

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): M.A.

Department: Women's and Gender Studies

College/School: A&S

Date: May 2019

Primary Assessment Contact: Amanda Izzo

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Learning Outcome #2: Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in women's and gender studies.

Learning Outcome #4: Articulate arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general audience, in both oral and written forms.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

#2: Original final research essays from Feminist Epistemologies; final reflection paper and curriculum materials from Internship (a course required of all M.A. students); essay and public presentation from Capstone

#4: Research proposal portfolio and research presentation from Cultural Methods; essay and oral defense from Capstone

There are no relevant Madrid courses.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

The department's three full-time core faculty, who teach the courses and supervise the internships and capstones, used the attached rubrics to assess the students' work. They met as a group to review the results and discuss their conclusions. There was consensus among them that its M.A. program is producing a satisfactory level of student achievement.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

#2 The capstone work completed by the two graduating students met and exceeded expectations. Based on instructor experience, it was decided that capstone students should be encouraged to workshop their papers while they are composing them. All students in the Epistemologies and Internships courses met or exceeded expectations for the assimilation and application of theories of feminism and gender studies, indicating that the assessment tools appropriately gauge the achievement of learning objectives.

#4 Most students met or exceeded expectations in Cultural Methods. It is the first time the course has been taught, and the curriculum was deemed a satisfactory infrastructure for the development of professional communication skills. Both capstone students exceeded expectations, with engaging presentation skills and

high quality of composition.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

With such a small graduate program—5 students total—the department must be cautious in drawing general conclusions about pedagogy and curriculum based narrowly on assessment measures, given the degree to which the individual students’ circumstances skew the data. At the same time, the lack of resources for program growth significantly limit the degree to which structural improvements can be made to this fairly new program.

Analysis of assessment results was done in concert with review of the results of exit interviews with graduating students. Together, the faculty concluded from these data that 1. the capstone projects have thus far testified to the maturation of M.A. students as scholars and researchers during their time in the program; 2. assessment of core course artifacts demonstrate that students are assimilating the discipline’s central concepts; 3. that more expansive offerings of theory courses and fewer dual enrollment (undergraduate/graduate) classes may be desirable—however, limited faculty resources hamper the ability to introduce such changes.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

The previous year’s feedback was reviewed, and the department has attempted to provide more descriptive accounts of its conclusions. Given that this is only the second year of data collection, that faculty are consistently in close contact with each other about graduate program performance, and that for most measures, data were drawn from the work of 2-5 students from courses that have been offered only once or twice, revision of the rubric was not determined to be a necessary step in appraising the value of the curriculum at this point in time. Such questions will be revisited as the program expands.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

Assessment rubric Capstone paper and oral defense

Learning outcome	Below expectations (BE)	(BE/ME)	Meets expectations (ME)	(ME/EE)	Exceeds expectations (EE)	Artifacts used
2. Applies WGS theories, practices, methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omits obvious relevant WGS theories or its implications for topic • Fails to account for feminist methodological issues, e.g., who gets to speak for whom, what impact diversity may have on evidence 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original analysis is well-supported by reference to authoritative scholarship • Attends to feminist methodological issues, e.g., who gets to speak for whom, what impact diversity may have on evidence 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesizes perspectives from multiple bodies of theory • Uses/proposes innovative solutions to feminist methodological issues, e.g., who gets to speak for whom, what impact diversity may have on evidence 	Written Capstone paper and oral Capstone defense
4. Written communication	Paper contains many typos, grammatical errors, or jargon, is poorly organized, and/or would be difficult for a general audience to understand		Paper contains very few typos, grammatical errors, and jargon, is well-organized, and can be understood by a general audience		Paper is not only clear and has minimal errors, but uses innovative techniques to communicate information and, if applicable, to facilitate use by the designated users	Written Capstone paper
4. Oral communication	Oral defense contains undue jargon, is poorly organized, and/or would be difficult for a general audience to understand		Oral defense contains little jargon, is well-organized, and can be understood by a general audience		Oral defense is not only clear but uses innovative techniques to communicate information and, if applicable, to facilitate use by the designated users	Oral Capstone defense
6. Uses intersectional analysis and acknowledges diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores obvious diversity and intersectionality issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounts for diversity and intersectionality issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes novel accounts of diversity and intersectionality issues 	Written Capstone paper and oral Capstone defense

Assessment rubric Feminist Epistemologies

Learning outcome	Below expectations (BE)	(BE/ME)	Meets expectations (ME)	(ME/EE)	Exceeds expectations (EE)	Artifacts used
1. Assesses relevant literature	Paper fails to give a coherent picture of the problem or how to address it, as discussed so far in existing literature. No original analysis.		Paper shows how existing literature defines and addresses the relevant issues. Moves beyond piece-by-piece approach to understanding it. Offers some original analysis.		Uses multidisciplinary resources in evaluating current approaches to the problem being discussed. They are understood thematically rather than article-by-article. Original analysis may be publishable.	Research paper
2. Applies WGS theories, practices, and methodologies	In written and oral work, student fails to consider the nature or impact of feminist epistemological contributions such as standpoint, intersectionality, and epistemic injustice.		In written and oral work, student grasps and applies feminist epistemic contributions such as standpoint, intersectionality, and epistemic injustice. Some attention to the distinctiveness of WGS and the implications for student work.		Grasps and pushes forward discussion of ideas and practices such as standpoint, epistemic injustice, and intersectionality. Grasps WGS praxis and applies it in written and oral work.	Classroom participation, current events links, research paper

Assessment rubric
Research methodologies courses (Research Design; Program Evaluation)

Learning outcome	Below expectations (BE)	(BE/ME)	Meets expectations (ME)	(ME/EE)	Exceeds expectations (EE)	Artifacts used
4. Written and oral communication	Project proposal contains typos, grammatical errors/jargon, is poorly organized, and/or would be difficult for a general audience to understand. Project presentation is poorly organized and/or lacks clarity.		Project proposal contains very few typos, grammatical errors, or jargon, is well-organized, and can be understood by a general audience. Presentation enables audience to understand major content areas.		Project proposal is not only clearly written with few errors, but uses innovative design to communicate information and, if applicable, to facilitate use by the designated users. Presentation effectively addresses general and professional audience.	Final project research design
5. Scholarly and/or professional integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students fail to take ethical issues into account • In group work, students do less than their fair share • Students fail to meet commitments when working with community partners 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students take ethical issues into account • In group work, students do their fair share • Students meet commitments when working with community partners 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students go above and beyond expectations to assist community partners 	Process of carrying out group/individual final projects, as indicated by class discussions and feedback from other students and/or community partners

Assessment rubric Graduate Internship

Learning outcome	Below expectations (BE)	(BE/ME)	Meets expectations (ME)	(ME/EE)	Exceeds expectations (EE)	Artifacts used
2. Applies WGS theories, practices, methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores obvious diversity, inter-sectionality, and power differentials in the organization • Fails to account for feminist methodological issues in carrying out internship activities, e.g., who gets to speak for whom, what impact diversity may have on data gathering or outcomes 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounts for diversity, intersectionality, and power differentials in the organization • Attends to feminist methodological issues in carrying out internship activities, e.g., who gets to speak for whom, what impact diversity may have on data gathering or outcomes 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses internship project to mitigate unequal power in the organization or broader society 	<p>Internship activities, as evidenced in project proposal, short reports, final paper, and site supervisor feedback</p>
5. Scholarly and/or professional integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student fails to take ethical issues into account • In any group work, student does less than their fair share • Student fails to meet commitments when working with community partners 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student takes ethical issues into account • In any group work, students do their fair share • Student meets commitments when working with community partners 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student goes above and beyond expectations to assist community partners 	<p>Process of carrying out internship projects, as indicated by project proposal, short reports, final paper, and site supervisor feedback</p>