

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: German	Department: Languages, Literatures & Cultures
Degree or Certificate Level: B.A. German Studies	College/School: Arts & Sciences
Date (Month/Year): June 2020	Primary Assessment Contact: Evelyn Meyer, PhD; evelyn.meyer@slu.edu
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2019-2020	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? Updated AY 2019-2020	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

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

I. GR 2010 (first course that counts towards a German major or minor)

Students are assessed at **the intermediate-low proficiency level, not at the intermediate-high level (that is the proficiency goal upon completion of the German major; LOGs are cited as written for completion of the German major.)**

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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.

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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.

LOG 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.

LOG 4: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

II. GR 4010 – Language Skills Course (Fall 2019)

Students are assessed at **the intermediate-mid proficiency level, not at the intermediate-high level (that is the proficiency goal upon completion of the German major; LOGs are cited as written for completion of the German major.)**

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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.

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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.

LOG 4: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

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

III. GR 4930 – Modern/Contemporary Course (Spring 2020):

Students are assessed at **the intermediate-mid proficiency level, not at the intermediate-high level (that is the proficiency goal upon completion of the German major; LOGs are cited as written for completion of the German major.)**

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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.

LOG 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.

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

IV. GR 4960 – German Senior Capstone (completion of German major)

All 6 LOGs; we had no students this year who completed her/his course work for the German major, so no assessment was done.

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

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

I. GR 2010 (face-to-face instruction, in STL only, Fall 2019; face-to-face/online instruction (online because of COVID-19), in STL only, Spring 2020)

- 1 Oral Proficiency Interview (LOG 1)
- 1 Cultural Exploration Composition (LOG 2, 3, & 4)

II. GR 4010 (face-to-face instruction in STL only, Fall 2019)

- 1 Oral Presentation of final research project (LOG 1)
- Student chose two writing assignments from semester that s/he felt represented their strongest writing and resubmitted as is for assessment (LOG 2)
- 1 Final research paper (LOG 4 & 5)

III. GR 4930 (face-to-face/online instruction (online because of COVID-19), in STL only, Spring 2020)

- 1 Final research paper

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

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

I. GR 2010

Two faculty members from the program do assessment of each student for the Oral Proficiency Interview. The course instructor is present at the OPI, but another member of the German faculty interviews the student. Both the course instructor and the interviewing faculty assess and fill out the rubrics for each student, 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. All German faculty members (T, NTT and Adjunct faculty) individually assess and fill out the assessment rubric for all students on the Cultural composition. We then meet at the end of each semester and discuss 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. Because of the sudden switch to online teaching during the pandemic in Spring 2020, we omitted the Oral Proficiency Interview, as it proved logistically too difficult to manage under the circumstances. But we assessed the Cultural Exploration Composition during Spring 2020.

II. GR 4010

Dr. Evelyn Meyer taught GR 4010 during Fall 2019 and since it was a small class, she decided to assess 4 of the 6 LOGs using assignments students were completing anyway for the course to see if our newly developed assessment rubrics were working or needed some more revisions. The course instructor did all of the assessment of all students in the course, as this is an interim assessment check. In future iterations of this course not all 4 LOGs assessed here will be assessed in a single semester. This was simply done to make sure if the new rubrics worked or not, which they did for the most part. The assessment done in this course and the initial roll out of the new assessment plan were discussed with the German faculty. We noticed that in the rubrics set up for the 4xxx level courses, we accidentally skipped over one proficiency level, we omitted intermediate-high and skipped ahead to advanced low. We also had also not included a “does not meet expectations” list of criteria in the rubric. Both issues have been corrected, and the data reported below follows the correct proficiency level based assessment rubric for the Fall 2019 data.

III. GR 4930

If you take a look at our Curriculum Map with Learning Outcome Goals and Assessment Artifacts, courses in the Modern/Contemporary category at the 4000-level are listed as assessing LOG 4 – speaking with the oral cultural presentation being used as the assessment artifact. This was the plan for Spring 2020, but when the pandemic forced us to switch to online/remote teaching, the symposium at which the students were scheduled to give these oral presentations was cancelled. Under these circumstances, we decided to do the assessment on their written final paper in the course instead, and expanded the assessment to include LOG 2, 3 and 5 instead.

