

Assessment Cycle: 2019 Reporting

Overall Review: Report Approved

COMPLIANT

## Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at the University of South Florida is feminist education, research, and practice. We promote social justice by engaging students in the discovery and production of knowledge that emerges from feminist perspectives on culture and society.

- We teach students to use the analytic skills that emerge from engaging the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.
- We expose limits in traditional higher education caused by excluding women and other marginalized groups, and create knowledge that is transformative and inclusive. We aim for knowledge that will better all people's lives, not just the lives of a few.
- We connect our work as academics with the social, political, and economic world outside the university to educate our students about social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, able-ism, and ethnocentrism. We link knowledge, research, teaching, and activism.

We seek to empower students through a feminist critique of social, cultural, and institutional structures that enables them to think more critically about their own lives and that inspires them to work as active citizens for social change.

## Goal 1: Not Assigned

Discipline Specific Knowledge and Skills

### 1a. Student Learning Outcome Statement

Audit Review: AC

Students will demonstrate the ability to produce unique work (scholarship, research, fieldwork/internship, activism, volunteerism, portfolio, etc.) in the field of WGS using methods and/or practices appropriate to the purpose of the topic/issue while acknowledging feminist critiques of epistemology and relations of power.

### 1b. Method of Assessment

Audit Review: AC

Students in each of the 3 tracks will be assessed by the final project required for that track: (1) Thesis track/master's thesis (2) Internship track/internship narrative (3) Elective course work track/writing portfolio of 1-2 academic papers produced for graduate courses, academic conferences, or scholarly publication. A minimum of 2 faculty raters will score the final project using scale of "excellent" (4.0), "good" (3.0), "adequate" (2.0), "inadequate" (1.0) to assess three areas: (1) epistemology & Power: demonstrated understanding of the impact of relations of power and exclusion on the production of knowledge; (2) Appropriateness of Method: demonstrated ability to produce work using methods and/or practices appropriate to the purpose, topic, and WGS issue; (3) Individual Area of Expertise: coherently defined and applied individual area of expertise in WGS. The faculty scores will be averaged for each student for each of the three areas to determine each student's final scores, and then all students' averages will be averaged for reporting.

### 1c. Performance Targets

Audit Review: AC

The faculty scores will be averaged for each student for each of the three areas to determine each student's final scores. 80% of students will achieve a score of "adequate" in all three areas.

### 1d. Assessment Results

Audit Review: AC

Student Learning Objective 1: Discipline Specific Knowledge Regarding Epistemology, Power, Methods, & Practice.

A total of 9 faculty raters participated in assessing a total of 3 WGS MA students' theses for the 2019 reporting cycle. There were no internship or portfolio students for this reporting cycle.

Students' theses were assessed on each of 3 dimensions using a 4-point scale. The 3 dimensions were: Epistemology and Power, Appropriateness of Method, and Area of Expertise. The scale was Excellent (4.0), Good (3.0), Adequate (2.0), and Inadequate (1.0).

On each dimension, each student's MA Thesis committee members rated the thesis. Those scores were averaged. Then all 3 theses ratings were averaged across each of the dimensions.

SLO 1	Student 1 Avg	Student 2 Avg	Student 3 Avg	Dimension Averages
-------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------

Dim1: Epistemology and Power	3.00	3.33	4.00	3.44
Dim 2: Appropriateness of Method	3.33	3.33	3.67	3.44
Dim 3: Area of Expertise	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.89

#### Analysis of Learning Outcomes

100% of the students' theses averaged scores that were Good or better on SLO 1. The overall average of all student theses across all three dimensions of SLO 1 = 3.59.

#### 1e. Use of Assessment Results

*Audit Review: AC*

Though the theses scored very highly, with almost all of the dimensions scored at or above Good (3.0) for all three student learning objectives, there is one dimension in particular that we consider a space for program intervention: SLO 2: Dimension 2: Intersectional Analysis. This dimension had the lowest average across theses (at 3.22), and was the only dimension where a thesis was rated below Good (3.0). Our understanding of this dimension is that students should apply intersectional analysis "to the student's specific issue or topic."

