# 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our website or contact us for more help.

| Report:   | BA Sociology  |  |
|---|---|--|
| Question 1: Progra  | am Learning Outcomes  |  |
| Q1.1. Which of the following Progra assess? [Check all that ap  | am Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning G <b>ply</b> ]   | oals (BLGs) <b>did you</b>   |
| 1. Critical Thinking  |   |  |
| 2. Information Literacy   |   |  |
| 3. Written Communicati  | on  |  |
| 4. Oral Communication   |   |  |
| 5. Quantitative Literacy  |   |  |
| 6. Inquiry and Analysis   |   |  |
| 7. Creative Thinking  |   |  |
| 8. Reading  |   |  |
| 9. Team Work  |   |  |
| 10. Problem Solving   |   |  |
| 11. Civic Knowledge and   | d Engagement  |  |
| 12. Intercultural Knowle  | dge and Competency  |  |
| 13. Ethical Reasoning   |   |  |
| 14. Foundations and Ski   | ills for Lifelong Learning  |  |
| 15. Global Learning   |   |  |
| 16. Integrative and App   | lied Learning   |  |
| 17. Overall Competencie   | es for GE Knowledge   |  |
| 18. Overall Competencie   | es in the Major/Discipline  |  |
| 19. Other, specify any a  | assessed PLOs not included above:   |  |
| a   |   |  |
| b<br>c.   |   |  |
|   | background information about <b>EACH PLO</b> you checked above and other background inked to the Sac State BLGs:  | er information such as   |
| "Integrative Learning." major at CSU Sacrame through a sociological  The outcome assessed social experience or pr from sociology." This | outcome assessed for 2015-16 was linked to the Sac State ——The general goal linked to the specific PLO for 2015-16 is ento will be expected to analyze a social experience or solve lens.  If was that Students will be able to: "Design a research students, using evidence and quantitative and qualitative resintegrated learning outcome encompassed the additional lalysis, because the projects used as measures for the learning | s: The sociology ve a social problem  dy to analyze a search methods PLO checked |

| Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?   |
|--|
| 1. Yes, for all PLOs   |
| <ul><li>2. Yes, but for some PLOs</li></ul>  |
|  |
| 3. No rubrics for PLOs   |
| ○ 4. N/A   |
| 5. Other, specify:   |
|  |
| Q1.3.  Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?  1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know   |
| Q1.4.  Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?  1. Yes 2. No (skip to Q1.5) 3. Don't know (skip to Q1.5) |
| Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?  1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know                       |
| Q1.5. Did your program use the <i>Degree Qualification Profile</i> (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?  1. Yes  2. No, but I know what the DQP is  3. No, I don't know what the DQP is   |
| 4. Don't know  O1.6.   |
| Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?  1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know  |
| (Remember: Save your progress)  Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO   |

**Q2.1.**Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Integrative and Applied Learning

**Q2.1.1.** Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

THE PLO is: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to analyze a social experience or solve a social problem through a sociological lens.

This PLO is measured by the specific outcomes that:

Students will be able to:

- i. Design a research study to analyze a social experience or problem, using evidence and quantitative and qualitative research methods from sociology.
- ii. Apply sociological theory to a social experience.
- iii. Apply a sociological imagination to a social experience to understand and/or explain it.

Specific outomce (i) was also assessed in 2014-15 and based on feedback from the Program Assessment Report, we chose to assess the same PLO in 2015-16 to compare results and improve reporting.

| 0 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|

| Has | the | program | developed | or adop | ted <b>exp</b> l | icit st | andards | of p | performa | ance f | or this | PLO? |
|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|------|----------|--------|---------|------|
|     | 1.  | Yes     |           |         |                  |         |         |      |          |        |         |      |
|     | 2.  | No      |           |         |                  |         |         |      |          |        |         |      |

- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

#### Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Rubric is attached

The standard of performance was also selected based on feedback from last year's report. We determined that a reasonable goal for performance was for 80% of the papers to be rated at a score of 2.5 or higher (on scale from 1 to 4) for each of the 9 items on the rubric. Since .5 rankings were allowed, the scale has, in practice, 7 possible rankings, and 2.5 is the mid-point. This standard was previously decided upon by the department faculty.

Because the two class projects assessed were quite different, we calculated the % of student papers meeting the standard of performance for each rubric item for each class separately (a total of 9 items for Class 1 and 7 relevant items for class 2)

| Ω | rubric for integrative learning PLO.docx |   |                  |
|---|--|---|------------------|
|   | 14.93 KB                                 | Ø | No file attached |

| Q2.4.<br>PLO | Q2.5.<br>Stdrd   | Q2.6.<br>Rubric   | Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO: |
|--------------|--|---|---|
|              | 1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |   |   |
|              |  | 2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |   |
|              |  | 6. In the acceptment or program review reports, plans, recourses, or activities |   |
|              |  |   |   |
| •            | •  |   |   |
| •            | •  |   |   |
| •            |  |   | 7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university  |

|  |   | 8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | 9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents  |
|  |   | 10. Other, specify:   |
| Quest<br>Select  |   | : Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the  |
| <ul><li>1. Ye</li><li>2. N</li><li>3. E</li></ul>                                | es<br>No (skip  | ow (skip to <b>Q6</b> )   |
| 2<br><b>Q3.2.</b>  | •   | sment tools/methods/measures <b>in total</b> did you use to assess this PLO?  |
| <ul><li>1. Y</li></ul>   |   |   |
| O 2. N   | No (skip  | to <b>Q6</b> )  |
| O 3. D   | Don't kno   | ow (skip to <b>Q6</b> )   |
| O 4. N   | V/A (skip   | o to <b>Q6</b> )  |
|  |   | ow you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what collected:   |
| Design<br>by GR.<br>gradua<br>questio<br>quantit<br>semeste<br>althous<br>papers | and An ADUAT ADUAT AT ADUAT AT A | gathered 10 student research papers from two different sections of Sociology 102 (Research nalysis) taught in Spring 2016 (a total of five sections were taught). This course is typically taken TING SENIORS, with a handful of students perhaps having one remaining semester before one course, students had developed a research project involving statement of the research ew of the past literature, framing of research hypotheses, development of research methodology, at analysis, interpretation of results, and discussions. In the other section, the last project of the a qualitative research proposal that also addressed integrative learning in a similar manner, wo items on the rubric related to "interpreting results" and "discussion" were N/A on this set of expert evaluators conducted the assessment with a 4-point scale formulated according to the d as appendix in this report. |

