SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Ph.D. in Theological Studies	Department: Theological Studies
Degree or Certificate Level: Ph.D.	College/School: Arts and Sciences
Date (Month/Year): September 2022	Primary Assessment Contact: Elizabeth Block

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021 and 2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2018

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Learning Outcome #4:
Graduate students will communicate their scholarly arguments effectively in both written and oral formats.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

The primary artifacts used to assess whether graduate students communicate their scholarly arguments in both written and oral formats are the dissertation prospectus and the dissertation itself, the centerpiece of the Ph.D. program.

In the third year of the program, students write and defend their dissertation prospectus before a committee of five persons: the dissertation director, two dissertation readers, a fourth member selected to serve only on the prospectus committee, and the Coordinator of Graduate Studies. This is considered to be the "oral exam," the successful passing of which moves a student to Ph.D. candidate status. During this two-hour oral exam, students offer a 15-minute summary of the argument of and plan for their dissertation and how they will execute it. Each faculty member then has 15-20 minutes to ask questions of the student and engage in a discussion of the proposed project.

Following the successful completion of the prospectus and prospectus defense, the Ph.D. candidate writes the dissertation. The successful dissertation itself and the dissertation defense, evaluated by the dissertation director and dissertation committee members using the department's rubric, indicate that the student has communicated scholarly arguments effectively both orally and in writing.

Finally, our graduate students present papers at professional meetings and publish articles and book chapters, all reported on their annual review forms.

In summary, the artifacts are:

1. Dissertation Prospectus and Defense: assessed by dissertation director using the Prospectus Template and Prospectus Oral Defense Rubric (See Appendix B)
2. Dissertation and Defense: assessed by dissertation director and dissertation committee using the Dissertation Rubric and Dissertation Oral Defense Rubric (See Appendix B)
3. Annual Review, specifically the portion that lists student publications and conference presentations: assessed by group of faculty considering the categories of the annual review form (See Appendix C)

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

1. Prospectus Template and Prospectus Oral Defense Rubric, evaluated by the prospectus committee immediately following the oral defense of the prospectus
2. Dissertation Rubric and Dissertation Oral Defense Rubric, evaluated by the dissertation committee and reported by the director immediately following the oral defense
3. Annual Review, specifically the section on conference presentations and publications: assessed by Coordinator of Graduate Programs and all faculty who have contact with graduate students in the department

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

In the past two years, six Ph.D. students wrote and defended their dissertation prospectus, thereby achieving doctoral candidacy status, and three Ph.D. candidates successfully defended their dissertations and are employed. This is no small feat in light of the challenges of COVID.

The six students who advanced to candidacy were among the first to defend their prospectus by Zoom, and they handled this new medium with grace. They each passed the oral defense, one with distinction. Among other criteria, each student is judged on whether he "defends, clarifies, and expands upon written prospectus with further evidence and argument" and "directly and correctly answers the examiner's questions," evidence of learning outcome 4.

The three graduates who successfully defended their dissertations all passed their oral defense with distinction, based on criteria including: "Defends, clarifies, and expands upon written dissertation with further evidence and argument" and "Directly and correctly answers the examiner's questions." Two of the three received distinction on the dissertation itself, based on criteria such as, "Articulates a question that has not yet been answered or has been answered inadequately," and "Directly answers the question," indicators of the ability to articulate scholarly arguments in writing.

This data is displayed in Table 1 in Appendix A.

The rubrics used for evaluating the prospectus defense, the dissertation, and the dissertation oral defense are attached in the appendix.

