



Saint Louis University  
Program Assessment Plan

**Program (Major, Minor, Core): M.A. in Sociology**

**Department: Sociology & Anthropology**

**College/School: Arts & Sciences**

**Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan: Graduate Program Director**

**Date Submitted: Revised October 15, 2016**

### **Department Mission**

The mission of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology is to produce and provide foundational, advanced, and practical knowledge in the Social Sciences and Forensic Science. Students are taught to think critically, discern and reconcile contradictory views, weigh factual evidence and move social discourse in inclusive, nuanced, and rational directions. At the same time, we work to expand knowledge of social behavior and advance public dialogue beyond the academy. We engage the community by teaching students to see communities as interacting social components while developing the professional skills to communicate and collaborate effectively to improve social well-being for all. We offer cutting edge education while serving the University, our professions, and the community in the Jesuit tradition.

### **Program Objectives**

The master's program in sociology is organized to ensure that students have an understanding of social theories and propositions that serve to explain the complexities of social life, particularly as it relates to the urban community. The program utilizes the concept of the Sociological Imagination that stresses the review of social problems and issues from a multi-directional, multi-disciplinary perspective in order to ensure a viable synthesis for analysis and solutions. The program strives to provide a number of courses that facilitate a student's ability to conduct sound, valid, and ethical analysis of issues and problems that occur in society today. The program also attempts to foster students' ability to think critically, reason logically, present persuasively and apply learned knowledge to the social setting. Finally, the program strives to instill a sense of justice and compassion, based on the Jesuit mission, in each student such that they understand what it means to be "women and men for others." Together, these skills will provide the student with the ability to operate in the community as a professional or to move on to obtaining a doctoral degree.

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
<p>Critically assess sociological literature and sociological theories.  <b>(Knowledge – theory)</b></p>	<p>SOC 6320 - Organizational Theory  SOC 5100 - ProSeminar  Coursework in substantive area  Research Proposal/Defense  Thesis/Research Papers</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes by producing a thesis or by producing two final papers (non-thesis route). Since the thesis (or two papers) represents a culmination of the work in the program, it is utilized as direct measures of what the student is able to know and do.</li> <li>2. A departmental committee will meet to review all theses or papers produced in a given academic year. The committee will evaluate this outcome for each student according to the attached rubric. [Direct].</li> <li>3. Exit interviews will solicit self-evaluations of the level of knowledge of theory. [Indirect]</li> <li>4. Assessment survey of program alumni to determine knowledge of theory. [Indirect]</li> </ol>	<p>A departmental committee of senior faculty will constitute the Graduate Assessment Committee and will meet in May of each academic year. This committee review all theses and papers completed in the evaluation cycle for this outcome, using the evaluation rubrics. They will write a summary report that will be shared with the departmental faculty for discussion at the departmental retreat in August. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.</p>

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
Appropriately apply major research methodologies utilized in Sociology. <b>(Knowledge – methods and analysis)</b>	SOC 5050 - Applied Inferential Stat SOC 5600 - Research Methodology Advanced Methods coursework Research Proposal/Defense Thesis/Research Papers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes by producing a thesis or by producing two final papers (non-thesis route). Since the thesis (or two papers) represents a culmination of the work in the program, it is utilized as direct measures of what the student is able to know and do.</li> <li>2. A departmental committee will meet to review all theses or papers produced in a given academic year. The committee will evaluate this outcome for each student according to the attached rubric. [Direct].</li> <li>3. Exit interviews will solicit self-evaluations of the level of knowledge of methods. [Indirect]</li> <li>4. Assessment survey of program alumni to determine knowledge of methods. [Indirect]</li> </ol>	A departmental committee of senior faculty will constitute the Graduate Assessment Committee and will meet in May of each academic year. This committee review all theses and papers completed in the evaluation cycle for this outcome, using the evaluation rubrics. They will write a summary report that will be shared with the departmental faculty for discussion at the departmental retreat in August. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
<p>Apply the Sociological Imagination to the study of social issues in a broader societal context.</p> <p><b>(Critical thinking and Synthesis)</b></p>	<p>SOC 5100 - ProSeminar  SOC 6320 - Organizational Theory  Coursework in substantive area  Research Proposal/Defense  Thesis/Research Papers</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes by producing a thesis or by producing two final papers (non-thesis route). Since the thesis (or two papers) represents a culmination of the work in the program, it is utilized as direct measures of what the student is able to know and do.</li> <li>2. A departmental committee will meet to review all theses or papers produced in a given academic year. The committee will evaluate this outcome for each student according to the attached rubric. [Direct].</li> <li>3. Exit interviews will solicit self-evaluations of the ability for critical thinking. [Indirect]</li> <li>4. Assessment survey of program alumni to ability for critical thinking. [Indirect]</li> </ol>	<p>A departmental committee of senior faculty will constitute the Graduate Assessment Committee and will meet in May of each academic year. This committee review all theses and papers completed in the evaluation cycle for this outcome, using the evaluation rubrics. They will write a summary report that will be shared with the departmental faculty for discussion at the departmental retreat in August. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.</p>

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
<p>Articulate scholarly research activity clearly, for professional and/or general audiences, in written, oral or visual formats. <b>(Communication)</b></p>	<p>Expected requirement of all coursework Research Proposal/Defense Thesis</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes by producing a thesis or by producing two final papers (non-thesis route). Since the thesis (or two papers) represents a culmination of the work in the program, it is utilized as direct measures of what the student is able to know and do.</li> <li>2. A departmental committee will meet to review all theses or papers produced in a given academic year. The committee will evaluate this outcome for each student according to the attached rubric. [Direct].</li> <li>3. Exit interviews will solicit self-evaluations of the ability to do written, oral or visual presentations. [Indirect]</li> <li>4. Assessment survey of program alumni to ability to do written, oral or visual presentations. [Indirect]</li> </ol>	<p>A departmental committee of senior faculty will constitute the Graduate Assessment Committee and will meet in May of each academic year. This committee review all theses and papers completed in the evaluation cycle for this outcome, using the evaluation rubrics. They will write a summary report that will be shared with the departmental faculty for discussion at the departmental retreat in August. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.</p>

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
Evidence scholarly and/or professional ethical integrity in their research of social issues. <b>(Ethics)</b>	SOC 5100 - ProSeminar SOC 5600 - Research Methodology SOC 5990 - Thesis Research Research Proposal/Defense Thesis/Research Papers Thesis/Papers Defense	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes by producing a thesis or by producing two final papers (non-thesis route). Since the thesis (or two papers) represents a culmination of the work in the program, it is utilized as direct measures of what the student is able to know and do.</li> <li>2. A departmental committee will meet to review all theses or papers produced in a given academic year. The committee will evaluate this outcome for each student according to the attached rubric. [Direct].</li> <li>3. Exit interviews will solicit self-evaluations of ethical beliefs. [Indirect]</li> <li>4. Assessment survey of program alumni to the extent that ethics plays a part in their own work. [Indirect]</li> </ol>	A departmental committee of senior faculty will constitute the Graduate Assessment Committee and will meet in May of each academic year. This committee review all theses and papers completed in the evaluation cycle for this outcome, using the evaluation rubrics. They will write a summary report that will be shared with the departmental faculty for discussion at the departmental retreat in August. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.

- 1. It is not recommended to try to assess (in depth) all program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.**

The materials for the five outcomes will be collected on an annual basis. The outcomes will be evaluated on a five-year cycle. This will be done in the order of the learning outcomes: Year 1 – Theory; Year 2 – Methods and Analysis; Year 3 – Critical Thinking and Synthesis; Year 4 – Communication; and Year 5 – Ethics. An alumni survey will be done every five years; otherwise there would not be sufficient numbers to make the survey valid.

The responsibility for organizing assessment will be given to a Graduate Assessment Committee composed of senior faculty in the department. Since each learning outcome is being assessed in a five year cycle, the Graduate Assessment Committee will collect all Theses and/or Two Final Papers that have been completed in that cycle. The committee will then meet in May to analyze these materials according to the rubric established for that outcome. The Committee will compile a summary report for the department. This summary report will be distributed electronically to all faculty members in the department and discussed as an action item at the department's annual August retreat. Decisions regarding program recommendations for curriculum or program changes and/or assessment process revisions will be made at this retreat. These decisions will be sent to the Graduate Assessment committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.

Every five years, when enough alumni have been accumulated, the Assessment committee will construct a survey to reflect on how well these outcomes have been utilized beyond the program. In order for this to happen, the department must be able to maintain a viable contact list of all graduating students in the MA program. This survey would take place over the summer period so that the results are available at a subsequent August annual retreat.

- 2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?**

These assessment efforts are not coordinated with any other courses or programs in Madrid. There are no MA sociology programs in Madrid.

- 3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:**

**a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)**

Each year (in May) a Graduate Assessment committee will gather, review and analyze the materials necessary for evaluating the scheduled program learning outcome. This committee will produce a summary report and distribute it to all faculty members for review. The entire department will meet at the August retreat to discuss, decide and suggest changes (if needed) in the program, the curriculum, individual courses, the collection of information, the rubric used to indicate mastery and the overall plan for reviewing. In essence, the department will meet annually to review (and, if determined, revise) this assessment process. The faculty will also decide on the necessary timeline for implementing any changes. These decisions will be conveyed to the Graduate Assessment Committee for compilation in an annual report to be submitted to all required University offices.

**b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.**

Graduate students, in the 15-16 cohort of the Master's in Sociology program, composed a focus group on these learning outcomes. The students reviewed and discussed the document, giving reactions and feedback that did result in the alteration of one of the learning outcomes. Current graduate students were asked to meet and discuss these proposed revisions, and thus constituted a second focus group.

**c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?**

Rhodes, Terrel & Finley, Ashley. 2013. Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Van Vooren, Nicole & Spalter-Roth, Roberta. 2011. Sociology Master's Graduates Join the Workforce. Washington DC: American Sociological Association, Department of Research and Development.

Stewart, Debra. 2011. Master's Programs Defy Easy Profiling. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 29.

Spalter-Roth, Roberta & Van Vooren, Nicole. 2009. Paying Attention to the Master's Degree in Sociology. Washington DC: American Sociological Association, Department of Research and Development.

ASA Task Force. 2005. Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major. American Sociological Association.

MA in sociology assessment programs reviewed:

- California State University – East Bay

- Humboldt State University
- Kean University
- Marshall University
- Northern Illinois University
- Oregon State University
- Southern Connecticut State University
- University of Central Missouri
- University of Colorado – Colorado Springs
- University of Missouri – Kansas City
- University of North Dakota
- University of Texas – Pan American
- University of Wisconsin – Whitewater
- Wayne State University
- American University in Cairo
- Liege University, Belgium

**d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel**

This plan creates additional work for the department faculty as a whole (at least 10 to 15 hours per year for review and for discussion at the department retreat plus working with students in their courses). For faculty members on the assessment committee, this assessment process will involve approximately 30 to 50 hours per year).

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project, of either a “thesis” or “two final papers,” from graduate students in the MA program in sociology, in regards to program learning outcome #1:

**Critically assess sociological literature and sociological theories. (Knowledge – theory)**

1 Does the paper/thesis show appropriate breadth of theoretical and/or research literature review?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of a literature and/or theoretical review.	Presents a very limited conceptual map of existing theories and/or research literature on the topical area and leaves out most of the relevant aspects of the topical area.	Presents a limited conceptual map of existing theories and/or research literature on the topical area and leaves out relevant aspects of the topical area.	Presents a good conceptual map of existing theories and/or research literature on the topical area but leaves out some relevant aspects of the topical area.	Presents a comprehensive conceptual map of existing theories and/or research literature on the topical area.

Comments regarding the breadth of theoretical review in paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

2 Does the paper/proposal/thesis show appropriate depth of theoretical and/or research literature review?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of a literature and/or theoretical review.	Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view and/or approaches.	Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view and/or approaches.	Presents information from relevant sources in an in-depth manner that represents a variety of view and/or approaches.	Synthesizes information from relevant sources in an in-depth manner that critically analyzes the connections between the various components discussed.

Comments regarding the depth of theoretical review in paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

3. Does the student clearly present his/her arguments regarding theory and research literature and does so in a manner that demonstrates a command of the topical subject matter?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of a literature and/or theoretical review.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to the topical area.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences or similarities related to the topical area.	Organizes evidence to reveal some important patterns, differences or similarities related to the topical area.	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences or similarities related to the topical area.

Comments regarding the communication of theoretical and critical review in paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

4. At what level would you place the theoretical and literature review work of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the student's level of work in the paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project, of either a “thesis” or “two final papers,” from graduate students in the MA program in sociology, in regards to program learning outcome #2:

Appropriately apply major research methodologies utilized in sociology. **(Knowledge – methods and analysis)**

1. Does the paper/thesis show application of appropriate research methodologies to the topic?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of a methodological plan is provided.	Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology and its application.	Critical elements of the methodology are missing, incorrectly developed or unfocused.	Critical elements of the methodology are appropriately developed; however, more subtle elements are ignored or left unexplained.	All elements of the methodology are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodologies are applied and/or synthesized from across discipline or subdisciplines.

Comments regarding the application of research methodologies. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

2. Does the paper/thesis show application of appropriate analytical techniques for understanding information collected regarding the topic?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of an analysis plan is provided.	Analysis plan demonstrates a misunderstanding of the analytical techniques and their application.	Analysis plan listed and adequate but described in a mechanical manner with limited connection to the topic or issue.	Analysis plan shows a good understanding of the analytical techniques. Rationale for selection is not explicitly or adequately described.	Analysis plan shows a strong understanding of the analytical techniques, both strengths and limitations. Explicitly describes the compelling rationale for the use of selected analytical techniques.

Comments regarding the application of analytical techniques. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

3. Does the student clearly present his/her research and analysis plan in a manner that demonstrates the viability of the research?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No functional presentation of a literature and/or theoretical review.	Organization and synthesis in the methodological and analytical plans have serious gaps and omissions.	Organization and synthesis in the methodological and analytical plans have some gaps and omissions.	Organizes and synthesizes the methodological and analytical plans but described in a manner that is not easily replicated.	Organizes and synthesizes the methodological and analytical plans in such a manner as to easily replicate the research.

Comments regarding the communication of methodology and analytical plans. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

4. At what level would you place the methodological plan of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the student's level of work in the paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

5. At what level would you place the analytical plan of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the student's level of work in the paper. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project, of either a “thesis” or “two final papers,” from graduate students in the MA program in sociology, in regards to program learning outcome #3:

Apply the Sociological Imagination to the study of social issues in a broader societal context. **(Critical thinking and Synthesis)**

1. Does the student utilize the precepts of the Sociological Imagination to “think outside the box” when researching societal issues?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Reformulates a singular idea with little focus or usefulness.	Reformulates a collection of available ideas.	Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format or procedure	Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format or procedure.	Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format or procedure to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.

Comments regarding thinking outside the box when researching. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

2. Does the student utilize the precepts of the Sociological Imagination to approach social problems and issues from an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary perspective?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Cannot recognize the connections among ideas or solutions.	Can recognize existing connections among ideas or solutions but does not actually make the connection in their work.	Connects ideas or solutions in novel manners that include input from different disciplines.	Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole that include input from different disciplines.	Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms that include input from different disciplines.

Comments regarding approaching social problems in an interdisciplinary manner. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

3. Does the student utilize the precepts of the Sociological Imagination to evaluate solutions from an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary perspective?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
No attempt is made to look at the solutions from multiple perspectives.	Evaluation of solutions is superficial and there is only cursory discussion of the history of the problem, logic/reasoning behind the problem, feasibility of solutions or weight of the impact of solutions.	Evaluation of solutions is brief and lacks depth in the discussion of the history of the problem, logic/reasoning behind the problem, feasibility of solutions or weight of the impact of solutions.	Evaluation of solutions is adequate and includes in-depth discussion of the history of the problem, logic/reasoning behind the problem, feasibility of solutions and weighs the impact of solutions.	Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes in-depth discussion of the history of the problem, logic/reasoning behind the problem, feasibility of solutions and weighs the impact of solutions.

Comments regarding approaching solutions in an interdisciplinary manner. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

4. At what level would you place the student's overall critical thinking and synthesizing abilities for addressing social issues?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the student's critical thinking. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

## Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project, of either a “thesis” or “two final papers,” from graduate students in the MA program in sociology, in regards to program learning outcome #4:

**Articulate scholarly research activity clearly, for professional and/or general audiences, in written, oral or visual formats. (Communication)**

1. Does the student demonstrate writing in his/her thesis and/or papers that show content knowledge and development?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Fails to uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and shape ideas in the thesis and/or papers.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the thesis and/or papers.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the thesis and/or papers	Uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the entire piece of work.	Uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer’s understanding and shaping the entire piece of work.

Comments regarding written content development. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

2. Does the student follow general sociological and professional conventions in his/her thesis and/or papers? If not, does the student adequately justify the alternative styles?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
There is no consistent system of organization or presentation in the thesis and/or papers.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.	Follows some of the appropriate sociological conventions but has drawbacks in terms of organization, content, formatting, citation support and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates mostly consistent use of important professional sociological conventions, including organization, content, formatting, citation support and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of professional conventions specific to sociology, including organization, content, formatting, citation support and stylistic choices.

Comments regarding professional writing style and structure. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

3. At what level would you place the writing competency of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master’s level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the level of the student’s writing competency. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

4. Does the student demonstrate prepared, purposeful and effective oral communication of his/her ideas?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is weakly observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.

Comments regarding oral communication skills. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

5. At what level would you place the oral presentation competency of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the level of the student's oral presentation skills. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

6. Does the student demonstrate prepared, purposeful and effective visual presentation of his/her ideas?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Visual presentation is very disjointed and detracts from the presentation.	The visual presentation is limited and provides minimal enhancement and support to some of the ideas, content, results, etc. of his/her thesis and/or papers.	The visual presentation is okay and provides enhancement and support to some of the ideas, content, results, etc. of his/her thesis and/or papers.	The visual presentation is good and provides enhancement and support to most of the ideas, content, results, etc. of his/her thesis and/or papers.	The visual presentation is an excellent supportive tool utilized by the student to enhance and support the ideas, content, results, etc. of his/her thesis and/or papers.

7. At what level would you place the visual presentation competency of this student?

❶ Beginning Undergrad student	❷ Senior Undergrad student	❸ Master's level student	❹ Doctoral level student	❺ Professional level colleague
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Comments regarding the level of the student's visual presentation skills. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project, of either a “thesis” or “two final papers,” from graduate students in the MA program in sociology, in regards to program learning outcome #5:

Evidence scholarly and/or professional ethical integrity in their research of social issues. **(Ethics)**

1. Does the student demonstrate that he/she has complied with all SLU IRB policies, procedures and regulations, **if applicable?**

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Student is not compliant with the SLU IRB requirements.	Student is compliant with some of the SLU IRB requirements.	Student is compliant with most of the SLU IRB requirements.	Student is compliant with all SLU IRB requirements but does not demonstrate an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.	Student is compliant with all SLU IRB requirements and demonstrates an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.

Comments regarding the compliance with SLU IRB policies, procedures and regulations. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

2. Does the student demonstrate compliance with the code of ethics of the American Statistical Association, **if applicable?**

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Student is not compliant with the ethical codes of the Amer. Stat. Assoc. regarding quantitative requirements	Student is compliant with some of the ethical codes of the Amer. Stat. Assoc. regarding quantitative requirements	Student is compliant with most ethical codes of the Amer. Stat. Assoc. regarding quantitative requirements.	Student is compliant with all ethical codes of the Amer. Stat. Assoc. regarding quantitative requirements but does not demonstrate an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.	Student is compliant with all ethical codes of the Amer. Stat. Assoc. regarding quantitative requirements and demonstrates an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.

Comments regarding ethical behavior with quantitative data and statistical analysis. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

3. Does the student demonstrate compliance with the code of ethics of the American Sociological Association?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Student is not compliant with the ethical codes of the Amer. Soc. Assoc. regarding research requirements.	Student is compliant with some of the ethical codes of the Amer. Soc. Assoc. regarding research requirements.	Student is compliant with most ethical codes of the Amer. Soc. Assoc. regarding research requirements.	Student is compliant with all ethical codes of the Amer. Soc. Assoc. regarding research requirements but does not demonstrate an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.	Student is compliant with all ethical codes of the Amer. Soc. Assoc. regarding research requirements and demonstrates an understanding as to why those requirements are important to ethical behavior in social research.

Comments regarding ethical behavior in regards to human subjects in social situations. If there are deficiencies, please describe.

4. Does the student demonstrate an understanding of ethical issues that are informed by SLU's Jesuit values and mission?

❶ Unacceptable	❷ Weak	❸ Adequate	❹ Good	❺ Excellent
Student shows no knowledge of ethical issues.	Student can recognize only limited ethical issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but has an incomplete picture of the contextual complexities, with no connection to Jesuit values.	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered context BUT cannot fully apply the Jesuit values in an appropriate manner.	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered context AND can apply the Jesuit values in an appropriate manner.

Comments regarding ethical behavior in regards to human subjects in social situations. If there are deficiencies, please describe.