SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms):Pharmacology & Physiology	Department: Pharmacology & Physiology
Degree or Certificate Level: Ph.D.	College/School: Medicine
Date (Month/Year): 12/22	Assessment Contact: Heather Macarthur

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? Fall 2018-Spring 2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? No, it is part of the University wide accreditation

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.)

Outcome 1: Students will show competency in the basic principles of Pharmacology and Physiology.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

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

The artifacts of student learning used to determine achievement of outcome included regular attendance and answers to written exam questions for the advanced level courses (PPY 5110, 5120, 5130) as well as regular participation in journal club presentations and discussions (PPY 6900)

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).

There were several methods employed to determine student achievement of the stated outcomes. These included regular written tests in their advanced level coursework and faculty evaluation sheets of journal club presentations (rubric included with this report). The course directors of the Advanced level courses reviewed exam results, and the course director of the Journal Club reviewed the evaluation sheets.

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)?

We examined data from the exam results and grading of student journal club presentations for the years 2018-2022 (10 students in all). The academic achievement was satisfactory with most students achieving a B grade or better in their exam results for PPY5110, 5120 and 5130 as well as their journal club assessments for PPY6900. During that time-frame one student was dismissed from the program for not maintaining the minimum GPA of 3.0 required for "good-standing" in the program.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

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

Academically our courses are achieving the desired outcomes, namely competency in the basic principles of Pharmacology and Physiology. Since 2018 all but one of our students have maintained a GPA of 3.0 as required for good standing in our program.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings**

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

We shared these results at our Fall Faculty Retreat. We also discussed improvements to our curriculum going forward. For now we have specifically focused on changes to our Systems Physiology & Pharmacology courses, PPY 5120 and 5130.

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.

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies: Although our findings are satisfactory from an academic standpoint, we are keen to ensure that our topics are up-to-date, and our teaching delivery incorporates more active forms of learning. As a result, we are decompressing our course schedules for PPY 5120 and 5130 from fixed/rigid topics covered each session to larger blocks of time devoted to broader topics guided by a small team of faculty, with time built in for students to dive more deeply into topics via in class presentations and group discussion of journal articles.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes**

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

N/A – we only have had a plan in place since 2021.

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

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

N/A

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

N/A

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, 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.

PPY 514 Grant Writing Course
Student Proposal Grade Sheet
800 Points Total (80% of Final Grade)

Student Name: _____   **Total Score:** _____

Grader Name: _____

1. Completeness of proposal (250 points): _____
Are all the elements of the proposal (Specific Aims, Significance, Innovation, Research Design) completed and appropriately detailed?

2. Clarity of proposal (250 points): _____
Are the hypothesis and goals of the proposal clearly articulated?

3. Scientific Content (250 points): _____
Are the Aims feasible? Do the proposed experiments adequately address the hypothesis? Are proposed experiments justified by Significance and Innovation?

4. Citations (50 points): _____
Is the proposal fully referenced using the appropriate citations?

Signed: _____   Date: _____

Evaluation Form - Department of Pharmacology and Physiology Journal Club (2020/2021)

Name of Presenter:_____   Date of presentation: _____

Name of Evaluator:_____

	Unacceptable A+			Outstanding	
1. Clearly describes the problem addressed by the target paper and the potential significance of the work.	1	2	3	4	4.25
2. Clearly explains the authors' stated objectives.	1	2	3	4	4.25
3. Clearly describes the methods and demonstrates awareness of whether or not they are appropriate to address the authors' objectives.	1	2	3	4	4.25
4. Clearly explains the results of the experiments.	1	2	3	4	4.25
5. Considers whether or not the work accomplished the authors' objectives.	1	2	3	4	4.25
6. Clearly summarizes the significance of the work (in the light of item 5).	1	2	3	4	4.25
7. Clearly explains how the field has been influenced by publication of the target paper and what future directions the authors and others might take to further advance the field.	1	2	3	4	4.25
8. Cogently addresses questions from the audience (i.e., has done the requisite reading).	1	2	3	4	4.25
9. Speaks clearly with adequate volume; avoids distracting mannerisms of speech and gesture; makes occasional eye contact, etc. In short, demonstrates good public speaking practices.	1	2	3	4	4.25
10. Makes presentation of the target paper interesting and appealing to the audience.	1	2	3	4	4.25
11. Selected a suitably substantive paper.	1	2	3	4	4.25
12. Overall rating (not necessarily an average of items 1-11)	1	2	3	4	4.25
13. Additional comments:					