This final report describes accomplishments and activities of a project at Winona State University (Minnesota) to integrate the concepts and skills of active citizenship and community action into the Women's Studies curriculum. The project supported faculty development seminars, course development, and community outreach activities. Faculty development included three day-long seminars and a week-long course development workshop. Curriculum development focused on the incorporation of a field experience requirement into the Women's Studies minor. Community outreach involved development of working relationships with local nonprofit organizations and community agencies as potential field experience sites. Project evaluation involved a statistical survey of Women's Studies students and other Winona State University students and a qualitative review. The survey found Women's Studies students were more confident than other students in their skills and belief that they could make a difference on an issue by attending a meeting. The qualitative report conducted by an outside evaluator used focus groups and concluded that the project made a significant impact on Women's Studies faculty and students. Individual sections of this report provide information on the project's purpose, background and origins, overall design, evaluation/results, and conclusions. The final evaluation report is attached.
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Executive Summary

Citizenship Education in Women's Studies
Winona State University
Winona, MN 55987
Project director: Colette A. Hyman, (507) 457-5880

A. Project Overview

The project Citizenship Education in Women's Studies (CEWS) was designed to promote students' effectiveness as citizens in their communities by integrating the concepts and skills of active citizenship and community action into the Women's Studies curriculum. The project prepared faculty to work as teachers and mentors in Women's Studies students' development as community activists and established a field experience requirement for the Women's Studies minor.

B. Purpose

CEWS was established in order to make issues of citizenship a central focus of the Women's Studies Program at Winona State University. Faculty development seminars allowed faculty teaching Women's Studies courses to explore the various meanings and implications of active citizenship and community action, and to explore ways in which they could integrate considerations of citizenship into the courses they taught. The CEWS project allowed the Women's Studies Program to develop and implement a field experience requirement in which students gain practical experience that furthers their understanding of and skills in active citizenship and allows them to apply to experiential settings concepts and analyses developed in their courses.

C. Background and Origins

The Women's Studies Program's concern with issues of democratic citizenship stems from two sources: a commitment to perpetuating the original spirit of women's studies and a concern with current definitions and implementations of "service learning." The field of women's studies emerged from the second wave of the women's movement, in the 1960s and 1970s. The first scholars and teachers in the field were also feminist activists, and sought to pursue their social change goals within the academy; entering the realm of higher education, however, was never intended as a farewell to efforts toward social and economic justice, especially regarding women. Yet in recent years, as the field of women's studies has gained increasing legitimacy and developed all the indicators of a full-fledged academic discipline (professional association, juried journals, tenure lines in colleges and universities), it has also moved away from its commitment to social action. The Women's Studies Program at WSU joins with women's studies educators around the country to return women's studies to its activist roots.

The experiences and stated preferences of faculty involved with the emerging Women's Studies Program for linking education and action coincided with a growing interest in "service-learning" and the meaning of citizenship. Contemporary statements by political and educational theorists on the importance of re-integrating notions of citizenship into educational curricula provided a valuable complement to increasingly popular formulations of "service-learning" which emphasized working on behalf of the common good and integrating such work with academic pursuits. In our activism-oriented feminist Women's Studies Program, "service" seemed like more of what women have conventionally been expected to do. We wanted our students to understand not only why things are as they are but how they could be different, and how they CAN make a difference. Service-learning provided a useful framework
for integrating experiential education into the curriculum of the Women’s Studies Program; citizenship education supported the more overtly political, social-change orientation of many of those involved in the Program.

D. Project Descriptions

The CEWS project included three major elements: faculty development, curriculum development and community outreach. Faculty development included three day-long seminars on citizenship and women’s studies, and a week-long course development workshop; curriculum development focused on the incorporation of a field experience requirement into the Women’s Studies minor; and community outreach was designed to cultivate potential field experience sites.

In order for the Women’s Studies Program to successfully incorporate citizenship education into its curriculum, faculty needed particular resources: specifically, a shared understanding of “citizenship” and the opportunity to work together to weave this concept into their courses. The former was developed through three day-long workshops during the first year of the grant. Faculty spent this time discussing various aspects of activism, social change, community relations and the relationship of all of these to women’s studies. While the original plan was to develop a common definition and understanding of citizenship that would inform the program, it became apparent very early on that we would not reach consensus; nor did participants feel the need for such consensus.

Differences in approaches to activism, and indeed to women’s studies became even more apparent during the week-long seminar designed to give participants the opportunity to develop course syllabi that would reflect the program’s commitment to social action. The three outside facilitators navigated these differences gracefully, although participants’ evaluations of their work and of the seminar as a whole, predictably, varied. On the whole, however, the eleven participants valued the opportunity to discuss curriculum and specific course plans. The seminar ended with a discussion of ways to maintain the process of collaboration begun that week.

The original proposal for integrating citizenship would have required that students undertake different kinds of experiential “citizenship” projects in various Women’s Studies courses. Such a plan rapidly proved unworkable and was replaced by a new field experience requirement. As project director for CEWS, I reviewed the structure and requirements of internships and other experiential learning components of other programs on campus and developed a proposal that would include as part of the field experience requirements a weekly seminar discussion that would draw out the links between students’ work at their field sites and questions of citizenship and social change.

The community outreach piece of the CEWS project was undertaken by a part-time staff member hired by the project. She contacted agencies and organizations in the area that would be interested in having a field experience student.

E. Evaluation/Project Results

Evaluation of the CEWS project was conducted along two distinct lines: a statistical survey of WSU students and Women’s Studies students in particular was undertaken to determine the impact of the Women’s Studies Program on students’ orientation toward social change and community action; a qualitative review, using focus groups and course materials, explored how faculty and students and faculty weigh the influence of the project on their teaching and learning.

The statistical survey, while limited by a small sample size of Women’s Studies students, clearly provides evidence of the successful implementation of the Citizenship Education in Women’s Studies project and its impact on students. Women’s Studies students are more confident in their skills and
confident that attending a meeting on a particular issue might make a difference that first-year students or WSU students overall.

The qualitative report conducted by the project's outside evaluator also shows that the CEWS project made a significant impact on Women's Studies faculty and students alike. Faculty made significant changes in course syllabi, and not just for their Women's Studies courses, but for all their courses. Students appear to be engaged and actively involved in their learning and aware of relevant community issues and of potential responses or actions they could take as responsible citizens.
THE FINAL REPORT

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Citizenship Education in Women’s Studies (CEWS) project emerged from a shared concern among the Winona State University faculty, staff and students involved in establishing the Women’s Studies Program in 1992: that the Program have and maintain significant and substantive links to the surrounding community and to current social issues and activism concerning women’s issues. Current interest in community service and “service learning,” as well as the historical connection of women’s studies to social action (see C. BACKGROUND AND ORIGINS) provided a language and a context for integrating commitment to social change into an academic curriculum.

