Sociology Department Assessment Report, 2005

A. B.A. in Sociology
1. Student Learning Outcomes (draft)
   a. understand basic sociological concepts such as social stratification; social roles; social construction of class, race, and gender; processes of development such as industrialization; urbanization, and population growth; social institutions and their variations between societies; sociological approaches to social problems.
   b. basic understanding of social theories
   c. basic understanding of methods of social research, quantitative and qualitative
   d. ability to read simple two-variable data tables and interpret the results
   e. ability to pose a simple sociological question and evaluate information about it
   f. ability to articulate and apply a sociological theory
   g. ability to use SPSS to analyze simple tabular data

2. SLOs will be placed on department website after the full faculty approves the draft.

3. Map SLOs to curriculum
   Required courses for sociology majors are Soc. 100, 300, 321, Soc. 475, 476, or 478, and [ ] additional 400 level courses. Non-majors enroll in virtually all sociology courses. Sociology is a discipline with many different approaches and the department welcomes students at any level. There is no prescribed sequence of courses, except that 300 level courses generally require Soc. 100 as a prerequisite, and 400 level courses generally require Soc. 300 as a prerequisite. A small number of 400 level courses require a related 200 or 300 level course as a prerequisite. Many students declare the major late, and take 300 and 400 level courses concurrently.
   a. Soc. 100, 200, 300, and 400 level sociology courses
   b. Soc. 321
   c. Soc. 300, Soc. 475, 476, 478
   d. Soc. 300, Soc. 475, 476
   e. Soc. 300, all 400 level courses
   f. Soc. 321, all 400 level courses
   g. Soc. 300, 475, 476

4. Methods of collecting assessment data
   The assessment covers all students enrolled in the courses that have writing assignments, from 100 to 400 level; hence the assessment covers majors, service students, and the general student population. At present we do not distinguish the categories, but will be able to do so as the data pool expands over time. Instructors collect writing assignments in electronic form, and at the end of the semester they submit them to the department for assessment along with a course list and syllabus. The papers are converted to pdf format and logged into our assessment database along with basic information about the student, course, and assignment. A simple four part evaluation scheme with up to 20 points per paper was developed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee. (See attachment A) We draw samples of the papers in the database and apply the assessment criteria to them. This provides consistent performance indicators for introductory through advanced courses. To date the database contains 516 papers collected over the past three years.
For this assessment one faculty member and one graduate student scored a sample of 30 papers which were systematically sampled to produce 10 each at the 100, 300, and 400 levels. There was considerable variation in the two sets of scores, suggesting that more training is needed before student coders can be used. The inter-coder variation was highest for the 100-level papers and decreased for the higher level papers, with the student coder generally awarding more points than the faculty member. Despite these variations, the averages for each coder within one course level were comparable: both found increasing sociological competence in the 300 and 400 level papers. Because of the amount of variation with this small sample, we report the average of the two scores for this analysis, with the separate coder averages in parentheses. The overall combined average score was 12.05 (10.5; 13.6).

The 100-level papers came from Sociology 100 (Introductory Sociology), which is taken by a wide range of students. As expected, this level produced the lowest level of sociological knowledge. The combined average score for the 100-level papers was 9.7 (7.2; 12.1). The 300-level papers came from two different courses, both of which are required for Sociology majors. Soc. 300 is the basic methods course for majors, and Soc. 321 is the basic theory course. While some non-majors do take these courses, the scores should represent the performance of students at the entry level of the major. The combined average score for the 300-level papers was 12.1 (11.1; 13.1). Students in the sociology major are required to take five 400-level courses, which are smaller-enrollment courses emphasizing student research and paper writing. While some non-majors do take the 400 level courses, the scores at this level should reflect the competence of majors in their senior year. The combined average score for the 400-level papers was 14.35 (13.2; 15.5). In sum, the assessment demonstrates that students’ knowledge of sociology increased as expected with more work in the major. As the number of papers in the database increases, we will be able to carry out more precise analyses and use the assessment as a tool for improving instruction.

5. We have only recently entered the first three years of data into the database and developed a satisfactory method for evaluating the papers. Hence we are not yet ready to use the assessment data to consider adjustments in the program.

6. Application of General Education Standards to the Major

1. The sociology major develops proficiency in methods of sociological data collection and analysis through Soc. 300 and the required 400 level methods courses.

2. The sociology major develops proficiency in sociological problem-solving through Soc. 100, Soc. 300, and through 200, 300, and 400 level courses on sociological specific topics. Oral communication skills are developed through group discussion, group projects, and oral reports in 300 and 400 level courses.

3. Sociology majors receive training and experience in sociological modes of inquiry and analysis in virtually every course, but particularly in Soc. 300 and in all 400 level courses they carry out research projects using such skills. These skills are measured directly in our assessment method, which evaluates student performance on regular class assignments using standardized evaluation criteria.

B. Graduate Assessment in the Plan A M.A. Program in Sociology
1. Student Learning Outcomes for the Plan MA Degree (draft)
   a. understanding of a broad range of sociological theories and methods, and
      commonly used statistical techniques
   b. ability to design a feasible research project to address a sociological problem or
      issue of theoretical interest
   c. understanding of principles of protection of human subjects and how to design
      sociological research that respects and protects human subjects.
   d. ability to carry out an independent research project to collect and analyze
      research data that addresses a sociological question
   e. ability to interpret research results in relation to sociological theory, to draw
      reasonable inferences, and to report research results and conclusions accurately
      and effectively.

1. The learning outcomes will be posted on the department website after the faculty has
   discussed them further in relation to our assessment measures and approved.

2. Map SLOs to curriculum
   a. Required graduate core course in theory (611 or 612) with undergraduate
      theory course (321 or equivalent) as prerequisite; required basic statistics
      course (476/L, with 605 optional), and required methods course (Soc. 475,
      478, 604, 606, 608, 609, or 691 ).
   b. Detailed thesis proposal, which must be approved by student’s thesis
      committee.
   c. Soc. 606 includes certification in human subjects protection for investigators;
      students must obtain human subjects committee approval for all thesis
      research involving human subjects or data on living humans. Consideration of
      human subjects protection is concurrent with development of an acceptable
      thesis proposal.
   d. Thesis data collection, data analysis, and write-up
   e. Thesis write-up and oral defense.

3. Assessment measures cover all students in the MA program.

4. We use four forms of assessment.
   a. Individual course grades, since students must maintain at least a B average to
      remain in good standing in the program. All 400, 600, and 700 level courses
      evaluate students on a combination of written work and oral performance in
      class.
   b. Supervision and evaluation of the thesis proposal, thesis, and oral defense of
      the thesis by a three-member committee. Most thesis proposals undergo at
      least two drafts before the committee approves them, and most theses require
      at least two or three drafts to meet committee standards. The oral defense of
      the thesis evaluates whether the student can organize a formal presentation of
      the work and can answer questions about it at an acceptable professional level.
      The completed theses are public products.
   c. Since most of our MA thesis projects involve human subjects, the research
      must also pass human subjects review before the student can carry it out. While
      this is not a direct measure of quality, it does require that the student
      present a clear description of a research project that provides appropriate
      protection of human subjects.
d. Annual review of all graduate students, in which the entire faculty of the department assesses whether each student is progressing at an appropriate pace through the program. Students receive a letter each year indicating whether they are progressing appropriately and what milestones they are expected to achieve by the time of the next annual review. Students who fail to meet annual goals despite two years of warnings are dropped from the program. (see attachments B and C) In the 2005 review, of 26 MA students reviewed, 76.9% (20) were making satisfactory progress, 15.4% (4) received warnings of inadequate progress, 7.7% (2) received unsatisfactory progress ratings, and 2 students were dropped from the program. This compares favorably with the 2004 review of 23 MA students, in which 69.6% (16) were making satisfactory progress, 13% (3) received warnings, and 17.4% (4) received unsatisfactory progress ratings.

5. Many of our MA students are selected competitively to present seminar papers or parts of their thesis at either graduate student conferences or at state, regional, or national professional meetings.

6. We try to determine what students do after completion of the MA. Although the MA is intended as a terminal degree, each year one or two of our MA students petition successfully to enter our doctoral program. We do not permit these transfers until the MA thesis is completed. In addition, about a third of our MA students earn a concurrent or subsequent second degree or certificate in another academic or professional field. About a third of them teach in community colleges or four year colleges with the MA degree. About a quarter are employed in public and private agencies, primarily in the state of Hawaii, where they use their sociological training for research, teaching, or social service positions. However, a recent increase in funded international students in the MA program will change these outcomes, since most of those students will return to positions in their home countries.

7. There have been two effects to date.
   a. The annual review has led to removal of inactive students from the program and serves to keep students on track toward completion of their degree. Since 1998 23 MA students have received C (unsatisfactory progress) evaluations in the annual review and have either gotten back on track, withdrawn from the program, or been formally dropped for non-performance.
   b. Imposition of stricter human subjects monitoring for the social sciences and the inclusion of this training in our required methods course has led to stricter evaluation of MA thesis proposals and a corresponding upgrading in the quality of MA thesis research. This has raised awareness of ethical standards and also provides students with practical experience in the negotiation of research bureaucracies.

B. The sociology department also offers a Plan B MA degree in Population Studies in conjunction with the Population Studies Program, but in recent years there have only been one or two students applying for this MA track. Performance in this program is assessed with a rigorous sequence of courses and an exit examination offered through the Population Studies Program.

B. The Doctoral Degree Program in Sociology
1. Student Learning Outcomes for the PhD Degree in Sociology (draft)
   a. high level understanding of a broad range of sociological theories and methods, and commonly used statistical techniques, and the ability to apply this knowledge to specific research problems.
   b. mastery of at least two specific subfields of sociology and a range of methods and statistical techniques appropriate to those subfields
   c. ability to design a feasible research project to address a sociological problem or issue of theoretical interest
   d. understanding of principles of protection of human subjects and how to design sociological research that respects and protects human subjects.
   e. ability to carry out independent research to collect and analyze research data that addresses a sociological question and makes an original contribution to the field.
   f. ability to interpret research results in relation to sociological theory, to draw reasonable inferences and interpretations, and to report research results and conclusions accurately and effectively.
   g. ability to present research results in professional venues through presentation of papers at professional conferences and publication in appropriate professional outlets.

2. The SLOs will be published on the department website when the department has approved the draft.

3. The program uses a combination of formal coursework and a sequence of writing requirements under the guidance of the student’s committee to develop the learning outcomes in students.
   a. Core courses Sociology 611* and 612* cover general theories, and Sociology 613, 615, 616, 631, 632, 638, 661, 706, 711, 715, 716, 720, 721, 722, 723, 725, 730, 735, 741, 750, 751, 752, 753, and 754 cover the middle range theories and research findings of various subfields of the discipline. Sociology 476/L, 605/L* and 705 cover introductory and advanced statistics. Sociology 604, 606*, 608, 609, 691, and 701 offer various research methods. (Asterisked courses are required core courses). Ability to apply theory and methods to specific sociological problem is developed through seminars and research papers, and is evaluated in the Qualifying Review.
   b. Obtained through seminars, research papers, and preparation for comprehensive examinations in two subfields. These areas of knowledge and skills and tested through written and oral comprehensive exams.
   c. Developed through all methods and subfield seminars, through the Qualifying Review requirement, the Research Paper requirement, and the Dissertation Prospectus. Qualifying Review requires submission of two papers that will demonstrate student’s ability to utilize sociological theory and methods to specific problems. Papers are first evaluated by the student’s own guidance committee and then submitted to the departmental QR panel convened each semester. For the Qualifying Review, Research Paper Requirement, and Dissertation Prospectus, students must develop their own research projects.
under committee guidance.

d. All students receive full investigator training in human subjects protection in Soc. 606. They must apply to the Committee on Human Studies for their dissertation research if it involves human subjects, but are encouraged also to apply for approval or exemption for any original research projects they carry out for the Qualifying Review and Research Paper Requirement, since the results of these projects may later be submitted for publication.

e. Developed through independent work in seminars and through research to fulfill the Qualifying Review, Research Paper Requirement, and Dissertation. Such research is developed and carried out under the careful guidance of the student’s committee.

f. Developed as in e., through independent work in seminars and through writing up research to fulfill the Qualifying Review, Research Paper Requirement, and Dissertation under the guidance of the student’s committee.

g. Because students produce original research papers through the Qualifying Review and Research Paper process, they frequently present these papers at professional conferences and then go on to publish some of them. The Research Paper Requirement is to produce a research paper in the form of a publishable quality professional journal article and to present it publicly. The process teaches students how to write in professional journal style and ensures that they also learn to present their work in a professional venue even before they get to the dissertation stage. Each year several students have their papers accepted at national professional conferences, and about a third of our doctoral students publish professionally before they complete the program.

4. All doctoral students are covered by our assessment measures.

5. We use seven different forms of assessment.
   a. Individual course grades, since students must maintain at least a B average to remain in good standing in the program. All 400, 600, and 700 level courses evaluate students on a combination of written work and oral performance in class.
   b. Qualifying Review is a required portfolio process in lieu of a qualifying exam in theory and methods, which doctoral students must pass in order to be officially admitted to candidacy in the doctoral program. They must submit two papers, one of which should have been developed through independent work under the supervision of a faculty member. The two papers, taken together, should display the student’s ability to utilize sociological theory and methods to address a specific sociological problem or issue. The papers must first be submitted to the student’s guidance committee for review and approval before being submitted to the department for Qualifying Review along with a confidential evaluation by each committee member (see attachment D). If the student’s committee does not find the two papers satisfactory in the fourth semester of doctoral work the review may be postponed to the fifth semester, and upon appeal can be postponed to the sixth semester. If the guidance committee does not
find the work satisfactory in the sixth semester, it must still be submitted for qualifying review. A Qualifying Review panel of faculty is convened each semester to read and evaluate all papers submitted for QR. The QR committee evaluates the paper for Quality of Writing, Methodological and Logical Ability, and Analytical Skills and produces an overall evaluation on a scale from 5 (excellent) to 1 (unacceptable) (see attachment E). Both papers must achieve passing scores in order for the student to pass the QR. Students who fail the review may retake it one more time in the following semester. If they fail a second time they are dropped from the program. Since fall 2000, a total of 34 students have presented papers for the Qualifying Review. Three students failed the review, after which one successfully passed the following semester and two others left the program. One student was passed in 2004 with a score of 2 (marginal) on each paper, after which the department voted to raise the standard for passing to 3 (acceptable). Average scores for recent semesters are as follows: Spring 2003, 3.79; Fall 2003, 3.425; Spring 2004, 2.5 (including one failure and one passing at 2.0 level, average of all passing students was 2.97); Fall, 2004, 3.75; Spring 2005, 3.4 (includes one failure. Average of passing students was 3.7). Grading is quite strict. Although individual members of the QR panel may award a 5 (excellent) to individual papers, the highest average score any student has achieved in the past three years is a 4.7 on both papers.

c. Annual review of all graduate students, in which the entire faculty of the department assesses whether each student is progressing at an appropriate pace through the program. Students receive a letter each year indicating whether they are progressing appropriately and what milestones they are expected to achieve by the time of the next annual review. Students who fail to meet annual goals despite two years of warnings are dropped from the program. (see attachments B and C) In the 2005 annual review of 46 doctoral students, 86.9% (40) were progressing satisfactorily, 8.7% (4) were making inadequate progress, and 4% (2) received unsatisfactory ratings. This compares favorably with the 2004 review of 54 doctoral students, in which 81.5% (44) were making satisfactory progress, 9.25% (5) were warned of inadequate progress, and 9.25% (5) received unsatisfactory ratings. (Two of those students were subsequently dropped by the Graduate Division for failure complete the dissertation in time.)

d. Research Paper Requirement. After passing the Qualifying Review, students must prepare a research paper in the form of a publishable quality journal article and present it publicly. The presentation is frequently achieved by having the paper accepted for presentation at a regional or national professional meeting, but presentation at a department colloquium is also permitted. The student’s five member doctoral committee must approve the final version of the paper, but acceptance of the paper for presentation at a professional meeting also indicates its positive evaluation by professionals in the discipline. Revised versions of these papers are often subsequently published.
e. Written and Oral Comprehensive Exams. The written comprehensive on two subfields selected by the student is based on a reading list of 25 to 50 items in each field, compiled by the student in consultation with the committee. The exam is a one week take-home in which the student writes on three or four questions. Students may consult any written source but may not discuss the exam with any person while they are taking it. It is followed within two to three weeks by an oral examination before the committee. Since fall 2000, twenty doctoral students have passed their comprehensive exams in sociology.

f. Since most of our students do research on human subjects, their research projects must be approved or declared exempt by the Social Science Committee on Human Subjects before the research can be conducted. This not only provides an external evaluation of the ethical standards of the research, but also requires that the students develop and articulate appropriate methodology to this external committee’s satisfaction.

g. Supervision and evaluation by a five-member committee of the dissertation prospectus and dissertation, and public oral defense of the dissertation. Most dissertation prospectuses undergo at least two drafts before the committee approves them, and most dissertations require at least two or three drafts to meet committee standards. The oral defense of the dissertation evaluates whether the student can organize a formal presentation of the work and can answer questions about it at an acceptable professional level. The completed dissertations are public products, most of which are subsequently revised for publication either as journal articles, as monographs, or both.

6. Our doctoral students frequently have their research papers accepted for presentation at regional and national conferences. In August, 2005, five students had papers accepted at the American Sociological Association and Society for the Study of Social Problems meetings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, two were unable to attend for financial reasons.

7. About a third of our PhDs go on to academic positions in the United States; another third fill professional positions in public and private agencies (many had these positions before entering the doctoral program); and the remaining third return to academic or professional positions in their home countries. Although we are unable to maintain complete records, many of our students do publish their dissertation work, and most go on to full professional careers.

8. The assessments have been used to improve the program in various ways.
   a. Evaluation of the results of the Qualifying Review led to a departmental decision to raise the standard for passing the review, so that a student cannot pass with only “marginal” performance.
   b. The annual review has succeeded in keeping most students on track toward their degrees, and has helped to remove some non-performing students from the program.
c. Recent analysis of the length of time students spend between the Qualifying Review and the Comprehensive Exams, based on annual review data, has led to suggestions for revising and strengthening the Research Paper Requirement by requiring that the paper actually be submitted for publication so that the student’s committee can work with the student to understand and address the external reviewers’ comments. Since this would require that the research paper actually represent an original contribution to the field worthy of publication, we would then eliminate the requirement that the Research Paper requirement be completed before the comprehensives, so that early results from the dissertation research could be used for this purpose. This proposal will be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee this year.

d. Imposition of stricter human subjects monitoring for the social sciences and the inclusion of this training in our required methods course has raised awareness of ethical standards. In order to obtain human subjects approval or exemption for their research, students must be able to develop an acceptable project and articulate it clearly to the committee, which has improved the quality of the research proposals. The process of seeking approval also provides students with practical experience in the negotiation of research bureaucracies.
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Attachment A. Scoring criteria for assessment of undergraduate papers

DRAFT INSTRUMENT (Revised after Soc Dept meeting, 4-27-04):

PROGRAM LEARNING ASSESSMENT

It is the policy of the Department of Sociology that each faculty member of courses that are “Writing Intensive” or otherwise require a good amount of writing (term papers, research projects, etc.), ask all students to keep copies of their written work on a disk to be turned into the Department at semester’s end. Student’s names should be attached for tracking purposes, but during actual assessment writer’s identities will be removed.

Each paper will be evaluated on the following four dimensions, on a scale of 5 to 1: 5= Excellent, A; 4=Good, B; 3= Fair, C; 2= Weak, D; 1= Fail, F.

I. CONCEPTUALIZATION: The paper reflects an ability to present sociological ideas.
   - is informative
   - reflects a sociological imagination, linking individual experience to social structure
   - articulates the sociological significance of the topic
   - displays familiarity with relevant literature
   - relates the topic to sociological theory, states hypotheses, etc.

II. EVIDENCE: The paper displays an ability to collect and report relevant data/information.
   - develops research methodology
   - gathers data scientifically, relying on original or secondary data collected systematically
   - is honestly presented, clarifying what are the author’s values and personal opinions
   - presents data that are relevant to the research topic
   - presents data and results/findings in easily understandable formats, conforming to acceptable standards (e.g. contingency tables, graphs, quoted field notes, etc.)

III. INTERPRETATION: The paper displays an ability to analyze data.
   - displays ability to understand and interpret data
   - demonstrates reasonably clear and logical reasoning in interpreting data
   - understands the relevance of findings to theory

IV. WRITING SKILLS: The paper shows the writer has acceptable writing skills.
   - the prose is usually clear and the meaning of ideas is effectively conveyed
   - displays a wide vocabulary and proper choice of words
   - exhibits proper sentence structure, some sentence variety, and cohesion between sentences
   - show minimum errors in grammar, observes conventions of standard written English

TOTAL ____
Attachment B. Scoring criteria and letter text for annual review of all graduate students

A (Satisfactory Progress)

In its annual review of graduate students, the department has found that you are making satisfactory progress toward your degree. Within the next year, we expect that you will [insert next step in program]. Keep up the good work!

B (Warning)

In its annual review of graduate students the department found that you are not currently making satisfactory progress toward your degree. Within the next semester we expect you to [insert next step in program]. If you are unable to show satisfactory progress toward your degree by the next annual review, your status in the program and any financial support you receive from the department may be placed in jeopardy.

C (Drastic Action)

In its annual review of graduate students the department found that you have not made satisfactory progress toward your degree. Please meet with your committee chair within the next two weeks to develop a plan and timetable for completion of [insert next step in program]. If you are unable to show satisfactory progress toward your degree by the next annual review, you will be dropped from the program.
Attachment C. Levels of Graduate Program Progress for Annual Review.
(Students are evaluated in terms of whether they are making satisfactory progress toward the designated level of achievement, and their annual letter specifies the next level to which they should be making progress for the following year’s review. Not every level can be completed in one year, and satisfactory progress is assessed accordingly.)

Eight Levels of the Graduate Program

1. MA have your thesis topic approved
2. MA complete your thesis and pass your oral.
3. MA complete all coursework for Plan B degree
4. Ph.D. complete your qualifying review
5. Ph.D. complete and present your research paper
6. Ph.D. pass your comprehensive exams
7. Ph.D. have your dissertation prospectus approved
8. Ph.D. finish writing dissertation and take your oral
Attachment D. Confidential Evaluation Sheet for Guidance Committee

CONFIDENTIAL

Evaluation sheet for Guidance Committee
(Feel free to use additional pages if necessary)

On Student’s Two Pages

What are the strengths of the two papers?

What are the major weaknesses of the two papers?

On Student’s Academic Promise

Does the student show sufficient intellectual promise to carry out dissertation research successfully? Please explain.

Do you have any concern with the student’s sociological training (e.g., lack of analytical skills, weak methodology, poor work habit, not take comments seriously)? Please explain.

How would you rank the student with other students who have successfully completed their PhD degree in Sociology (top 10%, top 25%, above average, below average)?

On the Formation of PhD Committee

Are you willing to serve as chair or member of the student’s PhD Committee?

Do we have enough faculty in Sociology willing to serve as chair or member of the student’s 5-person PhD Committee?

Signature________________________________________________Date____________

Chair/Member of__________________________________________’s Guidance Committee
Attachment E. Evaluation Sheet for Qualifying Review Committee

Evaluation Sheet For Qualifying Review Committee

Quality of Writing  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 1</th>
<th>Paper 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well is the paper written?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the arguments clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper well organized?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there many grammatical or typographical errors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodological and Logical Ability  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 1</th>
<th>Paper 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the key research questions of the study clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the research questions posed, does the student deal with them in a logical fashion, with the appropriate methodologies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the conclusions logically drawn from the analysis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical Skills  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper 1</th>
<th>Paper 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the student reveal an analytic ability to critically assess the relevant literature and to frame research questions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the student exercise some sociological imagination in probing into the research questions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the student draw interesting sociological/policy interpretations from the analysis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Evaluation  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please use the following numerical scores for grading. The overall evaluation does not need to be an average of the scores on Quality or Writing, Methodological and Logical Ability, and Analytical Skills. Scores from all QR Committee members will be combined. Papers must receive average scores of 3 in overall evaluation to pass the QR.

5. Excellent  
4. Good  
3. Acceptable  
2. Marginal  
1. Unacceptable