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

| Q3.        | <b>3.1.</b> ch of the following direct measures were ι  | used? [Check all that apply]   |                           |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|
|            | 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior t  |  |                           |
| <b>4</b>   | Key assignments from required classes   | ,, ,   |                           |
|            | 3. Key assignments from elective classes  |  |                           |
|            | • •   |  |                           |
|            | •   | ment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiqu  | es                        |
|            | ·   | ch as internships or other community-based projects  |                           |
|            | 6. E-Portfolios   |  |                           |
|            | 7. Other Portfolios   |  |                           |
|            | 8. Other, specify:  |  |                           |
|            | <b>3.2.</b> se <b>explain</b> and <b>attach</b> the direct measure  | e you used to collect data:  |                           |
|            | ntitative project and CLASS 2 for the class<br>closely connected to the assessed items o  | s with qualitative proposal) are attached. The directions for the rubric except where noted earlier. | these assignments         |
| Û          | Prompt for QUANT paper_class 1.pdf<br>94.4 KB   | Prompt for QUAL proposal Class 2.pdf 9.41 KB   |                           |
| Q3.        |   |  |                           |
| VVIIc      | at tool was used to evaluate the data?  1. <b>No</b> rubric is used to interpret the evid   | lence (skin to <b>03 4 4</b> )   |                           |
|            | •   | e faculty who teaches the class (skip to <b>Q3.4.2.</b> )  |                           |
| •          | Used rubric developed/modified by a control of the control of | ,  |                           |
|            | 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by  | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,  |                           |
|            | 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.   | ,  |                           |
|            | 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to <b>Q3.</b>   |  |                           |
| $\circ$    | 7. Used other means (Answer <b>Q3.4.1.</b> )  | · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •  |                           |
| 03.        | 4.1.  |  |                           |
|            |   | ng measures was used? [Check all that apply]   |                           |
|            | 1. National disciplinary exams or state/p   | rofessional licensure exams (skip to <b>Q3.4.4.</b> )  |                           |
|            | 2. General knowledge and skills measure   | es (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to <b>Q3.4.4.</b> )  |                           |
|            | 3. Other standardized knowledge and skil  | II exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to <b>Q3.4.4.</b> )   |                           |
|            | 4. Other, specify:  |  | (skip to <b>Q3.4.4.</b> ) |
| •          | <b>4.2.</b> It is the <b>rubric</b> aligned directly and explicitly   | with the DLO?  |                           |
| (          | 1. Yes  | With the FEG.  |                           |
|            | 2. No   |  |                           |
|            | 3. Don't know   |  |                           |
| 0          | 4. N/A  |  |                           |
|            | <b>4.3.</b><br>s the <b>direct measure</b> (e.g. assignment, t  | hesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric   | ?                         |
|            | 1. Yes  |  |                           |
| $\bigcirc$ | 2. No   |  |                           |
|            | 3. Don't know   |  |                           |

| Q3.4.4. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?  |
|---|
| <ul><li>1. Yes</li></ul>  |
| ○ 2. No   |
| 3. Don't know   |
| ○ 4. N/A  |
| Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data <b>collection</b> of the selected PLO?  |
| Q3.5.1.  How many faculty members participated in the <b>evaluation</b> of the assessment data for the selected PLO?  |
| Q3.5.2.  If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?  |
| 1. Yes  |
| 2. No   |
| 3. Don't know   |
| ○ 4. N/A  |
| Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?   |
| Papers were randomly selected. Each section of the 102 course has 30 students, and 10 papers were randomly selected from each of 2 sections. Total number of students in sections = 60, total papers selected = 20. |
|   |
| Q3.6.1.  How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?   |
| One-third of the student papers from each section was determined to be an adequate sample to assess, without putting anymore of an undue burden on already overworked faculty.                                      |
|   |

4. N/A

**Q3.6.2.** How many students were in the class or program?

| 30 students in each of 2 sections   |
|---|
| Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluated? 2 samples of 10 each  |
| Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?  1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know  |
| (Remember: Save your progress) Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)   |
| Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?  1. Yes 2. No (skip to Q3.8) 3. Don't Know (skip to Q3.8)  |
| Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]  1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)  2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)  3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups  4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews  5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews  6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews  7. Other, specify:  Q3.7.1.1.  Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data: |
| No file attached     No file attached   |

Q3.7.2. If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

| Q3.7.3.   |
|---|
| If surveys were used, how did you select your sample:   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| 02.7.4  |
| Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams,  |
| standardized tests, etc.)   |
| Q3.8.   |
| Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?  1. Yes |
| <ul><li>1. Yes</li><li>2. No (skip to Q3.8.2)</li></ul>   |
| 3. Don't Know (skip to <b>Q3.8.2</b> )  |
|   |
| Q3.8.1.   |
| Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]  |
| 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams  |
| 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)   |
| 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)   |
| 4. Other, specify:  |
| Q3.8.2.   |
| Were other measures used to assess the PLO?  1. Yes   |
| <ul><li>2. No (skip to <b>Q4.1</b>)</li></ul>   |
| 3. Don't know (skip to <b>Q4.1</b> )  |
|   |
| Q3.8.3.   |

If other measures were used, please specify:

| No file attached     No file attached  |   |
|--|---|
|  |   |
| (Remember: Save your progress)   | and Conclusions   |
| Question 4: Data, Findings,  | and Conclusions   |
| <b>Q4.1.</b> Please provide simple tables and/or graphs for <b>Q2.1</b> :                            | to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLC  |
| the results for the qualitative proposal from  | rs the results for Class 1 (quantitative project) and likewise Table 2 displays in Class 2. The tables present the % of student papers scoring at each level of g the 2.5 or higher score benchmark (on 1-4 scale). This format for the |
| ,  |   |
|  | ype of quantitative project (like the one assessed for Class 1) and most rat least assignment, that may not be as in depth as the one for Class 2, but  |
|  | tegrative learning goal related to qualitative methods. The assessed sample % of papers meeting the standard of 2.5 of higher, while for Class 2, the %   |
| of papers meeting the standards is much lo   | ower. We are using these papers as evidence of these general types of   |
| , , ,  | nparing the classes or the faculty teaching the classes, but rather as a rintegrating these particular SLOs into more classes, and focusing on  |
| Rubric TABLE with results 2015-16.pdf  |   |
| 84.39 KB   | No file attached  |
|  |   |
| Q4.2.  |   |
| Are students doing well and meeting the preperformance of the selected PLO?                          | ogram standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student  |
| Students in Class 1 met the standard on 7  | out of 9 items on the rubric. The items related to appropriately selecting a data   |
| analysis technique and interpretation of res   | sults did not meet the 80% mark. This is an on-going issue that we continue to  |
|  | students to remember much of the material from the SOC 101 course C 102 course. Faculty do not have time to review everything from the previous   |
| semester, but do end up doing quite a bit of   | of review so that students can completed these portions of their projects. The forming on these two rubrid items is not something that surprised us, and we will  |
| continue to work on this as a faculty.   | forming on these two rubhu items is not something that surprised us, and we will  |
| One way that we will work on this selected   | PLO is to develop a way (using the LMS, Blackboard) for faculty teaching SOC  |
| 101 and SOC 102 to communicate with one  | e another about how they are addressing the SLOs relevant to these two courses.  The teach the material in a way that will help students retain the material by   |
| ,  | e still allowing faculty their own freedom and flexibility). One faculty member   |
|  | regularly, has applied for a Sustaining Success project award from the<br>near future if that was awarded. The partial focus of the project is on   |
| developing/piloting the LMS site described   | above for the 101 course, and then communicating to other faculty teaching core   |
|  | cess so that hopefully we can have widespread use of an effective means of faculty to be informed about the rubrics and SLOs that should be included in all   |
| syllabi. The Sociology Department is on tra  | ack to have over 1000 majors this coming Fall 2016, and we are constantly hiring nich is not an ideal that situation. We also have 3 new faculty joining the  |
| department, all of whom may teach 102 at   | some point in the near future. Being able to efficiently integrate and  |
| communicate the issues learned from the dyear.   | department assessment to new faculty is critical and the focus for this coming  |
| ,  |   |
| ■ No file attached ■ No file attached  |   |
| 04.3   |   |
| <b>Q4.3.</b> For the selected PLO, the student performa  | ince:   |
| 1. <b>Exceeded</b> expectation/standard  |   |
| <ul><li>2. <b>Met</b> expectation/standard</li></ul>   |   |
| 3. Partially met expectation/standard  | i   |
|  |   |
| <ul><li>4. Did not meet expectation/standard</li><li>5. No expectation/standard has been s</li></ul> |   |

