

# Law and Society Major Assessment Report

## John Jay College of Criminal Justice

### 2014-2015 Academic Year

#### I. Overview

The Law and Society major at John Jay College, developed to replace the existing Legal Studies major, was approved by the New York State Department of Education on October 31, 2011. Some students enrolled in the Law and Society major in the Spring 2012 semester, but the first class of newly admitted students (both freshmen and transfers) came to the major in Fall 2012. At that time, the Legal Studies major was closed to new students, although existing Legal Studies majors can remain in it until graduation. In Fall 2014, the Law and Society major enrollment was 448 students, a 29% increase over Fall 2013 and a 134% increase over Fall 2012 when enrollment was first reported for the major.

Last year, the Law and Society (LWS) major offered its first section of the senior capstone course (LWS 425: Colloquium for Research in Law & Society). Prior to last year, the few graduating seniors in the major were offered substitutions for this course, specifically 400-level courses in the Political Science major (e.g., POL 409: Colloquium for Research in Government and Politics, POL 430: Seminar in Civil Rights and Liberties, POL 401: Seminar in Government, or POL 420: Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics). As such, this report represents only our second opportunity to examine the impact, structure and effectiveness of the full curriculum, from start to finish. Specifically, this report will assess students' abilities to effectively communicate in writing informed opinions in law and society, which is one of the major's learning outcomes. In order to assess this learning outcome, we used a sample population of final papers (n = 19 out of a possible 43) submitted for LWS 425 during the Spring 2015 semester. All papers are from the same section of LWS 425 to maintain consistency in final paper instructions. Overall, the results suggest that a majority of LWS majors meet expectations regarding effective writing. There are, however, areas for improvement particularly in areas of organization and mechanics.

The remainder of this report will proceed as follows. First, we briefly summarize the Governance Committee's attempts "to close the loop" and address last year's assessment report, which examined students' abilities to engage in independent research. Second, we provide assessment results for this academic year. Lastly, we will provide discussion and action items to address the results presented in this report.

Before turning to the specifics and results of this year's assessment, we would like to note that we have made significant and substantial strides in working to improve student learning across the major. Many of the responses to last year's assessment were achieved through instructors and the Department as a whole constantly working to ensure our students have high quality and rewarding experiences in the classroom and as majors.

We noted in last year's assessment that the major significant structural changes. As we will detail below, we have already begun the process of addressing these concerns (e.g., new courses, which will be required of all majors, are being developed), but structural changes also require additional faculty. There are only two full-time faculty members to teach the totality of required courses in the major. This

is simply unsustainable, given the size and number of students. As the major continues to grow in size and as we add additional courses to the curriculum, there will be a strong likelihood that students may proceed through all courses in the major without being exposed to any full-time LWS faculty. Given all this, we want to reiterate the need for more full-time faculty, hoping that the administration will recognize and support this burgeoning and rapidly growing major at the College.

## **II. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES**

### **A. Overview of Class-Based Solutions**

The 2013-2014 assessment report focused on assessing students' abilities to develop and execute independent research, which is a learning outcome of the major, in LWS 425. Overall, the report found that students grasp and understand the reasons for research and are clearly able to identify important and interesting questions within the field of Law and Society. When it comes to the actual implementation and execution of research, however, LWS students fall short of expectations. To attempt to close the proverbial loop, the major proposed several action items that include macro- and micro-level solutions to increase student learning. In regards to immediate changes (micro-level), LWS proposed two action items: (1) emphasis on preparation, editing, and revision of multiple drafts of written work before submission of the final product; and (2) seeking assistance from the Writing Center or considering a department-based solution.

In LWS 425, due dates were changed for scaffolded assignments. All small-stakes assignments as well as student-instructor consultations, which of course are designed to have students "march" to the final paper, were moved up about a week. While this may seem like a small change, the timing also allowed for more feedback at the early stages of the research project, which is the most critical time of the research process. Students, in a very short amount of time—one semester—are asked to design and execute an independent research project. Thus, more time to thoughtfully engage in selecting an appropriate and manageable research topic and question is key to the successful completion of the final paper.

Both sections of LWS 425 placed emphasis on poster sessions as key components to the research process. The preparation of a research poster provides students with another opportunity to organize as well as visually depict the critical components of their respective research projects. Moreover, poster presentations provide students with additional opportunities for questions, trouble-shooting and informal collaboration over potential issues in their projects, and reinforcement of concepts, ideas, and arguments of the course. Although it is not the purpose of the report this year, a cursory glance at the research projects from the section sampled here demonstrate significant improvements in the many aspects where there were deficiencies noted in last year's report. We are optimistic that future assessments will corroborate this.

Most importantly, the capstone places an undue burden on the instructors as well as the students. Given the requirement that all students design and execute an independent research project, there simply are not enough hours in the day and enough time in the semester to provide 25 students with appropriate mentoring through the research process. We believe that smaller class sizes in the capstones will assist in significantly and substantially increasing students' learning. Again, a cursory

glance at the research papers this semester easily demonstrates that LWS students are capable of independent research. They simply need additional time with and mentoring from the professor to successfully navigate this process. If there are fewer students per section, we anticipate increasingly robust learning outcomes. The student projects that normally would only approach expectations or even fail to meet expectations in the traditional research rubric all demonstrate promise (and only require additional time, guidance, and consultation with the instructor). Providing professors with more time (by decreasing the overall number of students) would increase performance from all students.

We also, as a department, discussed research concepts that should be reinforced in all courses (whenever possible) to adequately prepare students for their capstone experiences. Specifically, instructors of the POL capstones, especially POL 409, worked on a handout that contained a list of concepts and skills that should be emphasized in POL courses. While the focus was admittedly for Political Science, and Law and Society is interdisciplinary, we believe that continued reinforcement of research skills concepts in POL courses (as some are electives in the LWS major) will further enhance student preparation for the capstone requirement in Law and Society.

## **B. Overview of Structural Solutions**

For the past two years, the governance committee for LWS has noted the need for a Law and Society 200-level research skills course. As of now, the course required in the major that meets this need is SSC 325 (Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences) offered by the Sociology Department. Offering a required skills/research course in the major (i.e., a course with an LWS prefix taught solely by Law and Society faculty) will provide better flexibility in meeting the learning goals of the major. Also, it would offer an additional common experience for all Law and Society majors.

Since last year's assessment, the LWS governance committee has since moved forward and developed a 200-level LWS methods course, which passed UCASC during the spring semester. We believe that introducing students to introductory research skills and methods, which reflect the multidisciplinary nature of the major, and the interdisciplinary nature of law and society as an academic field, should and will increase student success across all levels of the LWS curriculum, especially the capstone. We believe that LWS 2xx will better prepare students for the capstone, allowing instructors to spend less time teaching new research skills and concepts and, instead, allowing them to only reinforce and refresh what they learned in previous courses. It is unclear at this point whether we have sufficient staff to actually offer this course in the near future, however.

Also, LWS 3xx: Supervised Undergraduate Research Experiences passed UCASC this past semester. This optional course will provide some of our burgeoning scholars with additional opportunities to refine research skills, while working alongside faculty on their research projects.

LWS faculty are currently developing two courses at the 300-level. Eventually, these courses will become classes in the major, which will help to resolve the deficiency in the major where there are NO common 300-level experiences. We believe this to be a critical and necessary feature in the major, ensuring successful student learning and adequate preparation for capstone experiences.

Most importantly, additional faculty hires are crucial to the future of the major. With only two full-time faculty members currently teaching LWS courses, we are hampered in developing and

implementing the action items that will improve the common experiences and academic development of our major and students.

### III. ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING GOALS for 2014-2015

The three learning goals for the Law and Society major are:

1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of law, legal phenomena and legal institutions from a variety of perspectives outside the discipline of law, with a focus on the relationship between law and political and social change.
2. Students will initiate, develop, and present independent research addressing and analyzing the relationship between law and society.
3. Students will develop written and oral communication skills to express informed opinions about issues in law and society.

Assessment this year addressed the development of effective writing skills using all 19 papers from one section of LWS 425: Colloquium for Research in Law and Society. All students in the major must take this course in their senior year and successfully complete the course in order to graduate with a Law and Society major. The instructions for the final paper are located in the Appendix, under “Assignment Prompt for Papers Used for Assessment.”

The rubric used to score the papers was adapted from the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics for Written Communication, developed through a program of the Association of American Colleges & Universities. Added to the VALUE measurement categories was a category on development of thesis statements, given the focus on thesis statements in earlier assessment activities and recommendations. Accordingly, for “Effective Writing,” we assess student work on the following items: context and purpose for writing, thesis statements, content development, application of disciplinary conventions to all aspects of the writing, use of sources and evidence, and control of syntax and mechanics. The rubric used to score the papers presented in Table 1A in the Appendix. Moreover, examples in scoring of representative student papers are presented in Table 2A in the Appendix. These papers are attached at the end of this report as well.

#### A. Direct Assessment Findings

<b>Table 1. Law and Society Learning Outcome 2: Effective Writing</b>				
<b>400-Level scoring:</b>	<b><i>Exceeds Expectations (3)</i></b>	<b><i>Meets Expectations (2)</i></b>	<b><i>Fails to Meet Expectations (1)</i></b>	<b><i>Fails to Meet Expectations (0)*</i></b>
<b>1. Context and Purpose for Writing</b>	0.0% (0)	68.4% (13)	31.6% (6)	0.0% (0)
<b>2. Content Development</b>	10.5% (2)	68.4% (13)	21.1% (4)	0.0% (0)

<b>3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b>	0.0% (0)	57.9% (11)	42.1% (8)	0.0% (0)
<b>4. Sources and Evidence</b>	15.8% (3)	78.9% (15)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)
<b>5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	0.0% (0)	63.2% (12)	36.8% (7)	0.0% (0)

\*Please note that if a student paper failed to include an area, the paper was scored as failing to meet expectations (0).

Table 1 presents the assessment of learning outcome 2, which states that students will develop written and oral communication skills to express informed opinions about issues in law and society. The assignments required students to identify a relevant topic in Law and Society (broadly defined) as well as develop and execute a research project designed to further investigate their research questions. Again, a cursory glance of all the papers reveals the fact students are grasping and understanding the goal of research: to find interesting questions that require further investigation. As for the results pertinent to this assessment, students at the capstone level are indeed able to effectively communicate informed opinions in law and society. A majority of the students consistently meet expectations across all measures of the effective writing rubric, but there is a noticeable minority that requires additional assistance to further enhance their skills and abilities.

Direct assessment scores for context and purpose (Area 1) are derived from the introduction section of the research papers, which should frame the research, present the research question/thesis, and provide a quick preview of the work ahead. For this item, students must demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience and purpose. As Table 1 notes, no student exceeded expectations on this rubric, which would have required a demonstrable understanding that this is an academic, independent research project. Of the 19 papers, 68.4 percent met expectations, meaning they demonstrated adequate consideration of the context, audience, purpose and a clear focus on the assigned tasks. Six students (about 31.6%) failed to meet expectations; it should be noted that all demonstrated at least awareness of the context, audience and purpose.<sup>1</sup>

To directly assess Content Development (Area 2), the literature/theory sections of each paper were used. A vast majority of the students (78.9%) at least met expectations, and were able to use appropriate, relevant and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of law and society. Two were able to create interesting and developed literature reviews that demonstrated mastery of their topics. Four students (21.1%) did include relevant literature (not surprising given the fact that the assignment required usage of at least 3 articles from highly reputable sources), but focused on one narrow aspect or a very limited perspective, neglecting the nuanced nature of the extant literature in law and society. Or, the articles were not used to create a synthesis and dialogue, creating a fuller understanding of the theoretical and empirical puzzle. While the sources used were appropriate, they were not utilized in a manner consistent with the expectations of a 400-level capstone project.

---

<sup>1</sup> Even utilizing the entire paper for those 6 papers that failed to meet expectations, there is a consistent lack of an academic voice, which demonstrates the appropriate audience and context of the assignment.

Assessment of Area 3 (genre and disciplinary conventions) is derived from an analysis of the entire paper. Of course, law and society is interdisciplinary and therefore the assessment also considered appropriate citations (APA), formatting and overall flow and structure of the paper. Here, about 57.9% of the students met expectations under the effective writing rubric. The other students (42.1%), however, did not present their papers in an effective organized manner, used appropriate citation formatting, or presented their work in a basic manner. It should also be noted that a vast majority of students used subheadings appropriately, but it is other elements (formatting, APA citations, footnotes, etc.) that prevented 7 of the 8 students from meeting expectations.

Area 4 (sources and evidence) was assessed from the data and methods as well as the discussion of the results sections of the final papers. All (about 94.7%) but one student at least met expectations in this area. These papers all utilized sources that were generated from originally gathered qualitative or quantitative data. Of course, there are variations to the how students were able to use this information to test their hypotheses, but nonetheless nearly all gathered credible evidence and sources for their final papers. Moreover, 3 of the papers revealed a deep comprehension of the issue, demonstrating the multiple dimensions of their research question and interpreting their results in accordance with the sources they used in previous sections of the paper. There were a few papers (despite meeting expectations) that simply needed additional time to craft their findings in a manner consistent with and indicative of a research project. Some minor deviations (which kept more papers from exceeding expectations) included deviations (at times, random) from their academic voice in presentation of the results (as actual results of their research) rather than something they stumbled upon or as something that was matter of fact. Most common, students did skillfully connect their sources and evidence in a full discussion of the theoretical puzzles they first presented. Instead, they simply summarized their findings rather than using multiple sources as part of a larger dialogue and discussion their data help resolve.

Area 5 (control of syntax and mechanics) is a consistent area of concern across the College. Here, the results are similar. As Table 1 indicates, 63.2% of the students met expectations by demonstrating the ability to use straightforward language that conveys meaning to the readers. There were quite a few papers that would have exceeded expectations with additional drafts and proofreading. For these papers, there were consistent issues of mechanics (punctuation, sentence construction, and grammar) that are easily resolved. Another consistent issue is the “over-working” of sentences where students tend to cram too many ideas, phrases and conditions into a particular sentence, which detracts from the overall quality of their writing; it is not an issue of the need for remedial assistance. Seven students (36.8%) were able to convey meaning, but almost every sentence contains consistent mechanical errors that inhibited their ability to effectively communicate.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND ACTION ITEMS**

The results were not entirely surprising, but they also create a sense of optimism for law and society majors. A majority of students met expectations for the 400-level rubric, which is an achievement for the Law and Society major. Our students are clearly capable of high-level writing and able to communicate their research effectively. Here, the students were asked to design, engage, and present their very own independent research projects. And, a majority of LWS students rose to the challenge!

Similar to last year's assessment, we believe that there are important problems resulting from structural issues in the major and contribute to the difficult task LWS capstone instructors face each semester. First, as an interdisciplinary major, we find it difficult to control the content of classes that are not housed in LWS or the governing department (Political Science). The classes that are offered by other departments obviously and rightfully service their respective majors. It can be awkward, or even difficult, to discuss LWS learning objectives and goals with other faculty/departments. Thus, students may not have sufficient reinforcement of critical and required skills for successful completion of the major (i.e., independent research, interdisciplinary approaches in addressing and discussing questions, continued refinement and improvement of communication skills, etc.) reinforced by coursework taken between LWS 200 and the capstone, LWS 425.

Second and related, it is challenging to assess the major when a large number of classes are not offered with the LWS designation. Currently, LWS 200 and 425 are the only required courses in the major. This creates two noticeable problems. One, we often lose classroom contact with our students between the introductory class and the capstone. Two, because the classes between 200 and 425 are offered/taught by multiple/different majors, we have noticed a wide range of abilities, skills and training in the students taking our capstone experience. We believe the solution to this would be creating additional classes with the LWS designation at the 200- and/or 300-levels and making at least some of these required courses, so students have common experiences in the major beyond the introductory and capstone courses. This requires more full-time LWS instructors in the major.

The two previous assessment reports as well as this one emphasized the need to improve and develop students' writing skills and abilities. Based on the results presented above, students require additional assistance in organization and the mechanics of writing. Perhaps, additional assistance in outlining and presentation would be a potential micro-level, class-specific solution. The problem of organization also indicates a larger issue. Again, the structural issues in the major also exacerbate the problem of effective written communication (or lack thereof). With little to no contact with our students after LWS 200 and before LWS 425, we are unable to reinforce critical skills specific to an interdisciplinary field such as law and society, and to assess their development.

To discuss the major's attempts to continue our efforts to "close the loop" on assessment, the action items are divided into three areas: (1) micro-level or class-specific; (2) curricular or major-specific; and (3) macro-level or administrative assistance. After each item, timelines are presented in parentheses.

Based on the results presented above, the following micro-level action items are suggested:

1. Emphasis on preparation, editing, and revision of multiple drafts of written work before submission of the final product (Implement starting Fall 2015).
2. Seek assistance from the Writing Center or consider a department-based solution. Perhaps LWS 200 and 425 could consider in-class sessions on refining writing skills and/or a referral system for students deficient in specific areas (Implement starting Fall 2015).

Based on the results presented above, the following curricular action items are suggested to begin or continue:

1. Develop additional 300-level substantive classes with the LWS designation, such as Law and Intimate Relationships or Law, Space, and Place. These courses would provide a more

common experience among majors, but also additional opportunities to reinforce concepts and skills learned in LWS 200 and needed for LWS 425 (Submit by Spring 2016).

2. Maintain regular communication with other departments offering courses in the major to ensure these courses further the LWS learning goals.
3. Seek assistance in reducing the number of students in LWS 425.

We would like to discuss curricular action 3 more detail. To ask students to design, execute, and complete an independent research project is a hefty requirement of the major. As this assessment demonstrates, our students are completely capable of this task. In every single paper, there is clearly effort and desire from our students. Even from the lower performing papers, there are glimpses of solid ideas and abilities. The gaps between exceeding, meeting and failing expectations are due to issues of time. We, as a major, believe that many of the students that did not meet expectations in this assessment only need additional assistance, guidance, and mentoring from faculty members. From the syllabus for the course, there are already scheduled intervals to consult with other students as well as the instructor. With fewer students to consult, an instructor will be able to appropriately guide students in a more effective manner. This includes the ability to provide formal and informal feedback to students as they progress in their research projects. With fewer students to schedule for individual consultations, an instructor will be able to meet with the students more often. With fewer students to present their posters, professors will have more time to troubleshoot with students as they present their research projects in the poster session. In short, students will have greater access and more time with their research mentor(s). Ideally, we believe an appropriate and effective number for LWS 425 would be 10-12 students.

Many of the curriculum-based action items will experience significant lags until full implementation can occur. For example, any course developed would not appear in the Bulletin until (at the earliest) Fall 2016. Thus, there will be no substantive or significant alterations for about three years. Until then, Law and Society will need additional assistance from the administration to “grease” the wheels and assist in bridging the gap between now and the changes in the curriculum are implemented. Thus, the following action items are suggested:

1. Seek assistance from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Provost to assist in making conversations with other departments/faculty easier, especially given the fact that many of the LWS classes are offered and controlled by other departments.
2. All the suggested changes above require additional assistance in terms of faculty. Currently, there are only 2 full-time, tenure-track faculty teaching courses with the LWS designation. To implement these changes, we desperately need additional full-time faculty to provide the curricular and substantive changes and ensure student success in the major.

The results of this assessment will be discussed at the first fall meetings of the Law and Society Governance Committee and the Political Science Department, the department with governance responsibility for the major. The Law and Society Governance Committee will make specific recommendations to the Political Science Department at the Department’s second meeting of the academic year in October for implementation in the Spring 2016 semester. These will be conveyed to the College’s Outcomes Assessment Director, Virginia Moreno, and discussed in next year’s report.

**Table 1A. Rubric for Learning Outcome 3: Effective Writing**

<i>Item</i>	<i>100-Level: 200-Level: 300-Level: 400-Level:</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectations Exceeds Expectations Exceeds Expectations Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectations Exceeds Expectations Meets Expectations Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectations Meets Expectations Meets Expectations Fails to Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations Fails to Meet Expectations Fails to Meet Expectations Fails to Meet Expectations</i>
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b> <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	
<b>Content Development</b>	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b> <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields.</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.	
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.	
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	

## Assignment Prompt for the Papers Used in Assessment

### Final Paper

#### General Instructions

The final paper is the centerpiece of this course, toward which all other assignments will build. The final paper will require you to ask and answer a two-part empirical research question with the following components:

- 1) First, you must ask how law is present in an **everyday life** setting. This part of the question requires you to **describe** law's presence (or, if appropriate, its absence).
- 2) Second, you must assess either the **causes or the consequences** of law's presence (or absence) in that setting. This part of the question requires you to **explain** issues of cause and effect related to law and society.

**"Everyday life"** refers to settings outside official legal institutions of law. Your research for this course **cannot focus on courtrooms, prisons, or lawyers' offices**. However, you may trace the ways these institutions appear in everyday life settings, such as through policing of public space or lawyers' advertisements on the subway.

#### Assessment Criteria

I will grade the final papers according to the following criteria.

- Logical, creative, and insightful **research design** (20 pts.) and **written analysis** (15 pts.)
- Strong use of both secondary and primary **sources** (15 pts.) and proper **citation** (10 pts.)
- Clarity, mechanics, flow, presentation, and style of **writing** (15 pts.)
- **Structural organization and coherence** of the paper as a whole (15 pts.)
- Effort you put into the **research process** itself (10 pts.)

A scoring rubric summarizing these criteria is attached to this handout. Assessment of each factor will incorporate the detailed requirements outlined below.

#### Detailed Requirements: Mechanics

The final paper must be 20-25 pages long using 12-point Times New Roman font and 1" margins on all sides. Failure to meet these requirements will substantially damage your overall score, **in addition** to any impacts on specific rubric items (e.g., because of sloppy presentation or omitted sections).

A Works Cited section is required (see below) but does not count toward the page requirement. Title, abstract, and appendix pages are optional and do not count toward the page requirement.

You will also be required to upload your research materials (interview transcripts and field notes) as a separate file. These will not be graded but will serve as a reference for me as I grade your final paper.

### Detailed Requirements: Structure

The final paper must include the following material organized into distinct sections with their own headings. Good use of sections contributes directly to your structural coherence score, and also strengthens your analysis score.

- Introduction
  - briefly introduce your topic, your research question, and your thesis
- Literature review
  - summarize the relevant literature in a way that supports your research question
  - based on the literature review assignment but revised to fit the final paper in both style and substance
- Methods
  - describe and justify your methodology, including attention to its limits
  - based on the proposal assignment but revised to fit the final paper in both style and substance
- Findings
  - present your major findings organized according to theme, **not** according to data source
- Conclusion
  - analyze your findings and their implications and suggest directions for future research

Note that much of the final paper represents revised versions of earlier assignments. Use those earlier assignments as a starting draft, but be sure both to address my comments on those earlier assignments and to revise them as necessary to fit the final paper you actually wrote. The earlier assignments will have been completed before you did the research, and they thus might include some material that is no longer relevant or omit material that became relevant as a result of your research. Furthermore, some stylistic revision will be necessary to make sure the sections flow well as a complete paper.

### Detailed Requirements: Citation

The paper must cite at least fifteen **scholarly** sources using APA format. At least **three** citations must come from the following journals: *Law & Society Review*, *Law & Social Inquiry*, *Annual Review of Law & Social Science*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Problems*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Anthropologist*, *American Ethnologist*, and *Cultural Anthropology*.

As with all assignments, all claims and direct quotations taken from elsewhere must be completely cited in APA style. This includes using quotation marks where necessary. **ANY PLAGIARISM AT ANY POINT DURING THE TERM PAPER PROCESS WILL BE HARSHLY PUNISHED.** You must also include a Works Cited section at the end, arranged in APA style.