The CEWS project allowed participants in the Women’s Studies program to meet the objective of maintaining close contact with current issues and those working on them outside of the university by integrating issues of citizenship into the whole Women’s Studies curriculum, and indeed integrating the concern for social action into the Teaching and Learning Objectives developed by the Women’s Studies Program in the final year of the FIPSE project. Approximately twenty faculty members participated in faculty development seminars and have incorporated into their courses readings and assignments that address questions of community action. Many of these faculty have integrated citizenship into all their courses, not just their Women’s Studies courses. In addition, Women’s Studies faculty have been able to articulate a much more coherent vision of our work in the Women’s Studies Program, as is evident by the Goal and Objectives document drafted by Program faculty and students in the third year of the grant. Finally, all students taking Women’s Studies classes in the past 2-3 years have been exposed to questions of citizenship and the need to develop the analyses and skills necessary to make positive social change, on issues of greatest concern to women and all groups in society. A survey of WSU students conducted by a project evaluator indicates that Women’s Studies students do indeed leave WSU with a greater concern for social issues and greater commitment to take action on them than mother WSU seniors.

B. PURPOSE

The “problem” that the CEWS project was designed to address was students’ active participation as citizens and agents of social change. As stated in the proposal submitted to FIPSE, the Women’s Studies program seeks to “develop in students a practical understanding of democratic citizen participation. The goal of the Women’s Studies Program is to empower students to seek out and set into motion new and better solutions to the problems that face our society.” The process of preparing students to be agents of positive social change is a highly developmental one, one that cannot be accomplished in the confines of a single course. The Women’s Studies Program thus sought to integrate this preparation throughout the curriculum, rather than require students simply to participate in a service-learning experience.

One of the most significant lessons learned, very early on in the project, is that a structured experiential learning component of the curriculum would be required in order for the program to achieve its goals. Both students and potential field site supervisors required this; expecting students to engage in experiential learning with the goal of citizenship development as part of different classes was unrealistic. We decided instead to institute a field experience requirement that included a seminar for analyzing and discussing students’ work at their field sites. Students would be prepared for this field experience and for drawing from it lessons of citizenship and community action by prior coursework in Women’s Studies.

In the Winter Quarter of 1997, the third cohort of Women’s Studies students completed the field experience requirement. As the instructor responsible for this course, I now realize that, just as Women’s Studies faculty had projected, any site can be a fruitful for this experience, if students receive the appropriate preparation and guidance. This requires that the students, as a group and individually, be
directed toward looking for the lessons to be learned about citizenship and activism in whatever situation they find themselves. What can an advertising major learn from working on publicity materials for a child care center? What can a student interested in working with children learn about democratic citizenship and social change from assisting a teacher in a child care center?

While research has indicated that women's studies graduates tend to be far more committed to social change than college graduates overall, much of this research is based on large urban universities and elite private colleges. How do we promote this sense of empowerment for social change when working with a student population that is largely rural, from lower-income families, and from families with little or no college education? How do we overcome the sense of disenfranchisement and alienation from political life that disadvantaged Americans feel far more frequently than their wealthier peers? In addition, how do we achieve this in a conservative small-town community where on-going social change projects are far fewer than in large metropolitan areas, and where existing ones are often considered to be the devil's work?

In the original formulation of the problem, rural issues (regarding communication, transportation and the farm economy) appeared to be ones that, among others, would distinguish this project from "service-learning" projects at other institutions. In reality, students have shown little interest in such issues, though the fact of being outside a metropolitan area did limit the selection of field experience sites, and limit students' opportunities for working with groups already seeking "new and better solutions to the problems that face our society." Students were resourceful in identifying sites that would allow them to examine gender issues and work in areas in which they had personal or academic or professional interests; several have used an on-going job as their field experience site, a possibility that had generated some dissension among Women's Studies faculty, but was finally accepted, since we all did agree that any site could, with appropriate preparation and guidance, provide students with new insights into the functioning of gender and power. What has been more challenging has been guiding students toward looking at their field experiences as opportunities for developing new skills and understandings necessary to them as active citizens in their communities.

In terms of "administrative pitfalls," I would note that the proposal tried to do too much for the students in one area: the project hired a part-time staff member to establish liaisons with potential field experience sites. While this provided an opportunity to promote the Women's Studies Program in Winona and surrounding communities, it was not a very effective use of resources, for several reasons. First, this contact set up the expectation that Women's Studies students would be appearing in the near future, which has not happened. Second, the kinds of organizations contacted and eventually listed in the program's directory of potential field sites--small local government offices and private non-profit organizations--tend to undergo frequent personnel turnover, leaving new staff members with little or no knowledge of prior contact with the Women's Studies Program. Finally, students benefit from identifying their own site, according to their own interests, skills, time and other constraints. The process itself of identifying such a site provides students with valuable experience in exploring both their own interests and the community around them.

C. BACKGROUND AND ORIGINS

Because the Citizenship Education in Women's Studies project was begun only one year after the establishment of a Women's Studies Program and academic minor, it is important to discuss the background of the Program in order to clarify the background and origins of the CEWS project. While the newness of the Women's Studies Program prior to the CEWS project makes it difficult, in many ways, to discuss a Women's Studies Program that does not contain a strong focus on citizenship and community action, the newness of the Program, combined with the experiences of many of the faculty members involved, facilitated the development of a Program-wide focus on citizenship.
Since the mid-1980s, WSU faculty in different departments began offering courses focusing on women and women's issues; other faculty consciously and actively used works by and about women in all of their courses. These faculty members did make a couple of attempts at establishing a Women's Studies program in the 1980s, but several factors, including WSU's fairly conservative curriculum and risk-averse faculty and administration, doomed such attempts to failure. Because of the general lack of hospitality to discussion of women's issues on campus, feminist faculty members, politicized by their earlier experience with feminism and other social change movements, became active in the local community, especially with the Women's Resource Center of Winona, among whose founding mothers were two WSU faculty members. Within a few years, more women faculty had been hired, including myself, who had been specifically hired to teach women's history. Soon after my arrival in Winona, I was invited to join the board of directors of the Women's Resource Center, which provides advocacy and support for battered women and victims of sexual assault and works to change attitudes and policies toward violence against women.

Therefore, when faculty interested in starting a Women's Studies Program began meeting in 1991, some of us were already teaching women's studies courses, and many of us had experience working with the small feminist community in Winona. Around the same time, the field of women's studies as a whole was taking a decisive turn toward the theoretical and the abstract, away from original commitments to making social change. From our earliest discussions, we wanted to reaffirm the importance of activism in the agenda of women's studies and to keep the program from being isolated in an academic ivory tower. In retrospect, it seems to me that, for many of us, this meant making a connection between the work we did on campus and our feminism off campus.

The fact that many of us were actively involved in the Winona community outside of the University gave integrity, substance and concreteness to faculty members' interest in fostering and maintaining ties with the surrounding community and with ongoing hands-on efforts to address women's social, economic and political needs. Among the women interested in starting a women's studies program that remained tied to the community were women who had been parents in a parent-run school, who had helped found and run a local food coop, who had been members of intentional communities, who were active in the local Democratic party, and whose personal history included civil rights and anti-war activism. When they said they wanted a program that remained connected to the community and to activism, they were drawing on their own lived experiences, rather than an abstract or exclusively theoretical understanding of the relationship between women's studies and community action. These experiences, I believe, made possible a commitment to incorporating citizenship throughout the curriculum of the Women's Studies Program once the new program received funding to do so from FIPSE.

Program coincided with a growing interest in "service-learning" and the meaning of citizenship. Contemporary statements by political and educational theorists on the importance of re-integrating notions of citizenship into educational curricula provided a valuable complement to increasingly popular formulations of "service-learning" which emphasized working on behalf of the common good and...
liberal arts majors offer students the option of completing an internship as part of their major requirements. Students as well as faculty and administrators were therefore familiar with the internships, as were local social service agencies—many of those approached as potential Women’s Studies field experience sites had experience with social work interns. These internship programs provided useful models for developing the Women’s Studies field experience requirement. Moreover, many student groups participate in community service projects; all fraternities and sororities, for example, have strict service requirements for their members, introducing the notion of working on behalf of social concerns to relatively large numbers of students. The Women’s Studies field experience requirement thus has benefited, from the beginning, from appearing in the familiar guise of an internship. Yet the internship has also been useful as a counter-model: unlike Social Work majors who learn, through their internships, how to be professionals in their chosen field, Women’s Studies minors learn from the field experience how to question existing professions and institutions and how to challenge existing institutions in order to make them more responsive to their constituencies.

The CEWS project also benefited from the presence on campus of an active Faculty Development Center and an institutional culture that supports faculty development. Faculty in many different disciplines and across disciplines are engaged in active discussions about teaching methodologies, and new faculty members often receive some degree of mentoring from more experienced faculty, inside or outside their department. Moreover, the union contract covering faculty members promotes faculty development in two ways: first, Professional Development Plans and Reports—to be completed yearly by probationary faculty and every four years by tenured faculty—require faculty members to address “teaching effectiveness” and “continuing preparation” as part of their professional activities; secondly, it provides Professional Development Funds to departments based on the number of faculty members in each department, and faculty members can use such funds to attend conferences, even when they are not presenting. The former strongly encourages faculty to attend to matters of pedagogy, while the latter provides funds to do so. Such support for faculty development was, I now realize, key to the success of the project because it predisposed faculty to talk openly about what they teach and how, and to work collaboratively in the area of curriculum development.

D. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The CEWS project included three major elements: faculty development, curriculum development, and community outreach. Faculty development included three day-long seminars on citizenship and women’s studies, and a week-long course development workshop; curriculum development focused on the incorporation of a field experience requirement into the Women’s Studies minor; and community outreach was designed to cultivate potential field experience sites.

In order for the Women’s Studies Program to successfully incorporate citizenship education into its curriculum, faculty needed particular resources: specifically, a shared understanding of “citizenship” and the opportunity to work together to weave this concept into their courses. The former was developed through three day-long workshops during the first year of the grant. Faculty spent this time discussing various aspects of activism, social change, community relations and the relationship of all of these to women’s studies. Though faculty members involved in the Women’s Studies Program still maintain diverse understandings of social change and social action, the seminars allowed us to bring such differences to the table. While the original plan was to develop a common definition and understanding of citizenship that would inform the program, it became apparent very early on that we would not reach consensus; nor did participants feel the need for such consensus. The guiding assumption here was the need to develop common definitions; this assumption was rapidly proven false, without detracting from the value of the discussions or from the eventual success of the project.

Differences in approaches to activism, and indeed to women’s studies became even more apparent during the week-long seminar designed to give participants the opportunity to develop course syllabi that would reflect the program’s commitment to social action. The three outside facilitators navigated these
differences gracefully, although participants’ evaluations of their work and of the seminar as a whole, predictably, varied. On the whole, however, the eleven participants valued the opportunity to discuss curriculum and specific course plans. The seminar ended with a discussion of ways to maintain the process of collaboration begun that week. While the seminar was extremely valuable in the process of developing new courses and course materials, and revising existing courses, as director of the Women’s Studies Program, I believe that the most valuable outcome of the seminar is the sense of community and collegiality that grew among Women’s Studies faculty. Since there had not been extensive contact among these faculty members prior to the establishment of the program and to the CEWS project, the intensive discussions of pedagogy and curriculum that took place in the week-long seminar at the end of the first year of the CEWS project strengthened the foundation of the program by developing firm working relations among participants.

The faculty development component of the CEWS project was the most labor- and resource-intensive. Recruitment of faculty participants, particularly for the week-long seminar, involved contacting all faculty who had until then expressed interest in the Women’s Studies Program, by letter and many by phone as well. As anyone planning faculty development events knows, most faculty are supportive and even enthusiastic, but the diverse demands made on faculty members’ time makes it difficult to make the kind of commitment necessary to participate in all sessions. Demands on faculty time are especially heavy at WSU, where there is a strong expectation that faculty, at all ranks, will actively participate in departmental and university-wide committees. Once faculty committed to the week-long seminar, however, they participated fully and consistently.

The curriculum development and community outreach pieces of the CEWS project are really two parts of the same initiative: incorporating experiential learning into the curriculum. The original proposal for integrating citizenship would have required that students undertake different kinds of “citizenship” projects in various Women’s Studies courses. Such a plan rapidly proved unworkable and was replaced by a new field experience requirement. As project director for CEWS, I reviewed the structure and requirements of internships and other experiential learning components of other programs on campus and developed a proposal that would include as part of the field experience requirements a weekly seminar discussion that would draw out the links between students’ work at their field sites and questions of citizenship and social change. I have now “taught” the field experience three times, giving more structure to discussions each time. I am now convinced that on-going structured discussions of the nature and processes of grass-roots activism are central to the success of the seminar and, indeed, to the success of the field experience as a training for social change activism.