Students' self-reporting on annual reviews indicates that in 2021 and 2022, 14 Ph.D. students have presented 35 times at professional conferences and workshops, including serving as respondents to other scholars' papers. They have on many occasions been invited to give papers or to respond to papers. In 2021 and 2022, six Ph.D. students published 13 papers, book reviews, or scholarship in online public forums. This data is presented in Tables 2 and 3 in Appendix A.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The data indicates that our students are effective in communicating their scholarly arguments in writing and orally. They show improvement from the prospectus defense to the dissertation defense, indicating that they grow in

learning outcome 4 as they write the dissertation under the guidance of their director and prepare to defend it. As they advance in the doctoral program, they are presenting papers at conferences, responding to others' papers, and publishing essays, book reviews, and public scholarship. The frequency of publishing and presenting increases after they have achieved candidacy.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The Coordinator of Graduate Programs shared this data with the entire department at our faculty meeting on September 7, 2022. We discussed the successes of our Ph.D. students with regard to learning outcome 4 but also agreed that soon we need to revisit our rubrics to ensure that they are updated and align with our learning outcomes, which also need to be revisited.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	• Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites	• Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Artifacts of student learning • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

Our doctoral students are successful in communicating scholarly arguments orally and in writing. They have many opportunities to work on this throughout the program. By the time they reach the oral defense of the dissertation, they are not only meeting this learning outcome but achieving it at the highest level by passing their dissertation defense with distinction. Additionally, graduate students are being invited or selected, through peer review, to present papers at professional conferences and to respond to others' papers. This is a good indication that their oral and written communication of scholarly arguments is very strong.

There is no need to change what we are doing with respect to learning outcome 4 because what we are doing is working. We do, however, need to do a better job of collecting and storing data. COVID is partly to blame for our lack of record-keeping, as is the frequent turnover of Graduate Coordinators in the department. Going forward, the Grad Coordinator will make sure rubrics are always filled out and filed for future reference.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

See above. Students are adept communicators of scholarly arguments by the time they leave our program and show that they are already successful by the time they defend their prospectus.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

There is no previous assessment of this learning outcome.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

N/A

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

N/A

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

2022 Theological Studies Ph.D. Program Assessment Report Appendices

Please note: Student names have been removed by the Assessment Director and student numbers do not imply the same student (e.g., Student 1 in Table 1 is not Student 1 in Table 2, etc.)

Appendix A: Data on Employment and Professional Development Activities (specifically conference

Table 1: 2020 and 2021 Ph.D. Dissertation Prospectus Defenses and Dissertation Defenses Results

Dissertation Prospectus			
Student Name	**Year Defended**	**Result**	
Student 1	2022	Passed	
Student 2	2022	Passed	
Student 3	2021	Passed	
Student 4	2021	Passed	
Student 5	2021	Passed with distinction	
Student 6	2021	Passed	
Dissertation and Oral Defense			
Student Name	**Year Defended**	**Dissertation Evaluation (Pass = 27 or above)**	**Dissertation Oral Defense Score (Pass = 18 or above)**
Student 1	2022	36/45 Passed	27/30 passed with distinction
Student 2	2021	43/45 Passed with distinction	29/30 passed with distinction
Student 3	2021	41/45 Passed with distinction	27/30 passed with distinction

Table 2: Ph.D. Student Conference Presentations 2021 and 2022

2020-2021			
Student 1	"'Who do you say that I am?' Signifying 'Jesusness' in James MacMillan's *Passions*," co-authored with Samantha Arten	Society for Christian Scholarship in Music conference (virtual)	2021
Student 2	Respondent, "Old Testament PhD Colloquium"	Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University	June 2022
	Ephrem and the Construction of 'Paganism' on the Roman-Persian Border"	American Academy of Religion	November 2021
	Respondent, "Hermeneutics and Unity in and after Scripture: Genesis 3"	Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University	June 2021
	Panelist, "The Mixed Legacy of Historical Criticism in Churches of Christ"	Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University	June 2021
	"Naming Hagar's Children"	Seventh Dorushe Graduate Conference in Syriac Studies	May 2021
Student 3	Presentation: "Strategic Ambiguity: Orange II and the Myth of Semi-Pelagianism"	Sacra Doctrina Project - Grace and Sanctification: Divine Causality, Human Action, and Supernatural Glory	Summer 2022

