Henry B. Tippie College of Business

Department of Management & Entrepreneurship

Formal Milestones
in the Ph.D. Program

Updated August 2026

Table of Contents

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT & ENTREPRENEURSHIP
PH.D. PROGRAM

Mission

The mission of Iowa's Ph.D. program in Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E) is to train future scholars for placement in top research and teaching universities. We develop our students to conduct the highest quality applied research, teach to standards of excellence, and be active participants in local and professional organizations. Graduates of our program are placed in tenure-track positions at accredited universities around the world, where they continue to engage in top-level scholarship, teaching, and service.

Admission Processes and Criteria

Admission into our program is highly competitive, with two or three students admitted out of 50 applications, on average. We keep our selectivity rates low to maintain a faculty-student ratio of approximate 1:1, and because we are committed to educating, mentoring, and graduating each student we enroll. Our intent is to admit students that we are confident will succeed rather than "weed out" students after they have been admitted. Our selection criteria include GMAT (or GRE), GPA, candidates' statement of purpose, and letters of recommendation. We strongly consider whether a candidate's career goals and research interests are aligned with our program strengths.

PhD Program Milestones

The purpose of this document is to help students and their faculty mentors effectively manage student performance in the Ph.D. program and to set goals that will enable student success. Within this overarching purpose, specific information is provided that should help students monitor their progress in the program and set goals for the future.

Students' progress in the Ph.D. program is monitored and evaluated in three main ways:
(1) completed course work in the student's plan of study; (2) major research milestones (e.g., second-year qualifying paper, dissertation proposal and defense) that are evaluated by faculty committees; and (3) every student's overall progress, including coursework, assistantships, research, teaching, and dissertation work, is reviewed by their faculty mentor team in the spring of each year.

These milestones correspond to the formal requirements toward earning a Ph.D. There may be a difference between fulfilling the requirements for earning a degree and preparing oneself to meet one's career goals. To be competitive for positions at research universities, students must have significant involvement in multiple research projects that will result in publication. Because students' goals are different, formal requirements for research projects are not defined here. Furthermore, although a student's mentor team will provide opportunities for research, and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) and other faculty can provide advice for getting involved in research projects, the impetus of such involvement rests with the student. Thus, although this document is meant to enhance students' management of their performance in the program, it is not a

performance management process in and of itself. Students need to be proactive, and work closely with their mentors, to make sure that both formal and informal goals are met.

This document should be interpreted as outlining normal procedures for moving through and completing the program. However, a student may appeal to waive or modify a particular procedure if they feel there is compelling reason to do so. Waivers or modifications may be approved provided: (1) the case for the proposed deviation is presented in writing; and (2) the student's mentor team, the department executive officer (DEO), and the DGS all agree to the modification.

Major milestones in the Ph.D. program are as follows:

1. Satisfactory annual student progress report and faculty review of student progress (every year).
2. Completion of required and elective course work (normally by the end of 2nd year or fall of 3rd year).
3. First-year mentored research project (1st year)
4. Second-year qualifying paper (2nd year)
5. Completion of Teaching Development Checklist (3rd year)
6. Third-year dissertation exploration process (3rd year)
7. Defense of dissertation proposal (during 4th year)
8. Defense of completed dissertation (during 5th year)
9. Participation in Friday Seminars and other program events (every year)

Except for the first and last milestone, which occur annually, the steps are typically completed in the order listed. Specifications for each milestone are outlined in the following sections.

Annual Report and Faculty Review of Ph.D. Student Progress

The progress of all Ph.D. students will be reviewed annually. At the end of the spring semester, students will prepare a Progress Report that consists of their: (a) up-to-date curriculum vita; and (b) a summary of goals attained during the year as well as goals and plans for the following year (see Appendix A). Students will send their completed progress report to the DGS and mentor team. The mentor team will review the student's progress report and provide written feedback to the student (see Appendix B). The mentor team will share the written feedback with the student and meet with the student to discuss the feedback. Once the feedback session has taken place, the mentor team should email their feedback form to the DGS. All student evaluations should be complete by June 30.

Academic Probation. Although most students complete program requirements successfully, continuation in the Ph.D. program is contingent on satisfactory academic progress. See the Graduate College manual, Section IV: Academic Standing, Probation, and Dismissal for further details.
Failure to Make Progress. Grades are one way that academic progress is assessed; however, faculty assessments of the student's overall performance in the program (including research and teaching assistantships), as well as the passing of other milestones are also considered. In cases where the overall faculty assessment is the student is failing to make adequate progress, the issues will be outlined in the faculty feedback form, as noted above. Recommendations for improvement will be

provided, and goals will be specified that need to be met to continue in the program. In some cases, the performance assessment may advise the student to consider other (nonprogram) options, if performance does not improve sufficiently to justify continuing in the program. ***Continued financial aid is contingent on acceptable progress in the academic program as well as on acceptable performance in research and/or teaching assistantships***.

Completion of Required and Elective Course Work

Completion of the doctoral program requires a total of 72 hours of credit. Required course work is normally completed during the first two years of a student's academic program. The following courses are required for all students:

Content Courses (12 hours)
MGMT:XXX Foundations of Organizational Theory (3 hours)
MGMT:7350 Foundations of Organizational Behavior 1 (3 hours)
MGMT:7360 Foundations of Organizational Behavior 2 (3 hours)
MGMT:7800 Foundations of Human Resource Management (3 hours)

Research Methods Courses (18 hours)
MGMT:7120 Research Design (3 hours)
MGMT:7140 Meta-Analysis (3 hours)
MGMT:7160 Advanced Regression Methods (3 hours)
MGMT:XXX Latent Variable Models (3 hours)

Two research methods elective courses (6 hours total). Students should work with the DGS to identify and select electives that will satisfy the requirements.

Mentored Research (12 hours)
MGMT:7700 Mentored Research

Dissertation (around 15 hours depending on transfer credits)
MGMT:7975 Thesis Mgmt. & Org.

Students should work closely with Tippie's Director of PhD Student Services and the DGS to ensure that they have accumulated the 72 hours required for graduation. Students are required to register each fall and spring semester until their degree is awarded. If a student fails to register, the student may not be readmitted to candidacy until they have submitted an application approved by the student's primary mentor, the DEO, and the Graduate College Dean. See Appendix C for an example Plan of Study.

First-Year Mentored Research Project

During their first year in the program, students will participate in a mentored research project and be enrolled in Mentored Research (MGMT:7700). The purpose of the mentored research project is to get students involved in faculty research projects as soon as possible. In this way, students will learn

the "nitty-gritty" of designing and executing studies, analyzing data, and writing papers for publication.

Students generally will work on two research projects during their first year in the program, one of which will be their mentored research project. The faculty mentor team will identify the two projects in advance, so incoming students can begin to work on the projects as soon as they start the program. The projects should be aimed at top-tier journals.

Students will present their mentored research project to the department at the end of the spring semester of their first year. The presentation resembles that of an academic conference presentation in which the student presents an overview of the project and key lessons learned from the mentored research project. Presentations will be approximately 20 minutes long with 10-15 minutes allotted for questions and answers. Students are also required to write a 3-page summary of the project (emailed to the DGS) prior to the presentation.

Second-Year Qualifying Paper

The second-year qualifying paper fulfills the Comprehensive Exam requirement outlined in Section XII.K of the Graduate College Manual. The second-year qualifying paper is a research project led by the student under the guidance of an M&E faculty member and evaluated by 3 additional faculty members. The paper provides hands-on experience in each stage of independent research aimed at publication. The paper can be based on a student's own idea (e.g., a class paper), an idea co-developed with faculty, or an idea from the first-year mentored research. The exact nature of each student's paper and leadership role will vary but should include project management by the student and a substantial role in idea development, design, writing, and analysis.

