

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Women's and Gender Studies Department: Women's and Gender Studies

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

College/School: Arts and Sciences

Date (Month/Year): September 2023

Assessment Contact: Claudia Karagoz

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2022-2023 academic year

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2019

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? No

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.)

As in AY 21-22, due to changes to the Google Sites web platform, we were unable to collect the main student learning artifacts (i.e., multiple projects collated into a PDF portfolio) we normally use to assess graduating majors. Attempts to revise the collection process in AY 21-22 were unsuccessful. In AY 22-23, we again decided that only one segment of the assessment plan could be completed. This is because ongoing departmental changes (senior faculty retiring, new leadership, mostly new faculty, etc.) and other departmental priorities (e.g., creation of courses for the new University Core) did not afford the time necessary to create a new collection process. We are happy to report that in AY 2023-24 a group of WGS faculty (WGS Assessment Working Group) will redesign the WGS assessment plan for future implementation (see 6b below).

We were able to evaluate a secondary measure, connected to our Introduction to WGS course, which provides insight into learning outcome #1: Graduates will be able to employ central concepts from women's and gender studies to analyze how culture and social institutions shape possibilities for justice in everyday life.

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.

A pre/post test that asks students to define but also employ central WGS foundational concepts (by providing, for each concept, examples of how 'culture and social institutions shape possibilities for justice in everyday life'), was administered in WGST 1900, Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies sections in AY 2022-23. These included Fall 22 and Spring 23 STL SLU sections, the online summer course, Madrid campus offerings (Fall 2022), and 1818 partners. However, the tests were not administered fully in some sections throughout the year or in a given semester, so data are incomplete for the 1818 sections.

This is a required course for WGS majors and minors but is also taken as an elective by many students across the University, especially as it satisfies the U.S. diversity ('old' Core) and the new core University EGI Dignity, Ethics and a Just Society requirements. Artifacts were examined for all students in the class.

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).

Four faculty members reviewed and evaluated all pre/post tests and discussed their findings as a group at an end-of-semester meeting. At this meeting, faculty also evaluated the state of the assessment process and offered preliminary suggestions for revision of the process. The rubric used to assess the pre/post tests is attached with this report ('1/fails to address'=does not meet expectations; '3/addresses'= meets expectations; '5/complexly addresses'=exceeds expectations).

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)?

Process: faculty provided an overall number (1 =does not meet expectations; 3 = meets expectations; 5 =exceeds expectations), based on the pre/post-test rubrics for each of the following 5 semesters: (1) Summer 22 session (online), (2) Fall 22 (STL SLU sections), (3) Spring 23 (STL SLU sections), (4) Fall 22 for 1818 only, (5) Fall 22 for Madrid only. The number faculty provided assessed the entire semester or Summer session (i.e., faculty did not provide a number for each concept: privilege, oppression, intersectionality, etc.). Each faculty member submitted 5 numbers.

Results: overall, by the end of the course students met expectations for defining and employing central concepts, as described by the attached rubric. Specifically, faculty assigned from a minimum of 3 (meets expectations) to 5 points out of 5 (exceeds expectations). Achievement did not significantly differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus and Madrid campus).

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

The data reveal that these continue to be worthwhile keywords/central concepts, but the results overall call for a revision of the process. The data to review are excessive, and these pre/post test measures do not give clear insight into improvement-over-time on mastery of these concepts. Most importantly, although students often declare their WGS Minors and Majors in their second or third year and enroll in Intro sections close to graduation, the data do not necessarily assess students at the end of the program.

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?

This report is shared with all faculty.

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 the Assessment Plan: in AY 23-24 we plan to revise our assessment plan for implementation in future years. Throughout the year, an Assessment Working Group consisting of three faculty members will work

on redesigning the WGS assessment plan, including: Evaluation process and tools, Data collection methods, artifacts of student learning. Hence, assessment data will not be collected in AY 23-24.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

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?

We moved the “Capstone” course to fall semesters to give students more opportunities to further work on and to present the research they conduct for that class.

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

It’s still being implemented.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

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

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.

Introduction to WGS Pre-/Post-Test Assessment Rubric

	(1*) fails to address:	(3) addresses:	(5**) complexly addresses:
Privilege	-some have unearned, automatic, naturalized (etc.) rights and power that others don't have due to r/c/g status (knapsack metaphor)	-some have unearned, automatic, naturalized (etc.) rights and power that others don't have due to r/c/g status (knapsack metaphor)	- directly connects privilege with oppression -includes more identity markers - unconscious/invisible - gives concrete examples
Oppression	- oppressed people have restricted options, often experience double bind; birdcage metaphor	- oppressed people have restricted options, often experience double bind; birdcage metaphor	- directly connects privilege with oppression -includes more identity markers - gives concrete examples
Intersectionality	- r/c/g hierarchies intersect, together influence people's experiences and life chances - multiple identities/statuses that cannot be separated	- r/c/g hierarchies intersect, together influence people's experiences and life chances - multiple identities/statuses that cannot be separated	- a third-wave concept/approach - at least 2 additional identity markers - connects with oppression/privilege or how power is intensified/re-distributed
Patriarchy	- structural (characteristic of social institutions and cultures) - advantages men -normalizes/naturalizes male power	- structural (characteristic of social institutions and cultures) - advantages men -normalizes/naturalizes male power	- gives examples - women can uphold patriarchy - reference to how it is upheld (e.g., ideology, policing, violence)
“What does it mean to talk about FeminismS”	- lack of understanding that there is no one coherent form of capital F Feminism - at least 2 examples	- understanding that feminism is multi-faceted - 2 examples like: liberal, radical, etc. OR multicultural, black, etc.	- more examples
Social construction	- differences between people based on r/c/g, etc. are not given by nature but, instead, constructed by society	- differences between people based on r/c/g, etc. are not given by nature but, instead, constructed by society	- nature v. nurture - how plays into oppression, patriarchy
Binary thinking	- society's tendency in language and thought to divide all people into two opposing categories, such as men/women, white/non-white, heterosexual/homosexual and to privilege one over the other	- society's tendency in language and thought to divide all people into two opposing categories, such as men/women, white/non-white, heterosexual/homosexual and to privilege one over the other	- nature v. nurture - how plays into oppression, patriarchy

*Give 0 (zero) points for no answer, answers such as “I don’t know,” or answers that do not offer anything relevant to explaining the concept.

**As long as they fulfill the requirements for a 3 rating, then answers that offer an engagement with authors, sources, or historicize the concept will fall into categories 4 or 5.