| 6. Don't know  |  |   |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Question 4A: Alignment and Quality   |  |   |  |  |   |
| Q4.4. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the differe PLO?  1. Yes   | nt assessmer   | nt tools/mea  | sures/meth   | ods directly   | align with the                                      |
|  |  |   |  |  |   |
| 2. No  |  |   |  |  |   |
| 3. Don't know  |  |   |  |  |   |
| Q4.5. Were all the assessment tools/measures/methods that were use   | ed good meas   | sures of the  | PLO?   |  |   |
| 1. Yes   |  |   |  |  |   |
| 2. No  |  |   |  |  |   |
| 3. Don't know  |  |   |  |  |   |
| Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Clo  | osina the  | e Loop)   |  |  |   |
| <b>Q5.1.</b> As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification  | k from OAPA  | . /   | icipate <i>mak</i>   | ing any chai   | nges for your                                       |
| 1. Yes   |  |   |  |  |   |
| 2. No (skip to <b>Q5.2</b> )   |  |   |  |  |   |
| 3. Don't know (skip to <b>Q5.2</b> )   |  |   |  |  |   |
| 3. Don't know (skip to Q3.2)   |  |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Q5.1.1.</b> Please describe <i>what changes</i> you plan to make in your program description of how you plan to assess the impact of these chang We have been discussing, although it is only in the idea phase, that would orient them to different resources on campus and all such as the many workshops on Excel or other software in the S and other resources. We would hold workshops more specific to important topic for such a workshop would be orienting students | es.<br>integrating a<br>ow them to<br>Student Techr<br>the departm | n elective co<br>earn credit f<br>nology Cente<br>ent as well | ourse for stu<br>or taking ad<br>er, as well a<br>that student | idents (wort<br>Ivantage of i<br>s the Writing<br>s could atte | h 2 units)<br>resources<br>g Center,<br>nd, and one |
| Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the <i>impact of the changes</i> that yo  1. Yes  2. No  3. Don't know  | u anticipate   | making?   |  |  |   |
| <b>Q5.2.</b> How have the assessment data from the last annual   | 1  | 2.  | 3.   | 4.   | <u> </u>  |
| assessment been used so far? [Check all that apply]  | 1.<br>Very<br>Much   | Quite<br>a Bit  | Some   | Not at<br>All  | 5.<br>N/A   |
| 1. Improving specific courses  |  |   | •  |  | 0   |
| 2. Modifying curriculum  |  |   |  | •  |   |
| 3. Improving advising and mentoring  |  |   | •  |  |   |

•

•

4. Revising learning outcomes/goals

5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations

6. Developing/updating assessment plan

| 7. Annual assessment reports  |                               |   |   |  |                   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|
| 8. Program review   |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| 9. Prospective student and family information   | 0                             |   | 0   | •  |                   |
| 10. Alumni communication  | 0                             |   | 0   | •  |                   |
| 11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)  | 0                             |   | 0   | 0  | •                 |
| 12. Program accreditation   | 0                             |   | 0   | 0  | •                 |
| 13. External accountability reporting requirement   | 0                             |   | 0   | 0  | •                 |
| 14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations   |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| 15. Strategic planning  |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| 16. Institutional benchmarking  |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| 17. Academic policy development or modifications  |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| 18. Institutional improvement   |                               |   | •   |  |                   |
| 19. Resource allocation and budgeting   |                               |   | 0   | 0  | •                 |
| 20. New faculty hiring  |                               | •   | 0   |  | 0                 |
| 21. Professional development for faculty and staff  | 0                             |   | •   | 0  |                   |
| 22. Recruitment of new students   | 0                             |   | 0   | 0  | •                 |
| 23. Other, specify:   |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| The feedback from the assessment report last year was used to attempt to improve the reporting this year. The actual data from the assessment report was used to have discussions among faculty teaching the SOC 102 courses to improve that course and the integration of that course with the preceeding 101 course. The assessment data was also instrumental in helping us see the need to develop better communication among all faculty teaching the core courses (as explained more fully in Q 4.2 above).  (Remember: Save your progress)  Additional Assessment Activities |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic useport your results here:  We have collected entrance surveys from students at Summer of scheduling courses (asking students if they need evening classes grown so much and the numbers of sections and majors is so high   | rientations a<br>, for exampl | ected data or<br>nd use that<br>e). However | n program <i>e</i><br>data to dete<br>r, now that | elements, plo<br>ermine thing<br>the departm | s like<br>ent has |
| and all times of day so we have eliminated those items. The remaining items were intended to be used for assessment, but these surveys are fairly outdated and will most likely be dropped and we hope to come up with a more effective means of tracking student retention and persistence using some of the more recent software tools available.   No file attached  No file attached  |                               |   |   |  |                   |
| <ul><li>No file attached</li><li>No file attached</li></ul>   |                               |   |   |  |                   |

|  | 5. Quantitative Literacy  |
|--|---|
|  | 6. Inquiry and Analysis   |
|  | 7. Creative Thinking  |
|  | 8. Reading  |
|  | 9. Team Work  |
|  | 10. Problem Solving   |
|  | 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement  |
|  | 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency  |
|  |   |
|  | 13. Ethical Reasoning   |
|  | 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning  |
|  | 15. Global Learning   |
|  | 16. Integrative and Applied Learning  |
|  | 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge   |
|  | 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline  |
| <b>✓</b>   | 19. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:   |
| a.   | I'm not sure what specific PLOs will be assessed. At our department retreat a new and more thorough assessment pla  |
| b.   |   |
| c.   |   |
| Q8.  | Please attach any additional files here:  |
| Ø  | No file attached 🔟 No file attached 🔟 No file attached 🔟 No file attached   |
| <b>Q8</b> .<br>Hav   | 1. re you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:  |
| Hav  | re you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:   |
| Ru   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3)   |
| Rı<br>Pı   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2)  |
| Rı<br>Pı   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2)   |
| Rı<br>Pı   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2)  |
| Rı<br>Pı   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2)   |
| Rı<br>Pr<br>Pr   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2)   |
| Ri<br>Pr<br>Ri   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) ubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  |
| Ri<br>Pr<br>Ri   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) ubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  |
| Ri<br>Pr<br>Ri<br>Pro  | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required) cogram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology   |
| Ru<br>Pr<br>Pr<br>Ru<br>Pro<br>BA  | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Digram Information (Required) cogram Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1.   |
| Ri<br>Pr<br>Pro<br>BA  | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required) cogram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology   |
| Ru<br>Pr<br>Pr<br>Ru<br>Prog<br>BA   | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.4.1)  Degram Information (Required)  gram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1.  gram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]  |
| Ru<br>Pr<br>Pro<br>BA<br>P1.<br>Pro<br>Soo   | ubric for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) ubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required)  Gram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]  Sociology  1.  gram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]  Gram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]   |
| Ri<br>Pr<br>Ri<br>Pro<br>BA<br>P1.<br>Pro<br>Soc   | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.4.1)  Degram Information (Required)  gram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1.  gram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]  |
| Proposed Pro | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required) cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1. cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]   |
| Proposed Pro | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required) cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1. cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by department] |
| Properties of the properties o | public for integrative learning PLO (Q2.3) compt for Quant paper_class 1 (Q3.3.2) compt for Qual proposal class 2 (Q3.3.2) cubric Table with results 2015-16 (Q 4.1)  Degram Information (Required) cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by degree] Sociology  1. cyram/Concentration Name(s): [by department]   |

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

| Ellen Berg  |
|---|
|   |
| P3.   |
| Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit  |
| Sociology   |
|   |
| P4. College:  |
| College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies                                      |
| Conlege of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies                                      |
| P5.   |
| Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book): |
| 2015 Department Factbook repor  |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| De .  |
| <b>P6.</b><br>Program Type:   |
| 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major  |
|   |
| 2. Credential   |
| 3. Master's Degree  |
| 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)  |
| ○ 5. Other, specify:  |
|   |
| P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has?                          |
| 1   |
|   |
| P7.1. List all the names:   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| <b>P7.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?  |
| 0   |
| DO Number of marked decrees an exercise the condense unit has                               |
| P8. Number of master's degree programs the academic unit has?                               |
| 1   |
| P8.1. List all the names:   |
|   |
| MA Sociology  |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| <b>P8.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?       |
| <b>P8.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?       |
| 0   |
|   |

| P9.1. List all the names:   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|---|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------------|
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P10. Number of doctorate degree progr   | ams the acad      | emic unit h | as?                |             |         |         |               |
| 0   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P40 4 Ust all the conse   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P10.1. List all the names:  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   | _           | _                  | _           | _       |         |               |
| When was your <b>assessment plan</b>  | 1.                | 2.          | 3.                 | 4.          | 5.      | 6.      | 7.            |
|   | Before<br>2010-11 | 2011-12     | 2012-13            | 2013-14     | 2014-15 | No Plan | Don't<br>know |
| P11. developed?   | •                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P11.1. last updated?  | 0                 | 0           | 0                  | 0           | 0       | 0       | •             |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         | 0             |
| P11.3.  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| Please attach your latest assessment pla  | n:                |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| No file attached  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P12.  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| Has your program developed a <b>curriculum</b>  | n map?            |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 1. Yes  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 2. No   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 3. Don't know   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P12.1.  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| Please attach your latest curriculum map  | ):                |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| No file attached  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P13.  |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| Has your program indicated in the curriculu   | ım map where      | e assessmen | t <b>of studer</b> | nt learning | occurs? |         |               |
| 1. Yes  | •                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   | ·                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 2. No   | ·                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 2. No 3. Don't know   | ·                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
|   | ·                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 3. Don't know   | ·                 |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| 3. Don't know   |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| <ul><li>3. Don't know</li><li>P14.</li><li>Does your program have a capstone class?</li></ul> |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| <ul><li>3. Don't know</li><li>P14.</li><li>Does your program have a capstone class?</li></ul> |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |
| P14. Does your program have a capstone class?  1. Yes, indicate:                              |                   |             |                    |             |         |         |               |

#### P14.1.

Does your program have any capstone project?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Please see attached Tables. Table 1 displays the results for Class 1 (quantitative project) and likewise Table 2 displays the results for the qualitative proposal from Class 2. The tables present the % of student papers scoring at each level of the rubric, as well as the % overall meeting the 2.5 or higher score benchmark (on 1-4 scale). This format for the results was recommended from last year's feedback on the department report.

Most sections of the course include some type of quantitative project (like the one assessed for Class 1) and most include some type of qualitative project, or at least assignment, that may not be as in depth as the one for Class 2, but is intended to address the section of the integrative learning goal related to qualitative methods. The assessed sample of 10 papers for Class 1, had a fairly high % of papers meeting the standard of 2.5 of higher, while for Class 2, the % of papers meeting the standards is much lower. We are using these papers as evidence of these general types of assignments and in no way specifically comparing the classes or the faculty teaching the classes, but rather as a program, we need to develop strategies for integrating these particular SLOs into more classes, and focusing on qualitative methods of inquiry, in addition to our focus on quantitative. As a program we have a longer history of attention to quantitative inquiry, so it makes sense that students would meet the benchmarks at a higher rate than they did for the measure using qualitative inquiry.

| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4   |
|--|--|---|---|
| No citations of previous literature; writer's "opinion" dominates  | Limited citations;<br>writer mainly<br>states "opinion"<br>without support   | Writer supports<br>most statements<br>appropriately with<br>citations   | Amount of support/citation is adequate and appropriate  |
| No theoretical framework mentioned   | theory mentioned<br>but not<br>adequately<br>explained or<br>integrated with<br>RQ   | theory is both<br>minimally<br>explained and<br>integrated  | Theoretical framework is logically integrated and adequately explained  |
| No formal<br>hypothesis or RQ  | Hypothesis(es) or RQ(s) do(es) not logically follow from previous literature or connect well to variables/method chosen  | Hypothesis(es) or<br>RQ(s) either<br>follows logically<br>from literature OR<br>fits with<br>variables/methods<br>but not both  | Hypothesis(es) or<br>RQ(s) logically<br>follows from<br>literature and are<br>appropriately<br>tested by chosen<br>method   |
| Statistical<br>technique<br>chosen/sampling<br>method etc. are<br>not appropriate<br>for proposed<br>study | Statistical technique chosen/sampling method is not inaccurate, but is not a strong or conventional choice   | Statistical<br>technique<br>chosen/sampling<br>method are<br>adequate for<br>proposed study   | Statistical<br>technique<br>chosen/sampling<br>method is<br>adequate and<br>choice(s) are well<br>supported   |
| Data set or data<br>source not<br>described  | Data set or data<br>source described<br>briefly and<br>unclearly   | Data set or data<br>source described<br>accurately but not<br>completely  | Data set or data source described accurately and thoroughly   |
| Variables are not explained  | Variables are explained unclearly or inaccurately  | Variables are explained accurately but not all conventions followed (e.g. using variable names (PRMSEX))  | Variables are explained accurately with conventions of scholarly writing followed   |
| Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are not interpreted                                      | Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are interpreted inaccurately   | Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are interpreted accurately  | Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are interpreted accurately and thoroughly  Discussion is  |
|  | No citations of previous literature; writer's "opinion" dominates  No theoretical framework mentioned  No formal hypothesis or RQ  Statistical technique chosen/sampling method etc. are not appropriate for proposed study  Data set or data source not described  Variables are not explained  Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are not | No citations of previous literature; writer's "opinion" dominates  No theoretical framework mentioned  No formal hypothesis or RQ  No formal hypothesis or RQ  Statistical technique chosen/sampling method etc. are not appropriate for proposed study  Data set or data source not described  Data set or data source not explained  Variables are not explained  Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are not interpreted  Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are not interpreted  Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are interpreted inaccurately  Limited citations; writer mainly states "opinion" without support  writer mainly states "opinion" without support  without support  theory mentioned but not adequately explained or integrated with RQ  Hypothesis(es) or RQ(s) do(es) not logically follow from previous literature or connect well to variables/method chosen  Statistical technique chosen/sampling method is not inaccurate, but is not a strong or conventional choice  Data set or data source described briefly and unclearly  Variables are not explained  unclearly or inaccurately | No citations of previous literature; writer's "opinion" dominates  No theoretical framework mentioned  No formal hypothesis or RQ No formal hypothesis or RQ literature or connect well to variables/method etc. are not appropriate for proposed study  Statistical technique chosen/sampling method etc. are not appropriate for proposed study  Variables are not explained  Results of statistical teets/qualitative analysis are not interpreted inaccurately  Results of statistical tests/qualitative analysis are not interpreted inaccurately  Iteratures, writer mainly states "opinion" without support appropriately states "opinion" without support depropriately states "opinion" without support citations  Hooton most statements appropriately with citations  Heory is both minimally explained and integrated  Itheory is both minimally explained and integrated  Heory is both minimally explained and integrated  Itheory is both minimally explained and integrated  Heory is both minimally explained and integrated  Itheory is both minimally explained and integrated |

