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This project is an attempt to document the course on Gender Issues in Development which has been taught at the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst since 1982. It has gone through many phases, changing its name from Women In Development to Gender Roles in Development to Gender Issues in Development to reflect the changing views on the subject. Throughout its life, the roots have remained the same, that is, the attempt to bring a feminist analysis into the development process, to integrate theory and practice, to include traditionally marginalized ways of knowing, and to acknowledge and include the wealth of knowledge of classroom participants in this area.

This project consists of two parts - 1) the curriculum design and its background, and 2) alternate class sessions, syllabi and course readings. The former are included here. The later are contained in the appendix which is additional to this document.

The course has been taught by numerous graduate students and two CIE faculty throughout the years. I would like to thank all of those who spent time and effort in the creation and continuation of this course. They are: Gail von Hahmann, Pat Maguire, Linda Abrams, Rema Pai, Deborah Fredo, Peggy Antrobus, Fredi Munger, Mary Jo Connolly, Jane Benbow, Mee-sik Kwon, Barbara Gardner, Barbara Love, Antonieta Bolomey, Hollyn Green, Kumiko Magome, Fatimah Ihsan, David Evans and all of the class participants who shared their knowledge to make this course possible.

And to those who will teach the course in the future including Joanie Cohen, Renuka Pillay, and David Evans in the fall of 1995 - Make It Your Own and Have Fun!
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I. Introduction

Since 1982, the Center for International Education (CIE or the Center) at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst has offered a course which looks at "development" from a "gendered" perspective. The earlier version of the course focused on a "women-centered" approach which over the years has more explicitly looked at the relationships between men and women particularly analyzing power dynamics as they related to defining women's "place" (marginal or central) in the development process.

The course is taught by graduate students with a particular interest in and knowledge of development's effects on women, and who have a desire to explore and analyze "development" from a feminist perspective. I use the term, feminist perspective, to signify a form of analysis in which women's experiences and women's "voices" both inside the classroom and "in the field" are central to any analysis of "development".

In this context, I take the definition of "voice" from several British and North American theorists of feminist pedagogy as

"the valuing of women's experiences ... and the disruption of the power hierarchies which have kept women silent" (Culley, 1985, p.213)

This interpretation of "voice" as a concept

"... spans literal, metaphorical and political terrains. In the literal sense voice represents the speech and perspectives of the speaker; metaphorically, voice spans inflection, tone, accent, style, and the qualities and feelings conveyed by the

---

speaker's words; and politically, a commitment to voice 'attests to the right of speaking and being represented'." (Britzman, 1989, p.146)

The Center for International Education has always stressed a participatory teaching methodology and, in keeping with the feminist ideals of "disruption of hierarchy", the course is taught collaboratively. Student facilitators, a faculty advisor and class participants all work together in an environment of shared learning and the make-up of the class - both participants and teaching staff - have a significant effect.

To date, two CIE faculty advisors have worked with the graduate students to teach the course, David Evans and Fredi Munger. They bring with them their knowledge of the development industry and collaborate with graduate students who contribute alternative knowledges and experiences.

What follows is an attempt to document the Gender Issues in Development course in an effort to give those who wish to teach it a base from which to draw upon. The teaching of the course is an organic process, in which the roots remain similar (using a feminist analysis to look at development and education, looking at the interplay between theory and practice, including traditionally marginalized voices and knowledges, and acknowledging the wealth of knowledges about the development process available from class participants) while the branches are dependant upon facilitators expertise and interests.

---

2 Ibid. p. 76.
Having taken the course in 1991, and taught it in 1992 and 1994, I have some historical perspective on the process. I have most thoroughly documented its last rendition given in the Spring of 1994. Included here is a syllabus, notes on each class session (including what was planned, what actually happened and my suggestions for improvement), and recommendations for the next course facilitators. The appendix contains course syllabi from each year the class was taught, alternate class sessions from 1992 (as content areas are continually modified, class sessions differ from one semester to the next), and the Collected Readings from 1994. I hope that this proves helpful.

II. Historical Overview

As a precursor to the present Gender Issues in Development course, Judy Evans taught "Women's Participation in Change" at the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst in the Spring of 1976. Having been a part of that course coupled with attendance at a conference on "Women and Development" held at Wellesley College in June of 1976, Center member Bonnie Cain called for a course specifically on Women and Development admonishing that "the next faculty member hired should be a person capable of dealing with the subject of 'women and development'" and that "graduate students should be funded to work in this area." Cain felt that it was important to institutionalize the course as Judy Evans' presence

---

3 Master copies of Collected Readings and other historical information can be found in Professor David Evans' files.

4 Cain, Bonnie J.; 1976. Memorandum to "Those Who Program" regarding the "requirements for continuing the "Women's Participation in Change" course. p.2. (See Appendix)
for the following year was uncertain. She saw the necessity of a course on Women and Development because as she stated in a memorandum to "Those Who Program":

"We (the U.S.) are beginning a new stage (hopefully) in which we are emphasizing "participation of the people," "listening to the people," and "respect for the people" ... In short, when we listen to "the people," we must listen to all the people. The reason we must do this is because developers have been ineffective when they haven't in the past.

What was made clear to Cain at the Wellesley conference was the fact that the "academic world had decided to enter the realm of international development and had no idea of what was involved." There were three distinct groups which attended this forum and reflected those involved in "development" as it was being practiced at that time (and, to a great extent, still is) - U.S. academics/theoreticians, "third world" women (in university contexts), and development practitioners. Traditionally, there had been little real dialogue between these groups. As Cain felt, "the Center houses persons with unique vision and understanding regarding research, alternate communication designs and development and its problems", it was important that it use these resources to look at development from a perspective that was both critical and gendered.

The Center for International Education offers Master's and Doctoral programs in Adult Development Education. Thus, Center members felt it important to look at the theoretical

---

5 ibid. p. 2.
6 ibid. p. 2.
7 Cain, B.J. 1976. Memo to "Those Who Program" regarding research needs articulated at the conference in Wellesley on Women and Development. (See Appendix).
8 ibid. p. 3.
underpinnings of development generally, and, more specifically, of Women in Development. It was felt that solely looking at economic and social development strategies from a "gender-neutral" perspective was insufficient and, therefore, it was imperative to analyze development from a perspective which made a conscious effort to consider women.

Although Bonnie Cain suggested the addition of a course on Women and Development in 1976, the first Women In Development course was offered by Gail von Hahmann with David Evans as faculty advisor in the spring of 1982. The course was subsequently offered in 1983 by Pat Maguire, in 1985 by Rema Pai and Deborah Fredo, and in 1987 by Peggy Antrobus, with David Evans as faculty advisor and co-facilitator in each case. In 1989 and 1991, Fredi Munger took over as faculty advisor for the course, teaching it with Jane Benbow, Mary Jo Connolly and Mee-Sik Kwon initially and Jane Benbow, Antonieta Bolomey, and Mary Jo Connolly in its following rendition. David Evans once again assumed faculty responsibility for the course working with Antonieta Bolomey, Hollyn Green, Sherry Kane, and Kumiko Magome in 1992 and with Jane Benbow, Sherry Kane and Fatimah Ihsan in 1994.

