## German, German-International Trade BA, 2017

There are two academic degree program options within the German Program at Auburn University. Students seeking a BA degree in German will complete all university core requirements, all CLA core requirements, and a minimum of 39 credit hours in required and elective FLGR course work. Required courses for the FLGR major constitute 21 credit hours, including 1-hour Senior Capstone course. The remaining minimum 18 credit hours for the FLGR major are FLGR elective credit hours. Students seeking a BA degree in German-International Trade will complete all university core requirements and all CLA core requirements. In addition, FLGT students will complete 24 credit hours of supporting coursework within the College of Business. FLGT students must also complete 39 credit hours in required and elective FLGR course work. Required course for the FLGT major constitute 27 credit hours, including 6 credit hours in Business German and the 1-hour Senior Capstone course. The remaining minimum 12 credit hours are FLGR elective credits hours.

## Student Learning Outcomes

### Specificity of Outcomes

By the time students complete the BA in German (FLGR or FLGT), they are expected to be able to: 1) identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to German and/or Germanophone cultures; 2) produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. paragraph-length utterances); and 3) compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. multi-paragraph-length texts).

### Comprehensive Outcomes

The above list of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) is comprehensive in that all coursework related to the major (FLGR or FLGT) contributes to the development and achievement of these three primary outcomes.

The German program measures the above measured SLOs according to the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Proficiency Guidelines, a nationally recognized rubric for assessing language-learner proficiency. These standardized rubrics are nationally and internationally recognized by many major corporations and government agencies, and are also aligned with evaluations of government agencies. They include detailed descriptions of what students must be able to tell, discuss, interpret, examine, formulate, and argue in the target language to demonstrate the respective proficiency level. Complete guidelines are available at: [ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012](http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012)

### Communicating Student Learning Outcomes

The German program shares its learning outcomes with all members of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures (FLL) faculty at the departmental meeting in August. At individual German program meetings throughout the academic year, faculty discuss the outcomes as well as possible methods to support and improve student learning. In the past, an electronic copy of the FLGR/FLGT Program Assessment Report has been made available to member of the German faculty. In addition, the assessment committee of FLL calls for an FLL faculty meeting once per year to discuss program outcomes and to suggest strategies for improved outcomes. The German program faculty also shares Student Learning Outcomes with students enrolled in the senior Capstone. Beginning in fall 2017, undergraduate advisors will share SLOs with prospective majors during advising sessions. Also effective fall 2017, faculty teaching upper-level German courses (3000- and 4000-level) will use class time to explain SLOs to students.

## Curriculum Map

### Curriculum Map

German, BA (FLGR)

Student Learning Outcomes.

Students graduating with a BA degree in German (FLGR) will:

1. Identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to German and/or Germanophone cultures;
2. Produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse; and
3. Compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse.

| Required Coursework | Outcome 1(Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3(Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FLGR 2010 (Intermediate German I) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| FLGR 2020 (Intermediate German II) | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3010 (Beg. German Comp & Con) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3020 (Int. German Comp & Con) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3110 (German Culture & Civ I) OR FLGR 3120 (German Culture & Civ II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLGR 3100 (Intro German Lit) ORFLGR 4110 (Masterpieces of German Lit I) OR FLGR 4121 (Masterpieces of German Lit II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| + 18 hours of elective coursework on the 3000- or 4000-level | 2-3 | 2-3 | 2-3 |
| FLGR 4980 (Senior Capstone) | 3 | 3 | 3 |

1 = introduced

2 = reinforced

3 = emphasized

**German-International Trade, BA (FLGT)**

Student Learning Outcomes.

Students graduating with a BA degree in German (FLGT) will:

1. Identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to German and/or Germanophone businesses/cultures;
2. Produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse; and
3. Compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse.

| Required Coursework | Outcome 1 (Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3 (Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FLGR 2010 (Intermediate German I) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| FLGR 2020 (Intermediate German II) | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3010 (Beg. German Comp & Con) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3020 (Int. German Comp & Con) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLGR 3110 (German Culture & Civ I) OR FLGR 3120 (German Culture & Civ II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLGR 3100 (Intro German Lit) ORFLGR 4110 (Masterpieces of German Lit I) OR FLGR 4121 (Masterpieces of German Lit II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLGR 4310 (German for Business and Economics I) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLGR 4320 (German for Business and Economics II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| + 12 hours of elective coursework on the 3000- or 4000-level | 2-3 | 2-3 | 2-3 |
| FLGR 4980 (Senior Capstone) | 3 | 3 | 3 |

1 = introduced

2 = reinforced

3 = emphasized

## Measurement

### Outcome-Measure Alignment

In the following brief narrative, outcome-measure alignment is considered according to the courses outlined in the curriculum map as well as the senior Capstone course.

