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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Artifacts of Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GR 2010 (Fall 2021 & Spring 2022): | | • Oral Proficiency Interview: SLO 1  
• Cultural Exploration Paper: SLO 2, 3 & 4 |
| GR 3010 (Spring 2022): | | • Written portions of the multimedia portfolio: SLO 2, 3 & 4 |
| GR 3020 (Fall 2021): | | • Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1, 3 & 4 |
| GR 4010 (Spring 2022): | | • Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1 & 4 |
| GR 4150 (Fall 2021): | | • Cultural oral presentation: SLO 1 & 4 |
| 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 tool(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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR 2010 (first course that counts in the German Studies Major):</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 both faculty members, 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR 3010/3020/4010/4150 (required or elective courses in the German Studies Major):</td>
<td></td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total students enrolled / assessed</th>
<th>Outcome assessed</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)</th>
<th>Meets expectations (Intermediate low)</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations (Novice high)</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 / 8*</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 / 8*</td>
<td>SLO 1: Intercultural competence</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total students enrolled / assessed</th>
<th>Outcome assessed</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)</th>
<th>Meets expectations (Intermediate low)</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations (Novice high)</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 / 10*</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>6 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 / 10*</td>
<td>SLO 1: Intercultural competence</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (55.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total students assessed</th>
<th>Outcome &amp; skill assessed</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)</th>
<th>Meets expectations (Intermediate mid)</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations (Novice high)</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 / 5*</td>
<td>SLO 2: language</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 2: composition mechanics</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 / 5*</td>
<td>SLO 3: comprehensibility &amp; Impact</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 3: Text Type</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (100%***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 / 5*</td>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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**

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

*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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total students enrolled / assessed</th>
<th>Outcome &amp; skill assessed</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)</th>
<th>Meets expectations (Intermediate low)</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations (Novice high)</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: language</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (42.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: composition mechanics</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: comprehensibility &amp; Impact</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>9 (64.2%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Text Type</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>5 (35.6%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (7.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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
Proiciency 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, 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.

Outcome / Totals 6 / 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 Language</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (33.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.8%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not ratable is a special grade given to students who have not completed the course requirements.

**April 2021 6**
### SLO 2: Composition Mechanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 2: Language</td>
<td>First 3xxx</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 2: Language</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome /Totals 6 / 7</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid /low</th>
<th>Intermediate-low</th>
<th>Novice high</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Comprehensibility &amp; Impact</td>
<td>4 (66.4%)</td>
<td>1 (16.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.8%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 3 Text Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 3: compreh &amp; impact</td>
<td>First 3xxx</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 3: compreh &amp; impact</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (83.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assessed</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx level courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>First 3xxx</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1 Language</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low</th>
<th>Intermediate low</th>
<th>Novice high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 1 Intercultural competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>First 3xxx</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Students</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>Third 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / Totals 5/5</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low</th>
<th>Intermediate low</th>
<th>Novice high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3 Comprehensibility &amp; Impact</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 3 Text Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>SLO 3: compreh. &amp; impact</td>
<td>First 3xxx</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Students</td>
<td>SLO 3: compreh. &amp; impact</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>SLO 3: compreh. &amp; impact</td>
<td>Third 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / Totals 5/5</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-low</th>
<th>Intermediate low</th>
<th>Novice high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome assessed by how many 3xxx level courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>SLO 4:</th>
<th>First 3xxx</th>
<th>1 (25%)</th>
<th>3 (75%)</th>
<th>0 (0%)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>Second 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>Third 3xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / Totals 7/7</th>
<th>Advanced low</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 Language</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 Intercultural competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets expectation: 7 (100%)</td>
<td>Does not meet expectation: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Students SLO 1: Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>First 4xxx</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Students SLO 1: Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second /third 4xxx</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 students SLO 1: Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth/more 4xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / Totals 7/7</th>
<th>Advanced low</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate-low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (42.8%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses

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

* 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 1 Intercultural competence**

- **Meets expectation:** 6
- **Does not meet expectation:** 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome assessed by how many 4xxx level courses</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>How many 3xxx levels courses</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectation</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Students</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>First 4xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>Second/third 4xxx</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 student*</td>
<td>SLO 1: Language</td>
<td>Fourth/more 4xxx</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 4:** Graduates will be able to name cultural differences and explain the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / Totals 6/7</th>
<th>Advanced low</th>
<th>Intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid / intermediate-high</th>
<th>Intermediate-mid</th>
<th>Intermediate low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total students assessed</th>
<th>Outcome &amp; skill assessed</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations - Advanced Low</th>
<th>Meets expectations - Intermediate High</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations - Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Not ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>SLO 1: language</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural competence</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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

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

* 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

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

* 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 Eloquenta Perfectionis 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative Task</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills</td>
<td>□ Creates with language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Able to narrate in all time frames (Past, present and future)</td>
<td>□ Present tense well</td>
<td>□ Simple face-to-face conversations</td>
<td>□ Simple conversation, reactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Talks in details</td>
<td>□ Past tense inconsistent</td>
<td>□ Asks simple questions</td>
<td>□ Occasionally initiates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Frequently uses complex sentences and not just simple sentences</td>
<td>□ Talks in generalities, not details</td>
<td>□ Responds to simple questions</td>
<td>□ Describes in a simple way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Speaks in paragraph-length discourse</td>
<td>□ Often a series of simple sentences</td>
<td>□ Simple descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context Content Areas</strong></td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills</td>
<td>□ Interacts spontaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Performs well in formal settings</td>
<td>□ Performs in limited formal settings</td>
<td>□ Operates in informal settings</td>
<td>□ Functions in informal situations minimally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 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</td>
<td>□ Topics: personal activities and immediate surroundings, some ability about areas of general interest</td>
<td>□ Topics: self, family members, leisure activities and immediate surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate high skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate mid skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of intermediate low skills</td>
<td>□ Student also shows mastery of novice high skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Understood by NS unaccustomed to dealing with NNS</td>
<td>□ Usually understood by NS unaccustomed to dealing with NNS</td>
<td>□ Understood by NS accustomed to dealing with NNS</td>
<td>□ Repetition, understood by sympathetic listeners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sentence level discourse with connectors</td>
<td>□ Sentence level discourse with some connectors</td>
<td>□ Sentence level discourse</td>
<td>□ Word level discourse with some attempt at sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Sentence level discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Comprehensible to NS accustomed to dealing with NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Sentence level discourse with some connectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Word or list level discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>Intermediate Mid</td>
<td>Intermediate Low</td>
<td>Novice High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Consistently uses Sie vs. du appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du &amp; consistently uses these forms appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du &amp; often uses these forms appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du &amp; sometimes responds appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du &amp; occasionally uses these forms appropriately.</td>
<td>□ May use some memorized gestures and formulaic expressions (e.g. Sie vs. du, expressions of politeness, greetings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Consistently responds appropriately to formal vs. informal situations.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du &amp; consistently responds appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expressions and often responds appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expression and often initiates them appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expressions and sometimes responds appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expression and sometimes initiates them appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expressions and consistently responds appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expression and consistently initiates them appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expression and often initiates them appropriately.</td>
<td>□ Recognizes polite expression and sometimes initiates them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Consistently initiates polite expressions appropriately him/herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S OPI:

RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Function</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language tasks</strong></td>
<td>□ Handles successfully some complicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail.</td>
<td>□ Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks.</td>
<td>□ Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks in areas of chosen topic with some detail.</td>
<td>□ Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements</td>
<td>□ Has no real functional ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner</strong></td>
<td>□ Narrates and describes consistently in all major time frames.</td>
<td>□ Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.</td>
<td>□ Narrates and describes consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.</td>
<td>□ Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way.</td>
<td>□ Speaks in present tense though there may be errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Control</strong></td>
<td>□ Consistently &amp; 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.</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct.</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates significant quantity of Intermediate-level language, e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct.</td>
<td>□ Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time.</td>
<td>□ Is most accurate with memorized language, including phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</strong></td>
<td>□ Generally able to speak accurately and fluently, but some linguistic difficulty may occur as more complex tasks are attempted.</td>
<td>□ Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex.</td>
<td>□ Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more complex.</td>
<td>□ Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language.</td>
<td>□ Accuracy decreases when creating and trying to express personal meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Type</td>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>Intermediate Mid</td>
<td>Intermediate Low</td>
<td>Novice High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)</td>
<td>□ Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.</td>
<td>□ Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.</td>
<td>□ Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.</td>
<td>□ Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.</td>
<td>□ Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intercultural Competence:</td>
<td>These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or does not meet expectations (not tied to proficiency levels)</td>
<td>• Emphasis on facts rather than entertainment value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation style is not too casual or informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Student presentation did meet these expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Student presentation did not meet these expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S ORAL PRESENTATION:**

*RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021*
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Function</th>
<th>Language Control</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Low</strong></td>
<td>Generally able to write accurately &amp; 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.</td>
<td>Uses connected sentences, frequently at paragraph length, and some extended discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate High</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Uses connected sentences with complex sentences (dependent clauses) and a higher degree of paragraph-like discourse than at intermediate mid level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Mid</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate mid-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures.</td>
<td>Uses mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Low</strong></td>
<td>Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as writing becomes more complex.</td>
<td>Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice High</strong></td>
<td>Has no real functional ability.</td>
<td>Uses some simple sentences and memorized phrases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: □ Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks in areas of chosen topic with good detail. □ Narrates and describes consistently in all major 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.
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)
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensibility</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who can understand this person’s writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?</td>
<td>□ Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur</td>
<td>□ 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.</td>
<td>□ Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.</td>
<td>□ Is understood with occasional difficulty by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>□ Presents in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions</td>
<td>□ Presents in a clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions.</td>
<td>□ Presents mostly or not in a clear and organized manner.</td>
<td>□ Presents mostly or not in a clear and organized manner.</td>
<td>□ Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized, Presentation features little or no detail. Visuals may be lacking or missing entirely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Type</td>
<td>These are the expectations for Meets:</td>
<td>This is a feature that exceeds expectations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lists sources</td>
<td>• Documents use of sources throughout the presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation follows standard academic conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Student presentation meets and exceeds these expectations</td>
<td>□ Student presentation did meet these expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Student presentation did not meet these expectations</td>
<td>□ Student presentation did not meet these expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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:

RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensibility</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who can understand this person’s writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?</td>
<td>☐ Is easily understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives, although minimal interference from another language may occur.</td>
<td>☐ 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.</td>
<td>☐ Is generally understood by those accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.</td>
<td>☐ Is understood with occasional difficulty by those accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are some recognizable logical transitions.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner, e.g. may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof.</td>
<td>☐ Paper may be either unclear or unorganized, e.g. is poorly organized overall, or introduction and conclusion may be missing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates originality and rich details.</td>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.</td>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.</td>
<td>☐ Paper features some detail in arguments.</td>
<td>☐ Paper features little or no detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are some recognizable logical transitions.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion.</td>
<td>☐ Paper written in a clear and organized manner, e.g. may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof.</td>
<td>☐ Paper may be either unclear or unorganized, e.g. is poorly organized overall, or introduction and conclusion may be missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates originality and rich details.</td>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.</td>
<td>☐ Argument in paper illustrates good detail and may demonstrate some originality.</td>
<td>☐ Paper features some detail in arguments.</td>
<td>☐ Paper features little or no detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td>☐ These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td>☐ These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td>☐ These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td>☐ These are the Expectations for Meets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lists sources</td>
<td>• Paper follows standard academic writing conventions</td>
<td>• Documents use of sources throughout the paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paper follows standard academic writing conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Student paper meets and exceeds these expectations</td>
<td>☐ Student paper did meet these expectations</td>
<td>☐ Student paper did not meet these expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Knowledge &amp; 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.)</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 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</td>
<td>□ Makes distinctions between own and target culture and goes beyond mere descriptions of differences □ 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</td>
<td>□ Describes differences between own and target culture □ Begins to draw 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</td>
<td>□ Begins to describe differences between own and target culture □ Uses some detail □ Expresses a personal viewpoint</td>
<td>□ Makes distinctions between own and target culture □ Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture □ Response includes personal viewpoints □ Response includes an appropriate amount of examples</td>
<td>□ Names cultural differences between own and target culture. □ May express a personal opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT:**

*RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021*
### Assessment Tool: Various

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

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

**OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT:**

---

**RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021**
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Sources</th>
<th>Advanced Low</th>
<th>Intermediate High</th>
<th>Intermediate Mid</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reads academic publications in German, synthesizes and incorporates content constructively into research projects</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>N/A (see Curricular Map, this SLO is not introduced until GR 4xxx level courses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT’S ASSESSMENT ARTEFACT:

RUBRIC REVISED NOVEMBER 2021