Throughout the life of the course, there have been threads of continuity as well as changes made based on new theoretical understandings in the social sciences and the varied expertise and interests of course facilitators and class participants. The course has always been offered on the graduate level with many participants having a background in the field of "development" (having worked in governmental and non-governmental organizations and/or having experienced the effects of development projects in one’s country or community).
The class has most often included people from a variety of backgrounds (predominantly geographic, ethnic, age, and class) with the majority of participants being female.

The necessity for the link between theory and practice has always been central, in part I believe, because this is a focus at the Center, and because this link helps us systematize and make sense out of our experiences and allows us to plan future strategies. In keeping with this theory/practice link, class members' participation has always been imperative. Although class facilitators bring with them an overview of the course, there are no "experts" and there has always been an attempt to make the class as participatory as possible.  

Another central aspect of the course throughout its history has been to look at development from a critical perspective. By the mid-1970s, when Bonnie Cain was calling for a course to look at Women and Development, there was much documentation on the fact that women were being adversely affected by development practices. Many of those participating in the class (both participants and facilitators) had experienced this first-hand.

The original purpose of the course was to "understand and ... plan for development from women's perspectives." It was designed to do a feminist analysis of the development process

---

9 I will deal with some of the issues around class participation, particularly with reference to allowing those who are traditionally silenced to speak, in Section ___.

10 See, for example, article by Irene Tinker on "The Adverse Impact of Development on Women" included in the Collected Readings, 1994 edition.

11 See 1982 Syllabus - Overall Purpose of the Course.
and to create new frameworks for analyzing and planning development projects from a gender-sensitive as opposed to a gender-neutral perspective.

The course has historically had three core objectives. These were:

1. Understanding and critiquing the field/industry of development, in general, and more specifically of Women In Development.

2. Analyzing theoretical frameworks related to gender (i.e. feminist theories).

3. Developing a framework and tools to plan and evaluate development projects from a gendered perspective.

Interestingly, in 1983 a course objective was "to integrate an understanding of your own life as a woman/man with an understanding of women’s status within your own culture and across cultures."12 This idea of understanding how our identity helps us to make meaning of the world became integral in later classes.

In looking through class evaluations from as far back as 1982, I found a number of striking similarities regarding course strengths and weaknesses. These are:

Strengths:

* the focus on women's and "third world" people's perspectives: Feminist theory courses offered at the University do not focus on "third world" issues, development, or the link between theory and practice. Courses in studies of "third world" peoples or "third world" women do not focus on development and education, and few University courses attempt to develop analytical tools for use in project planning and evaluation.

* the use of class participants' experiences: Class members come from a variety of backgrounds and countries with a wide variety of experiences. This has added to

---

12 See course syllabus from 1983 under Goals.
the readings, and the facilitators and guest speakers knowledge to give the class more substance.

* the use of varied knowledges from outside speakers: The inclusion of the experience of those outside the class (including those at other universities, UMass faculty and Center members working outside the University) has been considered useful, more so when the outside speakers have engaged in discussion with class members. This reinforces the idea of co-teaching and co-learning which the course encourages.

* co-facilitation of the course: Since the course is primarily taught by graduate students, it is a large responsibility for one person (although one student often assumes a large share of the workload). From a pedagogical perspective and, perhaps most importantly, it is imperative conceptually to offer various perspectives by having facilitators from a variety of "locations".13

* the use of varied teaching techniques including large and small group discussions, outside speakers, films/videos, etc.: Although groupwork met with varied reaction depending on class make-up, it was often felt that working in small groups helped more people feel comfortable participating, especially when the class was large.

Weaknesses:

* more time was needed both on specific classroom assignments and in general: The course tries to cover so much material that it can only touch on many complex issues related to gender issues and development. The course tries to look at traditional WID issues, development theories and tries to offer a critical perspective by integrating more alternative and "third world" perspectives into the curriculum. This is obviously a lot to cover in 13-14 weeks and, thus, suggestions have been made to make the course more focused or to lengthen it so that it will be given over two semesters. (I have included a brief outline of what this might look like in Section VII).

* the need to draw out students who do not speak much: The issues around voice and silence have been pedagogical challenges for years. I will reflect on some of these issues in the section on methodology.

* the desire to develop an alternative analysis framework and alternative tools to use in our work: Most existing frameworks are inadequate to address the issues we are raising in the class. In keeping with the integration of theory and practice, the theoretical understandings help us to critique and improve upon our practice.

13 See Adrienne Rich’s article on "Towards a Politics of Location" in the Collected Readings. (See Appendix).
The course was renamed in 1987 as Women and Development (Gender Roles in Development)\textsuperscript{14} to reflect the focus of looking at relationships between men and women in the development process (although the initial course syllabus from 1982 states as an objective the exploration of "what change in women's roles and status will mean for men, families, [and] society."\textsuperscript{15} Patricia Maguire (who had taught the course in 1983) published a book entitled, "Doing Participatory Research from a Feminist Perspective" which was integrated into the course at this time. The first edition of the Collected Readings was introduced offering students a variety of articles rather than solely textbooks.

In 1989, the Women in Development course was reconceptualized to include several of the important theoretical concepts which the course facilitators (Jane Benbow, Mary Jo Connelly, Mee-sik Kwon, and Fredi Munger) felt were central to any analysis of gender and which continue to direct the course. Rather than focusing solely on Women in Development (WID), the teaching team decided to look more explicitly at the power relationships which exist between women and men, "first world" and "third world", focusing on gender relations and critiquing the development industry. The "lens" through which the content area of the course has been viewed and which is included in the course syllabus is the following:

* The need to reflect on how gender, race, class, religion, ethnicity, and geographic region shape women's and men's identity, perspectives and world view and the implications of these perspectives for development theory and practice. This reflection aids one in analyzing the "missing pieces" of feminist theories, and development policies and programs.

\textsuperscript{14} See course syllabus from 1987.

\textsuperscript{15} See Women In Development Syllabus from 1982, Objective #3 in Appendix.
* The understanding that all knowledge is constructed but that the knowledge which is produced and disseminated is directly related to the power dynamic inherent in the unequal relationship of men/women, "first world/third world", academic/non-academic, etc. This understanding validates the "voices/knowledges" of those in the power"less" positions (who are affected by policies for social change as defined by others) regarding their conceptual understanding of human nature, oppression and social change.

* A theoretical base to examine how women, female identity and gender have been conceptualized from a variety of perspectives, and how these conceptualizations have been carried into debates about development and social change; to use and analyze gender-based theories, tools, policies and programs put forth by both the mainstream development industry and a wide range of critics; and, to articulate and examine the implications of these theories and issues for our own work and social change strategies.16

From this, the present Gender Issues in Development course was born and has been used as a jumping off point for its present and future incarnations.

III. The Gender Issues Course Curriculum and Methodology - or What We Do and Why We Do It?

What differentiates the Gender Issues course at the Center for International Education from other courses at the University and in the five college area is its focus on knowledge construction, feminist theory and its relationship to education and development, its international perspective, its inclusion of emerging theories and its focus on the practical application of theories to practice. In this way, the Center's offering is quite unique and will serve as a

16 Adapted from the course syllabi for 1989 and 1991 for a presentation given by Antonieta Bolomey and Sherry Kane at the Fifth Annual Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, San José, Costa Rica.
complement to courses focusing on U.S.-based feminist theories and those with international perspectives which tend to be more abstract and "academically-oriented."

This course is unique in several other ways. To enrich our theoretical perspectives, we use a combination of academic theory and narratives of women’s lives. By reading narratives as theory, we hope to include many "unheard and emerging voices" particularly by women not normally heard from in academic circles.

We focus on creating our own theoretical frameworks to help us in our lives and work and attempt to maintain consistency between course content and process - attempting to allow a variety of "voices" to enter the classroom.

The Gender Issues in Development course has as its purpose:

* To examine how women, female identity and gender have been conceptualized from a variety of perspectives, and how these conceptualizations have been carried into the debates about development and social change;

* To use and analyze gender-based theories, tools, policies and programs put forth by both the mainstream development industry and a wide range of critics and alternatives; and,

* To articulate and examine the implications of these theories and issues for our own work and social change strategies.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus, the course focused on theory and practice looking at mainstream development and social change strategies and their critiques. It included such concepts as "voice" and identity,

\textsuperscript{17} Thanks to Mary Jo Connolly and the other facilitators of the Gender Issues in Development course taught in spring of 1991.
Self/Other, the construction and dissemination of knowledge, and examined a broad base of feminist theories as a conceptual framework to look at policies and programs in the development field.

A. Theoretical Frameworks

As stated above, the course looks at theories related to the social construction of knowledge, identity politics and feminism, and takes some concepts from literary theory, post-colonial studies and post-modernism to "locate" ourselves in the development process and to help us to critically analyze it and our "place" in it.

Initially, some readings are given out on knowledge construction and on the construction of the "Other" to begin an analysis of the discourse around the entire field of Development/Women In Development. What is it? Who defines it? Who "writes" women's lives? How are women, particularly "third world" women, constructed as "Other"/as those to be "developed"?

With this, we look at how one's identity (gender, race, class, age, ethnicity, sexuality, dis/ability) shapes how one makes meaning of the world. Like the title of Rich's article, this reading is an attempt to "locate" ourselves and clarify our assumptions and perspectives and the assumptions of others working in development and educational organizations. This also helps us

18 See Transforming Knowledge by Minnich and Orientalism by Said in the course packet.

19 See Towards a Politics of Location by Rich in Collected readings.
to analyze the discourse around the field of Women In Development (how it’s talked about, what is talked about, who is talked about, who speaks and for whom) and our interpretation of it.

Several weeks are spent giving a very brief overview of some feminist theoretical constructs to give students a framework with which to analyze the development field. It is important to understand the theoretical underpinnings of programs and policies to be able to critically analyze their assumptions as well as our own as implementors of change strategies. This theoretical knowledge also helps us to understand the "practical side" of using and creating analysis frameworks for evaluation and planning purposes.

In this section, we start with an overview of the Women In Development Industry. "Western" feminist theories (from North America and Europe), such as Liberal Feminism, Socialist Feminism, Marxist Feminism, Radical Feminism and Post-modern Feminism are analyzed for their underlying assumptions about:

* how the world works,
* how and why women are oppressed, and
* how change occurs.

"Western" frames are looked at as they form the basis for many WID projects and programs (for example, income generating -liberal; women’s collectives - socialist; violence prevention projects -radical). Many of these theories have been thought about, analyzed, written down, critiqued and are available in an academic forum.
We also look at "emerging voices" - alternative Western knowledge and alternatives to Western knowledge (including academic and non-academic writings). We include narratives of women’s lives read as theory since women naming their own realities through story or song can be analyzed in much the same way as theory presented as academic discourse. This is particularly helpful to allow those who have traditionally been marginalized to "speak for themselves."

To analyze each theory, we used categories from Jaggar\(^{20}\) to ask what is this thinker’s view of:

1. Human Nature/Basic Philosophical Stance on the World (how the world works),
2. Women’s Oppression (if, how and why women are oppressed), and
3. Social Change and/or View of "Development" (how change occurs).

Through this, we can discover the assumptions underlying projects and programs. Theoretical understandings can help us to name and make sense of lived experiences by allowing us to systematize our knowledge. We can decide what parts of theories make sense to us and what do not, what concepts we find useful to help us, ultimately, create our own theoretical frames.

One objective of the course is to give the class participants enough of an overview so that they can use this knowledge to construct their own contextually appropriate theories to help them

\(^{20}\) See "The Politics of Liberal Feminism" by A. Jaggar (reading #4) in the Collected Readings for 1994.
in their lives and work. Participants are encouraged to plan and evaluate projects with their own contextually relevant conceptual "tools" as their final papers.  

B. Methodology

In keeping with the Center's "participatory" philosophy and course objectives of knowledge creation, the Gender Issues in Development course is taught by a collaborative team of people which includes a variety of experiences and expertise as well as ethnic and geographic diversity. To be true to the spirit of the course content of allowing many knowledges to co-exist in the academic forum, the course is a shared learning experience between facilitators and class participants.

21 Variations of this theory-making were done with a group of Malian popular educators who visited the Center in the Fall of 1993 to explore some of the theories related to their field (i.e., Freirian, Critical Theory, Feminism). I did a session on Feminism with the goal of having participants create their own theories. A series of flipcharts were used with removable "concept bubbles" (concepts written on pieces of paper which could be moved around—my thanks to Joanie Cohen for this idea) placed under the appropriate theoretical construct (i.e., rationality, equality—liberal; counting reproductive labor—socialist; men controlling women’s sexuality, objectification—radical; race & class issues, imperialism—"third world"). Workshop participants were encouraged to create their own theoretical frames by taking any concepts that they found useful and/or creating their own (on blank concept bubbles) and organizing them into categories of how they thought the world worked, whether they thought women were oppressed and, if so, how, and what would be their strategies for change. (See Appendix for training design). It was hoped that this would contribute to participants’ design of an action plan for their organization.
As stated above, a variety of "teaching tools" are used - theoretical readings, stories, videos, presentations, participant's and guests' personal and professional experience, etc. Acknowledging that people learn differently, it is important to vary the teaching medium.

