Program Plan and Findings: Four Column Layout

Program (SSB) - FIN - Business Administration: Finance (PhD) - 036

Program Mission Statement: The primary purpose of the OSU doctoral program is to prepare the candidate to conduct research in business and to teach. There are three dimensions of this preparation:

First, the candidate is provided the opportunity to develop knowledge in:
• a broad understanding of the theory, nature, and activities of business firms;
• an awareness of the impact of environmental forces — social, political, legal, governmental, and economic — on the firm's operation;
• a comprehensive understanding of a selected area of professional concentration within business administration.

Second, the candidate is provided the opportunity to develop research competency in:
• an orientation toward the development and usage of theory in business decision making;
• a scholarly competency in conducting both basic and applied research.

Third, the candidate is provided the opportunity to develop teaching skills in his or her area of specialty.

Program Information

2019 - 2020

Program Information
Assessment Coordinator's Name: Kevin E Voss
Assessment Coordinator's E-mail Address: kevin.voss@okstate.edu
Number of Students Enrolled in the Program: 9
Total Number of Students Graduated: 1
Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities?: No
If yes, describe how funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process:
Number of Student Graduates from Stillwater Campus: 1
Number of Student Graduates from Tulsa Campus: 0

Annual Executive Summaries

2019 - 2020

Program Assessment Coordinator: Kevin E Voss

Plan Review and Approval

Date Current Plan Was Reviewed and Approved: 09/09/2019
Date of Future Plan Review and Approval:

Summary of Assessment Findings

Describe overall assessment findings and faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results: Our results are consistent with a well functioning doctoral program. Our graduates are finding employment at accredited and Ph.D granting institutions, they have publications on their vita at graduation. Our students are demonstrating the ability communicate their research at a professional level both orally and in writing. More attention needs to paid to getting our 1st year students up to speed on their knowledge of the academic literature.

Dissemination of Findings

Describe the individual(s) or committee responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data: Kevin E Voss (Marketing, Chair), Brad Lawson (Accounting), David Biros (Management Science and Information Systems), Bryan Edwards (Management), Matt Rutherford (Entrepreneurship), Shu Yan (Finance).
Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment findings with program faculty: Assessment report is emailed to all faculty in the Spears School of Business.

Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on data collected this year, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?: No major changes are planned. Better orientation of incoming students to requirements of the program is needed. Program coordinators and faculty need to emphasize the importance of scholarly knowledge and conference presentations/publications to incoming doctoral students.
Based on this year's findings, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?: The SSB Ph.D. program committee will revisit the Knowledge of Scholarly Literature outcome to determine whether separate standards are warranted for first year students and or whether the current standard is appropriate given our historical data. The SSB program committee will revisit the Conference Submission outcome to determine whether the current 100% standard is appropriate given the data, and if a subsidiary outcome for mandatory submission of a conference paper for third year students might help drive the achievement of this outcome.
Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements: n/a
Program Improvements Made in the Last Year: Other Improvements
"Other" Improvements: We changed our standards of performance from arithmetic means to percentages.
Goals for the Coming Year: A new Chair will take over assessment and will need orientation and training on our assessment program and procedures. Outcome and performance standards for Knowledge of Scholarly Literature and Conference Presentations/Publications.
Is this Summary Report Complete?: Yes
List all individuals associated with this report preparation: Kevin E Voss (Marketing, Chair), Brad Lawson (Accounting), David Biros (Management Science and Information Systems), Bryan Edwards (Management), Matt Rutherford (Entrepreneurship), Shu Yan (Finance). Ramesh Sharda (Vice Dean for Research).

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
Knowledge of Scholarly Literature - Students should understand the scholarly literature in their field of specialization **Outcome Status:** Active **Planned Assessment Year:** 2016 - 2017, 2019 - 2020 **Start Date:** **Archived Date:** **Outcome Type:** Knowledge **Reason for Archival:**	**Performance or Jury -** Knowledge of scholarly literature is assessed on a 5 point scale on the Knowledge of Scholarly Literature assessment rubric. The rubric is attached as a related document in Nuventive. Learning Goal 1 will be assessed via course research papers, first year or second year papers, and or comprehensive exams written by first and second year students.	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 1 - Does Not Meet Program Expectations (Unacceptable) Does not meet our standard. Only 55.5% of first and second year students averaged a 4 or higher on the Knowledge of Scholarly Literature rubric. (09/08/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 18 **Number of Successful Students:** 10 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of 1st and 2nd year doctoral students in Business (Accounting,	**Use of Findings (Actions):** Program coordinators and faculty need to emphasize the importance of scholarly knowledge to incoming doctoral students. The SSB Ph.D. program committee will revisit the standard to determine whether separate standards are warranted for first year students and or whether the current standard is

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: 70% of students should achieve a rubric score of 4 based upon the 5 point scale on the Knowledge of Scholarly Literature assessment rubric. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly; beginning 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type: Related Documents:** [Literature Rubric Approved Revision 101217.docx](#)	Entrepreneurship, Finance, Management, Management Science and Information Systems, Marketing). **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 55.5% of our students met our standard of achieving a 4 out of 5 on the knowledge of the scholarly research rubric. This does not meet our standard of 70%. All of those below 4 were first year students and were spread across the six departments.	appropriate given our historical data. (08/31/2020)
Ethics in Research - Students should be familiar with and conduct research according to the highest ethical standards. **Outcome Status:** Active **Planned Assessment Year:** 2019 - 2020 **Start Date: Archived Date: Outcome Type:** Skills **Reason for Archival:**	**Other -** The doctoral program coordinator ensures training with respect to ethics and research as well as adherence to basic ethical conduct in research by requiring students to complete the university's Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training administered by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) The objective is for all students to complete RCR training by the second year in the program (by the first year is preferable) The amount of data collected on each student depends on the number of students in each program engaging in these activities, and varies from year to year, and from program to program. In addition, it requires verification of students' completion of the RCR requirement. (Active) *** Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark:** 100% of Ph.D. students complete RCR training by the end of their second year. **Timeline for Assessment:** Annual **Other Assessment Type:** University training module.	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) All business Ph.D. students are receiving training in conducting ethical research. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 6 **Number of Successful Students:** 6 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of second year doctoral students in Business (Accounting, Entrepreneurship, Finance, Management, Management Science and Information Systems, Marketing). **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** All of our doctoral students are getting exposure to the principles of conducting responsible, ethical research. Ten of 13 first year students have already completed the training.	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	Analysis of Written Artifacts - The doctoral program coordinators ensure adherence to basic ethical conduct in research by evaluating works submitted by students in Turnitin to assess similarity with published and submitted papers. The types of works analyzed are similar to those assessing knowledge of literature, including seminar papers, papers required for comprehensive exams, and thesis work. The objective is for all works to receive less than a 30% similarity score for evaluated works. The data collection is led by program coordinators. It requires collecting works submitted by students including papers in doctoral seminar courses, papers as required by program, dissertation proposals, dissertation defenses, etc. The amount of data collected on each student depends on the number of students in each program engaging in these activities, and varies from year to year, and from program to program. (Active) *** Learning Outcome** **Goal/Benchmark:** Average similarity score of less than 30% on assessed artifacts. **Timeline for Assessment:** Annual **Other Assessment Type:** Analyze papers using plagiarism detection software (Turnitin).	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) Students in the Business Ph.D. program are able to produce plagiarism free manuscripts. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 20 **Number of Successful Students:** 19 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Convenience sample of first- and second-year papers, seminar course papers, and dissertation proposals **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 95% of examined artifacts met the standard of less than a 30% similarity ratings.	**Use of Findings (Actions):** The Entrepreneurship department took specific action regarding the one artifact exceeding our standard. The author of the paper is no longer a student in their program. (08/31/2020)
Conduct Rigorous Research - Students should be able to conduct rigorous research in their specific discipline	**Presentation/Performance -** Evaluation of student curriculum vitae at graduation. *** Learning Outcome**	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 2 - Meets Minimum Program Expectations (Developing) Our Ph.D. students are able to publish research at	**Use of Findings (Actions):** Program coordinators need to emphasize the importance of conference presentation and

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
Outcome Status: Active **Planned Assessment Year:** 2016 - 2017, 2019 - 2020 **Start Date:** **Archived Date:** **Outcome Type:** Knowledge **Reason for Archival:**	**Goal/Benchmark:** 100% of graduating Ph.D. students should have a published proceedings paper and or conference presentation. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly, beginning in 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type:**	conferences in their fields. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 8 **Number of Successful Students:** 7 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of Graduating Class for 2019-2020. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** All of our students had published research at graduation. One student did not have a conference proceeding paper, but did have a peer-reviewed publication.	proceedings publications to their students. The SSB program committee will revisit the standard to determine whether the current 100% standard is appropriate given the data, and if a subsidiary outcome for mandatory submission of a conference paper for third year students might help drive the achievement of this outcome. (08/31/2020)
	Presentation/Performance - Evaluation of student curriculum vitae at graduation *** Learning Outcome** **Goal/Benchmark:** 50% graduating Ph.D.s should have an accepted or published paper at a peer-reviewed journal. **Timeline for Assessment:** yearly beginning 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type:**	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 4 - Exceeds Program Expectations (Advanced) Our students are able to publish their research in peer-reviewed journals. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 8 **Number of Successful Students:** 7 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of graduating Ph.D. students. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 87.5% of our graduates had a peer-reviewed journal publication at graduation, exceeding our standard of 50%.	
Effective Communication and Presentation: - To develop effective communication skills for the classroom and for presentation of research. **Outcome Status:** Active **Planned Assessment Year:** 2019 - 2020 **Start Date:** **Archived Date:** **Outcome Type:** Skills **Reason for Archival:**	**Oral Presentation -** The doctoral committee members as well as other SSB faculty rate the oral communication skills of each doctoral student making oral presentations at various times during the student's tenure in the Ph.D. program, e.g., in doctoral seminar courses, paper presentations, dissertation proposal, dissertation defense, etc. Oral presentations are rated on a three-item, five-point oral presentation rubric attached to Nuventive. *** Learning Outcome**	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 4 - Exceeds Program Expectations (Advanced) Our students are able to orally communicate their research findings at a high level or proficiency. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 28 **Number of Successful Students:** 26 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of doctoral student presentations. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 93% of our students exceeded our standard of 10.5 or higher based on faculty scores on the rubric.	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	Goal/Benchmark: : 67% of evaluated students should have a score of 10.5 or higher on the oral rubric. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly, beginning with 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type:** **Analysis of Written Artifacts -** The doctoral committee members rate the written communication skills of each doctoral student presenting a dissertation proposal. Other departmental faculty members in the SSB may also rate the student's written work from doctoral seminars, paper presentations, co-authored papers, etc. during the student's tenure in the Ph.D. program. Written work is rated on the three-item, five-point written presentation rubric attached to Nuventive. *** Learning Outcome** **Goal/Benchmark:** 67% of evaluated students should have a score of 10.5 or higher on the written rubric. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly beginning 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type:**	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 4 - Exceeds Program Expectations (Advanced) Students are able to communicate their research findings in writing at a very high level. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 26 **Number of Successful Students:** 24 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of first- and second-year papers, seminar course papers, and dissertation proposals. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 92% of our written artifacts were assessed by faculty at 10.5 or higher on the rubric, exceeding our standard of 67%.	
	Other - The doctoral committee members collect information from student evaluations of instruction with respect to three items directly rating communication in the class room: Item 6, Preparation and Organization; Item 8, Presentation of Material; and Item 10, Explanation of Subject Material. Scores are sourced from course evaluation reports for course sections taught by Ph.D. students.	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 2 - Meets Minimum Program Expectations (Developing) Our students are doing a good job of communicating material to students. Several students requiring additional mentoring. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 11 **Number of Successful Students:** 8 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of course evaluations for sections instructed by Ph.D. students. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement**	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: 67% of Ph.D. student teaching evaluations should have an averaged score of 3.75 out of a possible of 5 on the three items. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly beginning 2018-2019 **Other Assessment Type:** Scores from student evaluations of instruction	**of this learning outcome?:** 73% of the course evaluation average 3.75 or higher on the three communication items. The majority of our Ph.D. students are able to communicate effectively while teaching business courses to undergraduates. Three individual students need mentoring on improving their communication ratings.	
Ph.D. Student Placement - To provide graduates with desired placement or advancement opportunities consistent with their career objectives. **Outcome Status:** Active **Planned Assessment Year:** 2016 - 2017, 2019 - 2020 **Start Date:** **Archived Date:** **Outcome Type:** Skills **Reason for Archival:**	**Other -** Coordinators for each of the options communicate directly with graduates to determine their placement. *** Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark:** 100% of graduating students placed in AACSB accredited institutions unless the student has an alternative desired placement or career goal. **Timeline for Assessment:** Yearly **Other Assessment Type:** Placement at AACSB accredited and doctoral granting institutions.	**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020 **Conclusion:** 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) Our graduates are obtaining employment at AACSB accredited, doctoral granting Universities. (08/31/2020) **Number of Students Assessed:** 5 **Number of Successful Students:** 5 **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** Census of graduating Ph.D. students. **What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** 100% of our students achieved placement at AACSB accredited schools. 80% of the graduates gained employment at Ph.D. granting fields in their field. We are producing graduates that are attractive to our colleagues at other AACSB, doctoral granting institutions.	