All German faculty assess the above mentioned student learning outcomes in individual courses throughout the curriculum for which they are responsible. Iterations of these SLOs are explicitly stated on individual course syllabi. In order to measure students’ ability to identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to German and/or Germanophone cultures, assignments include cultural comparisons, reflective journals and response papers based on a cultural prompt. In order to measure students’ ability to produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse, assignments include dialogs, roleplays, skits and in-class presentations. In order to measure students’ ability to compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse, assignments include short essays, compositions, different modes of correspondence, and longer (research) papers.

During a student’s last semester prior to graduation, the student enrolls in a senior Capstone course. This is 1-credit hour course for which students receive either a grade of “S” (satisfactory) or “U” (unsatisfactory). In order to measure students’ ability to identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to German and/or Germanophone cultures, students are required to read and provide a written summary of a news or business article (without a dictionary) on an issue of current importance in a German-speaking country. Following this activity, students meet with the Capstone professor for a 35-45 minute interview in order to discuss the topic further. During this time, students must also subsequently discuss 10 cultural questions chosen at random from a master list of 20 questions. In order to measure students’ ability to produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse, students need to have submitted recordings of both a prepared text and extemporaneous speech prior to the Capstone interview. In addition, the 35-45 minute interview mentioned above includes a more general and spontaneous discussion used to assess oral competence. In order to measure students’ ability to compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse, the written summary of the news/business article is assessed. In addition, students are given four questions adapted from the ACTFL proficiency guidelines to which they must respond. Finally, students are required to have submitted prior to the interview a sample of their written work. The samples consist of a variety of papers from different upper-level courses and must total at least 5-7 pages, and include 2 culture and/or business-related samples.

### Direct Measures

All of the measures mentioned above are direct measures of student learning.

### Data Collection

Not including data collection for individual courses throughout the sequence, because this vary widely according to instructor and it would be extremely inefficient and impractical, if not impossible, to gather on a regular basis, our primary means of data collection is therefore based on our measurement of student learning outcomes as generated by graduating students in the senior Capstone course.

Therefore, data is collected as the Capstone faculty director, as well as other German faculty, complete a “Senior Capstone Assessment Worksheet” for each of the three SLOs identified above. The average scores from this year’s (2016-2017) data collection are provided below (section 8). The templates of these assessment worksheets are found immediately below.

This data collection is coming from the oral and cultural face-to-face interview as well as the students’ writing and oral samples. Because there are no standardized ACTFL guidelines for cultural assessment, as there are for oral and written proficiency, students’ cultural knowledge is evaluated based on rubrics and a scale ranging from 1 to 4 (indicating: does not meet expectations, almost meets expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations). For assessing oral and written communication, our rubric is mapped onto the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, whereby 1 = Intermediate Low and Mid; 2 = Intermediate High; 3 = Advanced Low and Mid; and 4 = Advanced High and Superior.

Student , CULTURE/BUSINESS: Rubrics for Evaluation

| Score | Exceeds expectations **4** | Meets expectations **3**  | Almost Meets expectations **2**  | Does not meet expectations **1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Recall and Identification | Accurate identification of event, person, date, or business fact | Recognizes name but lacks specificity | Recall of name | No recognition or vague recall |
| Analysis of meaning and context | Accurate description of details and cultural/business context | Description of contexts lacks detail with some incoherence | Simple description, little coherence | Vague description (after interlocutor assisted with recall) |
| Interpretation of relevance | Precise interpretation of historical-cultural/business relevance for society today | Adequate explanation of relevance | Some, minimal explanation of relevance | Inadequate explanation(after interlocutor assisted with recall) |

Student , Oral Production: Rubrics for Evaluation

| Score | Intermediate Low **1** | Intermediate Mid **1** | Intermediate High **2** | Advanced Low **3** | Advanced Mid**3** | Advanced- High/Superior **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Language/Vocabulary | Survival needs (food, making simple purchases) | Express personal meaning ; little circumlocution | Daily life and social situations, but limited when leaving the personal realm | Variety of communi- cative tasks; circumlocution and rephrasing | Large number of communicative tasks; circumlocution/ rephrasing | Abundant vocab on personal, inter/ national matters |
| Time frame | Present time | Present timeDifficulty manipulating time | Narrate and describe in all majors time frames most of the time | Narrate and describe in all major time frames; some control of aspect | Full accounts in all major time frames; good control of aspect | Explain in detail and narrate fully and accurately in all time frames |
| Topics/ Structure | Concrete topics; *limited* number of predictable topics social situations (self/family/ daily activities)Reactive, struggle to answer direct questions | Handle variety of communicative tasks in straightforward social situationsReactive, but capable of asking variety of questions to obtain information, strings of sentences | Ease and confidence in routine tasks and social situations related to work, school, and areas of competenceSome paragraph-length discourse | Personal topics as well as topics related to employment, current events; and matters of community interestLinked sentences, connected discourse, paragraph lengthHandle linguistic challenge by complications | Variety of topics related to work, school, leisure; and events of current/ public relevance. Narration combined and inter- woven in connected paragraph length dis- course. Handle linguistic challenge by complications | Variety of topics, structured arguments to support opinion, construction of hypothesesSome topics dis- cussed abstractly but comfortable to discuss concretely |
| Pronunciation/ Comprehensi- bility | Pronunciation and syntax influenced heavily by first languageGenerally understood by sympathetic interlocutors when accustomed to non-natives | Pauses and reformulations to find adequate vocabulary and syntaxGenerally understood by sympathetic interlocutors when accustomed to non-natives  | Generally understood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives, although interference from another language occurs (false cognates, literal translations) | Understood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives, with some repetition and restatementCertain grammatical roughness  | Readily under-stood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-nativesSubstantial flow of speech | Readily by native speakers unaccustomed to non-nativesGreat fluency and ease of speech |

Student\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, WRITTEN PRODUCTION: Rubrics for Evaluation:

| Score | Intermediate Low **1** | Intermediate Mid **1** | Intermediate High **2** | Advanced Low **3** | Advanced Mid**3** | Advanced- High/Superior **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vocabulary | Basic, elementary needs | Basic, personal and common needs | Basic, personal, social (work/ school) needs | Meets basic work and academic needs | Meets a range of work/academic needs | Wide general vocabulary for in/ formal correspondence |
| Time frame | Present time | Present time, contains reference to other time frames | Use different time frames, but inconsistent, with appropriate time markers | Describes in major time frames with control of aspect | Describes with detail in all major time frames, good control of aspect | Narrates and describes in major time frames, solid control of aspect |
| Function, Structure | Statements, quest-ions about familiar materialSimple, conversational type sentences, repetitiveTopics tied to personal information | Control of basic sentence structure, personalSentences loosely strung togetherResembles oral discoursePersonal topics, daily routines, common events | Compositions and simple summariesNarrations often of paragraph length, correspond to spoken languageDescriptions, narrations about school experience | Compositions, brief summariesParagraph length and structurePatterns of oral dis- course, resembles writing style of first languageFamiliar topics | Cohesive, several paragraphs in lengthcontrol of frequent target language syntactic structure (and vocabulary)Topics of general interest | Significant precision and details in sum- maries and reportsTopics relating to particular interests and special interests(Inconsistent) construction of hypotheses |
| Comprehen- sibility | Understood by natives used to writing of non- natives (with some effort) | Understood easily by natives used towriting of non-natives | Comprehensible to natives not used to the writing of non-natives | Understood by natives not accustomed to writing of non-natives (with some effort) | Understood readily by natives not used to the writing of non- natives | Some linguistic limitations may distract native reader from message |

## Results

### Reporting Results

Please find below the assessment results for the **academic years 2016-17**. These results encompass both FLGR and FLGT and include data from fall 2016 and spring 2017. There were 5 students who completed the major during this academic year, all in FLGR (there were no FLGT graduates this year). The reported score is the average from all faculty input received.

**AY 2016-17**

| STUDENT | OUTCOME 1 (culture) | OUTCOME 2 (oral) | OUTCOME (written) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student #1 | 4 | 3.25 | 3.5 |
| Student #2 | 4 | 3.8 | 4 |
| Student #3 | 3 | 3 | 3.3 |
| Student #4 | 4 | 3.25 | 4 |
| Student #5 | 3 | 3.125 | 3.25 |

For comparative purposes, below are the assessment results for the academic year 2015-16. These results encompass both FLGR and FLGT and include data from fall 2015 and spring 2016. There were 8 students who completed the major during this academic year, 6 in FLGR and 2 in FLGT. The reported score is the average from all faculty input received.

**AY 2015-16**

| STUDENT | OUTCOME 1 (culture) | OUTCOME 2 (oral) | OUTCOME (written) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student #1 | 3 | 3.9 | 3.25 |
| Student #2 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 |
| Student #3 | 3.4 | 3.25 | 3.2 |
| Student #4 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 2 |
| Student #5 | 3.5 | 3.25 | 3.3 |
| Student #6 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| Student #7 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 1.9 |
| Student #8 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 2.9 |

### Interpreting Results

During the academic year 2016-17, the German program has continued to show good results in all three identified student learning outcomes with its graduating seniors. No significant changes have been made to the curriculum, but the German faculty continues to be aware of the importance of all three learning outcomes in each course offered in its curriculum. We did, however, adapt a new textbook beginning in fall 2014 which is geared more toward oral production and will presumably have a positive corollary effect on data collection in oral proficiency in future years. This textbook is not as strong in the category of cultural learning, so we as a section have needed to supplement with additional cultural material so that student learning outcomes in this area do not suffer.

Regarding the assessment results for this current year, compared to the previous year’s graduates, there was much more uniformity in performance at a high level. The average score for cultural competency was 3.6, for oral proficiency 3.285, and for written proficiency 3.61, all significantly higher than last year’s averages (AY 2015-16). Though written proficiency tended to be higher than oral proficiency in both years, the percentage of students who reached an Advanced-level in both communicative competencies, was much higher this year. These results at the higher end of the scale can be partially explained by the fact that all 5 of these students came to AU with significant exposure to the language and/or culture: 4 had taken German in high school; one is a heritage speaker. In addition, four out of the five students have spent a significant amount of time in a German-speaking country, so this also accounts for the high performances.

### Communicating Results

Once our assessment results are reported to the Office of Academic Assessment, a copy of our program assessment report is circulated to other members of the German faculty via email.

Subsequently, this report is circulated again and discussed by program faculty in the following fall semester. Thus, this report will be shared, distributed and discussed during the fall 2017 semester. There are actually two meetings: one during a program-specific faculty meeting and another during a special meeting of the FLL department assessment committee to which all departmental faculty are invited. Last year – during fall 2016 – two professors provided a PowerPoint presentation about the new assessment measures focusing specifically on the curriculum map and students learning outcomes, two areas that were singled out as needing improvement in the feedback received from the previous year. After this presentation, there were break-out groups for each program where faculty discussed assessment results, as well as program-specific goals related to the SLOs and our curriculum.

## Use of Results

### Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan

The German faculty meets frequently (on an average 3 times a semester) to have micro-discussions about student performance in all three learning outcomes at all levels of the curriculum. The German section also shares its results with the FLL department at large. From these conversations, we are able to see how our assessment lines up with other programs in the department, and we are able to identify as a section areas of student weaknesses. These discussions are useful in that they allow us to reflect on ways in which we can support student learning in all three outcomes. For example, after seeing years of lower scores reported in the area of oral communication, we decided as a section to change our first- and second-year textbooks to ones that are more geared toward communicative competence. We believe that this decision has provided students with the opportunity to greatly improve in this specific learning outcome. We had also decided as a section to incorporate longer writing assignments with increased frequency and variety in type in order for them to produce more accurate and complex texts. We believe we have seen a positive impact on their written expression due to our efforts. In the next academic year, the German faculty are going to focus on providing more opportunities for cultural analysis by creating assignments which would require students to compare and contrast US-American vs. Germanophone cultures.