

Program Assessment: Annual Report

Program(s): PhD in International Business and Marketing

Department: International Business and Marketing

College/School: Chaifetz School of Business

Date: August 6, 2022

Primary Assessment Contact: Mamoun Benmamoun

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

- a) Students demonstrate their knowledge of the relevant literature and theories in the following areas: Marketing theory, Consumer behavior, International Business, International marketing theory, Global business strategy.
- b) Students shall be able to complete a research project that creates meaningful new knowledge in their chosen discipline. Students shall be able to create both written and oral research reports. Students shall be able to apply appropriate quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques.
- c) Students demonstrate their ability to apply marketing and international business knowledge through the completion of original empirical research projects that create meaningful new knowledge within these disciplines and presenting this research for others.
- d) Students understand and exhibit ethical practice in use and identification of published, unpublished, and electronic sources of information.
- e) Students understand and practice appropriate safeguards in the use of human subjects in research.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

- Preliminary and qualifying exams.
- Contributing in a meaningful way to seminar discussions.
- Completed research dissertation proposals and defenses.
- Completed certificate of teaching excellence
- Submitted journal articles to a refereed journal ranked Diamond, Gold, or Silver in the latest CSB Journal Listing and/or approved IB and marketing conferences.
- Feedback from the faculty advisor

Madrid student artifacts are not included as the program is only available at the main campus in Saint Louis, MO.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

- Faculty panels comprised of IB and MKT faculty members evaluate students on preliminary exams and qualifying exams using a rubric (see attached Rubric).
- Dissertations are assessed by a three-person dissertation committee made up of IB and MKT faculty members using a rubric and are measured as pass/fail. The rubric includes written

feedback.

- The program director tracks students' submissions to the approved list of conferences and journals (acceptance; journal ranking; frequency; review status)

4. **What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.**

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Our students are demonstrating the skills necessary to be productive and successful in developing, executing, and presenting original research. Because our program typically admits two students a year, we do not discuss the assessment results in terms of percentages as in other programs but focus on outcomes such as teaching certificates, journal acceptances, conference presentations, and comprehensive exam performance.

Major findings:

Students within the Ph.D. program in IB and MKT demonstrated success across all assessment areas, as illustrated by the following achievements:

- In 2021, we accepted three students, and they all completed original scholarly papers that have been published (2 students) or are under review (1 student) in ranked journals.
- The Ph.D. program consistently achieves a 100 percent placement rate.
- In 21-22, three students received teaching certificates from the Reinart Center for Teaching Excellence.
- In 21-22, nearly all the Ph.D. students in the program had conference papers accepted for presentations.
- In 21-22, nearly all the Ph.D. students in the program participated weekly in the CSB's Friday Research/Teaching Seminars & Early Career Faculty Mentorship Program.

5. **How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?***

The analysis and further input from program alums, current students, and all IB and Marketing faculty have shown a need to improve students' research productivity, methodology skills, and student-faculty interactions. As a result, the Ph.D. steering committee implemented a few changes that the CSB faculty assembly has approved. We changed the exam format to prioritize scholarly research. In the past, the first-year exam has two parts: Part A-research critique OR research paper + Part B-Written Exam. So, we changed the first-year exam format to prioritize the research paper option and eliminated Part B in the first year. We gave students three alternatives to submit the paper: (1) submit the paper to a refereed journal ranked Diamond, Gold, or Silver in the latest CSB Journal Listing, (2) submit to a prominent IB and marketing conference, or (3) submit to a Ph.D. committee for review. To support this option, our program further integrated classroom interventions that facilitate the development of research skills and provide pointers on conducting high-quality research on IB and marketing. Students were also offered a series of workshops on paper development and submission during the first year. Additionally, we upgraded the course listing for the research methodology minor and added a summer course that includes a workshop authored by research method experts that guide students on choosing the research method (qualitative and quantitative) best suited for their study. We also switched to a written comprehensive exam in the program's second year to strengthen the theoretical skills necessary for research. Furthermore, we allowed students to undertake independent research for course credit to enrich Ph.D. students' interdisciplinary research and provide them with theoretical depth relevant to their research interests. We also addressed student-faculty advisor research mismatch by carefully assigning students to faculty advisors whose research focus closely relates to students' academic/research interests.

6. **Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)**

The impact of the changes listed in question 5 was immediate. All the first-year students have engaged in multiple publications, notably more than their predecessors, and passed the first-year exam requirements. The first comprehensive exam in the current format will be administered in the summer of 2023. The Ph.D. steering committee and program faculty will monitor students' performance.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.