SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

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

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 21-22

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 21 & Spring 22):
SLO 1, 2, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low proficiency level

In GR 3010 (Spring 22):
SLO 2, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low to intermediate mid proficiency levels

In GR 3020 (Fall 21):
SLO 1, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low to intermediate mid proficiency levels

In GR 4010 (Spring 22):
SLO 1 & 4 – at the intermediate mid to intermediate high proficiency level

In GR 4150 (Fall 21):
SLO 1 & 4 – at the intermediate mid to intermediate high proficiency level

In GR 4960 (Fall 21):
SLO 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 – at the 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 2021 & Spring 2022):

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

In GR 3010 (Spring 2022):

- Written portions of the multimedia portfolio: SLO 2, 3 & 4

In GR 3020 (Fall 2021):

- Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1, 3 & 4

In GR 4010 (Spring 2022):

- Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1 & 4

In GR 4150 (Fall 2021):

- Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1 & 4

In GR 4960 (Fall 2021):

- Oral Presentation of the Senior Capstone project: SLO 1, 3, 4, 5
- Written Senior Capstone project (final, revised version): SLO 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
- Oral Proficiency Interview: SLO 1

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 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 3010/3020/4010/4150 (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).

GR 4960 (Senior Capstone course taken in the final year):
The two German faculty members assessed and filled out the rubrics for all students individually on the oral presentation and the final revised written paper of the Capstone project. We then met at the end of the 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 both faculty members, but the

student is interviewed by only one member of the German faculty. Both the course instructor and the interviewing faculty assess and fill out the rubrics for all students and 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).

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

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)?

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 course in which assessment is done.

All courses were taught on the St. Louis campus in face-to-face mode.

GR 2010 (Fall 2021 & Spring 2022)

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 2021

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
4 / 8*	**SLO 1: Language**	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 / 8*	**SLO 1: Inter-cultural competence**	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

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

Spring 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
9 / 10*	**SLO 1: Language**	2 (22.2%)	6 (66.6%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	N/A
9 / 10*	**SLO 1: Intercultural competence**	0 (0%)	3 (33.3%)	5 (55.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.1%)

* Course enrollment was 10, but one student did not sign up for the OPI interview.

AY 2021-2022 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
13	**SLO 1: Language**	3 (23.1%)	9 (69.3%)	1 (7.6%)	0 (0%)	N/A
13	**SLO 1: Intercultural competence**	2 (15.4%)	5 (38.5%)	5 (38.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (7.6%)

Direct Measures:
As the data above shows, students met or exceeded expectations 100% in language specific aspect of SLO 1 during the interview. In the spoken intercultural competence 92.4% of the students met or exceeded expectations, which is a significant increase over last year, when that number. Was around 50%. Only 7.6 % of the students found linguistic ways around the features of formal language expected and therefore we had to classify those OPIs as not ratable in that area. This is also a significant drop from last year, when that number was slightly above 40% of the students. Our work with the students on that very point during this year 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 2021

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
8 / 5*	**SLO 2:** language **SLO 2:** composition mechanics	3 (60%) 1 (20%)	2 (40%) 1 (20%)	0 (0%) 3 (60%)**	N/A
8 / 5*	**SLO 3:** comprehensibility & Impact **SLO 3:** Text Type	1 (20%) 0 (0%)	4 (80%) 0 (0%)	0 (0%) 5 (100%)***	N/A
8 / 5*	**SLO 4:**	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	N/A

** This is a graded course assignment, but some students did not turn in this assignment.*
*** The assignment has a minimum word count requirement excluding the bibliography and these student essays were too short.*
**** 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 2021

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
10/9	**SLO 2:** language **SLO 2:** composition mechanics	4 (44.5%) 0 (0%)	4 (44.5%) 6 (66.8%)	0 (0%) 2 (22.2%)	1 (11%)* 1 (11%)*
10/9	**SLO 3:** Comprehensibility & Impact **SLO 3:** Text Type	2 (22.2%) 0 (0%)	5 (55.80%) 3 (33.2%)	1 (11%) ** 5 (55.8%)***	1 (11%)* 1 (11%)*
10/9	**SLO 4:**	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)*

*Most of this essay was following the English source (listed) verbatim but was translated into German. We therefore cannot assess the work according to the stated SLOs.