|            | relevant to        | relevant to         | relevant to          | relevant to       |
|------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|            | findings and does  | findings but does   | findings and ties in | findings and ties |
|            | not integrate past | not tie in past     | minimal past         | in adequate past  |
|            | literature         | literature (or vice | literature           | literature in a   |
|            |                    | versa)              |                      | meaningful way    |
| References | Has no scholarly   | Has a few           | Has over 50%         | Nearly all        |
|            | sources            | scholarly sources   | scholarly sources,   | references are    |
|            |                    |                     | but many are not     | scholarly and at  |
|            |                    |                     | sociological         | least 50% are     |
|            |                    |                     |                      | from sociological |
|            |                    |                     |                      | journals/books    |

## **Research Paper & Presentation**

### Research Paper Due: Monday, August 10, 2015 at Professor Ida's Mailbox or Office

Total of 110 points (36% of Final Grade)

Congratulations on almost completing your research project! In your presentation and research paper, you must 1) demonstrate your understanding and application ability of the basic research methods and statistics learned in this semester and 2) show the evidence of your effort in putting together the best possible research presentation and paper that you can produce at this stage in your career as a sociologist.

#### **Research Presentation** (10 points; 5%)

You are required to present your complete research project using Microsoft Power Point. Please use this as the last opportunity to get feedback from your peers and myself. Your presentation must be well organized and must demonstrate that you understand the existing literature, theoretical framework, methods, and interpretation of findings. If you miss or are late for the scheduled presentation, you will not earn the presentation points. Lack of effort and preparation shown in your presentation will also result in point deduction.

Please look at this website for advice on presentation: <a href="http://www.aresearchguide.com/3tips.html">http://www.aresearchguide.com/3tips.html</a>.

There should be at least 6 slides: title slide, significance of the study, theoretical framework, methods, results (the number of slides depends on how many hypothesis you test.), and conclusion and future recommendation. I will give one example presentation in class.

### Final Research Paper (100 points; 50%)

This final product must be a well-written paper organized in the following sections. Write this paper to the best of your ability. This means that you must revise the paper based on feedback given by instructor(s).

A successful completion of this paper may be considered for a presentation in a research conference, a writing sample for a graduate program application, and/or a paper competition. I advise you to keep a clean copy as part of your professional portfolio (no need to submit the portfolio).

- Title Page
  - o Title of the study
  - o Your name and affiliation California State University, Sacramento
  - o Date of submission
- Abstract
- Introduction (Research Question and Significance of the Study)
- Literature Review (State of Knowledge, Theoretical Framework, and Hypotheses)
- Methods
  - Sample and Data Collection
  - Measures
- **Results** (Univariate and Bivariate Findings)

- Discussion and Conclusion
- **References** (at least 7 <u>scholarly</u> articles and/or books listed using the ASA style!! Websites do not count toward the 7 sources, but make sure to cite every source that you used for writing the paper.)

## **Checklist Before Handing in Your Research Paper**

| Your paper has your name and research project title. Please also have a submission date.           |
|--|
| Your research proposal is double-spaced using 12 point font (Times New Roman preferred) and        |
| written in total of <u>about 7 to 10 pages</u> excluding the reference page.                       |
| The ASA style of writing is used in formatting the text (including the citations used in the text) |
| and the reference page.  |
| Proof read the paper – no grammatical errors.  |
| Your paper is organized well and flows smoothly from the beginning to the end.                     |
| Headings and subheadings are used effectively to guide readers through your paper.                 |
| Your paper is written explicitly, clearly, and without redundancy.                                 |
|  |

# RA#1: Introduction & Literature Review Due on February 25, 2016 in class

(20 points)

In completing this assignment, you will learn how to write an introduction and literature review for your empirical research paper. The objectives are 1) to learn how a research article's introduction is structured, 2) to learn how to effectively introduce your study while capturing a reader's attention, 3) to learn how a research article's literature review section is structured, and 4) to learn how to effectively synthesize findings and arguments from the previously published works. In this assignment, you will develop the literature review and references.

An empirical research paper includes 8 sections: title, abstract, introduction, literature review, methods, findings, conclusion, and reference (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008: 200). Based on research assignments in this class (RA#1 to RA#4), you will develop all of the sections required for the final research paper in SOC 102. In this assignment, you will develop the *title*, *introduction*, *literature review*, and *references*.

Title (RA#1)
Abstract (RA#5)
Introduction (RA#1)
Literature Review (RA#1)
Methods (RA#2)
Results (RA#3)
Discussion & Conclusion (RA#4)
References (RA#1 and #4) – at least 7 scholarly references required

#### **Instruction for this Assignment**

#### Title

Make sure to develop a **title** that suits your research topic well.

#### Introduction

First of all, review p.213 to 218 in the Chapter 9 of the SPSS workbook recommended for this class (i.e., Sweet and Grace-Martin 2012). The book provides you with a good description of what you need to address in the title and introduction.

Please make sure that your introduction clearly addresses the following. Examine the model articles carefully. They would help you learn what to include and what to leave out in the introduction section of your paper.

#### 1) Research Question(s)

- Remember that <u>a research question should be stated in a neutral way</u> without specifying what you expect to find (i.e., no need to specify the direction and strength of the relationship. No need to indicate your expectation or hypothesis until RA#2 or the literature review section).
- It is a good idea to briefly explain what it is that your research is trying to investigate. For instance, who are the people that you are interested in? What is the goal of this study?

#### 2) Statement of the Problem and Significance of the Study

- <u>Briefly explain the current state of the problem (research topic)</u>: Make sure to define the central concepts (variables) in your study and consider using some statistics to show the current situation about the concept.
- Why should we care about your research or the topic? Best way to write a convincing introduction is to pretend that you are a sales person who is selling a product (i.e., research topic). Why should a consumer of the knowledge (i.e., reader) care about this topic? Convince your readers that your study is socially significant.

• <u>Cite Relevant Sources of Information:</u> Evidence, evidence, evidence! It is a good idea to use some literature in order to reinforce your argument here. You must present credible information (with a citation) when asserting the importance of the study. Make use of statistical findings from the Census report or any other credible sources. Use the ASA style of writing to cite information in the text and format your reference page.

#### **Literature Review**

Review p. 218 (Chapter 9) of the SPSS workbook recommended for this class (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2012). The book provides you with a good description of what you need to discuss in the literature review section. *Make sure that your introduction (RA#1) transitions smoothly to the literature review (RA#2)*. You should not include your opinion or attitudes. Instead, use the findings and arguments by other researchers to write the literature review (this applies for your introduction as well).

Reviewing the model articles carefully would help you in learning what to include and what to exclude in the literature review section.

Please make sure that your literature review clearly discusses the following points. I encourage you to <u>use subheadings</u> to organize your paper. Remember that each paragraph must be designed carefully and intentionally with a topic sentence and that it flows smoothly from one paragraph to another. Make sure your paper is reader friendly!

#### 3) Summary of the Findings from Previously Published Works

- **Define the main concepts** (i.e., independent variable and dependent variable). How did other researchers define the concepts?
- What have other researchers found regarding the research topic you chose? Based on those works, what do we know AND what do we not know about the topic? What are the variables/factors that are shown to be related to the topic? How are they related to the main topic? Keep in mind the lecture on "What is good writing?" Avoid using too many quotes; use quotes only when they are absolutely needed. Make sure to avoid plagiarism by carefully inserting citations in the ASA style. Finally, don't simply list one article after another; try synthesizing and highlighting the themes found among previous publications.

## 4) Theoretical Framework/Argument

• Summarize the **theory/theoretical concept/theoretical framework** that gave you a certain expectation for what you will find. Make sure to focus on the key aspect of the theory that is relevant to your study and that is helpful in developing the hypothesis.

#### 5) Summary & Hypothesis(-es) (About 1 paragraph)

- Quickly summarize what you have discussed so far in the introduction and literature review. Provide the overview in about 2 or 3 sentences.
- Then, state your hypothesis(-es) clearly. Your hypotheses must be supported by the theoretical framework/argument/concept that you introduced previously.

#### **Checklist Before Submitting the RA#1**

| Your RA#1 is double-spaced using 12 point font (Times New Roman preferred) and is about 1 page excluding the  |
|---|
| reference page. Attach a separate reference page.   |
| Your RA#1 has your name, title, introduction, literature review, and reference. Please also have a submission |
| date.   |
| You used the ASA style of citations and references. Magazines, unreliable websites (including Wikipedia), or  |
| newspapers do not count as sources. Use the scholarly sources.  |
| Proof read the RA#1, and it does not have any grammatical errors.   |

# RA#2: Methods Due on March 17, 2016 in class

(10 points)

In completing assignment, you will learn how to write the methods section of your research proposal. The objectives are for you 1) to learn how the methods section is written in a research article and 2) to learn how to effectively introduce your sample, data source, and measures.

The methods section of your paper describes the dataset, sampling strategies, sample size, data collection methods, and indicators/measures used in this study. You will also provide bibliographic information of the secondary dataset in the reference page.

Title (RA#1)
Abstract (RA#4)
Introduction (RA#1)
Literature Review (RA#1)
Methods (RA#2)
Results (RA#3)
Discussion & Conclusion (RA#4)
References (RA#1 and #4) – at least 7 scholarly references required

#### **Instruction for this Assignment**

First of all, review p. 218-219 in the Chapter 9 of the SPSS workbook recommended for this class (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008). Also, p. 475 of the Alder and Clark textbook would give you a brief description of what you need to discuss in the section. Please make sure that your "Methods" section clearly summarizes the following points. Examining a model article carefully would help you in learning what to include and what to leave out in the methods section (especially, Thompson and Keith 2001, which uses secondary data; page 322 to 324 of Mossakowski 2003 and page 342 to 344 of Thompson and Keith 2011 would be especially helpful in writing the measures subsection). To write these sections, there is no need to analyze the data with SPSS. Use the codebook or questionnaire that you downloaded with the dataset in order to write this paper.

Use the following subheadings to organize your paper:

#### **METHODS**

**Secondary Data** (Write about one paragraph.)

**Measures** (Write about a paragraph for each variable.)

Things to be addressed under each sub-section are as follows:

#### 1. Secondary Data

- a. What is the name of the dataset? (A citation should be included.)
- b. Where were the data collected?
- c. When were the data collected?
- d. Describe the study design.
- e. Describe how the data collection took place.
- f. Response rate? (If the information is available.)
- g. What/who was the study population? What/who were eligible to participate in the study?
- h. Indicate the sample size.
- i. What kind of sampling technique did they use?
- j. Is this sample a probability sample or nonprobability sample?
- k. In comparison to other existing data (e.g., Census), how were the sample different from the actual population? (*If the information is available*.)

#### 2. Measures

#### a. Dependent Variable

- i. Conceptual definition of the variable (What is it that you are interested in examining as a DV?)
- ii. Operationalization of the variable (Precisely, how is the DV measured?)
- iii. Response categories or response (How is the DV coded?)
- iv. For the purpose of this class, describe the level of measurement for this variable.

## b. Independent Variable(s)

- i. Conceptual definition of the variable (What is it that you are interested in examining as an IV?)
- ii. Operationalization of the variable (Precisely, how is the IV measured?)
- iii. Response categories or response (How is the IV coded?)
- iv. For the purpose of this class, describe the level of measurement for this variable.

### c. Control Variable(s) (NOT REQUIRED)

- i. Conceptual definition of the variable (What is it that you are interested in examining as a CV?)
- ii. Operationalization of the variable (Precisely, how is the CV measured?)
- iii. Response categories or response (How is the CV coded?)
- iv. For the purpose of this class, describe the level of measurement for this variable.

### **Checklist Before Submitting the RA#2**

| Your RA#2 is <u>double-spaced</u> using <u>12-point font (Times New Roman preferred)</u> and written in <u>1 page</u> |
|---|
| maximum without the reference page.   |
| Your RA#2 has your name, title, <i>methods</i> section, and reference. Please also have a submission date.            |
| You used ASA style of writing in formatting the text and the reference page with the bibliographic                    |
| information of the dataset.   |
| Proof read the RA#2 – no grammatical errors.  |

#### EXAMPLE based on Thompson and Keith 2001 (p.342)

The study description and reference available at <a href="http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/8512/detail">http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/8512/detail</a> helps in writing this section.

#### 1) Description of the Secondary Dataset

**a.** What is the name of the dataset? (A citation should follow.)

The National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) (Jackson and Gurin 1987)

**b.** Where were the data collected?

The United States

**c.** When were the data collected?

Not mentioned?? (They should have mentioned when the data were collected: 1979/80, 1987/88, 1988/89, and/or 1992.)

#### 2) Sample and its Characteristics

a. What/who was the study population? What/who were eligible to participate in the study?

Black American citizens age 18 or older (uninstitutionalized, English-speaking)

- b. Indicate the sample size. 2,107 respondents
- c. What kind of sampling technique did they use?

Multistage-area probability sampling (every Black household in the United State had an equal probability of being selected for the study, and one individual who meet the eligibility – black and 18 years old or older, English-speaker, uninstitutionalized – was randomly selected within the selected household.)

- d. Is this sample a probability sample or nonprobability sample? Probability sample (as noted above)
- e. In comparison to other existing data (e.g., Census), how were the sample different from the actual population? (*If the information is available*.)
  - "...the NSBA is representative of the national Black populations enumerated in the 1980 census, with the exception of a slight overrepresentation of women and older Blacks and a small under-representation of southerners..."

### 3) Data Collection Methods

a. Describe the study design.

Not mentioned?? (Longitudinal panel study of 4 waves, but the researchers seem to use only one wave... So, could be cross-sectional design)

b. Describe how the data collection took place

Face-to-face interviews (with questionnaires)

c. Response rate? (If the information is available.)

About 69 %

# RA#3: Results Due on April 14, 2016 in class

(20 points)

In completing this assignment, you will learn the structure of results section of a research paper. Just like an empirical research paper, your final research paper must include 8 sections: title, abstract, introduction, literature review, methods, results (or often called findings), conclusion, and reference (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008: 200).

Title (RA#1)
Abstract (RA#4)
Introduction (RA#1)
Literature Review (RA#1)
Methods (RA#2)
Possults (RA#3) University

Results (RA#3) – Univariate and Bivariate Results

Discussion & Conclusion (RA#4)

References (RA#1 and #4) – at least 7 scholarly references required

#### **Instruction for This Assignment**

First of all, review p.205 to 207 and p.219 to 221 in the Chapter 9 of the SPSS workbook assigned for this class (i.e., Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008). The book provides you with a good description of what you need to address in the results. Also, I suggest you to take a look at the model articles that are posted on SacCT. Pay attention to how the authors explain their results.

Note: To write this section, you must run SPSS analyses first. Remember the steps in the statistical analyses. If you focus only one a particular group, for example women, remember to select only the group before you begin analyzing the data.

- **Step 1:** Run a frequency table for each variable. Examine the table carefully to strategize your "data cleaning" outliers to be deleted? Reverse-code? Recode? Combine variables? Add variables to create scale?
- Step 2: Data cleaning (recode, reverse-code, combine, or add variable[s], or delete outliers, if necessary)
- **Step 3:** Run a frequency table again for each variable before and after the "data cleaning" and make sure you constructed the variables in correct ways.
- **Step 4:** Run appropriate univariate statistics. Create a table (see below) in Word/Excel file. Write your interpretations.
- **Step 5:** Run appropriate bivariate statistics to test each hypothesis. Copy and paste the SPSS output on your paper and interpret the results.

#### Writing the Univariate Results Section

Consider using subheading "Univariate Results."

- First, present the Means/Proportions and Standard Deviations table.
  - O You may use Word or Excel to create this table. Pay attention to the instruction given in class.
  - o The title of your table should be "<u>Table 1. Means/Proportions</u>, and <u>Standard Deviations</u>." Revise the title and the table accordingly with what kinds of variables YOUR analyses require.
  - Your table should look like this (example):

**Table 1. Univariate Results** 

| Variables   | Mean | Standard Deviation | Proportion(%) |
|-------------|------|--------------------|---------------|
| Self-Esteem | 3.22 | 0.72               | _             |
| Age         | 45   | 12.22              |               |
| Gender      |      |                    | 51% Women     |
|             |      |                    | 49% Men       |

- Variables Do not use the variable names that you see in SPSS because often they do not make sense (e.g., sesteem). Instead, make sure to present the name of the variable that makes sense to anyone who does not have access to SPSS data file (e.g., self-esteem).
- Mean/Proportion Present a mean only for an interval/ratio variable or ordinal variable with many response categories; present a proportion (%) of each response category for a nominal variable or ordinal variable with only a few response categories. (If a median is more meaningful to report, note in your table that you reported a median.)
- Standard Deviation Present this information just for the interval/ratio variable (or ordinal level variables if its mean is reported).
- **Describe the results thoroughly!** Using the mean, proportion, and/or standard deviation reported in the table, describe your sample characteristics. You can also report the actual range of the variable to give a context for a mean and standard deviation, although they are not shown on the table.

### Writing the Bivariate Results Section

Consider using subheading "Bivariate Results."

- The key in this section is to focus on the findings directly related to your hypotheses.
- Present and label a **table**(s) showing the results regarding your main hypothesis(-es). You may copy and paste the table on the SPSS output.
- Prepare at least one paragraph interpreting the results for each hypothesis. Make sure to begin each paragraph restating your hypothesis (this is helpful for the readers). Report any important **statistics** (e.g., t, F, chi-square, r, significance ...etc) and any other information that is important (e.g., % distribution for chi-square crosstab, means by groups for t-test and ANOVA). Interpret them thoroughly!
- Conclude the section by highlighting the general findings based on the results.

#### Writing the Multivariate Results Section (OPTIONAL –NOT GRADED)

Consider using subheading "Multivariate Results."

- The key in this section is to focus on the findings directly related to your hypotheses.
- Present and label a **table**(s) showing the results regarding your main hypothesis(-es). You may copy and paste the table on the SPSS output.
- Prepare at least one paragraph interpreting the results for each hypothesis. Make sure to begin each paragraph restating your hypothesis (this is helpful for the readers). Report any important **statistics** (e.g., B, Beta, significance, R-sqaure...etc) and <u>interpret them thoroughly!</u>
- Conclude the section by highlighting the general findings based on the results.

#### **Checklist Before Submitting the RA#3**

|   | Your RA#3 is <u>double-spaced</u> using <u>12-point font (Times New Roman preferred)</u> . Must be stapled! |
|---|---|
|   | Your RA#3 has your name, title, and results section. Please also have a submission date.                    |
| П | Proof read the RA#3.  |

## RA#4: Discussion, Conclusion, and Abstract Due on May 3, 2016

(20 points)

By completing this assignment, you will learn the structure of the discussion and conclusion section and abstract!

Just like an empirical journal article, your final research paper must include 8 sections: title, abstract, introduction, literature review, methods, results, discussion (and/or conclusion), and reference (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008:200). In this assignment, you will complete the draft of the "Discussion and Conclusion" section and an "Abstract". You may add some references in writing the section.

Title (RA#1)
Abstract (RA#4)
Introduction (RA#1)
Literature Review (RA#1)
Methods (RA#2)
Results (RA#3)
Discussion & Conclusion (RA#4)
References (RA#1 and #4) – at least 7 scholarly references required

#### **Instruction for this Assignment**

#### **Discussion & Conclusion**

First of all, review the Chapter 9 of the SPSS workbook assigned for this class (i.e., Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008). The book provides you with a good description of what you need to address in the discussion/conclusion section. Make sure to review the ASA style of writing (see the syllabus). Also, I suggest you to take a look at the model articles that are posted on SacCT. Pay close attention to how the authors conclude based on the findings.

The discussion section usually addresses the things noted below. Make sure your Discussion & Conclusion section includes the following points.

- A Brief Summary of General Findings (about 1 paragraph): This is better organized by starting the paragraph with a research question that you presented earlier in the Introduction, and then you can respond to the question based on the empirical findings (i.e., findings based on the data analyses you conducted).
- Discussion of YOUR Findings in relation to the Findings/Theory Presented by Others (about 1-2 paragraphs): In this section, you must relate your empirical findings back to the existing literature. In other words, you situate your own study in the larger ongoing debate on the topic. Did you find the similar results as others? If you found different results, what would be the reason explaining the difference? Was the existing theory supported? <a href="https://www.why.not?">Why or why not?</a> What do your findings imply in furthering our knowledge on the topic? In responding to these prompts, make sure to cite the studies to which you refer in comparison to your study.
- Limitations (about 1-2 paragraphs): As a researcher, you must acknowledge potential limitations that might have biased your findings. Discuss a few limitations that might have affected your findings. It is always good to say "Future studies would benefit from..." in framing the limitations of your study rather than implying that your study was useless...etc. Stay positive!
- Conclusion (1 paragraph): In this brief paragraph, you will conclude the entire paper. (In this way, your paper should look more coherent.)