Discussions are conducted in large and small groups at various times. This can help class participants (I include facilitators, here, as participants) get to know one another and feel comfortable expressing ideas and opinions. The hope is that ideas will be "freely exchanged" with class members learning from one another, however, not surprisingly, the power dynamics in the classroom must be constantly negotiated.

Depending upon the size and make-up of the class, different methods of expression are encouraged. Pairs, small groups, journal writing (with or without "feedback" by facilitators or other class members), speaking and silence (which can signify disapproval of ideas expressed or reflection on them, for example) all need to considered.

As the classroom is a microcosm of the larger environment, dominant voices may control or cut off discussions. The facilitators challenge, therefore, is to negotiate a shared space between voices that have traditionally spoken and those that have traditionally been silenced. I have found in many classes espousing these beliefs that content and process diverge with the teacher presented as the sole "knower".

A constant effort is made to allow multiple knowledges to co-exist in the classroom through observation and written and oral evaluation of the process as well as of the content. It is important to recognize the power dynamics in the classroom and create strategies to work with
this. Although, this is a shared learning process, facilitators should direct the process as facilitation should help the learning process occur.

IV. Recommendations

In the fall of 1992, the teaching team consisted of Antonieta Bolomey, Sherry Kane, Hollyn Green, Kumiko Magome and David Evans. It was felt that course participants should both gain a theoretical understanding of the WID/GID field and walk away with a "product", something to help them in their work. An attempt was made to look at gender analysis tools and their applications to development programs both for evaluation and planning purposes. As this occurred in the final class sessions, it was only marginally successful.

In the spring of 1994, based on class evaluations and the reflections of the instructors, the course was again modified. Other "third world" and emerging feminist theories were added, in this case Islamic Feminist Perspectives as Fatimah Ihsan joined the teaching team of Jane Benbow, Sherry Kane and David Evans. The gender analysis section of the course was looked at earlier in the semester to give students a chance to work through different evaluative and planning "tools" and help them with their final paper which was to analyze or plan a project using their own conceptual gender analysis framework.

Repeatedly, in course evaluations the issue comes up that the Gender Issues course tries to accomplish too much in too short of a period of time. In essence, the class is an overview of feminist theories, a brief mention of development theories and the concepts of knowledge construction and identity issues, an analysis and critique of the development industry, an
examination of gender analysis frameworks as well as their applications. Basically, the course attempts to cover several semesters worth of material in one semester, giving class participants an overview of many things while leaving them frustrated that each piece must be looked at superficially due to time constraints.

What follows is both the course design as it was presented in 1994 with my reactions as one of the instructors, as well as a preliminary course design for a two-semester class which would allow for more time to explore many of the concepts touched upon in the previous one semester course. In order to relate feminist theories to their applications in education and "development", theoretical frameworks could be interwoven with case studies which demonstrate what this might look like in practice. Similarly, a case study could be used and a project planned from several of the frameworks to help class participants compare and contrast different constructs.

Contextual recommendations are included after each class session followed by general recommendations in Section VI.
V. Curriculum Design and Reflections on the Class in 1994

Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK ONE

Introduction to Course & Syllabus; Historical Overview of WID

I. Picture Exercise - Look at pictures of women and pick one or two that most impress you. Introduce yourself and explain why you chose that picture. (30)

II. Needs Assessment - Brainstorm on board what are the students’ expectations for the class. (20)

III. Intro to syllabus - Go over syllabus to see what the correlation is between what the previous needs assessment and the syllabus. Explain syllabus (papers, readings, etc.) (30)

IV. Break (10)

V. Historical Overview of WID: From Boserup to DAWN - Lecturette by Jane (60)

VI. Give out and explain readings for next class. (30)
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK TWO

Liberal Feminism and the WID Industry; The Social Construction of Knowledge

Put up agenda on board

I. Reactions (emotional & intellectual) to all readings (10)

II. The world view of the Liberal Feminists (30)

A. Quote from Gramsci:

As an inventory of our assumptions and the assumptions of many development projects we would like you to divide into groups and discuss the reading on Liberal feminism with these categories in mind:

1. Human Nature - What is the liberal feminists’ view of Human Nature?
2. Social Value - What is the liberal feminists’ view of Social Value?
3. Social Reality - What is the liberal feminists’ view of Social Reality?
4. Oppression - What is the liberal feminists’ view of Oppression?
5. Social Change - What is the liberal feminists’ view of Social Change?

(Internal logic and circularity of these categories - discuss after Knowledge Construction)

B. Report out - Make a flipchart of these categories (30)

III. Break (10)

IV. Administrivia - Hand out new Syllabus and Collected Readings (15)

V. Lecturette on Social Construction of Knowledge by Jane (20)

VI. Small group discussions of texts: (30)

What do the articles have to say about how the social construction of knowledge operates?

Group 1 - Orientalism

1. What is the concept/construction of the "Other"?
2. How has the West (through what mechanisms and historical constructions) constructed the "Other"?
3. What has allowed the "Orient" to be a part of its construction of the "Other"?/ How has the "Orient" complied with or been a part of its construction as an "Other"?
4. What are the consequences to those named as the "Other"?
Group 2 - Transforming Knowledge

1. How is knowledge always a circular process?
2. What are the roles of language, generalization and mystification in that process?
3. What do you think is implied by the title of this book?
4. What are the consequences to women?

VII. Report out (30)
Group 1 - Orientalism
1. What is the concept/construction of the "Other"?
2. How has the West (through what mechanisms and historical constructions) constructed the "Other"?
3. What has allowed the "Oriental" to be a part of its construction of the "Other"? How has the "Oriental" complied with or been a part of its construction as an "Other"?
4. What are the consequences to those named as the "Other"?

Group 2 - Transforming Knowledge
1. How is knowledge always a circular process?
2. What are the roles of language, generalization and mystification in that process?
3. What do you think is implied by the title of this book?
4. What are the consequences to women?

Group 1 - Orientalism
1. What is the concept/construction of the "Other"?
2. How has the West (through what mechanisms and historical constructions) constructed the "Other"?
3. What has allowed the "Oriental" to be a part of its construction of the "Other"? How has the "Oriental" complied with or been a part of its construction as an "Other"?
4. What are the consequences to those named as the "Other"?

