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Women’s Studies engaged in a number of time-intensive activities in 2016-2017 related to assessment. These included:

* In the fall we engaged in closing the loop discussions on assessment activities for 2015-2016.
* In the fall we also wrote, deliberated and approved its 2015-2016 department and GE assessment reports.
* For the record the assessment report for 2016-17comments: “You should consider summarizing the main findings of the results. Overall though, the department carried out thorough assessment and is clearly engaged in meaningful assessment.”
  + Alignment of Soap -3.5
  + Evidence and Discovery -3.5
  + Consideration of and use of results – 3.5
  + Overall Engagement in assessment – 3.5
* The Assessment Coordinator was a co- facilitator at the workshop “So now you have learning outcomes . . . : Assessment at the 200 Level” presented at the National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) Annual Conference. PA&D Pre-conference program, Montreal, CA November 2016.
* The Assessment Coordinator, in her capacity as Provost representative to the GE taskforce, was part of the campus team to attend AC&U's *Institute on General Education & Assessment* 2017
* We held closing the loop and assessment training during our program meeting August, 2017.

|  |
| --- |
| 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.   A goal of our program assessment in this round is to look at our non-GE non-core curriculum. We chose WS 136 T Reproductive Justice: Global Issues taught in the fall 2016 semester. We were to use a rubric to read these assignments to test SLO 1, 2, 3, and 6:   * + 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.     2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of feminism(s) theories, histories and methods, including the history of women’s organizations and movements.     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.     4. 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.”   After consultation, in fall 2016 we did alter the assessment activity from that outlined in the 2015-2020 assessment plan. This SOAP calls for the development of an essay question; instead we chose to return to a method of assessment from our last SOAP plan. Here we would collect essays from the class and have instructors score them on a rubric. This alteration was made to allow us to think more constructively about differences and similarities between outcomes for our Core (tested in our last SOAP round) and non-core, non-GE classes, a focus of this new SOAP.  According to our 2015-2021 SOAP, for rubric-based assessments our benchmark is: 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.) |
| 1. **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).   Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, we hit a hurdle in completing assessment goals this year. This has been communicated to the University Assessment Coordinator, Dr. Jordine, who agreed to grant the Program a grace-period this year. |
| 1. **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.   See above, question 3. |
| 1. **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.   Our SOAP timeline states that in 2017-2018 we will engage in the following activities:  Method 1: Capstone Learning Exam  Method 3: Post Exam (GE)  However, since GE assessment has moved from the program/department to the campus level, and due to the problems with last year’s assessment, the Women’s Studies Program decided that it will conduct the Capstone Learning exam in the Spring 2018. In fall 2017, we will administer the rubric-based student essay assessment activity (outlined above) in a non-core, non-GE class to make up for last year’s issues. |
| 1. **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.”   Women’s Studies is still in the midst of having its last program review finalized. Over the summer, Drs. Slagter and Kensinger wrote our new action plan and submitted it to the Provost. We await final consultation.  **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. |