The community outreach piece of the CEWS project was undertaken by a part-time staff member hired by the project. As a recent graduate of the Women’s Studies Program and assistant in the Women’s Studies office, Elaine Phillips was familiar with the existing curriculum and with the CEWS project. She contacted agencies and organizations in the area that would be interested in having a field experience student. She emphasized that it was of central importance to the Women’s Studies Program that the field experience should not only benefit the individual student, but should provide useful work at the site. Elaine thus asked the potential sites about the kind of work that they needed and that a field experience student might be able to provide for them. In order to give the WSU Women’s Studies Program a clearer understanding of the significance of its work within the field of women’s studies, Elaine also developed and implemented a survey of women’s studies programs at 4-year state colleges and universities. Results of this survey suggest that the WSU Women’s Studies Program is leading the way, not only in reinstating experiential education requirements into the curriculum, but in developing conceptual frameworks for making such requirements part of the curriculum. Proposals have been submitted to present these results at regional and national women’s studies conferences.

As noted earlier in this report, this last piece was the least fruitful of the activities undertaken as part of the project. The project proposal included a substantial commitment to this element of the project in order to establish relationships between the Women’s Studies Program and community institutions that would clearly benefit both. The Women’s Studies Program wanted to avoid burdening agencies and
organizations that are probably already stretched thin. Because this is not a pre-professional internship, the requirements for the students' work are not sharply defined, in terms of the kinds of tasks that they need to be doing. With three years of experience, I now realize that it is the responsibility of the student to be clear about her or his goals and objectives in the field experience. This, in turn, requires that the Women's Studies Program in general and the field experience supervisor in particular ensure that students embarking on the field experience are adequately prepared for that component of the Women's Studies minor. In the planning stages, however, the Women's Studies Program wanted to ensure that this new requirement be seen as an opportunity for potential field sites, rather than an added burden. For institutions considering adding a field component to their academic requirements, I would retain the community liaison component of the project, but I would make it a more limited position, focused on introducing the relevant communities to the Women's Studies Program.

E. Evaluation/Project Results

Evaluation of the CEWS project was conducted along two distinct lines: a statistical survey of WSU students and Women's Studies students in particular was undertaken to determine the impact of the Women's Studies Program on students' orientation toward social change and community action; a qualitative review, using focus groups and course materials, explored how faculty and students and faculty weigh the influence of the project on their teaching and learning.

The statistical survey, while limited by a small sample size of Women's Studies students, clearly provides evidence of the successful implementation of the Citizenship Education in Women's Studies project and its impact on students. Because the data is self-reported, it must be viewed with some skepticism, but regardless of actual skill level, Women's Studies students (WSS) are more confident in their skills and confident that attending a meeting on a particular issue might make a difference that first-year students (FYS) or WSU students overall (OS). It is this sense of empowerment that perhaps was the most significant result of the CEWS project. We do not have the data that follows students once they leave the program, but we do know that they leave with the feeling that they can make a difference. The data on the following pages display key findings of the survey.
Taking Action
A number of interesting results were found in the analysis of data related to what students would do to support a cause. Issues which students were most concerned about were education, homelessness, the environment, and child abuse. (Numbers reflect percentages of students who responded that they would do the specific action identified).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FYS</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>WSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homelessness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>FYS</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>WSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women's Rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Peace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Hunger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Money</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Letter</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Meeting</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a Group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issues which were less salient to the subject pool were women's rights, world peace, health care, and world hunger. WSS were less likely to ignore the issues listed than OS or FYS. Interestingly, OS were the most willing to ignore the listed issues.

If asked to donate money, homelessness was the cause that drew the most positive response from all subject groups. World hunger was also a priority for FYS and OS, while no other issue emerged as a top priority for donations from WSS. Overall, FYS students were more willing to donate money than were either WSS or OS.

Writing letters to support an issue was identified as something that a large number of the subjects in all three pools would consider. The environment and child abuse were the issues which drew the greatest amount of letter writing support. Overall, WSS were twice as likely to write a letter in support of an issue than either FYS or OS.

When it comes time to actually attend a meeting in support of an issue, education, child abuse and race relations were the issues which drew the most support across subject pools, though there was notable support for virtually
every issue. Of the options listed (donate money, write a letter, attend a meeting, organize a group), attending a meeting grew the most support. Interestingly, on all of the action options identified, WSS were the most interested in attending a meeting on the issue. In seven out of the eleven issues, FYS were more likely than seniors to attend a meeting related to that issue.

Interesting results emerged when subjects were asked if they would consider organizing a meeting in support of the identified issues. The issue most likely to gain support was child abuse, with over 25% of each population stating that they would organize a meeting about the issue. FYS reported the greatest willingness to organize on the topic. WSS students reported the greatest willingness to organize a meeting on women's rights, while the topic that most interested seniors was also child abuse. A very important finding was that the FYS were more willing to organize a meeting concerning an issue than either WSS or the other group of seniors on five of the eleven topic areas. Other Seniors were most interested in organizing a group related to education or child abuse.

When presented with an issue closer to the student's experience ("Imagine that you live in a dormitory on a college campus and there have been five different crimes in the past month. Which actions would you take?") the same pattern emerged in terms of actions which would be considered, with WSS being more likely to engage in the identified activities than their FYS and OS counterparts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>FYS</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>WSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start a petition</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write to the President of the University</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a meeting that was organized by someone else</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a meeting for people in your dormitory</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities of interest

Subjects also were asked to rank seven activities in terms of their importance. While family/relatives ranked number 1 (most important) for all subjects, further ratings showed some interesting differences. For first year students, friends ranked second, followed by personal development, career, sports/relaxation, community and civic activities, and politics and public life. Seniors rankings were similar, except personal development ranked higher than friends, which dropped to fourth. WSS ranked both family and personal development as the most important, followed by friends, and then sports/relaxation. Career was ranked fifth, lower than FYS and other seniors ranked that item. Community activities and politics ranked sixth and seventh. Overall, the WSS rankings were closer to those of FYS than to the other seniors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FYS</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>WSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>career</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>4.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family/relatives</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>2.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community activities</td>
<td>5.802</td>
<td>5.525</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports / relaxation</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>5.115</td>
<td>3.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal development</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>2.820</td>
<td>2.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politics and public life</td>
<td>6.149</td>
<td>6.328</td>
<td>5.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>3.262</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibilities of Citizenship

The majority of subjects in all categories believe that registering to vote, registering for the draft, reporting for jury duty, paying taxes, obeying the laws, assisting the police when witnessing a crime, and paying attention to what happens in government are part of being a good citizen. Subjects were less convinced that running for elected office, volunteering for community service, giving blood, picking up litter, car pooling, recycling, or staying out of debt were parts of citizenship.

