Ph.D. in Education and Human Development

Organizational Change Leadership

Comprehensive Exam Model

College of Education and Human Development October, 2019

Comprehensive Exam Model Menu

Under the guidance of their advisor, students build a comprehensive exam plan from a list of options:

1. Scholarship Protocol

Referred journal article – publication-ready

2. Teaching Protocol

Design an original academic course in the field of organizational studies

or

TA for two semesters in the OCL Master's Program

3. Grant Protocol

Identify, write, and submit a grant proposal in the field of organizational change, leadership or student research focus

4. Organizational Change Leadership (OCL) Consulting Project Protocol

Design, lead, and evaluate an organizational change initiative with measurable key performance indicators in an organization

5. Program Evaluation Protocol

Conduct a program evaluation of an organizational change within a non-profit, public, military, or for-profit organization

The student must choose three of the components above and the scholarship component must be included in the student's comprehensive exam plan.

Student Comprehensive Exam Plan

Student Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Plan Description:

(Listing and brief description of the student’s comprehensive exam plan to include 3 of the 5 components of the comprehensive exam model. The scholarship protocol must be included in the student’s plan.)

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

Submit this form (along with any attachments) to your advisor at the end of your first year in the program.

CE1 – SCHOLARSHIP PROTOCOL

Comprehensive Examination 1 (CE1) requires the doctoral student to prepare a formal research article based on the student's research interests in the field of organizational change and leadership. The article must be written at a level of scholarship suitable for submission to a specified peer-reviewed journal.

For information on how to identify and locate peer-reviewed journals:

- California State University has published an online tool that may be helpful, http://lib.calpoly.edu/research/guides/peer.html
- A comprehensive list of science journals can also be accessed through the Thompson Reuters website at http://science.thomsonreuters.com/mjl.
- When choosing a journal for article submission, it can be important to be aware of the journal's impact factor. The impact factor, often abbreviated IF, is a measure reflecting the average number of citations to articles published in science and social science journals in a specified time frame. It is frequently used as a proxy for the relative importance of a journal within its field, with journals with higher impact factors deemed to be more important than those with lower ones.
- To explore the impact factor of journals you are considering, visit http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/free/essays/impact_factor.

Overview

The student's research article must conform to the format and bibliographic style of the selected journal. Once the student has received email notification from the student's advisor approving the manuscript as it is written, the article must then be submitted to the specified journal identified by the student. Confirmation of receipt of the article by the journal and academic honesty declaration must be sent to the student's advisor before the student will be granted a "pass" for CE1.

Requirements

1. The student must have successfully completed the following courses before submitting their article to their chosen journal: OCL 6400, EMR 6450 and EMR 6480.
2. The manuscript can be a theoretical paper (e.g., an integrative literature review) or an empirical paper (e.g., a pilot study related to the student's dissertation research).
3. The student must choose a journal in the field of organizational studies.
4. Students must submit the CE1 Research Pre-Approval form before developing the article which includes the name of the manuscript, the targeted journal for the manuscript, the type of manuscript (theoretical or empirical) and an abstract for the manuscript.
5. If human subjects are involved in the project, the student must follow the required procedures.

6. The manuscript must be:

- Formatted to conform to all the selected journal's specifications and incorporate feedback received from the student's advisor.

- Submitted electronically to the student's advisor along with an electronic copy of a sample article from the targeted journal.

- Revised as requested by the student's advisor, with substantial improvements made at each point in the revision process, and with explanation of responses to reviewers' comments outlined in cover letters/emails and track changes as requested by the advisor, until it meets the advisor's standards.

- A signed Academic Honesty Declaration should be emailed to the student's advisor when submitting the final approved draft. This document may be submitted with a typed signature via email attachment in lieu of an original signature.

7. The version of the manuscript approved by the student's advisor must be:

- Submitted to the selected journal editor for publication, but *only after* the student has received the written *Released for Submission/Pass* email from the student's advisor indicating that the article is ready to be submitted. When official notification of receipt by the journal is received, the student must then forward the official notification to student's advisor, who then will provide an email confirming that the CE1 requirements have been met.

- Acceptance of the article for publication is *not* a requirement of the examination. If the article is not accepted by the journal editor (and few articles are the first time around), the student is strongly encouraged to respond to reviewers' comments and to resubmit the article to the same journal, if given that option, or to a different journal if not. Revision and resubmission of the article are *not* requirements of the examination, but they are expected as good scholarly practice.

Assessment of Comprehensive Examination 1 – Research Article

When the student has completed a draft of the article which he or she believes is ready to be submitted to the targeted journal, the student's advisor will assess the article as 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory' (i.e., in need of revision) in meeting the criteria for CE1 summarized below. If the article is judged to be in need of revision, the student will receive within approximately 30 days a written description of:

1. The deficiencies and recommendations for improvements
2. Suggested date for resubmission (generally within 30 days from receipt of the draft)

Once a student submits a research article for CE1, it will be reviewed by the student's advisor in the same manner as by an editor and reviewers of a peer reviewed journal.

Similar to the peer-reviewed editing process, articles will be reviewed using the following quality indicators:

1. Reject *(student will still resubmit as long as first time submitted)*
2. Revise and resubmit with major revisions
3. Revise and resubmit with revisions
4. Revise and resubmit with minor revisions

5. Conditional Pass
6. Pass

Resubmitted materials must be sent to the student’s advisor using track changes throughout the document, with a cover memo explaining how the revised materials are responsive to the advisor’s major recommendations. The student must make all recommended revisions as defined by the student’s advisor before the article can be *released for submission* to the peer-reviewed journal.

