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Student Learning Outcome: Effectively Analyze Literature

Ph.D. candidates will have the ability to effectively analyze literature in their fields.

Outcome Status: Active
Outcome Type: Student Learning
Start Date: 07/15/2010

Assessment Methods

Criterion: "Sufficient competence in the analysis of business research literature for success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role".

Although this stringent standard will be perceived slightly differently by each doctoral faculty evaluator, it allows each evaluator (rater) to clearly identify sufficiency on the scale. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and other colleges of business. Thus, the aggregate (average) judgment of raters sets the criterion.

This rubric is anchored such that ratings of 0 or 1 (0-4 scale) are the range in which the ability to analyze business research literature is unacceptable for a graduate to function successfully in an assistant professor, research oriented, tenure track role. A rating of 2 is "minimally/marginally acceptable performance (on the criterion). Ratings 3 and 4 on the scale represent higher likelihoods of success in a tenure line, based on a superior ability to analyze business research.

Schedule: This is an annual evaluation process.

Related Documents:
PhD Strategic Narrative
PhD Student Learning Narrative
PhD Student Performance Evaluations - Combined File.xls

Student Learning Outcome: Effectively Synthesize Literature

Ph.D. candidates should have the ability to effectively synthesize literature in their field.
Degree Program - COB - Business Administration (PHD)

Outcome Status: Active
Outcome Type: Student Learning
Start Date: 07/15/2010

Assessment Methods

Post-Evaluation - The Rawls College of Business developed a rubric for the evaluation of business doctoral students. It uses a criterion based benchmark for evaluation, which sets a fairly stringent standard for skill and ability, which should be met by the end of the fourth year. Students are rated annually by faculty with whom they have worked.

(See Related Documents for the rubric and scoring instructions).
*Note: This method is a perennial post-annum evaluation. (Active)

Criterion: "Sufficient competence in the synthesis of business research literature for success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role". Students demonstrate the ability to combine and integrate theory from the business research literature throughout their doctoral research work and in their coursework.

Although this stringent standard will be perceived slightly differently by each doctoral faculty evaluator, it allows each evaluator (rater) to clearly identify sufficiency on the scale. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and other colleges of business. Thus, the aggregate (average) judgment of raters sets the criterion.

This rubric is anchored such that ratings of 0 or 1 (0-4 scale) are the range in which the ability to analyze business research literature is unacceptable for a graduate to function successfully in an assistant professor, research oriented, tenure track role. A rating of 2 is "minimally/marginally acceptable performance (on the criterion). Ratings 3 and 4 on the scale represent higher likelihoods of success in a tenure line, based on a superior ability to combine and integrate business theory for empirical testing.

Schedule: Annual Evaluation
Related Documents: PhD Student Performance Evaluations - Combined File.xls

Student Learning Outcome: Research Knowledge

Ph.D. candidates should have a breadth of research knowledge including research theory and research methodology.

Outcome Status: Active
Outcome Type: Student Learning
Start Date: 07/15/2010

Assessment Methods

Qualifying Exam - The earliest point in training at which research knowledge is thoroughly demonstrated is on qualifying exams, in the third year. Particular methods courses also involve components of this SLO, but do not cover the breadth of accomplishments needed to meet the criteria for this SLO.

(Active)

Criterion: Program Criterion: 90% of PhD students should surpass this standard by their third year of training.

Individual Criterion: "Sufficient knowledge of the research methods in the discipline of business discipline to promote success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role". Business has discipline specific methodology, such as the use of commercial business databases, acquisition and handling of proprietary corporate data, et cetera, which each student must master for a successful academic career.

This stringent standard will be perceived slightly differently by each qualifying exam grader, and their combined judgment determines success on this criterion. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and other colleges of business. The passing threshold for qualifying exams is how well the student stands to perform as a faculty member, based on qualifying exam performance.
Degree Program - COB - Business Administration (PHD)

**Schedule:** This is an annual evaluation process, completed once for each 3rd year student who successfully passes. (Students who are unsuccessful have a repeated measurement.)

**Post-Evaluation** - The Rawls College of Business a multi-part developed rubric for the evaluation of business doctoral students. It uses a criterion based benchmark for evaluation, which sets a fairly stringent standard for skill and ability, which should be met by the end of the fourth year. Students are rated annually by faculty with whom they have worked, or who have direct knowledge of their research methods acumen.

(See Related Documents for the rubric and scoring instructions).

*Note: This method is a perennial, post-annum evaluation. Criterion Criterion: "Sufficient knowledge of the research methods in the discipline of business discipline to promote success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role". Business has discipline specific methodology, such as the use of commercial business databases, acquisition and handling of proprietary corporate data, et cetera, which each student must master for a successful academic career. (Active)

**Criterion:** Although this standard will be perceived slightly differently by each doctoral faculty evaluator, it allows each evaluator (rater) to clearly identify sufficiency on the scale. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and other colleges of business. Thus, the aggregate (average) judgment of raters sets the criterion.

This rubric is anchored such that ratings of 0 or 1 (0-4 scale) are the range in which the research methods competence is unacceptable for a graduate to function successfully in an assistant professor, research oriented, tenure track role. A rating of 2 is "minimally/marginally acceptable performance (on the criterion). Ratings 3 and 4 on the scale represent higher likelihoods of success in a tenure line, based on a superior research methodological skill.

**Schedule:** Annual evaluation of students by doctoral faculty.

**Related Documents:**
- PhD Student Performance Evaluations - Combined File.xls

---

**Student Learning Outcome:** Expertise in Field of Study

Ph.D. candidates should have acquired expertise in the academic literature in their field of emphasis and supporting fields.

**Outcome Status:** Active
**Outcome Type:** Student Learning
**Start Date:** 07/15/2010

**Assessment Methods**

**Post-Evaluation** - The breadth and depth of knowledge of the literature in one's field is essential for academic success. This knowledge is specifically elicited and carefully evaluated in the qualifying examination process, although coursework in the first two years is also demonstrative for those not undergoing qualifying exams. In the fourth year, continuing progress on research demonstrates this knowledge.

These sources of data are captured annually on a rubric developed for this purpose. The rubric uses a criterion based benchmark for evaluation of students at different levels of progress through the program. It sets a fairly stringent standard for knowledge, which should be met by the end of the fourth year. Students are rated annually by faculty with whom they have worked, and as part of the third year qualifying examination process.

(See Related Documents for the rubric and scoring instructions).

*Note: This method is a perennial, post-annum evaluation. (Active)

**Criterion:** "Sufficient knowledge of the literature within the discipline to promote success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role". There is a vast research literature for business academics, and each area has a wealth of discipline specific knowledge. Students must master that literature to become successful researchers.

Although this stringent standard will be perceived slightly differently by each doctoral faculty evaluator, it allows each evaluator (rater) to clearly identify sufficiency on the scale. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and
other colleges of business. Thus, the aggregate (average) judgment of raters sets the criterion.

This rubric is anchored such that ratings of 0 or 1 (0-4 scale) are the range in which mastery of the content of the academic field is unacceptable for a graduate to function successfully in an assistant professor, research oriented, tenure track role. A rating of 2 is "minimally/marginally acceptable performance (on the criterion). Ratings 3 and 4 on the scale represent higher likelihoods of success in a tenure line, based on breadth and depth of knowledge of the literature.

First and second year students are not expected to have a level of knowledge sufficient perform well in an academic professional setting. There is no minimum criterion on the rubric for these groups. Roughly 50% of 3rd years, and more than 90% of 4th year students should surpass the threshold.

Schedule: This is an annual evaluation process, although the most complete test of student standing on this SLO is the 3rd year qualifying examination process.

Related Documents:
PhD Student Performance Evaluations - Combined File.xls

---

**Qualifying Exam** - Qualifying exam performance provides a robust and thorough demonstration of doctoral students' knowledge of the relevant business literature. This metric applies solely to 3rd years students and to those more advanced students who failed qualifying exam previously. (Active)

**Criterion:** Program Criterion: 90% of PhD students should surpass this standard by their third year of training.

Individual Criterion: "Sufficient knowledge of the academic literature in the relevant discipline in business to promote success in a research-oriented tenure-track, assistant professor role". Business has discipline-specific literature that is quite extensive. Each student must master that literature for a successful academic career.

This stringent standard will be perceived slightly differently by each qualifying exam grader, and their combined judgment determines success on this criterion. Doctoral faculty are keenly aware of the requirements for success at this and other colleges of business. The passing threshold for qualifying exams is how well the student stands to perform as a faculty member, based on qualifying exam performance.

Schedule: Annual administration of qualifying exams are conducted.

---

**Student Learning Outcome:** Communication of Complex Information

Ph.D. candidates should be able to communicate complex information clearly and coherently.

**Outcome Status:** Active
**Outcome Type:** Student Learning
**Start Date:** 06/01/2005
**End Date:** 06/01/2006

**Assessment Methods**

**Dissertation** - Completion of original research (dissertation) will be monitored to indicate the ability to effectively communicate complex research information. Timeliness of completion is a robust and multifaceted indicator of training program performance that is sensitive to challenges both internal to the program and personal challenges of the student. Thus, although it is considerably more sensitive than it is specific (i.e. prone to false positives), its high negative predictive power makes it an important metric to be tracked for oversight of students' ability to communicate in a scholarly fashion. (Active)

**Criterion:** Successful defense of dissertation within 24 months of candidacy should be the norm for doctoral candidates. Unlike other learning outcomes, this SLO has particular relevance only for those admitted to doctoral candidacy. Thus, 75% of doctoral candidates should complete the writing of the dissertation within this timeframe. Put another way, exceptions to this are expected, with roughly 1 in 4 students.

Schedule: The dissertation proposal to defense cycle can begin and end at nearly any time of the calendar or academic year. However, the assessment of the timeliness of completion criterion in the PhD program should be monitored annually, based on the academic year.
**Post-Evaluation** - Communication skill is an inevitable and core requisite for academic success. There are several activities that indicate scholarly communication ability, including coursework, qualifying exams, research productivity, and the dissertation. Faculty work closely with doctoral students and have a clear understanding of student communication ability and how it develops through the program.

Faculty evaluation of student communication ability is captured annually on a rubric developed for this purpose. The rubric uses a criterion based benchmark for evaluation of students at different levels of progress through the program. Students are rated annually by faculty from whom they take classes, with whom they have worked on research, and as part of the third year qualifying examination process and subsequent dissertation.

(See Related Documents for the rubric and scoring instructions).

*Note: This method is a perennial, post-annum evaluation. (Active)*

**Criterion:** This rubric is anchored such that ratings of 0 or 1 (0-4 scale) are the range in which mastery of scholarly communication is unacceptable for a graduate to function successfully in an assistant professor, research-oriented, tenure-track role. A rating of 2 is "minimally/marginally acceptable communication skill). Ratings 3 and 4 on the scale represent higher likelihoods of success in a tenure line, based on breadth and depth of knowledge of the literature.

For new PhD students, evaluated at the end of their first year, it is fully expected that they will NOT have sufficient communication skills to perform well in an academic professional setting. Thus, there is no minimum criterion on the rubric for this group.

As students advance through the program, their knowledge should rise steadily and surpass the threshold for effective functioning in a tenure-track role (Level 2). The median student is expected to reach this threshold by the end of the third year, as indicated by qualifying exam. Very nearly 100% of students are expected to reach or surpass this level by the doctoral defense. Those students who do not are anticipated to have little success, even if they obtain a research faculty position. Intervention or redirection in the third year is common when the rubric trajectory (and qualifying exam performance) suggests inadequate ability.

**Schedule:** Annually, and at qualifying examination and dissertation proposal and defense.

**Related Documents:**
PhD Student Performance Evaluations - Combined File.xls