SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Public Health Studies	Department: Multiple Departments
Degree or Certificate Level: PhD	College/School: College for Public Health and Social Justice
Date (Month/Year): 10/2021	Assessment Contact: Travis Loux

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020-2021

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2018

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

COMMUNITY / CULTURAL ORIENTATION: Devise research studies that integrate knowledge, awareness and respect for the impact of cultural, structural, legal, political, and public health and social justice on health outcomes.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Final project presentation from PHS 6050: Science, Theory & Public Health
Comprehensive Written Exam
Oral PhD Exam
Dissertation Defense
Annual PACE report

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

PHS 6050 final project presentation graded by course instructor.
Comprehensive Written Exam is scores on a rubric by 2-3 graders.
Oral PhD Exam is measured as pass/fail as determined by committee of 5 faculty.
Dissertation Defense is measured as pass/fail as determined by a committee of at least 3 faculty.
PACE report is a student self-evaluation and mentor evaluation of student. Assessments for program outcomes are on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Final project presentation: 7 of 7 (100%) of students received a grade of 90% or higher
Comprehensive Written Exam: 7 of 8 (88%) students passed
Oral PhD Exam: 4 of 4 (100%) students passed
Dissertation Defense: 5 of 5 (100%) students passed
PACE self-assessment: 25 of 34 (74%) students rated 4 or 5
PACE mentor assessment: 18 of 21 (86%) students rated 4 or 5

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

In general the program met all expected criteria. The weakest results come from student self-assessment.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

We plan to share results with the doctoral committee and instructors of the doctoral core courses. We will solicit feedback from both groups.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	• Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites	• Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Artifacts of student learning • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

TBD after discussion with steering committee.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We developed guidelines for written exam graders to try to standardize grading across exams. In addition, we revised the grading rubric to clarify unclear aspects as identified by the doctoral steering committee and recent graders of the exam.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

The updated guidelines and rubric were reviewed and voted on by the doctoral steering committee, which includes two student representatives.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The consensus was that the expectations for both students and grader were far more clear.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to review exam procedures and guidelines to address any issues of discontent among students and faculty graders.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

Grader:
Student:

Rubric for Grading the Comprehensive Exam [1]

Approved by Doctoral Committee 9-7-2016

Component	Pass with distinction (2 points)	Pass (1 point)	Fail (0 points)	SCORE
Introduction	• Well written • Brief, interesting, and compelling • Motivates the work • Has a hook • Provides a clear statement of the problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Places the problem in context • Lays out the study's implications • Comprehensive, thorough, complete, coherent, concise, and up to date • Shows critical and analytical thinking about the literature • Synthesizes the literature • Integrates literature from other fields • Displays understanding of the history and context of the problem • Identifies problem and limitations • Is selective-discriminates between important and unimportant works • Identifies and organizes analysis around themes or conceptual categories • Add own insights • Uses literature to build an argument and advance the field • Is like a good review article • Makes readers look at the literature differently	• Well written but less eloquent • Is less interesting; has less breadth, depth, and insight • Motivates the work but less well • Poses a good question or problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Comprehensive but not exhaustive • Provides a thoughtful, accurate critique of the literature • Shows understanding of and command over the most relevant literature • Selects literature wisely and judiciously • Sets the problem in context • Uses literature to build a case for the research	• Poorly written or organized • Lacks minimal motivation for the work • Makes a case for a small problem or fails to make any case • Does not do a good job of explaining why the problem is important • Provides minimum or poor context for the problem or fails to present an outline of the research • Presents minimal overview of the work • Contains extraneous material • Provides inadequate or incomplete coverage of the literature • Has clearly not read enough literature nor cites enough sources • Lacks critical analysis and synthesis or misinterprets the literature • Is not selective-does not distinguish between more-and less-relevant works • Misses, omits, or ignores important studies, whole areas or literature of people who have done the same thing • Cites sources student has not read or has only read the abstract • Cites articles that are out of date • Is an undifferentiated list, "This person said this, this person said that" • Does not put problem in context for the research	
Theory	• Original, creative, insightful, and innovative • Simple and elegant • Well-conceived, logically consistent, and internally coherent • Identifies and critically analyzes strength and weakness • Compares or tests competing theories • Advances concepts • Develops, adds to, revises, or synthesizes theory (ies) • Aligns with research question, methods, and observations • Has broad applicability	• Complete and correct • Uses existing theory well • Informs the research question and measures • Identifies where it works and where it does not work	• Is absent, omitted, or wrong • Is misunderstood or misinterpreted • Cannot explain it or why it is being used • Uses inappropriately • Does not align with research question, literature review, or methods • Understands theory at the base level • Does not specify or critically analyze the theory's underlying assumptions	
Methods	• Original, clear, creative, and innovative • Provides thorough and comprehensive description • Flows from question and theory • Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches • Applies or develops new methods, approaches, techniques tools, devices, or instruments • Uses multiple methods • Analysis is sophisticated, robust, and precise • Uses advanced, powerful, cutting-edge techniques	• Appropriate for the problem • Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct and creative ways • Discusses why method was chosen • Analysis is objective, thorough, appropriate, and correct • Uses standard methods	• Lacks a method • Uses wrong (statistical) method for the problem • Uses (statistical) method incorrectly • Methods do not relate to question or theory • Is fatally flawed or has major confound • Does not describe or describes poorly (insufficient detail) • Is minimally documented • Shows basic competence • Analysis is wrong, inappropriate, or incompetent	