Student 4	"Christ, the Mother of Virgins: Ambrose of Milan and the Subversive Character of Virginal *Integritas*"	Annual Meeting for the North American Patristics Society. Chicago, IL	May 2022
	"'How Intensely Was I Moved': Augustine and the Heart in Liturgy and Sacrament"	Patristic, Medieval, and Renaissance Conference. Villanova, PA	October 2021
Student 5			
	"David Walker's Appeal in Conversation with Wesleyan Christian Perfection as Scriptural Argument for Societal Metanoia"	Wesleyan Theological Society Annual Meeting	March 2022
	"The Sword that Heals: King, the Black Radical Tradition, and the Destructive Power of the Beloved Community"	American Academy of Religion Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX	November 2021
	From White Supremacy to the Beloved Community: King in Conversation with Schleiermacher"	American Academy of Religion Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX	November 2021
	"The Relationship between Hatred and Love in MLK's Theology"	Midwest American Academy of Religion annual meeting (online)	April 2021
Student 6	"Veiling, Hair, and Identity in John Chrysostom"	Midwest American Academy of Religion Meeting	April 2022
Student 7			
	"It Will Teach You Everything: The Monastic Cell as Pedagogue in Late Ancient East Syriac Prayer"	SBL	November 2022
	Invited Response Paper	Lumen Christi Institute, University of Chicago, Recovering Hymnody Symposium	May 2022
	"Reconsidering Prayer in the East Syriac Tradition"	SBL Annual Meeting	November 2021
	Invited response to Bissera Pentcheva, "Image, Chant, and Imagination at Ste Foy in Conques"	"Ways of Hearing, Ways of Knowing: Listening for the Sounds of Religion," Saint Louis University	October 2021
	"Sensing the Cross in Late Ancient East Syriac Prayer."	AAR-Midwest Regional Conference. Online.	April 2021
	"Embodied Christology: Miaphysitism and Ascetic Suffering in John of Ephesus's Lives of the Eastern Saints"	North American Patristics Society Annual Meeting. Chicago.	May 2021
	"Heavenly Existence and Asceticism in John the Solitary: A Case Study."	Seventh Dorushe Graduate Student Conference on Syriac Studies. Saint Louis, MO.	May 2021
	"The Divine Body and Ascetic Bodies: Theopaschism and Suffering Saints in John of Ephesus."	Christian Scholars Conference Annual Meeting. Nashville, TN.	June 2021
Student 8	"An Integrated Model of Yves Congar's Communion Ecclesiology: A Resource for	College Theology Society (Virtual Conference)	June 2021

	Interpreting Pope Francis' Categories of Center and Periphery"		
Student 9	Respondent to the presentations given at an undergraduate session, "Narrative and the Construction of Reality"	American Academy of Religion Midwest Meeting	March 2022
Student 10	"Virgin Martyrs and Christian Identity in Late Antique Syriac Christianity"	Dorushe Graduate Student Conference in Syriac Studies, Saint Louis University (online)	May 2021
	"The Celibate Martyr: Discourses of Martyrdom and Asceticism in Late Ancient Syriac Virgin Martyr Narratives"	North American Patristics Society annual meeting (online)	May 2021
Student 11	Conference paper	PMR	2022
	Conference paper	North American Patristics Society	May 2022
	Title not submitted	North American Patristics Society	May 2021
	Title not submitted	Dorushe Graduate Student Conference in Syriac Studies, SLU (online)	May 2021
Student 12	Invited panelist, "Navigating LGBTQ+ Identity and Religious Identity"	Rainbow Alliance of St. Louis	October 2021
Student 13	Conference Paper	North American Patristics Society	May 2022
	Conference Paper	Patristics, Medieval, and Renaissance Conference	Fall 2021
Student 14	"The Afterlife of a Heretic: Theodore of Mopsuestia and His Legacy as Scriptural Interpreter."	Dorushe Graduate Student Conference	May 2021
	"Fifth-Century Florilegia and the Reception of Antiochene Exegesis"	Society of Biblical Literature	November 2021

