

Date (Month/Year): September 2023

Assessment Contact: Benjamin Hutz

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2022-2023

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 2021-2022

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? NO

## 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.)

- MA Program
  - **PLO #1:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate the ability to learn high-level mathematical concepts and techniques.
  - **PLO #2:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate ability to apply methods of direct and indirect proof to solve problems at the master's level.
  - **PLO #3:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate ability to effectively communicate mathematics in both a written and oral setting.
  - **PLO #4:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate master's-level depth of understanding of mathematics at the foundation of contemporary applications.
- PhD Program
  - **PLO #1:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate fundamental knowledge of mathematical concepts and techniques.

These were completed in-person on Saint Louis University's main campus and consisted of the student and three faculty evaluators. The presentations were open to the public, but only the examiners were permitted to interact with

the student. Faculty members from both the evaluating and committee were able to submit evaluation reports on the students for the purposes of program evaluation and included in this document.

### 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).

Every faculty evaluator (committee member) was asked to complete a Google form that contained a series of questions rating the students in the following three broad categories:

- Mathematical Content
- Presentation Style
- Clarity and Organization

using the following rubric marks:

- 3 – Criteria fully met
- 2 – Criteria mostly met
- 1 – Criteria minimally met
- 0 – Criteria not met

Brief comments may be added for each category noting particular strengths or weaknesses of the presentation/presenter in that category.

Details on Categories and Criteria:

#### I. Mathematical Content

- Content presented is mathematically accurate
- Demonstrates adequate understanding of content and is able to answer questions related to the content
- Content is appropriate to the assignment/class/project (not off topic)
- Level of sophistication of the mathematics is appropriate to the class/project
- Appropriate amount of content is presented

a



Presentation Style



Examining each of these in turn:

1. We did not conduct an evaluation of coursework this assessment period. This was the main path of assessment for AY2021-2022
2. These have been slowly increasing in frequency since the end of the main restrictions in place from COVID-19. The department colloquium and graduate seminar restarted in AY2021-2022 and the additional research seminars restarted in AY2023-2024. Attending these seminars would help significantly for the graduate students. There is a weekly email to all students and faculty about the seminars. We do not track attendance at the seminars.
3. Students supported via a teaching assistantship undergo some basic training and mentoring in teaching and have an ongoing interaction with students over a number of years. For AY2023-2024 we've also increased the formality and scope of this training. Students not supported by a teaching assistantship (1-2 per year) do not