#### **Abstract**

Prepare an abstract on a separate page. This abstract should be inserted as the first page after a title page when you are completing final research paper.

An abstract is a brief summary of the entire study. Usually, an abstract is about 150 words (between 100 to 200 words) and is written in one paragraph. Keep in mind that you must write the abstract objectively. Usually, an abstract does not contain any citation (readers assume that the author cites the sources in the body of the paper followed by a reference list).

Review the Chapter 9 of the SPSS workbook assigned for this class (i.e., Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008). The book provides you with a good description of what you need to address in the abstract with an example! Also, I suggest you to take a look at the model articles that are posted on SacCT. Pay close attention to how the authors summarize an entire study in a concise abstract.

Your abstract must include the following information.

- Research question(s).
- Theory that you used as a framework.
- Describe what kind of data you used to answer the research question (no need to go in-depth, but make sure to give enough information for the reader to know what you used.... Just include the name of the dataset and year when it was collected.)
- Provide a brief summary of main finding(s).

#### **Checklist Before Submitting the RA#4**

| Your RA#4 is double-spaced using 12-point font (Times New Roman preferred). Must be stapled!              |
|---|
| Your RA#4 has your name, title, abstract, discussion, and reference. Please also have a submission date.  |
| Your RA#4 used the ASA style of writing for the citations and reference page.                             |
| Proof read the RA#4.  |
| Your abstract must be 1 page; no more than 200 words (no more than 100 words if you are registering for a |
| presentation at the SSRIC Student Conference).  |

SOC 102

Project Three: Qualitative Research Proposal

This is the final assignment in an on-going research project. It is worth 100 points. For this assignment, you are required to examine, evaluate, and synthesize all of your previous work into a coherent whole. Using much of the materials you have already written, produce a paper according to the instructions below that is approximately 8 - 12 pages. This assignment is due Wednesday May 18<sup>th</sup> by midnight (Blackboard).

### **Instructions:**

You have been invited by the National Science Foundation to write a competitive proposal. Your aim is to convince the NSF to fund your project. Following the results of Project Two (Quantitative Analysis) create a qualitative research study. Based on your results, develop a new research question that fits qualitative research. Regardless of whether you rejected or accepted your null hypothesis, there are more questions to be asked and answered. This is a writing exercise that does not require analysis. Your goal is to develop a substantial proposal that fully describes your research question, critiques the literature within your selected topic, describes your proposed qualitative methodology, outlines your proposed qualitative method of analysis, and includes a questionnaire. **Include section heads in your assignment.** 

Cover Page (not included in the overall number of pages)

Title

Your Name

Course Information

Abstract (not included in the overall number of pages)

150-word summary

Introduction (1/2 to 1 page)

Introduce your research topic

What is your topic? (Move from the general to the specific)

Why is it sociologically important?

Literature Review (3 - 4 pages)

What have others found regarding your research?

Critically assess the previous literature.

Identify strengths and weaknesses.

Offer suggestions as to how future research can contribute to the literature.

Discuss why your work is fundable (Why should they give you money if the research has already been done? Here is where you can point out the shortcomings of what has already been done.)

Qualitative Methods: (3 - 5 pages)

Discuss your proposed method of data collection.

Explain how this method of data collection fits your research goals.

Discuss your population.

Discuss your sample.

Discuss your sampling method.

Discuss your questionnaire.

Qualitative Data Analysis (1/2 – 1 page)

Discuss your proposed method of analysis.

Explain how this method of analysis fits your research goals.

Significance and Conclusion (1 - 2 pages)

End your proposal in a convincing manner.

What is the significance of this research?

Why should the NSF give you funding?

Appendix A:

Include your completed questionnaire.

Bibliography (not included in the overall number of pages)

Book and journal articles used in your literature review

CLASS 1: Quantitative project assignment - % of student papers at each level of rubric - Department of Sociology, Assessment 2015-16

| n=10 each item   | 1-1.5      | 2       | 2.5 At    | 3-3.5 Minimal | 4                   | Total % | % rated           |
|--|------------|---------|-----------|---------------|---------------------|---------|-------------------|
|  | Inadequate | Limited | benchmark |               | Adequate/Appropriat |         | 2.5 or            |
|  |            |         |           |               | e                   |         | above*            |
| Using past<br>literature/citations to<br>support research question | 0%         | 0%      | 0%        | 80%           | 20%                 | 100%    | 100%              |
| Supports research question with theoretical framework              | 0%         | 0%      | 20%       | 60%           | 20%                 | 100%    | 100%              |
| Formal hypothesis or research question                             | 0%         | 10%     | 0%        | 70%           | 20%                 | 100%    | <mark>90%</mark>  |
| Appropriate methods and statistical techniques chosen              | 10%        | 30%     | 20%       | 30%           | 10%                 | 100%    | 60%               |
| Description of Data<br>Set/Source of Data                          | 0%         | 20%     | 0%        | 50%           | 30%                 | 100%    | <mark>80%</mark>  |
| Explanation of Variables   | 0%         | 20%     | 10%       | 30%           | 40%                 | 100%    | <mark>80%</mark>  |
| Interpretation of results  | 0%         | 70%     | 10%       | 20%           | 0%                  | 100%    | 30%               |
| Discussion/limitations   | 0%         | 10%     | 10%       | 50%           | 30%                 | 100%    | <mark>90%</mark>  |
| References   | 0%         | 0%      | 0%        | 60%           | 40%                 | 100%    | <mark>100%</mark> |

<sup>\*</sup> Highlighted items indicate met goal of 80% of papers rating 2.5 or above on that item

CLASS 2: Qualitative proposal assignment - % of student papers at each level of rubric – Department of Sociology, Assessment 2015-16

| n=10 each item   | 1 – 1.5<br>Inadequate | 2 Limited | 2.5 At<br>benchmar<br>k | 3-3.5 Minimal | 4<br>Adequate/Appropriate | Total % | % rated 2.5 or above* |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Using past<br>literature/citations to<br>support research question | 20%                   | 30%       | 30%                     | 20%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 50%                   |
| Supports research question with theoretical framework              | 50%                   | 30%       | 10%                     | 10%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 20%                   |
| Formal hypothesis or research question                             | 30%                   | 20%       | 30%                     | 20%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 50%                   |
| Appropriate methods and statistical techniques chosen              | 50%                   | 20%       | 0%                      | 30%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 30%                   |
| Description of Data<br>Set/Source of Data                          | 40%                   | 30%       | 10%                     | 20%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 30%                   |
| Explanation of Variables   | 50%                   | 20%       | 0%                      | 30%           | 0%                        | 100%    | 30%                   |
| References   | 10%                   | 10%       | 30%                     | 30%           | 20%                       | 100%    | <mark>80*</mark>      |

<sup>\*</sup> Highlighted items indicate met goal of 80% of papers rating 2.5 or above on that item