SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Molecular Imaging and Therapeutics

Department: Clinical Health Sciences

College/School: Doisy College of Health Sciences

Date: 09/25/2018

Primary Assessment Contact: Sarah Frye, MBA, CNMT, PET, CCRP

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

   PLO #2: The molecular imaging and therapeutics student will exhibit appropriate professional communication.

   PLO #4: The molecular imaging and therapeutics student will demonstrate effective research techniques.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

   PLO #2: **MIT 6000** Masters Seminar I, Written article critique and **MIT 6100** Masters Seminar II, Teach Back assignment.

   PLO #4: **MIT 6000** Masters Seminar I, Literature Review and **MIT 6200** Masters Seminar III, Critical Reflection assignment number two.

   We did not have a student in Madrid.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?
   NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

   See Appendix for the rubric. The data was analyzed at the end of the academic year for Molecular Imaging and Therapeutics (Aug 2018). The faculty reviewed previous assignments and the PLO to see if the requirements were met as described in the rubric.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.
   NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

   PLO #2: 100% achieved a ranking of "application" or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric for the written article critique. 100% achieved a ranking of "synthesis" or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric for the Teach Back assignment.

   PLO #4: 100% achieved a ranking of "knowledge" or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric Literature Review in MIT-6000. 100% achieved a ranking of "synthesis" or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric for the Critical Reflection assignment number two.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Our analysis gave us insight about the content to add and change in the courses. The level of professional communication needs to be increased and more emphasis placed on the communication skills for the professional graduate student especially in the written article critique in MIT-6000. We do not believe a lot needs to be changed to assess the ability to demonstrate research techniques. However, the Literature Review assignment in MIT-6000 needs to have updated detailed information for the student to create an adequate literature review.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

No – this is the first time the PLOs were used to assess students.

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

Appendix

****IMPORTANT NOTES:** The ratings, identified by the column headings below, are of increasing complexity moving across the table (from left to right). Students who can demonstrate effective written communication in radiation therapy (that is, meet the "application" rating) must be able understand the components of clinical reflection (the "knowledge" rating). Likewise, in order for students to demonstrate appropriate written communicating in order to prepare a professional presentation in the form of a research poster (the "synthesis" rating), they must recognize the components of a critical reflection (knowledge) and demonstrate this by completing a professional poster. (application).

Molecular Imaging and Therapeutics (MIT)		
Program Learning Outcome (PLO #2): The molecular imaging and therapeutics student will exhibit appropriate professional communication.		
Knowledge**	**Application****	**Synthesis****
• Recognize molecular imaging and therapeutic modalities.	• Demonstrate the purpose of molecular imaging and therapeutic modalities.	• Integrate knowledge with communication.

****IMPORTANT NOTES:** The ratings, identified by the column headings below, are of increasing complexity moving across the table (from left to right). Students who can describe a complex radiation therapy treatment procedure (that is, meet the "application" rating) must be able to recite a radiation therapy treatment procedure (the "knowledge" rating). Likewise, in order for students to present a complex radiation therapy treatment procedure
to an audience, (the "synthesis" rating), they must identify treatment procedure components (knowledge) and interpret the components of a complex treatment procedure. (application).

Molecular Imaging and Therapeutics (MIT)		
Program Learning Outcome (PLO #4): The molecular imaging and therapeutics student will demonstrate effective research techniques.		
Knowledge**	**Application****	**Synthesis****
• Comprehend the components of research.	• Apply the components of research.	• Interpret the components of research.