Component	Pass with Distinction (2 points)	Pass (1 point)	Fail (0 points)	SCORE
Results	• Original, insightful • Is aligned with question and theory • Sees complex patterns in the data • Iteratively explores questions raised by analyses • Results are usable, meaningful, and unambiguous • Presents data clearly and cleverly • Makes proper inferences • Provides plausible interpretations • Refutes or disproves prior theories or finding	• Produces rich, high-quality data • Links results to question and theory • Substantiates the results • Provides plausible arguments and explanations	• Produces small amount of this data • Results are correct but not robust • Includes extraneous information and material • Has difficulty making sense of data • Interpretation is too simplistic • Data are wrong, insufficient, fudged, fabricated, or falsified • Data or evidence do not support the theory or argument • Interpretation is too simplistic, and not objective, cogent, or inferences • Overstates the results	
Discussion and conclusion	• Short, clear, and concise • Interesting, surprising, insightful • Summarizes the work • Refers back to the introduction • Ties everything together • Explains what has been accomplished • Underscores and explains major points and findings • Discusses strength, weaknesses, and limitations • Identifies contributions, implications, applications, and significance • Places the work in wider context • Raises new questions and discusses future directions	• Provides a good summary of the results • Refers back to the introduction • States what has been done • Ties everything together • States its contribution • Identifies possible implications • Discusses limitations • Identifies some future directions	• Summarizes what has been accomplished • Repeats or summarizes the results or major points • Repeats the introduction • Does not tie things up • Does not understand the results or what has been done • Claims to have proved or accomplished things that have not been proved or accomplished • Does not address the significance or implications of the research • Does not place the work in context • Identifies a few, nonspecific next steps Does not draw conclusions • Is inadequate or missing	
TOTAL SCORE				

Criterion for Grading:

- These guidelines are to serve as a reference.
- A student will be assessed overall by each component, rather than by individual elements listed in the component.
- All faculty graders must review materials independently and may not share their comments or decisions with the other grader or the tie-breaker. Each grader provides a score for each component and then sums to obtain a total score.
- If a student receives 1 or more fail in any component, a tie breaker will be brought in to decide the final outcome. If both grader 1 and grader 2 issue a fail in any component, the student fails and no tie-breaker will be necessary.

---

[1] adapted from: Barbara Lovitts. Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation, 2007.

PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

STUDENT OUTCOME EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 10-6-2016

Student Name: _____ **Date:** _____ **Committee Member Name:** _____

Each committee member completes his/her own worksheet either during the exam or immediately following.

		Fail	Pass	Pass with Distinction	Comments
1	The student has significant breadth and depth of knowledge in the area of emphasis and the dissertation topic.				
2	The student was able to analyze and synthesize information at an appropriate level of a doctoral student.				
3	The research is original and there is potential for publication and dissemination.				
4	The student has adequate knowledge of recent advances in methodological issues relevant to the topic area.				
5	The methodology of the proposed research is rigorous.				
6	The candidate understands the details of the methodological and analytic work related to the dissertation.				
7	The candidate is able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation topic.				
8	The candidate presented in a professional manner with confidence.				