** This student exceeded expectations in the comprehensibility part of the assessing this SLO, but did not meet expectations in the Impact, we decided to rank the student overall as not meeting the expectation but wanted to record the achievement in the one part of the 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 2021-2022 Totals

Total students enrolled / assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
14	**SLO 2:** language **SLO 2:** composition mechanics	7 (50%) 1 (7.2%)	6 (42.8%) 7 (50%)	0 (0%) 5 (35.6%)	1 (7.2%) 1 (7.2%)
14	**SLO 3:** comprehensibility & Impact **SLO 3:** Text Type	3 (21.4%) 0 (0%)	9 (64.2%) 3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%) 10 (71.4%)*	1 (7.2%) 1 (7.2%)
14	**SLO 4:**	5 (35.6%)	7 (50%)	1 (7.2%)	1 (7.2%)

* *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, 13 out of 14 students met or exceeded expectations in the area of SLO2 language, but not in the area of composition mechanic, i.e. meeting the minimum wordcount. In the Fall over 60% of the students did not meet the goal, but in the Spring it was only 22.2% that did not meet that expectation. Those not meeting the minimum

wordcount were not far off and this is likely the result of the Covid pandemic fatigue everyone is experiencing after over 2 years of living through a pandemic. We will monitor this in the future.
For SLO3, the data shows that 12 out of 14 students met or exceeded expectations in the area of comprehensibility and impact, but not in the area of text type, where over 70% did not meet the expectation. As the comment in the above statistic explains, this has to do with a discrepancy between the rubric and the assignment. The rubric states that listing academic sources and following good academic practices is needed to meet expectations. The assignment however states that additional research is optional, and the majority of the student elected not to do additional research and relied on their acquired cultural knowledge from class and textbook. We will change the assignment to make it clear that additional research on the chosen topic is required and that appropriate citing and listing of sources is a required element. That should change the statistics in the future.

Indirect assessment results for GR 2010:
Students' response rate to the survey was incredibly low this year. 0% of the students completed the survey in the Fall and only 20% of the students completed it in the spring semester. While this is not a representative sample meeting any "scientific" threshold, I will report the findings nonetheless. Students' perception of how much the German language courses at SLU have helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In the four language production skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), **100%** of students strongly agreed that they significantly improved in listening, speaking , reading and writing skill area. On the questions pertaining to culture, **100%** of the students strongly agreed that they not only now understand and know more about the culture of the German-speaking countries, but also about how their own culture relates to those cultures. The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures.

GR 3010 (Spring 2022)
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: Written portions of the multimedia portfolio
Proficiency level assessed:

A. **Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale** if it is the student's first GR 3xxx level course
B. **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

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

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.

Outcome / Totals 6 / 7	**Intermediate-high**	**Intermediate-mid**	**Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low**	**Intermediate low**	**Novice high**	**Not ratable**
SLO 2 Language	3 (50%)	2 (33.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.8%)*

SLO 2 Composition Mechanics	**Exceeds expectation:** 0 (0%)	**Meets expectation:** 5 (83.2%)	**Does not meet expectation:** 1 (16.8%)

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	**Outcome**	**How many 3xxx levels courses**	**Exceeds expe ctations**	**Meets expectations**	**Does not meet expectation)**	**Not ratable**
3 Students	**SLO 2:** Languag e	First 3xxx	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)*
3 Students	**SLO 2:** Language	Second 3xxx	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

*The writing submitted by the student was not their own original writing and therefore cannot be rated for assessment purposes.

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.