The student begins work on their second-year qualifying paper at the end of their first year, works on the paper throughout their second year, and submits their first draft after the spring semester in their second year. The student will revise the paper over the summer to produce a final draft during the fall semester of their third year. See Appendix E for further details.

Completion of Teaching Development Checklist

We will work with each student to develop a plan of teaching that will allow for successful development and demonstration of teaching capabilities prior to entering the job market. The department has generated a checklist of activities geared toward preparing students to step into the classroom (see Appendix F). Students generally will teach two standalone courses during the Ph.D. program, with the first course usually being taught in the spring semester of Year 3 and the second being taught sometime during Year 4.

Third-year Dissertation Exploration Process

The purpose of the third-year dissertation exploration process is for students to explore dissertation topics, narrow down the topic, and identify a dissertation chair. To be ready to propose their dissertation in their fourth year, it is recommended that students follow the timeline below:

Fall of Third Year

- The student formulates 2-3 research ideas for their dissertation and solicits feedback from faculty members
- The student identifies a chair for their dissertation

Spring of Third Year

- The student narrows down their research ideas into one idea that holds the most promise and discusses the idea with their dissertation chair
- The student refines the research idea into a research proposal. This requires conducting a literature review to refine the model and contribution.

Beginning of Fourth Year

- By the start of their fourth year, the student should submit a draft of Chapter 1 to their dissertation chair. See Appendix G for further details.

Oral Defense of Dissertation Proposal

The purpose of the dissertation is to demonstrate a student's ability to conduct independent research that makes a significant contribution to the management literature. The Council of Graduate Schools views the dissertation as requiring a student to "generate new knowledge and to develop as individuals who use the power of scholarly inquiry to advance society" (Council of Graduate Schools, 2016).

The oral defense of the dissertation proposal is conducted at the point where the candidate has: (a) completed all course work, (b) passed the second-year qualifying paper, (c) completed the third-year dissertation exploration process, (d) convened a dissertation committee and obtained their feedback on Chapter 1, and (e) submitted a formal dissertation proposal to the committee. Successful completion of the proposal defense will mean that the dissertation committee has approved the student's proposal and plan for the dissertation.

With respect to part (d), students must convene a committee of at least four faculty members willing to serve on the dissertation committee. At least three of the faculty members must be members of the University of Iowa tenure-track faculty. At least two of the faculty members must be from the major department (defined as faculty members who hold any appointment in the major department or program) and are members of the University of Iowa tenure-track faculty. The student, with the support of the department, may request the dean's permission to replace one of the four members of the graduate faculty by a recognized scholar of professorial rank from another academic institution. Also, a voting member may be added at the discretion of the Graduate College dean. See Section XII.P of the Graduate College Manual for further details.

Timeline of the Dissertation:

Experience has shown that students may underestimate the time it takes to work through dissertation revisions. Most dissertation proposals require several revisions before they are ready to go to an entire committee. Faculty also need time to review drafts and provide feedback. Faculty

will generally need at least two weeks to respond to a draft and provide feedback, and students themselves need at least 2-3 weeks to respond adequately to feedback. A recommended timeline is as follows:

Fall and Spring Year 3	Determine dissertation topic, choose a chair and begin literature review (see Third-year Dissertation Exploration Process above).
August, Year 4	Submit draft of Chapter 1 to Dissertation Chair.
November, Year 4	Submit Chapter 1 to all committee members for their feedback. Pre-proposal meeting completed.
January-March, Year 4	Submit dissertation proposal to committee members. Allow at least 2 weeks for feedback from committee members.
February-June, Year 4	Proposal defense scheduled and executed. Allow at least 2-3 weeks after receiving feedback to schedule proposal.

Requirements of Dissertation Proposal

Chapter 1 Feedback. Students are required to obtain feedback on Chapter 1 from all members of the dissertation committee before proceeding with writing the hypotheses and proposed methods. See Appendix G for further details.

Oral Defense. Advance approval of the advisor, having gathered feedback from the committee, is needed to conduct the oral defense of the proposal. The student must request a date and time for the defense and confirm this information with all four committee members. At least 14 days prior to this date and time, the student must provide Tippie's Director of PhD Student Services and DGS with this information. The Tippie Director of PhD Student Services will prepare the paperwork and reserve the room. If your committee includes a person outside the University of Iowa, please notify the Tippie Director of PhD Student Services earlier than two weeks in advance of the defense date.

The oral defense of the proposal is a public meeting in which committee members, faculty, PhD students may attend. Once the student receives confirmation of the room reservation, the student should send a meeting invitation to all faculty and PhD students in the M&E department and a copy of the written proposal saved to the designated shared drive. A suggested timeline for the oral defense of the proposal is outlined in Appendix H.

Outcomes of Oral Defense. The chair of the oral proposal committee is responsible for completing the Report on Oral Proposal Defense, initialed by all committee members, and notifying the student of the outcome. Possible outcomes are Satisfactory, Satisfactory with Reservations, or Unsatisfactory. Refer to Table 1 in Section XII of the Graduate College Manual for voting outcomes based on committee size.

The M&E faculty has a policy of writing letters of recommendation for students only after their dissertation proposal fully approved (except for minor reservations) by their dissertation committee.

Unless the proposal is defended, we also will normally not provide funding for travel to conferences for the purpose of job search. In short, this means that a successful job search requires students to have dissertation proposals prior to the Academy of Management conference, which typically takes place in late July or early August.

Final Dissertation Defense

The culmination of the PhD milestones is the final defense of the student's dissertation, which typically takes place in the spring of Year 5. It is recommended that the student consult the Graduate College website regarding Thesis and Dissertations with regards to formatting and submission requirements.

Early in the semester in which a student intends to defend the dissertation, the following documents should be obtained: (1) Ph.D. Final Examination (Thesis Defense) and Graduation Procedures, from the Graduate College; and (2) Report of Examination: Advanced Degree, which the Tippie Director of PhD Student Services provides. The dissertation committee of at least four faculty members must include a chairperson and is normally the same committee as the Dissertation Proposal Committee. Following the examination, the committee will complete and submit the Report of Final Examination: Advanced Degree form. More detailed procedures, including voting outcomes, for final dissertation examinations can be found in Section XII.O, P and Table 1 of the Graduate College Manual.

For the final defense of the dissertation, students should follow the same procedures outlined in Successful Oral Defense of Dissertation Proposal section above with regards to scheduling the final defense by coordinating with the Tippie Director of PhD Student Services, notifying their committee and department. Similar to the oral defense of the proposal, dissertation defenses are open to all members of the department as well as to the general public and a copy of the written dissertation should be saved to the designated shared drive. The meeting should proceed similarly to the oral defense. See Appendix H for further details.

All doctoral dissertations must be submitted to the Graduate College in electronic format. Please reference the Graduate College website regarding Thesis and Dissertations for further details.

Participation in Friday Seminars

Friday Seminars are devoted to skill development in the domains of research, teaching, and career preparations. The goal of these seminars is to socialize doctoral students to the various aspects of a successful career in academia. Topics will vary each semester but often include guest research speakers, practice sessions for poster and oral conference presentations, writing, teaching topics, and socialization topics on elements such as networks and job searches. Students are expected to attend all Friday Seminars. If they cannot attend, they should contact the DGS in advance of the seminar.

Mentoring Model

We are committed to educating, mentoring, and graduating each student we enroll. Our overarching goal is for students to become independent researchers who have formed their own research identity and can independently publish top-tier research.