- Committee Members may change their initial votes throughout the process. Members are encouraged to make notes throughout the presentation and Q&A session.
- After the exam, this worksheet will be given to the chair/mentor as a tool to help address problems or deficiencies in the project. The chair/mentor then provides the worksheets to the doctoral program coordinator who keeps them for programmatic quality assessment.

PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
STUDENT OUTCOME EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 10-6-2016

Criterion for a Failing Grade: A student receives one or more "Fail" in categories 1-7 from three or more members of the committee.

- For example, if committee members A and B felt category 4 was a fail, committee member C felt category 6 was fail, 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 may not rely on the committee members for assistance or committee members should not answer for the student*

Step 2: After questions have concluded, the mentor will close the public portion of the examination. Other students, faculty, and guests are excused. The committee, including at-large members, meets in private without the student to discuss the examination and vote using this evaluation worksheet. 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.

Step 3A: If the student passes the oral exam, the committee calls in the student solely to review what suggestions are being made by the committee and what revisions the student must make as he or she works forward with the formal dissertation committee to revise the Memo of Understanding (MOA) and/or Dissertation Proposal Prospectus. The student has 30 days for to secure those revisions and their formal Dissertation Committee approvals.

Step 3B: If the student fails the oral exam, the doctoral committee program coordinator must be called in along with the student, who will then witness the conversation with the committee and can further explain the steps for retaking the oral exam (see also Section 5 of the 2016-17 Student Handbook).

Dissertation Outcome Evaluation Worksheet[1]

Each committee member completes his/her own worksheet either during the dissertation defense or immediately following.

	A. Written dissertation	Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail	Comments
1	Introduction				
2	Literature review				
3	Theory				
4	Methods/approach				
5	Results/data analysis				
6	Discussion/conclusion				

7	**B. Dissertation defense**				

A. <u>Written Dissertation</u>

<u>Fail:</u> A student receives one or more "Fail" in categories 1-6 from two or more members of the committee.

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

<u>Passing with distinction:</u> A student receives at least 4 "Pass with Distinction" in categories 1-6 from two or more members of the committee.

<u>Passing:</u> A student receives any other combination of scores from the committee members.

Dissertation Defense Procedures

Step 1: After the presentation is completed, the chair/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 chair/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 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 will meet in private to discuss the examination and each committee member completes the Dissertation Outcome Evaluation Worksheet. The student's dissertation committee then votes and, based on these votes, the chair/mentor will complete both results form (one for the oral defense and another for the written defense) and returns them, along with worksheets, 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 defense 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.

Guidelines for Quality: Written Dissertation			
Component	**Pass with Distinction**	**Pass**	**Fail**
Introductions	• Well written • Brief, interesting, and compelling • Motivates the work • Has a hook • Provides a clear statement of the problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Places the problem in context • Presents an overview of the theory, methods, results, and conclusions • Lays out the study's implications • Provides a road map of the dissertation	• Well written but less eloquent • Is less interesting; has less breadth, depth, and insight • Motivates the work but less well • Poses a good question or problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Provides an overview of the dissertation	• Poorly written or organized • Lacks minimal motivation for the work • Makes a case for a small problem or fails to make any case • Does not do a good job of explaining why the problem is important • Provides minimum or poor context for the problem or fails to present an outline of the research • Presents minimal overview of the work • Contains extraneous material
Literature review	• Comprehensive, thorough, complete, coherent, concise, and up to date • Shows critical and analytical thinking about the literature • Synthesizes the literature • Integrates literature from other fields • Displays understanding of the history and context of the problem • Identifies problem and limitations • Is selective-discriminates between important and unimportant works • Identifies and organizes analysis around themes or conceptual categories • Adds own insights • Uses literature to build an argument and advance the field • Is like a good review article • Makes readers look at the literature differently	• Comprehensive but not exhaustive • Provides a thoughtful, accurate critique of the literature • Shows understanding of and command over the most relevant literature • Selects literature wisely and judiciously • Sets the problem in context • Uses literature to build a case for the research	• Provides inadequate or incomplete coverage of the literature • Has clearly not read enough literature nor cites enough sources • Lacks critical analysis and synthesis or misinterprets the literature • Is not selective-does not distinguish between more-and less-relevant works • Misses, omits, or ignores important studies, whole areas or literature of people who have done the same thing • Misses some important works • Cites sources student has not read or has only read the abstract • Cites articles that are out of date • Is an undifferentiated list, "This person said this, this person said that" • Does not put problem in context for the research
Theory	• Original, creative, insightful, and innovative • Simple and elegant • Well-conceived, logically consistent, and internally coherent • Identifies and critically analyzes strength and weakness • Uses more than one theory • Compares or tests competing theories • Advances concepts • Develops, adds to, revises, or synthesizes theory(ies) • Aligns with research question, methods, and observations • Has broad applicability	• Complete and correct • Uses existing theory well • Informs the research question and measures • Identifies where it works and where it does not work	• Is absent, omitted, or wrong • Is misunderstood or misinterpreted • Cannot explain it or why it is being used • Uses inappropriately • Does not align with research question, literature review, or methods • Understands theory at the base level • Does not specify or critically analyze the theory's underlying assumptions

Guidelines for Quality of Written Dissertation			
Component	**Pass with Distinction**	**Pass**	**Fail**
Methods/Approach	• Original, clear, creative, and innovative • Provides thorough and comprehensive description • Identifies strength and weakness/advantages and disadvantages • Flows from question and theory • Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches • Applies or develops new methods, approaches, techniques tools, devices, or instruments • Uses multiple methods	• Appropriate for the problem • Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct and creative ways • Discusses why method was chosen • Describes advantages and disadvantages	• Lacks a method • Uses wrong (statistical) method for the problem • Uses (statistical) method incorrectly • Methods do not relate to question or theory • Is fatally flawed or has major confound • Does not describe or describes poorly (insufficient detail) • Is minimally documented • Shows basic competence
Results and Data Analysis	• Original, insightful • Uses advanced, powerful, cutting-edge techniques • Analysis is sophisticated, robust, and precise • Is aligned with question and theory • Sees complex patterns in the data • Iteratively explores questions raised by analyses • Results are usable, meaningful, and unambiguous • Presents data clearly and cleverly • Makes proper inferences • Provides plausible interpretations • Discusses limitations • Refutes or disproves prior theories or finding	• Analysis is objective, thorough, appropriate, and correct • Uses standard methods • Produces rich, high-quality data • Links results to question and theory • Substantiates the results • Provides plausible arguments and explanations	• Analysis is wrong, inappropriate, or incompetent • Produces small amount of data • Results are correct but not robust • Includes extraneous information and material • Has difficulty making sense of data • Interpretation is too simplistic • Data are wrong, insufficient, fudged, fabricated, or falsified • Data or evidence do not support the theory or argument • Interpretation is too simplistic, and not objective, cogent, or inferences • Overstates the results
Discussion and Conclusion	• Short, clear, and concise • Interesting, surprising, insightful • Summarizes the work • Refers back to the introduction • Ties everything together • Explains what has been accomplished • Underscores and explains major points and findings • Discusses strength, weaknesses, and limitations • Identifies contributions, implications, applications, and significance • Places the work in a wider context • Raises new questions and discusses future directions	• Provides a good summary of the results • Refers back to the introduction • States what has been done • Ties everything together • States its contribution • Identifies possible implications • Discusses limitations • Identifies some future directions	• Summarizes what has been accomplished • Repeats or summarizes the results or major points • Repeats the introduction • Does not tie things up • Does not understand the results or what has been done • Claims to have proved or accomplished things that have not been proved or accomplished • Does not address the significance or implications of the research • Does not place the work in context • Identifies a few, nonspecific next steps • Does not draw conclusions • Is inadequate or missing

[1] adapted from: Barbara Lovitts. Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation, 2007.

B. Guidelines for Quality: Dissertation Defense		
Pass with Distinction	**Pass**	**Fail**
• Slides enhanced the presentation; they were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret. • The presentation had a clear and deliberate organizational structure. • The language was effective; delivery was clear and powerful. • The presentation was well timed, points made reflect their relative importance, and the presentation stayed within the allotted time. • The candidate answered additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion.	• Most slides were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret. • The presentation was adequately organized. • Language and delivery were generally good, but could have been more effective. • The balance between the points made reflect their relative importance, but could have been more effective. The presentation, stayed within the allotted time. • The candidate answered additional questions posed by the faculty but needed some additional guidance.	• Most slides were difficult to read and most graphs/figures were hard to understand. • The organization lacked any structure. • Language was unclear; delivery relied exclusively on notes. • The presentation did not stay within the allotted time and/or there was little balance between the points made and their relative importance. • The candidate was unable to answer many additional questions posed by the faculty and needed extensive guidance.

