

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): German Studies

Department: Languages, Literatures & Cultures

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

College/School: CAS

Date (Month/Year):

Assessment Contact: Evelyn Meyer -

evelyn.meyer@slu.edu & Evelyn Wisbey -

evelyn.wisbey@slu.edu

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 22-23

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 21-22

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

SLO 5: Graduates will be able to apply the German language to make connections with other disciplines/fields of study.

SLO 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

In GR 2010 (Fall 22 & Spring 23):

SLO 1, 2, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low proficiency level

In GR 3020 (Spring 23):

SLO 1, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low to intermediate mid proficiency levels

In GR 3210 (Fall 22):

SLO 3, 4 & 6 – at the intermediate low to intermediate mid proficiency levels

In GR 4500 (Fall 22):

SLO 2 & 3 – at the intermediate mid to intermediate high proficiency level

In GR 4930 (Spring 23):

SLO 1 & 4 – at the intermediate mid to intermediate high proficiency level

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and 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.

In GR 2010 (Fall 2022 & Spring 2023):

- Oral Proficiency Interview: SLO 1
- Cultural Exploration Paper: SLO 2, 3 & 4

In GR 3020 (Spring 2023):

- Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1, 3 & 4

In GR 3210 (Fall 22):

- Written cultural reflection paper: SLO 3, 4 & 6

In GR 4500 (Fall 22):

- Final written paper: SLO 2 & 3

In GR 4930 (Spring 23):

- Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1 & 4

3.

4. 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 document** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

GR 2010 (first course that counts in the German Studies Major):

The two German faculty members assessed and filled out the rubrics for all students individually on the Cultural composition. We then met at the end of each semester and discussed our individual assessment findings and where we had assessed a student differently, we worked through this to come up with an overall assessment for each student. The two German faculty members do assessment of each student for the Oral Proficiency Interview, which is conducted in the presence of the course instructor, but the student is interviewed by the other German faculty member. Both the course instructor and the interviewing faculty assess and fill out the rubrics for all students and we then discuss the individual assessment findings immediately after each interview and agree on the assessment finding if there are differences in the individual assessment between the two faculty. Students were given an exit survey (indirect measure).

GR 3020/3210/4500/4930 (required or elective courses in the German Studies Major):

As these are level checks in the assessment plan, the course instructor selects the assessment artifact from the course assignments based on what we agreed to assess in these courses in our assessment plan, be that a written artifact or a spoken one and/or a proficiency interview. It is the course instructor who does the assessment of these artifacts after the end of the semester but may consult with the other German faculty member for input or a second opinion. Students were **not** given an exit survey (indirect measure).

All rubrics used are included at the end of the report.

5.

6. 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)?

The adopted benchmark is that 80% of the students need to meet or exceed the criteria of the Student Learning Outcomes assessed in the course at the stated proficiency level for that course.

Students assessed in German are German Studies majors, minors and students simply taking the course as an elective or to meet the foreign language requirement in the old core. We include every student registered in the courses in which assessment is done.

All courses were taught on the St. Louis campus in person.

GR 2010 (Fall 2022 & Spring 2023)

Speaking – SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview

Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-low level on the ACTFL scale

Fall 2022

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
13 / 11*	SLO 1: Language	4 (36.4%)	6 (54.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.1%)	N/A
13 / 11*	SLO 1: Intercultural competence	3 (27.2%)	2 (18.2%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	N/A

* This is a graded course assignment, but two students either did not sign up or did not show up for their oral proficiency interview.

Spring 2023

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
8 / 6*	SLO 1: Language	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
8 / 6*	SLO 1: Intercultural competence	1 (16.66%)	1 (16.66%)	3 (50.02%)	1 (16.66%)	N/A

* Course enrollment was 8, but two students did not sign up or show up for the OPI interview, even though it is a graded final assignment.

AY 2022-2023 Totals

Total students assessed	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
17	SLO 1: Language	4 (23.6%)	12 (70.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.8%)	N/A
17	SLO 1: Intercultural competence	4 (23.6%)	3 (17.6%)	8 (47%)	2 (11.8%)	N/A

Direct Measures:

As the data above shows, students met or exceeded expectations 94.2% of the time in language specific aspects of SLO 1 during the interview. In the spoken intercultural competence, 88.2% of the students met or exceeded expectations, which cements the significant increase we saw a year ago when prior to that the number was around 50%. Only 11.8% of the students found linguistic ways around the features of formal language expected and therefore we had to classify those OPIs as not meeting expectations. Our work with the students on that very point during the last two years brought about the desired improvement in students' awareness of the cultural implications and proper use of formal language in German which is quite different from American markers of politeness and formality.

