

Assurance of Learning

PhD Program

Learning Goals, Objectives, & Assessment Processes/Methods

Timeline: calendar cycle for assessing and evaluating goals and objectives.

Learning Goals	F17	W18	S18	U18	F18	W19	S19	U19	F19	W20	S20
1	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	
2	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	
3	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R		
4	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	

- Legend and definitions
 - A: Assessment (Collection of Data on Student Performance)
 - C: Close the Loop (Evaluation of assessed data + Recommendations for change; pedagogically and in terms of instruments and rubrics)
 - E: Re-evaluate instruments
 - R: Refine goal, objectives, and rubrics
 - F: Finalize goal, objective, and rubrics

Learning goal #1: Our students will acquire advanced knowledge relevant to their areas of specialization.

- **Objective #1:** PhD students master the core body of knowledge of their discipline, as well as become experts in their specialized area of research.

Rubrics

- a. **Exam:** Comprehensive exam to test advanced specialized knowledge of the discipline
- b. **Time to Degree** used until 2/25/14, thereafter replaced by **Advancement to Candidacy**

Assessments

a. **Exam:**

- **Assessment:** Students demonstrate core knowledge by passing a comprehensive examination within two attempts.
- **Standard:** 80% and above meets standard

b. **Advancement to candidacy:**

- **Assessment:** Students demonstrate expertise in their specialized area of research by advancing to candidacy by June of their 3rd year.
- **Standard:** 100% meets standard

Timeline

Assessed every fall term, once per cohort. Loop to be closed every winter term.

Learning Goal	F17	W18	S18	U18	F18	W19	S19	U19	F19	W20	S20
1	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	



Learning goal #2: Our students will develop advanced research skills for their areas of specialization.

- **Objective #2:** PhD students conduct original research, contribute to the body of knowledge in their discipline, and disseminate this knowledge to their peers and professional colleagues.

Rubrics

Annual written evaluation: Written evaluations completed by the PhD Coordinators (freeform writing) and incorporating information from student self-evaluations (PhD Student Self Evaluation Template) (*See Appendix D*) and student CVs.

Assessments

a. **Presentations at major external venues:**

- **Assessment until 01/22/2013:** Students passing comprehensive exams present their own research at major external venues
- **Assessment:** Students passing comprehensive exams present at major external venues (1 - 2 per major)
- **Standard:** 80% and above present

b. Co-authored research paper with Lundquist faculty:

- **Assessment until 01/22/2013:** Students passing comprehensive exams co-author with Lundquist College of Business faculty
- **Assessment:** Students passing comprehensive exams co-author with Lundquist College of Business faculty and submit to a refereed conference or journal
- **Standard:** 80% and above co-authored

Timeline

Assessed every summer term, once per cohort. Loop to be closed every fall term.

Learning Goal	F17	W18	S18	U18	F18	W19	S19	U19	F19	W20	S20
2	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	



Learning goal #3: Our students will be able to assume teaching responsibilities at high-quality colleges and universities.

- **Objective #3:** PhD students prepare and deliver their own undergraduate courses in a rigorous and effective manner that promotes undergraduate student learning.

Rubrics

Student course evaluation: PhD Taught Course Evaluation Template (*See Appendix D*)

Assessments

a. Teaching excellence:

- **Assessment:** On a 5-point scale, all PhD students teaching their own course will be rated as “Exceptional” (5.0) or “Good” (4.0) in terms of instructional quality (the top two ratings out of 5) by 50% or greater percentage of their students on their evaluations.
- **Standard:** 100% meets the standard; changed to 80% on January 22, 2013

b. Instructional quality:

- **Assessment:** On a 5-point scale, the average course taught by a PhD student should be rated as above average (3.0) in the category of “instructional quality”.
- **Standard:** 100% meets the standard

Timeline

Assessed every summer term, for previous four terms. Loop to be closed every fall term.

Learning Goal	F17	W18	S18	U18	F18	W19	S19	U19	F19	W20	S20
3	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R		

.....
Learning goal #4: Our students will successfully graduate and place at high-quality, research-focused colleges and universities.

- **Objective #4:** PhD students achieve sufficient research and teaching experience to be competitive on the academic job market.

Rubrics

Inventory is taken at graduation and compiled for each cohort of graduating students. The Director of the PhD Program is responsible for tracking placement information.

Assessments

a. **Academic placement:**

- **Assessment:** Percentage of graduates placed in academic positions.
- **Standard:** 75% and above until 04/12/16; replaced by 100%.

b. **Doctorate-granting university placement:**

- **Assessment:** Percentage of graduates placed at doctorate-granting universities.
- **Standard:** 50% and above until 04/12/16; replaced by 67% and above.

c. **Major business doctorate-granting university placement**

- **Assessment:** Percentage of graduates placed at business doctorate-granting universities.
- **Standard:** 25% and above until 04/12/16; replaced by 33% and above.

Timeline

Assessed every summer term, for previous four terms. Loop to be closed every fall term.

Learning Goal	F17	W18	S18	U18	F18	W19	S19	U19	F19	W20	S20
4	A	C, R			A	C, R			A	C, R	

Status, Outcomes, & Results

How will you report and discuss your findings in your unit?

The PhD Program annually assesses each learning goal. Prior to the PhD Committee meeting (which consists of the 5 PhD Coordinators representing each department, the PhD Program Director, and a student representative), administrative staff sends out the data for the previous year so the committee has time to review it. During the PhD Committee meeting (only 2 goals are addressed per meeting), the data is discussed and the committee addresses questions including: Why have we met/not met this goal? What are we doing well/how could we do better? Are there other ways to measure or activities we should be assessing?

Afterwards, administrator sends the notes to the committee for approval, adjustments are made as necessary, and the information is posted on the Lundquist Intranet.

Decisions, Plans and Recommendations

Describe a general process for transforming analysis into action plans for improvement. Describe how action plans will be revisited and evaluated at some future date.

Changes that are recommended by the PhD Committee would be researched and implemented by the Director and Project Manager of the program. Data would be collected during a pilot period and upon completion of the pilot period, data would be reviewed and discussed as described above. Feedback would be collected from involved faculty and PhD students for major changes to programming. If the Project Manager or Director observe opportunities to improve processes, they can communicate this directly to the coordinators for feedback and implementation. Implementing changes is relatively easy given the size of the committee and program.