned for the past duplication of course contents. In addition, respondents note that two composition courses seems out of balance and what is needed is to eliminate one of the composition courses and to replace it with a course in teaching speaking and listening in a second language.

i) Special topics and Studies in Literature courses: The title of the actual course the student took should appear on his/her transcript: e.g. "Special Topics: African Literature"

j) 6055-6056-6058 Studies in Literature in itself can be valuable, but how it applies to the degree program is not clear. They provide guidance in conducting research about literature. The course should be eliminated when or if an MA in Literature is approved.

3) Suggested additional courses

Faculty respondents suggested a variety of courses to be added to the program that reflect current trends in language teaching and learning. These courses include the following: learning psychology, adolescent and children’s SLA, increased literature offerings, increased pedagogy courses in computer-aided instruction, a separate testing and evaluation in TESL course, a course in teaching listening and speaking, and L2 Writing/Composition. The numbers of requests for these additions are tabled below:

Number	Suggested additional course
1	Learning psychology
1	ESP courses
1	More literature courses including young adult and children’s lit
3	Pedagogy of Technologically enhanced classrooms CALL
2	Separate course on ESL testing
1	Course in listening and speaking

Table 12. Suggested additional course by number

4) Evaluation of the thesis option

The respondents report that the thesis option seems weak because of a lack of an explicit goal to develop students’ research skills. Nevertheless, the thesis option provides valuable experience to those students who plan to continue their graduate studies. The non-thesis option needs to be retained for students not interested in completing a thesis. Further, serving on thesis committees is a rewarding experience for faculty.

a) **improvement to the thesis option**

The thesis option, according to the respondents, could be improved through a clarification of its pedagogical component and by impressing upon students that they may change the composition of their graduate committees if their interests change.

5) Evaluation of the comprehensive exam

The faculty respondents find that the link between the comprehensive exam option and the program goals is weak and that the exam often repeats work already completed in the graduate coursework. They report that they would prefer a closer link to student research abilities and a development of skills in citing various important works in the course of the exam option. The oral presentation of the research paper is also thought to discourage

students from opting to take the comprehensive exam in lieu of writing a thesis. They recommend the exam option be revised to include more rigorous standards for passing.

a) improvement of the exam option

According to the faculty respondents, the comprehensive exam option is appropriate for those students who define the MAEE as a terminal degree and who will not continue future graduate work. This option could be improved by the incorporation of independent reading and research beyond the requirements for individual courses. Respondents recommend that the exam be refocused to include student participation in the formulation of questions. Students should also participate in practice forums where they can develop skills in answering the sorts of questions contained in the comprehensive exam. Faculty also suggest that students receive more assistance from faculty than they currently do under this option and that students not be allowed to sit for the exam until their committee believes that the student is capable of passing it.

6) Perceptions of entering graduate students rated by admission requirements

Respondents were asked to rate their perceptions of students entering the program as though they were assessing students in terms of entrance requirements. Responses indicated that faculty assessed entering students’ abilities primarily as *fair to good*, with the majority of marks falling in the *good* level across rated abilities.

Requirement	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent
Speaking ability					3	1	2
Writing ability		1	1	1	3		
Research skills			4		2		
Background knowledge			2	1	3		
Coursework done			1		3		
Clear notion of goal	1		1	1	3		
Ability to work independently			3		2		1
Ability to collaborate			1		2		3
Attitude towards graduate study	1				3		2
Attitude towards our MA program			1		3		2

Table 13. Incoming student ability rating by requirement

7) Perceptions of departing students rated by graduation requirements

Respondents were asked to rate students leaving the program in terms of their abilities. In general their responses, compared with student abilities upon entrance, showed significant improvement, with an overall decrease in *fair* marks awarded and an overall increase in *excellent* marks awarded.

Requirement	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent
Speaking ability					2	1	3
Writing ability			2	1	1	1	1
Research skills			1		3	1	1
Background knowledge				1	3	1	1
Coursework done					3		1
Clear notion of goal					3	1	1
Ability to work independently					4		1
Ability to collaborate					2	1	3
Attitude towards graduate study			1		2	1	2
Attitude towards our MA program			1		2	1	2

Table 14. Departing student ability rating by requirement

D. Evaluation of Research in the Graduate Program

The survey instrument identified four areas in which to seek faculty evaluation of the research opportunities in the graduate program, including those afforded to students and to faculty and how faculty have created extra-departmental research opportunities.

1) Evaluation of promotion of student research by program

The faculty respondents consistently note that student research is fostered in courses and through the thesis option. In addition they cite anecdotal evidence from former students who have gone on to seek doctoral degrees as stating that the program has prepared them to pursue advanced level research. Presentation opportunities for students at PR TESOL are cited as fostering research by students also. For illustration of the results, see Table 17 below:

Number	Current and Needed Methods of promotion of student research
1	Classes
2	Thesis option
1	PR TESOL
1	Require research course
1	Need more research assistantships
2	Excellent opportunities currently available

Table 15. Current and needed methods for promoting student research by number

2) Evaluation of intersection of faculty research interests and program

Faculty respondents report that teaching in the graduate program affords them opportunity to reflect critically on their own research. Guiding students through research projects also appears to have a positive impact on faculty perceptions of their own research. Some faculty find no relationship between their own research and the graduate

program, and others are currently studying in the areas of research offered through the graduate program. Faculty who work in the area at the intersection of the impact of education and training of practice note a positive correlation. For a list of comments by faculty, see Table 18 below:

Number	Intersection of research interests and program
1	No connection
4	Courses taught are directly connected to research interest
1	Connection not as strong as desired, but not the fault of the program

Table 16. Intersection of faculty research interests and program by number

3) Extra-departmental research activities provided students by faculty

Respondents indicate a variety of practical research activities in which they have engaged their students, ranging from literary criticism to applied ESL research. Below is tabulation of the types of research by number:

Number	Type of research
1	Literary criticism
1	ESL verbal protocols
1	Writing classroom observations
1	Recording and transcription of children
1	Recording and transcription of adult ESL learners

Table 17. Type of research by number

E. Evaluation of Program Administration

The instrument sought data in the area of program administration in terms of evaluation of the effectiveness of the Graduate Committee, the admissions process, the registration process, the facilities and the recruitment process.

1) Effectiveness of the Graduate Committee

The Graduate Committee's ratings can be summarized as follows: seven (7) faculty respondents felt that the committee functioned at levels *three* and *four*, indicating a positive response on the four-point scale. One (1) respondent categorized the functioning of the committee as negative, rating it two points on the four-point scale. For illustration, see Table 18 below.

Number of responses	Rating on four-point scale
0	1 (Ineffective)
1	2
4	3
3	4 (Effective)

Table 18. Rating of effectiveness of GC on a four-point scale by number

2) Suggested improvements to the Graduate Committee

Respondents noted several areas for improvement of functioning, including closer connections to tracks, better balanced representation of disciplines, inclusion of all faculty members teaching in the graduate program, removing ineffective leadership, inclusion of a coursework reduction for leadership, and greater transparency. For tabulated results see below:

Number	Suggested improvement
1	Greater connection to specific tracks
1	Balanced representation from tracks
1	Inclusion of all faculty teaching graduate courses
1	Process for removal of ineffective leadership
1	Course reduction for leadership position
1	Greater transparency of information

Table 19. Suggested improvement to GC by number

3) Effectiveness of admissions process

The effectiveness of the admissions process received a lukewarm evaluation, with the majority of responses at levels *two* and *three*. Only one (1) respondent ranked the admissions process as *effective*.

Number	Rating on four-point scale
0	1 (Ineffective)
2	2
3	3
1	4 (Effective)

Table 20. Rating of admissions process on a four-point scale by number

a) Suggested improvements of the admissions process

The suggestions for improving the admissions process ranged from a statement that there was nothing currently wrong with the process to the counter statement that there seems to be no process in place at all. In the middle, suggestions

including acting in a more timely fashion regarding the circulation of applications for review (which implies a process) and receiving applications as early as possible (which is not in the power of the department to control). Also suggested was a reconsideration of the policy for assigning deficiencies to incoming students. Tabulated results are displayed in Table 21 below:

Number	Suggested improvement
1	Revise policy on student deficiency
1	Receive applications as early as possible
1	Create a process
1	Handle applications uniformly
1	Process is already efficient
1	Circulate applications more punctually

Table 21. Suggested improvement in admissions process by number

4) Evaluation of the registration process

This item received a low-level of response, with only three faculty answering the question. Two of them rated the effectiveness as a *two* and one rated it as a *four* on a four-point scale. Results are tabulated below:

Number	Rating on a four-point scale
0	1 (Ineffective)
2	2
0	3
1	4 (Effective)

Table 22. Rating of registration process on a four-point scale by number

a) Improvements to the registration process

Faculty respondents suggest both that the registration process is efficient and that graduate students need to register at the same time as undergraduates or to register early so that professors can adequately prepare for the courses offered. To foster early registration, an annual course rotation needs to be established. These suggestions are tabulated below.