Writing – SLO 2, 3 & 4: SLO 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Assessment Tool: Cultural Exploration Composition

Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Fall 2022

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
13 / 12*	SLO 2: language SLO 2: composition mechanics	6 (50%) 1 (8%)	6 (50%) 10 (83%)	0 (0%) 1 (8%)**	N/A
13 / 12*	SLO 3: comprehensibility & Impact SLO 3: Text Type	9 (75%) 2 (17%)	3 (25%) 6 (50%)	0 (0%) 4 (33%)***	N/A
13 / 12*	SLO 4:	7 (58%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	N/A

* This is a graded course assignment, but one student did not turn in this assignment.

** This student's essay was significantly shorter than required, but performed well in the language aspect of this SLO.

*** Students are expected to list their sources and follow standard academic writing conventions in order to meet expectations. If they also document use of sources throughout the paper, that is assessed as exceeding expectations. However, the assignment states that they can write this essay simply with the cultural knowledge they have acquired over the course of the three German language courses (GR 1010-2010). The assignment states that they "may do additional research" on their topic, but it does not say that it is required. This is a discrepancy between the assignment and our assessment rubric that we noticed after the fact. The assignment will be changed to show that additional research is required. These students either did not do research or did not include their sources.

Spring 2023

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
8/8	SLO 2: language SLO 2: composition mechanics	2 (25%) 0 (0%)	4 (50%) 7 (88%)	2 (25%) * 1 (13%) **	N/A
8/8	SLO 3: Comprehensibility & Impact SLO 3: Text Type	3 (38%) 0 (0%)	3 (38%) 3 (33%)	2 (25%) * 5 (56%)***	N/A
8/8	SLO 4:	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)*	N/A

*The same 2 students were rated as 'does not meet expectations' for all SLOs assessed.

** One of the 2 students not meeting expectations is not included here because their essay was technically the required length, although the student did not meet the language expectation of this SLO.

*** Students are expected to list their sources and follow standard academic writing conventions in order to meet expectations. If they also document use of sources throughout the paper, that is assessed as exceeding expectations. However, the assignment states that they can write this essay simply with the cultural knowledge they have acquired over the course of the three German language courses (GR 1010-2010). The assignment states that they "may do

additional research” on their topic, but it does not say that it is required. This is a discrepancy between the assignment and our assessment rubric that we noticed after the fact. The assignment will be changed to show that additional research is required. These students either did not do research or did not include their sources.

AY 2022-2023 Totals

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
20	SLO 2: language SLO 2: composition mechanics	8 (40.0%) 1 (5.0%)	10 (50.0%) 17 (85.0%)	2 (10.0%) 2 (10.0%)	N/A N/A
20	SLO 3: comprehensibility & Impact SLO 3: Text Type	12 (60.0%) 2 (10.0%)	6 (30.0%) 9 (45.0%)	2 (10.0%) 9 (45.0%)*	N/A N/A
20	SLO 4:	9 (45.0%)	7 (35.0%)	4 (20.0%)	N/A

** Students are expected to list their sources and follow standard academic writing conventions in order to meet expectations. If they also document use of sources throughout the paper, that is assessed as exceeding expectations. However, the assignment states that they can write this essay simply with the cultural knowledge they have acquired over the course of the three German language courses (GR 1010-2010). The assignment states that they “may do additional research” on their topic, but it does not say that it is required. This is a discrepancy between the assignment and our assessment rubric that we noticed after the fact. The assignment will be changed to show that additional research is required. These students either did not do research or did not include their sources.*

Direct Measures:

As the data above shows, 90% of students met or exceeded expectations for SLO2. While we saw 60% of students not meet the expectations in the composition mechanics part of SLO2 last Spring (which we attributed to Covid pandemic fatigue), this is no longer the case, suggesting that our assumption of Covid fatigue at the time may have been accurate. For SLO3, the data shows that 90% of students met or exceeded expectations in the area of comprehensibility and impact, but the same is not true in the area of text type, where 45% did not meet the expectation. This is an improvement vis-a-vis last year, where over 70% of students did not meet this expectation. Some of this improvement is likely due to the fact that – as announced in last year’s report – we have since changed the assignment expectations as communicated to the students so that they better align with our assessment rubric (which states that listing academic sources and following good academic practices is needed to meet expectations; however, the assignment expectations previously only stated that additional research is optional, thus often leading to no sources listed). However, it is clear that more work needs to be done in this area. We will further work with students to clearly express the need to list sources and how to do so correctly and monitor any development in assessment outcomes in this area. For SLO4, 80% of all students met or exceeded expectations. 80% is our benchmark for all SLOs and we are happy with this outcome for this SLO; however, we will continue to monitor it moving forward, as the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the expectations on this SLO is overall lower than for the other SLOs.

Indirect assessment results for GR 2010:

Evelyn Meyer was Interim Department Chair in AY22-23. While she created the indirect assessment survey for Fall 2022, no student responded to it. We must not have sent out the survey to the students in the class. The end of Spring 2023 was a very hectic time and we simply forgot about the indirect measure survey. This was an anomaly due to the unusual circumstances. We will make sure to collect this data again going forward.

GR 3020 (Spring 2023)

Speaking – SLO 1, 3 & 4: SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Assessment Tool: Cultural Presentation (oral)

Proficiency level assessed:

- A. **Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's first GR 3xxx level course
- B. **checkmarks in both Intermediate-low and Intermediate-Mid on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's second GR 3xxx level course
- C. **Intermediate-Mid level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's third GR 3xxx level course

7 students enrolled in their first GR 3xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-low

2 students enrolled in their second GR 3xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-low to mid

SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

Total students enrolled / assessed	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 1 Language	2 (0%)	7 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 1 Intercultural competence	Meets expectation: 9 (100%)		Does not meet expectation: 0 (0%)		

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
7 Students	SLO 1: Language	First 3xxx	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2 Students	SLO 1: Language	Second 3xxx	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 students	SLO 1: Language	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

Total students enrolled / assessed	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 3 Comprehensibility & Impact	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 3 Text Type	Exceeds expectation: 4 (44%)		Meets expectation: 5 (56%)		Does not meet expectations: 0 (0%)

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
---	---------	------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	-------------

7 Students	SLO 3: compreh. & impact	First 3xxx	3 (43%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2 Students	SLO 3: compreh. & impact	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 students	SLO 3: compreh. & impact	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Total students enrolled / assessed	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 4	1 (0%)	7 (40%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
7 Students	SLO 4:	First 3xxx	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2 Students	SLO 4:	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 students	SLO 4:	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A

Background Comment: We recently changed the curriculum in German Studies (now in its second year) and as part of that we also changed prerequisites. In the old curriculum students had to take seven courses from GR 1010 up to GR 3250 in sequence, so it was logical to track development of proficiency skills in that sequential manner as well. In the new curriculum, a student can take any GR 3xxx course upon completion of GR 2010, and upon completion of one GR 3xxx course, they can enroll in any of the GR 4xxx level courses (except the Senior Capstone course). Therefore, we are now tracking how many 3xxx (and 4xxx level) courses a student has taken and are aligning what meets and exceeds expectations accordingly. Therefore, as stated on the rubric, if it is the student's first 3xxx level course, intermediate low proficiency meets the expectation and intermediate mid exceeds it; if it is the student's second 3xxx level course, checkmarks should appear in both the intermediate low and mid proficiency categories to meet expectations, but if all are at the intermediate mid, they exceed expectations; if it is the student's third 3xxx level course, intermediate mid proficiency meets expectations and intermediate high exceeds expectations.

Direct Measures: This was the second time this course was taught with the new redesigned curriculum, which places a strong emphasis on developing oral and visual communications as it counts for *Eloquentia Perfecta 2: Oral and Visual Communication* criteria in the new university undergraduate core. In the three SLOs that were assessed, all students met or exceeded expectations. This is particularly noteworthy as more than half of students progressed through our program at SLU, starting with German 1010 (1st semester Beginning German), which the other 4 students entering the program at various points in the sequence with previous experience from High School German programs. This indicates that we prepare students well to meet the expectations at higher levels in the program, helping them make progress throughout the program, but also that our placement procedures align well with our SLO expectations.