There was no recognizable pattern in the differences in responses between FYS, OS, and WSS.
The qualitative report conducted by the project's outside evaluator also shows that the CEWS project made a significant impact on Women's Studies faculty and students alike. Faculty made significant changes in course syllabi, and not just for their Women's Studies courses, but for all their courses. Students appear to be engaged and actively involved in their learning and aware of relevant community issues and of potential responses or actions they could take as responsible citizens. The full evaluation follows this report.

Faculty have taken seriously the responsibility of disseminating results of the CEWS project and of its impact on their work. During 1995, faculty made presentations at three conferences, including the annual meeting of the National Women's Studies Association. Response to the presentations was consistently enthusiastic and the Program has responded to numerous requests for information about our work with Citizenship Education in Women's Studies.

The CEWS project has been successfully institutionalized and integrated into the functioning of the Women's Studies Program. Descriptive materials on the program highlight its emphasis on citizenship and faculty teaching courses for the Women's Studies Program are required to incorporate some discussion of citizenship, in whatever way is appropriate to their course and discipline. As noted above, the Program's Teaching and Learning Objectives document (attached) emphasizes action and, finally, the new Field Experience requirement ensures that students will have the opportunity for experiential learning about citizenship and social action.

F. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the most valuable lessons I have learned from "doing" the Citizenship Education in Women's Studies project regards experiential education. Since my teaching field outside of Women's Studies is History, I have had few opportunities to explore the pedagogical implications and obligations of experiential education. This project has certainly taught me a great deal about these and, as I mentioned earlier, about the importance of providing a clear structure for students engaged in field experiences. I would certainly recommend that others interested in initiating such a project devote more resources to developing the seminar component of the field experience.

Working on the CEWS project with Women's Studies colleagues from various disciplines has reinforced for me the value of on-going discussion about pedagogy and goals among faculty in an interdisciplinary program. Working together in the faculty development seminars has created a cohesiveness that the institutional embodiment of Women's Studies, at Winona State University as elsewhere, makes difficult to achieve otherwise. While disciplinary departments share a subject matter broadly defined and methodologies, the interdisciplinary nature of women's studies --one of its strengths, certainly-- makes shared perspectives and approaches difficult. This situation is exacerbated when women's studies becomes institutionalized as a program without tenure lines, rather than a department with a set number of faculty. In addition, as the external evaluator notes, the continuing tenuousness of the Program's existence (somewhat reduced by the FIPSE grant) makes long-term planning difficult and diverts toward survival energies that might otherwise be directed toward program and curriculum development. The stability and resources offered by the CEWS project provided opportunities for crucial
and substantive discussions that ultimately benefit the students by facilitating the development of a more cohesive and focused curriculum in the Women's Studies Program.

The next objective I would like to see the Women's Studies Program move toward concerns student voices. The CEWS project has conceptualized students as "recipients" of faculty efforts in curriculum development. While the Program always invites students to participate in discussions and encourages student engagement in the governance of the Program, CEWS would be even more successful with full student ownership. The next step in developing the Women's Studies Program at Winona State University should, I believe, work toward institutionalizing student participation in the planning and implementing of Women's Studies goals and objectives. Such a project, however, by its very nature, must come from students themselves. I, for one, will continue to do all that is in my power as a faculty member and as Director of Women's Studies to empower students to become partners in the processes of guiding and sustaining the Women's Studies Program at Winona State University.
APPENDICES

1) The most valuable form of assistance that I received was in the form of the conferences for project directors. The opportunity to meet others working on similar project gave me new ideas for this project as well as concrete suggestions for courses and activities. I was disappointed by the low level of support that I received from FIPSE staff over the course of the project. The program director assigned to my project was changed midway through my project. I never felt that my project was a major priority to either staff member and the fact that neither came for a campus visit confirms this suspicion. A visit to WSU from a FIPSE staff member would have provided an important opportunity both for us to communicate with FIPSE on the progress of the project and possible new directions for our work, and for the WSU administration to communicate with FIPSE about the CEWS project, its importance to the Women’s Studies Program and its significance for Winona State University. I strongly believe that one way in which FIPSE could work more effectively with projects is by fulfilling the commitment made at the outset of the projects to come for a campus visit. I must add, however, that I received a great deal of valuable assistance from Carolyn Forman in the final stages of drafting the original proposal and that when I made requests to alter how project monies were to be spent, I received rapid approval.

2) I would like to see more in terms of evidence of student involvement in project planning. While students are a highly transient constituency, they should be brought into the planning process as much as possible, especially when issues of experiential education are involved, because experiential education asks them to put themselves on the line much more thoroughly than classroom learning.
Final Evaluation of the Citizenship Education in Women's Studies
FIPSE Project
Winona State University

Conducted by Jill M. Tarule, September 30 - October 1, 1996

Introduction

A final qualitative evaluation of the two year FIPSE-funded Citizenship Education in Women's Studies Project at Winona State University was conducted to examine participants' experience of the project and to explore how participants weighed the influence of the project on their teaching and learning.

The method of evaluation was qualitative and formative yielding what Geertz has called "thick description" of how the project influenced participants and a proximate measure of the extent to which the project was able to achieve the intended goals. Data reviewed for this report included the original proposal, general program materials, a student citizenship survey conducted by the on-campus evaluator (attached), relevant course syllabi, notes and articles of presentations made by faculty members involved in the project, three sets of evaluations of the faculty development seminars, portfolios of students' work, and a field experience handbook. In addition, the evaluator spent two days on the campus conducting interviews with the Project Director, the on-campus evaluator, and the VP for Academic Affairs. During that time, four hour long focus group interviews were conducted (numbers participating are indicated in parentheses): one with faculty teaching the Core Disciplinary Courses (3), one with faculty teaching Core courses (5), one with faculty teaching electives (3), and one with students (9). Interviews were captured primarily through notes, but they were audio-taped as well. All observations are based on an analysis of these data.
The evaluation report will first present a general statement regarding the context of the university and within that, the Women's Studies Program and the Citizen Education project. The next section will examine faculty and student response to the project around three themes: collegiality, curriculum, student outcomes. The final summary will examine potential impact and import of the project.

The Project and General Context

The overall purpose of the Citizen Education in Women's Studies project was to develop students' desire and ability "to play an active role as adults in their community" and to "empower students to seek out and set into motion new and better solutions to the problems that face our society" (quotes from original proposal).

To achieve this, the Winona State University (WSU) Women's Studies Program proposed to engage faculty through faculty development seminars (workshops) toward the development of courses which integrated a developmental approach to citizen education. The developmental approach included three phases. Phase one, lodged in the Introduction to Women's Studies Course, was to help students to "identify a problem with clear gender dimensions." In Phase 2, through the core and elective courses, students would be led to "examine critically the institutions that address a specific gender-related issue and to integrate a field-based experience which would "include a substantial paper analyzing public policy or services...and their effectiveness in meeting the needs of women." The third phase in a capstone seminar proposed that students would be ready to move "from research and analysis to action" and would be able to develop an action plan. Since the Project was two years and the Phases were three, there were very few students who had moved to the final phase. The faculty workshops explored
approaches to teaching and curriculum development in support of citizen education.

The general university context is relevant to the conduct of the project. Like many institutions of higher education, WSU has experienced rapid turnover in leadership during the course of the project. Two of the six deans are currently Acting Deans, there is a new Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the state system itself has been reorganized, which is influencing the form in which state appropriations are determined. There is a general sense expressed by many of a state of permanent transition which, while not uncommon these days in higher education, is contrary to a relatively widely held assumption that faculty members have that university life is stable and slow to change. The collusion between the fact of transition and the assumption of stability seemed to produce, at least for some, a sense of tentativeness about the level of support for their work as individuals and for the Project and the Women Studies Program generally.

In addition, the start of the WSU Women's Studies Program and the FIPSE Project, while not simultaneous, were very close (roughly a year). Some faculty members seemed to assimilate these two events, seeing them as co-terminus. Regardless of historical accuracy, this confusion meant that from the beginning the Women's Studies Program was perceived as integrating citizen education which I would assess as an important and distinctive contribution of the program to the academic culture and programs of the university.

But the relative newness of the program also has its down side. Faculty consistently expressed concern that the funding stream for the program, itself, was insecure. Echoing the faculty, the Vice President for Academic Affairs volunteered that this was also a concern of his for all the interdisciplinary programs that were marginalized. As a cross-university interdisciplinary program, Women's Studies (WS) has no faculty assigned permanently. Thus.
finding faculty to teach the WS courses must be negotiated each quarter. Often it requires
negotiation with the home department about course coverage so the faculty member is free to
teach her/his WS course. It is clearly a source of worry each time, and as funding streams
dwindle, anxiety increases. In some cases, faculty teach in the program as an over-load without
renumeration, an impressive demonstration of faculty commitment to both WS and the FIPSE
project. Nonetheless, staffing of WS courses frequently has to be completed late or involves
extraordinary negotiation, creating a kind of anxiety and concern for all.

The general level of faculty involvement in and commitment to the project was singularly
impressive. Faculty members from a variety of disciplines participated in the faculty
development workshops. But their participation is not simply an artifact of the special conditions
of the FIPSE grant such as stipends for attending the workshops, because their participation
continues in monthly WS faculty meetings. Many identify the latter as an important professional
activity that provides important support to their teaching and important opportunities for
colleagueship.

Analysis of Data by Themes

The themes reported below are drawn from the aforementioned material and the three
focus group interviews with faculty and the one with students. Although each group discussion
was audiotaped, the tapes were not transcribed. Thus, quotes are drawn mostly from notes and
their accuracy a factor of the speed with which the evaluator/interviewer could write. Without
question, the intent is correct though some words may have not been captured in the notes.

To begin with a general observation about the focus groups, all faculty members
interviewed identified their involvement with the project as providing an important “culture” for
women's studies at WSU. While two faculty members indicated that when they entered the project, they were already integrating some form of citizen education in their courses, all identified the opportunities afforded by the three faculty development workshops as prompting them to revise existing or develop new courses. In addition, both the interviews and the workshop evaluations underscore faculty member's appreciation of both the opportunity for collegiality and the chance to focus on teaching and curriculum that the workshops provided.

Students also seem engaged, to varying degrees, and welcome the community of WS as central in their college experience. Clearly, the students who had been involved with the program since its inception were more engaged and knowledgeable than their peers who were just beginning in the WS program.

The analysis of the focus groups and other data is grouped under three broad theme areas. The themes are: collegiality as an outcome of the project, the faculty and students' reflection on the influence the project had on teaching, and the views on how the project influenced students.

It is contended, finally, that each of the three had an indispensable influence on the overall success of the project major goal of introducing citizen education into the Women's Studies curriculum.

**Collegiality:** The whole project provided, as one faculty member said it, a chance to "collaborate with strong feminists on campus." The bonds were forged during the three faculty workshops, and were enhanced by team teaching opportunities, the Women's Studies faculty meetings, and a "power lunch" begun by a group of faculty -- a time to meet for lunch and talk about whatever seemed important at the time on campus, in their classes, in the world. The project was clearly the impetus in promoting this sense of connection with colleagues.

Students seemed to reflect a similar sense of collegiality that was lodged in the WS
courses specifically. They observed that the classes felt "welcoming" and "inclusive". "It was more like family", one student said, where she "not only learned from professors, but from my peers too."

**Influence on teaching:** Faculty members reported that the workshops, particularly, provided an unusual opportunity to focus on curriculum development, generally, and on integrating citizenship education into existing courses, specifically. The influence described seemed to be of two kinds. For some, the workshops prompted them to integrate new approaches to teaching. For others, the workshops prompted them to develop new courses or to integrate new content into an existing course. For some faculty, of course, changes in both process and content in their teaching were reported as influences of the workshops.

As an example of how the workshops changed teaching, one faculty member talked about how she had changed many of the learning activities in her class since taking the workshop, now employing more collaborative learning groups in the class, the use of a poster session in which students pick a topic relevant to gender issues, do research on the topic, write it up, and prepare a poster session to present during a class "poster session" modeled after the same in conferences. Another talked about how the way the workshop was conducted was a model for her: "I learned a lot about myself...and I used a lot of the workshop with my students."

Students reported that they also felt a difference in the WS classes. "It feels like there are no barriers, no I got the power, you're the student", one said. Although the students did not define specific pedagogical activities that prompted their sense that the WS classes were more "open", one student did observe that "in non-WS courses, expressing yourself is required, but in WS courses, you can't shut people up." Clearly, the faculty members' attempts to engage
students in active learning as a component of and preparation for citizenry was being successful.

