

Jul 6, 2016 9:25 PM

Any kind of doctoral level study should be acceptable. If good quality work is put into the study and the study turns out successful in every way, then the kind of study should not matter and should be good--passing. Did you know that a primary emphasis in the Faculty Code of Conduct is to maintain academic freedom? Academic freedom is important in many ways. There is no one, especially any faculty member, who should impede anyone else from teaching or learning. If a faculty member is involved with such hindering academic freedom to teach or learn, the faculty code of conduct says that the actions will be considered as misconduct and will subject the violator to discipline (University of Phoenix, Faculty Handbook, 2009-2010). The university's policy was to cultivate open thought and presentation for putting into the public knowledgeable and novel materials and for deciding on implementations of such materials and concepts (University of Phoenix, Faculty Handbook, 2009-2010). Any kind of study that is reasonable and meets many doctoral standards should be able to be a passable or even a more than passable study. Of course, such a passable study goes into a passable dissertation and enables successfully completing the doctoral program.

Jul 8, 2016 9:42 PM

The continuing situation involves improvement requiring concerning how meritorious people are treated. The proper rewards and honors have to be given actively and in reasonably due times. Past inaccuracies have to be corrected and gotten back to favorable standards.

My dissertation was always very good and still is, too. I should have finished this doctoral program years ago, and the issues involved should be adequately addressed and worked out without needing more than the wisdom of expressions and regard of the wise expressions.

There is much more involved than I can conveniently say here. I would rather have somewhere to post in addition to only this "QRM Super Confused" area. I myself am not "super confused," and I understand the wording was not really meant as being only confused but was meant as there being something wrong. I cannot post too much anyway because I do not have the time, and my postings have to count, as they are supposed to in the times.

I would like to see more in directions of working out the long-enduring issues. I will not wait and will keep doing what I do. Here, I am continuing with my good faith effort to fully complete this doctoral program that I earned successfully completing multiple times already. My dissertation went through the Quality Review Final (QRF) 5 times and has not been back into the QRF since January 2015, which means it is overdue at having its chance to go back into the QRF. I am presently looking forward to ONLY an efficient, continuously successful completion of this doctoral program.

07/12/2016

- Which committee do you mean? I am currently working with the fourth dissertation committee. The first dissertation committee was truly sufficient for passing my dissertation through the QRF and completing the doctoral program. The second dissertation committee was sufficient also, and expressed on four different occasions for my dissertation to be approved in the QRF. The third dissertation committee gave some suggestions, which were followed, but ended up totally failing as a dissertation committee by not regarding past work done, not regarding the reality of the ending phase of the doctoral program being different from the beginning or middle phase, and by straying from serving the purpose they originally agreed to serve. The fourth dissertation committee is the current one, which has been informed on the overdue ending phase of this doctoral program.

I do not see why each of the three dissertation committee members saying to approve a dissertation in the QRF on four different occasions was still not enough for the fourth reviewer to cooperate and approve the dissertation. I do not see why a more than passable dissertation was not approved in the QRF after 2 additional years, which were 2013 and 2014. I do not see why there would be no regard of the time spent with a more than passable dissertation and an otherwise successful doctoral program through a third additional year, which was 2015. I also do not see why a year further would be necessary after three years with a more than passable dissertation and an otherwise completely successful doctoral program. The year of 2016 makes four full years after I should have successfully finished the full doctoral program.

I am currently working with the next dissertation committee--the fourth dissertation committee--as best as possible, although the situation is truly not fair to anyone. I just continue to do the best that can be done on my part. The rest is accordingly in every direction, as I endeavor to keep all at best.

July 14, 2016

- I am sure that the situation is good to move on to a next job that is advancement. Everyone favors such a situation. If having a right opportunity--a legitimate valid offer that is too good to refuse, then a person may not be able to let it pass by. Going into an upgraded job makes the past job and its successes achieved more worthwhile and meaningful. We cannot just have much good and successful involved time after time of the seasons and years without being treated as though we did, or had involving us, anything any good, and the necessity is for relevant parties to bestow proper honors and opportunities to who they are due.

August 4, 2016

I have a next dissertation committee set now. I am waiting on word back from the university on which way to go next. I think that the university should take on some of its responsibility and be accountable for the way the doctoral program went through the past four years. A fully successful doctoral program and dissertation, among other things, were put and kept in jeopardy through the entire past four years instead of being secured, rewarded, and honored as was right.

The program still has to fully complete successfully on the part of the university. The university should customize its continuance and take a novelty approach in working out the ending times of the doctoral program. The university taking a responsible approach may not happen, although it

should, because being accountable would be the only way that the real facts and issues involved with the past four years would be addressed and worked out.

+++++

- May 16, 2011 6:54 PM (in response to Tracy La rue)

Re: Looking for Masters Programs

Two different forms of accrediting exist for the universities. I did not know this previous to acquiring an MBA from the University of Phoenix because I was repeatedly told that the degrees were the same, and I just thought that the UofPhx was different because of online use. I previously went to a university accredited by AACSB (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), and the UofPhx has accrediting with ACBSP (Accreditation Council for Business Schools & Programs). Both AACSB and ACBSP accredit many universities. Universities such as the University of Arizona, Harvard University, and Yale University have accreditation from AACSB, while universities such as the University of Phoenix, DeVry University, and Strayer University have accreditation from ACBSP. The administration at schools such as the University of Phoenix should work on the school credentials to match or bridge the accreditation, by establishing improved courses, additional courses, or an extra program available for students wanting to ensure their master's degree status as relevant to national and international standards.

The present times are good times for schools such as the University of Phoenix to work on their credentials—their accreditation. Many teachers throughout the United States are being laid off because of budget cut-backs, so maybe these teachers could add to some work in these university credentialing—accreditation areas. Education throughout the United States may not necessarily be up to its former standards because of the state of the United States society and its economy. Universities such as Temple University in Philadelphia did not previously have online Master's degree programs but started them a few years ago and excelled with the online graduate programs, following the lead of universities such as the University of Phoenix since 1976. Schools such as Temple University have two- and three-year Master's degree programs. Both types have AACSB accreditation, not just the three-year program but the two-year program, just like the University of Phoenix two-year Master's degree program. The present times are ideal for the accreditation work, if the staff of schools such as the University of Phoenix would do the work in ways such as improving the courses, adding courses, or adding a bridging program.

- Oct 7, 2012 8:24 PM (in response to Elizabeth Stincelli-davis)

Re: 93 days since submission. Still no word from IRB!!!

I thought I would add in this posting because it is relevant. I am posting this message out of responsibility. I was not going to make this posting, but after considering everything, I determined I should make the posting, and here was the right place.

I submitted my dissertation for final review and did not receive it back in more than a half-a-year--six months. I was hoping to finish up the doctoral program because I knew my dissertation was already very advanced and more than sufficient for completion. If I had to do a little more, I would not have minded, but I had no indication that too much additional was necessary. I then, after checking a few times, received word back that my dissertation was not passed beyond the final review and the rhetoric was the dissertation needed

significant changes, which made another course necessary, along with thousands of additional dollars and, perhaps, an additional year of time. I have been doing the doctoral program for six years now, and this university wants to make the time go to seven years. In the entire time so far, I have received no benefits. Even the university itself, too many of its faculty included, do not regard the dissertation or any of the true merits involved, so how could anyone be dealt with or regarded concerning a dissertation or anything involved with it?

I can do more with the dissertation, but nothing additional is truly necessary. Nothing additional will make any difference to the dissertation. Of course, more could be done. Always, more can be done. More being done, though, is completely needless. I feel the situation is abusive and wasteful at this point. I do not feel there is much, if any, value left involved here. I question everything on the part of this university when so much is not regarded and not treated right.

I could say much more in these same terms, but I do not want to. I do say, though, that the university should make some additional efforts to get on track with what is going on and involved. There should be better on the part of the university. The university should work on its own credentialing and merits, worthiness, ethics, and policies. The university should be adding to the meritorious people rather than others, and the university itself should not be a part of impropriety, especially excessively.

I was not going to post this message, but I considered that out of responsibility, I should and will post this message. The university cannot be taking so long to review materials at any time, including at the program's end because with that much time involved, additional issues arise and other parties are brought into play. For example, student loans become an issue, and the student loan creditors pick up that the school continuance has stopped beyond 30 days. These creditors immediately start calling on the phone and sending letters. Even the university itself reports the person as no longer in attendance unless some kind of leave is submitted and approved. Such results from a review mean that too long is taken for the review.

When at the end of a program, and six months passed by during a review, which declared significant additional work is necessary, an extreme amount of time becomes involved. The six months was already gone through. Add on another course, and if starting that course right away, two months additional has to pass by during the course. The dissertation is again submitted for review. How long is this review going to take? Six months plus two course-months equal eight months. Add on only three more months for this next review, and an additional month for the oral defense. The total time after original dissertation submittal equals one year ($6 + 2 + 3 + 1 = 12$ months—1 year). The main points are that taking six months to do a review is too long, and when adding more time onto that by saying more work should be done exacerbates the situation extremely significantly.

I will still work out this situation optimally. The dissertation committee members deserve additional pay from another course, but the university does not necessarily deserve such an additional pay. I do not have everything figured out and settled yet with the full continuance, but I will get everything done successfully. I am only making this posting out

of responsibility. People should know a little about what is going on. The university, and its faculty included accordingly, should be more responsible in these important areas and without distractions from something else. Improvement is recommended, and I would really like to see some models from the university for selecting from to be in one's successful career and paying back student loans of \$200,000 to \$500,000 within a year, three years, or five years, without any longer necessitating.



•
Joseph Mallon

45 posts since

Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

Nov 29, 2012 8:35 AM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: 93 days since submission. Still no word from IRB!!!

The postings here are lost in the clutter. Even worse, the postings are not properly regarded or worked with in any kind of adequate or realistic way. Everything in these types of areas may be considered like writing on the wall, but too much is being made to be merely writing on the wall while others expect to be, and some are, regarded and dealt with actively following each whimsical emphasis made. That situation is not a right or acceptable situation. I extensively recommend improvement.



•
Joseph Mallon

45 posts since

Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

Nov 29, 2012 9:08 AM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: 93 days since submission. Still no word from IRB!!!

Further, I went through much more needless ordeal concerning the doctoral program. My dissertation was absolutely not reviewed in a correct manner. I have done extensive additional work, that should not have been necessary at all. I worked diligently on my dissertation in the recent weeks, but I certainly cannot say that anyone else was working diligently and especially in any relevant direction. The reason I say about myself working is because I am doing so much work while other people are not necessarily doing such work and my work is not being regarded right or adequately respected or honored. My next edition of my dissertation will turn out to be excellent, but I will have two different dissertations that have two different focuses and serve two different purposes.

In addition, the first dissertation final review took six months to complete. That kind of time involved is way too long for no progress to result. My next dissertation submittal should not take that long to review, and if it does, the effects are negative and are not anything that I did. I will see; perhaps the second final review will take only a reasonable amount of time of, perhaps, a few weeks.

•

- Jan 27, 2013 3:43 PM (in response to Ronald Bradshaw)

Re: Is it worth it for me to go for Doctoral Degree at this point in my life?

The paying off of the education, whether that is a master's degree level or doctoral level, still remains questionable presently. That most probably is just a current situation, though, caused by the economic and professional state of the society--the American society. Some of the mentioned people in Washington, DC, as in other places, too, are whoever they are and got there however they did, but while some do not have the advanced or worthy credentials, that does not mean they belong there more than other people, including with the advanced and worthy credentials. Further, if going into any advanced level professional position, the master's degree and the doctorate are substantial aspects that add onto and complement other advanced aspects surely present concerning the worthiness and qualifications for an advanced level job in any field or any location. Plenty should come of such investments or accomplishments, and if seeing the opposite or less than what would enable contentment, the difficult business/economic/societal times need advancement although everyone may not be a part of or contributive to that advancement. The best that can be done is to stay meritorious and in accord with the accomplishments achieved to earn adequate honors, lifestyle, professional position, and worked-for progress.

- 106. Mar 10, 2015 9:57 PM (in response to Karen Franke)

Re: QRF and the 4th Reviewer

Of course, success will be achieved because the success will remain continuing. Dealing with the success could improve, and ideally, that will happen, too. The situation will then be as successful as possible for all involved. I am sure that mostly everyone who posted here will remain working for this type of situation ongoing.

- Mar 24, 2015 9:35 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)

Re: Moderator Locks Valuable Discussion on PhoenixConnect

I am not sure about deliberate and unjustified locking here in this university area, but I have seen such tactics used in these types of website forum areas. You just have to stay with your own knowledge and good intent and keep doing what is right, truthful, and successful.

Oh, by the way, Jude, I thought of your dissertation with the references to other dissertations. I had a thought that you may want to try, if you did not already do something like this. You can take all of your dissertations cited and make a list. Beside each dissertation, state a main point from the dissertation. Find one journal article that also expresses about that point. Next, cite the journal article instead of the dissertation. Of course, also list in the references the journal articles instead of the dissertations.

You could reduce the number of dissertations cited. Your general dissertation--the body (the formatting and structure) and substance (your intents, insights, and meanings) of your dissertation--stays the same. You could even still keep a few dissertations cited, but you would mostly have peer-reviewed journal articles cited and listed in the reference section.

Also, I noticed that most already done and published dissertations paraphrase more than directly quote. There are still direct quotes but mainly paraphrases and not mostly direct quotes. If you have most of your citations in paraphrase form, you will meet these standards. This type of work was among the latest work I did with my dissertation so that it passes on the next round, and appropriately last round, of me submitting my dissertation to the QRF.



6

Report on Situation after 8 Years of Doctoral Program

Posted by [Joseph Mallon](#) on Nov 22, 2015 7:06:28 PM

Previous postings for background of situation (Also, no word back yet and still watching) -

What also should be addressed is the matter of all those people unfairly treated in the past. There were too many times when these areas—IRB and QRF—took excessive amounts of time and then ended up not producing the right results. The burden was put predominantly if not entirely on the student who was made to seem as though not doing well and needing to do more to do better. People who went through these occurrences should be enabled to get caught up and advanced to levels where they previously were before excessive delays. There should not be any degradations, and there should be the honors due.

Originally posted: November 18, 2015

////////////////////////////////////

In this doctoral program, I am at 8 years in academic time and 9 years real time. I finished the standard doctoral program in 2012 and had an A level ending GPA. I have only been trying to get done through the recent past years. The university has now caused another delay to me and should not have done that, rather than working to facilitate me getting the doctoral program done successfully. I made a formal complaint and submitted it in an appropriate direction within the university, and I am now waiting to see the response I receive.

I consider that the situation should be worked out honorably. There should be an understanding that I am endeavoring appropriately to finish the doctoral program successfully, and a clear path should be enabled for me to reach my goal soon. I can also consider plenty of things the university can and should do, but I cannot just say them and have no functional capacity.

I mean things like the faculty, QRF included, having two chances to comment on a dissertation and with no further commenting being allowed or required to be acted on. Another thing is if the doctoral candidate does well through the time, the university has to turn over the doctorate if the university fails to complete its work of producing a successfully completed dissertation and doctoral program by a certain amount of time. Another possibility I have previously considered is making a post-doctoral program where people who are already doctors in their fields can work further on their dissertations—do more work with your own dissertation and earn post-doctoral credits. Such a program would be better than dragging doctoral candidates out longer and longer and without them being considered as doctors yet. There are more possibilities, but the active necessity is even for such right directions to be gone and which is what I am watching for astutely.

Originally posted: November 19, 2015

////////////////////////////////////

I think the first priority is for the doctoral program to be made sure to be gotten done successfully. The university was already paid good money for the doctoral program. That money was not just to take some courses, but that money already paid was for a doctorate that would be issued upon successful completion of the doctoral program requirements. The terms of the requirements did not include practices such as making the requirements never seem like they were fulfilled or never letting them be fulfilled. In the present circumstances, the only fair continuance is for the university to have responsibility of working out the end of the doctoral program.

I just had another dissertation committee member drop out. The dissertation chairperson recently resigned. My dissertation committee now has left only one dissertation committee member, in addition to myself. If I get another dissertation committee, that would make the fourth. I should not have to get a fourth dissertation committee.

Adding more dissertation committee members and forming a fourth dissertation committee is not fair to anyone. They just start out when I have already been through a long time. That means that I am ready to get done while they are ready to get started. They start out by thinking something more has to be done with my dissertation when nothing more has to be done. My dissertation already should have been passed through successfully but just has not been given its proper chances and honors. Further, there is not a realization that I should not be treated as being a learner or student and should be treated as being the teacher, the expert, and the authority.

The roles need straightening out. The priority right now, though, is that the right progressions have to be achieved. With me, the right progressions in the immediate times here involving the university are for me to successfully complete the doctoral program and receive my doctorate. The university has to ensure that I successfully complete the final less than 3% of the doctoral program and in a timely manner.

I would like to say, here is my dissertation. That does it for my dissertation passing successfully, as it should. Here are my oral defense slides for my study. That passes the oral defense successfully. The finishing processes can then just be gone through and completed, which would finish the doctoral program and enable my doctorate to be issued to me.

Right now, there is not even a dissertation committee any longer. I am watching for what the university works out following a formal complaint I made. I have not yet received any word back concerning my complaint. I presently continue astutely watching.

Originally posted: November 20, 2015



Joseph Mallon Nov 23, 2015 9:51 PM

I received no word back yet. I am still watching for a response to my latest communication. I will report on what I see and will provide adequate commentary.

Nothing back yet
Communication out

Active and substantial facts and situation
Rights actively involved and requiring
Countable time passing by



• [Joseph Mallon](#) Dec 1, 2015 9:44 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

No word back yet

Still watching

Another week

The university should turn over my doctorate to me.



• [Joseph Mallon](#) Dec 15, 2015 7:50 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

The university merely sent a negative letter back to me without regarding any of the facts expressed in my official communication. The university then, through its representatives, expressed about wanting to waste another six months.

I sent another official communication. The material sent formally rejected the university directives as being without constructive purpose. In addition, I assertively made a counter contention to further express the seriousness of the previous official communication and the fact of it being present first and longest.

The university administrative management should recognize the extensive substantiation of my pronouncements and work out the situation acceptably to me. Such situational solving includes my doctorate being awarded to me within a reasonable amount of time—expressed by me as being, for example, six months plus 10 days.

The formal rejection of the groundless contrast seemed to go to a different division of the university. The idea of implementing this procedure was to endeavor for some of the university administrative management to see the university errors and to expediently advise the university associates to immediately and continuing rectify the situation and issues involved.

After this other university division received the formal rejection of the groundless contrast, I was emailed a message saying that the rejection from me was received and that four to six weeks would be needed to respond.

This described context is where the situation stands right now, although not without any further negative effects. The ongoing continuance still remains heavily mitigated but with a continuing direction of balancing out from the latest very serious debacle. Further in this way will be gone, and there will remain continued anticipation of the university exhibiting an adequacy of wisdom by seeing the propriety and necessity of repairing the situation to my contentment, which includes my doctorate being rewarded to me.



• [Joseph Mallon](#) Jan 5, 2016 6:41 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

The time of the ongoing situation is now passed the 2015 holiday season and into the next year of 2016. A response is due back to me. I am checking each day this week, and by next week, I will be calling. I am keeping up in every other way, too. This doctoral program should already be done successfully. Time should not be merely wasted. My report presently is that the situation is continuing with a waiting for the due responses and with a continuing of full merits on this side.



Joseph Mallon Feb 11, 2016 7:50 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

The university faculty/associates involved (referred to hereafter as “university”) took until in the second half of January 2016 to have a pseudo meeting of its committee concerning my presented materials and then took another two weeks to get the letter to me. The total time the university took up on this wasteful process was more than six weeks (45 days). This committee ended up amounting to nothing but an agreeing with what the original person expressed inaccurately, unjustifiably, and very questionably. In addition, as most of us know in the doctoral program, you do not get any credit for merely agreeing or disagreeing with someone.

The university regarded none of the facts involved and did not take seriously anything that was presented. The university did not address any of the issues involved and did not work anything out realistically. Anything further was more I had to do following the university debacle.

I then had to make a separate complaint. The university then turned around and said that had already been addressed with the previous January 2016 committee determination of merely agreeing with whatever was said contrary previously. Again, as is the norm in the doctoral program, such lacking action does not deserve any credit. I replied that the issues had not been addressed because the university said about something else and not about the specific issue I presented concerning the university faculty—associates involved in a contrasting manner. To make up or emphasize a different issue is not dealing with the active issue. I advised about falsification and misrepresenting the facts.

The university appears to be continuing presently with very poor practices that should not continue and should not be active at all. The university should not have done anything contrary to ethical practices in regard of the facts, merits, rights, and interests involved. There are specific assertions for the university to seriously address, and those statements need their due attention, response, and work, including in terms agreeable to me. I should not have to be fighting against anything unjustified on the part of the university or holding something legitimately against the university. The university should face its issues and work through its responsibilities.

Further communication was made to the university. If the university works anything out by its own merits, I will report that here, and if not, I will not have any such thing to report here.



Joseph Mallon Feb 27, 2016 7:01 AM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Office supposed to handle such areas gone to but referred from there

Academic Manager communicated to but only expressed already known situation without any corrective actions enabled, presented, or advised

Office supposed to handle such areas gone back to; another document filed, and a phone call made, and on the phone call, again referred from there

Academic Director next contacted by voicemail and email through a week but no response yet

One more week in the Academic Director direction will be attempted, and either something comes of it or not. If something comes of it, that will be worked with accordingly. If nothing comes of it, the Office supposed to handle such areas will be gone back to and with an updating report

In addition, I followed the guidelines outline by this Office and as expressed on the university website, but the same is not true on the part of university associates involved with causing the problem situation.

Furthermore, the current time involved here with the university faculty-caused problem situation spans from September 2015 to now in the end of February 2016. Next week will be March 2016. That will make the time directly involved be 7 months (September, October, November, December, January, February, and March).

The indirect time involved will be since March 2012, when these problem situation causing university associates know I legitimately finished the doctoral program successfully. That full amount of time is 4 years. The 4 years is on the backend of a 3-year doctoral program, which should not have been more than doubled in time on the backend.

I want the situation corrected, and it either is or is not, especially mutually, agreeably, cooperatively, or satisfactorily.

- Nov 18, 2015 9:41 PM (in response to Gail Williams)

Re: Doctoral Dashboard

What also should be addressed is the matter of all those people unfairly treated in the past. There were too many times when these areas—IRB and QRF—took excessive amounts of time and then ended up not producing the right results. The burden was put predominantly if not entirely on the student who was made to seem as though not doing well and needing to do more to do better. People who went through these occurrences should be enabled to get caught up and advanced to levels where they previously were before excessive delays. There should not be any degradations, and there should be the honors due.

- Nov 19, 2015 8:12 PM (in response to Chidi Oguh)

Re: Doctoral Dashboard

In this doctoral program, I am at 8 years in academic time and 9 years real time. I finished the standard doctoral program in 2012 and had an A level ending GPA. I have only been trying to get done through the recent past years. The university has now caused another delay to me and

should not have done that, rather than working to facilitate me getting the doctoral program done successfully. I made a formal complaint and submitted it in an appropriate direction within the university, and I am now waiting to see the response I receive.

I consider that the situation should be worked out honorably. There should be an understanding that I am endeavoring appropriately to finish the doctoral program successfully, and a clear path should be enabled for me to reach my goal soon. I can also consider plenty of things the university can and should do, but I cannot just say them and have no functional capacity.

I mean things like the faculty, QRF included, having two chances to comment on a dissertation and with no further commenting being allowed or required to be acted on. Another thing is if the doctoral candidate does well through the time, the university has to turn over the doctorate if the university fails to complete its work of producing a successfully completed dissertation and doctoral program by a certain amount of time. Another possibility I have previously considered is making a post-doctoral program where people who are already doctors in their fields can work further on their dissertations—do more work with your own dissertation and earn post-doctoral credits. Such a program would be better than dragging doctoral candidates out longer and longer and without them being considered as doctors yet. There are more possibilities, but the active necessity is even for such right directions to be gone and which is what I am watching for astutely.

- Nov 20, 2015 10:48 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: Doctoral Dashboard

I think the first priority is for the doctoral program to be made sure to be gotten done successfully. The university was already paid good money for the doctoral program. That money was not just to take some courses, but that money already paid was for a doctorate that would be issued upon successful completion of the doctoral program requirements. The terms of the requirements did not include practices such as making the requirements never seem like they were fulfilled or never letting them be fulfilled. In the present circumstances, the only fair continuance is for the university to have responsibility of working out the end of the doctoral program.

I just had another dissertation committee member drop out. The dissertation chairperson recently resigned. My dissertation committee now has left only one dissertation committee member, in addition to myself. If I get another dissertation committee, that would make the fourth. I should not have to get a fourth dissertation committee.

Adding more dissertation committee members and forming a fourth dissertation committee is not fair to anyone. They just start out when I have already been through a long time. That means that I am ready to get done while they are ready to get started. They start out by thinking something more has to be done with my dissertation when nothing more has to be done. The dissertation already should have been passed through successfully but just has not been given its proper chances and honors. Further, there is not a realization that I should not be treated as being a learner or student and should be treated as being the teacher, the expert, and the authority.

The roles need straightening out. The priority right now, though, is that the right progressions have to be achieved. With me, the right progressions in the immediate times here involving the university are for me to successfully complete the doctoral program and receive my doctorate. The university has to ensure that I successfully complete the final less than 3% of the doctoral program and in a timely manner.

I would like to say, here is my dissertation. That does it for my dissertation passing successfully, as it should. Here are my oral defense slides for my study. That passes the oral defense successfully. The finishing processes can then just be gone through and completed, which would finish the doctoral program and enable my doctorate to be issued to me.

Right now, there is not even a dissertation committee any longer. I am watching for what the university works out following a formal complaint I made. I have not yet received any word back concerning my complaint. I presently continue astutely watching.

- In response to stakeholders should implement...
- Nov 22, 2015 9:16 PM (
-
- **Re: Doctoral Dashboard**
Yes, but all the real stakeholders and for real...
- Nov 8, 2015 7:41 PM (in response to James Brandl)
Re: UOP under fire - its ok
The unauthorized link message is probably just the University of Phoenix management making another inaccurate assertion. The university management seems to like discrediting practices. There should not be the misrepresentation the University of Phoenix has been involved with as a result of its management.
- Nov 24, 2015 7:43 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)
Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions
I am 8 years into the doctoral program (a three-year program). I really should have finished in 2012 but am still not done yet. I am only not done because my dissertation was excessively rejected in the QRF. My dissertation was always excellent, and dissertation committee members did not lead me astray, and the same goes for the previous university instructors. I previously questioned why would the QRF discredit all the previous work done by the doctoral candidate and the instructors, too, who worked through the previous years to accomplish the quality dissertation.

Last year 2014 to the beginning of this year 2015, my dissertation went into the QRF 4 times. On each occasion, the dissertation committee members said in the QRF to pass the dissertation, but the fourth reviewer rejected the dissertation each of the four times. My dissertation was then extensively worked on further through the remainder of this year of 2015 to the present. The university has now caused additional complications that involve nothing but further delays and which are only unjustifiably impeding my dissertation from

getting back into the QRF. This specific situation has continued through the past month and is still ongoing until some adequate resolution is worked out with me.

My dissertation was an A quality dissertation. I achieved A grades through much of the doctoral program and finished the program with an A level grade point average (GPA). The university should work out and ensure an honorable situation for issuing me the already exceedingly earned doctorate. I presently am looking for word back about this currently stagnant situation that should, instead, be successful. I also continue achieving success in all my ways and on all my levels through the active times.

- Nov 25, 2015 10:50 PM (in response to Lunthita Duthely)

Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions

Presently, the situation is getting my dissertation back into the QRF. I had to get another dissertation committee—a third dissertation committee, but that committee did not do the job. Too much time went by without enough of the right things being done that should have been done to get the dissertation back into the QRF. Now, two of the dissertation committee members are no longer on the committee, and I have to reform the dissertation committee.

This next committee will be my fourth dissertation committee. I do not want a fourth dissertation committee, really. I do not think another dissertation committee is fair to anyone, whether that be the dissertation committee members or me myself. I have just worked through a very long time, and the new dissertation committee members start and are ready to go. I am at a finishing point with this project, and they are at a beginning point with this project.

Everything cannot be denied or contradicted all the time. In this current situation, the university should be accountable and do the job it was already paid to do. I have 8 truly complete and very good dissertations at this point. Any one of them and all of them can be finished up and published. I only need and want one of them to be finished up and serve the purpose of completing the doctoral program successfully.

I had my original dissertations in the old style, which included APA 5th edition. I completely redid stylizing in my recent dissertations and put it all in the APA 6th edition style. My dissertation is in the current forms and above and beyond all current standards of the past two years to the present. In addition, more than my dissertation is presently not necessary. Nothing better than it is should be needed because it has been A quality for years and is just as good if not better than any already done and published dissertation.

There is also a point when the commenting has to stop. Next steps have to be taken, or other techniques have to be practiced. Successfully working on a dissertation should be able to produce a completed dissertation within a reasonable amount of time. The A level GPA shows the successful quality work was done and that there is ongoing potential, so the occurrences and results should not be showing or seeming to show the opposite. The practices, intents, actions, occurrences, and results should all be in directions of successfully completing the dissertation and doctoral program, and when the time situation is at an eight-

year point, there should not be anything else other than directions of successful completion of the doctoral program.

There is much more in these areas. The university has to answer at the present time. I am waiting for a response back concerning the present continuance. My only intent is to efficiently finish the doctoral program successfully, and the university should be facilitative of this honorable direction and its results. I presently continue watching, and I will report on what I see.

- Nov 30, 2015 10:17 PM (in response to Leslie Rowan)

Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions

I received no word back yet from the university. The university again has everything in limbo and being delayed.

The truth is that when the doctoral program work is completed on passing levels, the completed work should be regarded, and the rewards and honors due should be bestowed by the stakeholders involved and with the obligations.

For example, the university should turn over my doctorate to me. I already earned the doctorate by completing the courses of the doctoral program and maintaining an excellent dissertation through more than five years. The societal aspects involved remained very significant for a long time, too, when the society applicable stretches from the east coast to the west coast. So much involved for so long and with so much success achieved should not go neglected or misperceived. Right results should be secured at being produced in reasonable amounts of time.

There should be more of a regard for merits. Opportunities should be plenteously available and on various skill and earnings levels.

I am only saying a little that is already in my dissertation and that concerns the presently continuing situation. I presently continue waiting for word back from the university concerning its response to my recent communication honorably made.

- Dec 3, 2015 10:24 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions

I received word I should get a letter next week. I responded and said that I would look for the letter and reply as is right. I also expressed that I hope my descriptive complaint is regarded realistically so that correct results occur without further instructional declarations being needed from me.

- Dec 4, 2015 5:27 AM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions

By the way, I received A grades in the dissertation courses, too. There is coursework, and there are dissertation courses that are not just content study coursework. I achieved A grades in the coursework and the dissertation direct study, and I achieved the A grades

by working diligently and doing well. In addition, my dissertation was last submitted four times to the QRF, approved by each of the dissertation committee members in the QRF, and rejected without true justification each of the four times by the extra reviewer.

My dissertation was very good through all that past time. My dissertation is still excellent and does not have to be more than it is to be excellent and successful for passing through the QRF. I really already should have been done the doctoral program a long time ago. The university should award the doctorate to me because it was already earned and the university has obligations, especially in consideration of the extreme amount of time involved beyond the true end of the doctoral program.

- Dec 7, 2015 10:54 PM (in response to Genifer Johnson)

Re: Questions, Questions, & more Questions

I am a very modest person. I have to be realistic, though. I am also a positive person. I will not downgrade my own or any work without justification. I will regard a diamond as being a diamond and a piece of plastic as being a piece of plastic. I also think that there should be some limitations of the university faculty effectual functioning--commenting in an effectual judgmental way. One set of comments, and perhaps a little following up on the comments and maybe with some minor modifications, but not a third round of comments that do not truly serve constructive purposes and only degrade and cause further delay.

You mentioned your proposal in March 2012 and your oral defense in 2013. I finished my dissertation and submitted it into the QRF in March 2012. I was not only way beyond a proposal point, but I was truly done and had a good dissertation. (I have to call good as being good because that is how to describe it as referring to something as being beyond a level of merely passable and certainly not anything less). In 2012, there was no Editorial Manager. I submitted my dissertation to the QRF and then had to wait 6 months before receiving word back. This issue and other such issues remain not addressed realistically. By in 2013, I did very much more work on my dissertation, as I ended up doing through 2014 also. I should not have been going through 2015 doing the same thing and should have been done already. Eight years in a three-year doctoral program when a person did well through all that time is too long, is not right, and has many issues involved.

I am presently just endeavoring to get done reasonably. I have no interest in doing more here. I already did more than enough. I have other things to do. My time and work have value, and I support policies of valuing and not devaluing. In addition, the university owes me my doctorate, and I do not owe the university anything, not one dollar and not one penny. The university faculty should just be realistic and reasonable and get the work done concerning issuing me my doctorate that I already earned successfully and honorably.

- Jun 12, 2016 4:04 PM (in response to James Butler)

Re: Dr. Jeremy Moreland leaving University of Phoenix

Maybe the situation has to do with the state of this university. More should be worked on to try to improve the problem areas, rather than attempting to rationalize and normalize them. I would like to see some constructive project active and especially one that I would sign my name to as supporting.

- Jul 14, 2016 9:07 PM (in response to James Butler)

Re: Dr. Jeremy Moreland leaving University of Phoenix

I am sure that the situation is good to move on to a next job that is advancement. Everyone favors such a situation. If having a right opportunity--a legitimate valid offer that is too good to refuse, then a person may not be able to let it pass by. Going into an upgraded job makes the past job and its successes achieved more worthwhile and meaningful. We cannot just have much good and successful involved time after time of the seasons and years without being treated as though we did, or had involving us, anything any good, and the necessity is for relevant parties to bestow proper honors and opportunities to who they are due.

- Jan 10, 2016 7:02 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)

Re: IRB General Question

Way Doctoral Program Supposed to Be

The doctoral program has courses and a dissertation, and some extra components are reviews that are not courses or a program additional to the doctoral program. After going through approximately the first half of the doctoral program, a couple of reviews are done on the dissertation proposal to approve the study and its methodology and integrity. The rest of the program is gone through, and chapters four and five of the dissertation are completed. The ending of the doctoral program is reached.

The final grade point average of the program is obtained, and the dissertation is reviewed for one last time after all that was previously done with the dissertation, including courses that were direct and indirect. The final review (Quality Review Final—QRF) of the dissertation is not a course or a program in itself. The dissertation just has to be gone through one final time to find any little adjustments, if any, that have to be made. A round or two of this final review (QRF) work is all that should be needed, when considering that the entire doctoral program was previously gone through successfully and including with much successful work done on the dissertation.

The dissertation receives approval after a round or two, and an oral defense is next gone through. The oral defense is not a course or program in itself and is just another form of covering work previously done. This form is predominantly audible instead of textual. The oral defense completes in stride, and the doctoral program's ending formalities just have to be finished up, and again, the ending formalities are not a course or a program in itself. The only courses were those of the doctoral program, and the only program was the doctoral program itself. The doctorate is issued, and the person goes on as a doctor in the particular professional field.

The side areas of a proposal's methodology review, an internal review board's review, and a final quality review do not and are not supposed to override the entire doctoral program and successfully completed dissertation and become everything in themselves.

- Jan 19, 2016 6:55 PM (in response to Teresa North)

Re: IRB General Question

Fairness and correctness show in results, especially over time. Whether some issue is addressed accurately, if at all, shows up with the situation and the true expressions people involved make. Credentials and historical attributes mean something and go into meaning of other things and their worthiness and importance of upholding. A more substantial thing includes something lesser, and a direct cause supersedes aftereffects. Time still continues with the doctoral program active in real time, and the experience remembered goes through the time and beyond.



• **Joseph Mallon**

45 posts since

Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

Feb 26, 2016 9:47 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)

Re: IRB General Question

There truly does need to be improvement in these doctoral program side areas of QRM, IRB, and QRF. These areas are supposed to be only minor review areas and are not supposed to be more than that. These areas have been caused to be beyond their proper boundaries. Any one, and each of the thousands of people, hindered beyond propriety in these areas should be made up to realistically in some sufficient way.

- Jan 10, 2016 7:01 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Way Doctoral Program Supposed to Be

The doctoral program has courses and a dissertation, and some extra components are reviews that are not courses or a program additional to the doctoral program. After going through approximately the first half of the doctoral program, a couple of reviews are done on the dissertation proposal to approve the study and its methodology and integrity. The rest of the program is gone through, and chapters four and five of the dissertation are completed. The ending of the doctoral program is reached.

The final grade point average of the program is obtained, and the dissertation is reviewed for one last time after all that was previously done with the dissertation, including courses that were direct and indirect. The final review (Quality Review Final—QRF) of the dissertation is not a course or a program in itself. The dissertation just has to be gone through one final time to find any little adjustments, if any, that have to be made. A round or two of this final review (QRF) work is all that should be needed, when considering that the entire doctoral program was previously gone through successfully and including with much successful work done on the dissertation.

The dissertation receives approval after a round or two, and an oral defense is next gone through. The oral defense is not a course or program in itself and is just another form of covering work previously done. This form is predominantly audible instead of textual. The oral defense completes in stride, and the doctoral program's ending formalities just have to be

finished up, and again, the ending formalities are not a course or a program in itself. The only courses were those of the doctoral program, and the only program was the doctoral program itself. The doctorate is issued, and the person goes on as a doctor in the particular professional field.

The side areas of a proposal's methodology review, an internal review board's review, and a final quality review do not and are not supposed to override the entire doctoral program and successfully completed dissertation and become everything in themselves.

- Jan 10, 2016 7:47 PM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Dissertation proposal -> QRM -> IRB -> Chapters four and five completion -> Doctoral program courses successfully completed -> QRF for a round or two -> Oral defense -> Doctoral program finishing formalities -> Doctorate issued

Nothing more should be involved or needed.

- Jan 10, 2016 7:13 PM (in response to Coralene Quimby-worrell)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Receiving an efficient response that is relevant and constructive is beneficial. Progress and further success can be achieved with the facilitation. No extra days or weeks would be needed for a same issue. The work involved would be able to get done, and the project would be able to be successfully completed. After reaching ending points of a project, such as a doctoral program or dissertation, the mindset of anyone involved in any way should be to successfully reach completion as efficiently as possible.

-/-

- Jan 12, 2016 7:46 PM (in response to Coralene Quimby-worrell)

Re: QRM Super Confused

We all have not experienced the same efficiency in key areas effectual to the doctoral program and its realistic and accurate completion. I experienced many delays, but the main problem is when major delays are caused without good intent or constructive results. These kinds of delays cause nothing but additional delays. The current time situation with me here is 10 years with a three-year doctoral program, and that is totally unacceptable, inexcusable, and not a result of anything on my part.

I did well through the entire doctoral program and was always very efficient. Reciprocal results should show but obviously do not. While everyone at or of the university is not at fault, there should be appropriate accountability and secure responsibility for right results to be produced with reasonable efficiency.

For many valid reasons, I should be dealt with in an honorary capacity, and this program should be finished within the bounds of six months.

Academic time is 8 years

Real time is going into 10 years

Completed coursework March 2012 with A grade level GPA

Courses included dissertation courses and A grades received for dissertation work

I currently continue to remain successful. I am even now watching for correct results following more work I did since before the holiday season. I anticipate right intent and right directions gone. With correct results produced, the doctorate I already earned being issued to me is very likely within the next six months.

- Jun 9, 2016 10:27 PM (in response to Jude Bowman)

Re: QRM Super Confused

June 2016 - I am now reforming the dissertation committee. This is the fourth dissertation committee. The time involved is now an additional 10 months. There was absolutely nothing on my part that caused any delay. My dissertation was back from the QRF in January 2015 and was supposed to go back into the QRF shortly following. As of now in June 2016 (a year and a half later), my dissertation has still not gone back into the QRF.

- Jun 12, 2016 3:53 PM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Dissertation committee number 1 never got going again following my first QRF submittal and mainly because of too much time passing by following through the next 8 months without adequate progress. Dissertation committee number 2 went through about 2 years, and after reaching points of QRF submittals and advising approvals in QRF 4 times, they left the dissertation committee primarily because of too much time involved. Dissertation committee number 3 was formed for the primary purpose of finishing the ending of the doctoral program, but apparently, they did not take that seriously or realistically enough, so each of them too did not continue on the dissertation committee. Now, the 4th dissertation committee has to be formed. I do not honestly believe that forming a 4th dissertation committee is fair to anyone. I just also know that I have not been presented with any alternatives for successfully completing this doctoral program, which is in its 4th year beyond me finishing the actual program in 2012 with a more than passable dissertation and GPA in content and dissertation courses.

- Jun 14, 2016 5:52 AM (in response to Avideh Sadaghiani-tabrizi)

Re: QRM Super Confused

I am really wondering if anything is ever going to be enough. When will enough be enough? Not all things should be limited, but some things should be limited because of needless excess and abuse. For example, when a person does well in the doctoral program and finishes with an above passing grade point average, including with a more than passable dissertation, the doctoral program should be automatically stopped by the point of a time span, such as one year, and the doctorate should be turned over to the person. That way, no one of the university can arbitrarily prolong the doctoral program, undermine the program or work done, or cause more and more to be endlessly needed.

There is no reason why people of a university should not be able to get an acceptable dissertation done by a year after the completion of a three-year doctoral program when the doctoral student did well through the entire program and including with consistently more than passable dissertation work.

- Jun 22, 2016 9:49 PM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Dr. Jim Rice, there are alternate perspectives and experiences that are real, important, and truly involved. Perhaps, some improvement can be made if taking the information provided seriously enough to make some needed corrections and work out the involved situations.

1. The situation of dissertation committee members being paid very little has been understood through the past years. There is no reason the end of the doctoral program should take longer than the entire doctoral program. Further, the situation has to be remembered that the only ones paid less than the dissertation committee members are the students. For the end of the doctoral program to take as needlessly long as it has been taking, the value of everything is being destroyed.

2. In addition to standard content courses, we had dissertation courses through the doctoral program. When achieving passing grades for the standard content courses and the dissertation courses through the entire doctoral program, the end of the program should be able to be efficiently completed successfully. Years additional should not be necessary to finish a program that was successfully completed. Within the bounds of one year, the doctoral program successfully completed should be able to be fully finished up, or the university should be held accountable for turning over the doctorate to the person who was the doctoral student.

3. Faculty members undergoing a full round of familiarization with all the aspects of the dissertation and then placing their name on the dissertation is good for the first set of dissertation committee members, but the same situation does not apply in the ending of the doctoral program. Really, the doctoral program should be able to be reasonably finished up by the first set of dissertation committee members. These people should not have to spend a large amount of their careers and lives just finishing up a doctoral program with a doctoral student. If a second or third set of dissertation committee members are needed, especially for a reason of merely too much time passage being involved and not because of the doctoral student, then the situation is not fair to anyone, especially the doctoral student, for a next set of dissertation committee members to become totally familiar with a 200 to 400-page dissertation.

4. When a program, including a doctoral program, is done, it should be done. If wanting to do more beyond the doctoral program, that is fine, but to push a doctoral program far beyond the bounds of propriety and honestly not in a constructive way for anyone involved, is not right and needs correction. I have suggested before that there should be some kind of a post-doctoral program initiated. The dissertation is originally finished as it is, but then if the person who is then a doctor wants to work more on the person's completed dissertation, there is this post-doctoral program available. In the meantime, the person already is considered a doctor in the person's field and can receive any relevant benefits to that. If wanting to do more, the person has an opportunity to do more, and the person can work further with the good work the person already has done well. See how this situation is different from treating the person as if the person was not successful, did not do the work well enough, and needs to learn more for the work the person already did and level the person was already on. Of course, all these aspects are especially significant when functioning among other people who did not necessarily go through all these things.

Section 2

1. When we reached the end of the doctoral program, we already did the things you mentioned through not only the master degree program but now the doctoral program. We were respectful to the faculty members and worked diligently and efficiently, but there comes a time when the student has to advance and be the teacher, the master, the expert, authority, and doctor in the person's field.

2. When reaching the ending points of a doctoral program, most doctoral students have already communicated frequently and substantially with faculty members and understood or made efforts to understand every part of each piece of communication. Again, however, there comes a time when the doctoral student has to advance and be the one who is listened to and understood.

3. The main trouble is that by the end of the doctoral program, everything in a good and successful way has already been done extensively. A long time was already involved. A different phase of the program is needed. An ending of the program has to result. Taking more time is no longer the ideal or correct perspective, and finishing the program as the valuable time passes by is important.

I am not a person trying to say negative things. I did well in the MBA and the doctoral program. I am a person who does well with what I do and especially with what I am good at and am well practiced in. This current situation is serious and needs attention beyond what this forum area can enable and what most people have time to express. Doctoral students who have remained successful in this doctoral program beyond the point of a year, at the maximum, should be just issued their doctorates because of reaching the time limit for the university to do its job and get the doctoral program done successfully on its part.

- Jun 15, 2016 9:31 PM (in response to Deborah Ward)

Re: QRM Super Confused

There really should be some kind of a group organized. I have heard much mentioned about the needless delays. Various people said about the uncalled for blockages, setbacks, and multiple repeating. I am too much exhausted to do more myself because I have been through all this time with no alleviation or return on the investment. I was stronger and more connected years ago than I am now. Everyone is aging in their careers and lives with such an extreme amount of time passing by. Some of the people who used to be around are no longer around, and much of the common comprehension and functionality are no longer active adequately in the society, including at establishments or with organizations. For there and many other reasons, I do not think anything will come of anything here unless someone forms a group or does something like make a truly inclusive class action law case. As explained, I will not do those things myself, but I would sign my name or sponsor such things.

-

- Jun 26, 2016 10:17 AM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Do you understand that the things being done have not been right? There is no doubt that obtaining approval for the study in the QRM and IRB sound like just a matter of doing the needed work, and when processes one and two are done, proceed to phase three, the QRF, do the involved work, and

get it done. The trouble is that the materials were not treated right. They were downgraded and dishonored, instead of being positively treated, respected, and honored as being what they were. The trouble is not doing steps one, two, and three, but the trouble is to have to keep on needlessly doing them through long time spans of up to years.

- Jun 26, 2016 10:17 AM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Do you understand that the things being done have not been right? There is no doubt that obtaining approval for the study in the QRM and IRB sound like just a matter of doing the needed work, and when processes one and two are done, proceed to phase three, the QRF, do the involved work, and get it done. The trouble is that the materials were not treated right. They were downgraded and dishonored, instead of being positively treated, respected, and honored as being what they were. The trouble is not doing steps one, two, and three, but the trouble is to have to keep on needlessly doing them through long time spans of up to years.

- Jun 26, 2016 10:28 AM (in response to James Rice)

Re: QRM Super Confused

We stick with it. That is the way the situation has been; we stuck with it and continued doing good work, right work, and passable work. However, all the things mentioned in a positive way, were done, and can be done, in the actual program and do not need to continue in the same way after the true program reached its ending times and should end successfully. In addition, when going too far beyond the bounds of what should have been the successful completion of the doctoral program, opportunity cost amount to extremely significant, and many negative connotations are caused.



• **Joseph Mallon**
45 posts since
Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

- Jun 26, 2016 10:53 AM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: QRM Super Confused

I have certainly already done more to advance this situation. However, a better situation should have been caused or enabled. I do not want to keep saying negative things, and I do not usually say negative things. I am a positive person. Much is presently between the lines and in the background. Many issues still remain unaddressed and, whether or not they are worked on accurately, will just remain a part of the true state of the present and future situation.

- Jul 6, 2016 9:25 PM (in response to Fayette Willman)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Any kind of doctoral level study should be acceptable. If good quality work is put into the study and the study turns out successful in every way, then the kind of study should not matter and should be good--passing. Did you know that a primary emphasis in the Faculty Code of Conduct is to maintain academic freedom? Academic freedom is important in many ways. There is no one, especially any faculty member, who should impede anyone else from teaching or learning. If a faculty member is involved with such hindering academic freedom to teach or learn, the faculty code of conduct says that the actions will

be considered as misconduct and will subject the violator to discipline (University of Phoenix, Faculty Handbook, 2009-2010). The university's policy was to cultivate open thought and presentation for putting into the public knowledgeable and novel materials and for deciding on implementations of such materials and concepts (University of Phoenix, Faculty Handbook, 2009-2010). Any kind of study that is reasonable and meets many doctoral standards should be able to be a passable or even a more than passable study. Of course, such a passable study goes into a passable dissertation and enables successfully completing the doctoral program.



Joseph Mallon

45 posts since

Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

Jul 8, 2016 9:42 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: QRM Super Confused

The continuing situation involves improvement requiring concerning how meritorious people are treated. The proper rewards and honors have to be given actively and in reasonably due times. Past inaccuracies have to be corrected and gotten back to favorable standards.

My dissertation was always very good and still is, too. I should have finished this doctoral program years ago, and the issues involved should be adequately addressed and worked out without needing more than the wisdom of expressions and regard of the wise expressions.

There is much more involved than I can conveniently say here. I would rather have somewhere to post in addition to only this "QRM Super Confused" area. I myself am not "super confused," and I understand the wording was not really meant as being only confused but was meant as there being something wrong. I cannot post too much anyway because I do not have the time, and my postings have to count, as they are supposed to in the times.

I would like to see more in directions of working out the long-enduring issues. I will not wait and will keep doing what I do. Here, I am continuing with my good faith effort to fully complete this doctoral program that I earned successfully completing multiple times already. My dissertation went through the Quality Review Final (QRF) 5 times and has not been back into the QRF since January 2015, which means it is overdue at having its chance to go back into the QRF. I am presently looking forward to ONLY an efficient, continuously successful completion of this doctoral program.

- Jul 11, 2016 9:52 PM (in response to Fernando Montemayor gonzalez)

Re: QRM Super Confused

I am using a method that has been used numerous times in studies and is well accepted, and of course, I am using this method in various ways, including in ways unique to my dissertation. I am saying my method without saying it here for now because no lessening of any perspective involved is appropriate. The methods part of my study was approved years ago and was worked on much further since then. I have a base method and a building on that method. I include a diagram of the method in my dissertation.

The topic of my dissertation is excellent, too. This topic is one that has been around through many years in the professional world. The topic is one that has been having substantial societal effects and has involved billions of dollars a year in business. The topic area is absolutely insufficiently worked with in the present years and remains presently requiring far excessively. There is a tremendous amount of literature in my dissertation's topic area, but there is a scarcity of direct and presently active information or literature.

Many knowledgeable actions need to be taken in the directions of improving all involved in the topic area and how to do that is the research question of my study. The importance radiates through every day. To result in thoroughly answering the research question, my dissertation addresses the issues and provides doctoral level analysis and conclusions. Well-founded recommendations are made for wise guidance. This dissertation is more than done and more than passable in the QRF, and this dissertation is one that truly should be treated right for serving its purposes, such as going into the successful completion of the doctoral program.

Need I say more? Without saying more here, there is much more. My dissertation along with this doctoral program should have been fully done in 2012, 2014, and 2015, and now is 2016 with this successfully completed dissertation and doctoral program still not reciprocally completed successfully. The very ending times of the doctoral program need to be treated as being the very ending times of the doctoral program so that a perfectly good and successfully completed dissertation and doctoral program can be perfectly good and successfully completed.

- Jul 12, 2016 8:26 PM (in response to Silva Porter-deal)

Re: QRM Super Confused

Which committee do you mean? I am currently working with the fourth dissertation committee. The first dissertation committee was truly sufficient for passing my dissertation through the QRF and completing the doctoral program. The second dissertation committee was sufficient also, and expressed on four different occasions for my dissertation to be approved in the QRF. The third dissertation committee gave some suggestions, which were followed, but ended up totally failing as a dissertation committee by not regarding past work done, not regarding the reality of the ending phase of the doctoral program being different from the beginning or middle phase, and by straying from serving the purpose they originally agreed to serve. The fourth dissertation committee is the current one, which has been informed on the overdue ending phase of this doctoral program.

I do not see why each of the three dissertation committee members saying to approve a dissertation in the QRF on four different occasions was still not enough for the fourth reviewer to cooperate and approve the dissertation. I do not see why a more than passable dissertation was not approved in the QRF after 2 additional years, which were 2013 and 2014. I do not see why there would be no regard of the time spent with a more than passable dissertation and an otherwise successful doctoral program through a third additional year, which was 2015. I also do not see why a year further would be necessary after three years with a more than passable dissertation and an otherwise completely successful doctoral program. The year of 2016 makes four full years after I should have successfully finished the full doctoral program.

I am currently working with the next dissertation committee--the fourth dissertation committee--as best as possible, although the situation is truly not fair to anyone. I just continue to do the best that can be done on my part. The rest is accordingly in every direction, as I endeavor to keep all at best.



•
Joseph Mallon

45 posts since

Mar 28, 2011

Currently Being Moderated

Aug 3, 2016 10:59 PM (in response to Joseph Mallon)

Re: QRM Super Confused

I have a next dissertation committee set now. I am waiting on word back from the university on which way to go next. I think that the university should take on some of its responsibility and be accountable for the way the doctoral program went through the past four years. A fully successful doctoral program and dissertation, among other things, were put and kept in jeopardy through the entire past four years instead of being secured, rewarded, and honored as was right.

The program still has to fully complete successfully on the part of the university. The university should customize its continuance and take a novelty approach in working out the ending times of the doctoral program. The university taking a responsible approach may not happen, although it should, because being accountable would be the only way that the real facts and issues involved with the past four years would be addressed and worked out.