Group 2 - Transforming Knowledge
1. How is knowledge always a circular process?
2. What are the roles of language, generalization and mystification in that process?
3. What do you think is implied by the title of this book?
4. What are the consequences to women?
Week Two

Liberal Feminism and the WID Industry; The Social Construction of Knowledge

It is useful to get emotional and intellectual reactions to the readings. This is particularly useful when class participants have had little exposure to academic theories and feel intimidated by them. It is also useful to see what makes sense to people as this starts to create an "inventory of our assumptions".

*****Why we do location and social construction of knowledge stuff

Trying to understand the theoretical underpinnings of both Liberal Feminism and the Social Construction of Knowledge in the same class is a lot. It would be useful to use some case studies of WID projects from the liberal frame to give people a sense of what theory looks like in practice so that they can begin to grasp how theoretical assumptions translate into practice.

We used a modification of Jaggar’s categories to analyze the theories. We divided the theory into categories of how each framework thinks about:

1. Human Nature
2. Social Value
3. Social Reality
4. Oppression (specifically of women)
5. Social Change

Class participants generated a flipchart of these categories with input from the facilitators. This helped give people a good sense of the theory.

The text on Transforming Knowledge, although dense, is very good. It lays out very clearly how knowledge is created and disseminated and how this is a circular process.

It’s also important to explore the concept of the "Other" particularly as its construction in terms of colonial discourse and construction of "woman" and especially "third world women".

These are sophisticated concepts that take awhile to grapple with and need more time. We ran out of time and had to continue with them at the beginning of the next class.
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK THREE

Socialist and Marxist Feminist Perspectives

I. Group discussions on questions about two knowledge articles (cont. from last time) (20)

II. Report out (20)

III. Articles on concept of "location" (15)

1. What do you think of them?
2. What do you think the concept of location is?

   Relate back to knowledge construction
   Explain paper on location

1. Description of their positionality
2. Discuss how positionality affects their meaning-making

IV. Break (10)

V. Lecturette on: Marxist Feminism (20)
   Socialist Feminism - Unified vs. Dual systems theory

VI. Socialist Feminism (30)
   In groups pull out: World View
   Social Values
   Social Reality
   Oppression
   Social Change

VIII. Report out - Make a flipchart of these categories and compare to Liberal Feminism (45)
Week Three

Marxist and Socialist Feminist Perspectives

We continued the discussion about knowledge construction from the previous class and then moved on to the concept of identity/positionality or "location". We used theoretical readings interspersed with narratives to give people concrete examples of what "location" means. We then explained what we wanted out of the first paper which was due mid-semester. From the papers I read I think we need to work with how one's location helps you make meaning. People wrote about who they were but most did not take the next step to how that affects how they make meaning of the world. It would be especially fruitful to tie it into the theories that made sense and didn't to class members so they could get a sense of what theories they already know, what assumptions they have about the world and why.

The section on Marxist and Socialist Feminist Perspectives was more of an intellectual exercise and class members didn't seem to be very interactive. I think, however, discussing Marxism and Socialism in our context is more of an intellectual process than something people can get emotionally worked up over, particularly the analysis of dual-systems vs. unified systems theory in Socialist feminist thought.

Drawing out ideas from these theories was a little more difficult because class members had to really think it through. I think having a more diverse group would have helped particularly if some class members came from Socialist countries or areas where Socialism was more prevalent. Most class members this spring were white, North Americans.
Radical and Postmodern Feminist Perspectives

I. Small group discussions on articles about Radical Feminism (30)

1. What, in your opinion, has been the role/function of the concept of the family in propagating and maintaining power relations?

2. What would the authors opinion be about abolishing the family?

3. What are your own feelings or opinions about abolishing the family?

4. How would you rank order the following ways of seeing oppression: 
Class, race, gender, sexuality
What is the most crucial element in oppression and why?

5. What are your feelings and opinions about the role motherhood has played in oppressing women? How could that be changed?

II. Share opinions (20)

III. Break (10)

IV. Film - Killing Us Softly (30)

V. Reactions (30)

VI. Small group discussions - Postmodern Feminism (15)

- Questions about articles
- How does postmodern theory differ from and make contributions to the theories that we've studied

VII. Report out - Jane answers questions (30)

IX. Discuss presentations (15)
Radical and Postmodern Feminist Perspectives

Radical feminism is usually something that needs to be looked at thoroughly since it challenges many concepts including women's sexuality and the creation of gender identity and heterosexuality.

This theoretical frame usually gets the most "emotional" responses as it is often quite challenging. As there are many misconceptions and complexities about Radical feminist thought, it is important to work through the frame to try to really grasp the ideas. Using films that graphically demonstrate the objectification of women, violence against women and how women's sexuality is created by and for men helps connect the theory (which may seem radical and difficult to understand) with "real life". When we showed "Killing Us Softly" about the objectification of women by advertisers, class members who had difficulty understanding "seperatism" could understand its rationale.

Exploring the oppressive nature of the family and dissecting the idea of motherhood (what that means and what are some alternatives) lead to an interesting discussion. For the mothers in the class this is always quite challenging. As this questions some of our fundamental beliefs about the structure of society, it leads to rousing discussions and needs time to "process".

We just touched on Postmodern feminism answering questions about Postmodern Theory and some aspects of Postmodern femininst thought. This was again quite dense and more of an intellectual exercise. Rather than having people split into groups, we answered questions and discussed the issues as a large group.

We did not have time to draw out the flipchart concepts from Radical feminism and thus left it for the following class.
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK FIVE

Third World Voices: An Introduction

I. Radical Feminism (15)
   Pull out: World View
   Social Values
   Social Reality
   Oppression
   Social Change

   Make a flipchart of these categories and compare to other Feminisms

II. Small group discussions on questions about Mohanty articles (45)

   1. To the best of your ability, what do you think is Mohanty’s point?
   2. Do you agree that labeling women as oppressed limits and defines them in hegemonic ways? Why or why not?
   3. If so, how can the call to end inequality between genders be solidified into a movement?

III. Large group discussion about Mohanty articles (45)

IV. Break (10)

V. Give them information on their presentation groups (15)

VI. Presentation on Nature and Women (10)

VII. Discussion on article - Coming back into the circle (35)

   1. How do you make alternative knowledge systems valid?
   2. What do you do with these different types of knowledge?
Third World Voices: An Introduction

We drew out concepts from Radical Feminism at the beginning of the class. Each time we create a flipchart we compare the assumptions to the flipcharts of other theories.

As a broad overview of "third world" feminism, we looked at Mohanty’s articles, Cartographies of Struggle and Under Western Eyes. We asked a number of questions about what it looks like to include issues of racial and colonial as well as gender oppression.

This led into an interesting discussion about "labeling" and whether labels such as oppression are useful or not. It is important not to speak for women and not to see them as objects or victims only. However, the idea of not coming together on the issue of women as an oppressed group may be problematic for strategic political purposes. As we asked the group, if labeling women as oppressed limits and defines them in hegemonic ways, how can the call to end inequality between the genders be solidified into a movement?

We then looked at the interconnection between women and nature. Along with an article by an aboriginal woman Coming Back into the Circle, we attempted to give class participants an idea of what alternative knowledge systems would look like. This was an attempt to get people to think about what it would take for knowledge systems which are very different from western systems with which most of us have grown up to be taken seriously. We asked class members to think about how these knowledge systems could be integrated/used/thought about in their lives.
Third World Voices: An Islamic Perspective - Introduction
Week Six

Third World Voices: An Islamic Perspective - Introduction
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK SEVEN

Third World Voices: Islamic Feminist Perspectives

First Paper Due (Location)
Week Seven

Third World Voices: Islamic Feminist Perspectives
The Project Approach

I. Group Presentations (45 minutes each)
   - Health
   - Agriculture
   - Income Generating Projects
Week Eight

The Project Approach

This class was devoted to class presentations (3 of 45 minutes each). They focused on Health, Agriculture and Income Generating.

Overall, the presentations went relatively well although a couple were off track. This stemmed in one case from not being prepared and in another to discussing other issues besides the one at hand. As this was a transitional time (Jane left that week), I gave only cursory feedback. It is recommended that students get better feedback for their presentations.
Gender Issues in International Development  
WEEK NINE

Gender Planning and Analysis - Overview

I. Philosophical Stances of WID and GAD (45)

Planning for What?
Is the project agency or donor driven or driven by the women involved?
Gender Needs - Strategic vs. Practical
(Have class give examples)
How are these needs addressed?

To consider:
* Women’s triple role: Reproductive
  Productive
  Community Managing (esp. with regards to survival issues)
* Sexual division of labor
* Access to and Control over Resources and Benefits
* Practical and Strategic Needs

What your planning for = What you’ll consider successful outcomes
Your choice of desired outcomes -> reflects the indicators you’ll use

II. Groupwork (30)

Group 1 - How does AID see WID?
What AID is/is not
AID policy paper

Group 2 - Is GENESYS using a gender approach or are they coopting the language?
GENESYS training manual (first part)

Group 3 - What is the stance discussed? What are their desired outcomes and indicators?
Training Users...

Group 4 - What is the stance discussed? What are their desired outcomes and indicators?
Money and Power

III. Report Out (15-30)

IV. Hand back papers (5)

V. Break (10)

VI. Groupwork on Moser’s Approaches (Chapter 4) (30)
Groups for each of the 5 approaches

Each group devises a "project" from that approach -

What types of projects would be reflective of this approach
What are the outcomes you would be looking for with this approach

VII. Report out (30)

Next week read about planning and policy in Moser (last half)
Week Nine

Gender Planning and Analysis - Overview

We divided the Gender Planning and Analysis section into three class sessions - overview, policy issues, and tools and methodologies. The addition of class sessions which dealt with gender analysis was a response to the 1992 class which did not give students enough time to incorporate the idea of gender analysis to be able to use it.

I started by looking at the philosophical stances behind WID and GAD and asked the questions:

- Planning for What?
- Is the project agency/donor driven or driven by the women involved?

We looked at several major concepts:

- Strategic vs. Practical Gender Needs
- Women’s Triple Role (Productive, Reproductive and Community Managing)
- Sexual Division of Labor
- Access to and Control over Resources and Benefits

Your planning purpose -> successful outcomes -> indicators

The class was divided into four groups each looking at a different gender analysis framework to analyze its approach. They found this useful. Groups were then asked to analyze Moser’s approaches and devise what a project which reflected this. A class member stated that initially she thought that it would be impossible but after she started exploring the approaches and thinking about projects which put the approaches into practice, things became clearer.

Tell them what to read in Moser since, although it was on the syllabus, few knew what part to read and several did not bring their Moser book.
Gender Planning and Analysis - Policy Issues

I. DRE discusses Policy Issues (30)

II. Groupwork (30)

Think of some educational policy issues that you would consider from:
- a Liberal Feminist Perspective and
- an Islamic Feminist Perspective

for:
- New York City
- rural Pakistan
- Somalian refugees in a Kenyan Refugee Camp

What recommendations would you make for:
  a) government
  b) formal school system
  c) NGOs (with a focus on education and training)
  d) donor agencies

(See Handout)

III. Report out (30)

IV. Break (10)

Discussion of policy issues related to an Islamic Feminist perspective

V. Groupwork (45)
Divide into groups from presentations (Income, Health, Agriculture)

Plan a Project from any perspective

a. What Outcomes do you want?
b. What Indicators show that?
c. Create implementation strategies which are gender sensitive
d. Make theoretical stances explicit

VI. Report out (30)
Week Ten

Gender Planning and Analysis - Policy Issues

David discussed some of the issues related to policy and planning particularly with regards to education.

The class was divided into two groups. They had to think of some educational policy issues for NYC, rural Pakistan and Somalian refugees in a Kenyan refugee camp. One group took the perspective of Liberal feminists and the other tried to work out an Islamic perspective with the help of Fatimah. They could make recommendations at number of levels although they did not get through many for lack of time.

This led to a fruitful discussion in both the small and later the large group about what an Islamic feminist perspective would look like particularly with regards to different contexts. In the case of New York the issues were related to how to preserve the religion whereas in Pakistan, the issues dealt with how to break free from the religious restrictions. Mary Grant (a visiting faculty member from Australia who sat in on several of the classes) warned against playing into the oppressor’s hands. An example came up of having girls in separate classes for certain things (sports, for example). Mary suggested that we needed to be wary of separating the girls too much as this might only serve to ghettoize them. The point was brought up that if it meant the difference of girls playing sports or not, this might be an option but it is important to always be cognizant of that.

We did not get to the last group exercise as the discussion on Islamic Feminism and what that would look like in practice was so engaging that they wanted to discuss it as a large group.
Gender Planning and Evaluation - Tools and Methodologies

I. Overview (10)

Gender Planning - **Intended** impacts on Women, Men and the Community
Evaluation - "**Real**" impacts on Women, Men and the Community
    Unforeseen impacts

Planning and Evaluation loop

II. Data-gathering - Gender Analysis Tools (20)

* Interviewing
* Participant Observation
* Focus Groups - Small group discussions
* Surveys
* Questionnaires
* Review of documents
* Historical/Cultural Analysis - looking at cultural practices, traditional roles, etc. to hypothesize about the impacts of certain interventions
* Community Mapping - Access and Control over Resources, Who does What When?
* Seasonal Activities Calendar (Clark)
* Time Lines (Clark)
* Wealth Ranking (Clark)

Discussion with input of class members who have used these techniques. Looking at different techniques for data-gathering including pictorial representation for non-literates and visual learners.