The workshops also had a significant influence on curriculum development and revision with an emphasis on citizen education. Faculty members discussed their own thinking about the role and importance of citizen education. Many people noted the struggle they had individually and as a group in arriving at what was meant by citizen education, especially distinguishing political action (and the delicate ground of not imposing one's politics on students) and activism. There were also concerns about how to help students move beyond a "personal reaction" to a more critical stance. "I am teaching them (the students) how to have a voice of reason along with a voice for change..." is how one faculty member described her attempt to address this thorny issue. Another talked about how she believed that her course was designed so that students were now "giving permission to think about change," and emphasized that her teaching now emphasizes the role of advocacy as a citizen responsibility.

The review of the syllabi further illuminates the influence the project had on course design with a number of courses integrating specific assignments that require students to engage with significant community issues and to ask, as one faculty member summarized it, questions like: How did women make a difference? How did activism make a difference? What are the major issues in this situation? What are the arguments on both sides? Having taught her revised course a number of times, another faculty member observed that she was convinced that students needed more than simply arriving at an individual choice or position, and that through her course she believed students were beginning to "think beyond just [their] own needs and to know resources." Others described including new kinds of projects as assignments which "gets students out" and involved in their community. For example, a writing course that now requires students to find a community agency and do a writing project the agency needs which not only
"makes writing real", but also engages students in the community.

Faculty members observed that there had, in essence, been an "infusion" into the curriculum of citizen education concerns. They noted that students were now often arriving in their classes with identified issues that were of concern to them and a reasonable amount of investigation already underway. This level of engagement with "real" issues brings a new life to the classroom. With a fair amount of laughter, faculty noted that this infusion also meant that it was important to ensure that students weren't handing in the same project for multiple courses trying, as one teacher put it, "to get less for their money." But the faculty members also talked about where their course fell in the developmental sequence noting, for example, that their course was intended to "establish norms" for citizen involvement, while later ones would pick up on advocacy and activism. The level of consideration about sequencing is a highly desirable outcome of the project and seems to indicate that the developmental aspect of the proposed program was accomplished and is evidently well understood by the involved faculty members which bodes well for it's influence on students.

The observation about the infusion into the curriculum was also extended to include courses and programs outside the WS program. Faculty members observed that they believed the citizen education focus was beginning to have some influence in other courses, particularly as students began to have an expectation that their course of study would include application of material to relevant and contemporary issues, at least where appropriate. One of the, perhaps unintended, outcomes of the project may be this wider influence on infusing citizen education into all the academic programs of the university.

Students were also aware of the infusion into the curriculum, although it was less tangible for them. Students commented on being "helped to get involved" and being intrigued and
engaged by the serious examination of "real issues." They talked animatedly about projects that had led them into involvement with the community ("In Senior Seminar you could do anything you want to but they tried to get you involved in the community"), and they had passionate commitments to work they were involved in such as research on teen pregnancy, ecofeminism, empowering women with doctors, writing letters to congressmen (an assignment in Senior Seminar). Like the faculty, the students saw the curriculum of the WS courses as bringing them to a new level of awareness about the potential for advocacy, activism and becoming informed on the issues.

Student outcomes: The student survey (attached) suggests that students who participated in the project by enrolling in the redesigned courses were, indeed, introduced to a level of citizenship uncommon in academia. Most seemed to be flourishing as a result of this. Faculty saw students as having an increased sense of self esteem. Faculty was particular aware of what a challenge this posed for many students in what faculty identified as a relatively conservative student body. "It isn't easy to be a feminist on this campus" one faculty member observed. While another commented, "they (the students) are getting motivated."

Students cited the aforementioned activities as a direct result of their studies, and were fairly clear about the fact that they would not have sought civic engagement were it not supported by their studies and the faculty. Specific examples of advocacy/activism included two women who, during one of their WS classes, began a group in their dorm to discuss women's issues, a newly founded group called SAGE - Student Advocates for Gender Equity. Others talked about how their studies had required them to engage with issues "in a different way". And still others described how they had felt empowered by their WS courses to "get involved", which might mean advocacy, but also might mean joining a listserv and attending to a conversation
"beyond the textbook." The data suggests that the project was certainly an influence in students' learning and behavior.

Summary

It seems clear that to achieve the goals of the project, it was necessary to influence how faculty taught and to see an impact in both student learning and behavior. Faculty members needed to revise their courses to ensure that they addressed citizen education at the appropriate level (awareness, advocacy, activism is how one faculty member summarized the developmental stages). There was ample evidence that faculty members had engaged in this activity and the result was changes in their courses, reported by them and by students as well as evident in the syllabi.

Student behavior should also be different as a result of the project. There should be evidence that students are aware of relevant community issues and of potential responses or actions as a responsible citizen. In the focus groups, as well as students work, there was ample demonstration that students were engaged and actively involved in their learning.

As perhaps a serendipitous benefit, the collegiality that grew as the faculty worked together to create the program and the curricular focus was impressive. Faculty members seemed genuinely engaged with the ideas and with each other, a fact that bodes well for the work of the project continuing long beyond the funding period.

There are some important issues to be noted from this evaluation. First, that the funding stream for the Women's Studies program should be addressed so that the significant gains made during the FIPSE funded years are not lost.

Second, there is a possibility for extending the project's work beyond Women's Studies into a variety of other disciplines or the the campus as a whole. One can imagine that a small
university like Winona could become quite distinctive as a place where responsible citizenship is one of the expected outcomes of all academic inquiry and work. This would suggest a possibility of a follow up project focused on infusing citizen education "across the curriculum".

Third, following this possibility, it should be noted that the faculty in this project have developed themselves as educators with the particular focus on citizen education. This is a timely and important emphasis in higher education. Faculty should be encouraged to present their work at relevant conferences and to publish (as some are), so that the whole higher education community can benefit from this work.
Faculty Interview

As you know, I am here as an evaluator of your FIPSE project "Citizenship Education in Women's Studies." So, I would like our hour together to be a chance for you to reflect on and talk about how this project influenced you as a teacher. By that I mean both process and content -- pedagogy and curriculum or teaching techniques and how you engage students in your discipline.

Before we start, I would like to assure you that I will do my best to maintain confidentiality in the sense that I will not identify names in the report and if it seems wise, will endeavor to shield the discipline or course being discussed. I would like to tape this so I might have direct quotes for the report. Please let me know if at any point you would like the tape machine turned off -- and you are free to ask without saying why!

