

SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT END-OF-YEAR REPORT 2015-2016

May 26, 2016

Contact Person: Jamee Kristen

Sociology reported on its assessment work in its 2016 Program Review. The following is drawn from that report and presentation.

SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – MULTI-STATE COLLABORATIVE

Starting in Spring 2014, the Sociology SAC participated in the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC), a pilot study under the partnership of SHEEO (State Higher Education Executive Officers Association) and AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). The goal of the project was to determine whether participating in a collaborative, multi-state assessment project would provide useful assessment feedback regarding how well students, with 75% of their program completed, achieve general measures of critical thinking, written communication, and quantitative literacy. The MSC project required colleges and universities to submit student artifacts from embedded assignments that could be assessed using the LEAP VALUE rubrics for critical thinking, written communication, or quantitative literacy. Artifacts were collected from colleges and universities in nine states including Oregon. A national team of faculty and academic professionals scored the artifacts and returned the results to each institution.

With support from PCC Academic Affairs and the Learning Assessment Council, Sociology agreed to participate in the MSC in lieu of regular assessment activities. Sociology's plan was to submit artifacts to the MSC and then to analyze assessment data received from the MSC for critical thinking and written communication outcomes. In addition, Sociology planned to score a subset of artifacts ourselves and to compare the national data, the PCC in-house data, and the Sociology SAC data.

All sociology faculty were invited to submit artifacts from embedded (not common) assignments for which either 1) critical thinking criteria as defined by the LEAP VALUE rubric or 2) written communication as defined by the LEAP VALUE rubric could be measured. Faculty teaching the following courses agreed to participate: SOC 204, 205, 206, 211 & 213.

As there is no mechanism at PCC to require faculty (whether full-time or part-time) to participate in program assessment, we were pleased that 60% of faculty members volunteered to participate in this project representing all 6 full-time faculty members and 5 of 12 (42%) part-time faculty members. Twenty of 43 (54%) of sociology sections offered in Fall 2014 were included in the sample.

PCC Academic Affairs identified 135 students from participating sections (by CRN) who completed 75% of their program. Academic Affairs reviewed the artifacts to ensure all identifying information was removed before sending the artifacts on to the national Multi-State Collaborative project coordinator. Academic Affairs coded the artifacts so results could be returned to the SAC at the artifact-level, which provided the SAC with the opportunity to interpret results. In addition, Academic Affairs coordinated an "in-house" norming and scoring of all PCC artifacts, including artifacts from students who were not 75% completed.

Sociology faculty contributed 87 qualifying artifacts, which Academic Affairs divided across two of the MSC outcomes - critical thinking (n=37) and written communication (n=50). Our overall sample size was smaller than we expected due to student ineligibility as a result of the 75% program completion requirement. Many of the students enrolled in sociology courses have not completed 75% of their program, as determined by Academic Affairs. Of the 135 students who were eligible, 87 agreed to participate and completed the required assignment.

In addition to contributing artifacts to the MSC for national scoring, sociology faculty facilitated and/or participated in various assessment conferences, workshops, and committees from 2013-2016.

- LAC Core Outcome Assessment Class for PCC Faculty
- AALHE Fourth Annual Assessment Conference, June 2-4, 2014 Albuquerque, New Mexico
- PCC Learning Assessment Council
- PSU MSC training, May 2014
- PCC MSC Assignment Design Workshops (Summer 2014, Winter 2016)

Project Goals:

The Sociology SAC was curious as to whether a coordinated assessment project could provide useful assessment data, but we also saw participating in this project as an opportunity to improve our norming and scoring skills, especially with standard assessment rubrics (e.g., LEAP VALUE).

Specifically, we wanted to know:

1. if a standard (i.e., not discipline-specific) rubric would work to assess sociology outcomes
2. whether there would be any noticeable differences in scoring by a) a national, multi-disciplinary team, b) a local but also multi-disciplinary team, and c) a local sociology team for either outcome

Unfortunately, the MSC scoring was significantly delayed and the SAC did not receive national scoring results until Fall 2015, so our comparative analyses were also delayed. Full scoring tables that include national, PCC in-house, and Sociology SAC scores for Critical Thinking and Written Communication are included in Appendix 1.