No article may be submitted to any person or organization outside the program, including the student’s dissertation committee, until it has received a grade of “satisfactory” (which includes, at a minimum, a level of accept with minor to no revisions with evidence of completing any minor revisions that were required) AND the student is in receipt of an email from the student’s advisor indicating the paper is ready for submission to a journal.

Confirmation of the receipt of the article by the journal editor must be sent to the student’s advisor before the student will be granted a “pass” for CE1.

Timeline

Students should initiate a conversation with their advisors at the end of their first year in the program to explore an article for publication. Students should complete a draft of their article at the end of their second year in the program and submit their article to a journal as they begin work on their dissertations.

Criteria for Assessment of Research Article

The exact format will be determined by the selected journal's requirements; however, the article is expected to include the following **Essential Components**, each of which will be reviewed for quality as well as format. Papers will be reviewed as they would when sent to a peer-reviewed journal; the following serves as a guide for expectations of such articles.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	**Abstract** Includes the sections listed below (Intro through conclusions) within the word limitation provided by the journal.	Abstract is clearly and concisely written and includes purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.	Abstract is missing or does not include purpose, methods, results or conclusions or is written in an unfocused, unclear manner or exceeds a specified word limit.
2.	**Introduction/Background** Rationale for study, literature review and critique.	Introduction/background section that includes well-written description and critique of pertinent literature, rationale for study, and research question(s).	Introduction/background section is missing or is incomplete or lacks critical analysis
3.	**Methods** Research design and rationale, population studied, sampling method, data collection data analysis procedures and validity or trustworthiness.	Methods section that includes concise, clear and appropriate description of population studied, research design, sampling method, data collection technique and data analysis procedures and validity or trustworthiness.	Methods section demonstrates insufficient knowledge of the scientific method or summarizes the pertinent details in an imprecise or inaccurate manner.
4.	**Results** Related to research question(s) and methods used.	Results section that includes pertinent tables or graphs that are responsive to research questions(s) and methods used.	Results section does not include pertinent tables or graphs or is incomplete or not appropriate for the research questions(s) and methods used.
5.	**Discussion** Critical analysis and interpretation of findings, including consideration of strengths and limitations of research design and methods.	Discussion section includes a critical, insightful, well-reasoned and thorough review of findings, interpretation of principal findings in relation to prior research, discussion of methodological weaknesses and limitations of the study, as well as strengths and significance of study.	Discussion section demonstrates inadequate critical reasoning and interpretation or lacks sufficient depth; methodological weaknesses and limitations and significance of study omitted or insufficiently described or inaccurate.
6.	**Conclusions** Justified by the findings of the research.	Conclusions (either as separate section or merged with discussion section as appropriate for the specified journal) are supported by data and include recommendations for future research.	Conclusions (either as separate section or merged with Discussion section) and recommendations for future research are not supported by data or are missing.
7.	**References** Includes only references cited in article.	References are sufficient in breadth and depth for topic and consistent and correct in format according to journal specifications.	Not all references are cited or references not cited in the article are included, or are not appropriate or selection is superficial, or citation format is inconsistent or does not follow prescribed format.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
8.	**Overall Quality of Presentation** Presentation and organization, including correct grammar, spelling, and no proof-reading errors.	The manuscript is well-organized, attractively presented with grammar and spelling that is consistently correct.	Presentation is of poor quality and disorganized, or grammar and spelling errors present.
9.	**Adherence to all Journal Specifications** Including but not limited to font size, line spacing, margins, length, treatment of tables and figures, and reference style.	The manuscript adheres to all journal specifications including margins, font, treatment of figures and tables, article length.	Article does not fulfill all the specified journal's requirements.
10.	**Administrative Steps** The student completes all administrative steps and submits the article to the approved journal in the required time frame.	The student completes all administrative steps and submits the article to the approved journal in the required timeframe. The exam requirement is not met until the Examination Committee receives proof of submission.	The student fails to complete all administrative steps or does not submit the article to the approved journal in the required timeframe.

PHD – EHD IN OCL
Comprehensive Examination 1 – Research Article

ACADEMIC HONESTY DECLARATION

You are responsible for making yourself aware of and understanding the policies and procedures in the Graduate Catalog that pertain to Academic Honesty. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse.

If there is reason to believe you have been involved in academic dishonesty, you will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. You will be given the opportunity to review the charge(s). If you believe you are not responsible, you will have the opportunity for a hearing. You should consult with your advisor if you are uncertain about an issue of academic honesty prior to the submission of an assignment or test.

I have read and understand the Academic Honesty policies of Western Michigan University. The work that I submit as a requirement for Comprehensive Examination 1 for the PHD-EHD in Organizational Change Leadership degree is solely my own work, except as modified in response to reviewers' comments, and otherwise, as explained below.

Name:

Date:

CE1 Research Pre-approval Form

Student Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Name of proposed research article/paper:

Rationale for the article/paper:

Type of article/paper (theoretical or empirical):

Abstract of article/paper:

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

Submit this form (along with an attachment) to your advisor in preparation to beginning the completion of CE1.

CE1 Research Approval Form

Student name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Name of research article/paper:

Name of journal:

Date of submission to journal:

The student has successfully passed Comprehensive Exam 1.

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

CE 2 – TEACHING PROTOCOL

To meet the Comprehensive Exam (CE2) requirement, students have two options: (1) they can design an original course, or (2) they can assist a professor as a teaching assistant in the MA in Organizational Change Leadership Program for 2 semesters.

Option 1 – Original Course Design

Students can create an original course in the field of organizational studies. General knowledge areas include organizational leadership, change, culture, strategy, learning, theory, and methods. Students must develop a short proposal for the course they plan to design and obtain approval from their academic advisor. The course should be developed as a hybrid course so that students gain experience designing for both in-classroom and online delivery systems.

Course Proposal

The student's academic advisor approves the proposal and manages administrative aspects of the activity. Students must submit the Course Design Proposal Form to their advisors as soon as they have an understanding of the course they will be developing. The student also must submit a course proposal *prior to* beginning the development of the course.

The course proposal should include the following information:

1. The student's personal learning objectives, i.e., what the student wishes to accomplish through this exam component.
2. How the content of the course supports/is related to the content of the field of organizational studies.
3. A description of how the methodology proposed for use in this course is linked to adult learning theories
4. Course name
5. Target audience
6. Syllabus outline to include
    - Course description
    - Course objectives
    - Topics to be covered
    - Sequence in which topics will be presented.
    - Pedagogy to be employed.
    - Assessment methods plan

Once the advisor approves the proposal, the student should then develop the course.

Course Design

The materials should include a syllabus and an e-learning site, as well as other materials, as described below:

Syllabus

1. Course information, i.e., sample class dates, times, and locations
2. Instructor information: name, contact information, and office hours
3. Textbooks
4. Listing of readings

5. Course description
6. Course objectives
7. Class policies, i..e., attendance, make-up or late work, and academic honesty
8. Description of each class session, including:
    a. Topics to be covered
    b. Materials to be used, including audio-visual
    c. Activities, including lab activities
    d. Readings
    e. Assignments
    f. Pedagogy
    g. Assessment of student learning
9. Justification of the chosen topics, delivery model, and instructional methods
10. Grading policy
11. Materials including course packs, handouts, and activities
12. Assessments and scoring guides
13. Course and instructor evaluations

e-learning Site

In addition to the course syllabus, the student must design a complimentary e-learning site. The e-learning site must be designed in accordance with the policies and practices of WMU. The e-learning site should include the following components fully developed.

1. Course Home: Weekly announcements and widgets

2. Content: Start Here, Syllabus, Assignments, Rubrics, Writing Resources, Library Resources, Attendance and Late Policies, and Weekly sections that include descriptions of learning objectives, activities, readings, and assignments.

3. Communications: Weekly discussion board including discussion questions and activities

4. Assessments: Assignment assessments and grade book development

Timeline

If students choose this option, proposals are due in the fall semester of their second year in the program. Students engage with their advisors to agree on a completion schedule for this exam component.

Option 2 – Teaching Assistant

Students also have the option of being a teaching assistant in the MA in Organizational Change Leadership Program. To meet this requirement, students must assist a professor as a teaching assistant for 2 semesters across the fall, spring, and summer semesters.

Acceptable Courses

Approved courses include core and special topics courses in the MA in Organizational Change Leadership Program:

OCL 6400 – Foundations in Organizational Change Leadership
OCL 6410 – Organizational Culture and Globalization
OCL 6430 – Group Dynamics and Team Development
OCL 6890 – Special Topics in Organizational Change Leadership

Course formats can be face-to-face, hybrid, or online.

Student's Role

Students must identify a course to be a teaching assistant and obtain approval from his or her academic advisor. The student's role includes, but is not limited to, creating the syllabus, setting up the course in e-learning, integrating improvements into the course from previous teaching of the course, facilitating and grading online discussions, grading assignments, and designing and facilitating both online and in-class sessions.

Timeline

If students choose this option, they must meet with their advisor to arrange and commit to supporting a course as a teaching assistant for two semesters at the end of their first year in the program.

Option 1 – Course Design Proposal Approval Form

Student name:

Student WIN:

Course name:

Design schedule (include start date, interim reviews and completion date):

STUDENT SIGNATURE AND DATE:

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

Submit this form along with your proposal to your advisor to gain approval of the course you plan to design to meet the CE2 requirements.

Option 2 - Teaching Assistant Approval Form

Student name:

Student WIN:

Course names:

Instructor names:

Course locations:

Semesters:

Start and end date of each course:

Advisor name:

STUDENT SIGNATURE AND DATE:

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

Submit this form to your advisor as soon as there is agreement about the 2 courses and semesters you will support the OCL program as a teaching assistant.

Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Protocol Option 1 – Original Course Design

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	**Syllabus** 1. Course information, i.e., sample class dates, times, and locations 2. Instructor information: name, contact information, and office hours 3. Textbooks 4. Listing of Readings 5. Course Description 6. Course Objectives 7. Class policies, i..e., attendance, make-up or late work, and academic honesty 8. Description of each class session, including: a. Topics to be covered b. Materials to be used, including audio-visual c. Activities, including lab activities d. Readings e. Assignments f. Pedagogy g. Assessment of student learning 9. Justification of the chosen topics, delivery model, and instructional methods 10. Grading Policy 11. Materials including course packs, handouts, and activities 12. Assessments and scoring guides 13. Course and instructor evaluations	The syllabus is complete and comprehensive, including all the essential components, with information clearly and appropriately presented for the targeted student audience. There is no ambiguity in course content, objectives, policies, or instructions.	The syllabus does not include all the essential components. Information is incomplete, or disorganized, or uses inappropriate language for the targeted student audience. There is some ambiguity in course content, objectives, policies, or instructions.

2.	**e-learning** 1. Course Home: Weekly announcements and widgets 2. Content: Start Here, Syllabus, Assignments, Rubrics, Writing Resources, Library Resources, Attendance and Late Policies, and Weekly sections that include descriptions of learning objectives, activities, readings and assignments. 3. Communications: Weekly discussion board including discussion questions and activities 4. Assessments: Assignment assessments and grade book development	The e-learning site is complete and comprehensive, including all the essential components, with information clearly and appropriately presented for the targeted student audience. There is no ambiguity in course content, objectives, policies, or instructions.	The e-learning site does not include all the essential components. Information is incomplete, or disorganized, or uses inappropriate language for the targeted student audience. There is some ambiguity in course content, objectives, policies, or instructions.
	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	**SATISFACTORY**	**UNSATISFACTORY**
3.	**Course Materials** Materials including course packs, handouts, activities, etc.	Materials, including course packs, handouts, activities, etc., are complete, sufficiently detailed, well organized, clearly legible, attractively presented.	Materials, including course packs, handouts, activities, etc., are incomplete, lack sufficient detail, are disorganized, illegible in parts, or not attractively presented.
4.	**Assessment Tools** Copies of all assessments, including formal tests and scoring rubrics or other forms of assessment.	Assessments are well structured and show incremental assessment of knowledge and/or skills, test course objectives, integration, synthesis, and application of knowledge and/or skills, as well as factual information.	Assessments show little evidence of incremental assessment of knowledge and/or skills, or do not assess all course objectives, or predominantly require factual recall and fail to test synthesis and application of information.
5.	**Evaluations** Appropriate course and instructor evaluation forms including evaluation components under the student instructor's control and any evaluations required by the institution sponsoring the course	Course and instructor evaluations are comprehensive, of appropriate length, well organized, and clearly presented, and the student addresses all key points raised in the evaluation.	Course and instructor evaluations do not evaluate all aspects of the instructor's performance, or course content, or achievement of objectives. Evaluation tools under student control are imprecisely worded, of inappropriate length, disorganized, or poorly presented. Student does not adequately address all key evaluation issues.

Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Protocol Option 2 – Teaching Assistant

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1	**Content Knowledge**	☐ Teaching Assistant displays solid understanding of the knowledge and skills required to serve students.	☐ Teaching Assistant displays little understanding of the knowledge and skills required to serve students.
2	**Preparation**	☐ Teaching Assistant is punctual to meetings and to face-to-face and online sessions.	☐ Teaching Assistant is not punctual to meetings and face-to-face and online sessions.
		☐ Teaching Assistant organizes time well and functions in an efficient manner.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not organize time well and functions in an inefficient manner.
3	**Instructional Delivery**	☐ Teaching Assistant demonstrates knowledge of students' backgrounds, skills, and interests.	☐ Teaching Assistant makes little or no attempt to acquire knowledge of students' backgrounds, skills, and interests.
		☐ Teaching Assistant's presentation/work is clear and organized.	☐ Teaching Assistant's presentation/work is not clear or organized.
		☐ Teaching Assistant communicates information effectively to students.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not communicate information effectively to students.
		☐ Teaching Assistant serves by action and attitude as a positive model for students.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not serve by action and attitude as a positive model for students.
4	**Classroom and Online Management**	☐ Teaching Assistant's interactions with students are positive and appropriate.	☐ Teaching Assistant's interactions with students are negative and inappropriate.
		☐ Teaching Assistant sets clear expectations for student behavior and responds appropriately to student misbehavior.	☐ Teaching Assistant sets no clear expectations for student behavior and responds inappropriately to student misbehavior.
5	**Student Development**	☐ Teaching Assistant supports, cooperates, communicates, and shares information with appropriate personnel to enhance student learning and development.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not support, cooperate, communicate, or share information with appropriate personnel to enhance student learning and development.
		☐ Teaching Assistant advises and aids in preparing for future services, programs, or needs of students.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not advise or aid in preparing for future services, programs, or needs of students.
		☐ Teaching Assistant uses a variety of methods designed to meet student development.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not use a variety of methods designed to meet student development.
6	**Student Assessment**	☐ Teaching Assistant recognizes and accepts individual differences of students.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not recognize or accept individual differences of students.

7	**Collaboration**	☐ Teaching Assistant effectively handles problems through communication with students, educators, administrators, and others.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not effectively handle problems through communication with students, educators, administrators, and others.
		☐ Teaching Assistant's relationships with students and other professionals are positive.	☐ Teaching Assistant's relationships with students and other professionals are negative.
8	**Reflective and Responsive Practices**	☐ Teaching Assistant is actively involved in the process of meeting the needs of students.	☐ Teaching Assistant is not actively involved in the process of meeting the needs of students.
		☐ Teaching Assistant maintains appropriate records and submits reports in a timely fashion.	☐ Teaching Assistant does not maintain appropriate records and submits reports in an untimely fashion.

CE2 Teaching Approval Form

Student name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Name of original course designed:

or

Names of the courses and semesters in which the student was a teaching assistant:

Date of completion:

The student has successfully passed Comprehensive Exam 2.

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

CE 3 – GRANT PROTOCOL

Comprehensive Examination 3 (CE3) requires doctoral students to prepare a formal grant application. The grant application must receive preapproval from the student's advisor and be written at a level of scholarship acceptable and suitable for submission to a specified funding agency, conforming to the format and referencing style of that agency. Once the student has received an email indicating that the grant is *released for submission*, the grant must be submitted to the specified funding agency. Confirmation of the receipt of the grant by the agency must be sent to the student's advisor before the student will be granted a "pass" for CE3.

Requirements

1. It is highly recommended that if a student chooses this option, they compete a grant writing course offered in the college or university or a grant writing workshop.

2. Students must submit the Grant Application Pre-Approval form to their advisor before writing the grant. The form must include;

   - A brief description of the specific project and funding agency.
   - The Request for Proposals (RFP) of the agency, including any submission deadlines and page limits.
   - A one page "concept paper" outlining the essence of the proposed activity:
     1. Introduction – statement of problem, need, and significance
     2. Objectives – measurable objectives that can be evaluated
     3. Resources required – staff, equipment, and materials
     4. Implementation plan – what you are going to do, who is going to do it, how you are going to do it, and when you will do it
     5. Funding timeline – duration of funding needed

3. The student should be the primary author of the application but may collaborate with another principal investigator and other stakeholders in preparing the proposal, as preapproved by the student's advisor.

4. If the student is submitting the grant in collaboration with others, the student must provide documentation of approval (can be an email) from all key partners at each step of the process (pre-approval, draft review, and prior to final submission to the funding agency).

5. The application must be for a grant considered for external funding (not an internal grant) as determined by the student's advisor.

6. The application should meet all of the specifications of the funding agency.

7. If the requirements of the funding agency are "minimal," the student's advisor may require the student to provide a more extensive description of key components, such as the research plan or budget justification.

8. Grant application materials should be submitted to the examination committee sufficiently before the grant deadline to ensure time for multiple revisions prior to deadline for submission to the agency. Although the student's advisor will do his or her best to be responsive to tight timelines, the committee

cannot guarantee that submission deadlines can be met if substantial revisions are required. If so, the grant may need to be submitted in the following cycle.

9. As a requirement of the examination, the student must revise the grant application using feedback from the student's advisor as requested until it meets the program's standards. The application may not be submitted to the funding agency *until* the student has received an email indicating that the proposal has been *released for submission* documentation from the student's advisor. Receipt of the actual grant award is *not* a requirement of the examination, but submission to the agency is required. In rare cases, the examination committee may release the application for submission to meet a one-time deadline, but may ask for additional revisions for the purpose of the examination for an application that already has been submitted.

10. If human subjects are involved in the project, the student must follow required procedures. The student may not need HSIRB approval prior to submitting the grant if not required by the funding agency. However, if the grant is funded and HSIRB approval is required, and if the student is a member of key personnel for the project, the student must obtain the approval of the HSIRB at WMU *and* the sponsoring institution.

11. The proposal and accompanying approval forms must be consistent with the grant proposal and submission guidelines of the institution through which the application is being submitted, and all required administrative signatures must be obtained prior to actual submission to the agency.

12. The final submission to the student's advisor must be accompanied by a signed Academic Honesty Declaration. The document may be submitted with a typed signature via email attachment in lieu of an original signature.

Assessment of CE3 Grant Application

The grant application will be reviewed by the student's advisor using the criteria summarized below and with reference to criteria of the funding agency. When the review is complete, the student's advisor will judge the completion of the CE3 requirements as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." If the grant application is judged unsatisfactory, the student will receive a written description of:

1. The deficiencies and recommendations for improvements
2. Date for resubmission (generally 30 days from receipt of the email notification, or another agreed upon date that meets the submission deadline of the funding agency if sooner, and if possible).

If the grant is judged unsatisfactory on the first attempt, the student may receive mentoring and resubmit the grant. Resubmitted materials must be sent to the student's advisor with a cover memo that explains how the revised materials are responsive to the advisor's recommendations. If the student fails to satisfy the recommended revisions, and the revised grant is assessed again as unsatisfactory, additional revisions may be requested by the advisor.

The student must make all requested revisions before the email indicating *release for submission* can be supplied by the student's advisor. In some cases, the student may miss the intended grant cycle and may need to submit the application in a subsequent cycle. Exceptions can be discussed with the committee on a case-by-case basis.

Confirmation of the receipt of the grant application by the funding agency must be sent to the student's advisor before the student will be granted a "pass" for CE3. Formal notification of passing all requirements for Comprehensive Examination 3 will come from the student's advisor.

Timeline

If students choose this option, they must meet with their advisor at the end of their first year in the program to make arrangements to complete this component of their comprehensive exam plan.

Grant Application Pre-approval Form

Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Official name and address of grant agency:

Working title of proposed activity:

Concept paper: (One-page in length to include: Introduction, Objectives, Resources, Implementation Plan, and Funding Timeline)

Outline of agency's requirements: (These should be taken from the proposal guidelines and scoring criteria and pasted into this document, including page limits and whether the document should be single or double spaced.)

Submission deadline: (It is essential for the committee to be aware of submission deadlines and whether the deadlines roll on a quarterly or annual schedule.)

Reference: (Weblink where official information on the grant can be found.)