So, if we might begin:

1. Thinking about your participation in the project, what will stay with you about that work?
   - individual change
   - teaching
   - discipline/curriculum changes
   - interpersonal/new groups, etc.

2. As a faculty, what was most useful to you as you participated in the project? What didn't work?

3. I'd like now to read some sentences from a goal statement about this aspect of the Women's Studies program, and to ask you to comment about whether you believe that now the program is accomplishing what is described and how.

   "The Winona Statue University Women's Studies Program works to enhance students' effectiveness as participants in the public life of their communities by linking the academic pursuits of Women's Studies with experiential learning in the area of community action."

   - What are (or name some of) the significant ways that the program now "works to enhance students' effectiveness as participants in the public life of their communities?"

   - Do you see the "linking of academic pursuits of Women's studies with experiential learning in the area of community action as an important innovation in the program?"

   What is evidence of this linkage?
   How has it influenced students' experience?
   What have been the problems in accomplishing this?
4. A second quote:

"Citizenship education in Women's Studies prepares students for active and thoughtful citizenship by requiring them to work with local agencies and organizations on current social problems, and to reflect upon the relationship between that work and their formal course learning. Women's studies faculty work as teachers and mentors in their students' citizenship development."

- What evidence, in your experience, is there that this program has supported students to become "active and thoughtful citizens" through their work with agencies?

- Is there evidence that the work in agencies and organizations influenced students' ability to make connections between their "work and formal course learning?"

- Are there additional ways, that we have not discussed, that your role as faculty changed in order for you to become teachers or mentors in students' citizenship development?

5. Are there things that happened as a result of this program that I did not ask about, that have not been spoken about in our conversation?

THANK YOU.
Student Interview

Winona

As you know, I am here as an evaluator of your FIPSE project “Citizenship Education in Women’s Studies.” So, I would like our hour together to be a chance for you to reflect on and talk about how this project influenced you as a student.

Before we start, I would like to assure you that I will do my best to maintain confidentiality in the sense that I will not identify names in the report and if it seems wise, will endeavor to shield the discipline or course being discussed. I would like to tape this so I might have direct quotes for the report. Please let me know if at any point you would like the tape machine turned off—and you are free to ask without saying why!

So, if we might begin:

1. Thinking about your participation in the project, what will stay with you about that experience? How would you describe the project as affecting you as a student and a learner?
   - individual change
   - changes in learning or thinking
   - interpersonal/new groups, etc.

2. Were these Women’s Studies classes different from other classes you took? How?

3. As a student, what was most useful to you as you participated in the project? What didn’t work?

4. As a group, how would you define what citizenship means?

5. Do you imagine yourself involved in the future in your communities? How? Do you think this would have happened without this FIPSE project?

   (were you aware that there was a special project going on in the women’s studies program?)

6. I’d like now to read some sentences from a goal statement about this aspect of the Women’s Studies program, and to ask you to comment about whether you believe that the program is accomplishing what is described and how.

   "The Winona Statue University Women’s Studies Program works to enhance students’ effectiveness as participants in the public life of their communities by linking the academic pursuits of Women’s Studies with experiential learning in the area of community action."

   - What are (or name some of) the significant ways that the program now “works to enhance students effectiveness as participants in the public life of their communities?”
- Do you see the "linking of academic pursuits of Women's studies with experiential learning in the area of community action as an important innovation in the program?"

What is evidence of this linkage?
How did it influence students' experience?
What have been the problems in accomplishing this?

7. A second quote:

"Citizenship education in Women's Studies prepares students for active and thoughtful citizenship by requiring them to work with local agencies and organizations on current social problems, and to reflect upon the relationship between that work and their formal course learning. Women's studies faculty work as teachers and mentors in their students' citizenship development."

- What evidence, in your experience, is there that this program has supported students to become "active and thoughtful citizens" through their work with agencies?

- Is there evidence that the work in agencies and organizations influenced students ability to make connections between their "work and formal course learning?"

- Are there ways, that we have not discussed, that you experienced the faculty differently? Did you feel that you were taught or mentored?

8. If you were advising a new student about participating in the Women's Studies program, what is most important for her or him to know?

9. Are there things that happened as a result of this program that I did not ask about, that have not been spoken about in our conversation?

THANK YOU.
WOMEN'S STUDIES
AT
WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY

TEACHING AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students and faculty will:

Demonstrate knowledge of feminist / womanist theories and their application to a wide range of texts and academic disciplines

Understand how gender, race, class, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, ableness, and other distinctions that support discrimination are socially constructed, interact, and are used as tools of oppression

Analyze how images of women are mediated through cultural and political institutions

Recognize the contributions women have made to the social, political, artistic, and intellectual heritage of their own and other cultures

Recognize diverse feminist agendas internationally as well as within the United States

Examine how individual experiences and beliefs influence interpersonal and social behaviors

Seek ways of life that brighten self-esteem and promote equity

Develop, speak, and write in our own voices

Model campus and community involvement

Challenge authority

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Everyone involved in the Program will:

Encourage and facilitate team teaching and collaborative scholarship

Work with the Faculty Development Center to promote feminist classrooms and scholarship across the curriculum

Support and celebrate student and faculty scholarship and creative work

We are committed to sustaining the traditional role of Women's Studies as a social change agent, and we recognize the need for solidarity in the face of attacks on women's studies programs around the country.

We recognize that feminism, and feminist analyses, critiques, and processes to work for social change and personal and intellectual growth.

We believe that the language of the women's movement needs to allow for a variety of women's voices from both inside and outside the university.

Help develop and support student groups that share our values

Generate ongoing program goal-setting and evaluation processes

Faculty teaching Women's Studies courses will:

Incorporate a feminist perspective by including women and gender; facilitating connections between coursework and students' lives; encouraging active, cooperative learning; building communities beyond the classroom; and fostering feminist activism

Set high academic standards

Recognize and accommodate the complex lives of students

PRINCIPLES

We recognize that faculty, students, and staff share the responsibility for achieving these goals and objectives and we will work with the power differences between us in a respectful manner.

We believe that the language of the women's movement needs to allow for a variety of women's voices from both inside and outside the university.

Help develop and support student groups that share our values.

Generate ongoing program goal-setting and evaluation processes

Faculty teaching Women's Studies courses will:

Incorporate a feminist perspective by including women and gender; facilitating connections between coursework and students' lives; encouraging active, cooperative learning; building communities beyond the classroom; and fostering feminist activism

Set high academic standards

Recognize and accommodate the complex lives of students
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