Our chosen interventions for SLO 2: Dimension 2: Intersectional Analysis will be discussed under SLO 2.

#### Plan Review Comments

---

#### Report Review Comments

---

### Goal 2: Not Assigned

Critical Thinking

#### 1a. Student Learning Outcome Statement

*Audit Review: AC*

Students will demonstrate analytic skills emerging from engaging WGS core concepts and theories, including intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, ability, and nation in order to promote responsible citizenship in a diverse transnational environment.

#### 1b. Method of Assessment

*Audit Review: AC*

Students in each of the 3 tracks will be assessed by the final project required for that track: (1) Thesis track/master's thesis (2) Internship track/internship narrative (3) Elective course work track/writing portfolio of 1-2 academic papers produced for graduate courses, academic conferences, or scholarly publication. A minimum of 2 faculty raters will score the final project using scale of "excellent," "good," "adequate," "inadequate" to assess three areas: (1) Theory, as demonstrated conceptual knowledge relevant to Women's and Gender Studies; (2) Intersectional Analysis as applied to the student's specific issue or topic; (3) Applied Implications, articulated regarding the student's work, topic, and/or issue. The faculty scores will be averaged for each student for each of the three areas to determine each student's final scores.

#### 1c. Performance Targets

*Audit Review: AC*

80% of students will achieve a minimum of "Adequate" on all three items: Theory, Intersectional Analysis, and Applied Implications

#### 1d. Assessment Results

*Audit Review: AC*

Student Learning Objective 2: Critical Thinking and Discipline-Specific Knowledge.

A total of 9 faculty raters participated in assessing a total of 3 WGS MA students' theses for the 2019 reporting cycle. There were no internship or portfolio students for this reporting cycle.

Student theses were assessed on each of 3 dimensions using a 4-point scale. The 3 dimensions were: Women's and Gender Studies Theory,

Intersectional Analysis, Applied Implications. The scale was Excellent (4.0), Good (3.0), Adequate (2.0), and Inadequate (1.0).

On each dimension, each student's MA Thesis committee members rated the theses. Those scores were averaged. Then all 3 student thesis ratings were averaged across each of the dimensions.

SLO 2	Student 1 Avg	Student 2 Avg	Student 3 Avg	Dimension Averages
Dim 1: WGS Theory	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.89
Dim 2: Intersectional Analysis	2.67	3.00	4.00	3.22
Dim 3: Applied Implications	3.33	3.67	4.00	3.67

#### Analysis of Learning Outcomes

100% of student theses scored Adequate or better on SLO 2. One student scored Excellent (4.0) across all three raters and all three dimensions of SLO 2. One student's average scores were Good or better across all three dimensions. For the third student, their average on two of the three dimensions was Good or better. The overall average of all student theses across all three dimensions of SLO 2 = 3.59.

#### 1e. Use of Assessment Results

*Audit Review: AC*

Though the theses scored very highly, with almost all of the dimensions scored at or above Good (3.0) for all three student learning objectives, there is one dimension in particular that we consider a space for program intervention: SLO 2: Dimension 2: Intersectional Analysis. This dimension had the lowest average across theses (at 3.22), and was the only dimension where a thesis was rated below Good (3.0). Our understanding of this dimension is that students should apply intersectional analysis "to the student's specific issue or topic." Thus, it is incumbent on us as graduate faculty to implement two revisions to our MA program:

(1) Provide an opportunity in WST 6001 for students to learn about and articulate what it means to conduct an intersectional analysis. To complete this revision the Graduate Director will request that the Instructor of Record of WST 6001 design a learning opportunity about intersectional analysis for future iterations of the course. Including such a learning opportunity in WST 6001 is ideal, as the course is required of all WGS MA students. Information about the designed learning opportunity created for WST 6001 will be shared with current WGS MA students who have previously taken the WST 6001 course to ensure there are not cohort effects.