Mentor Team Composition and Selection

Each doctoral student is matched with a primary mentor and a secondary mentor. Although students are welcome to work with faculty members outside their mentor team (e.g., research projects, RA on grants), their primary and secondary mentors assume primary responsibility for each student (see below). The mentor team process unfolds as follows:

1. During the recruitment process, the Ph.D. Committee gathers input from faculty regarding their interest and availability to serve as a mentor to an incoming student. The committee assesses the research interests of applicants, as well as any particular faculty with whom they would like to work. Based on this information, the committee matches each admitted applicant with a primary mentor. The primary mentor typically will be a tenured faculty member interested in working with the prospective student. The Committee also attempts to match incoming students with a secondary mentor during recruitment or by the time incoming students begin the program. A secondary mentor is tenured or tenure-track faculty who is interested in working with the applicant, but not as the primary mentor. For example, the secondary mentor could be an assistant professor who would like to work with doctoral students but not serve as a primary mentor.[1]

2. As a general guideline, faculty serve as a primary mentor to no more than two students and participate in no more than three mentor teams overall.

3. Students generally should work on two projects during their first year in the program, one of which will be their mentored research project. The faculty mentor team will identify the two projects in advance, so incoming students can begin to work on the projects as soon as they start the program. In some cases, the mentors and student might be able to start working on the project(s) the summer prior to beginning the program. The projects should be aimed at top-tier journals. Although we recognize the variability of the research process, in general, one paper should be submitted by the end of Year 2 and the other by the fall of Year 3. This recommended timeline will help provide an opportunity for students to have one or more accepted top-tier publications by the time they begin the job market prior to Year 5.

4. At the end of Year 1, the Ph.D. Committee, faculty mentors, and students revisit each mentor team to ensure good fit. For example, if a student's interests change, or if the student would fit better with a different faculty member, the Ph.D. Committee can help adjust the mentor team. Importantly, students are encouraged to reach out to the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) or Ph.D. student services to discuss mentor team questions, issues, or potential changes.

[1] Although we welcome assistant professors to help mentor doctoral students, this is not an expectation (e.g., not required for tenure and promotion).

5. At the end of Year 2, each student's mentor team is revisited again to ensure fit between the student and the primary and secondary mentors. If the fit is still good, the expectation is that this mentor team will continue to serve for the duration of the student's time in the program. For example, the primary mentor may serve as the student's dissertation chair, or the primary and secondary mentors could serve as co-chairs. Conversely, if the primary and secondary mentors and/or the student conclude that adjustments are needed, the group will work with the DGS to identify an updated primary and/or secondary mentor to mentor the student during the remainder of the program.

6. Exceptions to these guidelines can be submitted to the Ph.D. Program Committee for consideration. Examples may include an assistant professor who would like to serve as a primary mentor (see point #1 above), or a faculty member who would like to help mentor a student but doing so would cause them to serve on more than three mentor teams (see point #2 above). In cases where a consensus decision cannot be reached, the DGS will make the final decision about the proposed exception to the process in consultation with the M&E DEO and/or the Associate Dean for Research.

Mentor Team Roles and Responsibilities

1. Work with the student on research projects aimed at publication in top-tier journals.[2]
2. Help students generate, evaluate, and select research ideas.
3. Help students prioritize projects based on top-tier potential and progress.
4. Maintain regular communication (e.g., bi-weekly virtual or in-person meetings) to monitor project development.
5. Conduct 2-3 formal progress reviews per year (e.g., end of fall, spring, and summer), with the spring review integrated into the annual evaluation process.
6. Report on the student's progress during annual review of Ph.D. students with tenure-track faculty.
7. Help engage the student in activities that cultivate intellectual independence, including research idea generation, project leadership, manuscript writing, and handling the review process.
8. Help the student develop a research network, such as by involving students in research projects with collaborators from other universities and introducing them to people at conferences.
9. Chair or serve on second-year paper and dissertation committees.
10. Write letters of recommendation for the job market.

PhD Student Responsibilities

1. Develop strategies and timelines to achieve goals, in consultation with your faculty mentors.
2. Meet with your mentor team at least twice each semester (four times per year) to discuss your progress towards goals, obstacles you are encountering, and seek advice on how you can stay on track.
3. Seek your faculty mentors' input before agreeing to any new research projects (whether with other faculty or fellow students). Your mentors can help you decide what is and is not a good use of your time, whether you may be stretching yourself too thin, and/or help support you if

[2] The primary and secondary mentor may work together and/or separately on projects with students they mentor.

you should or want to say "no" to a new project. Your mentors should be aware of all the research projects you are involved in.

4. Create and maintain a list of all your research projects, including co-authors and the project title. This will help you and your faculty mentors keep track of your progress on each project. This list could be included on your CV as part of "Working Papers" and "Research in Progress".
5. Seek your faculty mentors' guidance as needed throughout the semester, whether it be for concerns related to courses, research projects, teaching, or fellow students. We want to help you do well in the program so let your faculty member know when you need help with something.

PhD Student Funding

We commit to five years of funding for students who make satisfactory progress toward the completion of their degree. This funding typically is tied to students assigned research assistantship (RA) with their faculty mentors. In some cases, students may be partially funded by a grant one of their mentors holds. In these cases, some or all students RA responsibilities may be tied to the faculty member's grant. In addition, students will teach two standalone courses during their five years in the program. During those semesters, students' funding is tied to their teaching rather than to their RA.

To help pay competitive stipends, we ask our Ph.D. students to apply for fellowships the Iowa Graduate College provides, such as the Post-Comprehensive Research Awards and Ballard-Seashore Dissertation Award. Students will be asked to prepare materials for the application process these grants require. If students receive an award, the money does not add to their stipend but rather goes to the M&E Department to help fund student stipends and other expenses (e.g., travel).

PhD Travel and Research

To further support our students' learning and research, the department will provide the following:

1. Students will receive $3,000 annually for travel and research expenses. The budget cycle runs from July 1 to June 30.

2. Regarding travel:

    a. Students can be reimbursed up to $2,000 for a domestic conference at which they present a paper. The maximum reimbursement for international conferences at which students present may exceed this amount with approval of the DGS.

    b. Students can be reimbursed up to $1,000 per year to attend a conference(s) at which they do not present. However, they must have a business purpose to get reimbursed, such as participating in a doctoral consortium.

    c. Students are strongly encouraged to apply for Graduate Student Senate travel funding, which if awarded, would be added to their annual funding. Details can be found at: https://gss.grad.uiowa.edu/funding

d. Prior to traveling, students must complete the Graduate Student Travel form, which their primary mentor and DGS must approve. This form must be approved before students book any travel related expenses (e.g., airfare, hotel).

e. To minimize out-of-pocket expenditures, students should use the department "p-card" to pay for expenses like airfare, conference registration, and membership dues. Please contact Nicole Schrock to use the p-card.

3. Regarding research:

   a. Funds can be used to pay for professional memberships (e.g., AOM, SIOP), software not provided by the university (e.g., MPlus, Dropbox), and data (e.g., Prolific studies). All software must be purchased through STEAD.

   b. Funds cannot be used for course materials (e.g., books) or other computer related expenses.

4. Any leftover funds will not carry over into the next academic year.

PhD Honor Code

We are committed to ensuring our students adhere to the highest ethical standards in their research, teaching and service. Thus, our students must adhere to the Tippie PhD Honor Code which can be found in Appendix I.

Appendix A: Annual Progress Report Form - Students

<u>YEAR 1</u> PHD FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

STUDENT NAME _____

Key goals for Year 1 were: Learn course content; begin collaborating on projects; complete mentored research project; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; formulate idea for second-year qualifying paper:

Research and Coursework:

- List your current research projects. Please list all of them, regardless of status or your role on the project. For each project, provide the name of project (shortened name is fine), list the other members of the research team, describe your role in the project (and/or projected order of authorship), the status of each project (idea and study design, data collection, under review, etc), target journal, and projected timeline of getting project under review.

- Describe your feelings about the number of research projects on which you are working (too many, too few) and your role(s) on the projects (want more writing or methods responsibility; more of a role, less of a role).

- Any concerns with your performance in coursework? Do you feel adequately prepared for future courses?

- Any areas you would like to focus on regarding your skill development over the next two years? Describe anything that can be done to further your development.

- How was your RA performance? How well did your mentored research progress?

PhD Milestones:

- Now look ahead to your second year and your second year paper. Are there particular topics, research questions, or projects you would like to pursue as a second year paper List 2-3 topics, research questions, or projects. For each topic, research question, or project, list the potential mentor/coach for that project.

- Any concerns with your adjustment to program? Is there anything faculty can do to help you better succeed?

Teaching:

- Describe your comfort level with being prepared for future teaching responsibilities. What preparation do you need to succeed as a teacher?

Service:

- What are you doing as a department citizen (e.g., orienting/mentoring other students; attending department seminars, talks, events; being a positive influence on others; etc.)?

Review Committee:

- Finally, what 2-3 faculty members do you want to read this document and help you make decisions regarding your project pipeline, second year paper, and independent research project. Name 2-3 faculty members. Are there any of the faculty members you would like to designate as your mentor/coach?

Key goals for Year 2 are: Continue to learn course content; continue collaborations on research projects; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; submit a project to a conference; complete second-year qualifying paper; prepare for teaching.

<u>YEAR 2</u> PHD FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

STUDENT NAME _____

Key goals for Year 2 were: Continue to learn course content; continue collaborations on research projects; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; submit a project to a conference; complete second-year qualifying paper; prepare for teaching.

Research Projects:

- List your current research projects. Please list all of them, regardless of status or your role on the project. For each project, provide the name of project (shortened name is fine), list the other members of the research team, describe your role in the project (and/or projected order of authorship), the status of each project (idea and study design, data collection, under review, etc), target journal, and projected timeline of getting project under review.

- Describe your feelings about the number of research projects on which you are working (too many, too few) and your role(s) on the projects (want more writing or methods responsibility; more of a role, less of a role).

- Have you had a paper accepted at a professional conference yet? If so, describe the paper(s). If not, what barriers have you faced?

PhD Milestones:

- Have you finished the 2nd year paper? If not, how is it progressing?

- Now look ahead to your third year and your dissertation. Are there particular topics, research questions, or projects you would like to pursue as a dissertation. List 2-3 topics, research questions, or projects. For each topic, research question, or project, list the potential advisor for that project.

- Any concerns about your academic development during the first two years? Any areas you would like to focus on regarding your skill development over the next two years? Describe anything that can be done to further your development.

Teaching:

- Describe your comfort level with being prepared for future teaching responsibilities. What preparation do you need to succeed as a teacher?

Service:

- What are you doing as a department citizen (e.g., orienting/mentoring other students; attending department seminars, talks, events; being a positive influence on others; etc.)?

Review Committee:

- Finally, what 2-3 faculty members do you want to read this document and help you make decisions regarding your project pipeline, second year paper, and independent research project. Name 2-3 faculty members. Are there any of the faculty members you would like to designate as your mentor/coach?

Key goals for Year 3 are: Get papers under review for publication, designate dissertation chair and begin working on dissertation ideas, prepare for teaching, and teach a stand-alone course.

<u>YEAR 3</u> PHD FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

STUDENT NAME _____

Key goals for Year 3 were: Get papers under review for publication, designate dissertation chair and begin working on dissertation ideas, prepare for teaching, and teach a stand-alone course.

Research Projects:

- List your current research projects. Please list all of them, regardless of status or your role on the project. For each project, provide the name of project (shortened name is fine), list the other members of the research team, describe your role in the project (and/or projected order of authorship), the status of each project (idea and study design, data collection, under review, etc), target journal, and projected timeline of getting project under review.

- Do you have papers under review? Perhaps even a publication yet? Describe your most promising research projects (1-2 sentences).

PhD Milestones:

- Have you asked someone to be your dissertation chair? If so, will you have Chapter 1 ready to submit to your chair by the Fall of 4th year? What can be done to facilitate?

- Are there any concerns about not finishing within next 2 years? What can be done to help?

Job Search:

- What are your goals and aspirations for the job market?

- Is there anything we can help you do to make sure you will be a strong candidate on the job market in about 16 months?

Teaching:

- Have you taught a stand-alone course yet? If not, when will you? Do you want or feel you need to teach another stand-alone course? What do you need to further your development as a teacher?

Service:

- What are you doing as a department citizen (e.g., orienting/mentoring other students; attending department seminars, talks, events; being a positive influence on others; etc.)?

Review Committee:

- Finally, what 2-3 faculty members do you want to read this document and help you make decisions regarding your project pipeline and overall development. Name 2-3 faculty members.

Key goals for Year 4 are: Work on revise and resubmits, get papers under review for publication, and propose dissertation.

<u>YEAR 4</u> PHD FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

STUDENT NAME _____

Key goals for Year 4 were: Work on revise and resubmits, get papers under review for publication, and propose dissertation.

Research Projects:

- List your current research projects. Please list all of them, regardless of status or your role on the project. For each project, provide the name of project (shortened name is fine), list the other members of the research team, describe your role in the project (and/or projected order of authorship), the status of each project (idea and study design, data collection, under review, etc), target journal, and projected timeline of getting project under review.

- Do you have a publication yet? Do you have at least 2 papers under review? Describe how your research is progressing in terms of your most promising projects (1-2 sentences).

PhD Milestones:

- Have you proposed your dissertation or scheduled a proposal defense date? When is/was it?

- If you don't have a defended proposal, it will be done by August 1? What is your timeline? Describe what can be done to help facilitate.

Teaching:

- Do you want or feel you need to teach another stand-alone course? What do you need to further your development as a teacher?

Job Search:

- What are your goals and aspirations for the job market?
- What are your strengths as you enter the job search? What should we know about you in case we are asked at AOM?

Service:

- What are you doing as a department citizen (e.g., orienting/mentoring other students; attending department seminars, talks, events; being a positive influence on others; etc.)?

Review Committee:

- Finally, what 2-3 faculty members do you want to read this document and help you make decisions regarding your project pipeline and overall development. Name 2-3 faculty members.

Key goals for Year 5 are: Prepare for job search, get a job, complete dissertation (final defense), and keep working on publications for future tenure.

<u>YEAR 5</u> PHD FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

STUDENT NAME _____

Key goals for Year 5 were: Prepare for job search, get a job, complete dissertation (final defense), and keep working on publications for future tenure.

Research Projects:

- List your current research projects. Please list all of them, regardless of status or your role on the project. For each project, provide the name of project (shortened name is fine), list the other members of the research team, describe your role in the project (and/or projected order of authorship), the status of each project (idea and study design, data collection, under review, etc), target journal, and projected timeline of getting project under review.

- Looking toward tenure, what publications do you have? Do you have at least 2 papers under review? How is your research stream progressing? What help do you need as you transition into your new position?

PhD Milestones:

- Have you completed your final defense or scheduled a final defense date? When is/was it? Will you be done by August 1? What do you have left to complete?

Service:

- What are you doing as a department citizen (e.g., orienting/mentoring other students; attending department seminars, talks, events; being a positive influence on others; etc.)?

Review Committee:

- Finally, what 2-3 faculty members do you want to read this document and help you make decisions regarding your project pipeline and overall development. Name 2-3 faculty members.

Key goals for the future are: Graduate and keep working on publications for future tenure.

Appendix B: Annual Progress Report Form – Faculty

DOCTORAL STUDENT ANNUAL PROGRESS REVIEW
FACULTY FORM

Student's name: _____ Year in program: _____

Faculty reviewers: _____ Date of faculty meeting: _____

Feedback to student completed by: _____ on _____(date)

Pointers to Faculty:

a. The PhD committee would appreciate faculty members complete an evaluation for each student who has requested their feedback during the annual review process.
b. After meeting as a group to review the student's CV and annual self-assessment, one faculty member should document the feedback using this form and then conduct a separate discussion with the student to provide feedback about the student's progress in the program for this past year.
c. We encourage faculty members share this form with the student, perhaps prior to the discussion to help the student prepare for the discussion.
d. Please email this form to the Director of Graduate Studies and to the student after you have met with the student. The feedback session with the student and this form should be completed and sent in by June 30. (Paper copies of this form are not needed.)

PhD Milestones and Goals

Year 1: Learn course content; begin collaborating on projects; complete mentored research project; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; formulate idea for second-year qualifying paper. *In the future: Continue to learn course content; continue collaborations on research projects; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; submit a project to a conference; complete second-year qualifying paper; prepare for teaching.*

Year 2: Continue to learn course content; continue collaborations on research projects; develop research skills; develop academic writing skills; submit a project to a conference; complete second-year qualifying paper; prepare for teaching. *In the future: Get papers under review for publication, designate dissertation chair and begin working on dissertation ideas, prepare for teaching, and teach a stand-alone course.*

Year 3: Get papers under review for publication, designate dissertation chair and begin working on dissertation ideas, prepare for teaching, and teach a stand-alone course. *In the future: Work on revise and resubmits, get papers under review for publication, and propose dissertation.*

Year 4: Work on revise and resubmits, get papers under review for publication, and propose dissertation. *In the future: Prepare for job search, get a job, complete dissertation (final defense), and keep working on publications for future tenure.*

Year 5: Prepare for job search, get a job, complete dissertation (final defense), and keep working on publications for future tenure. *In the future: Graduate and keep working on publications for future tenure.*

1. Research. Evaluate the student's progress with regards to research responsibilities (RA), research projects, and publication progress. Provide feedback on number of projects, prioritization of projects, and project completion goals. Note any areas in need of further skill development (e.g., writing, methods, leading projects, responding to feedback, etc).

Comments:

2. PhD Milestones. Evaluate the student's progress with regards to PhD milestones. For first-year students, this includes mentored research and beginning stages of 2nd year paper; For second-year students, this includes the second-year paper; For third-year and fourth-year students, this includes dissertation proposal. For fifth year students, this includes dissertation final defense. See list on last page.

Comments:

3. Coursework. Evaluate the student's progress and performance in coursework (when applicable). Note any areas in need of further development.

Comments:

4. Teaching. Evaluate the student's progress in the development of teaching competence and/or the student's teaching performance. Note any areas in need of further development.

Comments:

5. Departmental Service and Citizenship. Evaluate the student's progress with regards to service and citizenship. Note any areas in need of further development.

Comments:

6. Job Search. Evaluate the student's progress with regards to preparation for the job market and overall job search process. Discuss student's goals for the job market, strengths/weakness for job market, and overall preparation for job market.

Comments:

7. **Overall evaluation of student.** Evaluate the student's overall progress with regards to research, teaching and service. Provide any additional feedback not noted above. Note any additional areas of faculty support or development needed for the student.

Other comments:

Appendix C: Sample Plan of Study

Fall Year 1	Spring Year 1	Summer Year 1
MGMT 7360: Foundations of Organizational Behavior 1 (3 hours) MGMT 7120: Research Design (3 hours) Methods Elective (3 hours)	MGMT XXXX: Foundations of Organizational Theory (3 hours) MGMT 7160: Advanced Regression Methods (3 hours) MGMT 7140: Meta-Analysis (3 hours) **Present First-Year Mentored Research Project**	**Begin Second Year Paper Process**

Fall Year 2	Spring Year 2	Summer Year 2
MGMT 7350: Foundations of Organizational Behavior 2 (3 hours) Methods Elective (3 hours) MGMT 7700: Mentored Research (3 hours)	MGMT 7800: Foundations of HRM (3 hours) MGMT XXXX: Latent Variable Modeling (3 hours) MGMT 7700: Mentored Research (3 hours)	**Submit first draft of Second Year Paper** **Revise Second Year Paper**

Fall Year 3	Spring Year 3	Summer Year 3
MGMT 7950: Directed Readings in Management (6-9 hours) **Defend Second Year Paper** **Prepare to teach next semester**	MGMT 7950: Directed Readings in Management (6-9 hours) **Teach first standalone course**	**Research and dissertation idea exploration**

Fall Year 4	Spring Year 4	Summer Year 4
MGMT 7975: Thesis in Management (6-9 hours) **Teach second standalone course** **Research and dissertation idea exploration**	MGMT 7975: Thesis in Management (6-9 hours) **Research and dissertation idea exploration** **Prepare for job search**	**Defend dissertation proposal** **Start job search**

Fall Year 5	Spring Year 5	Summer Year 5
MGMT 7975: Thesis in Management (6-9 hours) **Interview for jobs** **Work on dissertation**	MGMT 7975: Thesis in Management (6-9 hours) **Defend dissertation**	**Graduate and transition to new job!**

Appendix E: Second Year Qualifying Paper

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The second-year qualifying paper (hereafter "qualifying paper") is a research project led by the student under the guidance of an M&E faculty member (hereafter "faculty mentor") and evaluated by the faculty mentor and 3 additional faculty members (hereafter "committee"). The qualifying paper fulfills the Comprehensive Exam requirement outlined in Section XII.K of the Graduate College Manual.

The qualifying paper is a student-led research project under the direction of their faculty mentor. The paper provides hands-on experience in each stage of independent research aimed at publication. The paper can be based on a student's own idea (e.g., a class paper), an idea co-developed with faculty, or an idea from the faculty mentor. In the case where the paper is based on an idea from the faculty mentor and the student does not have a major role in idea development, the student should play a lead role in carrying out the research, including project management (e.g., scheduling meetings, establishing timelines), research design (as applicable), data collection (as applicable), data analysis (as applicable), and writing.

Acceptable qualifying papers include:

- **An empirical-based paper**. The student must conduct a literature review, develop the study design, collect new data or clean existing data (e.g., if an archival data set is used), analyze the data, and write an entire manuscript. This type of paper resembles a top-tier empirical paper like those found in AMJ, JAP, PPsych, and JOM.
- **A theoretical paper**. The student must conduct a literature review, develop a theoretical model and research propositions, and write an entire manuscript. This type of paper resembles a top-tier theoretical paper like those found in AMR.
- **A narrative or empirical review**. The student must conduct a literature search and review, code studies, conceptualize integration or analyze data, and write an entire manuscript. This type of paper resembles an integrated conceptual review like those found in JAP, a review article in JOM, or a systematic research synthesis (e.g., meta-analysis) in Psychological Bulletin.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The qualifying paper must be written wholly by the student. Although the faculty mentor can give guidance and feedback on the paper (e.g., sidebar comments within the manuscript), the writing must be the student's work (i.e., faculty should not edit the paper directly). The student can also obtain feedback on the manuscript from the Frank Business Communication Center.

The qualifying paper must be a full paper, including abstract, introduction, theory and hypotheses/propositions, methods, results (including tables and figures), and discussion. The paper, including references, must conform to the style guide of the journal for which it is intended.

For empirical papers and empirical reviews, the faculty mentor will determine what is adequate data collection or coding and analysis to meet the requirements of the qualifying paper. Pilot data collection and analysis is allowed (e.g., student sample, Prolific panel), with the understanding that this will likely not be a strong enough sample for publication in a top-tier journal and additional data collection may be necessary. The faculty mentor can help guide the student regarding data collection or coding, data cleaning, and/or data analysis and may share example templates and/or code, but the student must carry out these tasks. In principle, the student should wait until the completion of the qualifying paper evaluation to involve other collaborator(s), unless a task cannot be completed solely by the student and the faculty mentor deems that assistance is necessary (e.g., a meta-analysis that requires a second coder, an empirical paper that requires a team to manage the data collection). In cases where other collaborator(s) are involved, the student using the project as their second-year paper must lead all aspects of the project.

For theoretical papers and narrative reviews, the faculty mentor will determine what is an adequate review of the literature and adequate theoretical development to meet the requirements of the qualifying paper. Theoretical papers and narrative reviews should include a literature review, theoretical development and model, propositions, implications, and future research directions. The faculty mentor can assist with scoping the review and/or theoretical model and literature review coding, but the student must lead all these tasks. As with empirical papers, other collaborator(s) may assist only if a task cannot be completed solely by the student and the faculty mentor deems that assistance is necessary. In such cases, the student using the project as their second-year paper must lead all aspects of the project.

Journal authorship. Because the qualifying paper is written solely by the student, it is often a first draft and may look quite different from what is ultimately submitted to a journal. Any manuscript submitted for publication (not a requirement of this project) may be written or revised by coauthors, Further, the order of authorship should be determined based on each author's contribution at that time.

TIMING

<u>May 15 at end of Year 1:</u> Topic Selection

By the end of their first year, the student must choose a topic and an M&E faculty member to serve as the faculty mentor. In most cases, the student's primary or secondary mentor will serve as their mentor for the qualifying paper. The faculty mentor will serve as the faculty of record when the student enrolls in mentored research credits in their second year. Submit a one-page document to the DGS.

<u>August 1 before Year 2:</u> Proposal Submission

During the summer between Year 1 and Year 2, the student develops the research idea into a research proposal with the faculty mentor. This requires conducting most of the literature review to refine the model and contribution. The research proposal ultimately includes the introduction to the paper, proposed research model or theoretical framework, list of potential hypotheses or propositions, definitions and/or measures of key constructs, and outline of a study design. The

full literature review will be completed later. To accomplish this, the student must be proactive in meeting with the faculty mentor on a regular basis (e.g., weekly or biweekly).

At the end of the summer (i.e., by August 1), the student submits a research proposal to the faculty mentor who will assess whether the project has the potential to fulfill the requirements of the qualifying paper. The faculty mentor may also suggest that the student solicits feedback from other faculty members. If the faculty mentor determines the proposal is not sufficient to proceed, the student has until October 1 to submit a new proposal but remains on the same timeline in terms of completion.

December 15 of Year 2: Paper Progress Check

The student should plan to meet with their faculty mentor on a regular basis throughout the fall semester (e.g., weekly or biweekly). The close of fall semester date serves as a key check-in regarding progress on the paper. A formal update on the project is due to the faculty mentor and Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) via an email that details the student's progress on the project, current status, and future action items. The faculty mentor should document the progress of the student through their grade in mentored research credits.

If the student is pursuing an empirical paper or empirical review, data collection and/or coding progress should be evaluated. If the student is pursuing a theoretical paper or narrative review, the scope of the theoretical model or literature review and coding progress should be evaluated. For all projects, the student should have refined the introduction of the paper, written the literature review, and outlined the hypotheses or propositions.

Start of spring semester of Year 2: Identify Additional Committee Members

Starting in January of Year 2, the student and faculty mentor (in consultation with the DGS) will identify two additional faculty members to serve on the qualifying paper committee. A third committee member will be a member of the Ph.D. Committee, for a total of four members. The DGS will work with the student and faculty mentor to identify a Ph.D. Committee member to serve on the committee.

March 31 of Year 2: Progress Update

During the spring semester of Year 2, the student should provide a progress update to the faculty mentor and DGS. Students may submit this update anytime during the spring semester but no later than March 31. The faculty mentor should document the progress of the student through their grade in mentored research credits.

June 1 after Year 2: First Draft Submission

The first full draft of the paper is due to the faculty mentor, DGS, and other committee members. When submitting the qualifying paper, the student will include a one-page cover sheet that describes their role in the project, as well as the roles of the faculty mentor and other collaborator(s) who may have assisted at any stage of the project. The paper and the cover sheet

will be approved by the faculty mentor before the paper is sent to the rest of the committee. The faculty mentor must verify that the paper was written wholly by the student and that the student led the study design, data collection and/or coding, data cleaning, and analyses for an empirical paper or empirical review, or literature review and theoretical development for a theoretical paper or narrative review.

<u>June 15 after Year 2:</u> Preliminary Evaluation

The committee will read the paper and provide written comments to the student similar to a journal review. Written comments can be consolidated from all committee members into one review based on an exchange of emails between committee members, shared document, or as the result of a committee meeting. In addition, each committee member will evaluate the paper using the attached rubrics. Committee members' ratings based on the rubrics should inform their preliminary vote of 1) Satisfactory, 2) Reservations, or 3) Unsatisfactory using the following definitions:

1) **Satisfactory**. A vote of *satisfactory* should be used when a committee member sees no need for revisions. A vote of Satisfactory indicates that the student would likely pass the comprehensive exam requirement vote with no further action.

2) **Reservations**. A vote of *reservations* should be used when a committee member believes the deficiencies displayed in the paper likely can be rectified. Through their written comments, the committee member should document the actions required of the student that are necessary to correct the deficiencies. A vote of *reservations* indicates that the student would likely receive a *satisfactory* vote if all deficiencies were rectified or would likely receive a *reservations* vote if some deficiencies remained and could be rectified.

3) **Unsatisfactory**. A vote of *unsatisfactory* should be used when a committee member believes the deficiencies displayed in the paper are significant and either cannot be rectified or will take substantial revisions to rectify. If the deficiencies displayed in the paper cannot be rectified, the committee member should indicate to the student that they are unlikely to pass the comprehensive exam requirement. Alternatively, if the deficiencies displayed in the paper can be rectified through substantial revisions, the committee member should document the actions required of the student that are necessary to correct the deficiencies. In the case of substantial revisions, a vote of *unsatisfactory* indicates that the student would likely receive an *unsatisfactory* vote if the deficiencies are not rectified and, thus, will likely not pass the comprehensive exam requirement or indicates that the student would likely receive a *reservations* vote if some deficiencies remained and could be rectified.

<u>September 1 of Year 3:</u> Final Draft and Response Letter Submission

After receiving the committee's comments on the first draft of the paper, the student will work to respond to the comments and make appropriate changes to the paper. The student should consult with the faculty mentor regarding their plan for the revisions. The student may also consult with the other committee members regarding specific comments or suggestions from their evaluation.

By September 1, the student must submit responses to the written comments and revised paper to the DGS, faculty mentor, and other committee members. Submission requirements are the same as submission of the first draft noted above.

<u>September 15 of Year 3:</u> Oral Defense of Paper

The student will prepare a presentation that, if uninterrupted, would take around 30 minutes. The M&E Department faculty and doctoral students will be invited to attend the presentation and ask questions. Then, the audience will be dismissed, and the committee will have a chance to ask their questions. After the defense, the committee will meet to discuss what revisions, if any, they would like the student to address prior to finalizing their paper.

<u>October 1 of Year 3:</u> Submission of Final Paper

The student will submit a final paper to the committee that addresses the comments they provided during the oral defense. The student also will submit a document that describes whether and how they responded to each comment.

<u>October 15 of Year 3:</u> Final Evaluation

Based on how the student responded to the committee's comments after the oral defense, committee members will independently provide a final evaluation of the qualifying paper. This evaluation coincides with Section XII.K of the Graduate College Manual regarding comprehensive exams (see Table 2 for voting outcomes based on committee size). The committee will make a determination of 1) Satisfactory, 2) Reservations, or 3) Unsatisfactory based on the voting.

1) **Report of Satisfactory**. A report of *satisfactory* occurs with at least three positive votes. It indicates the student passes the comprehensive exam requirement with no further action.

2) **Report of Reservations**. A report of *reservations* occurs with at least two reservations votes and no more than one negative vote. A vote of *reservations* should be used when a faculty member believes the deficiencies displayed by the student were modest and can be readily rectified. In the event of a report of *reservations*, the actions required of the student that are necessary to correct the deficiencies must be recorded and submitted to the Graduate College with the examination report form. See more details regarding these action steps, timing, and how the student satisfies the required actions in Section XII.K of the Graduate College Manual.

3) **Report of Unsatisfactory**. A report of *unsatisfactory* occurs with at least two negative votes. It indicates the student has not passed the comprehensive exam requirement.

Evaluation Rubric for Empirical Papers or Empirical Reviews

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
Framing of study	• Clearly missing or significant deficiencies in the components of the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)		• Some missing components or deficiencies in the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)		• Strongly articulates the components of the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)
Theoretical model and hypothesis development	• Lacks theoretical foundation for model • Variables included in model not based on theory • Hypotheses lack theory foundation and empirical evidence • Constructs not well defined • Hypotheses not clearly testable		• Moderate theoretical foundation for model • Not all variables included in model based on sound theory or unclear how variables relate to overall theoretical framework • Development of hypotheses need to be guided more strongly by theory and empirical evidence • Some constructs in need of further definition • Not all hypotheses clearly testable		• Strong theoretical foundation for model • Variables included in model based on sound theory • Development of hypotheses guided strongly by theory and empirical evidence • Well defined constructs • Hypotheses clearly testable
Methodological rigor and transparency	• Inappropriate sample and procedures		• Appropriate sample and procedures with some adjustments		• Appropriate sample and procedures with no required adjustments

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
	• Does not use well-validated measures or inappropriately adapts existing measures • Measures do not align with constructs • Suffers from common method bias that could be avoided • Lack of transparency in description of methods		• Uses some well-validated measures and/or some deficiencies in adaptation of existing measures • Not all measures align with constructs • Some common method bias, but may be unavoidable • Additional transparency needed in description of methods		• Uses well-validated measures or appropriately adapts existing measures • Measures align with constructs • Avoids common method bias where appropriate • Description of methods aligned with APA Transparency and Openness Promotion Guidelines
Adequacy of data analysis	• Appropriate data analysis not performed • Did not correctly interpret results • Different data analysis needed • Data analysis does not result in reasonable and appropriate statistical conclusions • Did not demonstrate an understanding of analysis and results		• Appropriate data analysis performed, but did not correctly interpret some of the results • Additional analyses needed • Data analysis results in reasonable and appropriate statistical conclusions • Demonstrates some understanding of analysis and results, but more needed		• Appropriate data analysis performed • Correctly interpreted results • No additional analyses needed • Data analysis produced strong and appropriate statistical conclusions • Demonstrates strong understanding of analysis and results
Quality of discussion and implications	• Missing or significant deficiencies in aspects of the following components: 1) synthesis of empirical findings; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes, challenges or refines theory or		• Some missing aspects or deficiencies in the following components: 1) synthesis of empirical findings; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes, challenges or refines theory or empirical evidence; 4)		• Strongly articulates the following components: 1) synthesis of empirical findings; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes, challenges or refines theory or empirical evidence; 4)

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
	empirical evidence; 4) implications for practice; and 5) study limitations and areas of future research		implications for practice; and 5) study limitations and areas of future research		implications for practice; and 5) study limitations and areas of future research
Potential significance of contribution	• Does not develop, extend, or test theory • Limited empirical contribution • Limited contribution to the literature		• Tests theory, but extension of theory is modest • Moderate empirical contribution • Moderate contribution to the literature		• Extends theory and may even create new theory • Strong empirical contribution • Strong contribution to the literature
Clarity of exposition	• Poorly written and organized, not easy to understand • Arguments do not contain sound logic • Lack of flow or storytelling • Significant grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors		• Well written, moderately well-organized and somewhat easy to understand • Arguments need additional sound logic • Some flow or storytelling • Some grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors		• Clearly written, well-organized, and easy to understand • Arguments follow sound logic • Great flow or storytelling • Contains proper grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Evaluation Rubric for Theoretical Papers or Narrative Reviews

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
Framing of paper	• Clearly missing or significant deficiencies in the components of the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)		• Some missing components or deficiencies in the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)		• Strongly articulates the components of the 5Cs (Lange & Pfarrer, 2017), Setting the Hook (Grant & Pollock, 2011), or Consensus Building or Consensus Shift (Hollenbeck, 2008)
Incorporation of related theory and literatures and/or adequacy of integration of studies	• Missing key related theory and applicable literatures • Lack of integration of the literature		• Missing some related theory and applicable literatures • Further integration of the literature in a compelling and convincing way required		• Incorporates all related theory and applicable literatures • Integrates the literature in a compelling and convincing way
Conceptual development of propositions and theoretical model	• Lacks theoretical foundation for model • Development of propositions lacks theory foundation and empirical evidence • Constructs not well defined		• Moderate theoretical foundation for model • Development of propositions needs to be guided more strongly by theory and empirical evidence • Some constructs in need of further definition		• Strong theoretical foundation for model • Development of propositions guided strongly by theory and empirical evidence • Well defined constructs
Quality of discussion and implications	• Clearly missing or significant deficiencies in aspects of the following components: 1) synthesis of theoretical model; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes,		• Some missing aspects or deficiencies in the following components: 1) synthesis of theoretical model; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes, challenges or refines		• Strongly articulates the following components: 1) synthesis of theoretical model; 2) motivation for research; 3) how the study changes, challenges or refines theory or empirical evidence; 4)

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
	challenges or refines theory or empirical evidence; 4) implications for practice; and 5) areas of future research		theory or empirical evidence; 4) implications for practice; and 5) areas of future research		implications for practice; and 5) areas of future research
Potential significance of contribution	• Does not extend existing theory • Does not develop new theory • Limited contribution to the literature		• Extends existing theory • May develop new theory • Moderate contribution to the literature		• Develops new theory • Strong contribution to the literature
Clarity of exposition	• Poorly written, disorganized, and not easy to understand • Arguments do not contain sound logic • Lack of flow or storytelling • Significant grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors		• Well written, moderately well-organized, and somewhat easy to understand • Arguments need additional sound logic • Some flow or storytelling • Some grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors		• Clearly written, well-organized, and easy to understand • Arguments follow sound logic • Great flow or storytelling • Contains proper grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Evaluation Rubric of Paper Process

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
Proactivity in leading project	• Rarely acted in advance with respect to the project • Rarely initiated the next steps in the project • Relied on faculty mentor or others to take on additional responsibilities or roles		• At times, acted in advance with respect to the project • Took some prodding to advance to the next steps in the project • Sometimes took it upon themselves to take on additional responsibilities or roles		• Acted in advance with respect to the project • Initiated the next steps in the project • Took it upon themselves to take on additional responsibilities or roles
Receptiveness to feedback	• Not receptive to feedback • Reacted to feedback in defensive manner • Rarely applied feedback to future actions • Did not seek additional feedback		• Somewhat receptive to feedback • For the most part, accepted feedback in non-defensive manner • Sometimes applied feedback to future actions • Sought some feedback		• Very receptive to feedback • Accepted feedback in non-defensive manner • Applied feedback to future actions • Often sought out additional feedback
Communication with mentor and committee	• Did not communicate frequently • When they did communicate, it was severely delayed • Not responsive to communication		• Communicated somewhat frequently, but more needed • More timely communication needed • More responsiveness to communication needed		• Communicated frequently • Communicated in a timely manner • Responsive to communication
Methodological skill development	• Deficiencies in study design skills, significant further development needed		• Adequate study design skills, but further development needed		• Demonstrates strong study design skills, no deficiencies noted

Criteria	1 Completely Inadequate	2 Weak	3 Modest	4 Strong	5 Very Strong
	• Deficiencies in data analysis skills, significant further development needed		• Adequate data analysis skills, but further development needed		• Demonstrates strong data analysis skills, no deficiencies noted
Writing skill development	• Deficiencies in writing skills, significant further development needed • Deficiencies in grammar, punctuation and spelling, significant further development needed		• Adequate writing skills, but further development needed • Adequate grammar, punctuation and spelling, but further development needed		• Demonstrates strong writing skills, no deficiencies noted • Near perfect grammar, punctuation and spelling

Appendix F: Teaching Development Checklist

Required

- For students for whom English is not their first language, obtains a passing score on the Spoken Proficiency of English in the Classroom (SPEC) test.
- Observes teaching of at least one faculty member, ideally for the course they will be teaching.
- Receives feedback from a member of Ph.D. Committee on drafts of teaching materials the student develops (e.g., syllabus, sample slides, project guidelines).
- Practices first day class (or another class session) and obtains feedback from a member of the Ph.D. Committee.
- Teaches two standalone courses.
- Conducts mid-course feedback from students in standalone course. Considers adjustments to course if necessary.
- Reviews teaching evaluations (including department-level comparisons) with Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) upon completion of teaching standalone courses.

Encouraged but Optional

- Obtains feedback from a faculty member who observes the student teaching their standalone course(s).
- Takes PSQF 6217: Seminar in College Teaching.
- Attends Tippie College and/or University teaching presentations, workshops, or other activities to further develop their teaching skills.

Appendix G: Chapter 1 of the Dissertation

Requirements

Although variations may occur to fit the student's project, Chapter 1 normally includes: an introduction to the topic and explanation of why it is important to study; definition of key constructs; a short summary of the gaps in the literature; a theoretical overview of the research model in which the theoretical grounding of the model is briefly described (include any figures); identification of the study's intended contributions to the literature; and a brief description of the proposed methods. Chapter 1 should be about 10-15 pages, double-spaced, and should be written after completing a thorough literature review of the topic.

Chapter 1 Feedback

The student should work with his/her Chair on Chapter 1 before submitting it to the rest of the committee members. Students should submit Chapter 1 to the dissertation committee at least 2 weeks prior to expecting feedback. Students can obtain feedback through one of three options (as best determined by the student and Chair):

a) Student requests written feedback from each member and meets with each person one-on-one; the student then summarizes the collective feedback to share and discuss with the Chair;
b) The Chair can ask the committee members to meet at one time to discuss their concerns or suggestions with each other, without the student present, with a summary of the meeting prepared by the Chair. The Chair will then provide the summary feedback to the student.
c) The Chair can ask the committee members to meet at one time to discuss their concerns or suggestions with each other, with the student present. The student will prepare a summary of the committees' feedback to further discuss with the Chair.

It is **strongly recommended** that students submit Chapter 1 to the committee in November to ensure adequate time to complete the proposal prior to entering the job market and for best opportunities for internal and external funding. Faculty will be asked to provide feedback within 2-3 weeks. Students are expected to incorporate the committee members' feedback to revise the proposed model (as needed) and finish writing the full dissertation proposal. It is likely to take students at least 2 months (minimum) to finish writing the dissertation proposal. The purpose of this step is to help the student write a dissertation proposal that is likely to be accepted without having to do major revisions after the proposal defense. However, completion of this step is not a guarantee that the proposal will be approved "as is" on the day of the defense. Some additional revisions are very likely to be requested at the proposal defense. In general, it is in the student's best interest to keep committee members updated on any major revisions to the model or hypotheses as the proposal is developed so that no committee members are surprised by the hypotheses in the final proposal formally submitted.

Appendix H: Oral Defense of the Proposal or Final Examination

0-30 Minutes Student Presents Dissertation to Audience

In the first 30 minutes of the meeting, the student should be prepared to present the dissertation including, but not limited to, theoretical grounding and hypotheses, proposed methods, analysis and results (final examination) and academic contributions. For the final examination, the student may decide to provide a quick summary of the theoretical model and focus more on the analysis and results. The student should aim for a 15-20 minute presentation with 10-15 minutes for questions from the audience. All members of the audience can ask questions. The purpose of the presentation is to provide the student the opportunity to practice or demonstrate oral presentation skills in an academic environment. The presentation should be modeled after a conference-style talk or short job talk.

The dissertation committee can decide if they want to be present in the room for the presentation, or if they want to use the 30 minutes to meet in a separate room to discuss the upcoming oral defense. If the committee decides to be present for the presentation, then they should meet prior to the presentation (before audience members arrive) to discuss the upcoming oral defense.

30-75 Minutes Oral Defense

After the student presentation, the committee members should begin asking the student questions. Questions in the oral defense are restricted to committee members only. These questions can take any form, but the purpose is for the student to "defend" the choices they have made in the dissertation (theoretical and empirical), clarify various aspects of the proposal, and overall demonstrate their independence as a researcher. As noted in Section VII.O of the Graduate College handbook, the final examination should include: (1) a critical inquiry into the purposes, methods, and results of the investigation - not a mere recapitulation of the procedures followed - and (2) intensive questioning on areas of knowledge constituting the immediate context of the investigation.

75-120 Minutes Dissertation Committee and Student Meeting

Once the committee has exhausted their questions and is satisfied to conclude the oral defense, the audience is dismissed, along with the student. The committee should then meet to determine the outcome of the proposal or final examination (see possible outcomes below). After determining the outcome, the committee can use the remaining time to provide further changes or suggestions to the student in order to further develop the dissertation.

Appendix I: Tippie College of Business PhD Honor Code

The purpose of the Tippie PhD Honor Code is to ensure honorable and ethical behavior by PhD students at the Tippie College of Business. By enrolling into a Tippie PhD program, a student agrees to this Honor Code and accepts personal responsibility to uphold and defend academic integrity and to promote an atmosphere in which all individuals may flourish. By agreeing to the Honor Code:

- I commit to scholarly honesty and integrity
- I agree to maintain the spirit of the Honor Code
- I strive to set a standard of honest and ethical behavior that reflects well on me, the Tippie College of Business, and the University of Iowa.

Faculty, graduate assistants, and staff who discover Honor Code violations must report the violation in writing to the Associate Dean of Research at the Tippie College of Business. To report an honor code violation, please complete an incident report.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of punishable offenses under the Honor Code.

Cheating includes:

1. copying the work of others or allowing others to use your work during an exam or test;
2. using unauthorized notes, equipment, or communication during an exam or test;
3. using the work of others or helping others on an assignment, project, or quiz when not permitted;
4. obstructing or sabotaging another student's academic work, research, or experiments.

Plagiarism includes:

1. presenting the work of others without proper acknowledgment;
2. claiming the words and ideas of another as one's own;
3. failure to properly cite and specifically credit the source of information in papers or projects.

Using and modifying teaching materials of others, with permission and for instruction purposes, is not considered an honor code violation.

Forgery and falsification includes:

1. knowingly using false data in research;
2. presenting false transcripts or other official academic documents;
3. forging the signature of an instructor, advisor, dean, or another student without proper authorization.

A PhD Honor Code violation may bring a range of sanctions. If the violation is related to a course, the course instructor may apply sanctions such as a reduced grade or failing grade. In addition, the degree-granting department of the offending student can apply various sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the program or revocation of an awarded degree.

Student appeals
The appeal process for students accused of academic misconduct is specified in The University of Iowa document Policies and Regulations Affecting Students, C. Academic Misconduct which states:
“In the Graduate College, the questions [of academic dishonesty] are handled at the departmental level. If the departmental decision is appealed, the dean may appoint an appeals committee of faculty and students from a slate of nominees prepared by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Student Senate to recommend an appropriate course of action."

The appeal process must be initiated by the student. If the student wishes to appeal the department's or program's action, that appeal must be lodged with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the Graduate College within 30 days of program or departmental dismissal.