

Women's Studies REPORT for 2017-2018 Assessment Activities
Prepared by Professor Kensinger, Assessment Coordinator
Fall 2018

Women's Studies engaged in two assessment activities in 2017-2018. As always, to provide a fuller history of the Program's engagement with assessment, Women's Studies starts its report with provision of a fuller list of work related to assessment that faculty engaged in than the outcomes report structure calls for. For 2017-2018 these included:

- Writing and submission of 2016-2017 report
- Assessment Coordinator's participation as one of three workshop coordinators for assessment panel given at the National Women's Studies Association annual Program Administration and Development Conference, Baltimore, November 2017.
- Selection of assignment along with collection and preparation of papers from WS 150T/CLAS 180T in fall 2017.
- Rubric review and "norming" session during departmental meeting in February of 2018.
- Scoring of the data by Dr. Forbear and Dr. Forbes for WS 150T/CLAS 180T Latina Health and Size.
- Collaboration of Dr. Mercado-Lopez and Dr. Kensinger over three meetings in development of Senior Capstone Assignment, approved by program faculty Spring 2018.
- Distribution of Senior Capstone Assignment in core course, WS 175 Feminist Activism, and collection of responses, end of the semester, spring 2018.
- Reminder to all WS faculty to include GE assessment outcomes on syllabi, August 2018.
- Participation of faculty, including lecturers, in workshops on new GE assessment plan.
- Meeting between WS Assessment Coordinator and New COSS Assessment Director, Dr. Yoshiko Takahashi, Sept. 5, 2018.
- "Closing the Loop" discussion for WS 150T results Sept. 7 2018.
- 2017-2018 final report approved 9/21/18
- Final report emailed to Dr. Takahashi and Dr. Jordan by the deadline of Sept. 30 2018.

Report:

Department and Degree: Women's Studies, B.A.

Assessment Coordinator: Loretta Kensinger

- 1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.

Between Activity I and Activity II (see below) and due to the nature of the WS rubric, all SLO's will have been assessed.

Goal A. The program will provide advanced content knowledge to students and give them the ability to distinguish and appreciate multiple perspectives.

SLO 1: Students will demonstrate their comprehension of both the status of women in society and gender, as well as the unique impact of gender ideology on women.

SLO 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of feminism(s) theories, histories and methods, including the history of women's organizations and movements.

SLO 3: Students will demonstrate an awareness of intersectionality as well as comprehension of anti-oppression and social justice principles from within the Women's Studies perspective at the local and global levels.

Goal B. Key aims of the program are to improve the ability of students to think critically, particularly in the area of information literacy, communicate effectively and act on knowledge.

SLO 4: Students will demonstrate "information literacy".

SLO 5: Students will demonstrate communication skills by accurately summarizing texts, approaches, concepts and theories taught in the classroom as well as by formulation of their own ideas within a variety of assignments.

SLO 6: Students will demonstrate an ability to act on knowledge.

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be "On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric."

As noted in last year's report, we received a waiver on the 2016-2017 activity from Dr. Jordan. To get back on track with our timeline the program's 2015-2021 SOAP, we conducted two assessment activities this year, and completed assessment of one of them.

Assessment Activity I: From the SOAP timeline:

"Year 2016-2017

Method 2: Analysis of Student Essay (non-GE/non-Core)

- **This activity is the one whose results are reported on below.**

Per the WS 2015-2021 SOAP this activity is described as:

"For one non-GE/non-core course faculty will develop and administer a specific essay question built to assess learning on SLO 1, 2, 3, and 6. Questions will be added to an existing exam or conducted during the regular class period, at the end of the semester. The specific course(s) to be assessed will be chosen based on curriculum offered in the year this method of analysis is used. Responses will be analyzed using a rubric developed by the faculty based on a model utilized previously. "

- The chosen course was WS 150T/CLAS 180T Latina Health and Size, taught in fall of 2017.
- 9 papers were collected that responded to the assignment "Zumba is for Everybody Discussion Paper". (see attached instructions)

- The assignment fit the SLO's assessed well. SLO 1 focuses on women's status and gender in society and the assignment called for students to assess among others things "how fitness/exercise is racialized and gendered" and to look at comparatively at the gendered spaces of dance. SLO2 focuses on feminist history, method and theory, the assignment calls on students to consider "Ideologies about Latina sexuality and reproduction", and to grapple with important theoretical concepts such as "reclaiming power," and "body autonomy," and in the process consider "spectacle" or "taking up space". Further, it required students apply a Latina feminist methodology "tesimonios", For SLO 3, the assignment required students to grapple with intersections of "Zumba, Latina identity, and feminism" and to consider in this analysis racialization, gendering and sexuality. Further it required students to think about "both cultural relevance and appropriation" as applied to the example. For SLO 6, "acting on knowledge" the assignment was an assessment of a public "Zumba" event students organized, and the paper also asked students to consider their own "personal experience coordinating this event".
- Two faculty, Dr. Forbear and Dr. Forbes (neither of whom taught the course), scored the papers.

Rubric:

- The same rubric was or will be used for both assessment activities. While each activity focuses on separate, though sometimes overlapping, SLO's, the WS faculty decided to have faculty score all SLO on the rubric for each assignment in order to gather additional information.
- The rubric utilized is one the program has adopted before for assessing student work, and is thus tested.
- The rubric's uses of exact SLO language to ensure all scorers are scoring with the SOAP ideals fully in mind. In addition we hold a norming session at a regular faculty meeting, so that scorers can get clear on entire faculty expectations for each SLO appropriate to class and class level.

Benchmark Per the WS 2015-2021 SOAP:

- **Assessment Activity I Benchmark:** "For Non-GE/non-Core elective courses: 75% of respondents should receive a score of 2 or above on rubrics (with outcomes of: 0=unacceptable; 1=poor; 2=satisfactory; 3= good; 4=outstanding.)"

Assessment Activity II: Per the WS 2015-2021 SOAP, our timeline for this year:

Year 2017 to 2018

- Data on this activity is still being reviewed and assessed and so the activity will be more fully reported on in our next annual report.

Method 1: Capstone Learning Exam

Per the SOAP, this method is described as:

“Faculty in the program will submit questions for the CLE to be administered in two of our upper division core courses most frequented by our graduating seniors, one in fall semester one in spring semester. The test will consist of three questions. The first question will concentrate on broad based topical knowledge of intersectional analysis regarding gender and sex, the second on more specified knowledge of feminism geared toward our capstone courses and the third

question allows students to self-identify what they found important to their learning. Questions will be provided in a take home format, with the assignment either integrated into total course points or students provided extra-credit for completion of the work. Responses will be analyzed using a rubric developed by the faculty based on a model utilized previously. The rubric will evaluate answers in terms of SLO 1, 2, 3, 5. “

- The course chosen was the spring 2018 WS 175: Senior Seminar, Feminist Activism course.
- The program chose to conduct this activity in only one core class, rather than two classes noted in the SOAP, to avoid duplication issues, as students are often enrolled in two cores at the same time. We also decided to use this as a modified opportunity to test out movement toward a portfolio style assessment, so students were instructed to either respond to an essay response built on our SLO's or submit a piece of work that they had done in another WS class that they think represented their skills in that area, with a much shorter requirement to write a paragraph on why they chose that work (attachment will be provided when results are reported next year).
- 13 papers were collected in the course. As papers were collected in the last weeks before summer break they have not yet been scored. They will be scored and assessed over the fall of 2018 semester, with results discussed in the Program's 2018-2019 report.

Rubric:

- The same rubric was or will be used for both assessment activities.

Benchmark Per the WS 2015-2021 SOAP:

- **Assessment Activity II Benchmark:** “Capstone Exam: 75% of respondents should receive a score of 2 or above on each of the four outcomes listed above (with outcomes of: 0=unacceptable; 1=poor; 2=satisfactory; 3= good; 4=outstanding).”

2. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

WS 2017-2018 Assessment Activity I: Results

Class Assessed: WS 150T/CLAS 180T Latina Health and Size, taught in Fall of 2017.

Benchmark: “**For Non-GE/non-Core elective courses: 75% of respondents should receive a score of 2 or above on rubrics (with outcomes of: 0=unacceptable; 1=poor; 2=satisfactory; 3= good; 4=outstanding.)**” So for this N this means:

- Target 1: N of 9; **75% of 9=6.75.**
 - 6.75 students should receive a score of 2 or above on individual scores
- Target 2: N of 18 (9 x 2 scorers); **75% of 18= 13.5.**
 - Taken as a whole, 13.5 students should receive a score of 2 or above on combined scores.
- Per our SOAP the only **outcomes to be looked at are SLO 1, SLO 2, SLO 3 and SLO 6.** These are reported first and in bold.
 - As the rubric included SLO 4 and SLO 5, those scores are reported, but as they were not required in this activity, they were not a focus in our closing the loop discussions reported below.

PAPER	SLO 1 GENDER AND STATUS OF W.	SLO 2 FEM.(S) THEORY, METHODS, HISTORY	SLO 3 INTERSECTION., ANTI- OPPRESSION, SOCIAL JUSTICE	SLO 6 ACT ON KNOWLEDGE	SLO 4 INFORM. LITERACY	SLO 5 COM. SKILLS
	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores
P1	3 / 3	3 / 3	3 / 4	2 / 3	4 / 3	3 / 4
P2	2 / 2	1 / 2	2 / 3	2 / 2	1 / 2	1 / 2
P3	3 / 4	3 / 4	3 / 4	3 / 4	4 / 4	3 / 4
P4	3 / 4	3 / 3	4 / 4	3 / 4	4 / 4	3 / 3
P5	3 / 3	3 / 4	3 / 3	2 / 3	4 / 2	2 / 2
P6	4 / 4	3 / 3	3 / 4	3 / 3	3 / 3	3 / 3
P7	2 / 4	3 / 4	4 / 3	3 / 3	2 / 3	3 / 4
P8	3 / 3	2 / 2	2 / 3	3 / 2	2 / 2	2 / 2
P9	3 / 3	2 / 2	2 / 3	2 / 3	2 / 2	2 / 2
TOTAL RESPONSES OVER 2 PER SCORER (GOAL 6.75)	9 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	9 / 9	8 / 9	8 / 9
TOTAL RESPONSES OVER 2 COMBINED SCORES (GOAL 13.5)	18	17	18	18	17	17

Results:

- The program exceeds its benchmark in every category and on both individual scorers’ scores as well as in total scores.
- SLO 1 and SLO 3 appear to be our best scores, with 5 students receiving a 4 in SLO 1 and 6 scoring a 4 in SLO 3; and only 3 students scoring a 2 on either SLO.
- On only one paper did an SLO being assessed in this activity (SLO 2) fail to meet the benchmark (though across all SLO student 2 failed three times to meet the benchmark when SLO 4 and SLO 5 are taken into account.)
- SLO 6 has the least scores at the 4 level (n of 2), and was 6 times scored at the low 2 level.
- SLO 2 has 3 students scoring at the highest rank of 4 (more than SLO 6); however SLO 2 also has the only 1 score, and was 5 times cored at the low 2 level.
- To assess rubric norming, it is important to note that faculty scorers agreed on scores a good deal of the time: on 5 scores for SLO 1; on 5 scores on SLO 2; on 3 scores on SLO 3; and on 3 scores on SLO 6. They are within 1 point of each other in all but one scoring. Also, scorers switch off on scoring higher and lower (no scorer was

consistently the higher or lower scorer). Paper 7, SLO 1, is the score with the most discrepancy between scorers (a 2 point difference in scores).

- For the SLO's not required to be assessed per our SOAP (SLO 4 and SLO 5): SLO 4 results are most interesting to consider, with 6 papers scored at a 4, yet one scored at 1, and 7 papers scored at the 2 level.

3. What changes did you make as a result of the data? Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

A "Closing the Loop" discussion was held Sept. 7, 2018, for 45 minutes at a regular faculty meeting.

- The results and sample draft of this report, along with the assignment student's responded to, were distributed to faculty in advance of the Sept. 7 meeting.

Faculty discussion of data:

- Faculty are pleased that over 5 students scored at the 4 level on SLO 1 and SLO 3, especially because intersectionality is one of the primary foci of the program. Also the results reflect well on student ability to apply knowledge of the field as analytical tools in addressing specific, unique, topics (in this case Zumba).
- Regarding SLO 6, faculty are not overly concerned about this score, since it was above the benchmark, but are surprised by aspects of it. The assignment asked students to reflect on an event they had organized as a class. So the event is well suited to this SLO. The paper instructions called on students to apply a methodology covered in class, "Latina feminist testimonios," to "weave together your personal narrative, and feminist analysis of Zumba and our class event.; importantly, you will aim to make a larger argument about Latina as bodies under surveillance and the possibilities for Zumba as a means of reclaiming space, autonomy, and self-definition." While we are glad to have high results here, we are surprised this area did not get scored better.
- Faculty discussed if this might be a norming issue. However, we note that faculty scores between the two scorers are not drastically out of line on any paper, so norming may not explain all that is going on here.
- Faculty also discussed if results show a need to focus more throughout the curriculum on application of course materials to everyday life and situations; can we do more to help students develop the language necessary to translate organizing actions into the written word?
- This observation inspired a broader discussion of the two non-reviewed SLO's and why writing scores aren't more outstanding given the amount of writing students in the program engage in.
- Since the only courses all WS Major's and Minors are required to take are the core (103, 143, 153, 175), we wondered if this was not a good place to think about how to up the writing skills of students as well as up their ability to communicate and reflect on organizing and activism. We have been very clear where and at what level Information Literacy (SLO 4) and Ability to Act (SLO 6) are emphasized at the advanced level in the core. Perhaps we need to more discussion on how SLO 5 (Communication Skills) is being emphasized in the core at the advanced level, as well as considering how SLO's 4, 5, and 6 are being reinforced and interact throughout the Core's. We are concerned both

that we are clear where communication skills are emphasized, but also that we are able to help students articulate and translate activism into usable frameworks for different audiences.

Faculty concurred on the following actions:

- Continue doing what we are doing, particularly in SLO 1 and SLO 3. Nice job!
- Faculty teaching non-GE/non-core course will consider more completely where and how SLO 6 is present in their courses and assignments.
- In assessment, we need to be sure assignment instructions for project under review are more completely integrated into norming sessions. In other words, the norming discussion should be sure each time an SLO is normed, the faculty consider where and how it is reflected in the specifics of the assignment, not just in the abstract of the goal and course level.
- Given the small N, when we assess 2018/2019 data using this same methodology on another course, we will include a second table that combines results with this course so we can see if results hold across classes.
- Because much of WS's non-GE/non-core curriculum are in single section courses taught by one instructor and often offered only occasionally, instructors should be careful to choose and clearly state on their syllabus which of the program SLO their course emphasizes. This seems particularly important where courses are cross listed with other departments. This would help Women's Studies, for one thing, see if across these courses all SLO are being covered, or if courses emphasize particular SLO, aiding in faculty consideration of alignment with programmatic SLO across the curriculum. It would also help communicate to students how these unique classes fit in with the larger curriculum goals of the program.
- Our current SOAP divides our SLO into two sets of goal areas, those aimed at content knowledge, and those aimed at skills. Our above discussion led faculty to believe we should revisit the skills area SLO's (4,5, and 6) to be sure we are clear on which skills are being emphasized at the advance level in which of our core courses, as well as how SLO's are being reinforced in the cores. This discussion occurred at the faculty meeting on 9/21/18 where the Assessment Report is being approved.

4. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY? List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

Activities to complete this year include:

- A. Complete data scoring, analysis, and closing the loop discussions on Assessment Activity II outlined about.
- B. Per WS SOAP timeline: Year 2018 to 2019 : Method 2: Analysis of Student Essay (non-GE/non-Core)

5. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan? Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”

- Our program review was finally signed off on last spring so we now have an approved action plan. Below we report on areas we have made progress. Please note numbering correspond to numbering in the program's action plan.

I. Continue our already strong efforts to recruit and retain students

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: maintaining an updated web site and social media for recruitment for the Major, Double Major and minor; expanded outreach to majors using Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter; regular updates of listserve for students and is working on updating information on Alumni; regularly host annual event to celebrate graduating students; developed new brochure on “What to do with WS Major”; regularly print and distribute other three main program brochures; distribute materials to COSS advising center; regularly compile and distribute course offering flyers before registration; regularly engage at tabling, often with P.O.W.E.R.; WS students have served on the COSS Student Advisory Council; continued working with current cross-listing departments, including Public Health, English, CLAS, African Studies, Communication, Asian Studies, History, Political Science, Philosophy, Counselor Education and Linguistics; regularized Politics of Latina Health as a cross-listed course with CLAS; Coordinator, working with staff, regularly contacts program other chairs to coordinate scheduling of cross listings so they do not conflict with program core courses

III. Hiring

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: applied for and obtained permission for two positions, with emphases on American Indian Studies and LGBTQ studies; recruited and hired for above positions; on-going mentorship of new faculty toward program and RTP success.

IV. Diversifying Curriculum

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: were campus leaders in defending MI as graduation requirement; expanded curriculum and ties to American Indian Studies and LGBTQ Studies; intersectionality and diversity is a focus of at least one faculty curriculum discussion annually; Intersectionality is integrated as a regular part of assessment.

V. Service Learning

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: received approval to offer newly revised courses, WS 120 and WS 175, as service learning courses.

VI. Internship Opportunities

Progress is being made in the following areas stated in our review: on-going outreach with community agencies concerning the possibilities of internships; worked with Rape Counseling Services to establish protocols for the internship program; initiated internships with Rape Counseling Services.

VII. Reassigned Time for the Director

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: The Dean of the College of Social Sciences expanded assigned time for the director, from 3 units per semester to 9 units annually.

VIII. Responses to Undergraduate Academic Program Review Subcommittee

Progress made in the following areas stated in our review: maintained major strengths outlined in that review, which include “high-quality, committed faculty....Relevant and up-to-date curricular design that takes a student-centered approach...including a significant contribution to general

education, ...a robust assessment plan, and highly visible campus presence that contributes to the university's mission of diversity"; increased office and meeting space.

VIII. Program Goals in Addition to Review Feedback

Progress is being made in the following areas stated in our review: welcomed new Program Coordinator and aided in her success; continued regular annual department retreats and regular, in-person, faculty meetings throughout each semester; faculty continue to be well placed in campus faculty governance; continued active involvement in various community organizations; continued collegiality among faculty.

Additional Guidelines: If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.

Attachments (for the use of assessment review committees only; not for general distribution on web sites):

- Assessment Activity I: Instructions to Students.
- Scoring Rubric