All the faculty read the papers on their own and assessed the students using the rubric and then we met as a group and discussed our assessment and agreed on one consistent assessment rating for each student in the individual categories.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? 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)?

I. GR 2010

Speaking – LOG 1:

Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview

Skills assessed: interpersonal communication & intercultural competence, speaking

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

Fall 2019

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)
7 Students	LOG 1: interpersonal Communication	2 (28.7%)	4 (57%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
7 Students	LOG 1: Intercultural competence	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0%)

Spring 2020

Because of the COVID-19 Pandemic and the mid-semester switch to remote/online teaching, we decided not to include the Oral Proficiency Interview as part of the assessment done that semester, primarily for logistical & technological reasons.

AY 2019-2020 Totals

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)
7 Students	LOG 1: Interpersonal Communication	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
7 Students	LOG 1: Intercultural competence	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)

Writing – LOG 2, 3 & 4

Assessment Tool: Cultural Exploration Composition

Outcomes assessed: Presentational communication, impact & intercultural competence, writing

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

Fall 2019

Total students assessed *	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)
6 Students	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)
6 Students	LOG 3: Impact	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
6 Students	LOG 4: Intercultural Competence	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)

* There were 7 students enrolled in the course. 1 student did not submit this assignment.

Spring 2020

Total students assessed *	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)
7 Students	LOG 2:	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)

	Presentational Communication			
7 Students	LOG 3: Impact	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
7 Students	LOG 4: Intercultural Competence	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	2 (29%)

AY 2019-2020 Totals

Total students assessed *	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)
13 Students	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	8 (61%)	5 (39%)	0 (0%)
13 Students	LOG 3: Impact	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	0 (0%)
13 Students	LOG 4: Intercultural Competence	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	3 (23%)

II. GR 4010

Speaking – LOG 1:

Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation of Final Research Project

Skills assessed: Presentational communication

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

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Advanced low)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate High)	Meets expectations (Intermediate mid)	Does not meet expectations (intermediate low)
5 Students	LOG 1: Presentational Communication	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Writing – LOG 2:

Assessment Tool: Student chose 2 writing assignments completed during the semester and resubmitted them as is for assessment

Skills assessed: Presentational communication

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

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Advanced low)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate High)	Meets expectations (Intermediate mid)	Does not meet expectations (intermediate low)
5 Students	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)

Writing – LOG 4 & 5:

Assessment Tool: Final Research Paper

Skills assessed: Intercultural competence (LOG 4), Interpretive communication (LOG 4), and Connections (LOG 5)

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

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Advanced low)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate High)	Meets expectations (Intermediate mid)	Does not meet expectations (intermediate low)	Not ratable *
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	---	---------------

5 Students	LOG 4: Intercultural competence	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%) *
5 Students	LOG 4: Interpretive Communication	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%) *
5 Students	LOG 5: Connections	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

* One student did not do a cultural comparison analysis, and instead did a fantastic linguistic comparison analysis, but because of that topic choice, the paper cannot be rated in two areas.

III. GR 4930

Writing – LOG 2, 3 & 5:

Assessment Tool: Final Research Paper

Skills assessed: Presentational communication, Language proficiency (LOG 2), Presentational communication, research and argument (LOG 3), and Connections (LOG 5)

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

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Advanced low)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate High)	Meets expectations (Intermediate mid)	Does not meet expectations (intermediate low)	Not ratable *
9 Students	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	2 (22.22%)	6 (66.66%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
9 Students	LOG 3: Presentational Communication	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.1%)	4 (44.44%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%) *
9 Students	LOG 5: Connections	3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

* One student did not do a cultural comparison analysis, nor proper research on the assigned topic; the paper cannot be rated in this area.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

I. GR 2010

Direct assessment results:

- In the AY 2019-2020, we had thirteen students complete GR 2010. All students in Fall 2019 (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 1 (speaking) in all skill areas they were assessed in. All students in both semesters (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 2 & 3 in all skill areas they were assessed in. 77 % of the students met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 4, which means we narrowly missed our benchmark of 80%. Since 2/3 of those students not meeting that expectation fell into the Spring semester, this may have been the result of the mid semester switch to online/remote teaching & the limited access to research materials with the closure of libraries to do meaningful research on intercultural competencies.

Indirect assessment results:

The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures.

- Students' response rate to the survey was approximately 75% in the Fall and approximately 60% in the Spring. Students' perception of how much the German language courses at SLU have helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In all language production skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), **100%** of students agreed or strongly agreed that they significantly improved in each skill area. On the questions pertaining to culture, **100%** of the students agreed or 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. In addition, 60% of students listed other disciplines (outside of their German major) to which content covered in their German courses related.

II. GR 4010

Direct assessment results:

- All students in the course (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 1 (speaking) in presentational communication. **80%** of students met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 2 in presentational communication. 60% of the students met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 4, but 1 student (20%) did not do a cultural analysis, and instead did a fine linguistic analysis. Had the student chose another topic, we would have met our benchmark here as well. All students in the course (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for LOG 5 in area of making connections.
- For all of the students this was their first 4xxx-level German course, so these results are impressive, even if not all students are meeting expectations in all of the assessed areas yet. All of our LOGs are listed as being developed, reinforced and practiced on our curriculum map in the 4xxx level language skills courses.

Indirect assessment results:

The instructor did not administer an indirect assessment survey to the students.

III. GR 4930

Direct assessment results:

- All students in the course (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for all LOGs that were assessed.
- For some of the students this was their first 4xxx-level German course, but for some it was their second one, and we can see their improved skills with the higher percentage of students exceeding expectations in comparison to the results during Fall 2019. All of our LOGs are listed as being, developed, reinforced and practiced on our curriculum map in the 4xxx level language skills courses.

Indirect assessment results:

The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures.

- Students' response rate to the survey was low, as only a third of them responded to the exit survey. This needs to be viewed in context, namely that of the online fatigue that both students and faculty experienced at the end of this highly unusual semester in the middle of a pandemic. Students' perception of how much this course has helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In three of four language production skills (listening, speaking, and writing), **100%** of students agreed or strongly agreed that they significantly improved in each skill area. In the area of reading it was 66.6% of the students who agreed that their reading skills improved. This may in part be the result of the specifics of this course, which was a Film Studies course where students watched and analyzed films, which took a lot of the space normally dedicated to reading in the traditional sense. Reading a film is a subset of reading skills, but one that not all students picked up on. On the questions pertaining to culture, **100%** of the students agreed or 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 and they all listed other disciplines (outside of their German major) to which content covered in this German course related.

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?

At the end of Fall 2019, the entire German faculty met and discussed our individual assessment findings and worked out an overall assessment for each student on each artifact used for assessment. We discussed there as well which courses would be included in assessment for Spring 2020 as we roll out our new assessment plan, so that this information could be included on syllabi. Based on our discussion, Dr. Evelyn Meyer (Program coordinator) fine-tuned/finished the assessment rubrics for the spring and early in the semester shared them with the program faculty. At the end of Spring 2020, Drs. Meyer and Wisbey met and discussed our individual assessment findings and worked out overall assessments for each student on each artifact used for assessment. Dr. Meyer collected all the data from the entire year and generated this report which is shared with the program faculty. Closer to the start of the Fall semester, we will have a program meeting to discuss this report and the findings, and our assessment plans for Fall 2020 and which assessment artifacts we will use, as we are working through some curricular changes in most of our language courses over the summer.

B. How specifically have you decided to use 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 | • Course sequence |
| | • Teaching techniques | • New courses |
| | • Improvements in technology | • Deletion of courses |
| | • Prerequisites | • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings |

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- 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 the findings.

During AY 2018-19, the German faculty began revising our assessment plan and rubrics by developing the plan at the entry point into the German major (GR 2010) and the exit point (GR 4960). We used the new rubrics and tweaked them over the course of the year to make them work better. We also discussed at length in a way we hadn't before, what it is we can reasonably expect our students to do in German at the various levels. The revision of the rubrics was given priority, so that we could use them for the AY 2018-19 assessment cycle, a) not to end up with two different sets of rubrics that would make the report difficult, and b) because this is the first year in a new 4-year assessment cycle. Dr. Meyer developed the Learning Outcome Goals and the assessment plan, which were discussed and revised in Spring 2019 with Dr. Evelyn Wisbey, who significantly enhanced them all. During Fall 2019, the German faculty met several times with Kathleen Thatcher, then SLU's assessment coordinator, to seek input on the progress we made in developing our assessment plan. Ms. Thatcher told us that we were off to a great start, but that in program level assessment it is not enough to only assess students at the entry and exit points and that we needed to do pre-checks at different points throughout the curriculum and that we needed to develop a curriculum map in which we indicate where each LOG is introduced, developed, reinforced and expected to be mastered and then select appropriate assessment tools. Dr. Meyer drafted the curriculum map, suggested assessment tools and revised the rubrics and shared them with the German faculty. Dr. Evelyn Wisbey gave meaningful feedback on all of this. Creating the curriculum map during Fall 2019 and identifying where LOGs are introduced, developed, reinforced and mastery is achievable helped us make changes in the kinds of assessment artifacts we are using. In one instance, we noticed that we had included something in the GR 2010 assessment that simply was not possible to expect students to accomplish at that level and it was the one assessment area where in the past we did not quite meet our benchmark. We have now taken that out at the 2010 level and are introducing it in 3xxx level courses and doing some preliminary assessment checks with that, but really are not assessing it until the 4xxx level. The curriculum map was also helpful in deciding on meaningful assessment tools that fit the curriculum for individual courses and to use a variety of assignments to make sure that all LOGs are developed progressively and continually and are assessed through multiple tools. We began rolling out the new German program level assessment plan by doing assessment in GR 2010, 4010 (Language skills course) in the Fall and in GR 2010 and 4930 (Modern/contemporary course) in the Spring. Assessment in 3xxx-level courses will be rolled out during AY 2020-21. The content of these courses will be significantly revised, and GR 3210 is a new course. That is why we did not do assessment in these courses this year. Because of our ongoing conversations in the past two years, we have revised prerequisites for our courses at the 3xxx and 4xxx levels. We are in the process of redesigning the content of the GR 3010 and 3020 courses, we are adjusting the content covered in GR 1010, 1020, 2010 to allow students more time to develop the skills and especially to give the development of intercultural competence skills, the investigation of the target culture from a variety of cultural perspectives, and making meaningful connections more time. And we are introducing a new one-semester German Cultural History course (GR 3210) and are deleting the two courses in the two-semester sequence (GR 3200 & 3250), so that students in the German minor have one elective at the 4xxx-level. The mid semester switch to online/remote teaching caused by the pandemic in Spring 2020 also triggered a lot of conversations about pedagogy both in the online and face-to-face delivery of course content and down the road, specifically in the area of course-level assessment tools, for example replacing some of the traditional in class language exams with project-based learning which can be more meaningful for students, and lend themselves well in both online and face-to-face teaching environments. This can impact the artifacts collected for assessment, as well as course content.

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 intercultural learning more time and space to teach these skills more meaningfully and more in depth.
2. We have developed a full program level assessment plan in the last two years and are implementing it now. It has a much more diverse sets of artifacts built in.

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

1. It is assessed in the same manner as before.
2. We just completed year one of the roll-out of this new plan, which means that we added two courses in which assessment took place, and on a much more diverse set of artifacts, which will give us more reliable data on student learning and progress towards the LOGs at different stages.

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 the intercultural competence skill set throughout the entire curriculum.
2. In this initial phase of rolling out the assessment plan focused on adding assessment at two 4xxx –level courses, something that became quite obvious is the difference in proficiency for those students for whom either of the two courses was their first 4xxx level course in German (assessment findings for this group: some met the expectations, others are not quite there yet, which is to be expected) and for those for whom it was the second or third 4xxx level course those students consistently met or exceeded the expectations. Up to a year ago, students had to complete at least 3 of the 4 3xxx level courses before they were eligible to take a 4xxx-level German course. With the curriculum and prerequisite revisions made to German upper level courses, they can now enroll in any 4xxx level course upon completion of any one of the 3xxx level German courses. We either need to lower the proficiency expectation for those students for whom it is the first 4xxx level course, or lower the benchmark from the current 80% to maybe 60% to accommodate the fact that students taking these courses are each at very different levels based on when they take each 4xxx level course as they make progress towards their degree. This will warrant some further discussion among the German faculty to determine how to move forward on this issue.

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

As stated in C.2.: This will warrant some further discussion among the German faculty to determine how to move forward on this issue, be that noting for each students if it is their first, second, third, etc. 4xxx level course in the program, to better know where they are at and how they are doing with the expectations, be that creating a low or high meeting expectations category in our assessment rubrics, and/or lowering the overall benchmark for students meeting/exceeding expectations in this interim – developing LOG phase.

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

GR 2010: Interpersonal Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low
Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in 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.

NAME _____

DATE _____

A. Interpersonal Communication

	Intermediate High Exceeds expectation	Intermediate Mid Exceeds expectation	Intermediate Low Meets expectations	Novice High Does not meet expectations
Communicative Task	<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 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 mid skills <input type="checkbox"/> Usually understood by NS unaccustomed 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

COMMENTS:

B. Intercultural Competence-Speaking:

- The student will be able to show intercultural competence **primarily** by using **the linguistic markers for formality, politeness and questions** correctly, such as *Sie vs. du*, forms of linguistic politeness specific to German, and can formulate questions correctly (both in formal and informal settings)
- The student will be able to show intercultural competence by using the language to some extent to explain and reflect on the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the cultures studied. (ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012-Speaking)

	Intermediate High Exceeds expectation	Intermediate Mid Exceeds expectation	Intermediate Low Meets expectations	Novice High Does not meet expectations
Communicative Task & Accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between <i>Sie vs. du</i> & consistently uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between <i>Sie vs. du</i> & 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 <i>Sie vs. du</i> & often uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between <i>Sie vs. du</i> & 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 <i>Sie vs. du</i> & occasionally uses these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between <i>Sie vs. du</i> & 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. <i>Sie vs. du</i> , expressions of politeness, greetings)

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S OPI:

GR 2010: Assessment Artifact: Cultural Exploration Composition

Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **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. **LOG 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. **LOG 4:** Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

NAME:

DATE:

ASSESSOR:

A. Presentational Communication: LOG 2 & 3

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate Mid proficiency	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low proficiency	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High proficiency
Composition Mechanics Requirements: In German & at least 450 words	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is significantly more than 500 words.	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is at least 450 words long.	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is less than 450 words.
Language Function LOG 2 Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense with none to few errors.	<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.
Text Type LOG 2 follows standard academic writing conventions; quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions to a good degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases . <input type="checkbox"/> Paper does not follow standard academic writing conventions
Language Control LOG 2 Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	<input type="checkbox"/> There are few or minimal spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page in those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can control .	<input type="checkbox"/> There are more than just a minimal number of spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page in those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can control .	<input type="checkbox"/> There are numerous spelling, grammar, or syntax errors throughout the essay in those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can be expected to control.
Comprehensibility LOG 3 Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<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 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 LOG 3 Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<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 originality and rich details.	<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.
--	---	---	--

B. Intercultural Competence – Cultural Composition LOG 4

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Cultural Knowledge & self-awareness LOG 4 (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.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes distinctions between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a strong understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing more detailed awareness of cultural practices and institutions <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"/> Describes differences between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing awareness of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Response includes some personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported with some examples	<input type="checkbox"/> Describes few or no differences between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates little or inadequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by minimally or not showing awareness of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Does not draw constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Response is missing personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> If viewpoints and interpretations are included, they are unsupported.

* Source: Adapted from the AACU Intercultural Knowledge & Competence Value Rubric

COMMENTS:

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in 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 Presentation in Language Skills Courses (GR 4010, GR 4250, GR 4750)

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate Mid (one proficiency level below that expected at completion of German major)

NAME _____

DATE _____

A. Presentational Communication—Oral Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
<p>Language Function Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully some complicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in all major time frames.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning only in a basic way.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes comfortably only in present tense and limited use of other time frames.</p>
<p>Text Type Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Only uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences</p>
<p>Impact Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Presentation illustrates originality and rich details.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and demonstrates some originality.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features good detail & good visuals, and may demonstrate some originality.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Presents mostly or not in a clear and organized manner.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Presentation may feature some detail & appropriate visuals.</p>

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
<p>Comprehensibility Who can understand this person's language? Only sympathetic interlocutors used to the language of non-natives? Can a native speaker unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives understand this speaker?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur.</p>	<p><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.</p>	<p><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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Is generally understood by those accustomed to interacting with non-natives, although additional effort may be required.</p>
<p>Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<p><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.</p>	<p><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"/> Demonstrates significant quality of Intermediate-level language. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quality of Intermediate-mid level language. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more complex.</p>	<p><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.</p>

Comments:

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in 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.

Assessment Tool: Student self-selects one or two writing assignments from semester and resubmits them at end of semester

Assessment Done in Language Skills Courses (GR 4010, GR 4250, GR 4750) and Medieval Courses (GR 4500, GR 4550, GR 4600, GR 4650)

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate Mid (one proficiency level below that expected at completion of German major) Last Updated: DECEMBER 2019

NAME _____

DATE _____

Presentational Communication—Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
Language Function Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail. <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 with recognizable attempts at some complicated writing tasks. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.	<input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements <input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning only in a basic way. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes comfortably only in present tense and limited use of other time frames.
Text Type quantity and organization of language 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"/> Only uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	<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 high-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"/> Writing, vocabulary and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited quantity and lower quality of intermediate high-level language. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy of writing decreases as language becomes more complex.

LOG 4: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

Assessment Tool: Final Research Paper (or another paper that has cultural comparison required in topic) from semester from one of the Language Skills Courses (GR 4010, GR 4250, GR 4750)

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate Mid (one proficiency level below that expected at completion of German major)

NAME _____

DATE _____

Intercultural Competence – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
<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>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Analyzes distinctions between own and target culture, and draws appropriate conclusions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a strong understanding of the complexity of the target culture by providing rich detail and by showing deep awareness of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Makes distinctions between own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing more detailed awareness of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Describes differences between own and target culture and includes some distinctions between own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Draws constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture by showing awareness of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Only describes differences between own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> May begin to draw constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does not always demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of the target culture, or awareness of cultural practices and institutions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

Comments:

Interpretive Communication – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
Depth of Reflection	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper demonstrates more in-depth reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper includes more nuanced personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are consistently supported with appropriate examples <input type="checkbox"/> Strong use and integration of material from academic sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper demonstrates an adequate reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper includes adequate personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are usually supported with appropriate examples, some from academic sources and/or personal experiences	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper demonstrates only some reflection on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper includes some adequate personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported with appropriate examples, primarily from personal experiences, and only rarely from academic sources. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper demonstrates little reflection on and minimal analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper only includes some personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are only supported with some examples <input type="checkbox"/> There is only limited engagement with research and academic sources. <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

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

Assessment Tool: Final Research Paper (or another paper that has cultural comparison required in topic) from semester from one of the Language Skills Courses (GR 4010, GR 4250, GR 4750)

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate Mid (one proficiency level below that expected at completion of German major)

Connections – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts from language learning with another field of study or perspective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts from language learning to another field of study or perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledges and/or identifies that there are connections between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but does not develop examples or connections

RUBRIC REVISED December 2019

Assessment Tool: Final Research Paper in GR 4930-02 “German Cinema in German” (Spring 2020)

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate Mid (one proficiency level below that expected at completion of German major)

NAME _____

DATE _____

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in 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.

Presentational Communication—Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
<p>Language Function Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in all major time frames, but not always consistently.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail with recognizable attempts at some complicated writing tasks.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning only in a basic way.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes comfortably only in present tense and limited use of other time frames.</p>
<p>Text Type quantity and organization of language discourse</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Only uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.</p>
<p>Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<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.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as writing becomes more complex.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as writing becomes more complex.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing, vocabulary and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited quantity and lower quality of intermediate high-level language.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy of writing decreases as language becomes more complex.</p>

LOG 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.

Presentational Communication—Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
Text Type follows standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions, including in the bibliography.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper follows standard academic writing conventions to a good degree.
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 mostly or not 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.
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.

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

Connections – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts from language learning with another field of study or perspective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts from language learning to another field of study or perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledges and/or identifies that there are connections between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but does not develop examples or connections

Comments: