Saint Louis University
Program Assessment Annual Reporting

It is recommended program assessment results be used to celebrate achievements of student learning as well as to identify potential areas for future curriculum improvement.

Please email this completed form as an attachment to ThatcherK@slu.edu

CAS PROGRAMS: Please email this completed form by July 1 to Donna LaVoie lavoiedj@slu.edu

1. Degree Program(s) included in this report: Ph.D.
2. Department: Chemistry
3. School/Center/College: A&S
4. Name(s): Scott Martin (chair) and Dana Baum (graduate program director)
5. Email: martinrs@slu.edu, dbaum1@slu.edu
6. Phone: 977-2850

Instructions: Please answer the following five questions to the best of your ability for each degree program offered within your department.

1. Summarize your assessment activities during the past year for each degree program and how this work relates to the established assessment plan (e.g. what program outcomes were assessed, faculty discussions, new survey design, data collection, revised assessment plans or learning outcomes, etc.). Please include how Madrid courses/program were involved.

All students in the Ph.D. program underwent an annual review. Students completed a self-evaluation and were evaluated by their mentor. Copies of these evaluations were provided to the graduate program director for review.

All 2nd year students submitted a written update with their research progress to date to their committee. Each committee member provided feedback to the research mentor, who met with the student to discuss the feedback. A letter detailing the feedback was provided to the graduate program director.

All 2nd year students underwent an oral examination to assess their preparedness for continuation in the Ph.D. program. The committee’s recommendation was conveyed to the graduate program director via a letter.

All 3rd year students took comprehensive exams.

All 3rd year students underwent an oral examination to defend their original research proposal.

2 students completed a dissertation that was publically presented and privately defended before their committee.

The Madrid campus does not have any graduate programs in chemistry, so they were not involved.
2. Describe specific **assessment findings** related to the **learning outcomes** assessed for each degree program, including any pertinent context surrounding the findings. Please include the learning outcomes themselves. (e.g. Our goal was that 75% of students performed at the “proficient” level of competency in problem solving, using a new scoring rubric. 81% of students performed at the “proficient” level in problem solving, exceeding our expectations.) Do not include student-level data. Data included in this report should be in aggregate. Please include how Madrid courses/program were involved.

Students in the Ph.D. program are required to maintain a GPA at or above 3.0 and have no more than 2 grades of B- or below to be considered making “satisfactory” progress in the program. They are also expected to make progress in their research as assessed by their research mentor. 100% of the students in the Ph.D. program met that requirement at the time of their annual review.

100% of 2nd year students who underwent an oral examination in front of their committees were recommended for continuation in the Ph.D. program.

56% of 3rd year students passed their comprehensive exams on the first attempt and 100% passed on the second attempt.

78% of 3rd year students passed their oral proposal defense on the first attempt and 100% passed on the second attempt.

The Madrid campus does not have any graduate programs in chemistry, so they were not involved.

*Please attach any tables, graphics, or charts to the end of this report.*

3. Describe how assessment **feedback** has been provided to students, faculty, and staff. (e.g. report for faculty, executive summary for the dean, web page for students, alumni newsletter, discussion with students in class or club event, etc.)

Students are active participants in the annual review process used for assessment. For each examination (2nd year oral exam, comprehensive exam, and oral proposal defense), feedback is provided to the student by the committee, the research mentor, and the graduate program director as appropriate. Feedback to faculty will be provided at the annual retreat (to take place this summer). In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences posts this assessment report on their website so all students can see the report.

4. In what ways have you **used assessment findings** to celebrate student achievements and/or to improve the curriculum this past year? (e.g. prizes to students, hosting student parties, changes to curriculum, student projects, learning goals, assessment strategies, etc.)

Review of annual evaluations has provided guidance on ways to improve communication of program requirements (program worksheets).
The performance on comprehensive exams triggered conversations among the divisional faculty on ways to change/improve our graduate courses to address areas of deficiencies.

5. Describe any changes to your assessment plans, or any challenges or educational experiences with the assessment process this past year that you would like to share.

No changes are anticipated at this time.

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