Rubric for the 2nd Year Portfolio (Revised)  
Graduate Program in Spanish, U.Va.

The rubrics attached are meant to guide graduate students in the preparation of the Second-Year Portfolio required of all students at the end of their fourth semester in the program. It will be used by a committee of faculty members who have had the student in one of their classes to assess their performance during their first two years of graduate school and determine their eligibility for continuation into the rest of the PhD program.

According to the new curriculum, the 2nd Year Portfolio must include the following:

1. ﻿Two heavily revised course papers and/or a published article.
2. A revised Statement of Research Interests that includes a one-page bibliography.
3. The names of 3 tenure-track professors who have agreed to serve as comprehensive examination committee members.

Current students who have chosen to enroll in the new PhD curriculum should be aware of the ways that the requirements have been modified *for their cohort*. See the Memorandum of Understanding governing transition to the new program.

**The portfolio is due on April 1 by email to the DGS**. It will be evaluated by the faculty and the results will be communicated to the student by **May 15.**

# Statement of Research Interests

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Pass (3) | Fail (0) |
| Identification of Comps Fields | Identifies the General Area, the Primary Research Field, and the Secondary Research Field. Identifies faculty members who have agreed to serve on the comps committee. | Does not identify the general area and/or the two research fields. Does not identify committee members. |
| Identification of Committee Members | Identifies three tenure-track professors (at least two from SIP) who have agreed to serve on comps committee. | Does not identify committee members. |
| Examination Plans | Discusses how the student’s plans for the comps will further the student’s knowledge of and ability to pursue the stated research interest. | Does not discuss examination plans. |
| Coursework History | Discusses how the coursework has helped shape the student’s interest and methods. | Does not include a discussion of coursework. |
| Language Requirement | Provides a workable plan for fulfilling the language requirement | Does not provide a plan for fulfilling the language requirement. |
| Bibliography  (Optional 1st year; Required 2nd) | Includes one-page bibliography, properly formatted. | Does not include a bibliography. |

### Part 1. Program Narrative (The statement must include these components somewhere in its body. All categories must be passed)

### 

### Part 2. Research Interests

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Pass + (5) | Pass (3) | Fail + (2) | Fail- (0) |
| Research Interest | Clearly articulates a defined original, innovative, or emerging research interest, making strong connections among the proposed General Area and the two Research Fields. | Articulates a research interest that is actively guiding the student’s progress through the program, making connections among the proposed General Area and the two Research Fields. | Attempts to articulate a research interest that is actively guiding the student’s progress, but falls short. Either the interest itself is a bit vague or ill-defined, or the relationship among the parts of the exam is not clearly articulated. | Demonstrates that the student does not have a clear research interest guiding them through the program. |
| Theory and Methods | Demonstrates engagement with the theoretical approaches and ancillary skills involved in pursuing the research interest. | Successfully identifies the theoretical approaches and ancillary skills involved in pursuing the research interest | Suggests that the student is still struggling to identify some of the appropriate methods and theoretical approaches. | Demonstrates a serious lack of understanding of the methods and theoretical approaches involved in the chosen fields. |
| Disciplinary setting | Succeeds impressively at situating the research interest within broader intellectual conversations | Successfully situates the research interest within broader intellectual conversations. | Struggles to situate the research question in a broader intellectual conversation. | Does not situate the research interest in a broader intellectual conversation. |
| So what? | Makes a compelling case for the importance of the research interest. | Successfully articulates the importance of the research interest. | Suggests that the student is still struggling to articulate the importance of the research interest. | Demonstrates that the student cannot articulate the importance of the research interest. |
| Quality of Writing | The writing is exceptional in its clarity or mode of expression. | The writing is clear, concise and well-organized. | The writing is passable, but not where it needs to be. There are organizational problems or moments of obscurity. | The writing is poor. Lacks clarity. Poorly organized. |

# Written Work

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Pass + (10) | Pass (6) | Fail + (2) | Fail - (0) |
| Originality | The paper presents clear arguments that are not only original but seem to be significant. | The paper articulates clear arguments advancing original ideas. | The paper relies more than it should on the arguments or insights of others. | The paper is largely derivative of the ideas of others. |
| Scholarship | The paper demonstrates an impressive command of the intellectual conversation in which it is situated and the contribution it makes. | The paper situates its argument in a broader intellectual context, explaining the nature of the contribution it makes. | The paper attempts to situate the argument in a broader intellectual context, but struggles to identify it, or stumbles over the nature of its own contribution. | The paper fails to situate its argument in a broader intellectual context, and cannot articulate the nature of the contribution it makes. |
| Theory and methods | The paper demonstrates considerable mastery of the theory and/or methods involved, or even make methodological innovations. | The paper consciously adopts a certain theoretical approach or scholarly method and uses it appropriately. | The paper uses an identifiable theoretical approach or scholarly method, but suggests that the author is not aware of its strengths and limitations. | The paper suggests very little reflection on the matter of theory or method, or demonstrates considerable lack of skill in the use of a crucial theory or method. |
| Quality of Writing | The writing is exceptional in its clarity or mode of expression. It is free of unnecessary jargon and poses its argument in a particularly accessible and compelling manner. | The writing is clear, concise and well-organized. It is largely free of unnecessary jargon and poses its argument in an accessible manner. | The writing is passable, but not where it needs to be. There are organizational problems or moments of obscurity resulting from poor expression or reliance on jargon. | The writing is poor. Lacks clarity. Poorly organized. Thick with jargon. |

# Transcript

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pass + (25) | Pass (14) | Fail + (10) | Fail - (0) |
| The transcript evinces a consistent record of high achievement., demonstrating that the student is undoubtedly prepared for advanced graduate work. | The transcript includes more highs than lows, or demonstrates consistent improvement, suggesting that the student is ready for advanced graduate work. | The transcript includes many lows, or shows little improvement over time, suggesting that the student is not well prepared for advanced graduate work. | The transcript includes so many lows that the student is clearly not prepared for advanced graduate workl |

**SCORE\**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Score | Max Score |
| Program Narrative |  | 18 (obligatory) |
| Statement of Research Interests |  | 25 |
| Written Work |  | 40 |
| Transcript |  | 25 |
| TOTAL |  | 108 |

SCALE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PASS + | 95 – 108 |
| PASS | 80 – 95 |
| PASS - | 65 – 80 |
| FAIL + | 50 – 65 |
| FAIL | 35 – 50 |
| FAIL - | 0 – 35 |