Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): 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:

Background information – Updates to the LLC plan

In 2014-15, the Department of Languages, Literatures & Cultures (LLC) developed a new general assessment plan. Dr. Bregni was selected to spearhead the revision of the Outcomes Assessment process for all language programs in the Department. In the department meeting of October 29, 2015, the LLC voted to approve the new assessment plan: goals (language and culture); outcomes (speaking, writing, intercultural competence); assessment measures/methods (both direct and indirect) and related rubrics; feedback loop.

In Fall 2016, in response to feedback received from Dean LaVoie and Kathleen Thatcher, University Assessment Coordinator, Dr. Bregni, LLC Outcomes Assessment coordinator, and Dr. Sheri Anderson-Gutierrez, LLC Associate Outcomes Assessment Coordinator, began a process of revision of the LLC assessment plan. They more clearly defined and revised outcomes, assessment methods and related rubrics to reflect our intention to follow the American Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) *21st Century Standards*, 2015 (4th), which better reflect, and allow us to better measure, our students' actual abilities and competences. In Spring 2017, the revised plan for both the LLC B.A. and the LLC Core – Non-Major components was presented to the LLC faculty and discussed. Under the revised plan, the goals (assessing competence in language and culture) are measured through 21st Century Standards outcomes (interpersonal communication, presentational communication, interpretive communication; intercultural competence and connections) in speaking and writing; assessment measures/methods (both direct and indirect) and related rubrics have been revised; the feedback loop has been updated.

On October 25, 2017, Dr. Bregni completed his duties as LLC Outcomes Assessment Coordinator by submitting a fully revised LLC Outcomes Assessment Plan to the LLC Chair, the Dean's office and the University Assessment Coordinator.

German Studies at SLU – Evolution of the Implementation of the LLC OA Plan

The German Studies program is inter/multidisciplinary in nature. The focus of the German Studies Major is the development of linguistic and cultural proficiency within a multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary context. Students are also strongly encouraged to select a second major. The German Studies program also contributes to the A&S Core Foreign Language Requirement, and offers many courses that contribute to other components of the A&S Core (i.e. Literature, Global Citizenship, Cultural Diversity). Since Fall 2017, as approved by the curriculum committee, the German major and minor now includes GR 2010: Intermediate German language & Culture. GR 2010 is also the last course in the A&S B.A. core foreign language requirement. Up to AY 2017-18, the German program did assessment at the GR 2010 level, as we had been instructed to do so under an earlier LLC assessment plan for "core language requirement, non majors." With the inclusion of GR 2010 in the coursework of the German major & minor, we identify GR 2010 as the starting point for our majors and minors (while bearing in mind that this also includes non-majors and non-minors) and therefore also as a "point of departure" for our majors in our assessment plan, as we work towards the development and implementation of a true program-level assessment plan.

For A.Y. 2016-2017, German Studies test-piloted the new outcomes assessment format developed by the LLC Task force (of which Dr. Evelyn Meyer was a member) in a "hybrid" format, as many of the changes in the plan came mid year. All 5 outcomes were already in our curriculum, but we called and did our direct assessment in speaking and intercultural competence and writing and intercultural competence. The course instructor alone assessed the students. Dr. Evelyn Wisbey made the suggestion that all German faculty should be involved in the assessment of students, as our enrollment numbers are smaller (in comparison to other language programs in LLC) and we only have one section of the courses in which we do assessment, therefore making this manageable in German Studies. Additionally, we would get more accurate data by having multiple ratings per student.

For AY 2017-2018, German Studies continued to use the new outcomes assessment format developed by the LLC Outcome Assessment task force, that came about as a result of the feedback received on the general LLC Assessment Plan (see above). Specifically, while all 5 outcomes discussed below were already in our curriculum, we revised the curriculum in Spring 2017 for the Fall 2017, to be able to do assessment more clearly according to the 5 outcomes that were adopted by LLC during the previous year. We used the rubrics that were developed by Dr. Bregni and Dr. Anderson-Gutierrez based on the 21st Century Standards which were modified by Drs. Evelyn Wisbey and Evelyn Meyer to reflect some specifics for the German language and content of instruction. As of this year, all German faculty assessed each student individually on all assessment tasks. However, while in most cases, the faculty rated the student the same, at times we did not do so, which created problems in the compilation of the data for the AY 2017-2018 report. Therefore for AY 12018-2019, we decided to continue our practice of each faculty member rating each student individually, but to add a meeting at the end of each semester, in which we discussed each student's assessment and agreed on an overall rating in each of the stated outcomes on each assessment tool. In these wrap-up meetings, we also noticed that while the revised assessment rubrics were much improved and resulted in more meaningful data about the students' learning in the German Studies Program, they were still not clear or German curriculum specific enough, and we decided to revise them during AY 2018-2019.

German Studies Program – Assessment Activities in AY 2018-2019
Dr. Evelyn Meyer took the initiative in revising the entire German assessment plan, including the development of significantly revised rubrics and Learning Outcome Goals for the German major. The German faculty, though primarily Drs. Evelyn Meyer and Evelyn Wisbey, worked on revising all assessment rubrics during the Fall 2018 semester. Beginning in January 2019, Dr. Evelyn Meyer developed LOGs for the German major, which were discussed with the program faculty and Kathleen Thatcher. She asked us to map our LOGs onto the curriculum at a greater variety of points throughout the coursework in the German major. This is currently in development (for more detailed information on this, please see question 6 below).

AY 2018-2019:
At the **GR 2010 level**, the new point of departure in the coursework in the German major, assessment is performed through both direct and indirect measures in GR 2010 (Intermediate German Language and Culture) each semester students are enrolled in the course, which was both semesters during this AY. This is the first course that counts towards the German Studies major or minor at SLU, but the course is also taken by students who "only" complete their B.A. language requirement in the CAS core. The German Program chose to focus on **four outcomes**: interpersonal, presentational and interpretive communication and intercultural competence, which were assessed through **three direct measures** (an Oral Proficiency Interview, a cultural presentation, and cultural exploration paper) and **one indirect measure** (an exit survey). In terms of communication in the target language (interpersonal, interpretive and presentational), GR 2010 students in the German Studies program (like for other LLC Romance & Germanic languages) are assessed **at the Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale**.

For the **B.A. in German Studies**, assessment is performed through both direct and indirect measures in GR 4960 (German Senior Capstone Seminar), which students take in their last year of German Studies at

SLU, each semester students are enrolled in the course. This year we had students enrolled in GR 4960 in both semesters.

For Academic Year 2018-2019, the five outcomes (interpersonal communication, presentational communication, interpretive communication, intercultural competence, and connections) were assessed through **two direct measures** (oral presentation of the senior capstone paper and final written version of the capstone paper) and **one indirect measure** (an exit survey). In terms of communication in the target language (interpersonal, presentational and interpretive communication), B.A. students in the German Studies program (like for other LLC Romance & Germanic languages) are **assessed at the Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale**.

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

> As explained above, we focused on four outcomes at the GR 2010 level and five outcomes at the GR 4960 level, both in the areas of speaking and writing, the two-active language production skills in foreign language and culture acquisition. At GR 2010 we assessed presentational and interpersonal communication (oral), and presentational and interpretive communication (written). Intercultural competence is assessed as connected to and emerging from the other communicative skills, which is more consistent with the modes of foreign language and culture acquisition. See the updated attached rubrics. Similarly, at GR 4960 we assessed presentational & interpersonal communications and connections (oral), and presentational & interpretive communications and connections (written). Intercultural competence is assessed as connected to and emerging from the other communicative skills, which is more consistent with the modes of foreign language and culture acquisition. See the updated attached rubrics. All outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

