



## 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](mailto:thatcherk@slu.edu)

---

1. **Degree Program(s) included in this report: Molecular Microbiology and Immunology Ph.D. program**
  2. **Department: Molecular Microbiology and Immunology**
  3. **School/Center/College: School of Medicine**
  4. **Name(s): John Tavis, Ph.D., program director, and William Wold, Ph.D., Chairperson**
  5. **Email: tavisje@slu.edu**
  6. **Phone: 314-977-8893**
- 

**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.

Our entire program underwent a top-to-bottom review and revision during Summer 2015. This included re-evaluating our assessment procedures. The Graduate Oversight Committee (Drs. John Tavis, Lynda Morrison, and Rich Di Paolo) conducted the initial revisions to our policies, including our assessment plans. These were then reviewed by the faculty in three iterative rounds of editing, including dominating two very long faculty meetings. Following revision, the policy document was voted upon and approved by the full MMI faculty.

This led to the establishment of the first formal assessment plan for the MMI Ph.D. program following consultation with Ms. Kathleen Thatcher. This plan was written by Dr. Tavis as part of his duties as MMI Graduate Program Director.

Madrid was not included as we have no interactions with the Madrid campus.

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.

Our program is a small, mentorship based Ph.D. program in the biomedical sciences (2-4 students accepted per year). Our goals were that 100% of the students pass their required classes, that 100% of the students taking their preliminary degree examination passed the examination without need for remediation, that 100% of the students taking their candidacy examination pass on the first attempt, and that all students demonstrate adequate progress in their annual research seminar presented to the entire department. All students successfully met these expectations (ie, we had a good year in the program!).

*\*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.*)

This is an apprenticeship style program, so the majority of the feedback to the students is immediate and occurs in one-on-one discussions between the students and their research mentors and/or other faculty.

Feedback on student performance is also provided from the faculty's perspective by the discussions with the students. Additional feedback is provided by performance reports from the MMI course directors to the MMI Graduate Oversight Committee and by reviewing the students' grades. All of this information is collated by the Graduate Oversight Committee in annual reports synchronized with the students' annual research updates to the entire faculty.

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.*)

The MMI faculty annually elect an "MMI Graduate Student of the Year"; this honor comes with a small monetary award to purchase a monograph or similar item plus placing the student's name on a plaque. We send email announcements to the entire department when students receive any internal or external honor, if they are awarded an external grant, or when they publish high-profile scientific papers. We have department-wide parties for students when they successfully defend their Ph.D. thesis.

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.

The entire plan underwent a top-to-bottom re-evaluation this year. We are pleased with the outcome.

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