Program Assessment Plan

Program: GERMAN– B.A. in German Studies

Department: Languages, Literatures & Cultures

College/School: Arts & Sciences

Date: May 24, 2019

Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Evelyn Meyer, evelyn.meyer@slu.edu, (314) 977-7254

Narrative:

In **AY2018-2019**, the German Studies faculty decided to revise and update outcomes assessment, initially based on our own response to the revised assessment rubrics implemented after the revision of the LLC OA plan during Fall 2016, namely that some of the rubrics did not fit our curriculum, or that the distinctions between determining criteria were not clear to us. We tried to work with these rubrics for 3 semesters (SP 17-SP18), then decided this wasn't working well enough for us and therefore we sat down during Fall 2018 and revised the rubrics, making them fit our assessment tools, our curriculum and determined more clearly for ourselves what we can actually expect our students to do at the different proficiency levels throughout the various outcomes. With a curricular change that resulted in GR 2010 being part of the German major and minor requirements, we decided to include the GR 2010 assessment as part of our revised assessment plan, as a "point of departure" so to speak, though we are assessing students in GR 2010 at the intermediate low proficiency level, whereas students in GR 4960, the final course in the German major, are assessed at the intermediate high proficiency level on the ACTFL scale.

The AY 2018-2019 Program Assessment Plan reflects an interim stage as we are currently developing an assessment plan that no longer is a final course-level assessment done in the major (as we did up to AY 2017-2018), but one that has assessment check-ins at several stages throughout the German major curriculum. In its current version, the program assessment plan does assessment of each student at the first course and final course in the German major curriculum. Next year, we plan to roll out more pieces in the program-level assessment with different check-ins at the 3xxx and likely also the 4xxx level, pending final version of the Program Assessment Plan approved by the German faculty. As part of this revision, we developed 8 specific Learning Outcome Goals for the German Major. These are not reflected below as this work was done during the Spring semester and we decided to use the current outcomes for the entire year and roll out the new ones next year. The new German Studies Learning Outcome Goals are as follows:

1. Graduates will be able to express themselves and communicate effectively in spoken and written German on a great variety of everyday and specialized topics.
2. Graduates will be able to demonstrate cultural competence through investigation of the target culture, an awareness of cross-cultural difference, and an ability to view themselves and the world from a variety of perspectives.
3. Graduates will be able to make connections with other disciplines and perspectives, thus applying their German language learning to other fields of study.
4. Graduates will be able to interpret and critically analyze a wide array of texts and artifacts of the target language culture within their socio-historical context.

5. Graduates will have gained a background in the literary, linguistic and cultural histories of the German-speaking countries and be able to apply their knowledge to research projects.
6. Graduates will be able to demonstrate their research skills by accessing and synthesizing content from target language sources and apply appropriate research methodologies.
7. Graduates will be able to apply these research skills by writing a substantial research project in German which follows the conventions of academic writing.
8. Graduates will be able to present their research orally in a clear, organized and professional manner in German.

We then mapped these LOGs onto our current assessment rubrics and assessment tools for the major at the GR 4960 level. Secondly, we looked at our curriculum in the German major to identify in which of the required courses we can reasonably expect our students to reach the LOGs at the desired intermediate high proficiency level on the ACTFL scale, and created a draft curriculum map for the program-level assessment plan. This is one of the models for our revised program level assessment plan, which is quite ambitious and there are areas of concern about the achievability of the LOGs at the intermediate high level in 4xxx level courses other than the GR 4960, as there is no fixed order in which our 4xxx level courses are offered and it would be unreasonable to expect a student to have mastered an LOG at the intermediate high proficiency level immediately after completing the three 3xxx level courses, whereas it would be reasonable to expect a student to have reached the intermediate high proficiency skill of said LOG after a longer period of study of German. We either have to remain flexible and assess a student at either intermediate mid or intermediate high, pending the stage at which they take the course in their German major coursework – which would be cumbersome to keep track of for every student and most likely result in less consistent data, or we may implement another model, which follows more closely the natural language proficiency development of language learners by doing assessment that's driven by proficiency levels and not so much by the LOGs tied to the highest proficiency level in all areas, but adjusting the LOGs to different proficiency levels. The German faculty is currently discussing the pros and cons of both models, their feasibility of implementation, and what is a manageable and meaningful program assessment plan for German Studies.

#	Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?	Assessment Mapping From what specific courses (or other educational/professional experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed to demonstrate achievement of the outcome? Include courses taught at the Madrid campus and/or online as applicable.	Assessment Methods What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	Use of Assessment Data How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes *made in previous years*?
1	**Presentational Communication (oral presentation):**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are	- GR 2010 – direct measure: oral cultural presentation; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: oral presentation of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey.	Data is collected, analyzed and discussed by the German faculty each semester students are enrolled in GR 2010 and GR 4960, as each member of the German faculty assesses each student and we meet at the end of the semester in which assessment is done to discuss our assessment of each student and agree on a final overall assessment ranking for each student.

		assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	A more though analysis is performed this year, as this concludes the first four-year cycle in the assessment plan adopted by the Department of Languages, Literatures & Cultures. A new, four-year assessment cycle begins AY 2019-2020 as follows: AY 2019-2020 will be the first year. AY 2020-2021 will be the mid-point. AY 2021-2022 will be the third year. AY 2022-2023 will conclude the four-year cycle. We will focus on rolling out the new program-level assessment plan currently in development that includes assessment at the 2xxx, 3xxx, and 4xxx levels in the German Studies curriculum to monitor student progress in learning more closely along with our newly revised LOGs. Data will be collected, analyzed and discussed each year. Changes, if deemed necessary, will be implemented each year. A report will be created at the end of each academic year. A more thorough analysis will be performed at the midpoint in the assessment cycle in Spring 2021. A final analysis will be performed at the end of the four-year cycle in Spring 2023.
2	**Presentational Communication (written paper):**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior	- GR 2010 – direct measure: cultural exploration paper; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: final written version of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit	See above

		Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	
3	**Intercultural Competence (interview)**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 2010 – direct measure: oral proficiency interview; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	See above
4	**Intercultural Competence (oral presentation)**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 2010 – direct measure: oral cultural presentation; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: oral presentation of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	See above
5	**Intercultural Competence (written paper)**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 2010 – direct measure: cultural exploration paper; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: final written version of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught	See above

			at SLU Madrid.	
6	**Interpersonal Communication (oral interview)**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 2010 – direct measure: oral proficiency interview; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: oral presentation of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	See above
7	**Interpretive Communication (written presentations)**	- GR 2010, third semester German (last semester of the A&S B.A. Foreign Language requirement), as the starting point of the German Studies B.A. – students are assessed at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale. - GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 2010 – direct measure: cultural exploration paper; indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate low on the ACTFL scale - GR 4960 – direct measure: final written version of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	See above
8	**Connections (oral):**	- GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	- GR 4960 – direct measure: oral presentation of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	See above
9	**Connections (written):**	- GR 4960, the final course of the German Studies coursework (Senior Capstone Project) - students are	- GR 4960 – direct measure: final written version of the student's senior capstone project, indirect measure: exit	See above

		assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale.	survey. Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate high on the ACTFL scale Madrid: German is currently not taught at SLU Madrid.	

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? *(It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)*

In a language major, all 9 Learning outcomes goals are intricately connected and can and will be assessed each semester. This follows best practices, is manageable and it is the nature of foreign language & culture acquisition to assess these outcomes together each time students are enrolled in these courses.

Students in GR 2010 will be assessed on outcomes 1-7, but at the intermediate low proficiency level according to the ACTFL scale. Students in GR 4960 will be assessed on outcomes 1&2, 4-9, although we will also assess majors at the end of their coursework on outcome 3 as of next year.

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

Dr. Evelyn Meyer, German Program Coordinator, took the initiative in revising the entire assessment plan, including the development of new rubrics and Learning Outcome Goals for the German major, after each faculty member in our program mentioned that we were not always sure what some of the differences between proficiency levels in our previous assessment rubrics meant or even how the rubric fit our assignments on which we base the assessment of majors. The faculty in the German Program, Drs. Sydney Norton, Dr. Evelyn WIsbey (adjunct faculty) and myself, met on approximately a bi-weekly schedule throughout Fall Semester 2018 to revise the Assessment Rubrics (for the German major and for the GR 2010 level) to make them fit our program and our assessment assignments, and to help clarify to ourselves where the differences in skills and proficiency levels are that we are assessing. 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. Dr. Meyer began developing more specific Learning Outcome Goals that describe the skills and learning outcomes in language that can be understood by non-second language acquisition experts. The proposed LOGS were discussed and revised thereafter by the German faculty and further revised with input from Kathleen Thatcher, the University Assessment Coordinator. Work on revising a more complete program-level assessment plan for German is in development (see narrative above).

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?

Data is collected, analyzed and discussed annually by the German faculty. Our department has adopted a four-year cycle. This year completes the first four-year cycle. The German faculty, esp. the program coordinator, takes a look at our assessment plan, rubrics and Learning Outcome goals annually, in connection with the Assessment Report generated after the end of the academic year. If modifications or revisions are needed, they will be made at that time. We revised our assessment rubrics during Fall 2018 and already made minor modifications to them at the end of Fall 2018, the first time we used this new set and noticed that some items in the rubrics needed to be adjusted or corrected some more.

AY 2019-2020 will mark the start of a new four-year cycle, as follows:
AY 2019-2020 will be the first year.
AY 2020-2021 will be the mid-point.

AY 2021-2022 will be the third year.
AY 2022-2023 will conclude the four-year cycle.

We will focus on rolling out the new program-level assessment plan currently in development that includes assessment at the 2xxx, 3xxx, and 4xxx levels in the German Studies curriculum to monitor student progress in learning more closely along with our newly revised LOGs.

Data will be collected, analyzed and discussed each year. Changes, if deemed necessary, will be implemented each year. A report will be created at the end of each academic year. A more thorough analysis will be performed at the midpoint in the assessment cycle in Spring 2021. A final analysis will be performed at the end of the four-year cycle in Spring 2023.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any assessment rubrics (as noted above) along with this report.

GR 2010: Interpersonal Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low
Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview
(Interview not conducted by Course Instructor, but by another member of the German faculty)

- *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012-Speaking:*
  - **Speaking proficiency** in German **at least at the Intermediate-Low Proficiency on the ACTFL** scale:

    "Intermediate Low speakers are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward

    social situations such as exchanging information related to self and family, some daily activities and personal preferences, and some immediate needs, such as ordering

    food and making simple purchases. His/her speech is primarily reactive and s/he struggles to answer direct questions or requests for information. S/he is also able to

    ask a few appropriate questions. His/her responses are often filled with hesitancy and inaccuracies as s/he searches for appropriate linguistic forms and vocabulary

    while attempting to give form to the message. His/her pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax is strongly influenced by his/her first language. S/he can generally be

    understood by native speakers accustomed to dealing with non-natives."

- *ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners Interpersonal (intermediate range)*
  - Expresses self and participates in conversations on familiar topics using a variety of phrases and simple sentences and may use a series of sentences. Handles short social interactions in everyday situations by asking and answering a variety of questions. Can communicate about self, others, and everyday life.
  - Can communicate by understanding and creating personal meaning.
  - Can understand, ask, and answer a variety of questions.
  - Consistently able to initiate, maintain, and end a conversation to satisfy basic needs and/or to handle a simple transaction.
  - May show emerging evidence of the ability to communicate about more than the "here and now."
  - Able to communicate in contexts relevant to oneself and others, and one's immediate environment.
  - May show emerging evidence of the ability to communicate in contexts of occasionally unfamiliar topics.
  - Able to understand and produce discrete sentences, strings of sentences and some connected sentences. Able to ask questions initiate and sustain conversations.
  - Understands straightforward language that contains mostly familiar structures.
  - Control of language is sufficient to be understood by those accustomed to dealing with language learners.
  - Communicates using high frequency and personalized vocabulary within familiar themes or topics.
  - Uses some of the following strategies to maintain communication, but not all of the time and inconsistently, able to: Ask questions; Ask for clarification ; Self-correct or restate when not understood; Circumlocute
  - Recognizes and uses some culturally appropriate vocabulary, expressions, and gestures when participating in everyday interactions. Recognizes that differences exist in cultural behaviors and perspectives and can conform in familiar situations.

A. Interpersonal Communication

	Intermediate High **Exceeds expectation**	Intermediate Mid **Exceeds expectation**	Intermediate Low **Meets expectations**	Novice High **Does not meet expectations**
Communicative Task	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate mid skills** ☐ Present tense well ☐ Past tense inconsistent ☐ Talks in generalities, not details ☐ Often a series of simple sentences	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate low skills** ☐ Simple face-to-face conversations ☐ Asks simple questions ☐ Responds to simple questions ☐ Simple descriptions	☐ Student also shows mastery of **novice high skills** ☐ Simple conversation, reactive ☐ Occasionally initiates ☐ Describes in a simple way	☐ Creates with language
Context Content Areas	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate mid skills** ☐ Performs in limited formal settings ☐ Topics: personal activities and immediate surroundings, some ability about areas of general interest	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate low skills** ☐ Operates in informal settings ☐ Topics: self, family members, leisure activities and immediate surroundings	☐ Student also shows mastery of **novice high skills** ☐ Functions in **informal situations minimally**	☐ Interacts spontaneously
Accuracy	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate mid skills** ☐ **Usually understood by NS unaccustomed to** dealing with NNS ☐ Sentence level discourse **with some connector**s	☐ Student also shows mastery of **intermediate low skills** ☐ **Understood by NS accustomed to** dealing with NNS ☐ **Sentence level discourse**	☐ Student also shows mastery of **novice high skills** ☐ Repetition, **understood by sympathetic listeners** ☐ Word level discourse with **some attempt at sentences**	☐ **Comprehensible to NS** accustomed to dealing with NNS ☐ **Word or list level discourse**

COMMENTS:

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

NAME_____   DATE_____

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	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **consistently uses** these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **consistently responds** appropriately. **AND/OR** ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and **consistently responds** appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and **consistently initiates** them appropriately him/herself.	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **often uses** these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **often responds** appropriately. **AND/OR** ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and **often responds** appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and **often initiates** them appropriately.	☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **occasionally uses** these forms appropriately. ☐ Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & **sometimes responds** appropriately. **AND/OR** ☐ Recognizes polite expressions and **sometimes responds** appropriately. ☐ Recognizes polite expression and **sometimes initiates** them appropriately.	☐ May use **some memorized gestures and formulaic expressions** (e.g. Sie vs. du, expressions of politeness, greetings)

OVERALL COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S OPI:

GR 2010: Presentational Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low
Assessment Tool: Oral Cultural Presentation

**ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners Presentational (intermediate range)**

- Communicates information and expresses own thoughts about familiar topics using sentences and series of sentences.
- Expresses own thoughts and presents information and personal preferences on familiar topics by creating with language primarily in present time.
- May show emerging evidence of the ability to tell or retell a story and provide additional description.
- Creates messages in contexts relevant to oneself and others, and one's immediate environment.
- May show emerging evidence of the ability to create messages on general interest and work-related topics.
- Produces sentences, series of sentences, and some connected sentences.
- Control of language is sufficient to be understood by audiences accustomed to language produced by language learners.
- With practice, polish, or editing, may show emerging evidence of Advanced-level language control.
- Produces vocabulary on variety of everyday topics, topics of personal interest, and topics that have been studied.
- May use some or all of the following strategies to communicate and maintain audience interest, able to: show an increasing awareness of errors and able to self-correct or edit; use phrases, imagery, or content; simplify; use known language to compensate for missing vocabulary; use graphic organizer; use reference resources as appropriate
- Uses some culturally appropriate vocabulary, expressions, and gestures. Reflects some knowledge of cultural differences related to written and spoken communication.

GR 2010: Presentational Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low

Assessment Tool: Oral Cultural Presentation

NAME_____   DATE_____

A. Presentational Mode Rubric—Intermediate Learner (Integrated Performance Assessment Rubrics)

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Language Function Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner	☐ **Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks** in areas of chosen topic.	☐ **Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements** ☐ is able to express personal meaning in a basic way.	☐ **Has no real functional ability**.
Text Type Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	☐ Uses **mostly connected sentences** with **some complex sentences** (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	☐ Uses **simple sentences** and **some strings** of sentences.	☐ Uses **some simple sentences** and **memorized phrases**.
Impact Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation	☐ Presents **in a clear and organized manner**. ☐ Presentation **illustrates originality and rich details.** ☐ Presentation features **effective visuals** that enhance the content in a significant way.	☐ Presents **mostly in a clear and organized manner**. ☐ Presentation features **some detail & good visuals**.	☐ Presentation **may be either unclear or unorganized**, ☐ Presentation **features little or no detail. Visuals may be lacking** or missing entirely.
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?	☐ 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 occur**.	☐ Is generally **understood** by those **accustomed** to interacting with non-natives, although **additional effort may be required**.	☐ Is understood **with occasional difficulty** by those **accustomed** to the speaking of non-natives, **although additional effort may be required**.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	☐ Demonstrates **significant quantity and quality of Intermediate-level language**. ☐ Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when **attempting to handle topics at the Advanced level or as language becomes more complex.**	☐ Is **most accurate** when producing **simple sentences in present time**. ☐ Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. ☐ Accuracy decreases as **language becomes more comple**x.	☐ Is **most accurate** with **memorized language, including phrases**. ☐ Accuracy decreases when **creating and trying to express personal meaning.**

B. Intercultural Competence – Oral Presentation

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
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.)	☐ **Makes distinctions** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **a strong understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by showing **more detailed awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Describes differences** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture **by showing awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons t**hat present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Describes few or no differences** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **little or inadequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture **by minimally or not showing awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Does not draw constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture

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

COMMENTS:

GR 2010: Interpretive Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric

Assessment Tool: Cultural Composition

- *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 - Writing*

  Written proficiency in German at least at the **Intermediate-low** proficiency on the ACTFL scale:

  Writers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to meet some limited practical writing needs. They can create statements and formulate questions based on familiar material. Most sentences are recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures. These are short and simple conversational-style sentences with basic word order. They are written almost exclusively in present time. Writing tends to consist of a few simple sentences, often with repetitive structure. Topics are tied to highly predictable content areas and personal information. Vocabulary is adequate to express elementary needs. There may be basic errors in grammar, word choice, punctuation, spelling, and in the formation and use of non-alphabetic symbols. Their writing is understood by natives used to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required. When Intermediate Low writers attempt to perform writing tasks at the Advanced level, their writing will deteriorate significantly and their message may be left incomplete.

- *ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners Interpretive (intermediate range)*
  - Understands main ideas and some supporting details on familiar topics from a variety of texts.
  - Comprehends main ideas and identities some supporting details.
  - May show emerging evidence of the ability to make inferences by identifying key details from the text.
  - Comprehends information related to basic personal and social needs and relevant to one's immediate environment such as self and everyday life, school, community, and particular interests.
  - Comprehends simple stories, routine correspondence, short descriptive texts or other selections within familiar contexts.
  - Generally comprehends connected sentences and much paragraph-like discourse.
  - Comprehends information- rich texts with highly predictable order.
  - Sufficient control of language (vocabulary, structures, conventions of spoken and written language, etc.) to understand fully and with ease short, non-complex texts on familiar topics; limited control of language to understand some more complex texts.
  - May derive meaning by: comparing target language structures with those of the native language; recognizing parallels in structure between new and familiar language
  - Comprehends high frequency vocabulary related to everyday topics and high frequency idiomatic expressions.
  - May use some or all of the following strategies to comprehend texts, able to: skim and scan; use visual support and background knowledge; predict meaning based on context, prior knowledge, and/or experience; use context clues; recognize word family roots, prefixes and suffixes
  - Generally relies heavily on knowledge of own culture with increasing knowledge of the target culture(s) to interpret texts that are heard, read or viewed.

GR 2010: Presentational Communication, Interpretive Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low
Assessment Tool: Cultural Composition

NAME_____   DATE_____

A. Presentational Communication:

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Composition Mechanics Requirements: In German & at least 600 words	☐ Composition is **significantly more** than 600 words.	☐ Composition is **at least** 600 words long.	☐ Composition is **less than** 600 words.
Language Function Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	☐ **Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks** in areas of chosen topic. ☐ Narrates and describes in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently	☐ **Creates with language** by **combining and recombining known elements** ☐ Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way.	☐ **Has no real functional ability**.
Text Type follows standard academic writing conventions; quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	☐ Uses **mostly connected sentences** with **some complex sentences** (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse. ☐ Paper **follows** standard academic writing conventions	☐ Uses **simple sentences** and **some strings** of sentences. ☐ Paper **follows** standard academic writing conventions **to a good degree**	☐ Uses **some simple sentences** and **memorized phrases**. ☐ Paper **does not follow** standard academic writing conventions
Impact Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	☐ Paper written **in a clear and organized manner** e.g. a clear introduction, body **and** conclusion ☐ Argument in paper illustrates **originality and rich details**.	☐ Paper written **in a clear and organized manner,** e.g. **may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereo**f ☐ Paper features **some** detail in arguments.	☐ Paper may be **either unclear or unorganized,** e.g. is poorly organized overall, or **introduction and conclusion may be missing** ☐ Paper features **little or no** detail.
Comprehensibility Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	☐ 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**.	☐ Is **generally understood** by those **accustomed** to the writing of non-natives, **although additional effort may be required**.	☐ Is **understood with occasional difficult**y by those **accustomed** to the writing of non-natives, although **additional effort may be required**.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	☐ There are **few or minimal** spelling, grammar, or syntax errors **per page** in those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can control.	☐ 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.	☐ 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.

B. Intercultural Competence – Cultural Composition

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
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.)	☐ **Makes distinctions** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates a **strong understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by showing **more detailed awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Draws **more detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Describes differences** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by showing **awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Describes few or no differences** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **little or inadequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by **minimally or not showing** awareness of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Does not draw constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture

C. Interpretive Communication – Cultural Composition

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Depth of Reflection	☐ Response **demonstrates a reflection** on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Response **includes** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are supported **with appropriate examples**	☐ Response **demonstrates some reflection** on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Response **includes some** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are supported **with some examples**	☐ Response **demonstrates minmal or no reflection** on or analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Response **is missing** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ If viewpoints and interpretations are included, **they are unsupported**.

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

COMMENTS:

RUBRIC REVISED OCTOBER 2018

GR 4960: Presentational Communication, Intercultural Competence, Connections & Interpersonal Communication Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate High

Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation of Senior Capstone Project

NAME_____   DATE_____

A. Presentational Communication—Oral Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT Meet Expectations
Language Function Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner	☐ **Handles successfully some complicated tasks** in areas of chosen topic with good detail. ☐ Narrates and describes **consistently in all major time frames**.	☐ **Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks** in areas of chosen topic with some detail. ☐ Narrates and describes **in present tense and one or more major time frames**, although **not consistently**.	☐ **Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements** ☐ Is able to **express personal meaning only in a basic way**. ☐ Narrates and describes **comfortably only in present tense** and limited use of other time frames.
Text Type Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	☐ Uses **connected sentences**, frequently at **paragraph length**, and **some extended discourse.**	☐ Uses **mostly connected sentences** with **some complex sentences** (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	☐ Only uses **simple sentences** and **some strings** of sentences.
Impact Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation	☐ Presents **in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions**. ☐ Presentation **illustrates originality and rich details.**	☐ Presents **in a clear and organized manner**. ☐ Presentation features **good detail & good visuals,** and **may** demonstrate **some originality**.	☐ Presents **mostly or not** in a clear and organized manner. ☐ Presentation **may** feature **some detail & appropriate visuals**.
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?	☐ Is easily **understood by those unaccustomed** to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal **interference from another language** may occur.	☐ Is generally **understood by those unaccustomed** to the speaking of non-natives, although **interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur**.	☐ Is generally **understood** by those **accustomed** to interacting with non-natives, although **additional effort may be required**.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	☐ **Consistently & correctly** demonstrates high quantity and quality of **intermediate-level language** and **some features of advance level language**, e.g. consistently using past tense, and some use of subjunctive or passive. ☐ **Generally** able to speak **accurately and fluently**, but **some linguistic difficulty** may occur as **more complex tasks are attempted**.	☐ Demonstrates **significant quantity of Intermediate-level language**, e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. ☐ Demonstrates **significant quality of Intermediate-level language**. ☐ Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when **attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex.**	☐ Is **most accurate** when producing **simple sentences in present time**. ☐ Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. ☐ Accuracy decreases as **language becomes more complex**.

B. Intercultural Competence – Oral Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Cultural Knowledge & self-awareness (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	☐ **Analyzes distinctions** between own and target culture, and **draws appropriate conclusions.** ☐ 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 ☐ **Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Makes distinctions** between own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **an adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by showing **more detailed awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture	☐ **Only describes differences** between own and target culture ☐ Does **not always** demonstrates **adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture, or **awareness** of cultural practices and institutions ☐ **May begin to draw constructive cultural comparisons t**hat present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture

C. Connections – Oral Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives	☐ **Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts** from language learning with another field of study or perspective.	☐ **Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts** from language learning to another field of study or perspective.	☐ **Acknowledges and/or identifies** that there are **connections** between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but **does not necessarily develop meaningful examples or connections**.

D. Interpersonal Communication – Oral Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Interaction during Q&A with audience and responding to questions about the presentation	☐ Can give **in depth responses to questions** and **ask for clarification when needed** ☐ Demonstrates **confident use of communicative strategies** such as rephrasing, circumlocution, or examples ☐ Control of intermediate level language **is sufficient to be understood** by those **unaccustomed** to dealing with language learners.	☐ Can **respond appropriately to questions** and **ask for clarification when needed** ☐ **Uses some communicative strategies** such as rephrasing and circumlocution ☐ Control of intermediate level language **is sufficient to be understood** by those **accustomed** to dealing with language learners	☐ Demonstrates **inconsistent ability to respond to questions** and **may or may not ask for clarification** when needed ☐ **Only limited use of communicative strategies** such as rephrasing and circumlocution ☐ Control of intermediate level language is **not always sufficient to be understood** by those **accustomed** to dealing with language learners

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

GR 4960: Presentational Communication, Interpretive & Intercultural Competence & Connections Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate High
Assessment Tool: Written Senior Capstone Project (final version)

NAME_____   DATE_____

A. Presentational Communication—Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT Meet Expectations
Composition Mechanics Requirements: In German & at least 15 pages of text (excluding bibliography)	☐ Project is significantly longer than 15 pages of text (excluding bibliography)	☐ Project is at least 15 pages of text (excluding bibliography).	☐ Project is less than 15 pages.
Language Function Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	☐ **Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks** in areas of chosen topic with good detail. ☐ Narrates and describes **in all major time frames, but not always consistently**.	☐ **Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks** in areas of chosen topic with some detail ☐ Narrates and describes **in present tense and one or more major time frames**, although **not consistently**.	☐ **Creates with language only** by **combining and recombining known elements** ☐ Is able to **express personal meaning only in a basic way**. ☐ Narrates and describes **comfortably only in present tense** and limited use of other time frames.
Text Type follows standard academic writing conventions; quantity and organization of language discourse	☐ Uses **connected sentences**, frequently at **paragraph length**, and **some extended discourse.** ☐ Paper **follows** standard academic writing conventions, including in the bibliography.	☐ Uses **mostly connected sentences** with **some complex sentences** (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse. ☐ Paper **follows** standard academic writing conventions.	☐ **Only** uses **simple sentences** and **some strings** of sentences. ☐ Paper **follows** standard academic writing conventions **to a good degree.**
Impact Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	☐ Paper written **in a clear and organized manner with logical transitions** ☐ Argument in paper **illustrates originality and rich details.**	☐ Paper written **in a clear and organized manner** e.g. a clear introduction, body **and** conclusion ☐ Argument in paper illustrates **good detail** and **may** demonstrate **some originality**.	☐ Paper written **mostly or not in a clear and organized manner,** e.g. **may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof** ☐ 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?	☐ Is easily **understood by those unaccustomed** to the writing of non-natives, although minimal i**nterference from another language** may occur	☐ Is **generally understood** by those **unaccustomed** to the writing of non-natives, although **interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur**.	☐ Is **generally understood** by those **accustomed** to the writing of non-natives, **although additional effort may be required**.
Language Control Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	☐ Generally able to write accurately & fluently at the advanced level, e.g. some use of subjunctive and passive voice, but some linguistic difficulty may occur as more complex tasks are attempted.	☐ Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language, e.g. more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures. ☐ Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as writing becomes more complex.	☐ Writing, vocabulary and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. ☐ Demonstrates limited quantity and lower quality of intermediate high-level language. ☐ Accuracy of writing decreases as language becomes more complex.

B. Intercultural Competence – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Cultural Knowledge & self-awareness (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	☐ **Analyzes distinctions** between own and target culture, and **draws appropriate conclusions.** ☐ **Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **a strong understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by **providing rich detail** and by showing **deep awareness** of cultural practices and institutions	☐ **Makes distinctions** between own and target culture ☐ **Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons** that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ Demonstrates **an adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture by showing **more detailed awareness** of cultural practices and institutions	☐ **Only describes differences** between own and target culture ☐ **May begin to draw constructive cultural comparisons t**hat present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture ☐ Does **not always** demonstrates **adequate understanding** of the complexity of the target culture, or **awareness** of cultural practices and institutions

C. Interpretive Communication – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Depth of Reflection	☐ Paper **demonstrates more in-depth reflection** on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper **includes more nuanced** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are **consistently** supported **with appropriate examples** ☐ **Strong use and integration of material from academic sources**	☐ Paper **demonstrates an adequate reflection** on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper **includes adequate** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are **usually** supported **with appropriate examples, some from academic sources and/or personal experiences**	☐ Paper **demonstrates only some reflection** on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions ☐ Paper **only includes some** personal viewpoints and interpretations ☐ Viewpoints and interpretations are **only** supported **with some examples** ☐ There is only **limited engagement with research and academic sources**.

D. Connections – Written Mode

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives	☐ **Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts** from language learning with another field of study or perspective.	☐ **Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts** from language learning to another field of study or perspective	☐ **Acknowledges and/or identifies** that there are **connections** between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but **does not necessarily develop meaningful examples or connections**.

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

COMMENTS: