

Program: **PhD Degree** (Fogelman College of Business & Economics) - Spring 2019

Author: S. J. Schaeffer (sschaffr@memphis.edu)

Executive Summary

2018-2019

Summary: For the PhD Major (Marketing), five (5) learning goals including a total of sixteen (16) individual learning outcomes were assessed in AY 2018-19. The data was collected over multiple years using faculty committee observations at the point of graduation of each student's level of competency across all of the PhD learning goals and outcomes (LOs). The [PhD degree has five learning goals](#) in these broad areas: (1) Demonstrated knowledge in her/her areas of specialization, (2) Mastery of analytical/methodological skills needed to evaluate and conduct research in his/her areas of specialization, (3) Ability to design/conduct original research in his/her chosen fields of specialization, (4) Ability to teach college-level courses in his/her areas of specialization, and (5) Ability to communicate the results of his/her research in a clear and effective manner. Within each of those were multiple specific and measurable learning outcomes (LOs) that were individually assessed. An [Assessment Rubric for the PhD Program](#) of Fair (score=1), Good (score=2), or Exemplary (score=3) was used to assess each student's skills within a given LO. The scores of all students were consolidated and the PhD assessment committee determined that a benchmark of any level of performance at the fair level (score=1) for an LO merited attention and corrective actions.

Results: Data was collected for all graduating PhD candidates over the period of Fall 2016 thru Spring 2018 using input from their committee chair in coordination with other committee members to assess skills across all of the PhD LOs. This resulted in 22 completed assessments including students from ECON, FIR, MKTG/SCMS, and MGMT for this analysis. The most significant finding was in the area of journal publications and conference presentations (See: Goals 1, 2 & 3) where 27% of the students were not successful in publishing a paper and 9% were not successful in presenting at an academic conference.

Improvements taken: To address these shortfalls, the PhD program has increased the frequency of "dry run" presentations by all PhD candidates and developed a more structured rubric for assessing and providing feedback to those students. Additional efforts have been put into place to provide more financial support to assist PhD candidates in attending academic conferences.

OUTCOMES	MEANS OF ASSESSMENT & BENCHMARKS/TASKS	RESULTS	ACTION TAKEN & FOLLOW-UP
<p>LO1 – Demonstrated detailed knowledge of his/her areas of specialization.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Program-Embedded Assessments – Over the period of 2016-2018, all graduating PhD candidates were assessed across all LOs using observations by their committee chair with input from other committee members.</p> <p>Benchmark (and how determined): The PhD program’s goal is that no goal or individual learning outcome will have any graduating students scored at the fair (1) level. Alternately stated, all students will score at either the Good (2) or Excellent (3) level.</p>	<p>Reporting Cycle: 2018 - 2019 Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>A review of results from the assessment process showed that PhD candidate students fell short on LO1 in the areas of publication in a peer reviewed journal (27% Fair) or presenting at an academic conference (9% Fair). Thus, our goal was not met for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>Action Taken: The Fair level in these areas fell short of the PhD’s benchmark of all students scoring at either Good or Excellent levels. To address this deficiency, the PhD program has increased the frequency of “dry run” presentations by all PhD candidates and developed a more structured rubric for assessing and providing feedback to those students. Additional efforts have been put into place to provide more financial support to assist PhD candidates in attending academic conferences.</p>
<p>LO2 – Mastered analytical / methodological skills needed to evaluate and conduct research in his/her area of specialization.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Program-Embedded Assessments – Over the period of 2016-2018, all graduating PhD candidates were assessed across all LOs using observations by their committee chair with input from other committee members.</p> <p>Benchmark (and how determined): The PhD program’s goal is that no goal or individual learning outcome will have any graduating students scored at the fair (1) level. Alternately stated, all students will score at either the Good (2) or</p>	<p>Reporting Cycle: 2018 - 2019 Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>A review of results from the assessment process showed that PhD candidate students fell short on LO2 in the areas of publication in a peer reviewed journal (36% Fair) or presenting at an academic conference (14% Fair). Thus, our goal was not met for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>Action Taken: The Fair level in both of these areas fell short of the PhD’s benchmark of all students scoring at either Good or Excellent levels. To address this deficiency, the PhD program has increased the frequency of “dry run” presentations by all PhD candidates and developed a more structured rubric for assessing and providing feedback to those students. Additional efforts have been put into place to</p>

	<p>Excellent (3) level.</p>		<p>provide more financial support to assist PhD candidates in attending academic conferences.</p>
<p>LO3 – Demonstrated ability to design and conduct original research in his/her chosen field of specialization.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Program-Embedded Assessments – Over the period of 2016-2018, all graduating PhD candidates were assessed across all LOs using observations by their committee chair with input from other committee members.</p> <p>Benchmark (and how determined): The PhD program’s goal is that no goal or individual learning outcome will have any graduating students scored at the fair (1) level. Alternately stated, all students will score at either the Good (2) or Excellent (3) level.</p>	<p>Reporting Cycle: 2018 - 2019 Result Type: Criterion Not Met A review of results from the assessment process showed that PhD candidate students fell short on LO3 in the areas of publication in a peer reviewed journal (36% Fair) or presenting at an academic conference (9% Fair). Thus, our goal was not met for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>Action Taken: The Fair level in both of these areas fell short of the PhD’s benchmark of all students scoring at either Good or Excellent levels. To address this deficiency, the PhD program has increased the frequency of “dry run” presentations by all PhD candidates and developed a more structured rubric for assessing and providing feedback to those students. Additional efforts have been put into place to provide more financial support to assist PhD candidates in attending academic conferences.</p>
<p>LO4 – Ability to teach college-level courses in his/her area of specialization.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Program-Embedded Assessments – Over the period of 2016-2018, all graduating PhD candidates were assessed across all LOs using observations by their committee chair with input from other committee members.</p> <p>Benchmark (and how determined): The PhD program’s goal is that no</p>	<p>Reporting Cycle: 2018 - 2019 Result Type: Criterion Met A review of results from the assessment process showed that all PhD candidate students scored at either the Good (2) or Exemplary (3) levels in the area of teaching. Thus, this goal was met.</p>	<p>Action Taken: Because the benchmark was met on this LO, not actions were required.</p>

	<p>goal or individual learning outcome will have any graduating students scored at the fair (1) level. Alternately stated, all students will score at either the Good (2) or Excellent (3) level.</p>		
<p>LO5 – Ability to communicate the results of his/her research in a clear and effective manner. Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Program-Embedded Assessments – Over the period of 2016-2018, all graduating PhD candidates were assessed across all LOs using observations by their committee chair with input from other committee members.</p> <p>Benchmark (and how determined): The PhD program’s goal is that no goal or individual learning outcome will have any graduating students scored at the fair (1) level. Alternately stated, all students will score at either the Good (2) or Excellent (3) level.</p>	<p>Reporting Cycle: 2018 - 2019 Result Type: Criterion Met A review of results from the assessment process showed that all PhD candidate students scored at either the Good (2) or Exemplary (3) levels in the areas of communicating results. Thus, this goal was met.</p>	<p>Action Taken: Because the benchmark was met on this LO, not actions were required.</p>