PACE - 2019-20 Mentor

Start of Block: Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) Process

Q37 **Overview of Process for Mentor** SLU's mandatory advising requirement is fulfilled for all doctoral students during the spring semester with the program's evaluation tool, or the Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) process. The PACE process is part of a student's permanent record and some data is used for SLU program assessment and CEPH accreditation. The PACE process includes the following components. Students self-assess their performance in the program in specific areas as well as provide data about current employment and future career plans. Competencies: Self-assessment of level of attainment of doctoral and concentration competencies. Degree Requirements: Progress toward degree requirements. An updated IPS plan is submitted, including plan for completing coursework and taking written and oral exams and/or defending dissertation.

Accomplishments: Provide current publications, presentations, awards, grants. An updated CV is submitted. Research Goals: Assessment of progress toward research training goals and dissertation timetable planned with mentor. **Mentors review student PACE submissions and provide feedback and assessment to be shared with student and to be reviewed by the doctoral program director(s).** Feedback should be provided on each required element and include areas for improvement, any necessary timetable for accomplishments to be completed, and timetable for dissertation plan. Students and mentors are required to meet and discuss PACE results.

During the PACE process students are also encouraged to let the program director(s) know if they have concerns about their mentor that they are not comfortable sharing directly with their mentor.

The doctoral program director(s) review the PACE elements submitted from both students and mentors and provide an overall assessment and feedback in a letter written to the student and mentor. If there are concerns, program director(s) meet with student and/or mentor to plan for necessary improvements.

Q22 Mentor Information

- Mentor First Name (1) _____
- Mentor Last Name (2) _____

Q1 Student Information

- FirstName (1) _____
- Last Name (2) _____

Q32 Concentration Area

- BSHE: Behavioral Science and Health Education (1)
- BSDP: Biosecurity & Disaster Preparedness (2)
- BST: Biostatistics (3)
- EOH: Environmental & Occupational Health (4)
- EPI: Epidemiology (5)
- HMP: Health Management & Policy (6)
- HOR: Health Outcomes Research (7)

End of Block: Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) Process

Start of Block: Competency Assessment

Q29 Please rate mentee's level of ability for 7 program as well as concentration competencies. Compare your assessment against your mentee's self-assessment.

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
Domain 1-Critical Thinking: Critically evaluate, integrate and challenge existing scientific knowledge. Assess gaps in research to develop research questions. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Domain 2-Analytical Skills: Plan, design and conduct research studies. Interpret the results using inferential statistical methods and methods of qualitative data analysis. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
Domain 3-Communication: Communicate clearly and effectively about scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, grant applications, teaching/ training, etc. Develop partnerships in community, clinic, academic, and/or governmental settings to conduct research projects collaboratively (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Domain 4- Management & Leadership: Apply leadership and management principles to assemble and cultivate effective teams and successful projects or studies, including management of team members, budgets, and deliverables (18)					
Domain 5-Ethics & Professionalism: Adopt and apply ethical principles for public health research and decisions on social justice and equity in the global environment. Conduct research that requires Institutional Review Board approval. (19)					
Domain 6- Community/Cultural Orientation: Evaluate the impact of cultural, structural, legal, political, and public health and social justice on health outcomes. (24)					
Domain 7- Translation & Dissemination: Use innovative methods to communicate scientific findings and implications to					

diverse audiences, ensuring appropriate strategies. (20)	

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BSHE: Behavioral Science and Health Education

Q34 BSHE PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Synthesize relevant behavioral science literature (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Design intervention/behavioral science research that is appropriately grounded in theory and methodology is appropriate to the chosen setting. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Analyze and communicate intervention/behavioral science research findings for use by multiple audiences (e.g., fellow researchers, public health practitioners, policy makers, advocacy groups and the lay public). (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BSDP: Biosecurity & Disaster Preparedness

Q35 BSDP PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (6)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (2)
1) Design research studies to measure and assess problems in biosecurity and related fields (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Apply qualitative and quantitative research methods and strategies to solve problems in biosecurity and related fields (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Communicate research ideas effectively in order to write peer-reviewed manuscripts for biosecurity journals and competitive grant proposals (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BST: Biostatistics

Q36 BST PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Design research studies to address problems in biomedical and public health fields. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Apply biostatistical methods and computation strategies to solve problems in biomedical and public health fields. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Develop new biostatistical methods by applying fundamental ideas of biostatistics. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = EOH: Environmental & Occupational Health

Q37 EOH PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Synthesize literature on environmental hazards and exposures (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Prioritize risks areas in which to intervene, develop and test methods to control identified risks (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Develop and interpret risk models (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Communicate risk to key stakeholders, legislators, and the research community (24)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = EPI: Epidemiology

Q38 EPI PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Design and implement appropriate studies to test epidemiologic hypotheses and minimize bias (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Use statistical software to perform multivariable regression, survival analysis, and longitudinal analysis; examine data for the presence of confounding and interaction. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Communicate advanced epidemiologic results succinctly and persuasively in both oral and written communication to both scientists and nonscientists. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Analyze the scientific literature to identify gaps in knowledge that can be used to formulate original hypotheses and research questions leading to scientific discovery, presentations, and	○	○	○	○	○

papers. (24)

Display This Question:

If Q32 = HMP: Health Management & Policy

Q39 HMP PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Critical Thinking: Formulate evidence based policy alternatives for the improvement of healthcare delivery and outcomes (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Science and Analysis: Effectively use data and appropriate analytical methods to analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence to address health problems within the context of health management and policy (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Leadership: Generate appropriate study questions and aims to address problems in health management and policy (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Communication: Effectively communicate findings via oral and written communication to decision makers, the community, and the profession to inform processes related to health management and policy. (24)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = HOR: Health Outcomes Research

Q40 HSR/HOR PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Apply appropriate research and statistical methods in the design and conduct of clinical and population-based health outcomes research problems. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Demonstrate knowledge of development process for clinical, pharmaceutical, and device interventions and apply appropriate research and statistical methods for the measurement and evaluation of efficacy of interventions. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Apply quantitative, qualitative and economic methods to solve problems in clinical and outcomes research. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Design effective and efficient research	○	○	○	○	○

studies and clinical trials to address key outcomes research questions. (24)	

Q30 Please provide any specific competencies you suggest that mentee build or improve upon.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Competency Assessment

Start of Block: Block 6

Q40 Describe Student Areas of Strength.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q41 Describe student weakness(es) and plans for continuing improvement

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Block 6

PACE - 2019-20 STUDENT

Start of Block: Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) Process

Q37 **Overview** SLU's mandatory advising requirement is fulfilled for all doctoral students during the spring semester with the program's evaluation tool, the Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) process. The PACE process is part of the student's permanent record. Some data are used for SLU program assessment and CEPH accreditation.
The PACE process includes several components. Students self-assess their performance in the program in specific areas as well as provide data about current employment and future career plans. Competencies: Self-assessment of level of attainment of doctoral and concentration competencies. Degree Requirements: Progress toward degree requirements. An updated IPS plan is submitted, including plans for completing coursework, written and oral exams, and/or defending dissertation. Accomplishments: Provide current publications, presentations, awards, grants. An updated CV should also be submitted. Research Goals: Assessment of progress toward research training goals and dissertation timetable planned with mentor.
Mentors review student PACE responses (except the student's direct assessment of their mentor) and provide feedback and assessment to be shared with student, which will also be reviewed by the doctoral program director. Feedback should be provided on each required element and include areas for improvement, achievements, and a timetable for progressing through the doctoral program.. Students and mentors are required to meet and discuss the PACE results.
During the PACE process students are also encouraged to let the program director know if they have concerns about their mentor that they are not comfortable sharing directly with their mentor. The doctoral program director reviews all responses by each student and mentor in the form of a letter that will be part of the student's permanent record. If there are concerns, the program director will meet with the student and/or mentor to plan for necessary improvements.

Q1 Student Information

- FirstName (1) _____
- Last Name (2) _____

Q40 Banner ID

_____

Q42 Please provide your ORCID number. This will allow us to track your publications. Sign up here for a free ORCID number: https://orcid.org/register

_____

Q22 Mentor Information

- Mentor First Name (1) _____
- Mentor Last Name (2) _____

Q32 Concentration Area

- BSHE: Behavioral Science and Health Education (1)
- BSDP: Biosecurity & Disaster Preparedness (2)
- BST: Biostatistics (3)
- EOH: Environmental & Occupational Health (4)
- EPI: Epidemiology (5)
- HMP: Health Management & Policy (6)
- HOR: Health Outcomes Research (7)

End of Block: Performance Assessment and Career Enhancement (PACE) Process

Start of Block: Accomplishments

Q14 Briefly describe your experience in the program over the past year, including overall performance. Be sure to mention the focus of your planned dissertation and work completed (e.g. literature review, project design, IRB approvals, dissertation proposal prospectus, etc).

Q15 Briefly describe your goals through May 2021 and what you plan to do to accomplish (e.g. finish degree coursework, begin writing dissertation, work on publishable paper(s), write grant proposals, make conference presentation(s), etc).

Q16 Awards/Honors: Honors or awards received during the last year *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*.

Q24 Peer-Reviewed Presentations: Presentations at conferences or symposia (include conference name, organization, location, date and title of presentation). *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q25 Peer-Reviewed Publications: Published, In Press, Accepted -- Use AMA citation *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q27 Peer-Reviewed Publications: Submitted ONLY --Use AMA citation *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q26 Grants-Submitted: Include funder, title, role and amount requested - You do not have to have PI but can list grants on which you are part of the research team. *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q28 Grants-Awarded: Include funder, title, role and awarded amount. *(You can also cut & paste from your CV)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q17 Career Plans & Targets: Describe your career goals. Explain how completion of this degree will help you to accomplish your career goals.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q18 Concerns: List any concerns you have as well as any suggestions you would like to offer for improvement in the program which might help you and/or other students.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Accomplishments

Start of Block: Competency Assessment

Q29 Please identify the extent to which you feel you are competent in the following 7 program competencies and the competencies for your concentration.

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
Domain 1-Critical Thinking: Critically evaluate, integrate and challenge existing scientific knowledge. Assess gaps in research to develop research questions. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Domain 2-Analytical Skills: Plan, design and conduct research studies. Interpret the results using inferential statistical methods and methods of qualitative data analysis. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
Domain 3-Communication: Communicate clearly and effectively about scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, grant applications, teaching/ training, etc. Develop partnerships in community, clinic, academic, and/or governmental settings to conduct research projects collaboratively (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Domain 4-Management & Leadership: Apply leadership and management principles to assemble and cultivate effective teams and successful projects or studies, including management of team members, budgets, and deliverables (18)					
Domain 5-Ethics & Professionalism: Adopt and apply ethical principles for public health research and decisions on social justice and equity in the global environment. Conduct research that requires Institutional Review Board approval. (19)					
Domain 6-Community/Cultural Orientation: Evaluate the impact of cultural, structural, legal, political, and public health and social justice on health outcomes. (24)					
Domain 7-Translation & Dissemination: Use innovative methods to communicate scientific findings and implications to					

diverse audiences, ensuring appropriate strategies. (20)	

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BSHE: Behavioral Science and Health Education

Q34 BSHE PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Synthesize relevant behavioral science literature (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Design intervention/behavioral science research that is appropriately grounded in theory and methodology is appropriate to the chosen setting. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Analyze and communicate intervention/behavioral science research findings for use by multiple audiences (e.g., fellow researchers, public health practitioners, policy makers, advocacy groups and the lay public). (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BSDP: Biosecurity & Disaster Preparedness

Q35 BSDP PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (6)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (2)
1) Design research studies to measure and assess problems in biosecurity and related fields (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Apply qualitative and quantitative research methods and strategies to solve problems in biosecurity and related fields (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Communicate research ideas effectively in order to write peer-reviewed manuscripts for biosecurity journals and competitive grant proposals (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = BST: Biostatistics

Q36 BST PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Design research studies to address problems in biomedical and public health fields. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Apply biostatistical methods and computation strategies to solve problems in biomedical and public health fields. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Develop new biostatistical methods by applying fundamental ideas of biostatistics. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = EOH: Environmental & Occupational Health

Q37 EOH PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Synthesize literature on environmental hazards and exposures (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Prioritize risks areas in which to intervene, develop and test methods to control identified risks (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Develop and interpret risk models (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Communicate risk to key stakeholders, legislators, and the research community (24)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = EPI: Epidemiology

Q38 EPI PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Design and implement appropriate studies to test epidemiologic hypotheses and minimize bias (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Use statistical software to perform multivariable regression, survival analysis, and longitudinal analysis; examine data for the presence of confounding and interaction. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Communicate advanced epidemiologic results succinctly and persuasively in both oral and written communication to both scientists and nonscientists. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Analyze the scientific literature to identify gaps in knowledge that can be used to formulate original hypotheses and research questions leading to scientific discovery, presentations, and	○	○	○	○	○

papers. (24)

Display This Question:

If Q32 = HMP: Health Management & Policy

Q39 HMP PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Critical Thinking: Formulate evidence based policy alternatives for the improvement of healthcare delivery and outcomes (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Science and Analysis: Effectively use data and appropriate analytical methods to analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence to address health problems within the context of health management and policy (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Leadership: Generate appropriate study questions and aims to address problems in health management and policy (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Communication: Effectively communicate findings via oral and written communication to decision makers, the community, and the profession to inform processes related to health management and policy. (24)	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If Q32 = HOR: Health Outcomes Research

Q40 HSR/HOR PhD Competencies

	Little or No Ability (1)	Minor or Limited Ability (2)	Moderate or Average Ability (3)	Notable or Above Average Ability (4)	Major, Significant and Recognizable Ability (5)
1) Apply appropriate research and statistical methods in the design and conduct of clinical and population-based health outcomes research problems. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
2) Demonstrate knowledge of development process for clinical, pharmaceutical, and device interventions and apply appropriate research and statistical methods for the measurement and evaluation of efficacy of interventions. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
3) Apply quantitative, qualitative and economic methods to solve problems in clinical and outcomes research. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
4) Design effective and efficient research	○	○	○	○	○

studies and clinical trials to address key outcomes research questions. (24)	

Q30 If any no, limited, minor or moderate competencies checked, please describe what plans or steps you could take to build or improve those competencies.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Competency Assessment

Start of Block: Background Questions

Q3 When did you begin the PhD program (year)?

_____

Q8 Are you currently receiving financial support? Select all that apply.

- [ ] GTA (1)
- [ ] GRA (2)
- [ ] None (3)
- [ ] Employer (4)
- [ ] SLU Tuition Remission (5)
- [ ] Other (6)

Display This Question:
If Q8 = Employer
And Q8 = GTA
And Q8 = GRA
And Q8 = SLU Tuition Remission
And Q8 = Other

Q9 Please describe the type of financial support you received.

_____

Display This Question:
If Q8 = GTA
Or Q8 = GRA

Q10 Briefly describe your GRA or GTA duties and estimated hours worked per week, if any, associated with your financial support.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q41 Are you employed (not GRA or GTA)?

- ○ Yes (23)
- ○ No (24)

Display This Question:
If Q41 = Yes

Q42 Employer/Organization Name

_____

Display This Question:
If Q41 = Yes

Q44 How many hours a week do you work?

_____

Display This Question:
If Q41 = Yes

Q45 Position/Title

_____

Display This Question:
If Q41 = Yes

Q47 Job Duties (in Brief)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q12 How frequently did you meet with your mentor in person, via Zoom/Skype or phone?

- Weekly (1)
- Every two weeks (2)
- Monthly (3)
- Every other month (4)
- Once a semester (5)

Q38 How frequently did you email with your mentor?

- Every few days or daily (1)
- Weekly (2)
- Every other week (3)
- Every month (4)
- Once a semester (6)

Q13 Last meeting date:

_____

End of Block: Background Questions

Start of Block: Block 6

Q19 Improvements: Comment on any curricular, structural, financial, or advising problems that you have encountered in the last year and indicate suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Block 6

Start of Block: Block 6

Q39 Mentor Role Assessment: We are adding your assessment of your mentor.
THIS WILL NOT BE SHARED WITH YOUR MENTOR EXCEPT IN GENERAL TERMS IN THE DIRECTOR'S LETTER.

	Strong Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Slightly Disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Slightly Agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly Agree (7)
My mentor gives me advice on how to attain recognition. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor provides support and encouragement. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentors serves as my role model. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor is someone I identify with. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor guides my personal development. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor serves as a sounding board. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor accepts me as a competent professional. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor thinks highly of me. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My mentor sees me as being competent. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Block 6

Start of Block: Block 3

Q20 **Supporting Documents**

Send an email with your updated CV and IPS form to amber.donlan@slu.edu.

You can find your IPS Form for your matriculation year on the Google Site. The IPS form should be completed by filling out the semester in which a course was completed or is planned to be completed. Also include planned electives not pre-determined by the IPS form or course substitutions approved by your mentor.

End of Block: Block 3