Lessons Learned:

1. According to the approach of purposeful assignment design or “backwards design,” having learning objectives in mind ahead of assignment development helps faculty design better assignments and strengthen teaching strategies, leading to improved student attainment of those outcomes. Moreover, we realize it is important to be transparent about those outcomes with students via assignment instructions and/or grading rubrics so students know how they will be assessed prior to completing an assignment.
2. Norming and scoring artifacts from embedded assignments can provide faculty with evidence (or lack thereof) of student learning. We are concerned, however, that there

may be inconsistency in terms of what a “4” standard looks like, especially across different scoring teams, who did not norm to the rubric together. We found that our SAC scored artifacts lower than did the PCC in-house team. It would be helpful to see sample student work at the different rubric levels as part of the norming process.

3. It also was difficult for us to know how to weigh the scores themselves. Within the SAC several people scored each artifact and, with the raw data, we could see how much agreement there was among raters. For each artifact scored by the in-house PCC team, we received two scores. From the national team, we received only one score for each criterion for each artifact. We do not know if that is a calculated score averaged across multiple raters or if just one person scored each artifact. Obviously the greater the number of scorers per artifact, the more confident we can be regarding consistent scoring.
4. We found it challenging to “translate” generic rubric language to apply it to sociology. We found some standard criteria more useful to what’s important to sociology than other criteria. In order for us to assess student achievement of PCC Core Outcomes via the sociology program (i.e., how well does the sociology program helping students achieve PCC Core Outcomes), we need assessable sociology learning outcomes at the course level that are mapped to the PCC Core Outcomes.

Next Steps:

1. In Fall 2015, the SAC created a subcommittee tasked with developing consistent, assessable course outcomes for the core sociology courses (SOC 204, 205, 206). The committee collected information from the History SAC at PCC as well as from the American Sociological Association on how to assess sociology programs, drafted a mission statement, learning goals and a learning outcome for written communication.
2. Sociology program learning outcomes will be assessable and mapped to both PCC Core Outcomes and across the sociology curriculum. Following PCC History’s model, we will also create rubrics for assessing student achievement of our learning outcomes.

Challenges:

1. The literature on program assessment (rather than individual instructor assessment) emphasizes that assessment must involve the full faculty and all course sections. Because there is no mechanism for requiring faculty participation (full-time or part-time), limited compensation for part-time faculty, and limited job security for part-time faculty, we currently depend on voluntary participation in assessment work - this includes assignment design, artifact collection, scoring, analysis, developing interventions (i.e., changes to curriculum), and then following that changed curriculum.
2. While we agree that program assessment is necessary, we would appreciate it if PCC were to invest in developing additional faculty expertise in assessment. The current organizational structure for assessment requires individual faculty to invest a great deal of time and energy to gain some level of assessment expertise on their own before attempting to persuade SAC members to participate. It would be helpful if the College provided an “assessment resource czar” to assist SACs (along with the LAC and assessment coaches). The College’s investment in TLC programming is helpful for

individual faculty members improving their own teaching, but does not often address program level intervention and assessment.

3. As has been noted by most in the modern assessment community, assessment should be faculty led. In a recent NILOA report¹, Timothy Reese Cain argues: “Assessment experts, whether from the faculty or not, are important. They can bring knowledge, help educate faculty, coordinate institution-wide efforts, and help provide the context and framing that make data useful. At the same time, to protect the faculty’s academic freedom, the outcomes defined, plans designed and practices enacted must be under faculty control” (2014, p. 13). The Sociology SAC appreciates PCC’s stated commitment to faculty-led assessment and also for its recognition that there is no “one-size-fits-all” in assessment work. Faculty should not be pressured to follow a singular model, but rather should have the flexibility to enact projects that are specific to their disciplines (NILOA 2014). Unfortunately, the current use of the checklist template utilized by the LAC peer review process does not provide that flexibility.
4. Sociology has yet to “close the loop” by reassessing the same outcome after a program-level intervention, so while we have learned a lot about assessment and assignment design, we do not yet have evidence that this work has improved student learning. Further, unless we have full participation of the faculty, it may be difficult to derive meaningful and actionable program-level data even after we “feed” and “re-weigh” the pig.

SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – “WEIGH THE PIG, FEED THE PIG, WEIGH THE PIG”

At this point, changes in instruction have been made by individual sociology instructors, not to the broader curriculum. Our assessment projects have involved individual faculty volunteering to collect artifacts from embedded assignments based on enrollment in their classes. Consequently, assessment results are only applicable to those faculty and their assignments. Changes primarily have involved improving assignment instructions and developing grading rubrics.

Our review of the assessment literature informs us that pre-assessment, intervention, and re-assessment are each important steps in the program assessment process. NILOA (2014)² characterizes this “loop” process as “weigh the pig, feed the pig, weigh the pig.” According to NILOA, however, many programs focus on the mechanisms of assessment (e.g., sample size, interrater reliability, etc.) while overlooking meaningful program-level intervention and re-assessment. NILOA authors emphasize that once a program has assessable learning outcomes in place and mapped to the curriculum, appropriate intervention questions may include:

¹ Cain, Timothy Reese. November 2014. Assessment and academic freedom: In concert, not conflict. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

² Fulcher, Keston H., Megan Good, Chris M. Coleman, and Kristen L. Smith. December 2014. A simple model for learning improvement: Weigh pig, feed pig, weigh pig. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

- Is the map accurate?
- Are faculty actually following the curriculum map?
- Is there a breakdown in communication or coordination across faculty or sections taught?

Once these questions are answered, faculty propose learning modifications and lay out a plan for improvement.

SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – ALIGNMENT

Mission → **Learning Goals** → **Learning/Course Outcomes** → **Assessment Tools**

Our newly developed **mission** of the PCC Sociology program is to:

...support students in cultivating a sociological imagination - connecting their personal experience to broader social and historical contexts. In doing so, students develop the skills to identify, analyze and intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world.

Next: **Learning Goals**. The American Sociological Association’s 2005 publication “Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major”³ offers this definition of learning goals:

Learning goals are broad, abstract statements of the desired long-term outcomes of the curriculum and the program. They are derived from the mission statement and are logical outgrowths of it. Learning goals describe in general terms the achievable knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, and relationships with society and with constituencies in society that a department wants and expects students to develop as a result of being a sociology major (p. 9)

In October 2015, a SAC subcommittee was formed to revise previous “learning goals” and develop common, assessable course outcomes applicable for most core courses in the sociology program. The subcommittee collected information from the PCC History SAC, the American Sociological Association (ASA), and the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), and has shared information via Google docs.

As a result of this collaborative process, in December 2015, we identified the following learning goals for sociology, which are derived directly from our mission statement.

³ American Sociological Association. 2005. *Creating an effective assessment plan for the sociology major*. Available at http://www.asanet.org/documents/teaching/pdfs/Assessment_Final_Copy_2005.pdf

Sociology students will:

- Develop a sociological imagination - connecting personal experience to broader social and historical contexts
- Apply social theories and empirical evidence to analyze larger social forces
- Analyze the construction of culture and its relationship to systems of inequality
- Articulate a sociological perspective in written form
- Apply a sociological understanding of social change to intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world

Learning outcomes are derived from learning goals and then are associated with specific courses and assessments.

Following the ASA (2005), our next step is to develop specific learning outcomes or “learning objectives” which “are specific statements of learning outcomes that stem from the learning goals. They are realistic, measurable, and straightforward. They tell us how to determine if the learning goals have been achieved” (p. 9).

Given our recent assessment work with the LEAP VALUE rubric on Written Communication and our assumption that Communication will remain a PCC Core Outcome after the current revision, we decided to start by writing a learning objective/course outcome for written communication. As noted in Sociology’s Core Outcomes Mapping Matrix, Communication is mapped at 3-4 (level indicators) for all sociology courses; therefore, all sociology courses should include a communication learning outcome, and all sociology students should be learning and assessed on communication.

Learning Goal: Articulate a sociological perspective in written form

Learning Objective/Outcome: Express sociological ideas in a clear and coherent manner in written form

To pair with this outcome, we developed a rubric that defines what written communication means in sociology and to guide our assessment of student work (See Appendix 1 for the complete rubric and a sample embedded assignment).

The four criteria include:

- Topic Development and Organization of Ideas - includes thesis or topic statements, content clearly supports thesis or topic statements
- Sources/Evidence - integration of appropriate, relevant and credible sources
- Citations - ideas are correctly attributed to the appropriate source/s, uses a citation system consistently and accurately
- Grammar and Sentence Structure - grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling

With the learning outcome and rubric in hand, our next step, according to the ASA (2005), is to develop **assessments (mechanisms or tools)** for measuring student achievement of this learning outcome. The Sociology SAC has already invested a great deal in assignment design via our contributions to the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC) in 2014-16. Moving forward, we plan to continue to utilize course-embedded assignments.

In preparation for our program assessment work in 2016-17, all sociology faculty will be asked to develop new writing assignments or to revise their current writing assignments so that faculty have an assignment that aligns with our written communication rubric. The assessment subcommittee will offer several samples that faculty may choose to use or adapt for their own classes.

In Fall 2016, all sociology faculty will be asked to administer an aligned written assignment in every course they teach. The SAC aims to randomly sample student artifacts for written communication from all sociology courses. We plan to assess this sample of student artifacts with the rubric outlined here.

Once PCC finalizes the current list of PCC Core Outcomes, the Sociology SAC plans to ensure that all sociology course outcomes are assessable by repeating this process for the remaining Core Outcomes.

This is the process:

- Map newly revised PCC Core Outcomes to the sociology curriculum
- Develop measurable learning outcome/s (course outcomes) aligned with the PCC Core Outcomes, and Sociology's learning goals (and mission)
- Develop an assessment rubric for the learning outcome/s
- Utilize backwards design to revise or create new assignments to be embedded in courses
- Randomly sample and score student artifacts with the appropriate rubric

SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – ASSESSMENT SUPPORT

In our program review, Sociology asked for "Program Assessment Support". Similar to support provided to instructors for providing disability accommodations (e.g., accessibility) and for D2L instructional design, we need a full-time assessment resource person who has training and experience in program-level assessment in higher education.

- The current organizational structure for assessment requires individual faculty to invest a great deal of time and energy to gain some level of assessment expertise on their own before attempting to persuade SAC members to participate. It would be

- helpful if the College provided an “assessment resource czar” to assist SACs (along with the LAC and assessment coaches). The College’s investment in TLC programming is helpful for individual faculty members improving their own teaching, but does not often address program level intervention and assessment.
- As has been noted by most in the modern assessment community, assessment should be faculty led. The Sociology SAC appreciates PCC’s stated commitment to faculty-led assessment and also for its recognition that there is no “one-size-fits-all” in assessment work. Faculty should not be pressured to follow a singular model, but rather should have the flexibility to enact projects that are specific to their disciplines (NILOA 2014). Unfortunately, the current use of the checklist template utilized by the LAC peer review process does not provide that flexibility.

APPENDIX 1: COMPARISON OF SCORES

Critical Thinking Assessment Scores

Artifact	Scoring Group	Explanation of issues		Evidence		Influence of Context & Assumptions		Student's Position		Conclusions and Related Outcomes	
		Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores
1035 n=8	SOC SAC	1.4	0,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.5	1,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.1	0,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1.5	1,1,1,1,2 ,2,2,2
	PCC In-House	1	1,1	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1
	MSC	2		2		2		2		2	
1026 n=8	SOC SAC	2.1	2,2,2,2, 2,2,2,3	1.6	1,1,1,2, 2,2,2,2	1.5	1,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.4	1,1,1,1, 1,2,2,2	2	1,2,2,2,2 ,2,2,3
	PCC In-House	2	1,4	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	1.5	1,2
	MSC	2		1		2		1		2	
1038 n=8	SOC SAC	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,2,3,3	1.1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,2	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1.4	1,1,1,1,1 ,2,2,2
	PCC In-House	2	2,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	1	1,1	0.5	0,1
	MSC	1		1		1		1		0	
1165 n=7	SOC SAC	2.9	2,2,2,3, 3,4,4	1.7	1,1,1,2, 2,2,3	2.7	2,2,2,3, 3,3,4	2.4	1,2,2,2, 3,3,4	2.4	2,2,2,2,2 ,3,4
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2	2,2	2.5	2,3	1.5	1,2	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		2		2		2		2	
1159 n=7	SOC SAC	3	2,3,3,3, 3,3,4	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,3,3	2.1	1,1,2,2, 3,3,3	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,3,3	2.3	1,2,2,2,2 ,3,4
	PCC In-House	3.5	3,4	2.5	2,3	3	2,4	3	2,4	3	2,4
	MSC	3		2		2		2		2	
1037 n=6	SOC SAC	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	0.8	0,0,1,1, 1,2	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	1.7	1,1,1,2, 2,3	1.8	1,2,2,2,2 ,2
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	1	1,1	2	2,2	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2
	MSC	2		2		1		1		2	
1163 n=6	SOC SAC	2.5	2,2,2,3, 3,3	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	2.7	2,2,3,3, 3,3	2.2	2,2,2,2, 2,3	2.3	2,2,2,2,3 ,3
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	1,4	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		2		2		1		2	
1036 n=6	SOC SAC	2.7	2,2,3,3, 3,3	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2,2	1.8	1,1,2,2, 2,3	2	1,2,2,2,2 ,3
	PCC In-House	4	4,4	2	1,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		1		1		1	

Written Communication Assessment Scores

Artifact	Scoring Group	Context of & Purpose for Writing		Content Development		Genre & Disciplinary Conventions		Sources & Evidence		Control of Syntax & Mechanics	
		Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores
1209 n=8	SOC SAC	2.6	2,2,2,3, 3,3,3,3	2.5	2,2,2,2, 3,3,3,3	2.4	2,2,2,2, 2,3,3,3	2	2,2,2,2, 2,2,2,2	2	2,2,2,2,2,2, 2,2
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		2		1		2	
1207 n=8	SOC SAC	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1	0.8	0,0,0,1, 1,1,1,2	0	0,0,0,0, 0,0,0,0	1.5	1,1,1,1,2,2, 2,2
	PCC In-House	3	2,4	1.5	1,2	2	1,3	1.5	1,2	2.5	1,4
	MSC	2		3		2		1		2	
1206 n=8	SOC SAC	1.8	1,1,2,2, 2,2,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1.1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,2	1.3	1,1,1,1,1,1, 2,2
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	2	2,2	3	3,3	3	3,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		2		2		2		1	
1178 n=5	SOC SAC	1.4	1,1,1,2, 2	1.8	1,1,2,2, 3	1.4	1,1,1,2, 2	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2	1.6	1,1,1,2,3
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	3	3,3
	MSC	4		3		3		1		3	
1183 n=6	SOC SAC	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.3	1,2,2,3, 3,3	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.3	1,2,2,3,3,3
	PCC In-House	3.5	3,4	3	2,4	3	3,3	2	2,2	3.5	3,4
	MSC	3		3		3		4		3	
1179 n=6	SOC SAC	2.3	1,2,2,2, 3,4	2.5	1,1,3,3, 3,4	2	1,1,2,2, 2,4	2.2	1,1,2,2, 3,4	2.3	1,2,2,2,3,4
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	3	3,3	3.5	3,4	3	3,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		3		3		2		3	
1185 n=6	SOC SAC	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1	0.8	0,0,1,1, 1,2	0.3	0,0,0,0, 1,1	0.2	0,0,0,0, 0,1	1.2	1,1,1,1,1,2
	PCC In-House	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	2	2,2
	MSC	3		2		3		1		3	
1186 n=6	SOC SAC	1.3	1,1,1,1, 2,2	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	1	0,1,1,1, 1,2	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2,2	1.8	1,1,2,2,2,3
	PCC In-House	2	2,2	2	1,3	2	2,2	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		2		1		1	
1198 n=5	SOC SAC	0.6	0,0,1,1, 1	0.4	0,0,0,1, 1	0.2	0,0,0,0, 1	0.6	0,0,1,1, 1	1	1,1,1,1
	PCC In-House	1	1,1	0.5	0,1	1	1,1	1	1,1	1	1,1
	MSC	3		2		2		0		2	
1203 n=6	SOC SAC	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	1.8	2,2,2,2, 2,3	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	1.5	1,1,1,2, 2,2	2.3	2,2,2,2,3,3
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	2	2,2	2	2,2	2	2,2	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		2		1		0		2	

APPENDIX 2: Sociology's Written Communication Learning Outcome Rubric & Sample Assignment

Sociology Written Communication Learning Outcome Rubric
(adapted from the LEAP VALUE rubric for Written Communication)

Topic Development and Organization of Ideas - includes thesis or topic statements, content clearly supports thesis or topic statements

0= Does not provide thesis and/or topic statements

1= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with *no or limited* supporting content

2= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with supporting content through *most* of the work

3= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with supporting content *throughout* the work

Sources/Evidence - integration of appropriate, relevant and credible sources

0= Does not integrate appropriate, relevant or credible sources

1= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas through *some* of the work

2= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas through *most* of the work

3= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas *throughout* the work

Citations - ideas are correctly attributed to the appropriate source/s, uses a citation system consistently and accurately

NA= Assignment does not call for use of a citation system

0= Does not use a citation system at all

1= Citation system attempted, but used inconsistently and/or inaccurately

2= Citation system is accurately and consistently used in *most* of the work

3= Citation system is accurately and consistently used *throughout* the work

Grammar and Sentence Structure - grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling

0= Numerous grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

1= Several grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

2= A few grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

3= Uses correct grammar, syntax, punctuation and spelling throughout the work

Intergenerational Social Mobility Analysis

Note: there are additional materials provided to students with this assignment that we have not included here, including a sample family tree structure and grading guide.

Given our discussion of economic class and social mobility, I would like you to develop an *occupational family tree*. In particular, I want you to do some *ethnographic research* on your family members' occupations and then document that information in a family tree structure. Given that many of us may have been raised by people other than our genetic families, simply develop your chart and do your research on the people you consider to be your family. I also understand that many of us may not be able to find out about the complete histories of our families. Noting that reality, simply do your best to get as much detailed information about as much of your family's occupational history as possible.

Once you have completed the chart, on a separate, new page (using one inch margins, double spacing, and 12 point Times font), and drawing from our reading from C. Wright Mill's *The Sociological Imagination*, provide a sociological analysis (2-3 pages) that examines and explains any and all occupational shifts your family members have experienced. For example, what, if any, major social institutions, social forces, and/or historical events help us understand the occupational changes and social mobility that occurred in your family (e.g. did they experience shifts social structures, marital status changes, changes in educational status, immigration, death, illness, etc.). In other words, **employ your sociological imagination to analyze how and why any shifts in occupational status were connected to larger social forces**. In your analysis be sure to use and cite how Mill's discussion of the sociological imagination helps you understand the occupational changes your family members' have experienced.

Finally, please end your analysis with a brief discussion of the occupation you are pursuing and explain how you plan to achieve that goal. NOTE: In the event you feel this assignment may bring up too many painful personal issues, since many of us have difficult family histories, please see me and we will develop an alternative assignment (on social mobility) for you.

How elements of the assignment instructions map to the rubric:

Topic Development/Organization: Did you provide detailed information on the occupational chart about your family's work history and your occupational aspirations (including any foreseeable obstacles you may encounter)? Did you provide a sociological analysis of why any occupational shifts occurred and effectively connect it to Mill's discussion of the sociological imagination? Was your analysis and discussion well developed and clearly organized, including a topic/thesis statement with content/data that thoroughly supports that statement?

Sources/Evidence & Citations: Was your use and citation of Mill's work appropriately formatted (using the American Sociological Association citation formatting guidelines posted on D2L)?

Grammar/Sentence Structure: Was your analysis well written, free of grammatical, syntax, punctuation, and spelling errors?