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*.

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

1. **Degree Program(s) included in this report:** PhD
2. **Department:** Social Work
3. **School/Center/College:**
4. **Name(s):** Michael Vaughn
5. **Email:** mvaughn9@slu.edu
6. **Phone:** 314-977-2718

**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.

   Student participation in doctoral research symposia at the university, presentation at regional and national conferences, and published manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals was utilized as an assessment of the following program learning outcomes: 1) Critically evaluate and identify gaps in current scientific knowledge and develop sound explanations and research strategies; 2) Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of a specific area of research in your discipline; and 3) Communicate effectively about and disseminate scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, lay documents, and grant applications.

   All graduating doctoral degree recipients will fill out a survey comprised of program items related to their educational experience, program rigor, and areas for improvement. This activity will allow for the assessment of the following program learning outcomes: 1) Critically evaluate and identify gaps in current scientific knowledge and develop sound explanations and research strategies; 2) Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of a specific area of research in your discipline; 3) Communicate effectively about and disseminate scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, lay documents, and grant applications. 4) Use and interpret basic and inferential statistics; 5) Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study. Apply codes that guide application of these issues in research such as the importance of principles of confidentiality of information and data; and 6) Understand and apply pedagogic methods.
Comprehensive written and oral exams results will be reviewed by the PhD program director and the doctoral committee. This activity will allow for the assessment of the following program learning outcomes: 1) Critically evaluate and identify gaps in current scientific knowledge and develop sound explanations and research strategies. 2) Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of a specific area of research in your discipline; 3) Communicate effectively about and disseminate scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, lay documents, and grant applications; 4) Use and interpret basic and inferential statistics; and 5) Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study. Apply codes that guide application of these issues in research such as the importance of principles of confidentiality of information and data.

Successful completion of University IRB training modules will assess the following program learning outcome: Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study. Apply codes that guide application of these issues in research such as the importance of principles of confidentiality of information and data.

Students’ participation in and completion of the Certificate of University Trainings Skills and students’ scores on teaching evaluations will assess the following program learning outcome: Understand and apply pedagogic methods.

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.

86% of students participated in a student research symposia at the university. In particular, 71% of students participated in the College for Public Health and Social Justice Doctoral Student Research Symposium, 29% of students participated in the Graduate Student Association Research Symposium, and 29% of students participated in the SLU Sigma Xi Research Symposium. At the symposia, student presentations were judged by 2-3 faculty members. One student was awarded first place at the Sigma Xi Research Symposium, and another student was awarded second place at the College’s Research Symposium.

100% of students presented at a regional or national conference. On average, each student gave 2.4 presentations at a regional or national conference.

71% of students published a manuscript in a peer-reviewed journal. On average, 1.3 manuscripts were published per student. In comparison, full-time faculty members within the College for Public Health and Social Justice published on average 3.3 manuscripts in a peer-reviewed journal.

100% of students have successfully completed the University’s IRB training modules.

29% of students participated in the Certificate of University Trainings Skills. Among those participating in the certificate program, students attended on average 4 training sessions.

The following assessments were unable to be collected for the present school year as the program has only completed its second year: survey of graduating doctoral
degree recipients; review of students’ dissertation completion; review of comprehensive written and oral exams results; and students’ scores on teaching evaluations.

*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.)

All doctoral students meet each semester a minimum of one time with the doctoral advisor and their mentors to assess progress, receive direct feedback on performance, and suggest additional training if necessary.

Monthly productivity meetings are held involving the director of the PhD program and all PhD students. A living Google document is utilized that tracks articles and grant work that is published, under review, or in progress, and conference presentations to suggest changes that will increase productivity. Data is shared among the doctoral committee and the Director of the school. Faculty members are updated as a whole on doctoral student progress during monthly faculty assemblies.

All dissertation research is checked by the committee members to ensure the meeting of ethical guidelines. Research misconduct is monitored by academic staff members. Any misconduct found is shared with the school director, college dean, and university officials involved in monitoring appropriate research conduct.

Data on meeting program objectives as assessed in the oral exam are tracked and aggregated in order to fine tune and provide evidence for program changes.

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.)

In the future, we will use direct evidence from RAS and oral exams to assess program objectives. Achievement on the Research Area Synthesis and oral exam is assessed through a standardized form, included as an appendix. These are measured by at least three faculty directly reading and observing performance. Based on faculty assessments, individual students will be provided with feedback and offered suggestions on areas of improvements. The assessments will be aggregated to identify areas for improvement and additional trainings/curriculum changes will be organized to strengthen student performance. At this stage, being a new program we have no data from these assessments.

Based on judges’ feedback from the College’s PhD student Research Symposium, students with top performance were awarded gift cards. Students are scored by judges using a score sheet, which has been included as an appendix. Scores from student presentations will be aggregated to assess specific areas of strength and weakness. Areas of weaknesses will be identified and additional trainings will be organized to support student growth.

Feedback from students is received during mentor meetings each semester. Based on this feedback, a few changes in the curriculum were made. In particular, the curriculum
required students to complete Principles of Epidemiology, but students indicated that the material overlapped with other required courses and they were interested in taking upper-level Epidemiology courses instead. As a result of this feedback, the Epidemiology requirement was changed to an elective Epidemiology course, rather than the requirement to take Principles of Epidemiology. Additionally, student feedback indicated that additional training on statistical software was needed. As a result, professional development courses were created to provide students with these additional opportunities.

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.

As a result of challenges collecting productivity data (i.e. published articles and grants) from individual students, a shared Google document was created to collect this information and required monthly productivity meetings were begun for students to share progress on their articles and grants.

*Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.*
PHD SOCIAL WORK ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

STUDENT OUTCOME EVALUATION WORKSHEET
Each committee member completes his/her own worksheet either during the exam or immediately following. At-large members do not need to complete this worksheet but are encouraged to make notes for questions/comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critically evaluate and identify gaps in current scientific knowledge and develop sound explanations and research strategies.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of a specific area of research in your discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Use and interpret basic and inferential statistics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study. Apply codes that guide application of these issues in research such as the importance of principles of confidentiality of information and data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Committee Members may change their initial votes throughout the process. Members are encouraged to make notes throughout the presentation and QA session.
- After the exam, this worksheet will be given to the mentor as a tool to help address problems or deficiencies in the project.

**Criterion for a Failing Grade:** A student receives one or more “Unacceptable” in categories 1-7 from two or more members of the committee.

- For example, if committee member A felt category 4 was unacceptable and committee member B felt category 6 was unacceptable, then the student should fail the exam.

Step 1: After the presentation is completed, the mentor conducts at least two formal rounds of questions from the committee members, and then permits follow-up questions and additional inquiries until the committee is finished. The mentor will invite questions from the audience. *It is very important that the student demonstrates his/her command of the topic by answering the questions and not relying on the committee members for assistance.*

Step 2: After questions have concluded, the mentor will close the public portion of the examination. Other students, faculty, and guests are excused. If needed, the committee, including at-large members, will meet with the student privately to go over additional questions not suitable for the public forum.

Step 3: The mentor will excuse the student when all questions have concluded in the private portion.

Step 4: The committee, including at-large members, will meet in private to discuss the examination. The student’s dissertation committee (not at-large members) then vote and based on these votes the mentor will complete the results form and make sure that it is returned to the Doctoral Program Coordinator who will forward it to Graduate Education. The committee should return the completed results form in a timely manner after the oral exam either passing or failing the student. *The committee can no longer “hold” the results form until the student completes the requested changes to the Dissertation Prospectus.* If the changes to the dissertation prospectus requested by the committee are significant (as determined by the committee) or the student receives two or more unacceptable evaluations from the committee members, then the student fails the examination.
## Research Area Synthesis
### Evaluation Form

**Date:**
**Name of student:**
**Title of Research Area Synthesis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critically evaluate and Identify gaps in current scientific knowledge and develop sound explanations and research strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of a specific area of research in your discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade________
Comments:

Signature (lead faculty)

________________________________________

Signature (faculty)

________________________________________

Signature (faculty)

________________________________________
ORAL DIVISION

Judge # _________________________________ Oral Presenter ________________________________

CPHSJ FALL DOCTORAL RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM
OF SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Rating Scale:

poor 1 2 average 3 4 good 5 6 excellent 7

_____ Thesis: Was a thesis or objective presented? Was it clear, focused, and definable?

Comments:

_____ Sources: What sources/data were used? Did they relate to or inform the thesis/hypothesis? How well?

Comments:

_____ Conclusions: Were the conclusions supported by the sources or data? Did the presenter make connections between the conclusions and the original thesis or objective?

Comments:

_____ Presentation: Was the paper presented in an interesting manner? If additional media were used, were they effective? How did the presenter engage the audience?

Comments:

_____ Literacy: How well do you understand what was presented? Was jargon—if used—explained? Was the presenter articulate in their communication of ideas? Were questions addressed adequately?

Comments:

TOTAL:
POSTER DIVISION

Judge ___________________________ Student Name & Poster Title _______________________________

CPHSJ FALL DOCTORAL RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM
OF SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Rating Scale:

 poor average good Excellent
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

_____ Hypothesis: Is a hypothesis, objective or research question clearly identified or presented? Did the presenter explain or characterize the nature of their problem?

Comments:

_____ Background: Is there relevant and sufficient background information presented to determine the significance of the hypothesis?

Comments:

_____ Methods: Are the methods clearly outlined and presented in a clear, concise and appropriate manner that addresses the hypothesis or research question?

Comments:

_____ Results & Conclusions: Did the conclusion or findings address the hypothesis or research question? Were the end results clearly stated and presented?

Comments:

_____ Visual Appeal/Poster Layout: Have elements of the poster been chosen to help convey the intended message clearly and effectively? Is the argument logically and effectively presented?

Comments:

_____ Presentation: Did the poster identify the broader significance of the work being presented? How were questions handled? Did the presenter speak in terms free of technical jargon, easily discernable?

Comments:

TOTAL:
Progress Report Publications and Grants List for PhD Students

ARTICLES

2014

Published


BOOK CHAPTERS

GRANTS

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


2015

ARTICLES

Published


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


TEACHING

Teaching Assistant
Maynard, B.R. & Underwood, S.E. SWRK 5787-03 - Research Methods I (Fall 2015)
Tebb, S. & Stewart, D.B. SWRK 5745-01 - Health and Mental Health Interventions of Older Adults (Fall 2015)

2016

ARTICLES
Published

In press
Tyuse, S. & Underwood, S.E. Article on older adults & CIT response

Under review

In progress
Brendel, K.E., Maynard, B.R., Sarteschi, C.M., Underwood, S.E., & Vaughn, M.G. Causal and Prescriptive Statements in Published Social Work Research Articles.
Farina, A. S., & Huang, J. Mental Health of Latinos and Asian Americans: The Role of Trauma and Perceived Discrimination.
Farina, A. S., & Vaughn, M. G. Trauma-Related Dissociation in Adolescents: A Measurement Review.
Farina, A. S., Vaughn, M. G., & Delisi, M. Childhood Trauma and Psychopathic Features Among Juvenile Offenders.
Maynard, B., Farina, A., Carlson, J., Dare, M., Kish, C., Labuzienski, E., Marx, A., Pera, G. The Effectiveness of Animal Assisted Therapy with Children and Adolescents who have Experienced Trauma: A Systematic Review.
Gochez-Kerr, T., & Helton, J. NSCAW II Young Adults: How Are They Doing?
Gochez-Kerr, T. Which Children Are Hit?: A Target Congruent Perspective
Gochez-Kerr, T. Parental Physical Assault: A Biosocial and Target Congruent Approach
Gochez-Kerr, T. Who Are We Serving?: An Examination of St. Louis MST Clients
Gochez-Kerr, T. An Effectiveness Test of MST with Poly-victimized Juvenile Delinquents
Terzis, L.D., Vaughn, M.G. & Salas-Wright, C.P. A Comparison of Immigrant and Native-Born Children on Media Usage in their Free Time.
Terzis, L.D., Vaughn, M.G & Loux, T. Healthy Adolescent Lifestyles: Should Native-Born American Adolescents Adopt an Immigrant Lifestyle?
Glassford, T.S. & Wilson, A.N. Towards a functional analysis of gambling behavior.
Glassford, T.S., Wilson, A.N., & Vaughn, M. G. Self-generated contingencies and maintenance of healthy behaviors.

BOOK CHAPTERS

GRANTS
Underwood, S.E. Conference stipend through University of North Carolina

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


Underwood, S.E. (2016). Relationship health, sexual well-being, and high-risk behavior after substance use during first sexual encounter. Oral Presentation at the Sigma Xi Symposium, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO.


UPCOMING CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS (ACCEPTED)


TEACHING

Teaching Assistant
Maynard, B.R., & Underwood, S.E. SWRK 5788-03 - Research Methods II (Spring 2016)
Wilson, A.N. & Glassford, T.S. ABA - Thesis/Research Practicum (Fall 2015-Spring 2026)

Courses Taught
Farina, A. S. S30-7821 - International Child Welfare (Spring 2016)

Courses Appointed
Kremer, K.P. SWRK 5702-01 - Social Policy (Fall 2016)
Terzis, L.D. SWRK 5702-02 - Social Policy (Fall 2016)
Underwood, S.E. SWRK 2100-01 - Human Behavior and the Social Environment (Fall 2016)
Underwood, S.E. SWRK 2100-02 - Human Behavior and the Social Environment (Fall 2016)
Gochez-Kerr, T. SWRK 3700-05 - Introduction to Research Methods (Fall 2016/Spring 2017)

ACADEMIC SERVICE
Gochez-Kerr, T
2015-Present Society for Social Work Research (PhD Student Taskforce Member)

Glassford, T.S.
2016 The Psychological Record (Reviewer)

Stewart, D. B.
2016-Present Journal of the American Geriatric Society (Reviewer)
2016-Present Journal of Gerontological Social Work (Reviewer)
2016 The Gerontological Society of America (Conference Abstract Reviewer)

Terzis, L.D.
2016 Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health (Reviewer)

UNIVERSITY SERVICE
Farina, A.S.
2015-Present Social Work PhD Student Association (Mentoring Chair)

Glassford, T.S.
2015-2016 Social Work PhD Student Association (Public Relations Chair)
2016-Present President

Kremer, K. P
2014-2015 Graduate Student Association (Representative)
2015-2016 Social Work PhD Student Association (President)
2016-Present Social Work PhD Student Association (Public Relations Chair)

Stewart, D. B.
2015-Present Social Work PhD Student Association (Recruitment Chair)

Terzis, L.D.
2015-Present Social Work PhD Student Association (Social Chair)

Underwood, S.E.
2014-2015 Graduate Student Association (Representative)
2015-Present Social Work PhD Student Association (College Representative)