This annual report covers the period of section activity from the previous year (September 2020 to August 2021), plans for the coming year (September 2021 to August 2022), and budget for the next fiscal year (January 2022 to December 2022).

The Previous Year
Describe section activities during the period between September 2020 and August 2021.

Awards – Provide a description of the process by which winners were chosen.

Grad Student Paper Award:
Chair: Joan H Robinson: jrobinson1@ccny.cuny.edu
Shannon Malone Gonzalez: shannonmalone@utexas.edu
Marya Mtshali: marya_mtshali@fas.harvard.edu

Distinguished Career Award:
Chair: Celeste Watkins Hayes: cwhayes@umich.edu
Jessica Kizer: Jessica_Kizer@pitzer.edu
Courtney Patterson: cpatterson@wesleyan.edu
Joan Maya Mazelis: mazelis@camden.rutgers.edu

Best Article Prize:
Chair: Collin Mueller
muellerc@umd.edu
Diya Bose: dbose@wm.edu
Kasim Ortiz (Grad Student): kortiz5@unm.edu

Best Book:
Sharon Yee (Chair) sharon.yee@gccaz.edu
Katherine Irwin: kirwin@hawaii.edu
Amy Grau: agrau@ndm.edu
Kaitland Byrd: kaitbyrd@umich.edu

RGC Graduate Student Paper Award Report 2021

Committee:
Chair: Joan Robinson (The City College of New York, CUNY)
Member, Past Winner: Shannon Malone Gonzalez (University of Texas)
Member: Marya Mtshali (Harvard University)
Member: Rocío Garcia (Arizona State University)
Description:
This award is for the best graduate student paper in the field of race, gender, and class written by a graduate student. Eligible papers must be unpublished, sole-authored or authored with other students, and must have been written while the author was enrolled as a graduate student in 2018, 2019, or 2020.

Papers will be accepted from authors who are currently enrolled or who hold their terminal MA or PhD degree. Eligible papers must be no more than 25 pages in length (double-spaced, not counting references) and the references must follow the ASA Style Guide format.

Nominations may be submitted by the author or by others. To nominate a paper, applicants send an electronic copy of the paper and a letter of nomination not exceeding two pages that states why the paper makes a significant contribution to the field of race, gender, and class.

Goal:
The committee’s goal is to choose a winner and honorable mention for the Race, Gender, Class Graduate Student Paper Award.

Evaluation Criteria:
This award recognizes graduate students who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class. All submissions must be written by graduate students and the work must be unpublished at the time of submission.

Works should engage the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. However, be sure to consider whether the author excludes or ignores a category to the detriment of the work. For instance, a work that considers gender and sexuality but does not acknowledge racial difference could warrant a lower score.

An award-winning paper does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:
Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
• Readability. How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this paper?
• Contribution to Theory. Does the paper advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender, and class? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?
• Methods. Is this paper methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? (For purely theoretical papers, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?)

Criteria that should not be considered include:
• The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
• The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer or mentor.
• How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own
Task:
The committee’s task is to score each paper on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An outstanding article; <strong>definitely recommend</strong> for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An excellent article; <strong>probably recommend</strong> for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A good article; <strong>maybe recommend</strong> for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An article that has some merits, but also substantial weaknesses; <strong>probably do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has significant limitations; <strong>definitely do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure:

Round 1: Criteria-referenced scoring.
Each paper is read by two committee members. Committee members evaluate each submission according to the evaluation criteria above and score/rate each article in the first round on its own merits (not on a curve or in relation to each other, nor in consultation with other committee members). Each paper will be read by two committee members in the first round. Reading assignments are listed here. Submit scores in Google Form here.

Round 2: Norm-referenced scoring.
All papers will be read and reviewed by all committee members. Committee members evaluate each submission according to the evaluation criteria above and score each article in the second round on a curve / in relation to each other. We will agree upon a short list and put them in rank order. We will select a winner and honorable mention. Submit scores in Google Forms here.

Scoring for First Round: May 11 Meeting: 5/12 3pm EST Zoom link

Scoring for Second Round: June 9 Meeting: 6/10 3pm EST Zoom link

Decision submitted to RCG Committee: June 15

Submissions:

We had a total of 17 submissions for this award. For the first round of criteria-referenced scoring, each committee member was assigned either 8 or 9 papers to read. Each paper was rated by each reader on a scale from 1 to 5 on the four evaluation criteria listed above. The committee met to discuss and we were pleased that there was significant overlap between the two readers for each paper.
For the second round of norm-referenced scoring, each committee member read all of the papers and placed each in one of the following categories, roughly on a curve: 1 (2 papers), 2 (3 papers), 3 (7 papers), 4 (3 papers), and 5 (2 papers). Each person was asked to rank order their top five papers.

The committee met to discuss and we decided that all papers which were in anyone’s top five papers would be retained for further discussion. Upon much discussion we asked the Section Chair if we could award two winners, which we did:


- Winner: Blanca A. Ramirez, "Excluding Criminals or Mothers? How Vicarious Experiences Shape Legal Attitudes on Immigration Enforcement"

- Honorable Mention: Uriel Serrano, "Liberation is Just Wholesome, Complete, Intersectional: Intersectionality as a Multipurpose Collective Action Frame in the Youth Movement Against the Carceral State"

Recommendations for next year:
The committee recommends several steps to ensure fairness of the process. First, that the papers are anonymous to the committee, with names and institutions blinded to the readers. Next, we recommend that there is no statement of acceptance to a journal. Perhaps the committee could have a separate individual blind the papers before distribution.

Further, we recommend that there are no nomination letters. First, we know that recommendation letters frequently underserve students of color and women, while they serve to reinforce existing inequalities and privileges. Moreover, it would be difficult to retain such letters in an anonymous process.

Finally, We recommend more outreach for papers to increase the number of submission.

This report was prepared by Joan Robinson and any mistakes herein are mine alone.

RCG 2021 Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award Committee Report:

Committee Members:
Chair: Sharon Yee (Glendale CC)
Member: Katherine Irwin (U of Hawaii)
Member: Amy Grau (Notre Dame of Maryland University)
Member: Kaitland Byrd (U of Mich)

Goals: Our goal was to select the 2021 Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award.

Goal status: Completed. The timeline for the award process was as follows:
1/26-Call for nominations
3/1-Nominations due to chair
3/31-All books have to be received by committee
4/1-Committee updates the tracking document with books they have received
4/2-Chair makes the reading assignments based on which nominations are complete and communicates that out
5/17-First round of books is read and scores are reported back to chair
5/18-Chair tally the scores and identifies who are the few finalists
6/1-Final round of books is read and scores are reported back
6/11-Discussion of winner is made (either via email or conference call)
6/11-Report 2020 winner to section chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of nominations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of eligible nominations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In May, 2021, the committee determined that there would be three books that would be considered as finalists. Although historically there have been five finalists, the committee had the option of three finalists or eight finalists. Given the small size of the committee, the committee opted for three finalists.

On 6/1/2021, a decision was made regarding the finalist with the decision for honorable mention for a close second winner. The decision was communicated to the section chair for the section chair to order the plaques.

Recommendation: I recommend that we move our deadline for submission earlier to January 15 for the end of nominations and 1/31 for receiving all books or 1/31 for nominations and 2/15 to receive all books. This would put us more in alignment with the time frame of other sections. I do not, however, advocate or recommend accepting only electronic submissions.

Through this process, a few authors shared that they do not have electronic copies of their book and thus I believe that accepting only PDF of books would create barriers and a level of inequality. Additionally, the committee discussed accepting options of PDF books, given that campus closures due to COVID 19 were still in play during the 2021 award, and not all committee members desire to read a PDF copy. I recommend that the decision to allow for PDF books be made by the committee, but still require a hard copy for each of the books by the authors to ensure equity.

Proposed Process and Timeline:
January 26, 2021
Posting announcement: This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry. We accept nominations of books published (in print) in 2018, 2019, or 2020. Edited collections are not eligible.

Nominations may be submitted by the author or by others, and we encourage self-nominations. Authors must be members of the section unless membership costs would present a hardship (in such cases, please email the committee chair with a brief explanation). To nominate a book, please send a letter of nomination not exceeding two pages that states why the book makes a significant contribution to the field of race, gender, class, and related intersections. Letters of nominations will be acknowledged by the Chair of the Book Award Committee, Sharon Yee, Glendale Community College, sharon.yee@gccaz.edu, who will respond with information about where to send 6 copies of the nominated book. Please do not send books before receiving a response to the nomination. The deadline for nominations is March, 1, 2021; books must be received by all committee members by March 31, 2021 to be eligible.

Website: https://www.asanet.org/asa-communities/sections/sites/race-gender-and-class/race-gender-and-class-award-nomination-calls

Notes: Chair confirmed the nomination by email and verified that the nominee is a section member from a list sent from ASA after nominations had closed.

The chair kept a Google tracking log of the nominations. If the nominee was not a member of the section by the nomination deadline, then the nominee was automatically disqualified and marked in red. The chair also did a review of the nomination letter. If two of the three areas were not addressed in the nomination letter, it was automatically disqualified and not moved on to the tracking sheet for committee review.

The chair shared a Google document with the committee where assignments were made in a round robin format. In the same shared Google document, a separate tab was maintained for committee members to identify what books they had received and when.

The books were assigned out and each committee member had a scoring sheet to complete with comments. Scoring sheets were individual to avoid inadvertent biases. The chair did not read any of the books in order to remain impartial and ran all the logistics. Once the chair had all the scores for the first round, the scores were sorted numerically and the top three books were moved forward as finalists.

The committee read the three finalists and reported back their scoring by 6/1/2021 and determined a winner along with an honorable mention. The decisions were communicated to the section chair as well as award winners on 6/1/2021.
Goal: to create a short list of 5 books for the Race, Gender, Class Distinguished Book Award.

Task: 2 people independently evaluate each publication on the submission list

Deadline for First Round: May 1, 2020 - Postponed to March 1, 2021. Send scores directly to Chair: Sharon Yee sharon.yee@gccaz.edu rather than post them to the shared document so reviewers do not anchor scores on others’ impressions. The chair will not read the books in order to stay impartial and avoid biases based on others’ impressions.

The chair asked all committee members to update the spreadsheet with their correct book possessions by 10/1. On 9/28, the chair reached out to remind and confirm missing books with those who had missing books as noted on the tracking document.

This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry, engaging the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. However, be sure to consider whether the author excludes or ignores a category to the detriment of the work. For instance, a work that considers gender and class but does not acknowledge racial difference. That could warrant a lower score.

An award-winning publication does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:

- Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
- Readability. How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this publication?
- Contribution to Theory. Does the publication advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender and class? Is this publication theoretically important, interesting, or sophisticated? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?
- Methods. Is this publication methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? [For purely theoretical publications, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?]
- Impact. Will this publication impact the field or discipline? Is it likely to be read in 20 years?

Criteria that should not be considered include:

- The age, rank, or title of the author
- The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
- The author’s scholarly reputation outside of the publication
- The prestige of the publisher.
- The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer
- How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own
Task: score each publication on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see below). These ratings should be done independently and privately by committee members (rather than in the course of or after group discussion) to reduce the potential for bias.

● Qualitative comments on books are definitely welcome, and will add to our group discussion (but not necessary in this round – will be necessary for when we all read the short list books). The comments can be brief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An outstanding publication; <strong>definitely recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An excellent publication; <strong>probably recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A good publication; <strong>maybe recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A publication that has some merits, but also substantial weaknesses; <strong>probably do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has significant limitations; <strong>definitely do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process for Round 2: Final Round

Goal: to select the winner of the Race, Gender, Class Distinguished Book Award.

Task: all committee members independently evaluate each publication on the submission list

Deadline for Second Round: June 1, 2020 postponed to June 1, 2021
Send scores directly to Chair: Sharon Yee sharon.yee@gccaz.edu rather than post them to the shared document so reviewers do not anchor scores on others’ impressions

This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry, engaging the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. However, be sure to consider whether the author excludes or ignores a category to the detriment of the work. For instance, a work that considers gender and class but does not acknowledge racial difference. That could warrant a lower score.

An award-winning publication does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:

- Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
- Readability. How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this publication?
- Contribution to Theory. Does the publication advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender and class? Is this publication theoretically important, interesting, or
sophisticated? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?

- Methods. Is this publication methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? [For purely theoretical publications, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?]

- Impact. Will this publication impact the field or discipline? Is it likely to be read in 20 years?

- Criteria that should not be considered include:
  - The age, rank, or title of the author
  - The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
  - The author’s scholarly reputation outside of the publication
  - The prestige of the publisher.
  - The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer
  - How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own

1st Task: score each publication on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see below). These ratings should be done independently and privately by committee members (rather than in the course of or after group discussion) to reduce the potential for bias. The chair will tally the results and notify the committee. We will have a discussion if necessary. The chair will not rank the books in order to avoid being biased by others’ input.

- Qualitative comments on books are definitely welcome, and will add to our group discussion (but not necessary in this round – will be necessary for when we all read the short list books). The comments can be brief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>An outstanding publication; <strong>first choice</strong> for award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An excellent publication; <strong>should have honorable mention</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third choice for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fourth choice for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fifth choice for award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd Task: determine if we should have an honorable mention selection.

Additional information: The chair, Sharon Yee, is willing to share a folder with sample tracking sheets, emails, protocols, and templates for the next chair.

RCG 2020 Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award Committee Report:

Committee Members:
Chair: Sharon Yee (Glendale CC)
Member, Past Winner: Karida Brown (UCLA) - Removed as of 10/2020 for being unresponsive
Member: Hae Yeon Hoo (U Toronto, Mississauga)
Member: Gowri Vijayakumar (Brandeis U)
Member: Shobha Hamal Gurung (Southern Utah)
Member: Kaitland Byrd (U of Mich)

Goals: Our goal was to select the 2020 Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award.

Goal status: Completed. Due to the global pandemic of COVID-19, we were unable to achieve our goal as many of our committee members were at institutions that closed and remained closed prior to the 3/31/2020 deadline to receive the books. Some of us are still unable to return to campus to retrieve any books that have been delivered between the institutional shutdown and the end of July, 2020. Thus, we have requested to postpone the award decision until the 2021 ASA meeting.

In February, 2021, the committee determined that there would be three books that would be considered as finalists. Although historically there have been five finalists, the committee had the option of three finalists or eight finalists. Given that we lost a committee member along the way, the committee opted for three finalists.

By the end of May 2021, a decision was made regarding the finalist. The decision was communicated to the section chair and award recipient on 6/1/2021 via email in order to have that information included in the ASA annual meeting program.

Additional information: From March to mid April, the committee discussed how to proceed and decided that it would be good to see how other sections were handling their book award. On April 20, 2020, the Chair reached out to multiple other sections that had a book award to see how they were moving forward with their book award and process if they were still receiving books. Most sections had earlier deadlines for book submissions and some required all books to be sent electronically. Based on this information, the committee determined that we would like to move forward with the award, but requested to make the award announcement at a later date as not all members had access to the books. This request was made to the section chair by the committee chair.

The section chair gained input from the other award committee chairs. The Book Award committee will proceed with the 2020 book award and make the announcement at the 2021 meeting. No other book nominations will be accepted. Nominees were notified of the status of the award as noted later in the process and timeline section.

Recommendation: I recommend that we move our deadline for submission earlier to January 15 for the end of nominations and 1/31 for receiving all books or 1/31 for nominations and 2/15 to receive all books. This would put us more in alignment with the time frame of other sections. I do not, however, advocate or recommend accepting only electronic submissions. Through this process, a few authors shared that they do not have electronic copies of their book and thus I believe that accepting only PDF of books would create barriers and a level of inequality.

Proposed Process and Timeline:
January 9, 2020

Posting announcement: This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry. We accept nominations of books published (in print) in 2017, 2018, or 2019. Edited collections are not eligible.

Nominations may be submitted by the author or by others, and we encourage self-nominations.

Authors must be members of the section unless membership costs would present a hardship (in such cases, please email the committee chair with a brief explanation). To nominate a book, please send a letter of nomination not exceeding two pages that states why the book makes a significant contribution to the field of race, gender, class, and related intersections. Letters of nominations will be acknowledged by the Chair of the Book Award Committee, Sharon Yee, Glendale Community College, sharon.yee@gccaz.edu, who will respond with information about where to send 6 copies of the nominated book. Please do not send books before receiving a response to the nomination. The deadline for nominations is March, 1, 2020; books must be received by all committee members by March 31, 2020 to be eligible.

Website:

Notes: Chair confirmed the nomination by email and verified that the nominee is a section member. If the nominee was not a section member, then the chair notified the nominator that the nominee needs to be a section member by the nomination deadline of 3/1/2020.

The chair kept a Google tracking log of the nominations. If the nominee was not a member of the section by the nomination deadline, then the nominee was automatically disqualified and marked in red. The chair also did a review of the nomination letter. If two of the three areas were not addressed in the nomination letter, it was automatically disqualified and not moved on to the tracking sheet for committee review.

The chair shared a Google document with the committee where assignments were made in a round robin format, but committee members' areas of expertise and interest were taken into account when possible. In the same shared Google document, a separate tab was maintained for committee members to identify what books they had received and when. Given the global pandemic, on 7/23 the chair of the committee requested feedback on an email that would be sent to all nominees notifying them of the status of the award. The email to section member only nominees was sent out on 7/31/2020 along with an accompanying certificate of nomination acknowledgement to each nominee (or one author of the nominated work to be shared with their co-authors).
Recommendation—I implemented the idea of an nomination acknowledgement award after hearing that the Teaching and Learning Section did this for one of their awards. I recommend this continue as it’s simple, but it allows people to feel appreciated and acknowledge their nomination in a more formal way than just by email. It also provides nominees something tangible for their tenure packets.

Goal: to create a short list of 5 books for the Race, Gender, Class Distinguished Book Award.

Task: 2 people independently evaluate each publication on the submission list

Deadline for First Round: May 1, 2020 -Postponed to March 1, 2021. Send scores directly to Chair: Sharon Yee sharon.yee@gccaz.edu rather than post them to the shared document so reviewers do not anchor scores on others’ impressions. The chair will not read the books in order to stay impartial and avoid biases based on others’ impressions.

The chair asked all committee members to update the spreadsheet with their correct book possessions by 10/1/2020. On 9/28/2020, the chair reached out to remind and confirm missing books with those who had missing books as noted on the tracking document.

This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry, engaging the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. However, be sure to consider whether the author excludes or ignores a category to the detriment of the work. For instance, a work that considers gender and class but does not acknowledge racial difference. That could warrant a lower score.

An award-winning publication does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:

- Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
- Readability. How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this publication?
- Contribution to Theory. Does the publication advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender, and class? Is this publication theoretically important, interesting, or sophisticated? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?
- Methods. Is this publication methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? [For purely theoretical publications, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?]
- Impact. Will this publication impact the field or discipline? Is it likely to be read in 20 years?

Criteria that should not be considered include:

- The age, rank, or title of the author
• The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
• The author’s scholarly reputation outside of the publication
• The prestige of the publisher.
• The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer
• How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own

Task: score each publication on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see below). These ratings should be done independently and privately by committee members (rather than in the course of or after group discussion) to reduce the potential for bias.

● Qualitative comments on books are definitely welcome, and will add to our group discussion (but not necessary in this round – will be necessary for when we all read the short list books). The comments can be brief.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An outstanding publication; <strong>definitely recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An excellent publication; <strong>probably recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A good publication; <strong>maybe recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A publication that has some merits, but also substantial weaknesses; <strong>probably do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has significant limitations; <strong>definitely do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process for Round 2: Final Round
Goal: to select the winner of the Race, Gender, Class Distinguished Book Award.

Task: all committee members independently evaluate each publication on the submission list

Deadline for Second Round: June 1, 2020 postponed to June 1, 2021

Send scores directly to Chair: Sharon Yee sharon.yee@gccaz.edu rather than post them to the shared document so reviewers do not anchor scores on others' impressions.

This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a book on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry, engaging the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. However, be sure to consider whether the author excludes or ignores a category to the detriment of the work. For instance, a work that considers gender and class but does not acknowledge racial difference. That could warrant a lower score.
An award-winning publication does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:

- Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
- Readability. How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this publication?
- Contribution to Theory. Does the publication advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender and class? Is this publication theoretically important, interesting, or sophisticated? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?
- Methods. Is this publication methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? [For purely theoretical publications, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?]
- Impact. Will this publication impact the field or discipline? Is it likely to be read in 20 years?

Criteria that should not be considered include:

- The age, rank, or title of the author
- The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
- The author’s scholarly reputation outside of the publication
- The prestige of the publisher.
- The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer
- How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own

1st Task: score each publication on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see below). These ratings should be done independently and privately by committee members (rather than in the course of or after group discussion) to reduce the potential for bias. The chair will tally the results and notify the committee. We will have a discussion if necessary. The chair will not rank the books in order to avoid being biased by others’ input.

Qualitative comments on books are definitely welcome, and will add to our group discussion (but not necessary in this round – will be necessary for when we all read the short list books). The comments can be brief.

| 5 | An outstanding publication; **first choice** for award |
| 4 | An excellent publication; **should have honorable mention** for award |
| 3 | Third choice for award |
| 2 | Fourth choice for award |
| 1 | Fifth choice for award |

2nd Task: determine if we should have an honorable mention selection.
Additional information: The chair, Sharon Yee, is willing to share a folder with sample tracking sheets, emails, protocols, and templates for the next chair.

Distinguished Career Award Committee Report

Chair: Celeste Watkins Hayes: cwhayes@umich.edu
Jessica Kizer: Jessica_Kizer@pitzer.edu
Courtney Patterson: cpatterson@wesleyan.edu
Joan Maya Mazelis: mazelis@camden.rutgers.edu

Award Planning:

Through email correspondence beginning 2021, the committee used a Google form in which nominators could submit application materials.

We required nominators to submit the nominee’s name and contact information, up to 250 word rationale for the nomination, a list of up to 5 significant contributions (including but not limited to publications, creative project, research initiative, innovations in teaching/pedagogy, policy interventions, depth of mentorship, etc.), and current CV.

Nomination Call:

The Race, Gender, and Class Distinguished Career Award was established to honor ASA RGC section members who have made significant contributions to the development of the field of race, gender, class, and related intersections over the course of their career. Please submit your nominations the committee via our google form by Friday April 30, 2021. Complete nominations include name and contact information, up to 250 word rationale for the nomination, a list of up to 5 significant contributions (including but not limited to publications, creative project, research initiative, innovations in teaching/pedagogy, policy interventions, depth of mentorship, etc.), and current CV. Self-nominations are welcome. Must be member of the RGC section, unless the membership cost is prohibitive. Celeste Watkins Hayes: cwhayes@umich.edu. Form address: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdcuzwp4fnkcs-s3Pnr7rCA5win474_9DZhNcdfOaXPBBaP4A/viewform

Evaluation Process:

After the deadline passed, each committee member evaluated the nomination packet and ranked the nominees. Since there was not a unanimous ranking, we meet via zoom to discuss the nominees and hold another vote. Through the discussion we decided both nominees were deserving, especially considering our emphasis on full career. All members then voted unanimously to award co-winners.

Winner: Adia Wingfield

RGC Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Article Award Report 2021
Committee:
Chair: Collin Mueller
Member: Diya Bose
Member: Kasim Ortiz
Member: Jennifer Randles

Description:
This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a journal article or book chapter on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry. We accept nominations of articles and book chapters published (in print) in 2018, 2019, or 2020. Nominations may be submitted by the author or by others, and we encourage self-nominations. At least one author of each submission must be a member of the Race/Gender/Class Section, unless membership costs would present a hardship (in such cases, please email the committee chair with a brief explanation).

Our committee’s goal is to choose a winner or winners and an honorable mention for the Race, Gender, and Class Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Article Award.

Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria:
This award recognizes scholars who have made a significant contribution to the development of the integrative field of race, gender, and class through the publication of a journal article or book chapter on the "cutting edge" of sociological inquiry. All nominated papers must have been published (in print) in 2018, 2019, or 2020. At least one author of each submission must be a member of the Race/Gender/Class Section. Works should engage the intersection of at least two areas of either race, gender, and/or class. An award-winning publication does not need to be the best in every single area, but should be strong in most of the following areas:
  § Importance of Topic. Is the topic intellectually or socially significant?
  § Readability: How readable, engaging, well-written and well-organized is this publication?
  § Contribution to Theory. Does the publication advance intellectual debates relevant to race, gender and class? Is this publication theoretically important, interesting, or sophisticated? Does it analyze the intersection of these categories in new, innovative or important ways?
  § Methods. Is this publication methodologically sound? Is it methodologically interesting, innovative, creative, or does it use fascinating data well? Is it rigorous in data collection or analysis? [For purely theoretical publications, are the logical reasoning and argumentation rigorous, insightful, or creative?]

Criteria that should not be considered include:
• The author’s home institute (e.g., prestige, location, etc.)
• The identity/prestige or status of the nomination letter writer or mentor.
• How close it is to your work in topic or method; make a concerted effort to recognize excellence in fields that are farther from your own

Procedure Details:
Round 1: Individual Scoring

The goal of this step is to independently evaluate each publication on the submission list. Each paper is read by two committee members in the first round. Evaluators are instructed to score/rate each article in the first round on its own merits, and to not worry about comparing works. We do that in the second round. Here are the steps we each take for this first round:

• Please download the “First Round RGC Article Evaluation Sheet” here.
• You will see a column with your first name on it, and if you scroll down you will see 17 cells that are highlighted and blank; each of these cells corresponds with a paper that has been nominated for you to evaluate. Please do not assign scores to the cells that are not highlighted; I have filled these in with the words “DO NOT SCORE” to clarify.
• If you look to the left of each highlighted cell, you will find links for the nomination letter and paper. Please click the links and evaluate the paper.
• After you evaluate the paper, replace the word “SCORE” with a number ranging from 1-5. Here are the scoring instructions for the first round. Please score each paper on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest recommendation, and 1 being the lowest recommendation (see table below for more detail). These ratings should be done independently and privately by committee members (rather than in the course of or after group discussion) to reduce the potential for bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An outstanding article; <strong>definitely recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An excellent article; <strong>probably recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A good article; <strong>maybe recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An article that has some merits, but also substantial weaknesses; <strong>probably do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has significant limitations; <strong>definitely do not recommend</strong> for award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• When you have completed all the reviews, please email a copy of the sheet with your scores filled in directly to the Chair rather than post them in the shared document, so other selection committee members do not anchor scores on others’ impressions.

Qualitative comments on articles are welcome and add to our group discussion. Comments are not necessary in this round but will be necessary for when we all discuss the short list articles together.

Methodology for identifying the shortlist

Here is the methodology the Chair used to identify the “shortlist” of the 8 papers that we collectively read and rank order. The Chair identified the highest-rated papers in two steps:

• First, I took the average assigned score across the two assigned reviewers (“Raw average”, column L in the spreadsheet). This is not a perfect method; one reason is because scorers vary in their average assigned scores (looking at row 37 in the spreadsheet, we can see that the overall average scores assigned by each reviewer were 3.24, 3.47, 2.88, and 3.32, respectively). So, assuming that there are not “real” differences in the average quality of the individual papers assigned across reviewers, I wanted to take a second approach to try to mitigate possible scorer-level effects.
In the second step, I wanted to “adjust” for the possibility that one reviewer may tend to assign higher or lower scores than another reviewer. There are a few different ways we might do this, but I took the approach of assigning simple weights. I did this by calculating weighted averages: I first calculated a reviewer’s weighted paper score (by dividing the assigned raw score by the reviewer's overall average scores) and then averaged the two assigned scorers’ weighted scores to arrive at a “weighted score” for each paper. Reviewers’ weighted scores are reported in the columns immediately to the right of their assigned scores in the spreadsheet, and the “Weighted average” is reported in column M.

Substantive findings from this approach for identifying a “shortlist”:
- When I identified the top 5 papers in each method, I noticed that the two methods diverged regarding which papers were the overall top 5. But, the top 8 papers were the same across both methods. So, I highlighted the last names of the authors of the top 8 papers (column A) in the spreadsheet.
- I also highlighted the top 8 “raw average” scores (column L) and top 8 “weighted average” scores (column M), and I placed the top 5 scores in bold font in each of the two “averages” columns.

Round 2: Ranking and Final Selection

In the second/final round, all of the “shortlisted” papers are read and reviewed by all committee members. We each put them in rank order. Then, we meet via Zoom as a group to compare notes and select a winner and an honorable mention.

Timeline:

Scoring for first round: April 15, 2021
Scoring for second round: May 1, 2021
Decision submitted to RGC Committee: June 15

Submissions:

We had a total of 34 submissions for this award.

For the first round of scoring, each committee member was assigned half the papers (17) to read. Each paper was rated by each reader on a scale from 1 to 5 on the evaluation criteria listed above. The Chair then used this information to identify a “shortlist” of articles through a combination of (1) identifying the highest scores in terms of the actual number assigned and (2) identifying the highest scores by leveraging evaluator-level weighting to standardize scoring across evaluators, using the methodology described above. For the second round, each committee member independently read and rank-ordered all of the shortlisted papers. Each committee member brought their rank-ordering to the meeting where we met to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the articles, and quickly reached consensus about our winners.
We selected three award winners: the two Co-Winners are “The Racialization of Privacy” by Jessica Vasquez-Tokos and Priscilla Yamin and “The Sociology of Gaslighting” by Paige Sweet, and the Honorable Mention is “Intersectionality, Cognition, Disclosure and Black LGBT Views on Civil Rights and Marriage Equality” by Shawn McGuffey.

Recommendations for next year:
In line with the recommendations from the RGC Graduate Student Paper Award Committee’s recommendations, this committee also recommends several steps to enhance fairness of the process. First, we recommend that the papers be anonymous to the committee, with names and institutions blinded to the readers. Second, we recommend that subsequent years’ committees thoughtfully decide whether to blind the journal to which the article has been accepted. Third, we recommend that there are no nomination letters. We know that recommendation letters frequently underserve students of color and women, while they serve to reinforce existing inequalities and privileges. Moreover, it would be difficult to retain such letters in an anonymous process. Finally, We recommend more outreach for nominations to increase the number of submissions.

This report was prepared by Collin Mueller and any mistakes herein are mine alone.

Communications – How does the section communicate with its members? Did it begin using any new technologies or strategies? If so, were they effective? Include links to the section website, newsletters, and any other electronic media used.

Section Listserv Announcements

Kris Marsh compiled weekly to monthly announcements from the Race, Gender, and Class section email account (asargcsection@gmail.com) and distributed to the section listserv. Newsletter.

Social Media
• Twitter: @RaceGenderClass with 887 followers
• Facebook: @ASARaceGenderClass with 187 followers
• Instagram: @asaracegendercass with 4 followers

Diversity and Inclusion – Provide information on recent work on diversity and inclusion.

The section had the following panel:

Race, Gender, Class Section Meeting
Wednesday, February 17, 2021
11-12:30 PST

Tentative Agenda

11:00-11:05 Chair Opening Remarks
11:05-11:35 Discussion of RGC section activities (30 minutes)
Brief intro of council members.
Members might make brief announcements related to their respective roles/duties/tasks & report out?

1. Election Coordinator
   Contact: Kyle Crowder and Collin Mueller
2. Award Committee
   Contact: Nicole
3. Social Media
   Contact: Myron
4. Professional Development
   Contact: Queen
5. Website
   Contact: Myron

break! (5 min)

11:40-12:25 Panel Discussion: (45 minutes)
Achieving Work/Life Balance/Harmony/Integration Under COVID19 or Nah?

Invited Guest Panelists

Dr. Tanya Maria Golash-Boza
Professor of Sociology
University of California, Merced

Dr. Nadia Y. Kim
Professor
Sociology, Loyola Marymount University

Dr. Alicia Brunson
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Georgia Southern University

Dr. Raúl Pérez
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
University of La Verne

Facilitator: Zulema Valdez
Facilitated conversation 30 minutes, with 15 minutes for additional questions from attendees.

12:25-12:30 Chair Closing Remarks (5 minutes)
Adjourn.

Membership recruitment and retention – What efforts did the section make to retain members and reach out to new members? What were the results of the efforts?

No specific efforts were conducted between ASA 2020 and ASA 2021. It is notable that the RGC section membership is very strong despite little in the way of deliberate efforts to increase membership.

Mentoring – What, if any, mentoring opportunities does the section offer to students, early career faculty, nonfaculty, etc.?

See diversity and inclusion section above

Programming – Provide an overview of the section’s programming at the annual meeting, scholarly/professional development activities outside of the annual meeting, development of substantive resources, partnerships with other sections or groups, etc.

The 2021 annual conference. This limited programming.