Table 3: Ph.D. Student Publications 2021 and 2022

Author	Publication	
Student 1	Review of David Vincent Meconi, *On Self-Harm, Narcissism, Atonement, and the Vulnerable Christ* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2020). *Reading Religion*, September 23, 2021.	2021
	"An Augustinian Correction to a Faulty Option: The Politics of Salt and Light." *Journal of Moral Theology* 10.1 (2021): 46-72	2021
	"Making All Things New: The Laity as Transfigurers of the World." *Gregorianum* 102.1 (2021): 151-72	2021
	Book Note. *Augustine and the Dialogue* by Erik Kenyon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). *Ancient Jew Review*, February 21, 2021: https://www.ancientjewreview.com/read/2020/11/21/book-note-augustine-and-the-dialogue	2021
	Review of Rebecca Langlands, *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). *Journal of Moral Theology* 10.1 (2021): 234-236.	2021
Student 2	Oxford Handbook on the Pelagian Controversy - Survey of Research and Literature on Semi-Pelagianism in the Twentieth Century	2022
Student 3	A chapter, "Book XIII: The Heart Finds Rest through the Church," in a commentary on Augustine's *Confessions* from St. Paul Seminary Press (St. Paul, MN).	2020

Student 4	"Creation and Predestination," co-authored with Michael McClymond. In The Oxford Handbook to Jonathan Edwards, edited by Douglas Sweeney and Jan Stievermann. Oxford: OUP, 2021.	2021
Student 5	"The Sword that Heals: King, the Black Radical Tradition, and the Destructive Power of the Beloved Community," *Black Theology Papers Project* (Accepted for Publication)	2022
	"On Prophetic Rage," *Sightings* , The University of Chicago Divinity School, October 21, 2021, https://divinity.uchicago.edu/sightings/articles/prophetic-rage-0	2021
Student 6	eview of J. Edward Walters (ed.), Easter Christianity: A Reader. In Restoration Quarterly. Forthcoming, 2022.	2022
	Review of Dana Miller (trans.), and Mary T. Hansbury (ed.), Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on Jacob: On Jacob's Revelation at Bethel and On our Lord and Jacob, on the Church and Rachel and on Leah and the Synagogue. In Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 65, no. 3-4 (2021): 219-225.	2021
	Translation of Jacob of Serug's "Memra on the Maccabean Martyrs" still in progress for submission to Gorgias Press's Jacob of Serug translation series.	2021

Appendix B: Departmental Rubrics Used to Evaluate Prospectus Defense, Dissertation, and Dissertation Oral Defense

J: Prospectus Oral Defense Rubric

Student: _____

Committee Chair: _____

First Reader: _____

Second Reader: _____

Learning Goals

- Students will demonstrate the ability to defend, clarify, and expand upon arguments made in the written prospectus.
- Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate their understanding of the significance of the proposed dissertation to the broader field.

I. Instructions

- Listen to the oral defense.
- Using the rubric key, evaluate the defense and provide a total score.

Rubric Key

5 = Outstanding

4 = Very Good

3 = Acceptable

2 = Needs Work

1 = Unacceptable

II. Rubric Indicator

Defends, clarifies, and expands upon written prospectus with further evidence and argument	
Directly and correctly answers the examiner's questions	
Demonstrates knowledge of proposed dissertation subject, primary sources, and background scholarship	
Demonstrates ability to argue for significance of proposed dissertation topic to the broader field	
Shows awareness of the limits of his or her knowledge	
Demonstrates an understanding of the nature of the discipline	
Total Score	

III. Evaluation Score (Please List Number Score) _____

IV. Evaluation Possibilities for the Defense

- Pass with distinction (a score of 27 or above)
- Pass (a score of 18 or above)
- Fail (a score of 17 or below, with option for one retake)

_____ _____

Faculty Name Faculty Signature

K: Dissertation Rubric

Student: _____

Committee Chair: _____

First Reader: _____

Second Reader: _____

Learning Goals

- Students will present an original thesis in response to a question of significance to their fields.
- Students will craft a dissertation of substantial length that logically and persuasively argues in defense of the thesis.
- Students will demonstrate a critical grasp of major issues and themes in their fields and of relevance to the particular question that drives the thesis.
- Students will make an original contribution to their fields.

