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# Learning Goal Assessment Guide

This guide documents the assessment process for Goal 3 of the three learning goals in the Ph.D. program. The assessment process is processed in accordance of the Assurance of Learning (AoL) plan for the Ph.D. program.

# Learning Goals

The Ph.D. program has defined the following three Learning Goals.

* Ph.D. graduates can effectively communicate research in oral presentations.
* Ph.D. graduates will have sufficiently mastered the core knowledge and tools needed to conduct original research in a timely manner.
* Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.

# Learning Goal Introduction

This guide covers Learning Goal 3 for the Ph.D. program:

* Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.

**This goal is assessed at the end of every academic course a Ph.D. student has taught**. This goal requires students to achieve high average scores for the course and teacher evaluations.

**There is one primary method of assessment:** The assessment center of Stevens is conducting the course assessments.

**To complete this requirement successfully, students should ideally** receive course and instructor scores above an average of 3.0 (out of max. of 4.0) per course taught.

# Learning Objectives and Traits

The following table shows the objectives and traits to assess goal 3 of the PH.D. program.

**Learning Goal # 3: Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.**

The goal is to prepare students for an academic career. The process for preparing the students to teach effectively is organized in several steps to assure a seamless transition. It is manifested in the teaching policy of the Ph.D. program.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PhD - 3** | **Learning Goal, Objectives and Traits** |
| **GOAL[Lechler]** | **Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.** |
| **Objective 1:** | *Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.* |
| **Traits** |  |
| Trait 1: | Course Evaluation  |
| Trait 2: | Teacher Evaluation |

# Rubrics

Rubric: Course-Teacher-Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.* |
| **Trait** |  | **Mean Evaluations** |
| Trait 1 | Overall the quality of the course was excellent. |  |
| Trait 2 | Overall the instructor was an effective teacher. |  |
|  | **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 2.49; Meets: 2.5-3.49; Exceeds: 3.5 – 4.0 Total Score:** |  |

# Assessment Process

All Ph.D. students will be assessed who teach an academic course.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PhD LEARNING GOAL 3** | **Where and when measured?** | **How measured?** | **Criterion** |
| 3. Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment. | Every academic year | Sampling: All PhD students.Course/teacher evaluations | Achieve a mean course & instructor evaluation score of at least 3.0 out of max 4.0. |

Every teacher receives a teaching evaluation for a specific course when a course is finished. The course evaluation report is the basis for the collection of the necessary data.

# Results of Learning Goal Assessment

The results of the initial learning goal assessments carried out to date are included below.

**Explanation**

The learning goal #3 has one learning objective and is measured using the rubric “Course-Teacher-Evaluation”.

The assessment is conducted by classifying students into the three categories:

- Does not meet expectations
- Meets expectations
- Exceeds expectations

The person doing the assessment provides explanatory comments and recommendations on the bottom of the Results Summary Sheet. The recommendations improve content or policies of the program.

# Results of Assessment: SPRING 2018

**LEARNING GOAL # 3: Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1: Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: August, 2018 ASSESSOR: Ph.D. Program Director**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.* |
| **Trait** |  | **Mean Evaluations** |
| Trait 1 | Overall the quality of the course was excellent. | 3.11 |
| Trait 2 | Overall the instructor was an effective teacher. | 3.06 |
|  | **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 2.49; Meets: 2.5-3.49; Exceeds: 3.5 – 4.0 Total Score:** | 3.10 |

**Meets expectations.**

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Course Section | Credits | Teacher Evaluation | Course Evaluation |
| Baris Morkan | BT353C | 3 | 3.06 | 3.13 |
| Serhan Kotiloglu | BT372A | 3 | 3.63 | 3.53 |
| Theano Lianidou | BT100C | 3 | 3.9 | 3.65 |
| Elias Aleman Lopez | QF104A | 1 | 1.22 | 1.3 |
| Elias Aleman Lopez | QF104B | 1 | 1.95 | 1.84 |
| Elias Aleman Lopez | QF104C | 1 | 2.42 | 2.75 |
|  |  |  | 1.863333333 | 1.963333333 |
|  |  | Average | 2.577619048 | 2.594761905 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 3.113333333 | 3.068333333 |

Aleman taught a 1 credit laboratory course, each 1 credit. His averages are used to calculate the overall average.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:** Student Aleman was immediately informed and it was decided that he would not teach a section in his last semester of doctoral studies. He was also asked to attend a teaching workshop for Ph.D. students.

A teaching policy will be implemented in fall 2018 to improve results.

# Specific Steps Taken in FALL 2018

A teaching policy was implemented and included in the Ph.D. in Business Administration Handbook.

# Outcomes: PhD Learning Goal # 3 after 1 Round of Assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Objective 1 |
| SPRING 2018 | Meets Expectations |

# Close Loop Process – Continuous Improvement Record

**Assurance of Learning**

**Assessment/Outcome Analysis**

**Close Loop Process - Continuous Improvement Record Goal 3**

**Program:** Ph.D. in Business Administration

**Goal 3:** Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.

**Goal Owner:** Ph.D. Program Director

**Where Measured:** At the end of the academic year on the program level.

**How Measured:** **Sampling:** Students have to submit a progress and activity report at the end of every semester.

**Description:** Students finishing their third year should ideally have defended their dissertation proposals.

**Closing the Loop: Actions taken on specific objectives**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.* |
| **When** **Assessed** | *N.A.*  |
| **Remedial****Action** | *Teaching policy was defined and implemented.* |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | Meet Expectations |

# Results of Assessment: FALL 2018

**LEARNING GOAL # 3: Ph.D. graduates are able to effectively deliver academic courses in a university environment.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1: Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: February, 2019 ASSESSOR: Ph.D. Program Director**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Students will be able to effectively deliver a course in their area of expertise.* |
| **Trait** |  | **Mean Evaluations** |
| Trait 1 | Overall the quality of the course was excellent. |  |
| Trait 2 | Overall the instructor was an effective teacher. |  |
|  | **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 2.49; Meets: 2.5-3.49; Exceeds: 3.5 – 4.0 Total Score:** |  |

**Meets expectations.**

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Course Section | Credits | Teacher Evaluation | Course Evaluation |
| Serhan Kotiloglu | MGT671 | 3 | 3.56 | 3.78 |
|  |  | Average | 3.56 | 3.78 |

Only one student taught in the fall semester.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:** Student Aleman was immediately informed and it was decided that he would not teach a section in his last semester of doctoral studies. He was also asked to attend a teaching workshop for Ph.D. students.

A teaching policy was implemented in fall 2018 to improve results.

# Specific Steps Taken in FALL 2018

A teaching policy was implemented and included in the Ph.D. in Business Administration Handbook.

# Outcomes: PhD Learning Goal # 3 after 1 Round of Assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Objective 1 |
| SPRING 2018 | Meets Expectations |
| FALL 2018 | Exceeds Expectations |