Outcome /Totals 6 / 7	**Intermediate-high**	**Intermediate-mid**	**Intermediate-mid / -low**	**Intermediate low**	**Novice high**	**Not ratable**
SLO 3: Compre-hensibility & Impact	4 (66.4%)	1 (16.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.8%)*
SLO 3 Text Type	**Exceeds expectation:** 5 (83.2%)		**Meets expectation:** 0 (0%)		**Does not meet expectations:** 1 (16.8%)	

Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses	**Outcome**	**How many 3xxx levels courses**	**Exceeds expe ctations**	**Meets expectations**	**Does not meet expectation)**	**Not ratable**
3 Students	**SLO 3:** compreh.& impact	First 3xxx	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)*
3 Students	**SLO 3:** compreh. .& impact	Second 3xxx	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

*The writing submitted by the student was not their own original writing and therefore cannot be rated for assessment purposes.

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	**Intermediate-high**	**Intermediate-mid**	**Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low**	**Intermediate low**	**Novice high**	**Not ratable**
SLO 4	0 (0%)	5 (83.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.8%)	0 (0%)	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	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)	N/A
3 Students	**SLO 4:**	Second 3xxx	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

Comment: We recently changed the curriculum in German Studies (currently being rolled out) 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 other GR 3xxx or 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, and it placed a strong emphasis on developing writing skills and developing it for the writing intensive attribute (*Eloquentia Perfecta 4*) criteria in the new university undergraduate core. The course has since been approved to count for *Eloquentia Perfecta 4* in the new university core. In the three SLOs that were assessed, 85% of the students met or exceeded expectations, with one student submitting a non-ratable writing artifact. Especially the students for whom this was their first 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 is progressing well in developing their German proficiency skills.

No indirect measure survey was administered.

GR 3020 (Fall 2021)

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

4 students enrolled in their first GR 3xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-low
1 student enrolled in their third GR 3xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-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.

Outcome / Totals 5/5	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 1 Language	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SLO 1 Intercultural competence	**Meets expectation:** 5 (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
4 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	First 3xxx	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student	**SLO 1:** Language	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	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.

Outcome /Totals 5/5	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 3 Comprehensibility & Impact	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
SLO 3 Text Type	**Exceeds expectation:** 1 (20%)		**Meets expectation:** 4 (80%)		**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
4 Students	**SLO 3:** compreh. & impact	First 3xxx	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 Students	**SLO 3:** compreh. .& impact	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student	**SLO 3:** compreh. & impact	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	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	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low	Intermediate low	Novice high
SLO 4	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	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
4 Students	**SLO 4:**	First 3xxx	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	N/A
0 Students	**SLO 4:**	Second 3xxx	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student	**SLO 4:**	Third 3xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%	N/A

Comment: We recently changed the curriculum in German Studies (currently being rolled out) 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 first time this course was taught with the new redesigned curriculum and it placed a strong emphasis on developing speaking skills and developing it for meeting *Eloquentia Perfecta 2*: Oral and Visual Communication criteria in the new university undergraduate core. The course has since been approved to count for *Eloquentia Perfecta 2* in the new university core. In the three SLOs that were assessed, all students met or exceeded expectations. Especially the students for whom this was their first 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 is progressing well in developing their German proficiency skills.

No indirect measure survey was administered.

GR 4150 Modern / Contemporary Elective (Fall 21):

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:

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

2 students enrolled in their first GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-mid
2 students enrolled in their second or third GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation checkmarks in both intermediate-mid and intermediate-high columns
3 students 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 7/7	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 1 Language	0 (0%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
SLO 1 Intercultural competence	**Meets expectation:** 7 (100%)		**Does not meet expectation:** 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
2 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	First 4xxx	1 (50%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	Second /third 4xxx	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	N/A
3 students	**SLO 1:** Language	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	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 7/7	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 4	0	3 (42.8%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
2 Students	**SLO 4:**	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)*	N/A
2 Students	**SLO 4:**	Second /third 4xxx	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	N/A
3 students	**SLO 4:**	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)**	N/A