I. Instructions

- Read dissertation.
- Using the rubric key, evaluate the dissertation and provide a total score.

Rubric Key
5 = Outstanding
4 = Very Good
3 = Acceptable
2 = Needs Work
1 = Unacceptable

II. Rubric Indicator

A. Foundational Elements	
Statement of the Question • Articulates a question that has not yet been answered or has been answered inadequately • Articulates a question that can be answered • Articulates a question that deserves a dissertation-length response	
Thesis • Directly answers the question • Clear and concise • Advances the field • Orients and drives the structure of the dissertation	
State of the Question/Literature Review • Reviews literature in English and other languages • Identifies schools, trends, patterns, or other relationships in the existing scholarship • Recognizes relative significance of various scholarly contributions	

Primary Sources • Identifies diverse types of sources (if applicable) • Demonstrates use of sources in their original language • Places logical and coherent limit on sources	

• Demonstrates knowledge and use of unpublished sources (if applicable) • Critically assesses published primary sources	
Method • Articulates coherent method that fits the sources and thesis • Situates method in the context of existing scholarship	
B. Formal Elements	
Style • Employs clear, correct English grammar and syntax • Employs accurate vocabulary and technical terminology appropriate to the question • Effectively transitions from section to section, chapter to chapter, etc.	
Organization and Argumentation • Outlines the structure of the argument proposed in defense of the thesis • Adheres to the outline given • Presents appropriate and persuasive evidence in defense of the thesis • Constructs a logical argument in defense of the thesis on the basis of evidence presented • Demonstrates significance of thesis to the field	
C. Functional Elements	
Formatting • Employs footnotes formatted in Chicago Style and according to the conventions of the discipline • Includes footnotes containing original text from foreign-language sources that have been translated into English in the body of the dissertation • Includes appendices (if applicable) presenting relevant documentary materials, datasets, etc.	
Bibliography • Follows Chicago Style and the conventions of the discipline for bibliographic citations • Separates primary and secondary sources into discrete sections • Includes all sources cited in notes and appendices, as well as other works consulted • Arranges citations in alphabetical order	
Total Score	

III. Evaluation Score (Please List Number Score) _____

IV. Evaluation Possibilities for the Dissertation

- Pass with Distinction (a score of 40 or above)
- Pass (a score of 27 or above)
- Fail (a score of 26 or below, with option for one retake)

_____ _____

Faculty Name Faculty Signature

L: Dissertation Oral Defense Rubric

Student: _____

Committee Chair: _____

First Reader: _____

Second Reader: _____

Learning Goals

- Students will demonstrate the ability to defend, clarify, and expand upon arguments made in the written dissertation.
- Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate the significance of their dissertation to the broader field.

I. Instructions

- Listen to the oral defense.
- Using the rubric key, evaluate the defense and provide a total score.

Rubric Key

5 = Outstanding

4 = Very Good

3 = Acceptable

2 = Needs Work

1 = Unacceptable

II. Rubric Indicator

Defends, clarifies, and expands upon written dissertation with further evidence and argument	
Directly and correctly answers the examiner's questions	
Demonstrates knowledge of dissertation subject, primary sources, and background scholarship	
Demonstrates ability to synthesize dissertation topic with broader topics in the discipline of theology	
Shows awareness of the limits of his or her knowledge	
Demonstrates an understanding of the significance of the dissertation to the broader field	
Total Score	

III. Evaluation Score (Please List Number Score) _____

IV. Evaluation Possibilities for the Defense

- Pass with distinction (a score of 27 or above)
- Pass (a score of 18 or above)
- Fail (a score of 17 or below, with option for one retake)

_____ _____

Faculty Name Faculty Signature

Appendix C: Student Annual Review Form (contains data on student conference papers and publications)

M: Ph.D. Annual Review Form

DOCTORAL STUDENT ANNUAL REVIEW FORM

Students: Please complete electronically, sign, and submit hard copy to the Director of Graduate Studies by ***March 15.***

STUDENT INFORMATION

Date of Evaluation: _____
Name: _____ Phone:_____
Email: _____ Banner ID: _____
Graduate Program: _____ Mentor: _____
Area of Specialization: _____

Are you on Academic Leave? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please attach a copy of your Leave Agreement to this review.

ACADEMIC COURSEWORK

Previous courses: List chronologically all previous courses you have taken since enrolling at SLU, including the grades you received. Lines can be added to the table as you progress. You can find this information using Banner Self Service.

Term	Course #	urse Title	Instructor	Credits	Grade

Current courses: Which courses are you taking now? Lines can be added to the table as you progress.

Course #	Course Title	Instructor	Credits

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

List any language competency exams you have taken, the dates of those exams, and their results. Provide an expected timeline for the fulfillment of all language requirements (indicating in which languages you intend to demonstrate competency, how you intend to acquire competency, and when you plan to take the competency exams).

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS

List the comprehensive exams you have taken, the dates of those exams, and their results. Provide an expected timeline for the completion of all exam requirements.

DISSERTATION RESEARCH

Describe your current progress with the research requirements of the program (i.e., thesis, dissertation). Provide expected timelines, with dates, for completion of the major components of your thesis or dissertation (i.e., prospectus defense, written drafts of individual chapters, final written version, committee approval, oral defense).

ASSISTANTSHIP ACTIVITIES

Support: Have you received financial support from either SLU or external organizations? If so, what is the source (teaching assistantship or research assistantship from department, presidential scholarship, external fellowship, etc.)? Indicate whether your source of support included a stipend and the duration of the support contract. If none, leave blank.

Term	Source and Type of Support

Teaching: In which courses and semesters have you been a Teaching Assistant? In which courses and semesters have you been the Primary Instructor? If none, leave blank.

Term	Course #	Course Title	Instructor (for TAs)	Role

Research: With which faculty and in which semesters have you been a Research Assistant? If none, leave blank.

Term	Faculty Member	Main Activities

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

List below all presentations at professional meetings and conferences for the current academic year. Include any presentations to occur over the rest of the academic year, including summer.

List below all articles or manuscripts submitted for publication this academic year, indicating the journal to which they were submitted and the results of editorial reviews.

List below all internal or external grant submissions (or your participation in submissions) this academic year, indicating the funding source to which they were submitted and the results of the reviews, if known.

Describe any specialized training in teaching. Have you completed, or do you plan on completing, the Certificate Program in Teaching from the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning?

List below all internships that you have had this academic year, indicating the place, time commitment, and activities of the program.

List all professional organizations of which you are a student member, including any offices held.

Describe any professional service and/or leadership positions associated with the university, graduate education, department or program. Indicate your title and dates of service.

List any awards, honors, and achievements you have received this academic year.

Are there any other factors that you would like to have included in your evaluation?

EVALUATION: TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY

Based on the faculty's discussion, the quality of your work was rated in each of the following areas.

	Not Meeting Expectations	Meeting Expectations
Academic Quality of Coursework		
Research Quality of Thesis, Prospectus, or Dissertation		
Research Quantity (timely completion of project)		
Comprehensive Examinations		
Language Acquisition		
Assistantship Quality and Quantity		
Teaching Quality		
Professional Development		
Collegiality		

Commentary (Include specific, written goals for the upcoming year if a student is "not meeting expectations" in any area.)

_____ _____

Student's signature Date

_____ _____

Director of Graduate Studies' signature Date