No indirect measure survey was administered.

GR 3210 (Fall 2022)

Writing – SLO 3, 4 & 6: SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

SLO 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

Assessment Tool: Written cultural reflection paper (final exam)

Proficiency level assessed:

- A. **Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's first GR 3xxx level course
- B. **checkmarks in both Intermediate-low and Intermediate-Mid on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's second GR 3xxx level course
- C. **Intermediate-Mid level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's third GR 3xxx level course

3 students enrolled in their first GR 3xxx level course, the proficiency expectation for them is at least intermediate-low
 1 student enrolled in their second GR 3xxx level course, the proficiency expectation for them is checkmarks at both the intermediate-low and intermediate-mid levels

1 student enrolled in their third GR 3xxx level course, the proficiency expectation for them is intermediate-mid.

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

Total students enrolled / assessed: 5/5	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / -low	Intermediate low	Novice high	Not ratable
SLO 3: Comprehensibility & Impact	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 3 Text Type	Exceeds expectation: 0 (0%)		Meets expectation: 5 (100%)		Does not meet expectations: 0 (0%)	

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
3 Students	SLO 3: compreh.& impact	First 3xxx	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.4%)	0 (0%)	NA
1 Student	SLO 3: compreh. & impact	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 Student	SLO 3: compreh. & impact	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	N/A

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Total students enrolled / assessed: 5/5	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high	Not ratable
SLO 4	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	N/A

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
3 Students	SLO 4:	First 3xxx	1 (33.4%)	3 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 Student	SLO 4:	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 Student	SLO 4:	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	N/A

SLO 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

Total students enrolled / assessed: 5/5	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high	Not ratable
SLO 6	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (20%)	1 (20%)

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
3 Students	SLO 6:	First 3xxx	0 (0%)	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.4%)*
1 Student	SLO 6:	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 Student	SLO 6:	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	N/A

* student listed no sources and didn't do additional research for this project, even though this was pointed out to the student as part of the revise and resubmit process.

Comment: See comment under GR 3020 for curricular changes and impact on how we do assessment.

Direct Measures:

As indicated on the curriculum map, SLO 6 is being **introduced** formally for the first time in this course in the German curriculum. Instead of using "proper" academic sources, students on online resources, mostly encyclopedia entries or YouTube Videos, some in German, some in English, some merely listing sources for the required visuals of the project, but not for the content research component, where they merely relied on what they had learned throughout the semester. While there are academic sources accessible online, most students have a difficult time determining which count as academic sources and which are more references that do not meet the standard of an academic source. In the "anything can be looked up online quickly" environment, it has become more challenging to get students to do in-depth academic research and to rely exclusively on easily accessible generalist sources online. This is something we will need to focus on more going forward as we work with students, especially coming out of the Covid-19 pandemic that placed a strong emphasis on everything online in much of their academic work that may have impacted the choice of sources used by students in this project. I am going to rethink the assignment as well, because a cultural reflection on which three historical events they found the most impactful followed by a justification may sound too much like a personal opinion assignment and not enough like an actual research question. This may be part of why the academic research and synthesis of the research into the paper is barely meeting or not meeting expectations.

In the three SLOs that were assessed, 80-100% of the students met or exceeded expectations. Especially the students for whom this was their first or second GR 3xxx level course came to SLU with very strong German skills from their high school German programs. The student for whom this was the third GR 3xxx level course normally submits much better

work that they did on this final assignment, this was not what I am used to receiving from the student and while they did not meet the expectations on this particular artefact used for assessment purposes, it is an anomaly.

No indirect measure survey was administered.