** The student was close to meeting expectations, but not quite there. This primarily had to do with the chosen topic that made this more difficult.*

*** The student's comparisons were too simplistic and generalized to meet expectations.*

Direct Measures: All students met or exceeded expectations in the area of oral presentational communication for SLO 1. For SLO 4, 5 out of 7 students met or exceeded expectations (i.e., 71.5% which falls short of our benchmark expectation of 80% or more of the students meeting or exceeding expectations), but one of the students who did not meet expectations was very close to meeting expectations, which would have gotten us to 85,7% meeting or exceeding

expectations. The other student just didn't put the time and effort into meeting this expectation but has done so in previous courses.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

GR 4010 Language Skills Elective (Spring 22)

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

2 students enrolled in their first GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation at least intermediate-mid
3 students enrolled in their second or third GR 4xxx level course, proficiency expectation checkmarks in both intermediate-mid and intermediate-high columns
2 students 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 6/7	**Advanced low**	**Intermediate-high**	**Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high**	**Intermediate-mid**	**Intermediate low**
SLO 1 Language	1	2	1	2	0
SLO 1 Intercultural competence	**Meets expectation:** 6		**Does not meet expectation:** 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**
2 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	First 4xxx	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
3 Students	**SLO 1:** Language	Second /third 4xxx	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student*	**SLO 1:** Language	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	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 6/7	Advanced low	Intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high	Intermediate-mid	Intermediate low
SLO 4	1	2	1	2	0

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses	Outcome	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expe ctations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
2 Students	**SLO 4:**	First 4xxx	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	N/A
3 Students	**SLO 4:**	Second /third 4xxx	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	N/A
1 student*	**SLO 4:**	Fourth/more 4xxx	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A

** One of the 2 students taking their fourth or more 4xxx level course did not complete the task.*

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 in the area of oral presentational communication for SLO 1 and 5 out of 6 students (i.e., 83.3%) met or exceeded expectations for SLO 4.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

GR 4960 German Senior Capstone (Fall 21):

Speaking - SLO 1: 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-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expecta-tions - Advanced Low	Meets expectations – Intermediate High	Does not meet expectations – Intermediate Mid	Not ratable
3*	**SLO 1:** language Intercultural competence	0 (0%) 1 (33.3%)	3 (100%) 1 (33.3%)	0 (0%) 1 (33.3%)	N/A

** One of the majors who completed their German Senior Capstone during last academic year opted to do the OPI during their final semester at SLU and therefore is included only in the OPI assessment and not the oral presentation or final written version of the capstone project, as they were included in last year's report.*

Direct Measures: The student assessed in this area met expectations in the area of language, but not in intercultural competence. Two out of three students met or exceeded expectations which gives us a combined 66.6% meeting, which falls short of the 80% benchmark. One student did not meet expectations but is normally very aware of the intercultural linguistic markers and uses them correctly and well, but not on this day. If this hadn't been an off day for the student, we would have met expectations.

Speaking – SLO 1, 3, 4 & 5: 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.
SLO 5: Graduates will be able to apply the German language to make connections with other disciplines/fields of study.

Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation of the Senior Capstone project
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations - Advanced Low	Meets expectations – Intermediate High	Does not meet expectations - Intermediate Mid	Not ratable
2	**SLO 1** Presentation Q&A	 0 (0%) 2 (100%)	 2 (100%)* 0 (0%)	 0 (0%) 0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 1:** Intercultural Competence	**Meets expectations** 2 (100%)		**Does not meet expectations** 0 (0%)	
2	**SLO 3:** Comprehension & Impact	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 3**: Text Type	**Exceeds expectations** 1 (50%)	**Meets expectations** 1 (50%)	**Does not meet expectations** 0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 4**	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)**
2	**SLO 5**	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	N/A

** One of the students was very close to the Advanced Low Proficiency level.*
*** 1 was deemed not ratable because of the topic the student chose for this project and never addressed this required element even though it was brought to their attention throughout the semester and they were given specific suggestions for how to address this, but the student chose not to do so.*

Direct Measures: All students (100%) met or exceeded expectations in SLOs 1, 3 & 5. In the area of SLO 4 (cross-cultural perspectives), 1 student (50%) exceeded the expectation; the other student chose a translation theory topic and never addressed this required element even though it was brought to their attention throughout the semester and they were given specific suggestions for how to address this, but the student chose not to do so. Therefore, we decided to rate this as not ratable.