Number	Suggested improvements to registration process
3	Graduate students need to register early and with others
1	Process is efficient
1	Establish annual rotation of courses

Table 23. Suggested improvements to registration process by number

5) Evaluation of facilities

Faculty respondents were inclined to rate facilities negatively with five (5) faculty rating them at a level of *two* on a four-point scale. Generally positive and positive assessments occurred with one (1) rating at the level of *three*, or slightly positive, and two (2) at the level of *four*, or good. These results are tabulated below:

Number	Rating of facilities on a four-point scale
0	1 (poor)
5	2
1	3
2	4 (good)

Table 24. Rating of facilities by number

a) Suggestions for improvement of facilities

The suggested improvements included: increasing library holdings, creating a computer lab for students and enhancing existing computing facilities, locating individual offices for professors, creating larger faculty offices, creating a library room for graduate students, and subdividing the teaching assistants' office to make space for non-TA graduate students. One respondent thought the facilities were fine. For illustration, see Table 25.

Number	Suggested improvements to facilities
1	No improvements are necessary
2	Increase library holdings of books and online journals
1	Creating student computer lab for English majors
2	Creating individual offices for professors
1	Installing multimedia equipment in more classrooms
2	Improve current computer classrooms
1	Provide office space for all graduate students in current TA office
1	Create graduate student library room for meetings
1	Improve all classrooms

Table 25. Suggested improvements to facilities by number

6) Evaluation of recruiting process

One (1) respondent considered that the current recruitment process is in no need of improvement. Suggestions from the nine (9) who disagreed with this view included: developing the “unique” aspects of our program, using faculty research and interests in marketing materials, establishing a solid reputation in ESL, publicizing the flexible options in our current program, defining our program’s focus more specifically, eliminating unnecessary prerequisites, recruiting in local schools, hosting open houses, allowing the recruitment to remain in the hands of the Graduate Committee, creating a TESL degree separate from an MA in Literature, and reducing prerequisites in literature. Results are tabulated below.

Number	Suggested improvements
1	Develop our “unique” characteristics
2	Establish solid ESL reputation
1	Define and publicize flexibility of program
1	Eliminate unnecessary prerequisites
1	Recruit locally in schools
1	Invite in local school districts to open houses
1	Leave recruitment in the hands of the graduate committee
1	Create separate MA in Literature
1	Do nothing-it is already attractive

Table 25. Suggested improvements to recruitment by number

F. Discussion of Results

The findings presented here are offered with a specific caveat, for only 24% of the departmental faculty answered the survey. This fact raises serious questions about how valid certain findings are (especially the ones included in section A), for specifics of the department note a much broader array of degrees than is represented in the demographics of the faculty who participated in the survey.

1) Programmatic Issues

The findings point to the need to more attentively and narrowly define the profile of the MAEE program, to make the course requirements and course offerings directly pertinent to the objectives and disciplinary concerns of English Education. This revision, some respondents seem to suggest, would also entail updating curricular content, bringing it up to par with recent developments in the field. In tandem with this curricular review revision, which should result in a more rigorous formative track, the graduate program should undertake a careful definition of the profile of a parallel track in literature. Rigor and disciplinary specificity seem to be concerns of the graduate faculty.

2) Graduate faculty Issues

The respondents seem to be concerned about the lack of faculty involvement in, and commitment to, the graduate program. Evidently, measures should be taken to distribute the workload more evenly among those who are involved in graduate teaching, advising, mentoring and supervision. But, as the sparse level of response to the survey suggests, an even more aggressive effort needs to be made to “recruit” departmental faculty into the graduate program. The fact that many respondents regard their involvement in the graduate program as pertinent to their research endeavors could perhaps be used as a magnet to attract other faculty members (especially in light of the fact that our undergraduate teaching assignments seldom relate to our scholarly production).

3) Graduate student Issues

With regards to the “target audience” of our graduate program, two central areas of concern seem to emerge from the findings.

The first one pertains to the processes of *recruitment and admission* of qualified, committed and competent students. The lack of an aggressive and concerted recruitment strategy directed at the target population of our program seems to have been working against us, mitigating the growth, caliber and standing of our program. But the development of such a strategy is highly contingent upon our ability to sharply define the profile of the program: its objectives, its disciplinary focus or foci, the competencies it would develop in students, etc. Thus, the issue might not be resolved by simply developing an efficient, logistically-sound process for attracting and processing graduate student applications (even though this seems to be desperately needed). If we cross-tabulate the results of the survey we would find evidence to suggest that what we just as urgently need to do is to more precisely map out the contours and scope of the educational journey that we are encouraging applicants to undertake.

On the other hand, the survey results also reveal a need to revise the ways in which we work with students who are already enrolled in the program. Two areas where we appear to have much room for improvement are *research training* and *development of writing skills*. With regards to the first one, the focus seems to be centered on applying methodological approaches, at the expense of engaging with epistemological questions about the meaning and implications of research, or training students to analyze, evaluate and critique research methods and findings. This undoubtedly works to the detriment of our students, most of whom go on to write theses and thus need to be able to articulate original research questions and produce pertinent and critical reviews of scholarly literature. The second concern, our program’s ability to hone the students’ writing skills, seems to deserve urgent attention in light of the fact that the survey results show little indication that completion of the program results in any significant improvement in this crucial area of graduate student training.

II. FORMER STUDENT EVALUATION

Graduate subcommittee: Student Outcomes

Report authors: Drs. E. Blau, L. Dayton, B. Morales

Date completed: May 24, 2004

A. Introduction

On March 9, 2004, the sub-committee sent out a cover letter and questionnaire to approximately 80 former students of the MAEE program for whom we had addresses. Eight graduates of the program who are currently working in this department also received the questionnaire. In addition, five former students had already filled out a pilot version of the same questionnaire, and their feedback is included in this report. The total number of respondents was forty-one (41), and they were spread over the entire lifetime of the program: 1982-2003.

Of the 41 respondents:

- 32 completed the thesis option
- 7 completed the comprehensive exam option
- 2 did not complete the degree

Variation in responses in this section results from answers left blank or more than one countable answer provided per respondent.

B. Reasons for Entering Program and Career Paths upon Graduation

Most respondents stated that they wanted to improve their preparation as teachers and advance professionally; several stated that they hoped to teach at the college level. Other reasons for entering the program included enrichment, convenience, and experience in a Spanish-speaking environment; one student entered the program because of the Mayagüez Writing Project.

Several have gone into careers unrelated to education (e.g. massage therapy, law). Thirty-three (80%) have pursued teaching careers. Fourteen (34%) pursued or are pursuing a doctorate. A few have gone into administration or supervision.

C. Opinions about the Content of the Program

The respondents' opinions about the usefulness and importance of the three components of the program were varied. As Appendix A demonstrates, the response pattern corresponds loosely to the topics students have chosen for their theses. **Table 1** presents the evaluative ranking each program obtained (in terms of *importance and usefulness*) by percentage of respondents.

Component	High importance/ usefulness	Medium importance/ usefulness	Low importance/ usefulness
ESL/Pedagogy	89%	11%	0%
Linguistics	71%	26%	3%
Literature	67%	33%	0%

Table 26. Importance/usefulness ranking of each program component by percentage of respondents

The questionnaire also asked graduates to indicate whether to *keep*, *revise* or *eliminate* specific courses. Because the respondents span the 21-year period that the program has been in existence, they have obviously had different professors for these courses and have been exposed to different ways of handling the courses. There have also been changes in the curriculum since the program's inception: for example the Applied Linguistics Seminar is now two courses (Language Acquisition and TESL Materials and Testing); the Research Methods course used to cover research in both literature and language learning, acquisition and use, but it no longer includes research in literature. In addition, several courses have been added over the years (e.g. Practice in the Teaching of Composition, Theory and Practice in Composition).

With the above in mind, we report that all 41 respondents suggested keeping the following courses (the number of respondents follows the course title):

Table 2 lists the courses respondents suggested that we keep in the graduate curriculum. The **N** column indicates the number of respondents who opted for the *keep* option in the survey:

Course	Number
5010 Perspectives on Teaching English as a Second Language	19
6028 Psycholinguistics and the Reading Process	18
6016 Topics in Sociolinguistics	12
6018 Topics in Psycholinguistics	9
6085-6 Special Topics	9
5025 Current Approaches in Linguistic Theory	2

Table 27. Courses to be kept by number of respondents

Other courses obtained mixed rankings. **Table 28** lists their titles by the number and percentage of respondents who opted for the *keep* option in the survey. As these figures indicate, anywhere between ten (10) and thirty-five (35) percent of the students who ranked these courses recommended chose the *revise* option in the survey. The *eliminate* option was chosen by only two respondents: one indicated that **5009 Contrastive**

Grammar should be eliminated and another suggested that the same be done with **6005 Foundations of Education**.

Course	Number of respondents who chose <i>keep</i>	Percentage
6055 Studies in Literature	10	90%
6020 Second Language Acquisition	25	84%
6010 TESL Materials and Testing	24	83%
6030 Theory and Practice of Composition	8	75%
6008 Bilingualism and Language Contact	16	75%
6040 Practice in the Teaching of Composition	7	71%
5009 Contrastive Grammar	17	71%
6005 Foundations of English Education	27	70%
6006 Research Methods	19	68%
5015 English and American Literary Criticism	3	67%
6009 Models for Teaching Literature	29	65%

Table 28. Variably ranked courses by number and percentage of respondents who chose to keep them

The survey also asked graduates to make recommendations for courses or areas that should be included in the graduate curriculum. The seventy-three (73) responses gathered in this item of the survey reflect a wide variety of opinions. **Table 29** presents a synthesis of the recommendations, indicating the number and percentage of respondents who advocated for each of them.

Recommendations for new courses/areas	Number of respondents	Percentage
Add courses in educational technology	26	36%
Better training in practical pedagogy	24	33%
Balanced offerings in/attention to literature, linguistics and pedagogy	10	14%
Offer more literature courses	8	11%
Offer more linguistics courses	5	7%

Table 29. Recommendations for new courses/areas by number and percentage of respondents

Other recommendations included: offering on-line courses that foreign students could take; offering more and better courses in ESL composition; and offering more courses in the teaching of literature, Caribbean literature, writing, syntax, and linguistics.

D. Participation in and Evaluation of Teaching Assistantship Experience

Twenty-seven (27) of the respondents were employed as TAs while doing their MAEE; twelve (12) were not. The duration of their assistantships ranged from one to eight semesters; the average length was 2.4 semesters. Respondents taught a variety of proficiency track courses. Twenty (20) taught Basic English; fourteen (14) taught Pre-Basic English; eleven (11) taught 3201-3202 six (6) taught Intermediate English; and the Exchange Japan students taught Japanese in the Humanities Department though at least two of these also taught Basic or Pre-basic English at the end of their tenure here

Nine (9) of the respondents were full-time teachers while they held an assistantship, a practice that is against regulations and is no longer permitted. Eleven (11) held part-time jobs, teaching or non-teaching, and two (2) held full-time non-teaching jobs. They had a variety of types of guidance, but eight (8) of them had no teaching or mentoring guidance.

E. Representative Responses to Open-Ended Survey Items: General Evaluative Comments about the Graduate Program

- Fantastic program- helped me a lot to understand how students learn a second language, the difficulties it involves and the benefits.
- I learned so much in the MA program.
- The program met my expectations and I am where I'm at today as a result of my time at UPRM, expected to increase my understanding of literature and linguistics and get teaching experience.
- The program has a strong foundation; it's up to the students to get the most out of it.
- I have learned far more than I had expected.
- I expected a more "in-depth" preparation than the one I had, on the "language" per se as well as the research and teaching aspects of it. I definitely got what I was expecting and even more. . . the program gives the student the tools and the student, with those tools, builds what he/she wants to get from it.
- Writing the thesis and interacting with my advisors was probably the most important part of my MA.
- From conversations I've had with other co-workers who also went through a MA program, I believe our program was very demanding, they had it so much easier.
- I got what I was looking for to become a responsible and creative teacher for ESL students in college.
- The RUM MAEE program is world class.
- The classes are demanding. Not all the students came to class having done the necessary reading and research. This is not fair to the professors or other students.

- I learned so much about American and English literature, the political influence in every aspect (not only ESL) of Puerto Rican culture, second language acquisition, etc. It was a very enriching experience.
- I expected to acquire a stronger background on the teaching of ESL both in linguistics and literature and my expectations were met in both areas.
- My biggest concern and interest was in learning how to prepare my own teaching material since I am not satisfied with the quality of ESL material out there. . . This is one reason why I was very much interested in preparing instructional material in my thesis. Today I find preparing material is a much easier task than before.
- When I began taking classes I was very frustrated with the literature courses because it was not something I was used to. I had to take 15 credits of deficiency courses in order to be admitted to the program. At this point I was considering not continuing in the program. I thought I was going to be taking classes in pedagogy and the teaching of English. Even though I was confused when I entered the program, what I got out of it has been very valuable in my career decisions so far. Having a variety of courses provided me the opportunity to be admitted to an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program at UAF. I would say that without that teaching experience (she was a TA), probably it was not going to be so easy to find a job (at college level).
- (From a respondent who pursued a non-teaching career path) I've had opportunities and challenges to use and apply what I learned to my current work projects and assignments and still continue to do so- no regrets.

F. Representative Responses to Open-Ended Survey Items: Additional Recommendations

- The exam was very basic. I think it could have been more challenging.
- I preferred more in assessment; there should be a class that emphasizes listening and speaking.
- The department should coordinate with División de Extensión for 3-6 electives in School Administration and Supervision. It is a reality that once you have a Master's Degree the offers do appear.
- Models for teaching literature did not meet its purpose.
- Some topics that should be explored in the MAEE's core courses besides language are the concepts of critical theory, authority, subjectivity, culture and identity, globalization, media and technology, educational policies, just to mention a few.
- Focus more on research- more theoretical and practice research courses.
- Research methods should be required as it used to be.
- I would encourage more teaching techniques or integrate them in each class.
- Provide sources for international students.
- Include more core or required courses, such as, contrastive grammar, and practice in the teaching of composition, which could include many types of practical texts as well.
- There should be a "models for teaching linguistics" course.

G. Discussion of Results

The respondents in this area numbered forty-one (41), providing a broad picture, but this number represents fewer than fifty percent of the graduates of our program. Nevertheless, their input in the assessment process has enabled us understand the general evaluation of the program by those who have come through it in order to come to the following conclusions.

Programmatic Issues

The respondents indicate a need to review and revise the curriculum in the MAEE program with an eye toward specific classes that are named in the recommendation section. In addition, there is expressed a strong need for a development of new courses within the program to help meet current needs of teachers in the field of English and a need to integrate research into all courses in the program to foster in students the development of high-level research abilities. Respondents also pinpoint a need to assess the interrelationship among courses in the program and to reconfirm or modify these relationships in order to meet curricular objectives.

Faculty Issues

The data indicate a concern on the parts of students for the content of each course, specifically the actual course seemed to differ from what students expected based on the course description they read in the catalog. This mismatch seems to suggest an overall assessment of the current courses in terms of their current appropriateness to the program. Either or both the course content and the description should be updated to indicate current practice and sound theory.

Graduate Student Issues

Respondents articulated a significant need for a comprehensive program to be implemented to deal with their needs for oversight, timely advising, support, and mentoring by graduate faculty. In addition, they indicate a need for revision of the comprehensive exam option to make it a viable option.

In addition, teaching assistantships were seen as valuable learning experiences, but some comments indicate the need to assess the number of courses students teach each semester.

III. CURRENT STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Graduate subcommittee: Current Student Outcomes

Report authors: Dr. C. Fleck, Dr. M. James, Dr. A. Rodríguez

Compiled October 28, 2004

A. Introduction

The questionnaire was administered in Spring and Fall, 2004. 15 questionnaires were returned (7 from spring administration, 8 from fall administration). This number represents 25% of the student population.

The following sections of this document present the raw data gathered from the questionnaire, divided into 6 main sections:

- thesis/comprehensive exam
- courses
- research
- mission
- faculty guidance
- general feedback

Variation of number within this section indicates that not all respondents replied to every survey item and that some provided more than one countable response.

B. Findings by Survey Question

1. Thesis/comp. exam: (*All data in this section relates to theses)

(a) Is there sufficient information available about the thesis/comp. exam?

Yes	No	Comments
6	9	(-) need to be counseled by someone in the know (yes, but) not for comprehensive exam (yes, but) it should be given to students so they don't have to look for it

(b) Does thesis help you develop ...

	Yes	No	Comments
CS	5	1	(+) it is a lot of all of the above. better writing, better expression through my writing. we do a lot of research and reading. is a complete process where you use the 4 skills. I have done a considerable amount of reading and writing, as well as present ideas in classes and conferences.
RS	5	1	(+) doing a lot of it; experience is teaching me a lot. the more research I work with, the easier it becomes to understand other people's research. the process helps to encourage these. my interviewing skills have improved as well as my ability to find pertinent material. (-) there should be specific guidelines etc.
CT	5	0	(+) develops critical thinking skills because of all the reading and synthesis needed to do it well. the readings expand my thinking about certain topics. I have to think to develop my ideas. (yes, but) I learned more in my undergraduate program.
TS	3	3	(+) thesis topic has pedagogical implications. we TAs are obligated to go to workshops. (-)it is not that big of a problem; my thesis is not focused directly on what I am teaching. I do not apply this experience to my teaching.
KB	4	1	(+) my thesis is in curriculum hence I am looking at and receiving a lot of the above. my interests include linguistics. (-) My thesis focuses on writing. (yes, but) I have gotten ideas on what journals to look for but not actually guided towards.

