Action Plans

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Mission / Purpose

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

For Academic Programs

Informed by your assessment activities related to student learning, what changes have you made in your degree program in the last three to five years? Describe the changes (e.g., curriculum revision, new courses, faculty development), the general results that prompted the changes (e.g., student performance on an assessment measure), and any impact on student learning that you might attribute to these changes.

Our assessment results for the German MA have been consistently good to outstanding, and we have had no reason to alter the curriculum or course offerings. However, we have changed two of the assessment categories for evaluating our graduate teaching assistants. Formerly we asked undergraduate students to rate their course using departmental evaluations. However, we discontinued the use of these evaluations in cycle 2012-13. Another criterion was the observation and evaluation of graduate student teachers by a tenure track faculty member, the Language Program Director. Despite the use of a rubric, the results seemed too subjective and difficult to compare across French, German, and Spanish. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that Spanish has not had an applied linguist as Language Program Director for three years. We replaced these two measures with A&S computerized ratings of courses by students. These allow for better, more objective comparisons of teacher performance across our various disciplines and also allow for comparison throughout A&S. Results have been encouraging and we have not seen any reasons as yet to alter the mechanics of our training of graduate student teaching assistants.

Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the countries studied. In part, this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and theory to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer basic instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students; To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture

Students completing tracks in German literature or German studies, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the philology track will develop expertise in applied, general, and historical linguistics. Students will demonstrate their expertise in written and oral form.

Connected Documents

Curriculum Map II-German M.A.
Curriculum Maps I-German M.A.

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays

In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% will write satisfactory essays.
M 2: Oral presentation
During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
- 80% of students will make oral presentations that are satisfactory or better.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
- 80% of German MA students will make oral presentations and write essays that are satisfactory (rating of pass or better).

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Connected Documents
- Curriculum Map II-German M.A.
- Curriculum Maps I-German M.A.

Related Measures

M 4: A&S online evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3)

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
- The majority of A&S evaluations will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3).

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-O2
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
- The majority of A&S evaluations will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3).

M 21: Student Evaluation of Course
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
- Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: list of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 22: Placement as Quality Indicator
Students will have employment in their field or be enrolled for further education.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
- 60% of students will have employment in their field or be enrolled for further education within 6 months of graduation.

OthOtcm 4: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures
M 11: Number of Students in MA Program
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The program will have sufficient students to ensure graduate seminar enrollments of 7 students per seminar.

M 12: Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last five August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The five-year average will be sufficient to meet or exceed the target established by ACHE of 3.75 graduates per year over a five-year average.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
I made a mistake and thought this was 2012-13 and put in whether the target was met or not but now cannot remove it.

OthOtm 5: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Survey Results
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
60% of graduates will express satisfaction with their curriculum.

M 14: Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
60% or higher of graduates will report satisfaction with the quality of their teaching.

OthOtm 6: Department Outcome: Teach at superior level
Faculty will teach at a superior level.

Related Measures

M 15: A&S student evaluations
A&S student evaluations: The departmental aggregate will be above an average rating on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target:
The departmental aggregate for Instructor rating will exceed the A&S average of 3.

M 16: Departmental student evaluations
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

OthOtm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year. A book will count as 5 articles.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
27 faculty members will publish at least 27 refereed publications, with a book counting as 5 publications.

M 18: Faculty Activity Reports-conference presentation
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
27 faculty members should make 27 scholarly presentations.

OthOtm 8: Department Outcome: Provide services
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty engagement in community
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% of faculty members should be engaged in outreach activities at the local and/or state levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service**

Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 40% of faculty members should be involved in professional service at the regional, national, or international levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission / Purpose
Our mission is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the country/ies studied. In part this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and theory to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer basic instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students; To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture
Students completing tracks in German literature or German studies, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the philology track will develop expertise in applied, general, and historical linguistics. Students will demonstrate their expertise in written and oral form.

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays
In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In summer 2012 one student wrote comprehensive examinations and received a pass. In spring 2013 three students wrote comprehensive examinations and received a pass. Hence 100% of MA students wrote satisfactory essays.

M 2: Oral presentation
During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 80% of students will make oral presentations that are satisfactory or better.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In summer 2012 one student made an oral presentation and received a pass. In spring 2013 three students made oral presentations and received a pass. Hence 100% of German MA students made satisfactory oral presentations.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of German MA students will make oral presentations and write essays that are satisfactory (rating of pass or better).

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In 2011-12 one student wrote essays and made an oral presentation that were both rated pass with distinction. In 2012-13 four students wrote essays and made oral presentations that were rated pass.

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-German M.A
Curriculum Maps I-German M.A

Related Measures
M 4: A&S online evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3)
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target:
the majority of A&S evaluations will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3).
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For Fall 2012: 100% (or 2 out of 2) of students had evaluations average or better; most evaluations rated excellent or above average (3 of the 4 classes surveyed were in 4 or 5 range). For Spring 2013: 100% (or 6 out of 6) of students had evaluations average or better; all students were rated excellent or virtually excellent (all above 4 rating except one 3.9; 2 were rated 5.0).

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-02
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
The majority of A&S evaluations will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3).
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In Academic Year 2011-12, 100% of graduate teachers in German had teacher ratings above a "3" on the A&S rating scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). In Academic Year 2012-13, 100% also had above average ratings for teacher.

M 21: Student Evaluation of Course
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target:
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For GNMA in Fall 2012: 100% (or 2 out of 2) of students had their course evaluated as average or better (majority in the 4 range). In Spring 2013: 100% (or 6 out of 6) of students had their course evaluated as average or better (a majority were 4.5 or higher). Thus 100% of graduate teachers had ratings of their course that were above 3.5 on the A&S scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures
M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: list of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 22: Placement as Quality Indicator
Students will have employment in their field or be enrolled for further education within 6 months of graduation.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas
Target:
60% of students will have employment in their field or be enrolled for further education within 6 months of
graduation.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Of 4 graduates, 2 are pursuing further education in Germany, 1 is pursuing an MBA with an international component, and 1 is working in Germany.

**OthOtm 4: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Number of Students in MA Program**
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Enrollments will be sufficient for graduate seminars with 7 students.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
For the past three years, enrollments in fall were 13, 7, and 7.

**M 12: Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE**
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last five August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Graduation rates will meet or exceed the ACHE target of an average of 3.75 graduates per year over a five year period.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Graduation rates over the past 5 years have been: 7, 3, 8, 2, 4. This is an average of 4.8 per year.

**OthOtm 5: Highly Valued by Program Graduates**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Exit Survey Results**
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**Target:**
60% or higher of graduates will express satisfaction with their curriculum.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The survey was not administered this year but will be administered in 2013-14.

**M 14: Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching**
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**Target:**
60% or higher of graduates will report satisfaction with the quality of their teaching.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The survey was not administered this year but will be administered in 2013-14.

**OthOtm 6: Department Outcome: Teach at superior level**
Faculty will teach at a superior level.

**Related Measures**

**M 15: A&S student evaluations**
A&S student evaluations: The departmental aggregate will be above an average rating on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
The departmental aggregate for Instructor rating will exceed the A&S average of 3.

**M 16: Departmental student evaluations**
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**OthOtm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge**
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

**Related Measures**

**M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication**
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year. A book will count as 5 articles.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
27 faculty members will publish at least 27 refereed publications, with a book counting as 5 publications.
M 18: Faculty Activity Reports - conference presentation
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: 27 faculty members should make 27 scholarly presentations.

OthOtc 8: Department Outcome: Provide services
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty engagement in community
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: 40% of faculty members should be engaged in outreach activities at the local and/or state levels.

M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: At least 40% of faculty members should be involved in professional service at the regional, national, or international levels.
University of Alabama

Detailed Assessment Report
2011-2012 German M.A.
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Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the country/ies studied. In part this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and theory to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer basic instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students; To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture
Students completing tracks in German literature or German studies, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of German literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the philology track will develop expertise in applied, general, and historical linguistics. Students will demonstrate their expertise in written and oral form.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-German M.A.
Curriculum Maps I-German M.A.

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays
In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
German had one student complete written comprehensive exams in fall 2011 and none in spring 2012. All essays in fall 2011 were rated satisfactory, very good, or exemplary. There were no re-writes or issues of concern.

Conclusions: Based on these results, we deem no further action necessary at this point.

M 2: Oral presentation
During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 80% of students will make oral presentations that are satisfactory or better.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011 one student presented an oral presentation as part of the comprehensive exams. The result was rated very good. No students of German took comprehensive exams in spring 2012.

Conclusions: Based on these results, no further actions are necessary at this point.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Conclusions: Based on these results, no further actions are necessary at this point.
SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-German M.A
Curriculum Maps I-German M.A

Related Measures

M 4: A&S online evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3)
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
the majority of A&S evaluations will be average or better, an average based on the center of the A&S scale (3).
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011 A&S ratings of Instructor were 4.71 and 4.65, well above the target goal of 3. In spring 2012 A&S evaluations of instructor were 4.81, 4.88, 4.82, 4.78, 4.19, 4.67, 4.05. hence, 100% of GTA teaching evaluations were excellent (4 and above) and considerably exceeded the goal.
Conclusions: These teaching performances were some of the best German has had in several years. No action necessary at this time.

M 5: Observation by Faculty
Observation and evaluation by a faculty member. MA student teachers are evaluated on their use of the target language, on their delivery of the lesson plan, and on their application of pedagogical technique. Student teachers should attain ratings of average or better in each category.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Student teachers will achieve a rating of average or above in use of target language, application of pedagogical technique, and delivery of lesson plan.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011 the student was average in application of pedagogical technique and above average in the other two areas. In spring 2012 three students were superior in all categories and one was above average in all categories.
Conclusions: These are excellent results and no action is necessary at this time.

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-O2
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No target established.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The students performed well for beginning teachers, in part because 4 of the 5 had had previous pedagogical training in Germany. 4 students were superior to student teachers from the previous academic year, while one was less successful than her peers in the previous academic year.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality. The department has developed a long-range Action Plan based on the results of the 8-Year-Review of 2009-2010.

Related Measures

M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: List of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 4: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures
M 11: Number of Students in MA Program
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 12: Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last three August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 5: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Survey Results
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

M 14: Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

OthOtcm 6: Department Outcome: Teach at superior level
Faculty will teach at a superior level.

Related Measures

M 15: A&S student evaluations
A&S student evaluations: The departmental aggregate will be above an average rating on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: The departmental aggregate for Instructor rating will exceed the A&S average of 3.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall aggregate MLC Instructor ratings were 4.35 and in spring they were 4.41. These rating considerably exceed the aggregate goal of 3.
Conclusions: In the next academic year the department will need to raise the goal.

M 16: Departmental student evaluations
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year. A book will count as 5 articles.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: 27 faculty members will publish at least 27 refereed publications, with a book counting as 5 publications.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
27 faculty members published 22 articles or book chapters plus 3 books. Counting books as 5 articles, 27 faculty members published the equivalent of 37 articles.
Conclusion: faculty members exceeded their quantitative goals of contributing to the production of knowledge.

M 18: Faculty Activity Reports-conference presentation
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: 27 faculty members should make 27 scholarly presentations.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
27 faculty members made 79 scholarly presentations, according to Faculty Activity Reports.
Conclusions: Faculty members far exceeded the goal that was set. The goal should be increased for next academic year.

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Provide services
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty engagement in community
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:  
40% of faculty members should be engaged in outreach activities at the local and/or state levels.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met  
20 faculty members, or 74%, were engaged in outreach activities at the local or state level.  
Conclusions: the departmental goal has been greatly exceeded and can be increased for the next academic year.

M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service  
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:  
At least 40% of faculty members should be involved in professional service at the regional, national, or international levels.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met  
12 faculty members or 44% were engaged in professional service that extended beyond the local or state levels.  
Conclusion: the department was able to meet its goal and should strive to increase non-local service.
### Curriculum Maps #1  Student Learning Outcomes (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>GN 510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>GN 511</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>GN 512</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>GN 515</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>GN 520</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>GN 525</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>GN 530</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>GN 535</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td>GN 540</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td>GN 551/552</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 11</td>
<td>GN 599</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Map II  (Assessment Measures) (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GN 551/552</td>
<td>Mastery GN Lit and Culture</td>
<td>Mastery GN Philology</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td>Observation by Language Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students receive feedback. Measure 2.2. Fall/Spring 2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>A&amp;S Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority average or better. Fall/Spring 2011/2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>