Writing – SLO 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6:
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.

Assessment Tool: Written Senior Capstone project (final, revised version)
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations - Advanced Low	Meets expectations - Intermediate High	Does not meet expectations - Intermediate Mid	Not ratable
2	**SLO 2:**	0 (0%)	2 (100%)*	0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 2:** composition mechanics	**Exceeds expectations:** 0	**Meets expectations:** 1 (50%)	**Does not meet expectations:** 1 (50%)	N/A
2	**SLO 3:** Comprehens. & Impact	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 3:** Text Type	**Exceeds expectations:** 2 (100%)	**Meets expectations:** 0 (0%)	**Does not meet expectations:** 0 (0%)	N/A
2	**SLO 4:**	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)**
2	**SLO 5:**	1 (50%)	0(0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)**
2	**SLO 6:**	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	N/A

** One of the students was very close to the Advanced Low Proficiency level.*
*** 1 was deemed not ratable because of the topic the student chose for this project and never addressed this required element even though it was brought to their attention throughout the semester and they were given specific suggestions for how to address this, but the student chose not to do so.*

Direct Measures: All students (100%) met or exceeded expectations in SLO 2 & 3, with one student falling a bit short on the expected minimum length of the composition mechanics. For SLOs 4 & 5 1 student (50%) met or exceeded the expectations; the other student's work was deemed not ratable for these two SLOs, because they did not do the required work here, in part because of the chosen topic but it could have been included and the student was given suggestions on how to include this into the project but chose not to do so. For SLO 6 (use and integration of German academic sources), 1 student exceeded expectations, the other student did not meet expectations because most sources were in English and not in German. In terms of finding adequate sources and integrating the information from the sources into the paper, the student met expectations, but not in the area of using German language sources.

Indirect assessment results for GR 4960:
The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures. Students' response rate to the survey was 100%. Students' perception of how much the German language courses at SLU have helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In all four language production skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), **100%** of students (agree or) strongly agreed that they significantly improved in the skill area, **100%** of the students strongly agreed that they not only now understand and know more about the culture of the German-speaking countries, but also about how their own culture relates to those cultures. 100% of the students reported that they could connect their German Studies to other disciplines, and specifically mentioned Anthropology, History, Theology, Psychology -- in many ways knowing a different culture has helped along with looking at things from a different perspective

5. 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.

- Rolling out the new 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.
- 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 that addressed issues we encountered in previous years was necessary and are much improved. We 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. We also noticed inconsistencies in the descriptors in our assessment rubrics that are the result of the earlier assessment plan that focused only on GR 2010 and GR 4960. We fixed those.
- That we need to correct the cultural exploration paper assignment in GR 2010 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.

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?

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. The German program coordinator collected the assessment data and drafted the annual assessment report, sharing the document with the entire faculty, Dr. Wisbey entered her assessment findings for GR 4010 (Spring 2022) into the document, the other 3xxx and 4xxx level courses were taught by Dr. Meyer this academic year, who compiled and recorded the data and statistics for all other courses presented in this report. The report was then shared with the German faculty, and we discussed the assessment findings and this 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

- 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.

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 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, 3010, 4150 & 4010, 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 this past year, we have no plans to make changes in the assessment plan at this time. The changes we made are a significant improvement.
- In the future, we will need to make changes again, because of the Academic Portfolio Review decision to close the German Major as a free-standing degree and the Provost's decision that Italian, German and Russian create a combined new major with concentrations in the respective languages. Once the new major is defined, we will make the necessary adjustments in our assessment plan.
- Integrating German courses into the new university undergraduate core (at this time we have courses approved for *Eloquentia Perfecta* 2, for the writing intensive attribute, for Ways of Thinking: Aesthetic, History and Culture, and for Identities in Context) is resulting in some curricular changes in these courses and ***could*** result in additional changes to our assessment plan.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

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?

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.

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. But we are definitely getting better and more reliable data because of these changes.

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 first 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. This was the first time in years that we didn't struggle with how to assess that skill as it was separated out into three distinct areas. Breaking this skill set up into distinct areas is giving 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 last year, 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	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills ☐ Able to narrate in all time frames (Past, present and future) ☐ Talks in details ☐ Frequently uses complex sentences and not just simple sentences ☐ Speaks in paragraph-length discourse	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills ☐ Present tense well ☐ Past tense inconsistent ☐ Talks in generalities, not details ☐ Often a series of simple sentences	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills ☐ Simple face-to-face conversations ☐ Asks simple questions ☐ Responds to simple questions ☐ Simple descriptions	☐ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills ☐ Simple conversation, reactive ☐ Occasionally initiates ☐ Describes in a simple way	☐ Creates with language
Context Content Areas	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills ☐ Performs well in formal settings ☐ 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	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills ☐ Performs in limited formal settings ☐ Topics: personal activities and immediate surroundings, some ability about areas of general interest	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills ☐ Operates in informal settings ☐ Topics: self, family members, leisure activities and immediate surroundings	☐ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills ☐ Functions in informal situations minimally	☐ Interacts spontaneously
Accuracy	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills ☐ Understood by NS unaccustomed to dealing with NNS ☐ Sentence level discourse with connectors	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills ☐ Usually understood by NS unaccustomed to dealing with NNS ☐ Sentence level discourse with some connectors	☐ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills ☐ Understood by NS accustomed to dealing with NNS ☐ Sentence level discourse	☐ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills ☐ Repetition, understood by sympathetic listeners ☐ Word level discourse with some attempt at sentences	☐ Comprehensible to NS accustomed to dealing with NNS ☐ Word or list level discourse

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Linguistic Intercultural Competence	☐ Consistently uses Sie vs. du appropriately. ☐ Consistently responds appropriately to formal vs. informal situations. AND ☐ Consistently responds appropriately to polite expressions. ☐ Consistently initiates polite expressions appropriately him/herself.	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & consistently uses these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & consistently responds appropriately. AND/OR ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and consistently responds appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and consistently initiates them appropriately him/herself.	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & often uses these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & often responds appropriately. AND/OR ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and often responds appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and often initiates them appropriately.	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & occasionally uses these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & sometimes responds appropriately. AND/OR ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and sometimes responds appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and sometimes initiates them appropriately	☐ 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
Language Function Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner	☐ Handles successfully some complicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail. ☐ Narrates and describes consistently in all major time frames.	☐ Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks. ☐ Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.	☐ Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail. ☐ Narrates and describes in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.	☐ Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements ☐ Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. ☐ Speaks in present tense though there may be errors.	☐ Has no real functional ability.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	☐ 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. ☐ Generally able to speak accurately and fluently, but some linguistic difficulty may occur as more complex tasks are attempted.	☐ Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct ☐ Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex.	☐ Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. ☐ Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more complex.	☐ Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time. ☐ Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. ☐ Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex.	☐ Is most accurate with memorized language, including phrases. ☐ 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)	☐ Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.	☐ Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.	☐ Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	❑ Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.	☐ Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases.
Linguistic Intercultural Competence: Meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	These are the Expectations for Meets: • Emphasis on facts rather than entertainment value • Presentation style is not too casual or informal ❑ Student presentation did meet these expectations ❑ Student presentation did not meet these expectations				

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

Composition Mechanics Exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	*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.* Exceeds expectation: ☐ Project is significantly longer than stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography) Meets expectation: ☐ Project is at least the stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography) Does not meet expectation: ☐ Project is less than the stated minimum length of text specified in assignment (excluding bibliography)

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?	☐ Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur	☐ 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.	☐ Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.	☐ Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.	☐ 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	☐ Presents in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions ☐ Argument in presentation illustrates originality and rich details.	☐ Presents in a clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions. ☐ Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and demonstrates some originality.	☐ Presents in a clear and organized manner. ☐ Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and may demonstrate some originality.	☐ Presents mostly or not in a clear and organized manner. ☐ Presentation may feature some detail & appropriate visuals.	☐ Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized, ☐ 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)	These are the expectations for Meets: • Lists sources • Presentation follows standard academic conventions This is a feature that exceeds expectations: • Documents use of sources throughout the presentation ❑ Student presentation meets and exceeds these expectations ❑ Student presentation did meet these expectations ❑ Student presentation did not meet these expectations				

Linguistic Intercultural Competence meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	These are the Expectations for Meets: • Emphasis on facts rather than entertainment value • Presentation style is not too casual or informal ❑ Student presentation did meet these expectations ❑ 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?	☐ Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur	☐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.	☐ Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.	☐ Is generally understood by those accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.	☐ 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	☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions ☐ Argument in paper illustrates originality and rich details.	☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are some recognizable logical transitions. ☐ Argument in paper illustrates good detail and demonstrate some originality.	☐Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion ☐Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.	☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner, e.g. may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof ☐ Paper features some detail in arguments.	☐ Paper may be either unclear or unorganized, e.g. is poorly organized overall, or introduction and conclusion may be missing. ☐ Paper features little or no detail.
Text Type Exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)	These are the Expectations for Meets: • Lists sources • Paper follows standard academic writing conventions This is a feature that exceeds expectations: • Documents use of sources throughout the paper ❑ Student paper meets and exceeds these expectations ❑ Student paper did meet these expectations ❑ Student paper did not meet these expectations				

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S PAPER:

RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021

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
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.)	☐ Analyzes distinctions between own and target culture, and draws appropriate conclusions. ☐ Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ 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	☐ Makes distinctions between own and target culture and goes beyond mere descriptions of differences ☐ Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ Response includes personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are supported with appropriate examples ☐ Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing more detailed awareness of cultural practices and institutions	☐ Describes differences between own and target culture ☐ Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons that describe the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ Response includes personal viewpoints ☐ Response includes an appropriate amount of examples	☐ Begins to describe differences between own and target culture ☐ Uses some detail ☐ Expresses a personal viewpoint	☐ Names cultural differences between own and target culture. ☐ May express a personal opinion.

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT:

Assessment Tool: Various

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

	Advanced Low	Intermediate High	Intermediate Mid	Intermediate Low	Novice High
Depth of Reflection	☐ Paper demonstrates more in-depth reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper includes more nuanced personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are consistently supported with appropriate examples ☐ Strong use and integration of material from academic sources in any language	☐ Paper demonstrates an adequate reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper includes adequate personal viewpoints and interpretations Viewpoints and interpretations are usually supported with appropriate examples, some from academic sources in any language and/or personal experiences	☐ Paper demonstrates only some reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper only includes some personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are only supported with some examples ☐ There is only limited engagement with research and academic sources in any language.	N/A (see Curricular Map, this SLO is not introduced until GR 4xxx level courses)	
Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives	☐ Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts from language learning with another field of study or perspective.	☐ Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts from language learning to another field of study or perspective	☐ Acknowledges and/or identifies that there are connections between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but does not necessarily develop meaningful examples or connections.	N/A (see Curricular Map, this SLO is not introduced until GR 4xxx level courses)	

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	☐ Strong use and constructive synthesization from and integration of material from German academic sources	☐ Good use and synthesization from and/or integration of material from German academic sources, but not always constructively.	☐ 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) er	

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT: