Fogelman College of Business and Economics Close the Loop Improvement Checklist Ph.D. in Business Administration Degree Spring, 2014

Degree Program: Ph.D.

| Goal | Objective | Recommendation | Implementation |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1.Students will | · · | | |
| | 1. Present a completed | 1. Rephrase to include | Wording was revised |
| demonstrate a | paper as part of student's | a quality dimension | on the Ph.D. degree |
| detailed | coursework requirements. | regarding evaluation | rubric to include a |
| knowledge of | | of paper. | quality dimension. A |
| their areas of | 2. Complete questions on | | quality statement was |
| specialization | theoretical topics from | 2. Insert requirement | added to the rubric to |
| | comprehensive exam. | for quality score on | include a requirement |
| | | performance on | for a quality score on |
| | 3. Publish a manuscript in | theoretical questions | theoretical questions. |
| | peer reviewed journal or | on comps. | The Rubric was |
| | national conference | | reworded to make a |
| | proceedings. | 3. Delete "national | distinction between |
| | | conference | levels of conference |
| | 4. Present a paper at a | proceedings" | proceedings expected |
| | national conference. | component, since | by the learning |
| | | Objective 4 deals with | outcome. Objective 5 |
| | 5. Successful final defense | conference | was deleted to remove |
| | of a dissertation. | presentations. Tie | redundancy from the |
| | | possible receipt of | learning outcome |
| | | summer research | rubric. |
| | | funding or | |
| | | assistantship to | |
| | | accomplishment of | |
| | | this Objective. | |
| | | - | |
| | | 4. Rephrase to include | |
| | | evaluation of | |
| | | presentations at local, | |
| | | national, and | |
| | | international | |
| | | conferences. | |
| | | | |
| | | 5. Delete – redundant | |
| | | since sample consists | |
| | | of graduated Ph.D.s | |

| Goal | Objective | Recommendation | Implementation |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2. Students will | 1. Complete analytical / | 6. Rephrase to include | Learning outcome |
| master | methodological questions | a quality dimension | rubric was reworded |
| analytical / | from students' | for performance on | to include a |
| methodological | comprehensive exams. | methodology section | performance quality |
| skills needed to | | of comprehensive | dimension for |
| evaluate and | 2. Publish a manuscript in | exam. | methodology for the |
| conduct | peer-reviewed journal or | | comprehensive exam. |
| research in their | national conference. | 7. Delete "national | The level of the |
| areas of | | conference | expected conference |
| specialization | 3. Present a paper at a | proceedings" | presentation was |
| | national conference. | component, since | revised for the rubric |
| | | Objective 3 deals with | to delete national |
| | 4. Successful final defense | conference | from the choices. The |
| | of a dissertation | presentations. | third objective was |
| | | | revised to include |
| | | 8. Rephrase to include | provisions for |
| | | evaluation of student | evaluation at local, |
| | | presentations at local, | state as well as |
| | | national as well as | international |
| | | international | conferences. The |
| | | conferences. | fourth elective for the |
| | | | learning outcome for |
| | | 9. Delete. Redundant | the rubric was deleted |
| | | since sample consists | to avoid redundancy. |
| | | of graduated Ph.D.s. | |

| Goal | Objective | Recommendation | Implementation |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Students will | <u>1</u> . Present a completed | 10. Rephrase to | The rubric for the |
| demonstrate | paper in research seminar to | include consideration | learning outcome was |
| ability to design | faculty. | of a quality dimension | revised to include a |
| and conduct | | regarding evaluation | dimension for quality |
| original | 2. Publish a manuscript in | of completed paper. | relative to evaluation |
| research in his | peer-reviewed journal or | | of the research paper. |
| or her chosen | national conference | 11. Delete "national | The rubric was |
| fields of | proceedings. | conference | revised to remove |
| specialization. | | proceedings" | national from the |
| | 3. Present a paper at a | component, since | wording for the |
| | national conference. | Objective 3 deals with | second objective. The |
| | | conference | third objective for the |
| | 4. Successful defense of a | presentations. | learning outcome |
| | dissertation. | | rubric was revised to |
| | | 12. Rephrase to | reflect local, national, |
| | | include evaluation of | and international |
| | | student presentations | levels for |
| | | at local, national as | presentations. The |
| | | well as international | fourth objective for |
| | | conferences. | the rubric was deleted |

| | to remove |
|--------------------|-------------|
| 13. Delete. | redundancy. |
| Redundant since | · |
| sample consists of | |
| graduated Ph.D.s. | |

| Goal | Objective | Recommendation | Implementation |
|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 4. Students will | 1. Complete instruction of | 14. Satisfactory | Ph.D. Coordinators |
| be able to teach | assigned college course or | progress. Suggest | and department chairs |
| college-level | classes with course. | continued focus on | have been developing |
| courses in their | | maintaining current | additional ways to |
| areas of | 2. Assess student teaching | performance standard | measure teaching |
| specialization. | evaluations for each course | and continuing to | effectiveness for |
| | taught by a Ph.D. student. | improve. | doctoral teaching |
| | | | assistants. |
| | | | |

| Goal | Objective | Recommendation | Implementation |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 5. Students will | 1. Evaluate written and oral | 15. Find ways to | Ph.D. Coordinators |
| be able to | presentations from student's | support and improve | agreed to work within |
| communicate | coursework. | student presentation | the departments to |
| results of their | | skills in | devise additional |
| research in a | | comprehensive | opportunities for |
| clear and | 2. Evaluate oral | exams. Increase | students to |
| concise manner. | presentation in research | presentation | demonstrate and |
| | seminar. | opportunities and | improve oral and |
| | | feedback to help | written |
| | | students prepare to | communications |
| | | think and present | skills. Oral and |
| | 3. Evaluate oral and written | ideas in face-to-face | written |
| | presentations given in | settings under exam | communication skills |
| | comprehensive exams. | pressure situations. | will be assessed |
| | | | separately during the |
| | | 16. General: Develop | next assessment cycle. |
| | | separate objectives for | |
| | | written & oral | |
| | | presentation skills. | |

Note: After a careful review and analysis of the assessment data, the Ph.D. Close the Loop Committee determined that all learning outcomes relating to the Ph.D. degree program were being achieved based on the benchmark of 70 percent or higher of the assessment results, based on the rubric, showing achievement at the Exemplary or higher level. However, the Committee felt that several adjustments and revisions of the criteria wording, as recommended, can be made to clarify and improve assessment of learning in the Ph.D. degree program during the next assessment of learning cycle.