GR 4500 medieval Elective (Fall 22):

Speaking – SLO 2 & 3: SLO 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

Assessment Tool: Final written paper

Proficiency level assessed:

- A. Intermediate-Mid level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s first GR 4xxx level course
- B. checkmarks in both Intermediate-Mid and Intermediate-High on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s second or third GR 4xxx level course
- C. Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s fourth or more GR 4xxx level course

0 students enrolled in their first GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-mid

4 students enrolled in their second or third GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation checkmarks in both intermediate-mid and intermediate-high columns

0 students enrolled in their fourth or more GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-high

SLO 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

Total students enrolled / assessed: 4/4	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 2 Language	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 2 composition mechanics	Exceeds expectation: 0 (0%)		Meets expectation: 4 (100%)	Does not meet expectation: 0 (0%)	

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 4xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
0 Students	SLO 2: Language	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 Students	SLO 2: Language	Second /third 4xxx	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 students	SLO 2: Language	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

Total students enrolled / assessed: 4/4	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 3 Composition Impact	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 3 Text Type	Exceeds expectations: 0 (0%)		Meets expectations: 4 (100%)	Does not meet expectations: 0 (0%)	

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 4xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
0 Students	SLO 3:	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 Students	SLO 3:	Second /third 4xxx	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 students	SLO 3:	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

Direct Measures: All students exceeded expectations in all areas assessed in SLO 2 & 3. They are a very strong student cohort group and have been from the start. They work well together and support each other, and it shows in the high quality of their work.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

GR 4930 Modern/Contemporary Elective [German Cultural Identity] (Spring 23)

Speaking – SLO 1 & 4: SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Assessment Tool: Cultural Presentation (oral)

Proficiency level assessed:

- D. Intermediate-Mid level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s first GR 4xxx level course
- E. checkmarks in both Intermediate-Mid and Intermediate-High on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s second or third GR 4xxx level course
- F. Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student’s fourth or more GR 4xxx level course

0 students enrolled in their first GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-mid

4 students enrolled in their second or third GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation checkmarks in both intermediate-mid and intermediate-high columns

1 student enrolled in their fourth or more GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-high

SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

Outcome / Totals 5/5	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 1 Language	1	1	2	1	0
SLO 1 Intercultural competence	Meets expectation: 4		Does not meet expectation: 1		

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
0 students	SLO 1: Language	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 Students	SLO 1: Language	Second /third 4xxx	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	N/A
1 student	SLO 1: Language	Fourth/more 4xxx	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Outcome / Totals 5/5	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 4	1	1	3	0	0

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
0 students	SLO 4:	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 students	SLO 4:	Second /third 4xxx	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student	SLO 4:	Fourth/more 4xxx	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

Direct Measures: Our benchmark expectation of 80% or more of students meeting or exceeding expectations was met for both SLO 1 and SLO 4. Specifically, all students met or exceeded expectations for SLO 4 and 4 out of 5 students (80%) met or exceeded expectations for SLO 1.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

7. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

In general, the data tells us that

- Overall, we are doing very well, and our curriculum teaches students well in terms of the learning outcome goals we have set.
- Year 4 of rolling out the revised assessment plan from one that had only assessed the entry (GR 2010) and exit (GR 4960) points in the German Studies major, to one that has pre- and level checks throughout all courses in the curriculum that is aligned with ACTFL proficiency levels is set up correctly and tracks students' progress well and gives us good data and even more with our improved assessment rubrics that we are now using in their second year.
- Adjusting our assessment to track in the pre/ level checks in the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses how many courses a student has taken in German and aligning that with variable proficiency levels and what counts as (not) meeting and exceeding expectations gives us much better data and a more reliable way to track their progress throughout the curriculum.
- The extensive revisions of our SLOs and rubrics and the assessment plan overall two years ago that addressed issues we encountered in previous years were necessary and are much improved. We had separated intercultural competence into three areas: intercultural competence in speaking, in writing and in content (which resulted in revised SLOs 1, 2 & 4) and a clear definition of what our expectations can be and are in all these areas across the proficiency levels. As a result, our data is more reliable.
- That we need to correct the cultural exploration paper assignment in GR 2010 and in GR 3210 to include required additional research, since we had a discrepancy between our assessment rubric and the assignment as noted above.

Course specific interpretation of results (direct and indirect measures) was added below the statistics in section 4 of this report for each course and SLO assessed in each course.

8. 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?

Throughout the summer and fall of 2021, the German faculty met once or twice a month to revise our SLOs, our rubrics and the assessment plan. This was a significant overhaul that addressed a variety of issues we had tried to address over the course of the previous years but never getting us to a place we were satisfied with. This was a significant overhaul and we implemented it this year. We are happy with the results of the overhaul and the better data we are getting from it about student learning.