Note. CS = communication skills; RS = research skills; CT = critical thinking; TS = teaching skills; KB = knowledge base;

(c) Is the thesis process efficient?

Ye s	No	
6	2	<p>(+) I did what I was told and interviewed various professors. It is helpful, sequential. only if you have sufficient time to dedicate to the entire process. it is based on the student; it is as efficient or inefficient as you make it; all profs. seem to have an open door and are willing to talk.</p> <p>(-) finding a supervisor and committee is a bit hard because you have to be sure of what you want to write about and I didn't know when I had to choose my committee. students shouldn't have to beg for help, they should be guided; profs. shouldn't accept students if they are working on too many projects.</p>

(d) How do you feel about the thesis?

very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
1	3	1	0	1

Main strengths of thesis option

- The experience is great. I am learning a ton. The research is great and I am improving my writing.
- Feedback from my committee
- the research process

Main weaknesses of thesis option

- Office hours of graduate office -- if our classes are late because we work, why can't they have a schedule for graduate students later as well?
- No one here gets along enough to work together. No one can put aside their differences to focus on the students. Professors should not obligate students to participate in activities that is of no relevance to the course, for example TESOL. More classes should be offered for each foci.

General comments

- There should be a required course on how to develop a thesis.

2. Courses

(a) Do courses help you to develop ...

	Yes	No	Comments
CS	13	1	<p>(+) variety of communication skills being taught. the program is focused on preparing students to get ready for the thesis or exam. I practice my English with professors and peers. courses require a lot of the before mentioned communication skills. Variety of readings, expansion of thoughts, better expression through speaking and writing. By complying to the course requirements of presentations and investigations. So far the courses require that the student consistently use and develop these skills. they have been adequately exposed. everything helps. research papers, oral presentations. courses prepare us to be efficient teacher and to prepare for thesis or exam. my writing has greatly improved since entering the prog.</p> <p>(-) some classes have no relevance to what the course is supposed to cover; some are all writing, others are all listening, etc. No one class has all covered.</p>
RS	12	2	<p>(+) even early on, classes get you to think about thesis proposal. main focus is thesis preparation. all classes have required me to do research. classes are designed around research. I did not have much experience with looking for research. I did this, particularly in the 6005 where we had to prepare a mini-thesis (and also presented it at TESOL). the work we do requires it. research papers, TESOL presentations. most of the courses require research projects and practice makes perfect. I have done a lot of it and have had excellent guidance throughout.</p> <p>(-) I need a lot of direction. they ask for research but have no guidelines.</p>
CT	12	1	<p>(+) a lot of the reading material can be debatable. all classes have required me to think critically. I have been taught to think on my own, no matter what my professors tell me to think. I have developed divergent thinking, am more analytical. we always have to put our own thinking. papers about book and articles. to do well in most classes, we are required to use these skills.</p>

			<p>(-) it is more focused on research skills. (yes, but) we are encouraged to follow what they say rather than argue different views.</p>
TS	10	4	<p>(+) some courses focus exactly on that. the TAship has helped me develop my teaching skills. I have been able to apply a lot of what I learned. I am preparing myself and am more confident. lesson plans; apply the theory in the classroom.</p> <p>(-) none of the courses have anything to do with teaching except 6009 and 6010 I have learned teaching skills through my TA experience. many of the courses don't relate directly back to practice. (yes and no) it depends on the class; SLA more than a class like psycho or socio linguistics.</p>
KB	10	4	<p>(+) I have taken a little of all three My BA was not in English ed., so my knowledge base has expanded immensely. it is well-balanced in those three. the pedagogy books help it. there is a good balance at least in theory; the core courses are good, but some could be taught <u>much better</u>.</p> <p>(-) there is not equal distribution between the 3 in the program; there is more of one foci. not all three, just linguistics. only one class of literature has been offered.</p> <p>(yes and no) it depends on the class and what it focuses on</p>

(b) Is the course work element of the program efficient?

Yes	No	Comments
7	5	<p>(+) I get a balanced education in all 3 areas. I have applied them in my work; I have grown as a student and as an adult. it has to do with me directly; unlike the Inter, where group work is their focus; I don't have time to waste. we are expected to carry out projects, assignments, presentations, readings, plus tests (sometimes too much).</p> <p>(-) too much focus on theory, not enough on practice. should include more courses on literature. the dept. needs to get more students in the program to be able to offer a wider selection of courses per semester, more choice. scheduling is a major problem; students are usually not happy with selection; however, without more students it is hard to fix.</p>

(c) How do you feel about the courses?

very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
3	8	2	1	0

Main strengths of course work

- lecture style/teaching approach.
- project work.
- the efficient balance of everything that is done in the class.
- content coverage.
- research oriented.
- Most of the work has allowed me to expand my way of thinking and writing and each one has prepared me for the following class.
- I'm really glad we don't have to do group work like at fellow "wippity" colleges where professors don't teach because the students demonstrate classes and this is how the semester goes.
- teaching approach.
- the teaching approach and the work that is required is very good.
- the research process and critical thinking.
- project work.
- project work and the ability to do research in areas that interest me.
- all classes have focused on each of those areas, but no one class covered all in equal amounts; project work.

Main weaknesses of course work

- content coverage.
- content coverage.
- diversity of course offerings.
- a lot isn't related to applying the course to teaching in the classroom; not enough workshop-like courses.
- Availability of certain courses -- focus of certain courses are aimed at teachers of higher levels of education -- they should include lower levels as well.
- the teaching approach for pedagogical topics.
- content coverage.
- some of the teachers don't teach things that can be used in class; theory is good and important, but so is having practical material and tips to use in class.
- lecture style.

General comments about coursework:

- I feel that it is a bit unrealistic to people who can not read large amounts of information and soak it all in at once; it is kind of unmotivational.

- I believe that all three areas should receive equal attention, given the fact that students have different interests.
- I believe more needs to be done to attract a more diverse student population; with a larger student population the dept. will be able to offer more classes and thus keep the students happy and allow them to take courses they wish to.
- So far I have taken two courses which appear to have relative similarities.
- Pedagogy courses should be revised.
- I'm a literature student and the lack of literature courses in the program makes me wonder if I want to stay in the program.
- In order to get into the program, one must have 18 credits in prerequisites. However, 9 of them can be taken in the 1st year, which means that the students are taking classes without the prerequisites for some courses. The point is many people don't come to our program because they don't want to take the prerequisites. So we can't get the students needed to fill classes. As a result, students cannot take the classes they want. Scheduling is a big problem!
- It all sucks, OK! You will use this info for statistics but won't actually change anything; no one cares about anything after tenure.

3. Research

(a) Are you involved with any of the research being conducted in the department?

Yes	No
3	11

(b) Are you familiar with any of the research being conducted in the department?

Yes	No
5	8

(c) Is participating in research being conducted in the department helping develop your ...

	Yes	No	Comments
CS	3	0	(+) I have to use all my skills to work successfully in research. I have been doing a lot of all of them; I have also had good training from profs.
RS	3	0	(+) I learn to collect data. practice and repetition makes me better.
CT	3	0	(+) I learn to work with people and explain to them the purpose of the research. I am constantly having to relate everything to my topic, trying to see all the different points of view.
TS	1	2	(+) I am in contact with public schools. (-) my project doesn't necessarily have to do with in-class teaching skills.
KB	2	1	(+) I have learned a lot about administrative work in research.

			(-) I don't have the background in literature, but it won't create a problem with my research, which is pedagogy with linguistics.
--	--	--	--

(d) Is the process for participating in English department research efficient?

Yes	No	
2	1	(+) it is different work that helps a lot as a mechanism for other research and the thesis. it is if you want it to be; the research is important in all of the classes, so I think everyone is efficiently forced to do it. (-) there is not enough of it; only a handful of professors do it

(e) How do you feel about participating in research being conducted in the department?

very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
3	0	0	0	0

Main strengths of participating in research being conducted in the department

- It has taught me a lot, analytical reading and writing'
- It is a whole different type of work in which other skills can be developed in the field of SLA.
- The focus is publishing and presenting and profs. are positive and willing to help.

Main weaknesses of participating in research being conducted in the department

- Many professors are overworked and stressed out

General comments about participation in research

- The dept. is spread too thin; many professors are required to do way too much, have very little time for research.
- More RA positions should be available in the 3 areas (linguistics, literature, pedagogy).
- I have found it very strong and an excellent experience. Research is the thing I don't think other universities have as much of. IAU doesn't have any.

4. Mission

Question	Yes	No	Comments
(a) Are you aware of the mission?	4	10	
(b) Is it effective?	1	3	(-) it isn't very clear; do you want to create a well-balanced student? what does that mean? shouldn't I have to take a balanced amount of literature and linguistics? Some areas can be modified in accordance with students' interests. the mission is old and outdated. There is no clear definition to what the program really is. English education? What does that mean if we are in PR?
(c) Is it efficient?	3	1	(+) it talks about ideas, research, and teaching in PR and complementary areas. (-) it is not specific enough; a lot has changed since it was written 20 years ago. (yes but) it is reasonable for a MA; just not the one in place; the MA mission is to create better English teachers in the public schools, when in reality it doesn't

(d) How do you feel about the mission?

very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
1	1	0	2	0

Main strengths of the mission

- broad, so a focused student can do whatever they choose
- encourage the students to be a flexible professional and encourage to do research and work independent
- it is broad enough that almost anything falls under it

Main weaknesses of the mission

- not very specific; students that are decided or want to concentrate in one area have a hard time doing so because of scheduling
- RUM doesn't offer a wide variety of courses and in summer there are none, which makes it difficult to speed up our course work.
- Pedagogical courses focus on theoretical bases of teaching.
- it really doesn't say much about the program; it is confusing for entering and prospective students, which is not good, considering the small numbers of students in the program.

General comments about the mission

- The mission needs to be revised to take into account different students. The mission should be to not only prepare school teachers but also ESL and or students who want to do a Ph.D.

5. Faculty guidance

	Yes	No	Comments
(a) Are you receiving it?	8	6	(-) I haven't asked anybody for help. I have not been informed ever. I haven't made any contact for lack of time. I haven't been properly counseled and I feel kind of lost. I am keeping track myself. Requirements are not clearly stated; people are hard to find.

(b) Is faculty guidance helping you to develop ...

	Yes	No	Comments
CS	3	4	<p>(+) feedback from faculty is always helpful because of the experience that person has versus yours. they orient me well for classes and thesis.</p> <p>(-) it is more focused on helping me with teaching skills. it's not their job. the guidance is geared toward what will help me with what I teach. they are functioning as counselors.</p>
RS	4	3	<p>(+) the faculty can tell you where to look, who to talk to. they give me ideas for thesis topic and research. advice, ideas, brainstorming.</p> <p>(-) it is more focused on helping me with teaching skills. the guidance is geared toward what will help me with what I teach.</p>
CT	3	4	<p>(+) they may voice their opinion but they will give you space to express what you think. they encourage me to think about different ideas. profs force me to use my head.</p> <p>(-) it is more focused on helping me with teaching skills. not their job. the guidance is geared toward what will help me with what I teach.</p>
TS	5	2	<p>(+) they will treat you as a colleague and because you can present to the class. they help me to decide which is the most efficient way to teach my students. observing classes. I can learn their teaching techniques. they have offered lots of good advice.</p> <p>(-) the guidance is geared toward what will help me with what I teach.</p>
KB	3	4	<p>(+) the faculty is mixed into these specialties. they answer any questions I have. I have also learned about other work, like administration in education.</p> <p>(-)it is more focused on helping me with teaching skills. the guidance is geared toward what will help me with what I teach. I haven't asked.</p>

(c) Is faculty guidance efficient?

Yes	No	Comments
6	1	(+) they are always willing to help. they have helped me to make wise choices. they are always willing to help with any of your doubts. it is there when you want it or need it, always open door (-) sometimes it is hard to locate a certain faculty member

(d) How do you feel about faculty guidance?

very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
4	3	2	0	0

Main strengths of faculty guidance

- their experience, understanding, and flexibility
- TA help
- profs. are willing to help
- they keep our goals in mind
- to be able to receive information that will enable me to make decisions that will be in accordance with my interests and professional development.
- It is a wide variety faculty, and every member has something positive to support my interests.
- It seems that everyone has an open door, always positive, and good people

Main weakness of faculty guidance

- their inaccessibility
- thesis or exam (with the exception of the thesis committee)
- may be willing, but often have too much other things going on
- availability
- Some profs. don't like others. If you don't choose one for your thesis committee, then they no longer are as willing to help.

General comments about faculty guidance

- The division between linguistics and literature is evident. Students are almost forced to take sides. Not cool. This is a major problem.

6. Evaluative responses about the program in general

- I believe that the program should be restructured in a way in which all of the foci receive equal attention.

- I feel very happy with the MAEE that this university offers. It is well-prepared and the professors are very good.
- I really think every student should sit down with a “mentor” for a one-on-one to discuss plans of study. And most important, there should be more clarity about which classes will be offered which semester in the future. This is extremely unclear!!
- Overall, I would like to say I am very happy with the program. However, I believe there is great room for improvement. First, advertising must be done to lift student enrollment. This would have a major impact on scheduling conflicts of masters’ classes that we currently have. Second, something must be done that allows a prospective student who wants to concentrate in ESL or in literature, so that they don’t have to spend 1.5 years making up deficiencies. The problem with deficiencies is that a student can start classes without having finished their deficiencies, so what purpose do they serve? If you require 18 credits of pre-requisite or deficiencies, very few people will apply, which affects point #1. Third, this is a great program which should advertise internationally. We are in a great position in PR, and we need to take advantage of our location and resources.
- I have recommended the program to my peers, especially those who have gone to other universities for their MAs because it is “free” and are going crazy with the lack of consideration from their profs. and the amount and quality of work required of them seems unchallenging, unnecessary, and just plain funky.
- Bummer: No classes in summer or Saturdays. For a working person like me this is slowing me down and I am dragging along. Inter is ahead of us a RUM on this point. Our program could be a lot better if this were arranged.
- As I continue my studies I hope to encounter more strengths than weaknesses along the way in order to achieve my goals.
- Classrooms are in much need of renovation; more course offerings please, especially in the summer.
- I have learned a lot and it is what I want to study.
- The program can be focused in linguistics and literature as the BA, or at least more courses of these.
- I think the program is awesome for my needs. I have been able to be admitted without deficiencies and have had my own mission and goals the whole way. The problem I see with the program is very few students enter as I have. In order to be admitted to the program, one must have 18 credits in lit. and lx., without having to take undergraduate classes. This wasn’t a problem personally; however, in my application process I wondered, “who the hell do these people think they are? 18 prerequisites for a MAEE in PR. Come on!” Georgetown’s MAT in English only requires intro to linguistics. Because of prerequisites and a very poorly defined mission and program I don’t think the dept. will be able to register the amount of students it needs to offer and fill classes that students want. Scheduling is a major problem that cannot be resolved until there are more students. The focus of the program shouldn’t really be on developing teachers for public schools. It should be to develop teachers to teach teachers, administrators, and students who want to go on and do a Ph.D. Let’s be honest, we cannot compete with IAU and their grants that pay teachers (over 80) to study in an easy much more basic “mickey mouse” program.

- The questionnaire is inappropriate. The questions are open ended and let people be influenced by other factors. Don't ask so much, don't repeat. Now, the program needs improvement in all areas.

C. Discussion of Results

The findings presented here are offered again with the caveat that only 25% of current students completed the questionnaire and participated in the assessment process.

1. Programmatic Issues

Findings based on current students' responses indicate a need to define carefully the objectives of the program and the intended outcomes in a way that allows for flexibility of options while maintaining clearly a focused program once students have selected from the options available. Students' interests in research in collaboration with faculty projects and in developing their own independent projects need to be fostered in order to promote their development as professionals. Prerequisites required for entrance into the program, according to respondents, sometimes significantly delay progress toward degree completion, a situation that suggests the need for reassessment of the admissions policy. Diverse responses regarding curricular issues within the program suggest that only one program of study within the department is insufficient in meeting students' needs, reinforcing the impetus to complete the process to implement the Literature Master's Degree Program approved by the Department and to investigate the tandem ESL Program. In addition, the need to develop a more flexible schedule of courses for graduate students suggests a study of the feasibility of offering summer and/or Saturday courses.

2. Graduate Faculty Issues

Findings regarding faculty seem to indicate a positive relationship between faculty and students, in spite of the difficulty some respondents reported in scheduling meetings with advising faculty. The observations of students about the stress levels under which faculty members work indicate a need to reassess how faculty workloads are computed and how advisory functions are distributed. In addition, reports by students of friction among faculty members further indicates the need for reassessment of assignments and for development of channels of communication to work out differences before they impact the environment in the department. The tenor of the results regarding faculty issues suggests that additional faculty members need to participate in the graduate program and that a concerted effort needs to be made to interest more faculty in such assignments.

3. Graduate Student Issues

The results of student commentary on registration and advising/mentoring indicate the need for significant improvement. Timely and competent advising is essential for student success and thus should be given priority. In addition, reported confusion over the rotation of courses indicates a lack of communication of that rotation to students that needs immediate attention. Further, student dissatisfaction with the registration process needs to be addressed and corrected to foster early confirmation of courses and to assure availability of courses when they are scheduled to be offered.

The processes of registration and advising impact Teaching and Research Assistants as well. Comments regarding scheduling, advising and oversight of Teaching Assistants indicate that immediate action is required to improve the timeliness and effectiveness of these crucial support mechanisms if students are to gain the most benefit from these opportunities for professional development.

IV. REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

In spite of the aforementioned serious limitations of this assessment tool, the Graduate Committee feels confident in recommending certain revisions and improvements to the current configuration of our graduate program. Addressing the types of concerns raised by the preceding reports, we offer recommendations to improve the following three areas of our graduate program: (A) program development and curricular revisions; (B) faculty involvement and participation in the graduate program; (C) student recruitment, retention and training.

A. Recommendations for Program Development and Curricular Revisions

The Graduate Committee has undertaken already the task of updating the Mission of the MAEE Program and presents a draft of their ongoing work that has not yet been put to a vote:

In harmony with the UPRM mission as well as the mission of the Department of English the MAEE program directs its efforts toward preparing professionals with the theoretical and practical knowledge and the social awareness necessary to meet the educational needs of Puerto Rican society in three fundamental areas: linguistics, literature, and pedagogy.

In the following two weeks, the committee anticipates completing the update of the Mission Statement and will submit it to the department for approval. This mission is written specifically for the MAEE program and will be revised to accommodate new options within the program as they come online.

To address the need for further developed focus of the MAEE, the Graduate committee recommends that they receive the findings of the report completed by the MAEE two-track ad hoc committee. Based on analysis of the results of the report and the specific recommendations of this assessment document, the Graduate Committee will begin revising and updating the MAEE program.

The Graduate Committee will read and familiarize themselves with the Master's Degree in Literature Proposal drafted by the ad hoc committee and approved by the Department

To address the need for greater focus within the ESL/TESOL/TEFL area, two task forces will be created, one to design a program in TESOL and another to design a Certificate Program in TEFL.

To address student requests for an alternative to the thesis, the Graduate Committee recommends the revision of the Comprehensive Exam option, a process that is already underway. The Committee also notes a possibility for the creation of Option II, which would entail the design of a project to satisfy the thesis requirement.

Finally, we recognize the fact that the assessment instruments that inform this report failed to systematically gather information about the implications of the eighteen-credit prerequisite condition for admission into the program. Nonetheless, comments issued by faculty and student respondents suggest that there might be a need to revise this condition both for course pertinence and program marketability reasons. To address this issue, the Graduate Committee, between the gathering and analysis of these data, has revised the entrance requirements of the program to more appropriately represent the needs of students for adequate preparation to do well in our program. The Graduate Committee has implemented the following coursework requirements for admission into our program in Fall Semester 2005 as follows:

- 3 credits of American Literature
- 3 credits of British Literature
- 3 credits of Introductory Linguistics
- 3 credits in Structure **OR** Syntax

Revision needs to occur within the Program at the level of individual courses. The following courses are recommended for immediate evaluation and update if necessary by the graduate committee:

- Models for Teaching Literature
- Research Methods
- Foundations of English Education
- Contrastive Grammar
- Bilingualism and Language Contact
- ESL Materials and Testing

In addition we believe that based on students' comments and our own discussion, we should consider the following tasks:

- Develop new courses to reflect recent developments in the fields: linguistics, literature, and ESL pedagogy.
- Change the title for 6010 to focus on material development for listening and speaking and testing. Develop a second ESL testing course.
- Develop the Contrastive Grammar course to provide more linguistics coursework particularly useful to language teachers.
- Reinforce the guidance of students' research in all courses including academic writing and presentations.

- Integrate into classes where appropriate:
 - How to prepare and make an academic presentation
 - How to apply the content of the course to the classroom integrating theory and practice.
- Consider connecting our program more with the División de Extensión and the Department of Education.
- Investigate on-line courses particularly for the proposed Certificate Program in TEFL

B. Recommendations for Graduate Faculty Involvement and Participation in the Program

The Profile of Faculty holding doctoral degrees and who are capable of teaching in the graduate program is presented here, prepared from the Faculty Academic Profile prepared in 2003-2004. Because only eleven professors filled out the questionnaire, we reiterate our concerns about the limitations of these data.

Currently in the 2005-2006 academic year, we have eighteen (18) members of the department with doctoral degrees in their fields; these degrees are in the following areas:

- 4—SLA, Second Language Literacy, Education
- 3—Linguistics or Applied Linguistics
- 4—Rhetoric and writing, communication, and media,
- 10—Literature, film and criticism

We have one (1) professor who is completing his PhD in Literature with emphasis in multi-media and e-texts and another one (1) who is completing a PhD with expertise in Instructional Technology, Design, and Media. Two more new PhDs in our program are currently writing dissertations in areas including ESL, media, culture and literature. And we have openings for two faculty members in ESL and Applied Linguistics. Our total staff capable of offering graduate-level curricula numbers eighteen at the moment, but projected degree completions and new hires increases that number to twenty-two (22).

Clearly the current profile of faculty possessed of doctoral degrees indicates a need to diversify our program in order to maximize current untapped faculty resources in terms of research and graduate-level teaching potential. It indicates an urgent need to push forward in the development of curricula to keep pace with the level of expertise in the department.

To address the issues of faculty workload, the Graduate Committee recommends that the Director of the department distribute incoming student advising responsibilities among all members of the department qualified to teach in the graduate program. In this manner the Director will foster interaction among all qualified faculty and students and thus promote collaborations that can lead naturally to the development of mentor/mentee relationships.

To address the numbers of committees a faculty member can supervise, the Graduate Committee will assess the maximum number allowed and recommend a cap beyond

which a faculty member can not accept additional chair positions on graduate student committees. Under special circumstance, the Director of the department can make exception to the cap.

To address issues of faculty collegiality, the department will request funds from the Dean of Arts and Sciences to implement a faculty development series that addresses issues of faculty dispute in order to foster greater harmony in the department.

To address the issues of graduate student support and advising needs, the graduate committee proposes to create a series of workshops designed to train faculty and prepare them to address the issues of advising and mentoring graduate students.

C. Recommendations for Student Recruitment, Retention and Training

Advising and registration issues have already been addressed by the interim director who assigned temporary advisors, as per the Graduate Handbook, to graduate students to foster their entrance into the program and to locate and identify faculty members who will serve on their graduate committees. In addition, an orientation meeting for incoming graduate students will be held as is required by the Handbook in the first weeks of each new semester. In the orientation students will be awarded a temporary advisor who will assist them in locating a graduate committee chair who will subsequently advise and assist them in the processes of conforming their committees and completing the program.

The Graduate Committee has made significant changes in the policy governing the award of teaching assistantships, negating the prior coursework requirement in order to use teaching assistantships as a recruitment tool. The Graduate Committee also recommends that the assignment of Teaching Assistantships be used as a method of recruiting to increase student enrollment and attract a wider pool of students to our program. In addition, assistantships should be awarded for a full year, contingent upon performance, and be renewable for a second year, and at the discretion of the Director for a third year on a semester-by-semester basis. This measure would benefit both the quality of our undergraduate teaching and the caliber of the teaching training our graduate students receive.

In the interest of this last concern, we recommend that the Department Director, in conjunction with the Graduate Committee, endorses the appointment of a Coordinator of Graduate Teaching Assistant Education to insure adequate oversight and training of TAs and to teach the one-credit Teaching English in Higher Education course that will be required for the first year of appointment. In the second year, TAs will be required to participate in the WebCT portion of the course and to mentor incoming TAs.

Based on the explicit need of additional positions and the unsatisfied demand for research training voiced by both students and faculty, the Graduate Committee requests that the Department Director approach the Dean with a request for additional Research

Assistantships for our department. These positions will help our program enhance its research training capacity and will foster both faculty and student research output.

The Graduate Committee further recommended that the appointment of Teaching Assistantship conforms to their recommendations as outlined in the letter to the Director from Spring Semester 2004. These guidelines are under review, but their intentions require the following:

- Restrict TAs from teaching more than two courses per semester,
- Require a course for TAs to take simultaneous to their position as a TA,
- Receive a “Statement of their Rights and Responsibilities” to insure their understanding of these issues,
- Be overseen by a Coordinator of TA Education in conjunction with their TA course,
- Receive appointments on an annual basis (with review of performance after the first semester in which the student must be found competent to continue their appointment) with automatic renewal for an additional year based on performance, with possibility of semester-by-semester support in the third year based on department need, and
- Take prerequisite courses as necessary before or concurrently with appointment to teach particular courses in the department, but which may be waived by the director of the department under special circumstances, such as equivalent coursework and/or experience.

To heighten our program profile, enhance recruiting ability, and develop the quality of the student profile, a recruitment program will be devised, moving us in the direction of becoming a “Graduate Program of Choice” in this region. To this end, we have begun the task of providing graduate program information in English on our department web page, and we will work in close contact with the graduate school to insure compliance with graduate school policy.

D. Recommendations for Ongoing Assessment Measures

As we have established, there are serious limitations to this document, but we perceive it as a starting point from which we will revise and develop our assessment process and thereby the quality of information we are able to garner about our students, faculty, and programs of study. .

A comprehensive plan for an assessment is needed and will be developed in order to facilitate yearly and periodic assessments. The Graduate Committee will assign a subcommittee to include the Graduate Committee Coordinator to revise these assessment means based on our current findings regarding their utility in the current process. In the Spring Semester 2006, these instruments will be put into their final form for implementation in Fall Semester 2006.

Additional data collection mechanisms will be put into place in Fall Semester 2006 within the department to begin the routine collection and tabulation of data for use in compiling subsequent assessment documentation.

In addition, a five-year plan will be developed in Spring Semester 2006 in consultation with the departmental assessment committee and in order to guide us in meeting our short-and long-term program goals. In this updated plan will be included sections of enrollment and registration data, profiles of incoming students and graduates, faculty profile, library holdings, infrastructure, technology, budget, equipment and materials, and accreditation information in addition to the current types and categories.

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Current Students in MAEE

Have you had sufficient access to information about the thesis and comprehensive exam?
yes / no

If you are working on your thesis, is the process helping you to develop ...

- your communication skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your research skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your critical thinking skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your teaching skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your knowledge base in the field of English education, across the three foci of linguistics, literature, and pedagogy? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

Do you think the thesis process (i.e., finding a topic/question, finding a supervisor and committee, carrying out research, writing and finishing the report) is efficient? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

If you are working on your comprehensive exam, is the process helping you to develop ...

- your communication skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your research skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your critical thinking skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your teaching skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your knowledge base in the field of English education, across the three foci of linguistics, literature, and pedagogy? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- Do you think the comprehensive exam process is efficient? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

How do you feel about the thesis or comprehensive experience so far?
Very positive ___ **Positive** ___ **Neutral** ___ **Negative** ___ **Very negative** ___

What is the main strength of the thesis or comprehensive exam process for you?

What is the main weakness of the thesis or comprehensive exam process for you?

Feel free to write any general comments about the thesis or comprehensive exam process here:

3. Courses

Which courses have you completed?

(Please note that we are interested in what you think about courses, not the professors teaching the courses.)

Is the coursework element of the program helping you to develop ...

- your communication skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your research skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your critical thinking skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your teaching skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your knowledge base in the field of English education, across the three foci of linguistics, literature, and pedagogy? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

Do you think the coursework element of the program is efficient? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

How do you feel about the coursework element of the program so far?
Very positive ___ **Positive** ___ **Neutral** ___ **Negative** ___ **Very negative** ___

What is the main strength of the coursework element of the program for you? (e.g., teaching approach [lecture style, project work, etc.], content coverage)

What is the main weakness of the coursework element of the program for you? (e.g., teaching approach [lecture style, project work, etc.], content coverage)

Feel free to write any general comments about the coursework element of the program here:

4. Research

Are you involved with any of the research being conducted in the English department?

yes / no

Are you familiar with any of the research being conducted in the English department?

yes / no

(If you are not involved with any research in the department, skip to the next section, “Mission”.)

Is the process of participating in English department research helping you to develop ...

- your communication skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening)? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

-
-
- your research skills? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

-
-
- your critical thinking skills? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

-
-
- your teaching skills? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

- your knowledge base in the field of English education, across the three foci of linguistics, literature, and pedagogy? **yes / no**
If yes, why?
-
-

If not, what is the problem?

Do you think the process for participating in English department research is efficient?
yes / no
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

How do you feel about the process of participating in English department research so far?
Very positive ___ Positive ___ Neutral ___ Negative ___ Very negative ___

What is the main strength of the process of participating in English department research for you?

What is the main weakness of the process of participating in English department research for you?

Feel free to write any general comments about the process of participating in English department research here:

5. Mission

Are you aware of the mission of the MAEE program? **yes / no**
(If “no”, skip to section 6, “Faculty guidance”.)

Is this mission effective (e.g., it addresses important things)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

Is this mission efficient (e.g., it is easy to understand, its scope is reasonable for a master’s degree)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

How do you feel about this mission so far?

Very positive ___ **Positive** ___ **Neutral** ___ **Negative** ___ **Very negative** ___

What is the main strength of this mission for you?

What is the main weakness of this mission for you?

Feel free to write any general comments about the mission here:

6. Faculty guidance

Are you getting faculty guidance to help you navigate through this program? **yes / no**

If you are not getting faculty guidance, why not?

Now, **skip to section 7.**

If you are getting faculty guidance, is the faculty guidance helping you to develop ...

- your communication skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening)? **yes / no**
If yes, why?
-
-

If not, what is the problem?

- your research skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?
-
-

If not, what is the problem?

- your critical thinking skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?
-
-

If not, what is the problem?

- your teaching skills? **yes / no**
If yes, why?
-
-

If not, what is the problem?

-
- your knowledge base in the field of English education, across the three foci of linguistics, literature, and pedagogy? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

Do you think the faculty guidance is efficient? **yes / no**

If yes, why?

If not, what is the problem?

How do you feel about the faculty guidance so far?

Very positive ___ **Positive** ___ **Neutral** ___ **Negative** ___ **Very negative** ___

What is the main strength of the faculty guidance for you?

What is the main weakness of the faculty guidance for you?

Feel free to write any general comments about the faculty guidance here:

7. Program in general

If there are any general comments you would like to make about this program (e.g., strengths or weaknesses that are not addressed in the previous sections of this questionnaire), please feel free to do so in the following space.

Appendix B

MAEE Thesis Data

Appendix A- Categorization of Thesis Topics and Titles

Overview of MAEE THESES (1985-PRESENT) – ORGANIZED BY AREA/TOPIC (Determined by keywords in title)

I. PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS N=14 (20%)

<u>Teaching</u>	11
<i>Teaching of human values in ESL</i>	1
<i>Teaching of English in ESL</i>	4
<i>Teaching of literature in ESL</i>	6
<u>Learning</u>	3
<i>English language learning</i>	3

II. FOCUS ON A SKILL AREA N=28 (39%) (many w/ pedagogical focus)

<u>Reading</u>	
<i>Reading comprehension</i>	10
<i>Reading & contrastive rhetoric</i>	4
<u>Vocabulary</u>	4
<u>Writing</u>	6
<u>Listening</u>	3
<u>Speaking</u>	1

III. LINGUISTICS: SOCIOLINGUISTICS & SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION N=21 (30%)

<u>Attitudes & motivation</u>	7
<u>Bilingualism</u>	8
<u>Focus on a variety of English</u>	
<i>Description</i>	4
<i>Acquisition</i>	2

IV. LITERATURE N=8 (11%)

N=71

MAEE Thesis Data:

PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS (n=14)

TEACHING (n=11)

Teaching of Literature in ESL

1. The use of creative dramatics in the teaching of drama with special application to the teaching of English as a second language / by Darnyd W. Ortiz Seda, 1984 (#1 Hunt)
2. Using creative dramatics to teach the short story in the ESL classroom in Puerto Rico / by Minerva Gonzalez Lopez, 1989 (#13 Jonassen)
3. The quest archetype as schema for teaching poetry in an English as a second language class / by Alena Anastasia Alberani Hrachovsky, 1991 (#21 Hunt)
4. The use of works by Puerto Rican playwrights living in the U.S. in the teaching of drama with special application to the teaching of English as a second language in Puerto Rico / by James D. Rivera Martinez, 1996 (#35 Ortiz)
5. Night-sea crossing: teaching the macabre in the ESL classroom / by Edwin Astacio Sanchez, 1999 (#41 Hunt)
6. The teaching of poetry to ESL students through the use of creative dramatics/ by Carmen Sierra Monroig, 2003 (#71, Ortiz)

Teaching of Human Values in ESL

1. The use of Chekhov's plays for the teaching of human values in the ESL classroom / by Maria M. Montes de Condat, 2000 (#51 Ortiz)

Teaching of English in ESL

1. A description of Puerto Rico's ESL classrooms: teachers, methods, and materials / by Betsy Morales Caro, 1992 (#24 Gutierrez)
2. Returned migrants and the teaching of English in secondary schools of Puerto Rico: an individualized approach / by Myrna Rivera, 1994 (#28 Blau)
3. English language education in Japan and the use of English by Japanese in the world Englishes framework / by Sanae Eda, 1994 (#26 Blau)
4. Visual Art and the teaching of English as a second language / by Ingrid Carre, 1996 (#33 Hunt)

LEARNING (n=3)

English language learning

1. A description of English language learning in a rural elementary

- community school in Puerto Rico/ by Jill Heinlein-Pacheco, 1999 (#49 Dayton)
2. Perceptual learning style preferences in the college English classroom in Puerto Rico/ by Coraly Romero Garcia, 2002 (#58 Dayton)
 3. A comparison of learners of English in Puerto Rico and Japan/ By Tsuneko Ryu, 2003 (#57 Blau)

FOCUS ON A SKILL AREA (n=28)

READING (n=14)

Reading Comprehension

1. Reading comprehension in English as a second language: cultural background knowledge through a single universal theme / by Gladys Cruz Rivera, 1985 (#2 Hunt)
2. Increasing reading comprehension by providing a purpose to read / by Nancy Torres Claudio, 1985 (#4 Blau)
3. The use of pre-reading activities to build background knowledge and its effects on reading comprehension / by Martha Elugardo, 1986 (#5 Blau)
4. The use of teacher-underlining as an aid to reading comprehension for ESL students in the public school system of Puerto Rico / by Dorothy A. Martinez, 1987 (#9)
5. A comparison of native and second language reading comprehension of Puerto Rican university students of English as a second language / by Jose Irizarry Rodriguez, 1988 (#11 Blau)
6. Poetry: a medium for ESL language processing and reading comprehension / by Thomas Wm. McNeil, 1988 (#10 Sherwin)
7. The effects of silent reading (monitored and unmonitored) and oral reading (by the teacher and by the students) on the reading comprehension scores of tenth grade Puerto Rican students of English as a second language / by Lilliam I. Rivera Rivera, 1990 (#17 Gutierrez)
8. The reading-writing relationship: using script form writing to enhance reading comprehension / by Eulalia Texidor Ortiz, 1990 (#18 F. Betancourt)
9. Using cultural schemata as a mechanism for easing comprehension and increasing reading interest for Puerto Rican students of English as a second language/ by Agapito Ruiz Millan, 1999 (#46 Hunt)
10. The effect of cultural background knowledge on reading comprehension/ by Daisy Perez Soto, 2003 (#66 Irizarry)

Reading

1. The effects of first language reading ability and second language competence on learning to read in the second language / by Ana D. Arce, 1990 (#15 Jonassen)
2. Materials for crossing the reading threshold / by Yoichiro Shirasaka, 1998 (#40 Strodt)

3. An analysis of the influence of English students' proficiency on the use of oral reading mode vs. silent reading mode / by Gitasri Mazumdar, 1999 (#43 Smyrniou)

Contrastive Rhetoric

1. Comparison of English and Spanish short story structure / by Ismael Jimenez Vega, 1989 (#14 Gutierrez)

VOCABULARY (n=4)

1. A comparison of the effectiveness of two vocabulary development techniques / by Mercedes Olivieri, 1987 (#6 Gutierrez)
2. Strategies for the teaching and learning of vocabulary in English as a second language / by Clarena Larrotta Monsalve, 1999 (#42 Strodt)
3. Vocabulary acquisition through reading: a study of the effectiveness of different call-based annotations / by Aimet Coriano Velasquez, 2001 (#54 Baker-Gonzalez)
4. Let's put our heads together: The processing of idioms by Spanish speakers at different proficiency levels/ by Rosita Rivera Rodriguez, 2002 (#59 Morales)

WRITING (n=6)

1. Error correction in ESL compositions / by Sandra Rios Miranda, 1987 (#7 Gutierrez)
2. Testing the effectiveness of using word processors in the reading and composition course for ESL learners / by Anuradha B. Venkatesan, 1990 (#19 Jonassen)
3. Computers, writing and ESL learners: an observational study / by Margarita Acevedo Cortes, 1991 (#20 F. Betancourt)
4. Modifying programmable grammar checkers to enhance their effectiveness for native Spanish-speakers writing in English: a feasibility study / by David Dayton, 1994 (#25 Sherwin)
5. The implementation of the writing process in a low-proficiency college English course in Puerto Rico/ by Luz Ospina Cortes, 2002 (#65 Dayton)
6. Types of feedback in the ESL writing process and student noticing/ by Melissa Garcia, 2004 (# 70 Pratt)

LISTENING (n=3)

1. The effects of contextual pictures and sound effects on the listening comprehension of short stories among seventh grade students / by Milagros M. Mendizabal Garcia, 1985 (#3 Blau)
2. The effects of speech rates on the listening comprehension of fifth grade students / by Enid Crooks de Dwyer, 1987 (#8 Kilpatrick)
3. The effect of closed caption television on the listening comprehension of students in a rural middle school in Puerto Rico /by Hector Acosta Matos, 2003 (#64 Blau)

SPEAKING (n=1)

1. Fluency and the planned and unplanned speech of Spanish-English

bilinguals/ by Angel Portalatin, 2004 (#68 Dayton)

SOCIOLX AND SLA (n=21)

Attitudes and Motivation(n=7)

1. Motivation, attitude and achievement of eleven Hispanic adult ESL learners in Roxbury, Massachusetts / by Edil Flores-Velez, 1989 (#12 F. Betancourt)
2. Attitudes of business students toward learning English / by Maritza Munoz Carrasquillo, 1991 (#23 F. Betancourt)
3. The effect of accent on listening comprehension and attitudes of ESL students / by Iris Toro Manzano, 1997 (#55 Moreno)
4. Attitudes of Japanese adolescents toward the use of English in Japanese mass communication / by Yuki Sakurai, 1999 (#47 Padilla)
5. The effect of political affiliation on motivation to learn English in Puerto Rico / by Nancy Vanessa Vicente Velez, 2000 (#52 Padilla)
6. The influence of motivation and proficiency on communication strategy use of English as a second language learners / by Edna Jimenez Lugo, 2000 (#50 Padilla)
7. An approach to changing attitudes towards sexist language among Puerto Rican high school students / by Ivette Alicea Ruiz, 2001 (#53 Moreno)

Bilingualism (n=8)

1. An implementation of Project “De Orilla a Orilla”: cultural exchange program in a fourth grade English immersion class in Mayaguez. Puerto Rico / by Colette C. Green, 1990 (#16 Betancourt)
2. Political affiliations vs. Spanish language maintenance, English language shift, and/or bilingualism in Puerto Rico / by Michelle Crespo Ortiz, 1991 (#22 F. Betancourt)
3. Parental strategies used in Puerto Rico to raise bilingual children / by Douglas P. Lay, 1994 (#27 Ortiz)
4. A description of Buenaventura as an English-using society in Colombia / by Klinger Casquete Gomez, 1995 (#29 Dayton)
5. The relationship between environment and self-reported language attrition / by Orville O. Villanueva Feliciano, 1999 (#48 Moreno)
6. English use in manufacturing plants in Puerto Rico / by Rosa Roman Perez, 1999 (#45 Moreno)
7. A description of immersion for 10th grade students at the English Immersion Laboratory in Aguadilla, Puerto Rico/ by Dagmar Alicea Alvarado, 2003 (#56 Dayton)
8. The Spanglish of New York Puerto Rican Bilinguals: Attitudes and Code-switching / by Jessica Tubens, 2004 (# 67 Dayton)

Focus on the L2 English Language (n=6)

Description

1. A description of the English lexicon of Puerto Rican English teachers: a world Englishes perspective / by Annie Johnston, 1995 (#32 Blau)
2. Address forms and politeness routines: a comparative study of regular and Chapter 1 teachers / by Sonia G.Cubero Lopez, 1995 (#30 Moreno)
3. Japanese backchannel cue behavior in English conversation / by Natsumi Itoh, 1995 (#31 Dayton)
4. Style-shifting awareness and the English of Spanish-English Puerto Rican bilinguals / by Katherine Hernandez Gonzalez, 1997 (#36 Dayton)

Acquisition

1. Acquisition of simple past and past progressive aspect by learners of English in Puerto Rico / by Clifton Deed Armstrong Pedersen, 1998 (#38 Strodt)
2. Acquisition of subjacency by nonnative speakers in two different contexts / by Shizuko Ozaki, 1999 (#44 Padilla)

LITERATURE (n=8)

1. Bildungsroman written by Puerto Rican women in the US: Nicholasa Mohr's *Nilda*: a novel and Esmeralda Santiago's *When I was Puerto Rican* / by Ismael Muniz Cruz, 1996 (#34 Batra)
2. Judith Ortiz Cofer and Esmeralda Santiago, two women, two voices-a common story / by Ivonne Marie Vancelette El-Koury, 1997 (#37 Batra)
3. The tell-tale ending: the poetics of closure in Poe's short stories / by Claudio Salas, 1998 (#39 Haydock)
4. Voices of Caribbean women in the slave period between 1780-1830: A closer look at the history of Mary Prince / by Humberto Campos Rodriguez, 2001 (#60 Rodriguez)
5. The transmutation of mother love-daughter love and community: The Construction of identities in Toni Morrison's *Beloved* and *Sula*. / by Liz Torres, 2002 (#61 Irizarry)
6. The bildungsroman in female fiction: A study of female development in selected woman writers of color, 2002 / by Zenaida Sanjurjo Rodriguez, 2002 (#62 Irizarry)
7. Deconstructing *Beowulf*, 2002 / by Noel Casiano Saez, 2002 (#63 Haydock)
8. Charting a route: From Gothic to magic realism/ by Hugo Rios, 2003 (#69 Batra)