

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): German Studies

Department: Languages, Literatures & Cultures

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

College/School: CAS

Date (Month/Year): August 2021

Assessment Contact: Evelyn Meyer;  
evelyn.meyer@slu.edu

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 20-21

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 19-20

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

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

LOG 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects

**In GR 2010 (Fall 20 & Spring 21):**

LOG 1, 2, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low proficiency level

**In GR 3010 (Fall 20):**

LOG 2, 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low proficiency level

**In GR 3210 (Spring 21):**

LOG 3 & 4 – at the intermediate low to intermediate mid proficiency levels (see "comment" on p. 6 for explanation of range of proficiency in Spring as opposed to Fall 3xxx course)

**In GR 4500 (Fall 20):**

LOG 2 & 3 – at the intermediate mid proficiency level

**In GR 4250 (Spring 21):**

LOG 2, 4 & 5 – at the intermediate mid to intermediate high proficiency levels (see explanation in "Direct Measures" on p. 7 for explanation of range of proficiency in Spring as opposed to Fall 4xxx course)

**In GR 4960 (Spring 21):**

LOG 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 – at the intermediate high proficiency level

## 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

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

### In GR 2010 (Fall 2020 & Spring 2021):

- Oral Proficiency Interview: LOG 1
- Cultural Exploration Paper: LOG 2 & 3

### In GR 3010 (Fall 2020):

- Written multimedia portfolio: LOG 2, 3 & 4

### In GR 3210 (Spring 2021):

- Final Cultural Paper: LOG 3 & 4

### In GR 4500 (Fall 2020):

- Written portions of the final portfolio: LOG 2 & 3

### In GR 4250 (Spring 2021):

- Final Cultural Exploration Paper: LOG 2, 4 & 5

### In GR 4960 (Spring 2021):

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

All courses were taught in **hybrid mode** because of the Covid-19 pandemic, i.e., we had some students in person while others attended class simultaneously via Zoom, except for GR 2010 in Fall 2020, which was taught online synchronously.

## 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

### GR 2010 (first course that counts in the German Studies Major):

The two German faculty members assessed and filled out the rubrics for all students individually on the Cultural composition. We then met at the end of each semester and discussed our individual assessment findings and where we had assessed a student differently, we worked through this to come up with an overall assessment for each student. The two German faculty members do assessment of each student for the Oral Proficiency Interview, which is conducted in the presence of the course instructor, but the student is interviewed by another member of the German faculty. Both the course instructor and the interviewing faculty assess and fill out the rubrics for all students and we then discuss the individual assessment findings immediately after each interview and agree on the assessment finding if there are differences in the individual assessment between the two faculty. Students were given an exit survey (indirect measure).

### GR 3010/3210/4500/4250 (required or elective courses in the German Studies Major):

As these are level checks in the assessment plan, the course instructor selects the assessment artifact from the course assignments based on what we agreed to assess in these courses in our assessment plan, be that a written artifact or a spoken one and/or a proficiency interview. It is the course instructor who does the assessment of these artifacts after the end of the semester but may consult with the other German faculty member for input or a second opinion. Students were **not** given an exit survey (indirect measure).

**GR 4960 (Senior Capstone course taken in the final year):**

The two German faculty members assessed and filled out the rubrics for all students individually on the oral presentation and the final revised written paper of the Capstone project. We then met at the end of the semester and discussed our individual assessment findings and where we had assessed a student differently, we worked through this to come up with an overall assessment for each student. The two German faculty members do assessment of each student for the Oral Proficiency Interview, which is conducted in the presence of both faculty members, but the student is interviewed by only one member of the German faculty. Both the course instructor and the interviewing faculty assess and fill out the rubrics for all students and discuss the individual assessment findings immediately after each interview and agree on the assessment finding if there are differences in the individual assessment between the two faculty. Students were given an exit survey (indirect measure).

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

**4. Data/Results**

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The adopted benchmark is that 80% of the students need to meet or exceed the criteria of the Learning Outcome Goals assessed in the course at the stated proficiency level for that course.

All courses were taught on the St. Louis campus in hybrid mode, except for GR 2010 in Fall 2020, which was taught online synchronously.

**GR 2010 (Fall 2020 & Spring 2021)**

**Speaking – LOG 1:** “Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.”

**Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview**

**Skills assessed: interpersonal communication & intercultural competence**

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

Fall 2020

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
6	LOG 1: Interpersonal communication	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
6	LOG 1: Intercultural competence	1 (16.6%)	1 (16.6%)	1 (16.6%)	1 (16.6%)	2 (33.3%)

Spring 2021

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
6 *	LOG 1: Interpersonal communication	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	N/A

6*	LOG 1: Intercultural competence	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
----	---------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	--------	--------	---------

\* Course enrollment was 8, but two students did not show up for the OPI interview.

#### AY 2020-2021 Totals

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate high)	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
12	LOG 1: interpersonal Communication	5 (41.6%)	4 (33.4%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	N/A
12	LOG 1: Intercultural competence	2 (16.6%)	3 (25%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.6%)

#### Direct Measures:

As the data above shows, students met or exceeded expectations 100% in the interpersonal communication during the interview. However, in spoken intercultural competence only 50.1% of the students met or exceeded expectations. Only 8.3% of the students did not meet the expectation, but 41.6% of the students found linguistic ways around the features of formal language expected and therefore we had to classify those OPIs as not ratable in that area. We discussed this at length after doing these OPI interviews and will make students aware of the cultural implications that the language they used was not wrong and can certainly be understood by native speakers, but in terms of linguistic intercultural competence, they used American markers of politeness and formality, not German ones.

**Writing – LOG 2 & 3:** LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

#### Assessment Tool: Cultural Exploration Composition

**Outcomes assessed: Presentational communication, intercultural competence, interpretive communication, and connections**

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

Fall 2020

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
6	LOG 2: Presentational communication	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)*
6	LOG 3: Impact	4 (66.6%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	N/A

\* Too much external help; the writing could therefore not be rated as the student's exclusively own writing.

Spring 2021

Total students assessed *	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
7	LOG 2: Presentational communication	4 (57%)	2 (28.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.5%)**
7	LOG 3: Impact	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

\* Course enrollment was 8, but one student did not submit this assignment.

\*\* Too much external help; the writing could therefore not be rated as the student's exclusively own writing.

