

Saint Louis University  
Program Assessment Plan

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

**Department: Sociology & Anthropology**


**College/School: Arts & Sciences**

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

<b>Program Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Curriculum Mapping</b>	<b>Assessment Methods</b>	<b>Use of Assessment Data</b>
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>			


<b>Program Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Curriculum Mapping</b>	<b>Assessment Methods</b>	

<b>Program Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Curriculum Mapping</b>	<b>Assessment Methods</b>	<b>Use of Assessment Data</b>
<i>What do you expect all students who</i>			



---

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

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

Each year (in Ma(n)(n)0.93878)0.46908 1922( )0.46) i M(632(d(n)0.9387u(n)0.93876189()TJt670127(a(ne189()TJ8)0703.46A6903)4.3(s



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

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



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


Unacceptable	Weak	Adequate	Good	Excellent
No functional presentation of a literature and/or theoretical review.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to the topical area.			

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

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

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

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

Unacceptable	Weak	Adequate	Good	Excellent
				



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

---

Unacceptable

Weak

Adequate

Good

Excellent

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

Rubric for the evaluation of the final project in sociology, in regards to program learning objectives

Articulate scholarly research activity clearly

1. Does the student demonstrate writing in English

Unacceptable	Weak
Fails to use appropriate and relevant content to develop and shape ideas in the thesis and/or papers.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop in some parts of the thesis and/or papers.

Comments regarding written content development

2. Does the student follow general sociology writing conventions and adequately justify claims?



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

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

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

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

Beginning Undergrad student	Senior Undergrad student	Master's level student	Doctoral level student	Professional level colleague
-----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------

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

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

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

7. At what level would you place the visual present

Rubrics for the Learning Outcomes Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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