> **DIRECT MEASURES:**
> **GR 2010 (intermediate low proficiency on ACTFL scale):**
> **Outcomes (4):**
> - **Presentational communication**
> - **Interpretive communication**
> - **Interpersonal communication**
> - **Intercultural competence**
>
> **Artifacts:**
> - The assessment tool: Oral Proficiency Interview assessed interpersonal communication and intercultural competence (spoken language)
> - The assessment tool: Cultural Presentation assessed presentational communication and intercultural competence (spoken language)
> - The assessment tool: Cultural Exploration Paper assessed presentational & Interpretive communication and intercultural competence (written language)
>
> **GR 4960: (intermediate high proficiency on ACTFL scale):**
> **Outcomes (5):**
> - **Presentational communication**
> - **Interpretive communication**
> - **Interpersonal communication**
> - **Intercultural competence**
> - **Connections**

Artifacts:
- The assessment tool: Oral Presentation & Discussion assessed presentational & interpersonal communication, connections and intercultural competence (spoken language)
- The assessment tool: Senior Capstone Project assessed presentational & Interpretive communication, connections and intercultural competence (written language)

INDIRECT MEASURES:
Students in GR 2010 and GR 4960 were given an exit survey.

Madrid: German is not currently taught at the Madrid Campus, though it was several years ago.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?
   NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

- Rubrics, revised during Fall 2018 primarily by Drs. Evelyn Meyer (German Studies Coordinator) and Evelyn Wisbey (Adjunct faculty member) to reflect changes/modifications in curriculum and assessment plan (attached) were used.
- All faculty in German Studies (both full-time & adjunct faculty) were involved and assessed each student on every assessment tool used at both the GR 2010 and GR 4960 levels, with the exception of the GR 2010 OPI, which was assessed only by the course instructor and one other member of the German faculty to be less intimidating to the student who has to do the OPI with another faculty member they may or may not be familiar with. At the end of each semester, the German faculty gets together to discuss the assessment ratings for each student, and if there are differences in how individual faculty members rated a student, we discuss our reasons for our rankings and work out an overall ranking that we all agree on.
- Data was collected, compiled, analyzed and discussed internally.
- The German Studies Coordinator compiles the results of both the direct and indirect measures across the program for each semester separately and then for the entire year overall in order to gain insight into the progress made by students, the success of instruction and the needs for improvement. This year, the curricular changes needed already came up in the end of semester assessment discussion of the German faculty, as we discussed "not ratable" cases and why and how these came about (see Question 5 below for more detail). The Coordinator reports to the German Studies faculty at the end of the academic year with recommendations for changes or improvements to the curriculum, implementation of and revisions to the assessment plan.
- Students are included in the assessment feedback-loop on a regular basis throughout the courses by receiving ongoing feedback on their work and progress in spoken and written German and their intercultural competence, and by participating in self-assessment and reflection on their own progress. For example, students receive individual feedback on oral proficiency evaluations from the faculty member teaching the course after each interview assignment, and on their written proficiency during individual writing workshops for each essay in a course. Additionally, at the end of GR 2010 and GR 4960, students complete an exit survey in which they are asked to assess and self-reflect on their own progress in 7 distinct areas of language and culture acquisition.
- The German Studies Outcome Assessment Plan and Report are published annually on the Provost Office website. They are accessible to the public.
- An executive summary of the assessment activities of the German Studies Program is compiled for the Program faculty, the Department Chair of Languages, Literatures & Cultures, the College of Arts & Sciences Dean's office and the Provost Office.

4. What did you learn from the data? <u>Summarize</u> the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.
   NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Results are presented per semester, then compiled & commented. As it is best practices in our field (Foreign Language & Culture acquisition), as per ACTFL standards, the assigned benchmark for meeting and exceeding criteria is 80%.

GR 2010 – Assessed in Fall 2018 & Spring 2019 – Assessment Data

I. SPEAKING
Fall 2018:
A. Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview
Outcomes assessed: Interpersonal Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome		Meets expected outcome (intermediate low)	Does not meet expected outcome (Novice high)
		Intermediate high	Intermediate mid		
12 Students	Speaking: Interpersonal Communication	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.6%)	2 (16.6%)	4 (33.3%)

B. Assessment Tool: Cultural Presentation
Outcomes assessed: Presentational Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable
12 Students	Speaking: Presentational Communication	6 (50%)	5 (41.6%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	2 (16.6%)	8 (66.6%)	2 (16.6%)	0 (0%)

SPEAKING (GR 2010) continued
Spring 2019:
A. Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview
Outcomes assessed: Interpersonal Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome		Meets expected outcome (intermediate low)	Does not meet expected outcome (Novice high)
		Intermediate high	Intermediate mid		
6 Students	**Speaking: Interpersonal Communication**	1 (16.6%)	1 (16.6%)	4 (66.4%)	0 (0%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	0 (0%)	4 (66.4%)	2 (33.2%)	0 (0%)

B. Assessment Tool: Cultural Presentation
Outcomes assessed: Presentational Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable*
6 Students	**Speaking: Presentational Communication**	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

*Comment:
While all six students completed the cultural presentation component, two presentations did not fulfill the requirements of the assignment in the area of presentational communication because the students memorized their presentation instead of speaking freely and were thus deemed not ratable in that category, but ratable in the area of intercultural competence.

AY 2018-2019 Totals SPEAKING
A. Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview
Outcomes assessed: Interpersonal Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome		Meets expected outcome (intermediate low)	Does not meet expected outcome (Novice high)
		Intermediate high	Intermediate mid		
18 Students	**Speaking: Interpersonal Communication**	5 (27.7%)	5 (27.7%)	8 (44.4%)	0 (0%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	4 (22.2%)	6 (33.3%)	4 (22.2%)	4 (22.2%)

B. Assessment Tool: Cultural Presentation
Outcomes assessed: Presentational Communication and Intercultural Competence
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable*
18 Students	**Speaking: Presentational Communication**	8 (44.4%)	7 (38.8%)	1 (5.5%)	2 (33.3%)
	Speaking: Intercultural competence	4 (22.2%)	12 (66.6%)	2 (11.1%)	0 (0%)

* See comment above, Spring 2019.

II. WRITING:
Fall 2018:
Assessment Tool: Cultural Explorations Paper
Outcomes assessed: Presentational Communication, Intercultural Competence, and Interpretive Communication
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable*
12 Students	**Writing: Presentational Communication**	6 (50%)	5 (41.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)
	Writing: Intercultural competence	7 (58.3%)	3 (24.9%)	2 (16.6%)	0 (0%)
	Writing: Interpretive Communication	4 (33.2%)	3 (24.9%)	5 (41.6%)	0 (0%)

* Comment:
All twelve students submitted the cultural exploration papers. One of the submitted papers was not deemed a ratable sample in the area of presentational communication, since a translation program or heavy reliance on native speaker language sources seemed to have been used to generate the German version of the paper. However, the paper was deemed ratable in the area of intercultural competence & interpretive Communication.

WRITING (GR 2010) continued

Spring 2019:

Assessment Tool: Cultural Explorations Paper

Outcomes assessed: Interpretive Communication and Intercultural Competence

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

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable*
6 Students	**Writing: Presentational Communication**	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)
	Writing: Intercultural competence	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Writing: Interpretive Communication	0 (0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.6%)	0 (0%)

*Comment:

All six students submitted the cultural exploration papers. Two of the submitted papers were not deemed a ratable sample in the area of presentational communication, since a translation program or heavy reliance on native speaker language sources seemed to have been used to generate the German version of the paper. However, the paper was deemed ratable in the area of intercultural competence & interpretive Communication.

AY 2018-2019 Totals WRITING

Assessment Tool: Cultural Explorations Paper

Outcomes assessed: Interpretive Communication and Intercultural Competence

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

Total Students	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome	Not ratable*
18 Students	**Writing: Presentational Communication**	8 (44.4%)	7 (38.8%)	0 (0%)	3 (16.6%)
	Writing: Intercultural competence	7 (38.8%)	9 (50%)	2 (11.1%)	0 (0%)
	Writing: Interpretive Communication	4 (22.2%)	8 (44.4%)	6 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

*see comments above for Fall 2018 & Spring 2019.

Comments:

The assigned benchmark for meeting and exceeding criteria is 80%: students are required to show acquisition of speaking, writing and intercultural skills that correspond to at least 80% of the skills developed in the course.

Direct assessment results:

- SPEAKING: In AY 2018-2019, all of our students met or exceeded criteria for Interpersonal communication on the OPI (**100%**) and most students met or exceeded criteria for Intercultural competence on the OPI (**77.7%**), though narrowly missing the benchmark of 80%. In the area of

Presentational Communication in speaking (cultural presentation), **83.8%** of our students <u>met</u> or <u>exceeded</u> the criteria, but two presentations were deemed not ratable. Most students **(88.8%)** <u>met</u> or <u>exceeded</u> criteria for Intercultural competence in speaking (cultural presentation)**.**

- WRITING: In AY 2018-2019, most of our students <u>met</u> or <u>exceeded</u> criteria for Presentational communication in writing **(83.2%)** and Intercultural competence in writing **(88.8%).** In the area of Interpretive Communication in writing, **66.6%** of our students <u>met</u> or <u>exceeded</u> the criteria, which does not meet our benchmark of 80%.

Indirect assessment results:
The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures.
- In Fall 2018, students' response rate to the survey was 83.3% [= 10 students out of 12 in the class took the survey] and in Spring 2019, the response rate was also 83.3% [= 5 students out of 6 in the class took the survey]. In both semesters, students' perception of how much the German language Core requirement courses / first course in the German major or minor 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 responding to the survey <u>agreed</u> or <u>strongly agreed</u> that they significantly improved their skills in each area. Similarly, on the questions pertaining to culture, **98%** of the responding students <u>agreed</u> or <u>strongly agreed</u> 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.

Assessment findings:
This academic year is the first year that we did not meet the benchmark of 80% in a few areas of our assessment at this level, mostly because we ended up with a few "does not meet expectations" and even several "non-ratable" samples in the cultural presentation and cultural exploration papers at the GR 2010, intermediate low proficiency level. This does **not** reflect the students' inability to meet the expectation on those outcomes, but instead demonstrates the fact that our new assessment tools, the cultural presentation & the cultural exploration paper, were designed as too advanced a task for the intermediate low proficiency level. We are redesigning these assignments for AY 2019-2020 so that they will be at a task level representative of what students can master at the intermediate low proficiency level and with an assignment that is representative of intermediate low speaking and writing. Upon reflection of these assessment results, the German faculty had to acknowledge that these assignments were really more representative of intermediate mid and intermediate high proficiency tasks, but at the same time we can conclude that we have very strong students who in spite of the overly challenging tasks put before them, collectively missed the 80% benchmark only by a narrow margin. We believe that with revised and more level appropriate tasks, we will again meet and exceed the 80% benchmark in the future.
However, if we combine all 4 areas of assessment at this level into one overall percentage rating, our students did meet the benchmark of 80% in the area of speaking with **87.5%** and in the area of writing missed it by half a percentage point with **79.5%**, which again by combining the percentages in speaking, writing and intercultural skills gives us an overall **83.5%** meet or exceeds at the intermediate low proficiency level in all assessed outcomes. So overall we met the assessment expectations, but not in all categories and we will address this in our curriculum immediately.

GR 4960 – Assessed in Fall 2018 & Spring 2019 – Assessment Data

I. Speaking
Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation, Q&A, and Discussion
Outcomes assessed: presentational communication, intercultural competence, connections, and interpersonal communication
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale

Fall 2018

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
2 Students	**Speaking: Presentational Communication**	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	**Speaking: Intercultural competence**	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	**Speaking: Connections**	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	**Speaking: Interpersonal Communication**	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)

Spring 2019

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
1 Student	**Speaking: Presentational Communication**	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1 Student	**Speaking: Intercultural competence**	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
1 Student	**Speaking: Connections**	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
1 Student	**Speaking: Interpersonal Communication**	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

AY 2018-2019 Totals SPEAKING

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
3 Students	**Speaking: Presentational Communication**	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
3 Students	**Speaking: Intercultural competence**	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
3 Students	**Speaking: Connections**	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

3 Students	Speaking: Interpersonal Communication	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	

II. Writing
Assessment Tool: Senior Capstone Project paper
Outcomes assessed: Presentational communication, intercultural competence, interpretive communication, and connections
Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-High level on the ACTFL scale

Fall 2018

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
2 Students	Written: Presentational Communication	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	Written: Intercultural competence	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	Written: Interpretive Communication	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
2 Students	Written: Connections	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Spring 2019

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
1 Student	Written: Presentational Communication	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1 Student	Written: Intercultural competence	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
1 Student	Written: Interpretive Communication	0 (0%))	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
1 Student	Written: Connections	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)

AY 2018-2019 Totals WRITING

Total	Outcome assessed	Exceeds expected outcome	Meets expected outcome	Does not meet expected outcome
3 Students	Written: Presentational Communication	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

3 Students	Written: Intercultural competence	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.6%)	0 (0%)
3 Students	Written: Interpretive Communication	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)
3 Students	Written: Connections	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

Comments:
The assigned benchmark for meeting and exceeding criteria is 80%: students are required to show acquisition of speaking, writing and intercultural skills that correspond to at least 80% of the skills developed in the German Studies major curriculum.

Direct assessment results:
- In the AY 2018-2019, we had three students complete a B.A. in German (two graduated in May 2019, one will graduate next academic year as he needs to complete his coursework in his second major). All students (**100%** of students) met or exceeded the criteria for Presentational communication (spoken and written), Connections (spoken and written), Intercultural Competence (spoken and written), and Interpersonal communication (only assessed in spoken). **66.6%** of students met or exceeded the criteria for Interpretive Communication, which is only assessed in writing.

Indirect assessment results:
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 agreed or strongly agreed that they significantly improved in each skill area. On the questions pertaining to culture, **100%** of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they not only now understand and know more about the culture of the German-speaking countries, but also about how their own culture relates to those cultures. In addition, all students listed other disciplines (outside of their German major) to which content covered in their German courses related.

Assessment findings:
This year, 100% of the majors graduating with a German Studies major attained the expected ACTFL proficiency level of **intermediate high**, most of them exceeding the expectations in almost every area. All students progressed nicely throughout their coursework from lower levels of proficiency to either intermediate high or advanced low. All three students studied abroad in Germany for a semester during their B.A., which contributed to **their advanced low rating** (which **exceeds proficiency expectations**) in the language production areas presentational communication in speaking (**66.6%**) and writing (**100%**). The one "does not meet expectation" rating in interpretive communication in writing came about as the student hardly went beyond describing to analyzing, whether this was the result of lacking effort or truly not knowing the difference could not be determined.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

> The assessment data from AY 2018-2019 revealed, that two of our assessment tools at the GR 2010 level were not at the appropriate level for intermediate-low proficiency, and in fact at a higher proficiency level and we decided to revise these assignments for the appropriate

proficiency level.

The assessment data also revealed that we need to work even harder with students in GR 1010, 1020 and 2010 courses on linguistic intercultural competence skills, specifically formal vs. informal language, expressions and gestures of politeness and greetings, etc. American culture is much more casual than German culture is, both in cultural behavior and language, and this is one of the more difficult things to teach students and help them acquire as a skill set, especially since we are so far removed geographically from the German-speaking countries, so students do not see this in action in their daily lives.

The feedback from students on the exit surveys suggests, that they want courses with more cultural and contemporary content that goes beyond the more traditional topics of literature and the arts, to include topics that affect our societies today, such as the environment, political organization, the German speaking countries in the EU, in addition to more historical background on how these entities developed into modern culture. Students reported that the German faculty has started to implement some of these content areas already into existing and new courses and that they greatly appreciate our efforts, and that we listen to their suggestions and implement as is feasible. Several students mentioned that they wished that they could have taken the German Film course while they were students in the German Studies program. Unfortunately, because of the small size of the program, we only get to offer one 4xxx level course a semester and it takes us longer to rotate through our 4xxx-level courses; and the fact that several of our 4xxx level courses in recent semesters were cancelled due to low enrollments did not make this possible. The course is currently scheduled for Spring 2020.

The German Studies faculty also decided that we need to introduce an Oral Proficiency Interview at the GR 4960 level that assesses the student's speaking skills more broadly and not just in an area of expertise developed on the topic of the student's Senior Capstone Project or a 4xxx level seminar. The OPI will be added as an additional assessment tool in AY 2019-2020.

The feedback from Kathleen Thatcher prompted a revision of our outcomes to Learning Outcome Goals and the development of a program-level Assessment plan (in progress) in which LOGs are assessed at different points in the curriculum, thus allowing us to better measure student progress and learning.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

We did follow up and "closed the loop" on past assessment work. The AY 2018-2019 results **close the four-year cycle** that German Studies had begun with the initial implementation/test piloting of the new LLC OA plan in AY 2015-2016. Each year we revised either the assessment rubrics and/or curriculum and assessment tools.

Specifically in AY 2018-2019, because of our analysis of the assessment data from AY 2017-2018, Dr. Evelyn Meyer took the initiative to revise all assessment rubrics significantly. The German faculty, though primarily Drs. Evelyn Meyer and Evelyn Wisbey, worked on revising all assessment rubrics during the Fall 2018 semester meeting approximately on a bi-weekly basis throughout the fall to revise the Assessment Rubrics (for the German major and for non-Majors at 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, as we wanted to use them for the AY 2018-19 assessment cycle and not end up with two sets of rubrics by switching mid year. We decided to assess 4 outcomes at the GR 2010 level (speaking:

presentational & interpersonal communication, and intercultural competence; writing: presentational & interpretive communication and intercultural competence) and 5 outcomes at the GR 4960 level (speaking: presentational & interpersonal communication, connections and intercultural competence; writing: presentational & interpretive communication, connections and intercultural competence.) After a meeting with Kathleen Thatcher we were asked to develop actual Learning Outcome Goals (LOG) for German, and to revise our Assessment Plan accordingly to map in the curriculum at multiple points where these new LOGs will be assessed. Beginning in January 2019, Dr. Evelyn Meyer developed LOGs for the German major, which were discussed with the German Studies faculty and Kathleen Thatcher, who gave us important feedback on our new assessment rubrics, the Learning Outcome Goals—we have reduced them from our initial 12 to 8—and at which points in the curriculum we are doing assessment. Her biggest challenge to us was to revise our assessment plan from course-level assessment to actual program-level assessment and while doing assessment at the beginning of the coursework for the major (GR 2010) and at the end of the coursework (GR 4960) was a step into the right direction but not quite at the level of program-level assessment. She asked us to map our LOGs onto the curriculum at a greater variety of points throughout the curriculum in the German major. Dr. Evelyn Meyer proceeded to develop a curriculum map with our 6 LOGs and the assessment tools used, and she began revising the assessment rubrics to match this program-level assessment plan. This draft plan needs to be revised, as it can work in theory, but there are concerns if it could work in practice (see German Program Assessment Plan AY 2018-2019 for more detail). The revisions of this draft program-level assessment plan will continue into the AY 2019-2020 and new points of assessment in the curriculum will likely be implemented next year.

Next AY, we will begin 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 submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator 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:

RUBRIC REVISED AY 2018 – 2019

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 comple**x.

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:

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:

RUBRIC REVISED OCTOBER 2018