(2) Remind WGS thesis advisors to talk with their advisees about the importance of incorporating an intersectional analysis into their projects, and providing resources or support as students do so. To complete this revision, following the development of the learning opportunity on intersectional analysis for revision #1, information about this student learning opportunity and the goal of ensuring thesis students incorporate an intersectional analysis into their thesis projects will be shared with all graduate faculty.

#### Plan Review Comments

---

#### Report Review Comments

---

#### Goal 3: Not Assigned

**1a. Student Learning Outcome Statement**

*Audit Review: AC*

Students will complete and defend a writing project demonstrating the ability to articulate and defend arguments that connect their work as scholars, teachers, and activists with the social, political, and economic world outside the university regarding social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, ableism, and ethnocentrism.

**1b. Method of Assessment**

*Audit Review: AC*

Students in each of the 3 tracks will be assessed by the final project required for that track: (1) Thesis track/master's thesis (2) Internship track/internship narrative (3) Elective course work track/writing portfolio of 1-2 academic papers produced for graduate courses, academic conferences, or scholarly publication. Utilizing the University of California Composition Scoring Rubric and a scale of "excellent," "good," "adequate," and "inadequate," a minimum of 2 faculty raters will score the written work in the areas of (1) thesis, (2) support, (3) organization, (4) language, and (5) oral defense demonstrating feminist arguments regarding the social inequalities that result from sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, racism, classism, able-ism, and ethnocentrism. The faculty scores will be averaged for each student for each of the five areas to determine each student's final scores.

**1c. Performance Targets**

*Audit Review: AC*

80% of the students will achieve a score of at least adequate in all five areas.

**1d. Assessment Results**

*Audit Review: AC*

Student Learning Objective 3: Communication Skills.

A total of 9 faculty raters participated in assessing a total of 3 WGS MA students' theses for the 2019 reporting cycle. There were no internship or portfolio students for this reporting cycle.

Student theses were assessed on each of 5 dimensions using a 4-point scale. The 5 dimensions were: Thesis, Support, Organization, Language, and Oral Defense. The scale was Excellent (4.0), Good (3.0), Adequate (2.0), and Inadequate (1.0).

On each dimension, each student's MA Thesis committee members rated the theses. Those scores were averaged. Then all 3 student thesis ratings were averaged across each of the dimensions.

SLO 3	Student 1 Avg	Student 2 Avg	Student 3 Avg	Dimension Averages
Dim 1: Thesis	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.78
Dim 2: Support	3.33	3.00	4.00	3.44
Dim 3: Organization	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33
Dim 4: Language	3.00	3.67	4.00	3.56
Dim 5: Oral Defense	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.78

**Analysis of Learning Outcomes**

100% of student theses assessed scored Good or better across all five dimensions of SLO 3. One student thesis scored Excellent (4.0) across all three raters and all 5 dimensions of SLO 3. The overall average of all student theses across all five dimensions of SLO 3 = 3.58.

**1e. Use of Assessment Results***Audit Review: AC*

Though the theses scored very highly, with almost all of the dimensions scored at or above Good (3.0) for all three student learning objectives, there is one dimension in particular that we consider a space for program intervention: SLO 2: Dimension 2: Intersectional Analysis. This dimension had the lowest average across theses (at 3.22), and was the only dimension where a thesis was rated below Good (3.0). Our understanding of this dimension is that students should apply intersectional analysis “to the student's specific issue or topic.”

Our planned program interventions are discussed above under SLO 2.

**Plan Review Comments**

---

**Report Review Comments**

---

**Assessment Methods****Course Related Assessments**

---

**Cumulative Assessments**

---

Faculty Committee Evaluation of Dissertation, Thesis or Treatise  
Portfolio of Student Work

**Performance Related Assessments**

---

**External-course Assessments**

---

**Standard Assessments**

---