Tracking where a student is in the curriculum in the “pre-level check” courses, i.e., how many 3xxx or 4xxx level courses they had taken and aligning that with different proficiency levels that can be expected from a student is also getting us better data. In the statistics in section 4, you will see an overall table of where the students fall based on the proficiency level, but then we also break it down based on where they are in the curriculum i.e. how many courses they have taken and that gives us a realistic view of who meets, exceeds or does not meet expectations that we did not get in the old assessment plan. This year we found a better way to record that data than in our initial year of tracking this (AY20-21).

Generally, it is the practice of the German faculty to meet each semester that GR 2010 and GR 4960 are taught as we do assessment together on the artefacts of those courses. In these meetings we primarily focus on assessment results of those courses, but we always discuss assessment holistically then as well and discuss changes. Dr. Wisbey entered her assessment findings for GR 3020 and GR 4930 into the document, Dr. Meyer entered her assessment findings for GR 3210 and GR 4500 into the document and we both entered the data for GR 2010. We had several meetings each semester and over the summer and in August & September, discussing assessment findings as we collaborated in writing the annual assessment report.

- 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning outcomes • Artifacts of student learning • Evaluation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Changes to curriculum:

- We will continue to work more on helping our students understand the different linguistic cultural markers of formal language in German in the lower-level courses, as that is an area that needs continued work – a difficult thing to master for students. This year’s data again showed an improvement over last year. We will continue to focus on that in our teaching and to monitor these results.
- We defined the progression of and expectations for content intercultural competencies (separated from linguistic intercultural competence) and are aligning them with assignments in the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses, based on the revisions we did to our assessment plan. This year we tweaked assignments and curriculum in GR 3020, 3210, 4500 & 4930, the courses that were offered during the academic year. Our assessment rubrics and our curriculum and assignments at these levels are much more in sync. We will continue this work in the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses we are offering next academic year.

Changes to the Assessment Plan:

- Since we overhauled the entire assessment plan, the SLOs and rubrics a year ago, we have no plans to make changes in the assessment plan at this time. The changes we made are a significant improvement and is resulting in reliable data.
- Because of the Academic Portfolio Review decision to close the German Major as a free-standing degree and the remaining majors being on a teach-out plan, we will do assessment internally with all our students as we have done every year in our assessment practices, i.e., we included all students taking our courses, not just students who are declared majors in German Studies. Going forward, we plan to enter data into our tables found in section 4 of this report, but we do not intend to submit a formal report with this much detail, unless the university requires assessment of all minor programs.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

9. 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?

1. In all courses, we are giving the development of intercultural competencies more time and space to teach these skills more meaningfully and more in depth and overall. Students are doing very well in content intercultural competence as our results have shown, especially once they move beyond the lower level (language) courses. With increased linguistic proficiency it becomes easier to tackle more complex content and analysis as well.
2. The biggest change was the complete overhaul of our assessment plan, the SLOs and rubrics and the tracking of where students actually are in the curriculum at the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses and assessing them at different proficiency levels, that we mentioned above already.
3. In all courses, we will dedicate more time on developing research skills and how to use research findings and integrate it into student work in an appropriate academic manner.

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

1. & 2. It was assessed using the revised SLOs and assessment rubrics, but otherwise in the same manner as before. We are definitely getting better and more reliable data because of these changes.
3. The research part is already part of the assessment plan and rubrics, but we didn't make the expectations clear enough to students in the assessment artefact assignment and we have revised the assignment and anticipate better results going forward.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

1. It is quite noticeable that the percentage rate of students meeting and exceeding these skills is continually increasing as a result of us working more intentionally on developing all competencies (oral and written communication skills combined with intercultural competencies in the area of communication; intercultural competencies in the area of content; academic competencies in the area of research in general and working with academic sources, going from describing to analyzing cultural practices) throughout the entire curriculum and that the scaffolding of introducing, developing and mastering these skill sets as determined on our curriculum map really helps us see the big picture and not just focus on what happens in an individual course.
2. In this second year of rolling out the revised assessment plan, in which we built on our previous revisions where we added assessment of the 3xxx and 4xxx-level courses, we addressed one of the biggest issues we had in our previous assessment plans, namely the different aspects of what intercultural competence means, how we teach it and assess it. And that resulted in revising the SLOs and assessment rubrics. As was the case last year, we no longer struggle with how to assess that skill as it was separated out into three distinct areas. Breaking this skill set up into distinct areas gives us reliable data that helps us understand what students are learning and where we need to emphasize this more in our classes to help them develop these skills which are difficult to master.

