**UCR Sociology**

**Form for the evaluation of the required professional paper (aka pro paper)**

**Instructions:** Before the defense, the student works with the Graduate Assistant to complete Part 1 and forwards the form to the committee chair. At the defense, each faculty member uses the rubric to evaluate the pro paper and records their numeric scores in Part 2. The chair calculates the average total score and records it and the exam outcome in Part 2. The student must receive an average of 18 or greater to pass. The chair forwards the form to the Grad Advisor, Enrollment who conducts a full faculty vote, records the outcome in Part 3, and sends the completed form to the Grad Assistant.

**Part 1**

Student name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Specialization 1\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Specialization 2\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

GPA\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ B or lower grades (count)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Incompletes (count)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Pro paper title\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Defense date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Part 2: Committee evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Committee** | **Signature** | **Problem**  **statement** | **Lit**  **review** | **Method** | **Results** | **Discussion** | **Writing** | **Oral**  **defense** | **Total**  **n/35** |
| **Chair:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Average:** |

Outcome:

\_\_\_\_\_Pass: Grant an MA (if applicable), admit to the PhD program, and note the exceptional excellence of the paper. Avg. ≥ 32

\_\_\_\_\_Pass: Grant an MA (if applicable) and admit to the PhD program. Avg. = 25-31

\_\_\_\_\_Pass: Grant an MA (if applicable), but do not admit to the PhD program. Avg. = 18-24

\_\_\_\_\_Fail: Do not grant an MA (if applicable) or admit to the PhD program. Avg. ≤ 17

**Part 3: Full faculty vote**

Grant student MA degree \_\_\_\_\_Approve \_\_\_\_\_Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_Not applicable (already has MA in Soc)

Admit to the PhD program \_\_\_\_\_Approve \_\_\_\_\_Disapprove

Approve areas of specialization \_\_\_\_\_Approve \_\_\_\_\_Disapprove

Grad Advisor, Enrollment signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of vote: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Rubric for the Second-Year Professional Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1= fail – unacceptable** | **2=fail - poor/marginal** | **3=pass-acceptable** | **4=pass – very good** | **5=pass-exemplary** |
| **Statement**  **of**  **problem** | The study does not seem relevant to sociology. Lack of evidence provided to support the significance of the study. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is not provided or is incomplete. | The study is relevant to sociology, but evidence provided to support the significance of the problem is inadequate. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is provided but is inappropriate or incomplete. | The study is relevant to sociology. Adequate evidence provided to support the significance of the problem. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is appropriate and nearly complete. | There is a theoretical basis for the study’s relevance to sociology. Good evidence is provided to support the significance of the study. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is appropriate and complete, such that it is clear that the work can make a contribution to the field. | There is a strong theoretical basis for the study’s relevance to sociology. Abundant and compelling evidence is provided to support the significance of the study. A description of the approach for investigating the problem is compelling and complete, such that it is clear that the work has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field. |
| **Review**  **of literature** | The review is not relevant to the goals/focus of the study. The material reviewed is out of date, omits seminal work, or is insufficient. The quality of the review is marginal or inappropriate for scientific research. | The review is for the most part relevant to the goals/focus of the study, but the material reviewed is out of date, omits some important work, or is otherwise not quite sufficient. The quality of the review is marginal in some manner (e.g., not well-organized, not clear enough or well-integrated). | Good review that integrates findings from many relevant sources. The review provides support for the aims of the project and the research design and methodology selected, with some corrections or additions needed. | Very good review that includes summaries, synthesis, and critiques of evidence-based sources. The review provides good support for the aims of the project and the research design and methodology selected. | Extensive review that includes summaries, synthesis, and critiques of rigorous evidence-based sources. The review provides strong support for the aims of the project and the research design and methodology selected. |
| **Methodology** | Significant aspects of the design and methodology are inappropriate for the problem/hypotheses under study. | Some aspects of the design and methodology are inappropriate for the problem/hypotheses under study. | Appropriate application of existing methodology for the problem/hypotheses under study. | Study design and methodology are appropriate and represent the quality (in terms of scientific rigor and detail and accuracy of description) necessary for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. | Study design and methodology are appropriate and represent the quality (in terms of scientific rigor and detail and accuracy of description) necessary for publication in a top-tier peer-reviewed journal. |
| **Results (Data Analysis and Findings)** | The analyses are inappropriate or inaccurately described. Major errors in data analysis or reporting of findings are made. Inappropriate interpretation of the results. | The analyses are not fully appropriate or not described with complete accuracy. Some errors in data analysis or reporting of findings are made. Some inappropriate interpretation of the results. | The analyses are appropriate and accurately described. Very few errors in data analysis or reporting of findings are made. Appropriate interpretation of results for the most part. | Reports data analyses with a level of clarity and accuracy necessary for publication in a refereed journal or other publication outlet with some corrections. | Reports data analyses with a level of clarity and accuracy necessary for publication in a refereed journal or other publication outlet. |
| **Interpretations, Conclusions, and Implications** | Draws unrelated, inaccurate, or overstated conclusions. Description of study limitations and their implications for future research are omitted, inaccurate, or insufficient. Theoretical, empirical, and/or policy implications are omitted, insufficient, or unrelated to the findings. | Draws some unrelated, inaccurate, or overstated conclusions from the data in some spots of the document. Description of study limitations and their implications for future research are not completely accurate or are insufficient. Theoretical, empirical, and/or policy implications are present but are insufficient or need major revision. | Draws accurate conclusions from the data for the most part. Description of study limitations and their implications for future research are generally appropriate but may be missing some insights. Theoretical, empirical, and/or policy implications may be a bit superficial and/or may not be fully related to the findings and/or the limitations in the study. | Draws accurate conclusions from the data that are well-stated. Description of study limitations and their implications for future research are appropriate. Theoretical, empirical, and/or policy implications are thoughtful and appropriately related to the findings and/or the limitations in the study. | Conclusions are accurate, appropriately linked to the problem and methodology, and are insightful in their implications for further study. Description of study limitations and their implications for future research are appropriate. Theoretical, empirical, and/or policy implications are compelling in their potential applications and appropriately related to the findings and/or limitations in the study. |
| **Quality**  **of**  **writing** | Does not adhere to ASA style requirements. Numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and format. The writing is not organized and lacks clarity. Writing is not of the quality for submission to a scholarly journal. Citations not used appropriately, with numerous errors. | Considerable errors in ASA style requirements. Quite a few errors in spelling, grammar, and format. The writing is poorly organized and lacks clarity. Writing is not of the quality for submission to a scholarly journal. Considerable errors in citations used. | Some errors in ASA style requirements. Very minor errors in spelling, grammar, and format. Organizational and clarity errors that detract slightly from the ability to accurately convey ideas and will need to be revised. Approaching quality for submission to a scholarly journal. Citations used appropriately with few errors. | Few or minor errors in ASA style requirements. Virtually no errors in spelling, grammar, and format. Some organizational and clarity errors, but they do not detract from the ability to accurately convey ideas. Nearly ready for submission to a scholarly journal. Citations used appropriately, with few to no errors. | Very few to no apparent errors in ASA style requirements. Very few to no apparent errors in spelling, grammar and format. Well organized and clear. Writing accurately conveys ideas. The writing is of the quality for submission to scholarly journals. Citations used appropriately, with no errors. |
| **Oral**  **Defense** | The presentation has significant errors or omissions in the components above (i.e., statement of problem, literature review, etc.). Responses to questions are inappropriate or demonstrate a lack of understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation does not follow a logical sequence or is not well paced. The presenter does not demonstrate confidence and/or ability to engage the audience. | The presentation has some fairly significant errors or omissions in the components above (i.e., statement of problem, literature review, etc.). Responses to questions are sometimes inappropriate or demonstrate a lack of full understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation mostly follows a logical sequence but with some errors. The presentation pace can use improvement. Presenter confidence and ability to engage the audience can use improvement. | The presentation has few errors or omissions in the components above (i.e., statement of problem, literature review, etc.). Responses to questions are generally appropriate or demonstrate a good understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation follows a logical sequence. The presentation is well paced for the most part. The presenter demonstrates confidence and/or ability to engage the audience for the most part. | The presentation is accurate and comprehensive. Responses to questions are appropriate or demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the literature and study findings. The presentation follows a logical sequence. The presentation is well paced. The presentation is of professional quality for the most part. | The presentation is accurate and comprehensive beyond expectations. Responses to questions are appropriate or demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the literature and study findings consistent with that of a scholar in the field rather than a doctoral student. The presentation follows a logical sequence and is well paced. The presentation is of professional quality and serves as a model for other students. |