III. Groupwork with Frameworks (30)

Using a case study from Moser, analyze the case using:

Group #1 - Moser’s frame
Group #2 - Overholt’s frame
Group #3 - World Bank frame

What did you find helpful with this frame?
What was missing?

IV. Report out (20)

V. Looking at Alternatives (40)
a. Evaluation - Jane’s WAND evaluation
b. Planning - Alternative planning framework: Women in Connection/Reaffirming Differences (from AWID conference)

a. WAND Evaluation
   Overview of project
   Alternate criteria - categories (outcomes) and indicators
   Benefits - concrete project related
   Alternative indicators
      * Voice - shyness stories
      * Self-esteem
      * Community building
      * Reduction in violence against women
      * More "love"
      * Integrating men into development

   Hand out of alternative indicators

b. Alternative Framework
   Co-scriptive vs. prescriptive model - Evolving
   Interaction between theory and practice (Action - Reflection - Action)
   "Theory-full" - uses parts of many theories

   1. Value-laden - Emancipatory practice rooted in empowerment, freedom and equality
   2. Acknowledge dangers of Western hegemony - Redirect West
   3. Participatory practice - 4 types
   4. Hermeneutics - reading and interpreting texts & blending of horizons
   5. Blending of horizons empowers rather than constructs - comes from the standpoint of the most marginalized
   6. Voice - Naming the World
   7. Overcoming internalized oppression
   8. Value-driven rather than concrete outcome driven

   Phase 1 - Start-up
   Identification of potential sites - readiness

   Phase 2 - Implementation
   Action and Reflection - project goals evolve

   Phase 3 - Evaluation
   What happened and What can be learned?
   Good and Bad outcomes defined by community first and intervenor secondarily
   Value-driven

VI. Break (10)
VII. Groupwork (30)

Using all the frames discussed come up with a gender framework to plan for the next phase of a project

Devise categories and indicators

VIII. Report - out (30)

IX. Hand out Sultan’s Case Study
Week Eleven

Gender Planning and Analysis - Tools and Methodologies

After giving a brief overview regarding the interconnection between planning and evaluation, I went over a number of data-gathering techniques. We shared the information that we had and I asked group members to comment on any methods which they had tried. Mark Protti shared some of the tools and techniques that he had heard of or used and brought in a number of materials.

Using a case study from Moser, three groups analyzed the case using Group #1 - Moser’s frame, Group #2 - Overholt’s frame and, Group #3 - World Bank frame. They discussed what was helpful as well as what was missing from this frame to give them a jumping off point to devise their own frame.

I then proceeded to give a lecture on "Alternatives". This included the highlights of the evaluation of the WAND project which Jane did a couple of years ago and the Alternative Framework which a number of us created for the AWID conference this past fall. Jane’s evaluation used a number of alternative indicators such as voice and self-esteem. Our alternative framework had a number of concepts which were offered as a different way to plan for and analyze projects.

Although this lecture piece was somewhat lengthy (about an hour), class participants said they appreciated seeing alternatives to the mainstream models.
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK TWELVE

Nonformal Education; Literacy as an Approach to Development for Women

I. Overview (10)
Formal vs. Nonformal Education
Child vs. Adult Education

Education for Women often in the form of Adult nonformal literacy classes - proposed linkage to family benefits

International Literacy Year - 1990
Education for All Conference - 1990

II. Sultan discusses case study (20)

III. Discussion about case (30)
What were the anticipated results
- by the government?
- by the muhlahs?
- by the women?

What are the implications of this case for women’s education?
What are the constraints to women’s education?
What kind of strategies could one devise from:
- these women’s perspective?
- an Islamic feminist perspective?

IV. Groupwork about readings (30)
Group #1 - International Organizations
- ILY Newsletter
- UNESCO literacy lessons
Group #2 - Other voices
- Literacy for Women, Why and How
- Women and literacy in S. Africa
- 5 Challenges

What are the assumptions made by the authors about literacy?
What is the relationship between education and the family/community/society?
What are the stated goals for making women literate?
- the constraints?
What are some of the strategies that the authors have suggested or might suggest with regards to women’s literacy?

V. Report out (20)

VI. Break (10)
VII. Groupwork (30)

Design a literacy project. Come up with the:

- Goals/desired outcomes
- indicators
- implementation strategy

Group #1 - UMass Workplace ed with both native and non-native English speakers, those literate in their own languages and those who are not.

Group #2 - Pakistan

VIII. Report out (30)
Nonformal Education; Literacy as an Approach to Development for Women

I gave a brief introduction to the idea of literacy as a means to educate women.

Sultan spoke about a project which he had evaluated in Bangladesh. They received the case study at the end of the last class. This led to a very interesting discussion about change, conflict and resistance to change. Although slated to speak for about 30 minutes, Sultan stayed for over an hour. The case study was very engaging (particularly as it dealt with a Muslim area and class members could relate their understandings of Islamic feminism to the case).

Participants then looked at the discourse and assumptions around literacy as … (stated, pronounced) by large international agencies (the UN) and some critiques.

To follow this, the class was asked to design a literacy project for: Group #1 - Workplace Ed at UMass, and Group #2 - an area in Pakistan. We used Pakistan as a case study for several of the classes as Fatimah was a good contextual resource.
Schooling for Girls; The UN Initiative on Education for All

I. Overview - DRE (20-30)
   Women in Formal Education in development
   Influences on Women’s education
   Policy options - External and Internal

II. Groupwork (30)
   Using the first two readings (Letting Girls Learn and Women’s Education in Developing Countries) as well as your own thoughts on the matter, what are the:
   - Factors influencing women’s education
   - Constraints to women’s education
   - What actions, programs or policy changes would you make?

III. Report out (20)

IV. Break (10)

Plan A

V. Groupwork (20)

   What are the stated goals of the EFA campaign?
   What are the expected outcomes?
   Who is being targeted and why?
   What are the proposed strategies?

VIII. Large group report out (15)

IX. Education for All Planning Committee (45)

   In two groups:

   You are on the Planning Committee participating in the Education for All Summit to be held in Sydney, Australia in 1995.

   - Pick a context that your work will be addressing
   - Use a feminist agenda - Be explicit as to your theoretical stance(s)
   - Come up with a strategy to meet the goals of Education for All by the Year 2000
   - What would you do? -> How would you implement this? (projects, policies, etc.)

X. Present your ideas at "the Summit" (45)

Plan B
V. Video from Aga Khan foundation re: educational issues in Pakistan

VI. Discussion of video with input by Fatimah

Plan C

V. Fatimah discusses her project
Week Thirteen

Schooling for Girls; The UN Initiative on Education for All

DRE gave an overview of girls/women in formal education in development with policy options.

Students came up with a list of factors influencing girls education as well as some constraints girls and women face to formal schooling. They were also asked to list what actions and policies they would implement to allow girls and women more access to education.

Class members who attended Fredi and Judith’s course on girl’s education found this piece a little repetitive however many class members had not been exposed to the information.

Students then analyzed the discourse and assumptions behind the Education for All campaign. Following this, as a Planning Committee, they were to come up with policy options for an Education for All Summit.
Gender Issues in International Development
WEEK FOURTEEN

Wrap-up; Sharing of Projects; Evaluation

Final Paper Due (Gender Planning or Analysis of a Case Study)
Week Fourteen

Wrap-up; Sharing of Projects; Evaluation

Students discussed their paper topics and other salient issues which were of interest to them. A male class member discussed how he had been engaging in a reflective process to try to come to terms with feminism. He felt that he "moved" from being offended by it and discounting it, to being able to respect feminism as a valid body of knowledge worthy of being studied and taken into account.

I gave a lengthy evaluation which everyone answered in writing. I mentioned that I was thinking of extending the course to cover two semesters and everyone thought it would be a good idea given the amount of information which we attempted to cover in only one. I received some helpful information about what students felt they would like in a two semester course.

I also received oral feedback in class. Participants stated that they were happy with the class and that it was interesting and useful. One member stated that she would really miss it and would prefer if it lasted for a year. She also stated that it was her best class she had taken here at the University. Participants from outside the Center said they found the relaxed atmosphere pleasant and conducive to learning esp. with regards to theory which initially frightened many people. (Evaluations are included in Appendix ... )
Gender Issues in International Development is an evolving course which changes with each successive teaching. New information about gender issues which is emerging in the academic environment and in the development field along with the expertise of the facilitators serve to make the course into something slightly different each time it is taught. To help in the process of updating this class, please give us any relevant information you feel would help the next facilitators of Gender Issues. Thanks.

What did you find useful in this course?

Please briefly evaluate the course’s:

a. Content

b. Methodology

c. Instruction

What aspects of the course did you find unhelpful? Why?
What aspects of the course would you like to see changed, expanded, reduced, etc.?

Do you have any other suggestions which would help us improve this class?
VI. Some General Recommendations for the Course

These are not in any particular order of importance.

* Make it one year

* Do not remove theoretical frame as this would gut the course. Other theory courses which offer emerging views do not exist at the University. It would be helpful if people came in having taken something on Feminist Theory and on Development theories beforehand.

* Work through various conceptual frameworks so that participants can walk away with a theoretical and a practical frame to help them in their work.

* Be flexible and "read the class". With a small class, there may be too few people to do groupwork all the time. Check to make sure classroom is a "shared space". This will require working out creative ways to keep dominant voices from dominating.

* Use of journal again for readings. Have them start dialogue journals about the readings and about relevant issues and have them respond to each other. Have them write up something in their journals or write a reflection paper on each theory when it is over to see if they have grasped some of the main concepts.

* Revisit their flipchart paper with the theories on them throughout the course, and particularly when trying to practically apply the theoretical understandings.

* Do more theory flipcharts with emerging voices theories.

* Continue to tap the knowledge of speakers, videos, participant’s personal and professional experience. David Evans should contribute his knowledge and expertise in the fields of policy, planning, how large development organizations such as USAID and the World Bank function, predominant strategies for girl’s education, etc.

* Have them attend "feminist" and "development" forums in Campus Center, etc.

* Internships - particularly if this is a one-year course, internships might be arranged.

* Use some of Arturo Escobar’s new book which is a critical analysis of development
VII. A Brief Outline of a Full-Year Course Design

What follows is a possible outline of a year-long Gender Issues course in answer to the call for more time. There is a precedent for this with Literacy courses which are presently offered at the Center. There can be any number of variations on this including having more theory the first semester, allowing students to digest and interpret it and concentrate on practical applications in the second semester. I have a combination of theory and practice here so as to reinforce theoretical principles and perhaps make it clearer and easier to understand by being less detached from reality. It would, of course, be ideal to have the same students in both semesters for continuity. Based on my experience with the course, I think this would be feasible as there has been an expressed interest in this idea for several years.
Gender Issues in International Development
Fall Semester

Week 1 - Intro; Historical Overview of WID
Week 2 - Theories of Knowledge Construction & "Location"
Week 3 - Liberal Feminism - Case Studies of Liberal feminist based projects, theoretical frames
Week 4 - Case studies and the WID Industry; Take a case study and analyze it from a liberal frame
Week 5 - Marxist and Socialist feminism
Week 6 - Case studies of projects with a Marxist/Socialist perspective; Use the same case study and analyze it from a Marxist and Socialist frame.
Week 7 - Radical feminism / First Paper (on Location due)
Week 8 - Case studies of Radical feminist projects; Use the same case study and look at it from a Radical frame.
Week 9 - Presentations on projects from the above-mentioned perspectives. (Income generating, health, agriculture, and literacy)
Week 10 - Post-modern Feminist Perspectives and a critique of "Western" feminist theories - what is missing?
Week 11 - "Third World"/Emerging Voices: An introduction

What "emerging voices" are chosen will depend on who is teaching the class and what the class is interested in. This will vary from semester to semester. The following is a suggestion for some of the emerging voices one might use.

Week 12 - Black Feminist Thought - Patricia Hill Collins, Combahee River Collective
Week 13 - Case studies or what it might look like in practice; Revisit the case study and look at it from this alternative frame.
Week 14 - Closure / Discussion of "unexplored" WID/Women's issues

** Note: At least one case study in each section should be related to education in some way.
Gender Issues in International Development  
Spring Semester

Week 1 - Intro; Recap of last semester; Overview of the second semester. Recalling last semester’s theoretical frameworks.

Week 2 - Women on the "Borderlands" - Writings from Women of Color in the U.S.; Case studies or what it might look like in practice

Week 3 - Exploring different knowledge bases - Aboriginal woman’s text, alternative spirituality, etc.; Aboriginal women’s stuff from Mary Grant; Narrative of women’s lives as theory.

Week 4 - Ecofeminism - some theoretical frames, including exploring ideas of "alternative" spirituality, indigenous knowledge, "sustainable" development.

Week 5 - Looking at projects or ideas related to this - ex. Chipko movement, Sri Lankan movement, Integrated Pest Management??

Week 6 - Islamic Feminism - introduction to Islam

Week 7 - Islamic Feminism & Case studies

Week 8 - Presentations of alternative case studies or what projects might look like from "alternative" frames.

Week 9 - Planning for what? Planning and policy issues - An overview.

Week 10 - Approaches to Gender Analysis. Tie in with theories.

Week 11 - Approaches to Gender Analysis

Week 12 - Creating a gender analysis tool and applying it to a case study.

Week 13 - Planning and/or evaluating a project with the help of gender analysis tools;

Week 14 - Closure