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

As stated in C.2.: Our conversations about our assessment findings this year confirmed what we found the last two years, that noting for each student if it is their first, second, third, etc. 3xxx or 4xxx level course in the program matters to better know where they are at and what proficiency level they are expected to function at. We also confirmed for ourselves that we can use the same rubrics because they are aligned with ACTFL proficiency levels. By defining ACTFL proficiency expectations based on time studying the language we can assess students who are in the same class but are at different proficiency levels in a way that does not assess more advanced students at too low a level and those who are at a lower proficiency level won't "not meet" expectations they cannot yet meet. We had to make these adjustments because of the program being understaffed and not being able to offer enough courses that would separate student groupings based more closely on their proficiency levels. We will monitor our assessment results going forward to see if we will continue to get improved and more reliable data that way.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview
(Interview not conducted by Course Instructor, but by another member of the German faculty)

SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Communicative Task	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Able to narrate in all time frames (Past, present and future) <input type="checkbox"/> Talks in details <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently uses complex sentences and not just simple sentences <input type="checkbox"/> Speaks in paragraph-length discourse	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills <input type="checkbox"/> Present tense well <input type="checkbox"/> Past tense inconsistent <input type="checkbox"/> Talks in generalities, not details <input type="checkbox"/> Often a series of simple sentences	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills <input type="checkbox"/> Simple face-to-face conversations <input type="checkbox"/> Asks simple questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to simple questions <input type="checkbox"/> Simple descriptions	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of novice high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Simple conversation, reactive <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally initiates <input type="checkbox"/> Describes in a simple way	<input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language
Context Content Areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Performs well in formal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: informal and some formal conversations on topics related to school, home, and leisure activities, as well as some topics related to employment, current events, and matters of public and community interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills <input type="checkbox"/> Performs in limited formal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: personal activities and immediate surroundings, some ability about areas of general interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills <input type="checkbox"/> Operates in informal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: self, family members, leisure activities and immediate surroundings	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of novice high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Functions in informal situations minimally	<input type="checkbox"/> Interacts spontaneously
Accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Understood by NS <u>un</u> accustomed to dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence level discourse with connectors	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills <input type="checkbox"/> Usually understood by NS <u>un</u> accustomed to dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence level discourse with some connectors	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills <input type="checkbox"/> Understood by NS accustomed to dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence level discourse	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of novice high skills <input type="checkbox"/> Repetition, understood by sympathetic listeners <input type="checkbox"/> Word level discourse with some attempt at sentences	<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensible to NS accustomed to dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Word or list level discourse

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Linguistic Intercultural Competence	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently uses Sie vs. du appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently responds appropriately to formal vs. informal situations. AND <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently responds appropriately to polite expressions. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently initiates polite expressions appropriately him/herself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & consistently uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & consistently responds appropriately. AND/OR <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and consistently responds appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and consistently initiates them appropriately him/herself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & often uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & often responds appropriately. AND/OR <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and often responds appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and often initiates them appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & occasionally uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & sometimes responds appropriately. AND/OR <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and sometimes responds appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and sometimes initiates them appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> May use some memorized gestures and formulaic expressions (e.g. Sie vs. du, expressions of politeness, greetings)

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S OPI:

Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation

SLO 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
<p>Language Function Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully some complicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in all major time frames. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements <input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. <input type="checkbox"/> Speaks in present tense though there may be errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Has no real functional ability.
<p>Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently & correctly demonstrates high quantity and quality of intermediate-level language and some features of advance level language, e.g. consistently using past tense, and some use of subjunctive or passive. <input type="checkbox"/> Generally able to speak accurately and fluently, but some linguistic difficulty may occur as more complex tasks are attempted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more complex. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time. <input type="checkbox"/> Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Is most accurate with memorized language, including phrases. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy decreases when creating and trying to express personal meaning.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Text Type Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases.
Linguistic Intercultural Competence: Meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	<p>These are the Expectations for Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on facts rather than entertainment value • Presentation style is not too casual or informal <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did meet these expectations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did not meet these expectations</p>				

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ORAL PRESENTATION:

Assessment Tool: Written Paper

SLO 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in culturally appropriate written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
<p>Language Function Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in all major time frames.	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail, and with recognizable attempts at some complicated writing tasks. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in all major time frames, but not always consistently.	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in present tense, and also in one or more major time frames, although not consistently in the other time frames.	<input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements <input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense though there may be errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Has no real functional ability.
<p>Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally able to write accurately & fluently at the advanced level, e.g. some use of subjunctive and passive voice, but some linguistic difficulty may occur as more complex tasks are attempted.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct, and a variety of other grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as writing becomes more complex.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate mid-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as writing becomes more complex.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate low-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate mid level or as writing becomes more complex.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of novice high-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate low level or as writing becomes more complex.
<p>Text Type quantity and organization of language discourse</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases.

<p>Composition Mechanics Exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)</p>	<p><i>Composition mechanics is not tied to proficiency levels as the word count/page number minimum requirement has nothing to do with proficiency levels per se, although the amount a student can write grows with increased proficiency and that is reflected in the minimum length becoming longer between GR 1010 and GR 4960.</i></p> <p>Exceeds expectation: <input type="checkbox"/> Project is significantly longer than stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography)</p> <p>Meets expectation: <input type="checkbox"/> Project is at least the stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography)</p> <p>Does not meet expectation: <input type="checkbox"/> Project is less than the stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography)</p>
---	--

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S ORAL PRESENTATION:

Assessment Tool: Oral presentation

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Comprehensibility Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is understood with occasional difficulty by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.
Impact Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in presentation illustrates originality and rich details.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and demonstrates some originality.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and may demonstrate some originality.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents mostly or not in a clear and organized manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation may feature some detail & appropriate visuals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized, <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features little or no detail. Visuals may be lacking or missing entirely.
Text Type Exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	<p>These are the expectations for Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists sources • Presentation follows standard academic conventions <p>This is a feature that exceeds expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents use of sources throughout the presentation <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation meets and exceeds these expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did meet these expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did not meet these expectations </p>				

Linguistic Intercultural Competence meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	These are the Expectations for Meets: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Emphasis on facts rather than entertainment value• Presentation style is not too casual or informal <input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did meet these expectations<input type="checkbox"/> Student presentation did not meet these expectations
---	---

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ORAL PRESENTATION:

Assessment Tool: Written Paper

SLO 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Comprehensibility Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is understood with occasional difficulty by those accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.
Impact Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates originality and rich details.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are some recognizable logical transitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates good detail and demonstrate some originality.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a clear and organized manner, e.g. may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features some detail in arguments.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper may be either unclear or unorganized, e.g. is poorly organized overall, or introduction and conclusion may be missing. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features little or no detail.
Text Type Exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	<p>These are the Expectations for Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists sources • Paper follows standard academic writing conventions <p>This is a feature that exceeds expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents use of sources throughout the paper <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student paper meets and exceeds these expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Student paper did meet these expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Student paper did not meet these expectations</p>				

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S PAPER:

Assessment Tool: Various

SLO 4: Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
<p>Cultural Knowledge & self-awareness (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzes distinctions between own and target culture, and draws appropriate conclusions. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a strong understanding of the complexity of the target culture by providing rich detail and by showing detailed awareness of cultural practices and institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Makes distinctions between own and target culture and goes beyond mere descriptions of differences <input type="checkbox"/> Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Response includes personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported with appropriate examples <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing more detailed awareness of cultural practices and institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describes differences between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons that describe the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Response includes personal viewpoints <input type="checkbox"/> Response includes an appropriate amount of examples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Begins to describe differences between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Uses some detail <input type="checkbox"/> Expresses a personal viewpoint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Names cultural differences between own and target culture. <input type="checkbox"/> May express a personal opinion.

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT:

Assessment Tool: Written Paper, especially the written Senior Capstone Project

SLO 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Academic Sources reads academic publications in German, synthesizes and incorporates content constructively into research projects	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong use and constructive synthesization from and integration of material from German academic sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Good use and synthesization from and/or integration of material from German academic sources, but not always constructively.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is only limited engagement with research and academic sources in German.	N/A (see Curricular Map, this SLO is not introduced until GR 4xxx level courses)	

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT: