I. Assessment Plan

Q1. The department has an assessment plan for the undergraduate program. [Y] [N]

Q2. The department has an assessment plan for the graduate program. [Y] [N]

Q3. The assessment plan/s is/are linked to the departmental mission. [Y] [N]

Please identify the types of tools in the assessment plan(s): if possible, indicate the academic years in which they have been or are intended to be employed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools used to directly assess student learning:</th>
<th>Undergraduate Program</th>
<th>Graduate Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses, Dissertations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre &amp; Post Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools used to indirectly assess student learning:</th>
<th>Undergraduate Program</th>
<th>Graduate Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Of the tools used to directly assess student learning, which provide the most useful information? [Local Exams]

Q6. Of the tools used to directly assess student learning, which provide the least useful information? [Capstone Courses]

Q7. Of the tools used to indirectly assess student learning, which provide the most useful information? [Exit Interviews]

Q8. Of the tools used to indirectly assess student learning, which provide the least useful information? [Student Surveys]

Q9. Please elaborate on any of the responses given above (please attach additional pages as needed).
II. Assessment Processes

Q10. Responsibility for assessment has been assumed by

If responsibility is delegated to an individual, this person is:

the chair [ ]
[ ] tenured faculty /
[ ] untenured faculty / academic staff / short term staff / other:

If responsibility is delegated to a committee, this group is:

Specially constituted to address assessment of student learning
[ ] Y [ ] N
Part of the Curriculum Committee
[ ] Y [ ] N
Part of the Executive Committee
[ ] Y [ ] N
Part of the Undergraduate/Graduate Education Committee
[ ] Y [ ] N
Other:

Q11. The department has requested funds from the University Assessment Council (UAC) to help the department assess student learning.

If “yes”, did the UAC award the department funds? in 1998

[ ] Y [ ] N
Were those funds useful?

[ ] Y [ ] N

Q12. The department has sought professional assistance to conduct assessment.

If “yes”, from whom has the department sought professional assistance? (For example, the LEAD Center, the Office of Quality Improvement, the UW Survey Center, etc.)

III. Additional Information

Please attach any assessment reports you may have submitted to the University Assessment Council in compliance with the UAC’s funding support requests.

These were submitted with last year’s report (May 2000)

In the interest of streamlining our requests for assessment information, please identify an assessment contact person:

Prof. James Streater (undergrad)

Prof. Marc Silberman, Chair (grad)

Do you have any suggestions for workshops or learning opportunities in the area of student outcomes assessment?


Thank you for taking time to complete this report.

Please return this form to the Associate Dean’s Office by May 25, 2001.
To:      Elaine Klein  
      Associate Academic Planner  
      307E South Hall 
From:   Marc Silberman  
      Chair, German Department 
Re:     Annual Assessment Reports 

May 23, 2001 

In response to Herb Wang’s memo of 28 March concerning the assessment reports for 2000-2001, I am attaching the completed survey form as well as the narrative below. 

In 1999, following on a thorough self-assessment enabled in part by a University Assessment Council grant, the Department substantially restructured its undergraduate major program with the aim of giving students greater flexibility in the fulfillment of major requirements and improving articulation with study abroad programs in Bonn and Freiburg. These changes have now been in effect for two years, and the Department has been regularly monitoring their usefulness by tracking enrolments, assessing course evaluations, and surveying graduating seniors. Based on data gathered over the past two years, the Undergraduate Program Committee will undertake a thorough review during the 2001-02 academic year, and additional changes in the program are to be expected. 

Responding to the quantitative section of the departmental survey of graduating seniors, students have generally given very high marks to the overall undergraduate program, including the existing options within the major – in culture, linguistics, and literature (and Honors available within each option). In the second part of the survey, students write expository responses to 19 questions on the quality of instruction, advising, and career preparation. These narratives make it clear that students particularly regret not being able to take certain courses due to scheduling conflicts and/or the infrequency with which they are offered. The Undergraduate Program Committee will seek to address these issues during its upcoming deliberations. 

On the graduate student level the Department implemented in Fall 1999 for the first time the oral and written proficiency assessment of all incoming graduate students (MA and post-MA). This has continued this year as well. In late September 2000, each student completed a writing sample and an oral proficiency interview; a faculty committee consisting of the MA advisor, the TA supervisor, and two faculty teaching MA-level required courses evaluated the assessment samples, and each student was advised individually of the results, with recommendations and strategies for improvement where necessary. The same procedure will be implemented in Fall 2001. We intend to charge the Department standing committee on TA- & Fellowships to confer as well about the progress of all students in the graduate program who are on Department support packages and to provide feedback to individual students, as necessary.
In response to meetings with the Department graduate student association (GDGSA), it was decided that during Fall semester there will also be a review of the MA and Ph.D. requirements by the Graduate Program Committee with a view towards streamlining the course rotation. Together with the usual qualifying exams and thesis requirements, these assessment efforts have kept us well-informed about the graduate students' views on their learning experience.