ADVI SOR SIGNATURE AND DATE

Criteria for Assessment of Grant Application

Repeated failure to achieve a "Satisfactory" rating for *any* Essential Component may result in failure to pass CE3, Grant Application.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
	Responsive to Funding Agency All elements of the application (including organizational headings) conform to the guidelines required by the funding agency and address its mission.	All elements of the application are within the parameters required by the funding agency, and the purpose of the project is relevant to the agency's mission.	Not all elements required by the specified funding agency are included, or the student demonstrates insufficient knowledge of the funding agency's requirements and mission.
	Overview and Purpose Clarity and precision of overview of project, goals, and specific problem the project will address.	Clear overview of project, concise account of project goals, clear statement of problem to be addressed.	Overview confusing or missing, or goals unclear or problem not well defined.
	Background and Significance Persuasive nature of the description of the significance of the problem evidenced by the review of the key literature.	Thorough review of the literature and other data provide a cogent argument for the importance of addressing this problem, using excellent sources and rationale for establishing the background and the significance of the proposed activity.	Review of literature cursory, absent, or inappropriate. Inadequate sources of information are used, or the background is poorly described, or the significance of the proposed activity is not well established.
	Objectives Objectives are described with measurable benchmarks.	An appropriate number of clearly defined measurable objectives.	Inappropriate number of objectives or objectives that are not measurable; or poor or ill-conceived research design; inadequate or poorly articulated methodology, or inappropriate analysis.
	Implementation Plan Methods for addressing the problem include (as appropriate) research design, procedures, and analysis plan. Also describes appropriate work plan including resources required and realistic timeline: What, who, when, and how.	Effective research design, well thought-out and detailed description of the methodology. Detailed, achievable work plan and timeline. Detailed description and justification of all resources including named personnel, equipment, and materials required at each stage.	Implementation plan lacks detail or is illogically presented; or lacks adequate description of personnel roles, equipment or materials needed; or unrealistic timeline.
	Evaluation/Statistical Analysis Plan Comprehensive evaluation plan and/or plan for statistical analysis of outcomes to answer research questions.	A fully developed evaluation plan of outcomes which details how outcomes will be measured and evaluated.	Evaluation plan poorly developed, or does not measure outcomes, or is missing.

	Budget and Justification Budget detail that is comprehensive, realistic, and accurate, with convincing justification and approval from appropriate collaborating administrators.	The budget is comprehensive, realistic, and accurate; the justification is sufficiently detailed and convincing; input and approval from appropriate program administrators is clear.	The budget, its justification, and forms include inaccuracies, are unrealistic, incompatible with requirements, or suggest that an incomplete grasp of concepts of budget construction and justification, or student has not sought administrative approvals.
	References References are appropriate, cover sufficient breadth and depth, use a citation format that is consistent and accurate, and exactly match the citations in the grant narrative.	Cited references are appropriate, cover sufficient breadth and depth of topic, and the citation format is consistent and accurate. Reference list matches citations in document exactly.	Some references are inappropriate, their selection is superficial, or citation format is inconsistent or does not follow prescribed format. Some references are missing, others that were not cited are included in the reference list.
	Overall Quality of Application Quality of application is organized, accurate, scholarly, and of solid substance.	Information is presented and organized efficiently and effectively, with accurate grammar and spelling and no proofreading errors.	Presentation is of low quality and disorganized, or grammar and spelling or proofreading errors are present.
	Length Proposal length conforms to agency's prescribed limit.	Length of the proposal conforms to funding agency's limit, and addendum, if required, meets the Examination Committee's specifications.	Length of the proposal does not conform to agency's limit, or addendum, if required, does not meet the Examination Committee's specifications.
	Administrative Steps The student must complete all administrative steps for institutional approval and submit the application to the approved agency in the required timeframe. The exam requirement is not met until the Examination Committee receives evidence of submission.	The student completes all administrative steps and submits the application to the approved agency in the required timeframe.	The student fails to complete all administrative steps or does not submit the application to the approved agency in the required timeframe.

CE3 Grant Proposal Approval Form

Student name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Official name and address of grant agency:

Working title of proposed activity:

Date of completion:

The student has successfully passed Comprehensive Exam 3.

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE:

CE 4 – OCL CONSULTING PROJECT PROTOCOL

To meet the Comprehensive Exam (CE4) requirement, students must design, lead, and evaluate an organizational change initiative. The initiative can be a change in the student's organization or a change in an organization to which the student has access.

Change Proposal

This protocol starts with the development of a change proposal. The student's academic advisor approves the proposal and helps the student manage the administrative aspects of the activity. Students must submit the OCL Consulting Project Protocol Approval Form to their advisors as soon as they have an understanding of the change they will be leading. The student also must submit a proposal *prior to* beginning the planning of the change.

The course proposal should include the following information:

1. The student's personal learning objectives, i.e., what the student wishes to accomplish by completing this exam component.
2. How the change supports/is related to the content of the field of organizational studies.
3. Name of the change
4. Description of the content of the change – what's to be changed and change type
5. Description of the inner and outer context systems surrounding the change
6. Description of the change strategies and methodologies to be used including diagnostic techniques, intermittent assessments techniques, and post-hoc evaluation methods
7. Timeline for the project (start and end dates)

Once the advisor approves the proposal, the student should begin the change process, starting with planning as described below.

Reports

As the student leads the change, the student must develop and submit the following reports:

Planning Report

Before implementing the change, the student must identify the client, and develop and agree on a contract for the change. The contract must include: the objectives and boundaries of the project, description of consultant's role and client's role, information needed, deliverables, support needed, milestones, timeline and confidentiality.

The planning report must also describe the presenting problem and the purpose of the project, the organizational diagnosis model to be used to diagnose the situation, and the theory used to guide the student's data collection and analysis efforts. After this report is reviewed and approved by the student's advisor, the student can conduct a diagnosis.

Diagnosis Report

With his or her chosen diagnosis model, the student collects and analyzes data to gain an understanding of the client's problem, conducting a diagnosis surrounding the change. Based on the findings learned from the diagnosis the student develops a set of recommendations and reviews them with the client. Interventions (and at what level) are designed and prepared for execution. The diagnosis should include a change readiness assessment to determine a level of system readiness among change recipients in the human system surrounding the change. In addition, the student must collect a baseline of data in order to measure the effectiveness of the change after its implementation. Before moving on to implement the change, the student's advisor must approve the student's diagnosis report.

Implementation Report

During the implementation of the change, the student keeps a journal tracking his or her actions (what he or she does, i.e., strategies and tactics used to lead the change) and change recipient responses (how change recipients respond on cognitive, emotional, intentional, and behavioral levels). In addition to tracking strategies and resistance, other issues to be addressed in this report include organizational change momentum, communication, and a plan for sustaining the change.

Evaluation Report

Once the project has ended, the student conducts an evaluation of the organizational change consulting engagement. Students select an organizational consulting evaluation model and conduct an evaluation. The evaluation must include a comparison between the baseline data collected during the diagnosis and the data collected during this final phase to assess the effectiveness of the change.

Timeline

If students are interested in completing this option, proposals are due in the fall semester of their second year in the program. Students engage with their advisors to agree on a completion schedule for this exam component.

OCL Consulting Project Pre-approval Form

Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Description of the change to be led by the student:

Name of organization in which the change will be carried out:

Timeline for the change (start and end dates):

Students should attach their proposal to this form.

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE

OCL Consulting Project Approval Form

Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Description of the change to be led by the student:

Name of organization in which the change will be carried out:

Timeline for the change (start and end dates):

Planning Report Approved

Advisor's Signature and Date:

Diagnosis Report Approved

Advisor's Signature and Date:

Implementation Report Approved

Advisor's Signature and Date:

Evaluation Report Approved

Advisor's Signature and Date:

Criteria for Assessment of OCL Consulting Project

Repeated failure to achieve a "Satisfactory" rating for *any* Essential Component may result in failure to pass CE4, OCL Consulting Project.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	**Planning Report** Includes contract (the objectives and boundaries of the project, description of consultant's role and client's role, information needed, deliverables, support needed, milestones, timeline and confidentiality) and discussion of presenting problem and the purpose of the project, the organizational diagnosis model to be used to diagnose the situation, and the theory used to guide the student's data collection and analysis efforts.	Clear plan for the project, concise account of the elements of the contract, and problem, purpose, model, theory and data collection and analysis procedures are well-defined.	Planning report confusing or missing components, or information unclear
2.	**Diagnostic Report** Report includes diagnostic and change readiness model, data collected and analyzed, and set of recommendations. Interventions (and at what level) are presented.	Clear presentation of the data collected and analyzed from the diagnosis. Recommendations and interventions are rational and logical and are directly related to the data.	Diagnostic report confusing or missing components, or information unclear
3.	**Implementation Report** Included series of journal entries tracking actions of change leader and responses among change recipients. Resistance, momentum and communication is discussed. A plan for sustain the change is presented.	Perceptive observations of the change strategies used and the reaction to those strategies. Judicious assessment of momentum and communication as change was implemented. Sustainment plan is clear and based on literature.	Implementation report confusing or missing components, or information unclear
4.	**Evaluation Report** Report to include evaluation model, data collected and analyzed and evaluation summary. Student learnings are discussed.	Rigorous assessment of the project. Clear presentation of data collected, data analyzed, and evaluation outcomes. Student learnings are comprehensive and clear.	Evaluation report confusing or missing components, or information unclear

CE5 – PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL

To meet the Comprehensive Exam (CE5) requirement, students must conduct a program evaluation of an organizational change initiative. The initiative can be a program in the student's organization or a program in an organization to which the student has access.

Evaluation Proposal

This protocol starts with the development of a program evaluation proposal. The student's academic advisor approves the proposal and helps the student manage the administrative aspects of the activity. Students must submit the Program Evaluation Protocol Pre-Approval Form to their advisors as soon as they have an understanding of the program they will be evaluating. The student also must submit a proposal *prior to* starting the evaluation.

The program evaluation proposal should include the following information:

1. **Introduction**
   - Purpose of the evaluation
   - Stakeholder identification
2. **Description of what is being evaluated**
   - The need and context for the evaluation
   - Target population
   - Stage of development of what is being evaluated
3. **Evaluation Design**
   - Evaluation questions
   - Stakeholder information needs
   - Evaluation design
4. **Data Collection**
   - Methods of data collection
   - Methods relevance to the evaluation questions
5. **Data Analysis and Interpretation**
   - Indicators and standard to judge the success
   - Method for data analysis
   - Data interpretation and justification
6. **Communication and Reporting**
   - How the information will be presented?
   - How you plan to disseminate the results?
7. **Evaluation Management**
   - People involved in the evaluation process
   - Timeline of activities
   - Budget (if applicable)

Once the advisor approves the proposal, the student should begin the program evaluation.

Program Evaluation Report

Upon completing the program evaluation, the student must submit a report using APA style. The report includes the following elements:

1. **Title Page**
   - Student's name and date of preparation
   - Evaluand's name and affiliation
2. **Executive Summary**
   - Description of the program
   - Evaluation questions
   - Brief description of methods
   - Summary and implication of findings
   - Brief recommendations
3. **Table of Contents and Other Sections that Preface the Report**
   - List of tables and acronyms
4. **Introduction and Background**
   - Purpose of evaluation and evaluation questions
   - Description of the program
   - Identification of target groups, stakeholders, audiences
   - Research (literature) review
5. **Methodology**
   - Evaluation approach/model
   - Design of the evaluation (sample, timeline)
   - Data collection methods and informants
   - Limitations, if appropriate
6. **Results Chapter**
   - Findings
   - Discussion of findings
7. **Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations**
   - Summary of findings and interpretation
   - Program/project merit and worth
   - Recommendations, if appropriate
8. **References and Appendices**

Timeline

If students are interested in completing this option, proposals are due in the fall semester of their second year in the program. Students engage with their advisors to agree on a completion schedule for this exam component.

Program Evaluation Protocol Pre-approval Form

Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Description of the program to be evaluated by the student:

Name of organization in which the evaluation will be carried out:

Timeline for the evaluation (start and end dates):

Students should attach their proposal to this form.

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE

Program Evaluation Approval Form

Name:

Student WIN:

Advisor:

Description of the program to be evaluated by the student:

Name of organization in which the evaluation will be carried out:

Timeline for the evaluation (start and end dates):

ADVISOR SIGNATURE AND DATE

Criteria for Assessment of Program Evaluation

Repeated failure to achieve a "Satisfactory" rating for *any* Essential Component may result in failure to pass CE5, Program Evaluation.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1	**Responsive to Evaluation Report Requirements** All elements of the report (including headings) conform to the guidelines required by the department.	All elements of the report are within the parameters required by the department, and the purpose of the project is relevant for this piece of comprehensive exam.	Not all elements required by the department are included, or the student demonstrates insufficient knowledge of the department's requirements.
2	**Title Page** Clarity and preciseness of the title page, including information about the author, evaluand, and date of the evaluation report.	Clear and concise title to facilitate indexing. Author(s)' names, affiliations, and date are accurately included. Name of the evaluand/organization is identified. Text and material on title page are clearly and properly arranged.	The title page is poorly arranged. The title is not clear and creates confusion. The report lacks the date and it does not identify the evaluand/organization.
3	**Executive Summary** The summary describes the program/project, touches upon the main elements covered in the report, including findings and recommendations.	Accurate description of program/project, including the evaluation questions and purpose of the evaluation. A clear and short summary of main findings is included with the implications of findings and recommendation if appropriate.	The program/project description is very vague, the evaluation questions are not specific, and the purpose of the evaluation is not convincing. The findings are not convincing and recommendations are not relevant.
4	**Table of Contents and Preface Sections** The table of contents includes all of the sections of the report.	Table of contents contains at least all first and second level headers in the reports. Titles and page numbers are accurately presented. Lists of tables, figures, and appendices are included, if appropriate. List of acronyms or abbreviations is included, if appropriate.	The table of contents is poorly organized, with no differences in header levels and wrong page numbers for the chapters. The report misses the list for tables, figures, or acronyms.
5	**Introduction and Background** Clarity and precision of the overall report structure, including purpose of the project, its description, target population, stakeholders.	Clear and concise statement of the purpose of evaluation and evaluation questions. The program/project and its goals being evaluated is presented accurately. The introduction identifies the target population and stakeholders for the evaluation. The review of related research is logical.	The program/project description is vague and confusing. The goals of the project are not clear. The target population and stakeholders are not mentioned or they are not relevant to the project.
6	**Methodology** Provide information on methods by which the student has	The evaluation approach or model being used is described and is supported by rationale for having	The evaluation approach or model used for the project is not relevant to the evaluation questions. The

	collected/compiled data, and how those methods are related to the evaluation questions he/she identified.	used it. Design of the evaluation is discussed, including timing of data collection. The sample size is sufficient. Methods of data collection are included, including description of data collection instruments, sources of information and data. The limitations of the evaluation are disclosed, if appropriate.	design of the evaluation is poor and the sample size is very small. The methods of data collection are overlooked.
7	**Results Chapters** Results present the findings from the evaluation report, supported by evidence and explanations.	Details of the evaluation findings are clearly and logically described. Charts, tables, and graphs are understandable and appropriately and consistently labeled. Discussion of evaluation findings is objective and includes both negative and positive findings. All evaluation questions are addressed or an explanation is included for questions that could not be answered. Findings are adequately justified.	The report findings are questionable and they don't have a logical flow. There is no supportive evidence presented, such as charts or tables. The evaluation findings are vaguely discussed and no justification was made. The findings are limited to presenting only positive or negative discoveries.
8	**Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations** The summary wraps up the findings and the procedure of the evaluation project. It addresses author's conclusions and recommendations.	Summary of findings is included is clearly indicated in this chapter. Discussion and interpretation of findings are accurately included. Summary and conclusion fairly reflect the findings. Judgments about the program that cover merit and worth are included. If appropriate, recommendations are included and are based on findings in the report.	The report fails to summarize the findings from the evaluation project or findings are stated vaguely without a further discussion or interpretation. Merit and worth factors for the project are not mentioned, and no recommendations were provided.
9	**References and Appendices** The report should be written in APA style, therefore follow the corresponding references and appendices.	APA style is used consistently for all references. References cover all in-text citations. All appendices referenced in the text are included in the appendix section, in the order they are referenced.	The report has a number of APA mistakes. It misses in-text citations and references. It does not have any appendix.
10	**Overall quality of the report** Clarity of writing, adherence with report requirements, convincing findings	The report presents a high quality. It is written in a professional manner, adhering to the report requirements by the department. The findings are convincing and well-supported by evidence.	The quality of the report is poor. It lacks organization and structure. The report findings are not sufficiently supported by evidence.