AY 2020-2021 Totals

Total students assessed *	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
13	LOG 2: Presentational communication	7 (53%)	4 (31%)	0 (0%)	2 (16%)
13	LOG 3: Impact	11 (84.5%)	2 (15.5%)	0 (0%)	N/A

**Direct Measures:**

As the data above shows, all students met or exceeded expectations in the area of written presentational communication and impact.

**Indirect assessment results for GR 2010:**

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

Students' response rate to the survey was 82.5% in the Fall and 75% in the Spring. Students' perception of how much the German language courses at SLU have helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In the four language production skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), **100%** of students agreed or strongly agreed that they significantly improved in listening, speaking and writing skill area, 83.5% in reading skills. 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.

**GR 3010 (Fall 2020)**

**Writing – LOG 2, 3 & 4:** LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

**Assessment Tool: Written multimedia portfolio**

**Outcomes assessed: Presentational communication, intercultural competence, Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-Low level on the ACTFL scale**

Fall 2020

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations (Intermediate mid)	Meets expectations (Intermediate low)	Does not meet expectations (Novice high)	Not ratable
4	LOG 2: Presentational communication	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4	LOG 3: Impact	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4	LOG 3: Comprehensibility	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4	LOG 4: Cultural knowledge	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

**Direct Measures:** All students exceeded expectations in the area of written presentational communication, impact, comprehensibility and cultural knowledge. This was the first time the redesigned curriculum for this course was taught; the results indicate that the course content and goals are well aligned with the assessment plan and expectations at this level.

To contextualize why all students exceeded expectations, the four students had exceptionally high proficiency skills for this level, which is why they all exceeded expectations. The fact that students got to choose a topic that they were really interested in and passionate about and worked on it all semester long as they created their multimedia newspaper portfolio is likely a strong contributing factor in these high results. We will check this against data in the future when the course is taught next (currently approximately every three semesters).

No indirect measure survey was administered.

### GR 3210 (Spring 2021)

**Writing – LOG 3 & 4:** LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners. LOG 4: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture from a variety of cross-cultural perspectives.

**Assessment Tool:** Final Cultural paper, written

**Outcomes assessed:** Presentational communication, intercultural competence

**Proficiency level assessed:** Intermediate-Low level to intermediate mid on the ACTFL scale based on how many courses taken at the 3xxx level (see comments below)

Spring 2021

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	How many 3xxx levels courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectation)	Not ratable
3 Students	LOG 3: Presentational communication	First 3xxx	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (66,6%)*
2 Students	LOG 3: Presentational communication	Second 3xxx	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
4 students	LOG 3: Presentational communication	Third 3xxx	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	N/A

9 students	LOG 3: Presentational communication	Combined totals	6 (66.7%)	1 (11,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.2%)
9 Students	LOG 4: Cultural knowledge & awareness	N/A	8 (88.9%)	1 (11,1%)	0 (0%)	N/A

\* Too much external help; the writing could therefore not be rated as the student's exclusively own writing.

**Comment:** We recently changed the curriculum in German Studies (currently being rolled out) and as part of that we also changed prerequisites. In the old curriculum students had to take seven courses from GR 1010 up to GR 3250 in sequence, so it was logical to track development of proficiency skills in that sequential manner as well. In the new curriculum, a student can take any GR 3xxx course upon completion of GR 2010, and upon completion of one GR 3xxx course, they can enroll in any of the GR 4xxx level courses (except the Senior Capstone course). After our discussion of assessment results at the end of the Fall semester, we revised the expectations based on how many courses a student had taken in the curriculum, as proficiency is developed over time, not necessarily by the order in which courses are taken. Therefore, we are now tracking how many 3xxx (and 4xxx level) courses a student has taken and are aligning what meets and exceeds expectations accordingly. Therefore, as stated on the rubric, if it is the student's first 3xxx level course, intermediate low proficiency meets the expectation and intermediate mid exceeds it; if it is the student's second 3xxx level course, checkmarks should appear in both the intermediate low and mid proficiency categories to meet expectations, but if all are at the intermediate mid, they exceed expectations; if it is the student's third 3xxx level course, intermediate mid proficiency meets expectations and intermediate high exceeds expectations.

**Direct Measures:** This was a new course (combining the previous two-semester cultural history sequence into a one semester course) and taught for the first time. The cultural history course is always an adjustment to students as it is the first truly content focused course after several courses that focus primarily on language skill development with contemporary culture included. This was the first time in the new German Studies curriculum that some students enrolled in cultural history having only completed GR 2010, and for them the first time they were in a German class with students that had significantly higher levels of German proficiency. While we assured them that they are not expected to perform at the higher proficiency levels of other students and shouldn't be intimidated by that, instead be inspired by them, some in the group of "first 3xxx level course" tried to work at levels well above them and resorted to the use of external help that is not acceptable. Therefore, the language on the assessment artefact had to be deemed not ratable, resulting in overall narrowly missing our benchmark expectation in that one area of presentational communication LOG 3 at 77,8%. All students met or exceeded expectations in the area of cultural knowledge.

No indirect measure survey was administered.

### GR 4500 Medieval Elective (Fall 20):

**Writing – LOG 2 & 3:** LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

#### Assessment Tool: Written portions of the final portfolio

**Skills assessed: presentational communication**

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

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

14	LOG 2: Presentational communication	4 (28.5%)	6 (43%)	4 (28.5%)	0 (0%)	N/A
14	LOG 3: Presentational communication	4 (28.5%)	4 (28.5%)	6 (43%)	0 (0%)	N/A

**Direct Measures:** All students met or exceeded expectations in the area of written presentational communication.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

### GR 4250 Language Skills Elective (Spring 21)

**Writing – LOG 2, 4 & 5:** LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

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

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

**Assessment Tool: Final Cultural Exploration Paper**

**Skills assessed: presentational communication, language proficiency (LOG 2), intercultural competence/Analysis (LOG 4), and connections (LOG 5)**

**Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale**

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	How many 4xxx level courses	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Not ratable
2	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	first 4xxx	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
5	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	second 4xxx	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	third 4xxx	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	fourth or more 4xxx	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10	LOG 2: Presentational Communication	Combined totals	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10	LOG4: Intercultural Analysis	N/A	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
10	LOG 5: Connections	N/A	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

**Direct Measures:** As explained in the comments for GR 3210, starting in the Spring semester we are now tracking how many GR 4xxx level courses a student has completed and are aligning proficiency expectations accordingly to track the natural proficiency development irrespective of course number. Therefore, as stated on the rubric, if it is the students'



first 4xxx level course, intermediate mid proficiency meets the expectation; if it is the students' second or third 4xxx level course, checkmarks should appear in both the intermediate mid and high proficiency categories to meet expectations; if it is the students' fourth or more 4xxx level course, intermediate high proficiency meets expectations. As would be expected, the more GR 4xxx level courses a student has completed, the more students exceed expectations. Overall, all students met or exceeded expectations in written presentational communication, intercultural analysis and connections.

No indirect measures survey was administered.

**GR 4960 German Senior Capstone (Spring 21):**

**Speaking – LOG 1, 3, 4 & 5:** LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

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

**Assessment Tool: Oral Presentation of the Senior Capstone project**

**Skills assessed: presentational communication, language proficiency (LOG 1 & 3), intercultural competence-oral mode (LOG 4), and connections (LOG 5), Interpersonal communication-oral mode (LOG 3)**

**Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale**

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Not ratable
2	LOG 1 & 3: Presentational Communication, oral mode	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 4: Intercultural Competence	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
2	LOG 5: Connections	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 3: Interpersonal Communication	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

**Direct Measures:** All students (100%) met or exceeded expectations in presentational communication (oral mode), Connections and Interpersonal communication. In the area of intercultural competence (content), 1 student (50%) met the expectation; the other student chose a historical linguistic topic that did not lend itself easily to intercultural comparison and analysis, even though the student was given suggestions on how to include this into the project but chose not to do so. Therefore, we decided to rate this as not ratable.

**Writing – LOG 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6:** LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

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

LOG 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

**Assessment Tool: Written Senior Capstone project (final, revised version)**

**Skills assessed: presentational communication, language proficiency (LOG 1 & 3), intercultural competence (LOG 4), and connections (LOG 5), Interpretive communication (LOG 4)**

**Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale**

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Not ratable
2	LOG 2: Presentational Communication, written mode	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 3: Presentational Communication, written mode	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 6: Presentational Communication, written mode	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
2	LOG 4: Intercultural Competence	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
2	LOG 4 & 5: Interpretive Communication	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
2	LOG 5: Connections	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

**Direct Measures:** All students (100%) met or exceeded expectations in presentational communication (written mode, LOG 2 & 3), Connections and Interpersonal communication. In the area of intercultural competence (content) and interpretive communication, 1 student (50%) met the expectation; the other student chose a historical linguistic topic that did not lend itself easily to intercultural comparison and analysis, even though the student was given suggestions on how to include this into the project but chose not to do so. Therefore, we decided to rate this as not ratable. In the presentational communication LOG 6 (use and integration of German academic sources), 1 student exceeded expectations, the other student did not meet expectations because most sources were in English and not in German. In terms of finding adequate sources and integrating the information from the sources into the paper, the student met expectations, but not in the area of using German language sources.

**Speaking – LOG 1:** LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

**Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)**

**Skills assessed: Interpersonal communication, linguistic intercultural competence-oral mode (LOG 1)**

**Proficiency level assessed: Intermediate-mid to intermediate high level on the ACTFL scale**

Total students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Not ratable
1*	LOG 1: Interpersonal communication	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1*	LOG 1: Linguistic intercultural competence	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

\* The OPI is a non-graded but required proficiency interview to assess the student's speaking ability more broadly. 1 student asked to postpone the OPI to the following semester to allow them to improve their speaking skills in their final semester of study. That OPI will be conducted during the Fall 2021 semester.

**Comment:** The OPI is a new assessment artifact that we added to the GR 4960 assessment plan, as we felt we needed to assess the student's speaking ability broadly at the intermediate-high level and not just with the presentation of a highly specialized topic of their capstone project.

**Direct Measures:** The student assessed in this area met expectations.

**Indirect assessment results for GR 4960:**

The exit survey corroborates the positive outcomes from the direct assessment measures. Students' response rate to the survey was 100%. Students' perception of how much the German language courses at SLU have helped them substantially improve their language skills was very high. In all four language production skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), **100%** of students strongly agreed that they significantly improved in the skill area, **100%** of the students strongly agreed that they not only now understand and know more about the culture of the German-speaking countries, but also about how their own culture relates to those cultures. 100% of the students reported that they could connect their German Studies to other disciplines, and specifically mentioned Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Pharmacy, Philosophy, Theology, History, and French.

**5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

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

In general, the data tells us that

- Overall, we are doing very well, and our curriculum teaches students well in terms of the learning outcome goals we have set.
- Rolling out the new assessment plan from one that had only assessed the entry (GR 2010) and exit (GR 4960) points in the German Studies major, to one that has pre- and level checks throughout all courses in the curriculum that is aligned with ACTFL proficiency levels is set up correctly and tracks students' progress well and gives us good data.
- Adjusting our assessment to track in the pre/ level checks in the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses how many courses a student has taken in German and aligning that with variable proficiency levels and what counts as (not) meeting and exceeding expectations gives us much better data and a more reliable way to track their progress throughout the curriculum.
- That our goals and rubrics work well for spoken and written presentational, interpersonal and interpretive communication, as well as for connections.
- That we need to work on intercultural competence in the area of developing student skills especially in the lower levels and primarily in speaking and speaking in formal settings, but it is a difficult skill to acquire and takes time and students develop these more slowly.
- That we need to work on our rubrics for intercultural competence and separate linguistic intercultural competence (spoken/written) assessment from content intercultural competence and in the latter define expectations more clearly for each level, just as we did with spoken and written skills' development. This will result in LOG 4 being split into a LOG 4A (linguistic intercultural competence) and a LOG 4B (content intercultural competence), something we already have in our rubrics, and the development of a clear

curricular mapping for what we can realistically expect in the area of content intercultural competence at the different levels, i.e., when is describing cultural differences enough, how to develop true analysis of cultural differences and how to align this with proficiency levels and our curriculum that is also undergoing a lot of course redesign, i.e., this is ongoing and in need of refinement.

Course specific interpretation of results (direct and indirect measures) was added below the statistics in section 4 of this report for each course and LOG assessed in a given course.

## 6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

### A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The German faculty meets each semester that GR 2010 and GR 4960 are taught as we do assessment together on the artefacts of those courses. In these meetings we primarily focus on assessment results of those courses, but we always discuss assessment holistically then as well and discuss changes. In several of the rubrics, we improved the wording when distinctions between the descriptors for the different proficiency levels were not clear to us (anymore) and at the same time discussed what students can realistically be expected to do at that level. As we are rolling out the assessment plan to include assessment in the GR 3xxx and 4xxx level courses, this year (after our Fall 2020 assessment discussion), we noticed that we had not built into it a system that tracks where a student is in the curriculum i.e., how many 3xxx or 4xxx level courses they had taken and aligned that with the proficiency that can be expected from a student. Simply because students are in the same class, with our limited course offering due to being understaffed, for some it was their first course after GR 2010, for others it was their 7<sup>th</sup> course after taking GR 2010 and in terms of foreign language proficiency, we need to expect different levels of proficiency and competency towards achieving the proficiency levels stated in the LOGs for German majors. After our conversation in December 2020, we revised the assessment plan and now our rubrics for the 3xxx and 4xxx level courses (except for GR 4960, German Senior capstone) state different proficiency expectations that meet, do not meet, and exceed expectations based on where students are in the curriculum. This gives us more nuanced data, and therefore better data based on where students are in the curriculum. We implemented this in our Spring 2021 assessment.

The German faculty again met after the end of the Spring 2021 semester, initially to discuss the GR 2010 and GR 4960 assessment artifacts, since we assess those together. Then the German program coordinator collected the assessment done by each professor in their respective 3xxx and 4xxx level courses and compiled the data and statistics for the entire year presented in this report. The report was then shared with the German faculty, and we had several meetings in August to discuss assessment findings and this report. We also talked about curricular improvements as well as changes to our assessment plan for the AY 21-22 during these meetings that are the result of our assessment findings (see below).

### B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

#### Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

#### Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

#### Changes to curriculum:

- We will work more on helping our students understand the different linguistic cultural markers of formal language in German in the lower-level courses, as that is where many did not do as well as they could have as emerged in the data presented above. However, we believe that the hybrid or online

synchronous teaching modalities of the COVID-19 pandemic also played into these results, because the percentage of non-ratable language on OPIs in the area of intercultural competence was much higher than it had been prior to the start of the pandemic. Discussion based courses were more challenging to manage under pandemic conditions and everything took much longer in the class which left significantly less time for practice or discussion of such cultural differences. But we will continue to monitor these results.

- Once we clearly define the progression of and expectations for content intercultural competencies (separated from linguistic intercultural competence) and align them with assignments in the 3xx and 4xx level courses, it will be easier to track and assess that skill set. It is solid at both the GR 2010 and at the GR 4960 levels because we have assessed it there for a long time and refined it, but the assessment in the interim courses is new and therefore naturally not as “mature” yet as it could be. We will continue to work on this as courses are offered and redesigned. Our students are achieving the LOGs, but our assessment rubrics need refining and then mapped back onto our curriculum.

Changes to the Assessment Plan:

- Continued refinement of wording in existing assessment rubrics.
- LOG 4 that deals with intercultural competence will be split into a LOG 4A (linguistic intercultural competence) and a LOG 4B (content intercultural competence) and our existing rubrics that contain both competencies will be separated to align with these related but different skills.
- We will define clear goals for developing the new LOG 4B throughout our curriculum that aligns with what students can realistically be expected to do in alignment with their linguistic proficiency level and map that onto our curriculum, while we are redesigning many of the courses at the same time.
- We are **considering** presenting the data (section 4 of this report) differently in the future. While the current data presentation arranged by courses and the LOGs assessed in them works for us, as it follows ACTFL best practices of competencies such as presentational, interpersonal, intercultural communications, etc., and that is how the departmental assessment plan was developed before the LOGs were created which we then mapped onto these proficiency-based competencies, we are considering reporting the data by LOGs and then listing the courses and assessment tools used to assess it at all levels in the German curriculum, thus following the curriculum map we created with the LOGs indicating where an LOG is introduced, developed and mastered in our curriculum.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

## 7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

1. In all courses, we are giving the development of intercultural competencies more time and space to teach these skills more meaningfully and more in depth and overall. Students are doing very well in the area of content intercultural competence as our results have shown, especially once they move beyond the lower level (language) courses. With increased linguistic proficiency it becomes easier to tackle more complex content and analysis as well.

2. We have developed a full program level assessment plan in the last three years and have implemented or rolled it out for the past two years. It has a much more diverse set of artifacts built in and a good variety of which LOG we assess in which course. Our curriculum also allows us to group our LOGs for assessment in many different ways and this flexibility allows us to match the LOGs in the assessment plan to our redesigned curriculum easily and effectively.

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

1. It is assessed in the same manner as before.

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

**C. What were the findings of the assessment?**

1. It is quite noticeable that the percentage rate of students meeting and exceeding these skills is continually increasing as a result of us working more intentionally on developing all competencies (presentational, interpretive, interpersonal communications; intercultural competencies; academic competencies in the area of research in general and working with academic sources, going from describing to analyzing cultural practices) throughout the entire curriculum and that the scaffolding of introducing, developing and mastering these skill sets as determined on our curriculum map really helped us see the big picture and not just focus on what happens in an individual course.

2. In this second year of rolling out the revised assessment plan, in which we added assessment at two 4xxx – level courses and two newly designed 3xxx level courses, we had to make adjustments in the course-level assessments because of our change of prerequisites in the German Studies degree, that I described above, which necessitated a way to track how many courses a student had taken to know what proficiency level they were at and that students in the same class had to be assessed at different proficiency levels. We had noticed that last year at the 4xxx level, but it was something we needed to do at the 3xxx level as well in order to get reliable assessment data. Because of the uncertainties of the Fall 2020 semester on account of the pandemic we forgot to implement this in our Fall 2020 assessment, but then remembered it and included it in our Spring 2021 assessment. The rubrics now reflect that more nuanced proficiency level-based assessment and we will do our assessment that way from now on.

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

As stated in C.2.: Our conversations about our assessment findings this year confirmed what we found last year, that noting for each student if it is their first, second, third, etc. 3xxx or 4xxx level course in the program matters to better know where they are at and what proficiency level they are expected to function at. We also confirmed for ourselves that we can use the same rubrics because they are aligned with ACTFL proficiency levels. By defining ACTFL proficiency expectations based on time studying the language we can assess students who are in the same class but are at different proficiency levels in a way that does not assess more advanced students at too low a level and those who are at a lower proficiency level won't "not meet" expectations they cannot yet meet. We had to make these adjustments because of the program being understaffed and not being able to offer enough courses that would separate student groupings based more closely on their proficiency levels. We will monitor our assessment results going forward to see if we will continue to get improved and more reliable data that way.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.**

**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.
- Speaks fluently (not haltingly) on the tasks presented to them.
- 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.

**LEARNING OUTCOME GOALS ASSESSED:**

This is the first course that counts towards the German Major or Minor. We are not assessing the Proficiency Skill expected of majors (Intermediate High), but at the Intermediate Low proficiency level, which is appropriate for GR 2010.

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.



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

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Interpersonal Communication**

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

COMMENTS:

**B. Intercultural Competence-Speaking:**

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

	Intermediate High <b>Exceeds expectation</b>	Intermediate Mid <b>Exceeds expectation</b>	Intermediate Low <b>Meets expectations</b>	Novice High <b>Does not meet expectations</b>
<b>Communicative Task &amp; Accuracy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>consistently uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>consistently responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>consistently responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>consistently initiates</b> them appropriately him/herself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>often uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>often responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>often responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>often initiates</b> them appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>occasionally uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>sometimes responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>sometimes responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>sometimes initiates</b> them appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> May use <b>some memorized gestures and formulaic expressions</b> (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: Final Composition of semester**

- **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 identifies 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.

LEARNING OUTCOME GOALS ASSESSED:

This is the first course that counts towards the German Major or Minor. We are not assessing the Proficiency Skill expected of majors (Intermediate High), but at the Intermediate Low proficiency level, which is appropriate for GR 2010.

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

**GR 2010: Presentational Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate Low**  
**Assessment Tool: Final Composition of semester**

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Presentational Communication: LOG 2 & 3**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate Mid	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High
<b>Composition Mechanics</b> Requirements: In German & at least 450 words	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is <b>significantly more</b> than 500 words.	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is <b>at least</b> 450 words long.	<input type="checkbox"/> Composition is <b>less than</b> 450 words.
<b>Language Function LOG 2</b> Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense with none to few errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in present tense though there may be errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Has no real functional ability.</b>
<b>Text Type LOG 2</b> follows standard academic writing conventions; quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>mostly connected sentences</b> with <b>some complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>simple sentences</b> and <b>some strings</b> of sentences. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions <b>to a good degree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>some simple sentences</b> and <b>memorized phrases</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>does not follow</b> standard academic writing conventions
<b>Language Control LOG 2</b> Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	<input type="checkbox"/> There are <b>few or minimal</b> spelling, grammar, or syntax errors <b>per page</b> in <b>those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can control</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> There are <b>more than just a minimal number</b> of spelling, grammar, or syntax errors <b>per page</b> in <b>those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can control</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> There are <b>numerous</b> spelling, grammar, or syntax <b>errors throughout the essay</b> in those areas a student with intermediate low proficiency can be expected to control.
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, <b>although additional effort may be required</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>understood with occasional difficulty</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>additional effort may be required</b> .
<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written <b>in a clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>originality and rich details</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written <b>in a clear and organized manner</b> , e.g. <b>may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>some</b> detail in arguments.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper may be <b>either unclear or unorganized</b> , e.g. is poorly organized overall, or <b>introduction and conclusion may be missing</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>little or no</b> detail.

**B. Intercultural Competence – Cultural Composition LOG 4**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness LOG 4</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Describes differences</b> between own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a <b>strong understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Draws <b>more detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Response <b>includes</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported <b>with appropriate examples</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Describes differences</b> between own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Begins to draw constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Response <b>includes some</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported <b>with some examples</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Describes few or no differences</b> between own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>little or inadequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by <b>minimally or not showing</b> awareness of cultural practices and institutions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Does not draw constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Response <b>is missing</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> If viewpoints and interpretations are included, <b>they are unsupported.</b></li> </ul>

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

**COMMENTS:**

GR 3010

**LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.**

**LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.**

**LOG 4B: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture and present it with rich detail.**

Proficiency Level Assessed: A. first 3xxx course: Intermediate Low; B. second 3xxx course: Intermediate Low/Mid; C. third 3xxx course: Intermediate Mid

Assessment Artifact: Written Multi-Media Portfolio

**A. Presentational Communication: LOG 2 & 3**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations - High Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High Proficiency Level
<p><b>Language Function LOG 2</b> Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with <b>recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in <b>present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Is able to <b>express personal meaning only in a basic way.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>comfortably only in present tense</b> and limited use of other time frames.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Has no real functional ability</b>
<p><b>Text Type LOG 2</b> Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences with complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and a <b>higher degree of paragraph-like discourse</b> than at intermediate mid level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.	<input type="checkbox"/> Only uses <b>simple sentences and some strings</b> of sentences	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>some simple sentences and memorized phrases.</b>
<p><b>Language Control LOG 2</b> Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity of Intermediate-level language</b> , e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quality of Intermediate-level language.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when <b>attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity of Intermediate-level language</b> , e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quality of Intermediate-mid level language.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>most accurate</b> when producing <b>simple sentences in present time.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy decreases as <b>language becomes more complex.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>most accurate</b> with <b>memorized language, including phrases.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy decreases when <b>creating and trying to express personal meaning.</b>

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations - High Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High Proficiency Level
	<b>becomes more complex.</b>	<b>complex.</b>		
<b>Text Type LOG 3</b> follows standard academic presentation conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, including <b>referencing sources in presentation and listing them.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, <b>including listing sources.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, but lists <b>no sources.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions to a <b>good degree</b> , but lists <b>no sources.</b>
<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a <b>clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and demonstrates <b>some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a <b>clear and organized manner.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and <b>may demonstrate some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents <b>mostly or not</b> in a clear and organized manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>may</b> feature <b>some detail &amp; appropriate visuals.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>may be either unclear or unorganized,</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>features little or no detail. Visuals may be lacking</b> or missing entirely.
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, <b>although additional effort may be required.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>understood with occasional difficulty</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although <b>additional effort may be required.</b>

### B. Intercultural Competence – LOG 4B

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations - High Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High Proficiency Level
<b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>an adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> Does <b>not always</b> demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture, or <b>awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>little or inadequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by minimally or not showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions

Comments:

RUBRIC Created January 2021



**LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.**

**LOG 4B: Graduates will be able to investigate the target culture and present it with rich detail.**

**Proficiency Level Assessed:**

- A. first 3xxx course: Intermediate Low**
- B. second 3xxx course: Intermediate Low/Mid**
- C. third 3xxx course: Intermediate Mid**

**Assessment Artifact: Final Essay in semester OR Final Exam Cultural Paper**

**A. Presentational Communication: LOG 3**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations Intermediate High Proficiency Level</b>	<b>Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level</b>	<b>Meets Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High Proficiency Level</b>
<b>Text Type LOG 3</b> follows standard academic paper conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, including <b>referencing sources in Paper and listing them.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, <b>including listing sources.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions, but lists <b>no sources.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic conventions <b>to a good degree</b> , but lists <b>no sources.</b>
<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization, and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a <b>clear and organized manner with some recognizable logical transitions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and demonstrates <b>some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a <b>clear and organized manner.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and <b>may demonstrate some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents <b>mostly or not</b> in a clear and organized manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>may</b> feature <b>some detail &amp; appropriate visuals.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>may be either unclear or unorganized,</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>features little or no detail. Visuals may be lacking</b> or missing entirely.
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, <b>although additional effort may be required.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>understood with occasional difficulty</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>additional effort may be required.</b>

**B. Intercultural Competence – LOG 4B**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations - High Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Novice High Proficiency Level
<p><b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>an adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Does <b>not always</b> demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture, or <b>awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>little or inadequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by minimally or not showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</p>

**Comments:**

**Assessment Done in Medieval Courses (GR 4500, GR 4550, GR 4600, GR 4650)**

**LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in written German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.**

**Assessment Tool: Written Responses on the final project**

**This is the student's FIRST / SECOND / THIRD / \_\_\_\_\_ GR 4xxx level course. If first intermediate mid proficiency meets expectation, if second or third intermediate mid with some check marks in intermediate high, if fourth or more, intermediate high proficiency is expected. Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Presentational Communication—Written Mode**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) Advanced Low Proficiency level	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) Intermediate High Proficiency Level	Meets Expectations Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Low Proficiency Level
<p><b>Language Function LOG 2</b> Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with good detail.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>in all major time frames, but not always consistently.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail with <b>recognizable attempts at some complicated writing tasks.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Creates with language only by combining and recombining known elements</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is able to <b>express personal meaning only in a basic way.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>comfortably only in present tense</b> and limited use of other time frames.</p>
<p><b>Text Type LOG 2</b> quantity and organization of language discourse</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences</b>, frequently at <b>paragraph length</b>, and <b>some extended discourse.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences</b> with <b>complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and a <b>higher degree of paragraph-like discourse</b> than at intermediate mid level.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>mostly connected sentences</b> with <b>some complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Only uses simple sentences</b> and <b>some strings</b> of sentences.</p>
<p><b>Language Control LOG 2</b> Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Generally able to write <b>accurately &amp; fluently at the advanced level</b>, e.g. some use of subjunctive and passive voice, but <b>some linguistic difficulty</b> may occur as <b>more complex tasks are attempted.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language</b>, e.g. <b>broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct, and a variety of other grammatical structures.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as writing becomes more complex.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language</b>, e.g. <b>more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as writing becomes more complex.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing, vocabulary and syntax <b>are strongly influenced by the native language.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates limited quantity and lower quality of intermediate high-level language.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy of writing decreases as <b>language becomes more complex.</b></p>

**LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.**

**A. Presentational Communication—Written Mode**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) <b>Advanced Low Proficiency level</b>	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) <b>Intermediate High Proficiency Level</b>	Meets Expectations <b>Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations <b>Intermediate Low Proficiency Level</b>
<b>Text Type LOG 3</b> follows standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions, including in the bibliography.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions to a <b>good degree</b> .
<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner with logical transitions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper <b>illustrates originality and rich details</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are <b>some recognizable logical transitions</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and demonstrate <b>some originality</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and <b>may demonstrate some originality</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written <b>mostly or not in a clear and organized manner</b> , e.g. <b>may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>some detail</b> in arguments.
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although minimal <b>interference from another language</b> may occur	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, <b>although additional effort may be required</b> .

**Assessment in Language Skills Course (GR 4010, GR 4250, GR 4750)**

**LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in spoken German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.**

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

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

**Assessment Tool: Written (final) Paper**

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

This is the student's **FIRST / SECOND / THIRD / \_\_\_\_\_** GR 4xxx level course. If first intermediate mid proficiency meets expectation, if second or third intermediate mid with some check marks in intermediate high, if fourth or more, intermediate high proficiency is expected.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Presentational Communication—Written Moden LOG 2**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations (Exceeds Expectation upon completion of German major) <b>Advanced Low Proficiency level</b>	Exceeds Expectations (Desired Expectation upon completion of German major) <b>Intermediate High Proficiency Level</b>	Meets Expectations <b>Intermediate Mid Proficiency Level</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations <b>Intermediate Low Proficiency Level</b>
<b>Text Type</b> follows standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions, including in the bibliography.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions to a <b>good degree</b> .
<b>Impact</b> Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner with logical transitions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper <b>illustrates originality and rich details</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are <b>some recognizable logical transitions</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and demonstrate <b>some originality</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and <b>may demonstrate some originality</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written <b>mostly or not in a clear and organized manner</b> , e.g. <b>may have an introduction, body and conclusion, or parts thereof</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Paper features <b>some detail</b> in arguments.
<b>Comprehensibility</b> Who can understand this person's writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although minimal <b>interference from another language</b> may occur	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>accustomed</b> to the writing of non-natives, <b>although additional effort may be required</b> .

Comments:

**B. Intercultural Competence/Analysis – LOG 4**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Analyzes distinctions</b> between own and target culture, and <b>draws appropriate conclusions.</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>a strong understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by <b>providing rich detail</b> and by showing <b>deep awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Makes distinctions</b> between own and target culture, that go beyond mere descriptions of differences</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>an adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Only describes differences</b> between own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>May begin to draw constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Does <b>not always</b> demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture, or <b>awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions</li> </ul>

Comments:

**C. Connections – LOG 5**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p>Sees/Makes connections across disciplines and perspectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Meaningfully synthesizes and draws conclusions by combining examples and facts</b> from language learning with another field of study or perspective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Effectively develops and/or connects examples and facts</b> from language learning to another field of study or perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Acknowledges and/or identifies</b> that there are <b>connections</b> between language learning to another field of study or perspective, but <b>does not necessarily develop meaningful examples or connections.</b></li> </ul>

Comments:

**GR 4960: Interpersonal Communication & Intercultural Competence Assessment Rubric—Proficiency Level: Intermediate high**  
**Assessment Tool: Oral Proficiency Interview**

- **ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012-Speaking:**

- **Speaking proficiency in German at least at the Intermediate-high Proficiency on the ACTFL scale:**

“Intermediate High speakers are able to converse with ease and confidence when dealing with the routine tasks and social situations of the Intermediate level. They are able to handle successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information related to their work, school, recreation, particular interests, and areas of competence.

Intermediate High speakers can handle a substantial number of tasks associated with the Advanced level, but they are unable to sustain performance of all of these tasks all of the time. Intermediate High speakers can narrate and describe in all major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length, but not all the time. Typically, when Intermediate High speakers attempt to perform Advanced-level tasks, their speech exhibits one or more features of breakdown, such as the failure to carry out fully the narration or description in the appropriate major time frame, an inability to maintain paragraph-length discourse, or a reduction in breadth and appropriateness of vocabulary.

Intermediate High speakers can generally be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident (e.g., use of code-switching, false cognates, literal translations), and a pattern of gaps in communication may occur.”

- **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.

**LEARNING OUTCOME GOALS ASSESSED:**

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate High

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.



**A. Interpersonal Communication LOG 1**

	<b>Exceeds expectation Advanced Low</b>	<b>Meets expectation Intermediate High</b>	<b>Does not meet expectations Intermediate Mid</b>	<b>Does not meet expectations Intermediate Low</b>
<b>Communicative Task</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Able to narrate in all time frames (Past, present and future) <input type="checkbox"/> Talks in details <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently uses complex sentences and not just simple sentences <input type="checkbox"/> Speaks in paragraph-length discourse	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate mid skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Present tense well <input type="checkbox"/> Past tense inconsistent <input type="checkbox"/> Talks in generalities, not details <input type="checkbox"/> Often a series of simple sentences	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate low skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Simple face-to-face conversations <input type="checkbox"/> Asks simple questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to simple questions <input type="checkbox"/> Simple descriptions	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>novice high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Simple conversation, reactive <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally initiates <input type="checkbox"/> Describes in a simple way
<b>Context Content Areas</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Performs well in formal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: informal and some formal conversations on topics related to school, home, and leisure activities, as well as some topics related to employment, current events, and matters of public and community interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate mid skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Performs in limited formal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: personal activities and immediate surroundings, some ability about areas of general interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate low skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Operates in informal settings <input type="checkbox"/> Topics: self, family members, leisure activities and immediate surroundings	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>novice high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Functions in <b>informal situations minimally</b>
<b>Accuracy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Understood by NS unaccustomed to</b> dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence level discourse <b>with connectors</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate mid skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Usually understood by NS unaccustomed to</b> dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence level discourse <b>with some connectors</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>intermediate low skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Understood by NS accustomed to</b> dealing with NNS <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Sentence level discourse</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student also shows mastery of <b>novice high skills</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Repetition, <b>understood by sympathetic listeners</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Word level discourse with <b>some attempt at sentences</b>

<b>Linguistic Intercultural Competence</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently</b> uses Sie vs. du appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently</b> responds appropriately to formal vs. informal situations. <b>AND</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently</b> responds appropriately to polite expressions. <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently</b> initiates polite expressions appropriately him/herself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>consistently uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>consistently responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>consistently responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>consistently initiates</b> them appropriately him/herself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>often uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>often responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>often responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>often initiates</b> them appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>occasionally uses</b> these forms appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes the distinction between Sie vs. du & <b>sometimes responds</b> appropriately. <b>AND/OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expressions and <b>sometimes responds</b> appropriately. <input type="checkbox"/> Recognizes polite expression and <b>sometimes initiates</b> them appropriately.
--	---	--	--	---

**COMMENTS ON STUDENT'S OPI:**

**LEARNING OUTCOME GOALS ASSESSED:**

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate High

LOG 1: Graduates will be able to communicate in **spoken** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

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

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Presentational Communication—Oral Mode LOG 1 & 3**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Advanced Low	Meets Expectations Intermediate High	Does NOT Meet Expectations Intermediate Mid
<b>Language Function LOG 1</b> Language tasks the speaker is able to handle in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully some complicated tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with good detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in all major time frames</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully all uncomplicated tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail, with <b>recognizable attempts at some complicated tasks</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in present tense and one or more major time frames</b> . <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>in present tense and one or more major time frames, although not consistently</b> .
<b>Language Control LOG 1</b> Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently &amp; correctly</b> demonstrates high quantity and quality of <b>intermediate-level language</b> and <b>some features of advance level language</b> , e.g. consistently using past tense, and some use of subjunctive or passive. <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Generally</b> able to speak <b>accurately and fluently</b> , but <b>some linguistic difficulty</b> may occur as <b>more complex tasks are attempted</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity of Intermediate-level language</b> , e.g. broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quality of Intermediate-level language</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decreases when <b>attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as language becomes more complex</b> . <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity of Intermediate-level language</b> , e.g. broad vocabulary, a variety of grammatical structures. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quality of Intermediate-mid level language</b> . <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as language becomes more complex</b> .
<b>Text Type LOG 1</b> Quantity and organization of language discourse (continuum: word - phrase - sentence - connected sentences - paragraph - extended discourse)	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences</b> , frequently at <b>paragraph length</b> , and <b>some extended discourse</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences with complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and a <b>higher degree of paragraph-like discourse</b> than at intermediate mid level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.

