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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.)

Due to changes to the Google Sites web platform, we were not able to collect the main student learning artifacts, which consist of multiple projects collated into a PDF portfolio, used in our assessment of graduating majors. Attempts to revise the collection process were laborious and unsuccessful, and it was accordingly decided that because of the time necessary to create a new collection process, only one segment of the assessment plan could be carried out in AY 2021-22. A new artifact collection process will need to be instituted in the coming year. As a new chair and additional faculty hires will be joining the department, the time is propitious to revise policies and materials.

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 the artifacts in detail and identify the course(s) in which they 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 vocabulary test based on central WGS concepts was administered in all WGST 1900 Introduction to Women’s and Gender Studies courses in AY 2021-22. This included online winter and summer term courses, Madrid campus offerings, and 1818 partners; however, the exam was not administered fully in some sections so data is incomplete for the Madrid and winter/summer term versions.

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 (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

Two faculty members and the departmental admin reviewed all pre/post tests and evaluated the state of the assessment process at an end-of-semester meeting. The rubric used to assess the pre/post tests is attached with this report.
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)?

Overall, across all course sections, students meet expectations for defining and employing central concepts, as defined by the keywords included on the attached rubric, by the end of the course. There was some divergence in opinion about the adequacy with which the term intersectionality was addressed, which has been a source of discussion for several assessment cycles. However, the concept is capacious and its reach in the field is extensive, so a more narrow interpretation would not provide a more precise measure of whether students are engaging its ideas. The question has been flagged for further consideration. Incomplete data prompts the recommendation that instructors in Madrid and online sections need to be encouraged to administer the pre/post exam fully in order to gain insight into performance in those course sections.

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 beg for revision of the process. There is a surfeit of data to review, and these pre/post test measures do not give clear insight into improvement-over-time on mastery of these concepts.

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?

   May 2022, in-person faculty meeting.

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.

   We will be undertaking a review of the assessment plan and a revision of the data collection methods in the coming academic year. It is likely that the work will be referred to a departmental committee.

   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?

Following last year’s assessment, an excerpted version of Kimberle Crenshaw’s Mapping the Margins was distributed to all Introduction to WGS teachers in hopes that it would produce more congruity in defining the keyword “intersectionality.” The results this year do not suggest that this had an impact on student responses.

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

Informally

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., artifact prompts, 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

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

*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.*