<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner <b>with logical transitions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <b>illustrates originality and rich details.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner <b>with some recognizable logical transitions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and demonstrates <b>some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents in a clear and organized manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation features <b>good detail &amp; good visuals</b> , and <b>may</b> demonstrate <b>some originality.</b>
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although minimal <b>interference from another language</b> may occur.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Is generally <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the speaking of non-natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.</b>

COMMENTS:

**B. Intercultural Competence – Oral Mode LOG 4A**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Advanced Low	Meets Expectations Intermediate High	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Mid
<b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Analyzes distinctions</b> between own and target culture, and <b>draws appropriate conclusions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>a strong understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by <b>providing rich detail</b> and by showing <b>deep awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Makes distinctions</b> between own and target culture and goes beyond <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>an adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Describes differences</b> between own and target culture <b>and includes some distinctions</b> between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Draws constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions

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

COMMENTS:

**C. Connections – Oral Mode LOG 5**

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

COMMENTS:

**D. Interpersonal Communication – Oral Mode LOG 3**

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

COMMENTS:

**LEARNING OUTCOME GOALS ASSESSED:**

Proficiency Level Assessed: Intermediate High

LOG 2: Graduates will be able to communicate in **written** German at least at the level of Intermediate-High proficiency according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ACTFL.

LOG 3: Graduates will be able to present their research in a clear and organized manner in German that can be understood by native speakers not accustomed to interacting with the language of language learners.

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

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

LOG 6: Graduates will be able to read academic publications in German, to synthesize and incorporate the content constructively into their research projects.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Presentational Communication—Written Mode LOG 2 & 3 & 6**

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Advanced Low	Meets Expectations Intermediate High	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Mid
<b>Composition Mechanics</b> Requirements: In German & at least 15 pages of text (exclud. bibliography)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project is significantly longer than 15 pages of text (excluding bibliography)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project is at least 15 pages of text (excluding bibliography).	<input type="checkbox"/> Project is less than 15 pages.
<b>Language Function LOG 2</b> Language tasks the writer is able to handle in a consistent manner	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully some complicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with good detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in all major time frames.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with good detail, and with <b>recognizable attempts at some complicated writing tasks.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>in all major time frames, but not always consistently.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Handles successfully uncomplicated writing tasks</b> in areas of chosen topic with some detail <input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes <b>consistently in present tense, and also in one or more major time frames, although not consistently in the other time frames.</b>
<b>Language Control LOG 2</b> Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, degree of fluency	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally able to write <b>accurately &amp; fluently at the advanced level</b> , e.g. some use of subjunctive and passive voice, but <b>some linguistic difficulty</b> may occur as <b>more complex tasks are attempted.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language</b> , e.g. <b>broad vocabulary, solid present tense, good use of past tense though not always correct, and a variety of other grammatical structures.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the advanced level or as writing becomes more complex.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>significant quantity and quality of intermediate high-level language</b> , e.g. <b>more extensive vocabulary, use of variety of grammatical structures.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Accuracy and/or fluency decrease when <b>attempting to handle topics at the intermediate high level or as writing becomes more complex.</b>
<b>Text Type LOG 2</b> quantity and organization of language discourse	Uses <b>connected sentences</b> , frequently at <b>paragraph length</b> , and <b>some extended discourse.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>connected sentences with complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and a <b>higher degree of paragraph-like discourse</b> than at intermediate mid level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses <b>mostly connected sentences with some complex sentences</b> (dependent clauses) and some paragraph-like discourse.
<b>Comprehensibility LOG 3</b> Who can understand this person's	<input type="checkbox"/> Is easily <b>understood by those unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-	<input type="checkbox"/> Is <b>generally understood</b> by those <b>unaccustomed</b> to the writing of non-

writing: sympathetic interlocutors or a native speaker unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives?	natives, although minimal <b>interference from another language</b> may occur	natives, although <b>interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may still occur.</b>	natives, although <b>interference from another language is evident and gaps in comprehension occur.</b>
<b>Impact LOG 3</b> Clarity, organization (introduction, body and conclusion), and depth of paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner with logical transitions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper <b>illustrates originality and rich details.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion. There are <b>some recognizable logical transitions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and demonstrate <b>some originality.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper written in a <b>clear and organized manner</b> e.g. a clear introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Argument in paper illustrates <b>good detail</b> and <b>may demonstrate some originality.</b>
<b>Text Type LOG 3</b> follows standard academic writing conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions, including in the bibliography.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>follows</b> standard academic writing conventions.
<b>Academic Sources LOG 6</b> reads academic publications in German, synthesizes and incorporates content constructively into research projects	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong use and constructive synthesization from and integration of material from German academic sources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Good use and synthesization from and/or integration of material from German academic sources, but not always constructively.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> There is only <b>limited engagement with research and academic sources in German.</b>

COMMENTS:

#### B. Intercultural Competence – Written Mode LOG 4A

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations Advanced Low	Meets Expectations Intermediate High	Does Not Meet Expectations Intermediate Mid
<b>Cultural Knowledge &amp; self-awareness</b> (e.g. Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks; specifically in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices ; not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Analyzes distinctions</b> between own and target culture, and <b>draws appropriate conclusions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistently draws detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>a strong understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by <b>providing rich detail</b> and by showing <b>deep awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Makes distinctions</b> between own and target culture and goes beyond mere descriptions of differences <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Draws more detailed constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>an adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture by showing <b>more detailed awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Describes differences</b> between own and target culture <b>and includes some distinctions</b> between own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Draws constructive cultural comparisons</b> that present the strengths and weaknesses of own and target culture <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates <b>adequate understanding</b> of the complexity of the target culture <b>by showing awareness</b> of cultural practices and institutions

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

COMMENTS:

#### C. Interpretive Communication – Written Mode LOG 4A & 5

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
----------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

	<b>Advanced Low</b>	<b>Intermediate High</b>	<b>Intermediate Mid</b>
<b>Depth of Reflection</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>demonstrates more in-depth reflection</b> on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>includes more nuanced</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are <b>consistently supported with appropriate examples</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong use and integration of material from academic sources in any language</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>demonstrates an adequate reflection</b> on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>includes adequate</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are <b>usually supported with appropriate examples, some from academic sources in any language and/or personal experiences</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>demonstrates only some reflection</b> on and analysis of cultural practices and institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Paper <b>only includes some</b> personal viewpoints and interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are <b>only supported with some examples</b> <input type="checkbox"/> There is only <b>limited engagement with research and academic sources in any language.</b>

COMMENTS:

#### D. Connections – Written Mode LOG 5

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

COMMENTS: