

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2018-2019 Academic Year
Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director
May 26, 2020

2019 Portfolio Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
· General Information about Portfolio Assessment	<u>2</u>
· Critical Thinking and Writing	<u>5</u>
· Interdisciplinary Thinking	<u>15</u>
· Self Discovery	<u>20</u>
· Most Personally Satisfying Experience	<u>28</u>
· Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	<u>34</u>
· Letter to Truman	<u>44</u>
· Reader Information and Feedback	<u>51</u>
· Portfolio Collection Matters	<u>52</u>
· Portfolio Summary and Future Plans	<u>54</u>

General Information about Portfolio Assessment

Who takes it?

All students must develop and submit a portfolio as a requirement for graduation. In academic year 2018-2019, 1103 students submitted portfolios.

When is it administered?

Most students complete the process as part of their capstone experience, so students usually submit portfolios before the deadline during their senior year. Some submit earlier, while others complete their Truman course work and submit past the deadline after they have finished their time on campus. Since it is a graduation requirement, students who do not submit their portfolio by the deadline are subject to transcript/diploma/verification holds. Our present online portfolio submission system went online in August 2011, and it is specifically designed to allow students to store potential portfolio elements in their own portfolio vault throughout their college career. Regardless of when students submit the portfolio, the work itself may have been completed at any time during their college career.

What office administers it?

The portfolio project director administers portfolio collection in conjunction with each discipline/program. The portfolio project director also leads faculty and staff readers who evaluate and score the portfolios. These groups of readers also participate in faculty development and campus discussion during reading sessions.

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

The Assessment Committee evaluates requests for specific portfolio items, led by the portfolio project director, working with faculty assessors and the Portfolio Committee (a standing subcommittee of the Assessment Committee).

When are results typically available?

The portfolios have been read and scored in May and August interims although in 2019 we only read in May. The results are usually available late in the fall or early in spring of the following year.

What type of information is sought?

Faculty evaluators and the Assessment Committee designate the types of works requested from students, but many of the requested items have remained constant for multiple years. In the 2018-2019 academic year, student portfolios included works demonstrating 1) critical thinking and writing, 2) interdisciplinary thinking, and 3) self-discovery. The portfolio also included a work or experience the student considered 4) most personally satisfying, and 5) a Letter to Truman in which students give summary thoughts about their experience with the Portfolio and at Truman. Other items may be included, but these are evaluated separately, if at all, including a 6) transformative learning experience questionnaire. The civic engagement prompt was discontinued for 2018-2019.

To whom are results regularly distributed?

Overall results of portfolio assessment are available to the Truman community through this [Assessment Almanac](#). Occasional reports are given to governance, at planning workshops (SPAW), and other forums. Most departments use the information to reform their curriculum, improve programs, and engage in self-study, as mandated by the Faculty Senate. Portfolio data is particularly useful when departments are analyzing data in preparation for a 5-year review. Faculty who participate in reading sessions report that their interaction with colleagues from other disciplines on campus gives them new ideas and helps them modify assignments and teaching techniques for the next year.

From whom are the results available?

The director of the portfolio project can release datasets or additional analyses upon request.

Are the results available by school or department?

Yes.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

No. Truman's portfolio is quite unique and while some universities are using portfolios for assessment of general education or liberal studies, most do not use similar prompts or submission categories.

Table 1. Counts of Students by first major 2015-2019

		First Major				
	Major	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Arts and Letters	ART	39	29	34	30	20
	CML	27	8	21	25	24
	CRWT	8	74	10	17	12
	ENG	72	17	65	61	68
	LING	10	12	10	7	11
	MUSI	28	16	32	28	24
	THEA	13	13	16	15	10
	AAL	197	169	168	183	169
Business	ACCT	70	56	75	56	63
	BSAD	93	118	111	124	136
	BUS	163	174	186	180	199
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	7	8	7	9
	CMDS	40	43	32	36	27
	ES	123	111	82	85	101
	HLTH	78	63	73	73	71
	NU	54	43	36	47	45
	HSE	303	267	231	248	253
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	52	68	64	71	46
	ECON	20	17	17	11	9
	HIST	38	26	46	40	32
	JUST	40	40	32	26	26
	PHRE	6	2	10	8	4
	POL	21	20	15	24	19
	PSYC	101	91	105	89	93
	SOAN	20	16	19	19	17
	SCS	298	280	308	288	246
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	30	29	20	42
	BIOL	100	103	120	104	99
	CHEM	22	16	26	18	19
	CS	24	30	42	33	41
	MATH	26	31	26	28	15
	PHYS	9	5	9	8	9
	STTS	*	*	*	3	7
	SAM	201	215	252	214	232
	IDSM	5	8	5	3	4
ALL	1167	1113	1170	1116	1103	

The Critical Thinking and Writing Prompt (CTW), Data, and Discussion

A Critical Thinking and Writing (CTW) Prompt has been in the portfolio for many years, but was seriously reexamined as part of the charge of the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) committee. In this committee's University-wide sanctioned report (submitted October 30, 2012), they included a rubric for evaluating any document for every element of its critical thinking. The portfolio committee attenuated that rubric to include four major components of critical thinking, as well as writing quality. These critical thinking components are the *issue* of the document, its *context*, the supporting *evidence* of its argument, and the resulting *conclusion*. Since 2013, the Portfolio has used this attenuated HOTS rubric to score CTW submissions.

Students are asked in this prompt to submit their best work that illustrates critical thinking. Usually, it is the student's strongest classic research-style paper and the prompt specifically asks for such a paper. They note what year of their college experience the work was done, and state whether the work came from a particular course or some other source. They then describe the instructor's assignment, reflect on their growth as a critical thinker, attach their document via their vault, and perform a self-evaluation with our scoring rubric.

Following the prompt and the rubric are the tables of CTW scores sorted by major and course prefix. Following that is an inter-rater reliability table that indicates our readers are well calibrated in the scoring of these submissions; a random number of CTW submissions are scored by two different readers to double check this assertion each year. A final table shows the university-wide scores by year for the last 5 years.

Critical Thinking and Writing Prompt

Truman's Common Framework of Critical Thinking Pedagogy states that critical thinking includes the ability to understand and articulate well-reasoned arguments. It involves using evidence to determine the level of confidence you should have in a proposition. It demands comprehensively exploring issues and ideas before coming to conclusions.

In addition, good writing is a reflection of good thinking. Therefore, good writing communicates meaning and integrates ideas through analysis, evaluation, and the synthesis of ideas and concepts. Good writing also exhibits skill in language usage and clarity of expression through good organization.

NOTE: Please consider your best classic research-style paper from either your junior or senior year. Students typically compose their best critical writing later in college.

As you consider this category, you may find that a submission from another category demonstrates strong critical thinking and writing. If so, feel free to use that item for this category as well.

Please submit the document you have written that demonstrates your strongest critical thinking skills.

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

Please describe the instructor's assignment, remembering that faculty and staff from all across campus should understand your explanation. If the work was not generated by an assignment, please describe your purpose and process in using this kind of thinking.

Please comment on how you have grown in critical thinking skills since arriving at Truman.

Reviewer Specific Questions:

Following the Portfolio Rubric for Critical Thinking and Writing, please assign scores for: Issue, Context, Supporting Evidence, Conclusion, and Communication.

Portfolio Critical Thinking and Writing Rubric (adopted summer 2013)

This rubric has been adapted from the Critical Thinking rubric adopted by Truman. For each component, assign a score that best fits a student submission.

1. Identifies, summarizes, and appropriately formulates the issue (e.g. a question to be answered, hypothesis to be tested, subject to be interpreted, or a problem to be solved).

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 - Emerging
Clearly identifies and summarizes issue including nuances and details, revealing subsidiary, embedded, or implicit issues.	Identifies and summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Some nuances or key details missing or glossed over.	Identifies and summarizes issue in a confused or incorrect way. Nuances and key details missing.	Fails to or does not attempt to identify and summarize issue.

2. (merged with 3) Identifies and considers existing context, theory, and/or previous work in the field (literature reviews, world-views, contentions, interpretations, interdisciplinary approaches).

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 - Emerging
<p>Approaches issue with clear sense of scope and context. May consider multiple relevant contexts.</p> <p>Shows clear and nuanced understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of contexts.</p> <p>Engages multiple, convergent and divergent perspectives in nuanced ways that qualify or enrich own perspective.</p>	<p>Presents and explores relevant contexts in relation to issue, but with some limitations.</p> <p>Shows some clear understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Engages both convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, may be tentative, overstating, or too easily dismissive.</p>	<p>Presents context superficially or connects to issue in a limited way.</p> <p>Shows limited understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Presents convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, but with little engagement.</p>	<p>Does not connect issue to context, or attempts but fails to do so.</p> <p>Shows little or no awareness of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Raises only convergent or agreeable perspectives or conclusions; avoids challenging, divergent, or discomforting perspectives.</p>

3 (was 5). Presents, interprets, analyses, and/or assesses appropriate supporting evidence (e.g. observations, data, information, citations, argumentation, proofs, etc.) using validated techniques.

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 – Emerging
<p>Shows excellent skills in searching, selecting and evaluating appropriate sources.</p> <p>Appropriate and salient evidence is thoroughly developed and clearly supports conclusions.</p> <p>Causal relationships are clearly and consistently distinguished from correlations.</p> <p>Demonstrates understanding of complex relationships between facts, opinions, and values in light of available evidence; recognizes bias, including selection bias.</p>	<p>Shows some adequate skills in searching, selecting, and evaluating appropriate sources.</p> <p>Evidence is appropriate— exploration may be routine or gaps may exist in relation to conclusions.</p> <p>Distinguishes causality and correlation,</p> <p>Distinguishes among facts, opinions, and values, may recognize some issues of bias, and opinions are responsive to evidence.</p>	<p>Shows inadequate skills in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources.</p> <p>Some evidence may be inappropriate or related only loosely to conclusions.</p> <p>Aware of distinction between cause and correlation, but confuses application.</p> <p>Attempts or begins to distinguish fact, opinion, values may mention without developing issues of bias.</p>	<p>No indication of search, selection, or source evaluation skills.</p> <p>Evidence is lacking, simplistic, inappropriate, or unrelated to the topic.</p> <p>Conflates cause and correlation.</p> <p>Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and values; seems unaware of problems of bias or holds opinions in face of counterevidence.</p>

4 (was 6). Identifies and assesses conclusions (e.g. theses, contentions, hypotheses, answers, solutions, interpretations) and further implications or consequences (e.g. practical applications, policy implications, relevance to other issues or disciplines, discussions or future research).

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 – Emerging
<p>Conclusions are tailored to fit the best available evidence within the context and in relation to relevant perspectives.</p> <p>Grounds own conclusions with strong support, qualifies own conclusions with balance and acknowledgement of scope, limitations, or ambiguities.</p> <p>Conclusions are nuanced and developed and provide evidence for, discuss, and extend relevant implications, and consequences.</p>	<p>Presents conclusions as following from the evidence; shows some insight into context or perspectives.</p> <p>Grounds own conclusions with clear and appropriate support, may have occasional inconsistencies or lapses.</p> <p>Conclusions are developed to provide some linkage and integration with relevant consequences and implications.</p>	<p>Presents conclusions as relative or only loosely related to evidence, lacking insight into context or perspectives.</p> <p>Presents own conclusions with weak support or support from inappropriate authorities.</p> <p>Identifies some relevant consequences or implications with weak attempt to link to conclusion.</p>	<p>Fails to present conclusions; or conclusion is a simplistic summary or unrelated to stated evidence.</p> <p>Presents own assertions without support, as absolute, or as attributed to external or inappropriate authorities.</p> <p>Fails to identify implications or consequences or mentions purported implications or consequences without linking to conclusions.</p>

5 (was 7). Communicates effectively (e.g. clarity and precision, organization, ease with use of medium, voice or palette, disciplinary conventions, stylistic and mechanical conventions).

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 – Emerging
<p>Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent.</p> <p>Organization is clear and cogent; transitions between ideas enrich presentation.</p> <p>Errors of grammar, syntax, voice, etc. are minimal, even when using complex structures.</p> <p>Style is consistent, sophisticated, and appropriate for discipline, genre, and audience.</p> <p>Consistent use of appropriate format. All sources cited and used correctly; shows understanding of disciplinary, economic, legal and social aspects of using information.</p>	<p>In general, language does not interfere with communication.</p> <p>Basic organization is clear; transitions connect most ideas, although some may be rote.</p> <p>Errors are not overly distracting or frequent, or attempts at more complex structures lead to occasional errors.</p> <p>Style is generally consistent and appropriate for discipline, genre, and audience, may be occasional lapses.</p> <p>Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent. Most sources cited and used correctly, appropriate style is employed.</p>	<p>Language occasionally interferes with communication.</p> <p>Basic organization is apparent; some transitions connect ideas, but some gaps or confusions.</p> <p>Some errors are repeated or distracting; some copy-editing errors should be caught by proofreading.</p> <p>Some attempt at appropriate style, but with major lapses or inconsistencies; begins or attempts to attend to discipline, genre, or audience.</p> <p>Format is flawed or occasionally distracting; citations are uneven, inconsistent, or incorrectly documented.</p>	<p>In many places, language (word choice) obscures meaning.</p> <p>Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas.</p> <p>Grammar, syntax, voice or other errors are repeated, frequent, and distracting, or show lack of proofreading.</p> <p>Style is simplistic, inconsistent, or inappropriate; little to no attention to discipline, genre, or audience.</p> <p>Format is absent, incorrect, or distracting; citations are absent or used or documented incorrectly.</p>

Table 2. Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by first major 2019

Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by First Major 2019									
	Major	N 2019	Issue	Context	Evidence	Conc.	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm.
Arts and Letters	ART	20	2.60	2.60	2.55	2.40	10.15	90%	2.90
	CML	24	2.92	2.58	3.00	2.50	11.00	92%	2.79
	CRWT	12	2.67	2.33	2.75	2.42	10.17	83%	2.92
	ENG	68	2.99	2.66	2.91	2.59	11.15	99%	3.00
	LING	11	3.27	2.91	2.55	2.64	11.36	100%	3.27
	MUSI	24	2.54	2.79	3.04	2.54	10.92	100%	3.00
	THEA	10	2.60	2.60	2.80	2.60	10.60	90%	2.90
	AAL	169	2.84	2.65	2.86	2.54	10.89	95%	2.96
Business	ACCT	63	2.75	2.65	2.62	2.32	10.34	83%	2.71
	BSAD	136	2.71	2.63	2.72	2.34	10.39	88%	2.72
	BUS	199	2.72	2.63	2.69	2.33	10.37	86%	2.72
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	2.78	2.22	2.56	2.33	9.89	100%	2.56
	CMDS	27	2.37	2.59	2.70	2.33	10.00	85%	2.96
	ES	101	2.61	2.44	2.54	2.23	9.82	82%	2.78
	HLTH	71	2.89	2.82	2.73	2.31	10.75	93%	2.90
	NU	45	3.07	3.20	2.96	2.31	11.54	89%	3.18
	HSE	253	2.75	2.69	2.69	2.28	10.41	87%	2.90
Soc. and Cult. Studies	COMM	46	2.93	2.85	2.78	2.57	11.13	91%	2.87
	ECON	9	3.22	3.00	3.11	2.67	12.00	100%	3.33
	HIST	32	2.84	2.81	2.94	2.63	11.22	88%	2.81
	JUST	26	2.77	2.50	2.54	2.23	10.04	81%	2.73
	PHRE	4	2.75	3.50	2.75	2.50	11.50	100%	3.00
	POL	19	3.05	3.11	3.05	2.53	11.73	100%	2.95
	PSYC	93	2.77	2.61	2.59	2.35	10.33	83%	2.84
	SOAN	17	2.59	3.00	2.82	2.59	11.00	100%	2.94
SCS	246	2.84	2.76	2.74	2.46	10.80	88%	2.87	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2.79	2.45	2.52	2.43	10.19	86%	2.69
	BIOL	99	2.85	2.77	2.92	2.53	11.06	95%	3.00
	CHEM	19	3.42	3.26	3.37	3.21	13.26	100%	3.42
	CS	41	2.56	2.46	2.68	2.41	10.12	78%	2.80
	MATH	15	2.87	2.87	2.80	2.27	10.80	100%	2.93
	PHYS	9	3.00	2.56	2.78	2.56	10.89	100%	2.78
	STTS	7	1.86	1.86	2.00	1.57	7.29	29%	1.86
	SAM	232	2.81	2.67	2.80	2.50	10.78	89%	2.90
IDSM	4	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.75	11.25	75%	2.75	
ALL	1103	2.79	2.69	2.75	2.42	10.64	89%	2.87	

Table 2 shows the number of students within the various majors and their average scores for the issue, context, evidence, and conclusions of their CTW submissions. Recall that each component can range from 1-4, with the sum of these 4 components (Sum4) leading to the overall score for critical thinking. A Sum4 total of 10 or more is deemed satisfactory for this prompt. The averages for the Sum4 for each

major are shown here, as well as the percentage of students from each major whose Sum4 was 10 or more. The final column in the table is the average score for writing skill and acumen within each major.

The university average Sum4 score is 10.64, and all schools have an average Sum4 above 10. Only one department (STTS) showed a Sum4 average of less than 9.5. This lower scoring major could require less writing than others or the writing is mostly technical in nature. The factors that lead to this lower score are not clear and it is possible some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. It should also be noted that this is the first year that STTS was separated from MATH so this is likely another factor. The department that scored the highest on the Sum4 value was CHEM, with an average score of 13.26. Other departments that scored at the high end of the range (>11) include IDSM, BIOL, POL, PHRE, HIST, ECON, COMM, NU, LING, and ENG.

Viewing the data through the lens of percentage of students who earned 10 or more on the Sum4 for critical thinking gives a subtly different perspective. University-wide, 89% of 2019 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is a marked improvement from the prior 4 years. This may be a result of some clarifications made in the prompt which included a note to use a classical-style research paper and the elimination of the WACT course from the list of source courses which discouraged submissions from freshman level courses. It is good that we are getting better at asking the students specifically what we want them to submit. The lowest average was the School of Business with 86% which was however a marked improvement from last year. Departments that had the least percentage of students scoring 10 or more (<80%) are STTS, IDSM and CS. There are 10 Departments with 100% of students scoring 10 or more: LING, MUSI, ATHT, ECON, PHRE, POL, SOAN, CHEM, MATH, PHYS.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2019 Scores by course prefix

Critical Thinking and Writing: 2019 Scores by Course Prefix								
Prefix	N 2019	Issue	Context	Evidence	Conc.	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm.
ALL	1082	2.79	2.56	2.65	2.40	10.40	89%	2.82
ACCT	37	3.00	2.89	2.78	2.49	11.16	92%	2.89
AGSC	39	3.00	2.62	2.69	2.62	10.92	95%	2.90
ART	16	2.69	2.81	2.75	2.44	10.69	100%	3.06
BIOL	36	2.97	2.86	3.19	2.69	11.72	97%	3.17
BSAD	75	2.76	2.76	2.79	2.48	10.79	89%	2.77
CHEM	24	3.29	3.13	3.29	2.92	12.63	100%	3.38
CMDS	15	2.33	2.53	2.87	2.40	10.13	93%	3.00
CML	26	2.81	2.46	2.77	2.31	10.35	92%	2.31
COMM	34	2.79	2.79	2.68	2.35	10.62	91%	2.79
CS	22	2.73	2.68	2.77	2.45	10.64	82%	2.95
ECON	10	3.10	2.90	3.10	2.40	11.50	90%	2.90
ED	9	2.89	2.44	2.33	2.44	10.11	78%	2.33
ENG	147	2.67	2.39	2.63	2.26	9.94	84%	2.72
ENVS	8	2.75	2.88	2.88	2.63	11.13	88%	2.75
ES	43	2.86	2.53	2.60	2.47	10.47	86%	2.74
GEOG	1	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	100%	3.00
HIST	33	2.94	3.00	3.03	2.79	11.76	97%	2.91
HLTH	43	3.12	2.93	2.65	2.28	10.98	95%	2.86
IDSM	2	3.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	10.50	100%	3.00
INDV	2	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	12.00	100%	3.50
JAPN	1	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	11.00	100%	3.00
JINS	178	2.72	2.69	2.79	2.38	10.57	88%	2.90
JUST	29	2.69	2.45	2.55	2.17	9.86	86%	2.79
LATN	2	2.50	2.00	3.00	2.00	9.50	100%	3.00
LING	14	3.21	2.86	2.79	2.64	11.50	100%	3.29
MATH	1	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0%	1.00
MS	3	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	6.67	33%	2.33
MUSI	21	2.33	2.57	2.76	2.29	9.95	81%	2.90
NU	36	3.25	3.47	3.19	2.42	12.33	97%	3.36
PD	1	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	10.00	100%	2.00
PHRE	48	2.33	2.40	2.31	2.15	9.19	83%	2.81
PHYS	2	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	9.50	50%	2.00
POL	30	3.13	3.00	3.07	2.63	11.83	97%	3.13
PSYC	51	2.84	2.82	2.65	2.47	10.78	82%	2.88
SOAN	28	2.71	2.75	2.71	2.61	10.79	96%	2.93
SSTE	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	11.00	100%	3.00
STAT	6	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.33	10.33	100%	3.00
THEA	7	2.29	2.57	2.57	2.29	9.71	71%	2.71
WGST	1	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	9.00	100%	3.00

In 2019, 1082 out of 1103 submissions (98%) came from Truman courses. Table 3 shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular

course prefix. By count, ENG and JINS courses led to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%). CHEM, NU, and INDV and led to the highest Sum4 scores (>12). While critical thinking may have been involved in these papers, they may not have been in the best format to score higher.

Table 4. CTW 2019 Inter-rater Reliability

Abs. Diff.	Counts	Percent
6+	44	6.81%
5	53	8.20%
4	63	9.75%
3	89	13.78%
2	153	23.68%
1	161	24.92%
0	83	12.85%
Total	646	100.00%

Each year, some random number of CTW submissions are scored by a second reader. Note that the second reader of a submission cannot see the score of the previous reader! In 2019, we had 646 papers that were read by more than one person. In the years since complete implementation of this new rubric, the number of “double-reads” that we recorded ranged from a low of 189 in 2016 to a high of 589 in 2015, so this number of double-reads is higher than previous years. Continuing the tradition of years past, the inter-rater reliability rate is very good especially considering the scores are out of a possible 16 points.

Table 5. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-wide Scores 2015-2019

CTW: University-wide Scores 2015-2019			
Year	N Students	University Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2015	1157	10.4	64%
2016	1099	10.4	61%
2017	1170	10.3	61%
2018	1117	10.1	61%
2019	1103	10.6	89%

This final table shows the Truman university mean Sum4 and the 10+(%) for the last 5 years. As you can see, the Sum4 values are slightly higher and the 10+ scores are significantly higher this year, so we must still be offering students the opportunities they need to hone their critical thinking and writing skills well. Another contributing factor to this may be that we removed ENG 190 (WACT) “from the source of entry” choices and have focused on encouraging students to select from work in junior and senior years.

The Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The earliest results from the interdisciplinary thinking (IDS) prompt motivated the campus to develop our Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar (JINS) courses in the late 1990s. This prompt also requires a research style paper, but in this instance, the subject of the paper must be explored using the perspectives of more than one discipline. A student's paper produced as part of their JINS course should satisfy the criteria of our rubric well. Since the implementation of JINS courses, the scores on this prompt have held steady with the mean score near 2 out of 4 and with 60-70% of the scores deemed above the competent score of 2.

The prompt defines the concept of interdisciplinary thinking, and asks for the source and time of completion of the submitted document. Next, the student must briefly describe the instructor's assignment, provide a list of the disciplines used in the work, and reflect on their growth of this skill. As is usually the case, we ask for a self-evaluation using our scoring rubric, which we hope encourages the student to choose their paper that best fits the rubric.

Following the prompt itself and the scoring rubric are the tables of data for this prompt. The first table organizes the mean scores and the percentage of students scoring 2 or more by department. The second table lists scores by course prefix for the submissions that were derived from coursework. A final table shows the inter-rater reliability.

Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt

What paper have you written that demonstrates your strongest interdisciplinary thinking?

"Interdisciplinary Thinking" means using the perspectives, methodologies or modes of inquiry of two or more disciplines in exploring problems, issues, and ideas as you make meaning or gain understanding.

* You work in an interdisciplinary way when you integrate or synthesize ideas, materials, or processes across traditional disciplinary boundaries.

* You should not assume that you are generating interdisciplinary work if you merely use essential skills like writing, speaking, a second language, computation, percentages, or averages to explore content, perspectives and ideas in only one discipline.

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

Please describe the instructor's assignment. If the work was not generated by an assignment, please describe your purpose and process in using this kind of thinking.

List here all the disciplines (two or more) whose concepts, methodologies or modes of inquiry, and/or perspectives you believe that you have integrated and synthesized in this piece.

Please reflect on and specifically describe to faculty and staff from all across campus how this submission demonstrates interdisciplinary thinking.

Interdisciplinary Thinking Rubric

Some Descriptors of Competence as an Interdisciplinary Thinker

The items submitted may have some, many, or all of these features which influence your holistic response to the material you review.

4 Strong Competence

- A number of disciplines
- Significant disparity of disciplines
Uses methodology from other disciplines for inquiry
- Analyzes using multiple disciplines
- Integrates or synthesizes content, perspectives, discourse, or methodologies from a number of disciplines

3 Competence

- A number of disciplines
- Less disparity of disciplines
- Moderate analysis using multiple disciplines
- Moderate integration or synthesis

2 Some Competence

- A number of disciplines
- Minimal disparity of disciplines
- Minimal analysis using multiple disciplines
- Minimal evidence of comprehension of interdisciplinarity

1 Weak Competence

- A number of disciplines
- Mentions disciplines without making meaningful connections among them
- No analysis using multiple disciplines
- No evidence of comprehension of interdisciplinarity

0 No demonstration of competence as an interdisciplinary thinker

- Only one discipline represented
- No evidence of multiple disciplines, of making connections among disciplines, or of some comprehension of interdisciplinarity

Table 6. Interdisciplinary Thinking: Scores by first major 2015-2019

	Major	2019	Mean Score					2+ (%)				
			2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Arts and Letters	ART	20	1.91	0.98	2.12	2.13	1.60	58	51	78	73	50
	CML	24	1.87	1.15	1.89	2.12	2.08	58	55	65	76	71
	CRWT	12	2.50	1.38	2.50	2.29	1.50	75	44	100	88	58
	ENG	68	1.92	2.23	2.05	2.18	1.91	68	82	74	75	60
	LING	11	2.28	2.33	2.27	1.71	2.09	64	88	75	71	73
	MUSI	24	2.72	1.41	2.09	2.07	1.92	94	54	79	79	67
	THEA	10	2.08	1.71	1.91	1.87	1.50	92	56	72	60	50
	AAL	169	2.18	1.60	2.12	2.11	1.80	73	61	78	75	55
Business	ACCT	63	1.62	1.76	1.91	1.75	1.79	57	64	84	64	57
	BSAD	136	1.88	1.56	1.64	1.81	1.81	67	51	58	66	63
	BUS	199	1.75	1.66	1.78	1.79	1.80	62	57	71	66	53
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	1.38	1.96	1.63	2.29	1.78	31	66	63	86	56
	CMDS	27	2.00	1.80	1.59	2.14	1.74	65	60	48	67	56
	ES	101	2.11	1.72	1.71	1.80	1.60	77	58	62	6	56
	HLTH	71	2.31	1.78	2.14	2.15	1.87	76	67	75	73	62
	NU	45	1.99	1.89	1.80	2.04	2.02	66	68	58	68	69
	HSE	253	1.96	1.83	1.78	2.01	1.80	63	64	61	67	57
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	2.09	2.10	1.71	2.13	1.93	72	72	59	70	65
	ECON	9	2.11	1.97	1.56	2.09	2.33	75	67	68	73	78
	HIST	32	2.07	2.50	2.12	2.24	1.88	79	80	78	80	66
	JUST	26	2.12	1.80	1.73	1.77	1.69	67	59	63	65	58
	PHRE	4	2.50	1.50	1.99	2.13	2.00	83	100	60	75	75
	POL	19	1.96	2.33	2.30	1.88	2.58	68	65	93	63	89
	PSYC	93	2.07	1.82	2.05	1.98	1.78	66	62	73	69	58
	SOAN	17	2.23	2.15	2.34	2.11	1.76	78	73	87	74	65
	SCS	246	2.14	2.02	1.98	2.04	2.00	73	72	73	71	56
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2.39	1.70	2.02	2.25	1.79	75	48	71	75	60
	BIOL	99	1.98	2.14	2.12	2.02	1.93	69	70	74	68	65
	CHEM	19	1.90	2.13	2.24	2.22	2.11	75	71	79	72	58
	CS	41	1.83	2.19	2.17	2.21	1.85	58	78	77	76	56
	MATH	15	2.38	1.77	1.86	2.18	2.07	90	60	65	68	73
	PHYS	9	2.42	0.80	1.89	0.75	1.22	89	60	61	25	22
	STTS	7	*	*	*	2.33	1.43	*	*	*	100	57
	SAM	232	2.15	1.79	2.05	2.07	1.77	76	65	71	69	55
IDSM	4	1.50	2.71	2.06	2.00	1.50	30	100	100	67	50	
ALL	1103	2.07	1.84	2.00	2.01	1.78	70	72	72	69	55	

University-wide, the 2019 average score is 1.78, which is near the low end of the 5 year range of 1.8-2.1. Note that the Statistics major was added in 2018, so only two years of data is available. The average score by school changed little from last year, but

examination by department shows a bit more variability. Departments themselves might be able to better address why that might be so. Changes at the department level could surely get some of these scores higher.

Table 7. Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2019 Scores by course prefix

Prefix	2019 N	Mean	2+ (%)
JINS	711	2.01	69%
ENG	58	1.52	45%
BSAD	33	1.36	45%
CML	22	1.91	68%
PSYC	20	1.40	45%
PHRE	20	1.65	50%
POL	17	1.65	59%
SOAN	16	1.56	50%
COMM	15	2.00	60%
ENVS	14	2.50	79%
ART	14	1.43	43%
AGSC	14	1.71	57%
HIST	12	1.67	50%
CMDS	9	1.00	22%
ES	9	1.11	33%
ECON	8	1.75	63%
ACCT	8	1.38	25%
MUSI	8	1.63	50%
NU	8	2.00	63%
STAT	8	1.00	25%
JUST	7	1.57	43%
IDSMS	6	1.33	50%
BIOL	6	1.17	33%
CS	6	2.33	83%
ED	6	1.17	33%
<5	30	1.24	30%

As is usually the case, and as intended the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2019, with 711 submissions. ENG, BSAD, CML, PSYC and PHRE had 20 or more and most other prefixes had many fewer. Additionally, the submissions from JINS courses scored quite well with our rubric although the number is a bit lower by about 5% than the last 5 years; in 2019, JINS submissions average 2.01, with 69% of them scoring at the satisfactory score of 2 or more. No other prefixes had mean scores of 2 or more. The preponderance of JINS submissions is completely logical, since the JINS courses were invented as a way to promote interdisciplinary thinking and many faculty who teach these courses include the Portfolio's IDS rubric as part of their course.

Table 8. IDS 2019 Inter-rater Reliability

2019 Abs Diff	N	%
4	1	0%
3	23	4%
2	107	16%
1	308	47%
0	210	32%
Total	649	100%

In 2019, 649 submissions were scored by a second reader, with 32% of those giving identical scores to the first reader. Another 47% of second readers assigned a score that differed by only one unit. These consistent scores assigned by different readers suggest that calibration among scorers remains excellent.

Self-Discovery Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Portfolio's newest prompt is the Self-Discovery Prompt, which was envisioned as a way to explore how students are discovering their true selves with our present curriculum and circumstances. It was added to the Portfolio in the fall of 2015, so this report is the third to include evaluation of this issue.

During the spring of 2015, at the request of President Troy Paino, the campus participated in Action Teams that explored the ways that a Truman education could be made more distinctive for recruiting purposes. One of the Action Teams read and discussed **Why Choose the Liberal Arts** by Mark William Roche. Roche proposes three pillars of Liberal Education: 1) Intrinsic learning (learning for its own sake), 2) practical learning (learning related to career preparation), and 3) character formation, especially in connection to a higher purpose or calling. This final pillar was the motivation behind the Self-Discovery prompt. The character formation pillar also moved the Blueprint and Next Step teams to develop proposed common Freshman Seminar(s). These Self and Society Seminars began in 2018.

The Self-Discovery prompt itself is given here followed by the set of Reviewer Specific Questions. Reviewers are asked to tally all the reasons that led the student to report self-discovery, and that data is given in the first set of tables. Note that many reasons can be offered for each submission, so the totals can add up to more than 100%. Finally, the categories of "Context of the Submission" are listed and tallied for all students in the last table.

The Self-Discovery Prompt

College is an important time of self-discovery and character development. Consider how you have grown since you first arrived at Truman; in many ways you likely feel you have matured a great deal, even if at times you might also feel very much the same. The changes that you have experienced may or may not have been easy or fun. Sometimes significant growth in character is quite challenging or uncomfortable.

What or who has been the biggest influence on who you have become during the years you have attended Truman? What or who do you feel made the biggest difference in developing who you are now as you head to the next chapter of your life?

Please write about your self-discovery experience in the space provided below. A supporting “artifact” might enhance your reflection if included; however, it is not absolutely necessary. If you do provide an “artifact”, please attach it from the vault.

Please tell us here about your most influential and/or significant self-discovery during your time at Truman. Feel free to mention anything you feel is relevant, especially if you feel that it probably wouldn't have happened if you were not specifically at Truman.

We are especially interested in why it was so important to your self-discovery and character formation, out of all of your experiences at Truman. Why, specifically, is it so essential to who you have become?

NOTE: You may find that you have included some discussion of this self-discovery in the Transformative Experiences Questionnaire. In that prompt, we focus on each particular experience, and here we want you to focus more deeply on its particular effects on you.

Reviewer Specific Question

Why, according to the student, was it so self-defining? (check all that apply)

Risk/Challenge/Growth

- *Engaged in deep introspection.*
- *Examined her/himself from a new perspective (historical, artistic, philosophical....)*
- *Achieved significant personal growth.*
- *Demonstrated responsibility.*
- *Explored a moral or ethical dilemma.*

Academic/Scholarship

- *Achieved a personal best.*
- *Especially challenging.*
- *Engaged in significant intellectual risk.*
- *Developed a sense of vocation.*
- *Modeled working as a professional.*

Relationships

- *Demonstrated service to others*
- *Fruitful collaboration with other students or peers*
- *Fruitful collaboration with faculty, staff, mentor, other professional*
- *Built a special mentoring relationship*
- *No indication.*
- *Other*

Table 9. SELF-DISCOVERY: University-wide Student Rationales 2017-2019

Self Discovery: University-wide Student Rationales 2017 - 2019				
Categories	Reasons	2017	2018	2019
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	35%	31%	23%
	New Perspective on Self	6%	29%	25%
	Personal Growth	43%	57%	60%
	Responsibility	15%	19%	20%
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	3%	4%	6%
Academic/Scholarship	Personal Best	5%	6%	10%
	Especially Challenging	15%	21%	26%
	Intellectual Risk	3%	6%	7%
	Vocational Development	17%	23%	21%
	Worked as Professional	8%	14%	12%
Relationships	Service to Others	8%	10%	11%
	Collaboration w/ Peers	20%	24%	21%
	Collaboration w/ Professional	2%	12%	11%
	Mentoring Internship	3%	8%	5%

The reasons that students could have expressed for significant self-discovery were categorized into three groups: **Risk/Challenge/Growth**, **Academic/Scholarship**, and **Relationships**. As a category, **Risk/Challenge/Growth** offered the greatest potential for self-discovery university-wide. For all students, *Personal growth* was the biggest reason for self-discovery in all years (2017: 43%, 2018: 57%, 2019: 60%). *Deep Introspection* also spurred a lot of self-discovery although it is trending downward (2017: 35%, 2018 31%, 2019: 23%). *Demonstration of Responsibility* was also a significant factor (2017: 15%, 2018: 19%, 2019: 20%).

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, students found *Vocational Development* (2017: 17%, 2018: 23%, 2019: 21%) and *Especially Challenging* activities (2017: 15%, 2018: 21%, 2019: 26%) to be great sources of self-discovery. Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration with Peers* in all years (2017: 15%, 2018: 24%, 2019: 21%).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2019 is tabulated in tables 10-12. How different majors' students are motivated should be valuable information for the faculty as they craft improvements within their majors. Since coursework is the largest context for self-discovery for all Truman students, especially within the majors (as shown in table 13), we should work to optimize appropriate opportunities for self-discovery within each of our majors.

Table 10: SELF-DISCOVERY: 2019 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by major

			Risk / Growth / Challenge									
			Introspection		Perspective		Personal Growth		Responsibility		Dilemma	
Major	N 2019		Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	20	5	25%	5	25%	12	60%	4	20%	2	10%
	CML	24	7	29%	10	42%	16	67%	3	13%	0	0%
	CRWT	12	2	17%	3	25%	5	42%	2	17%	1	8%
	ENG	68	19	28%	23	34%	44	65%	14	21%	6	9%
	LING	11	2	18%	3	27%	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
	MUSI	24	7	29%	13	54%	15	63%	6	25%	2	8%
	THEA	10	6	60%	1	10%	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%
	AAL	169	48	28%	58	34%	108	64%	34	20%	11	7%
Business	ACCT	63	8	13%	17	27%	34	54%	13	21%	4	6%
	BSAD	136	35	26%	33	24%	93	68%	29	21%	8	6%
	BUS	199	43	22%	50	25%	127	64%	42	21%	12	6%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	3	33%	0	0%	6	67%	3	33%	1	11%
	CMDS	27	7	26%	4	15%	20	74%	6	22%	2	7%
	ES	101	16	16%	26	26%	60	59%	18	18%	4	4%
	HLTH	71	11	15%	15	21%	48	68%	18	25%	4	6%
	NU	45	10	22%	9	20%	26	58%	14	31%	8	18%
	HSE	253	47	19%	54	21%	160	63%	59	23%	19	8%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	12	26%	14	30%	27	59%	5	11%	6	13%
	ECON	9	1	11%	3	33%	6	67%	1	11%	0	0%
	HIST	32	9	28%	10	31%	16	50%	4	13%	2	6%
	JUST	26	8	31%	7	27%	14	54%	5	19%	2	8%
	PHRE	4	1	25%	1	25%	4	100%	1	25%	0	0%
	POL	19	5	26%	2	11%	6	32%	2	11%	1	5%
	PSYC	93	26	28%	22	24%	57	61%	15	16%	4	4%
	SOAN	17	4	24%	7	41%	6	35%	2	12%	3	18%
	SCS	246	66	27%	66	27%	136	55%	35	14%	18	7%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	12	29%	8	19%	22	52%	7	17%	5	12%
	BIOL	99	21	21%	27	27%	53	54%	27	27%	4	4%
	CHEM	19	3	16%	0	0%	12	63%	3	16%	0	0%
	CS	41	9	22%	11	27%	20	49%	5	12%	1	2%
	MATH	15	2	13%	2	13%	13	87%	3	20%	1	7%
	PHYS	9	1	11%	1	11%	5	56%	1	11%	0	0%
	STTS	7	3	43%	2	29%	4	57%	4	57%	0	0%
	SAM	232	51	22%	51	22%	129	56%	50	22%	11	5%
IDSM	4	0	0%	2	50%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	
ALL	1103	255	23%	281	25%	663	60%	220	20%	72	7%	

Table 11. SELF-DISCOVERY: 2019 Student ACADEMIC/SCHOLARSHIP Rationales by major

			Academic / Scholarship									
			Personal Best		Challenging		Intellectual Risk		Vocation		Professional	
	Major	N 2019	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	20	1	5%	5	25%	1	5%	2	10%	2	10%
	CML	24	2	8%	4	17%	1	4%	4	17%	1	4%
	CRWT	12	2	17%	5	42%	1	8%	3	25%	3	25%
	ENG	68	10	15%	23	34%	5	7%	9	13%	6	9%
	LING	11	2	18%	5	45%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%
	MUSI	24	6	25%	8	33%	2	8%	8	33%	4	17%
	THEA	10	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	5	50%	2	20%
	AAL	169	24	14%	51	30%	11	7%	32	19%	18	11%
Business	ACCT	63	2	3%	16	25%	4	6%	7	11%	8	13%
	BSAD	136	16	12%	30	22%	10	7%	20	15%	18	13%
	BUS	199	18	9%	46	23%	14	7%	27	14%	26	13%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	2	22%	1	11%
	CMDS	27	1	4%	5	19%	0	0%	6	22%	5	19%
	ES	101	8	8%	22	22%	3	3%	27	27%	15	15%
	HLTH	71	6	8%	19	27%	2	3%	19	27%	10	14%
	NU	45	4	9%	10	22%	3	7%	10	22%	8	18%
	HSE	253	19	8%	58	23%	8	3%	64	25%	39	15%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	5	11%	6	13%	2	4%	9	20%	8	17%
	ECON	9	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%
	HIST	32	3	9%	5	16%	2	6%	10	31%	3	9%
	JUST	26	4	15%	9	35%	2	8%	2	8%	2	8%
	PHRE	4	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	19	1	5%	6	32%	3	16%	5	26%	4	21%
	PSYC	93	11	12%	22	24%	7	8%	15	16%	12	13%
	SOAN	17	0	0%	3	18%	0	0%	3	18%	1	6%
	SCS	246	24	10%	53	22%	16	7%	45	18%	31	13%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2	5%	8	19%	2	5%	11	26%	4	10%
	BIOL	99	6	6%	27	27%	13	13%	35	35%	12	12%
	CHEM	19	3	16%	12	63%	3	16%	5	26%	1	5%
	CS	41	7	17%	15	37%	5	12%	4	10%	1	2%
	MATH	15	2	13%	5	33%	2	13%	3	20%	1	7%
	PHYS	9	1	11%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	STTS	7	2	29%	5	71%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	232	23	10%	75	32%	26	11%	58	25%	19	8%
IDSMS	4	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	
ALL	1103	109	10%	284	26%	76	7%	228	21%	134	12%	

Table 12. SELF-DISCOVERY: 2019 Student RELATIONSHIP Rationales by major

		Relationships								
		Service		Collab w/ Peers		Collab w/ Prof.		Mentoring		
Major	N 2019	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	
Arts and Letters	ART	20	4	20%	6	30%	2	10%	0	0%
	CML	24	3	13%	4	17%	3	13%	1	4%
	CRWT	12	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	1	8%
	ENG	68	10	15%	14	21%	5	7%	3	4%
	LING	11	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%
	MUSI	24	3	13%	7	29%	3	13%	2	8%
	THEA	10	0	0%	1	10%	3	30%	0	0%
	AAL	169	22	13%	32	19%	20	12%	7	4%
Business	ACCT	63	9	14%	16	25%	5	8%	1	2%
	BSAD	136	11	8%	26	19%	12	9%	8	6%
	BUS	199	20	10%	42	21%	17	9%	9	5%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	1	11%	5	56%	1	11%	0	0%
	CMDS	27	6	22%	11	41%	3	11%	0	0%
	ES	101	11	11%	20	20%	16	16%	5	5%
	HLTH	71	21	30%	24	34%	11	15%	5	7%
	NU	45	3	7%	7	16%	2	4%	1	2%
	HSE	253	42	17%	67	26%	33	13%	11	4%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	3	7%	10	22%	4	9%	1	2%
	ECON	9	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%
	HIST	32	2	6%	1	3%	5	16%	3	9%
	JUST	26	0	0%	3	12%	3	12%	0	0%
	PHRE	4	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%
	POL	19	0	0%	3	16%	3	16%	1	5%
	PSYC	93	8	9%	20	22%	12	13%	4	4%
	SOAN	17	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
	SCS	246	16	7%	40	16%	27	11%	10	4%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2	5%	10	24%	5	12%	6	14%
	BIOL	99	13	13%	20	20%	12	12%	9	9%
	CHEM	19	0	0%	7	37%	1	5%	2	11%
	CS	41	0	0%	6	15%	5	12%	1	2%
	MATH	15	4	27%	4	27%	1	7%	0	0%
	PHYS	9	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	2	22%
	STTS	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	232	20	9%	47	20%	25	11%	20	9%
IDSM	4	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	
ALL	1103	121	11%	229	21%	123	11%	58	5%	

Reviewer Specific Question

In what context did the experience occur (choose one)?

Coursework Other Academic

LSP
Major
Capstone
Minor
Elective
Research
Internship
Study Abroad
Resume/Professional Statement
Service Learning
Tutoring/Teaching/Mentorship
Other Academic

Student Organization

Governance
Service Organization
Social Fraternity/Sorority
Professional/Major
Religious
Honor Society
Campus Media
Other Student Organization

Athletics

Varsity Athletics
Club Athletics
Other Athletics

Employment

Campus Employment
Volunteer Work
Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

Public Performance/Recital
Other Creative Effort

Other

Relationships/Friendships
Residence Life
ROTC
Other Misc.

As can be seen from Table 13 on the following page, in 2019, 36% of our graduates enjoyed significant self-discovery within Truman's coursework, with most of that (22%) being within the student's major. Student organizations (17%) and Other Relationships/Friendships (13%) also were important categories of contexts for self-discovery. These proportions have stayed roughly the same over the 3 years that we have monitored them. With this in mind, we should be able to construct more opportunities in these contexts for this important aspect of liberal arts and sciences education.

Table 13. SELF-DISCOVERY: Context of the Experience 2017-2019

SELF Context Specifics	2017 N	2017%	2018 N	2018%	2019 N	2019%
Coursework						
LSP	44	4%	57	5%	81	7%
Major	229	21%	253	24%	247	22%
Capstone	1	0%	2	0%	5	0%
Minor	24	2%	20	2%	26	2%
Elective	33	3%	23	2%	41	4%
All Coursework	331	30%	355	33%	400	36%
Other Academic						
Research	20	2%	11	1%	14	1%
Internship	40	4%	35	3%	29	3%
Study Abroad	64	6%	50	5%	53	5%
Resume/Prof. Statement	1	0%	5	0%	6	1%
Service Learning	4	0%	3	0%	7	1%
Tutor/Teach/Mentor	20	2%	14	1%	19	2%
Other Academic	36	3%	33	3%	30	3%
All Other Academic	185	17%	151	14%	158	14%
Student Organizations						
Governance Organizations	5	0%	5	0%	2	0%
Service Organization	19	2%	21	2%	27	2%
Social Fraternity/Sorority	139	13%	113	11%	100	9%
Professional/Major	11	1%	15	1%	14	1%
Religious Organization	26	2%	37	3%	33	3%
Honor Society	8	1%	4	0%	4	0%
Campus Media	5	0%	3	0%	3	0%
Other Organization	20	2%	22	2%	9	1%
All Student Organization	233	21%	220	21%	192	17%
Athletics						
Varsity Athletics	43	4%	41	4%	35	3%
Club Sports/Intramurals	7	1%	5	0%	11	1%
Other Athletics	4	0%	6	1%	7	1%
All Athletics	54	5%	52	5%	53	5%
Employment						
Campus Job	11	1%	14	1%	21	2%
Volunteer	10	1%	8	1%	7	1%
Off-Campus Job	22	2%	23	2%	17	2%
All Employment	43	4%	45	4%	45	4%
Performance/Creative Activity						
Public Performance/Recital	8	1%	3	0%	5	0%
Other Creative Activity	4	0%	5	0%	17	2%
All Performance/Creative Activity	12	1%	8	1%	22	2%
Other						
Relationships/Friendships	123	11%	140	13%	139	13%
Resident Life	22	2%	18	2%	25	2%
ROTC	8	1%	6	1%	9	1%
Other Misc.	99	9%	72	7%	60	5%
All Other	252	23%	236	22%	233	21%
Total	1110	100%	1067	100%	1103	100%

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Most Personally Satisfying (MPS) prompt is an opportunity for each student to describe and/or submit something that represents their most fulfilling college experience. Readers do not score these submissions using a rubric with a quality scale, but instead classify each submission for the reasons why the student found it so satisfying, similarly to how the self-discovery prompt is evaluated. The prompt does not require a document, although many students do attach them. Readers can select as many reasons as the student indicates in their submission, so the percentages can add up to more than 100%. The percentage of students indicating each reason does vary some, but the trends are remarkably consistent over the years.

The readers also categorize the submission for where the submission came from, e.g., from coursework, student organizations, athletics, etc. While this data has been collected for some time, downloading of this data began in 2016. In Table 17, the 2017-2019 context data has been consistent over this time period. It will be interesting to see if and how the data from these categories evolves in the future.

The Most Personally Satisfying Prompt

What was your most personally satisfying experience during the years that you have attended Truman? This is space for something you feel represents your most important aspect, experience, or event of your college experience.

Your most personally satisfying submission may be a work from a class, an experience from an extracurricular activity, an account of a performance, objects which are symbolic to you, etc. You don't need to submit an "artifact" here, but if you do, please attach it from the vault. You can simply write about it in the space provided below.

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

Please describe your most personally satisfying experience. If this submission is from a course, please describe the instructor's assignment. If the work was not generated by an assignment, please just describe it here.

We are especially interested in why this item was so important and/or impactful to you, out of all of your experiences at Truman. Why, specifically, is it so meaningful to you?

Reviewer Specific Question

Why, according to the student, was it so satisfying? (check all that apply)

- It represented a personal best*
- The student achieved personal goals*
- The student achieved significant personal growth*
- It was especially challenging*
- It modeled working as a professional*

- *It was a collaborative effort*
- *It was enjoyable*
- *No indication*
- *The student solved a problem*
- *It took a lot of work and/or time*

Table 14. Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2015-2019

Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)					
Year	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Personl Growth	45%	48%	47%	50%	46%
Enjoyable	47%	42%	52%	47%	56%
Challenging	27%	35%	39%	38%	40%
Professional	26%	26%	29%	32%	27%
Personal Goals	24%	21%	27%	31%	28%
Personal Best	20%	21%	20%	26%	11%
Lots of Time	*	17%	26%	25%	27%
Collaborative	16%	18%	23%	22%	17%
Problem Solving	1%	7%	6%	9%	11%

Table 14 shows the percentages of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why their submission was so satisfying for them. In 2019, “Enjoyable” (at 56%) returned to the top reason for student satisfaction, although “Personal Growth” (at 46%) was a close second. These two categories have actually flipped each alternating year as the top categories chosen. “Challenging” work (40%) was the third most popular reason for student satisfaction again this year. These three choices have been the top three reasons for many years now. This shows that Truman students do generally enjoy being pushed to excel, even though there is strong evidence that some students feel stressed by the challenging workload. Therefore, it is critical to provide services that can help students deal with their stress while they are being asked to work so hard.

Interestingly, from 2015-2018 there was a steady increase in students reporting that accomplishing professional or personal goals, and working collaboratively are satisfying to them. However, in 2019 the number returned to 2017 levels. Which could be linked to an increasingly uncertain job market as a factor for this increase.

Tables 15 and 16 show the 2019 data broken down by major. The data for each reason is indicated as a raw number of students from within that major and as a percentage of that major’s total students. The reasons chosen within a particular major vary greatly, so it would be worthwhile for each department to see what motivates their own students.

Table 15. Most Personally Satisfying 2019: Scores sorted by FIRST MAJOR

	Major	N 2019	Personal Best		Personal Goals		Personal Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%
Arts and Letters	ART	20	6	30%	5	25%	6	30%	5	25%	5	25%
	CML	24	3	13%	6	25%	13	54%	7	29%	4	17%
	CRWT	12	1	8%	4	33%	5	42%	5	42%	2	17%
	ENG	68	9	13%	17	25%	38	56%	25	37%	14	21%
	LING	11	3	27%	5	45%	7	64%	5	45%	4	36%
	MUSI	24	6	25%	9	38%	8	33%	8	33%	6	25%
	THEA	10	0	0%	5	50%	5	50%	5	50%	7	70%
	AAL	169	28	17%	51	30%	82	49%	60	36%	42	25%
Business	ACCT	63	8	13%	13	21%	16	25%	25	40%	15	24%
	BSAD	136	14	10%	45	33%	61	45%	54	40%	35	26%
	BUS	199	22	11%	58	29%	77	39%	79	40%	50	25%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	0	0%	1	11%	5	56%	2	22%	4	44%
	CMDS	27	5	19%	3	11%	11	41%	12	44%	15	56%
	ES	101	13	13%	22	22%	51	50%	42	42%	21	21%
	HLTH	71	5	7%	25	35%	42	59%	27	38%	18	25%
	NU	45	3	7%	11	24%	25	56%	22	49%	14	31%
	HSE	253	26	10%	62	25%	134	53%	105	42%	72	28%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	5	11%	8	17%	20	43%	15	33%	14	30%
	ECON	9	2	22%	2	22%	4	44%	3	33%	1	11%
	HIST	32	7	22%	14	44%	10	31%	15	47%	6	19%
	JUST	26	2	8%	8	31%	9	35%	11	42%	8	31%
	PHRE	4	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%
	POL	19	4	21%	9	47%	11	58%	13	68%	6	32%
	PSYC	93	4	4%	22	24%	45	48%	28	30%	22	24%
	SOAN	17	2	12%	8	47%	7	41%	7	41%	2	12%
SCS	246	27	11%	72	29%	107	43%	93	38%	60	24%	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	3	7%	9	21%	20	48%	13	31%	11	26%
	BIOL	99	12	12%	24	24%	39	39%	48	48%	33	33%
	CHEM	19	4	21%	7	37%	8	42%	10	53%	6	32%
	CS	41	3	7%	8	20%	17	41%	12	29%	17	41%
	MATH	15	1	7%	4	27%	7	47%	8	53%	3	20%
	PHYS	9	0	0%	3	33%	5	56%	3	33%	4	44%
	STTS	7	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%
	SAM	232	23	10%	57	25%	99	43%	96	41%	75	32%
IDSMS	4	0	0%	3	75%	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	
ALL	1103	126	11%	303	27%	501	45%	435	39%	301	27%	

Table 16. Most Personally Satisfying: Scores sorted by FIRST MAJOR continued

	Major	2019	Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Problem Solving		Lots of Time	
			Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%	Yes	%
Arts and Letters	ART	20	2	10%	12	60%	0	0%	2	10%	6	30%
	CML	24	5	21%	17	71%	0	0%	4	17%	9	38%
	CRWT	12	1	8%	7	58%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
	ENG	68	10	15%	43	63%	0	0%	4	6%	17	25%
	LING	11	2	18%	7	64%	0	0%	1	9%	3	27%
	MUSI	24	4	17%	16	67%	0	0%	0	0%	6	25%
	THEA	10	3	30%	7	70%	0	0%	3	30%	3	30%
	AAL	169	27	16%	109	64%	0	0%	14	8%	45	27%
Business	ACCT	63	11	17%	33	52%	0	0%	12	19%	20	32%
	BSAD	136	39	29%	71	52%	2	1%	16	12%	37	27%
	BUS	199	50	25%	104	52%	2	1%	28	14%	57	29%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	2	22%	6	67%	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%
	CMDS	27	5	19%	14	52%	0	0%	4	15%	6	22%
	ES	101	18	18%	48	48%	0	0%	9	9%	16	16%
	HLTH	71	14	20%	50	70%	0	0%	2	3%	21	30%
	NU	45	7	16%	25	56%	1	2%	5	11%	13	29%
	HSE	253	46	18%	143	57%	1	0%	21	8%	57	23%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	8	17%	32	70%	0	0%	3	7%	9	20%
	ECON	9	1	11%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
	HIST	32	5	16%	19	59%	0	0%	2	6%	13	41%
	JUST	26	3	12%	14	54%	0	0%	3	12%	9	35%
	PHRE	4	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%
	POL	19	3	16%	10	53%	0	0%	4	21%	13	68%
	PSYC	93	11	12%	53	57%	0	0%	8	9%	20	22%
	SOAN	17	1	6%	9	53%	0	0%	3	18%	6	35%
	SCS	246	32	13%	141	57%	1	0%	23	9%	72	29%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	4	10%	22	52%	1	2%	5	12%	9	21%
	BIOL	99	16	16%	52	53%	0	0%	13	13%	35	35%
	CHEM	19	3	16%	11	58%	1	5%	1	5%	5	26%
	CS	41	7	17%	18	44%	1	2%	10	24%	9	22%
	MATH	15	2	13%	7	47%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%
	PHYS	9	3	33%	4	44%	0	0%	2	22%	5	56%
	STTS	7	1	14%	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%
	SAM	232	36	16%	118	51%	3	1%	38	16%	68	29%
	IDSM	4	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
ALL	1103	191	17%	616	56%	7	1%	124	11%	300	27%	

Reviewer Specific Question

In what context did the experience occur (choose one)?

Coursework Other Academic

LSP
Major
Capstone
Minor
Elective
Research
Internship
Study Abroad
Resume/Professional Statement
Service Learning
Tutoring/Teaching/Mentorship
Other Academic

Student Organization

Governance
Service Organization
Social Fraternity/Sorority
Professional/Major
Religious
Honor Society
Campus Media
Other Student Organization

Athletics

Varsity Athletics
Club Athletics
Other Athletics

Employment

Campus Employment
Volunteer Work
Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

Public Performance/Recital
Other Creative Effort

Other

Relationships/Friendships
Residence Life
ROTC
Other Misc.

Table 17. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2017-2019

Most Satisfying Contexts	2017 (N)	2017 (%)	2018 (N)	2018 (%)	2019 (N)	2019 (%)
Coursework						
LSP	90	8%	97	9%	128	12%
Major	396	36%	453	41%	386	35%
Capstone	22	2%	22	2%	23	2%
Minor	58	5%	42	4%	47	4%
Elective	68	6%	52	5%	83	8%
ALL Coursework	634	57%	666	60%	667	61%
Other Academic						
Research	22	2%	37	3%	34	3%
Internship	30	3%	28	3%	35	3%
Study Abroad	38	3%	50	4%	36	3%
Resume/Professional Statement	10	1%	13	1%	9	1%
Service Learning	4	0%	0	0%	5	0%
Tutor/Teacher/Mentor	8	1%	4	0%	12	1%
Other Academic	26	2%	10	1%	12	1%
ALL Other Academic	138	13%	142	13%	143	13%
Student Organizations						
Governance Organization	4	0%	5	0%	3	0%
Service Organization	28	3%	22	2%	26	2%
Social Fraternity/Sorority	80	7%	62	6%	59	5%
Professional/Major	14	1%	11	1%	12	1%
Religious Organization	16	1%	7	1%	12	1%
Honor Society	1	0%	4	0%	1	0%
Campus Media	3	0%	3	0%	6	1%
Other Organization	9	1%	11	1%	19	2%
ALL Student Organizations	155	14%	125	11%	138	13%
Athletics						
Varsity Athletics	28	3%	37	3%	40	4%
Club Sports/Intramurals	15	1%	7	1%	6	1%
Other Athletics	30	3%	9	1%	7	1%
ALL Athletics	46	4%	53	5%	53	5%
Employment						
Campus Job	14	1%	14	1%	11	1%
Volunteer	22	2%	20	2%	7	1%
Off Campus Job	14	1%	13	1%	10	1%
ALL Employment	50	5%	47	4%	28	3%
Performance/Creative Activity						
Public Performance/Recital	24	2%	31	3%	21	2%
Other Creative	16	1%	12	1%	16	1%
ALL Performance/Creative Activity	450	41%	43	4%	37	3%
Other (Misc.)						
Relationships/Friendships	15	1%	23	2%	17	2%
Residence Life	5	0%	6	1%	9	1%
ROTC	4	0%	1	0%	2	0%
Other Misc	17	2%	11	1%	7	1%
ALL Other Misc	41	4%	41	4%	35	3%
TOTAL	1104	100%	1117	100%	1101	100%

Table 17 shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, since downloading of the data began in 2016. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission, so the total percentage here reflects that. Consistently, well over half (61% in 2019) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (35% in 2019) being from course work within the student’s major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Other academic activities (13% in 2019) and student organizations (13% in 2019) are the other areas that show greater than 10% of the submissions.

Transformative Learning Experiences Questionnaire (TEQ) 2019

Many learning opportunities (such as study abroad, undergraduate research, service learning, and internships, often called the “Big 4”) have a tremendous potential to lead to transformational changes in a student. In 2010, the portfolio project started administering a survey that asks about many of these experiences together with the goal of assessing not only participation but also how transformative they were for our students.

We defined Transformative Learning as follows:

“Transformative Learning occurs when an educational experience that includes reflection results in a profound change in the way you think and/or behave relative to what you have learned.”

Students may complete the TEQ at any time, but are also asked to review it again when they indicate that their portfolio is complete. Students are first asked to consider:

“Thinking of your higher-education experience at Truman as a whole, to what degree was your education Transformative, according to the definition above?”

- 5 - Totally Transformative
- 4 - Very Transformative
- 3 - Transformative
- 2 - Somewhat Transformative
- 1 - Not Particularly Transformative

Table 18. 2015-2019 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

Acad. Yr.	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.5	56%	3.5	56%	3.6	57%	3.4	52%	3.04	43%
BUS	3.2	41%	3	33%	3.1	40%	3.1	41%	2.65	36%
HSE	3.5	54%	3.5	58%	3.5	53%	3.4	47%	3.13	50%
SCS	3.4	53%	3.5	56%	3.6	59%	3.4	53%	3.01	46%
SAM	3.4	52%	3	52%	2.9	50%	3.4	49%	2.97	40%
IDS	4.2	100%	3.4	50%	3.6	50%	3.3	33%	3.5	75%
All students	3.4	52%	3.3	52%	3.3	53%	3.4	49%	2.97	43%

From 2015 to 2018 about half of students answered “Totally” or “Very” transformative to this question which is a value that has been remarkably consistent however the 2019 average is considerably lower than the previous years

Table 19. 2019 Counts of Scores, Sorted by Major, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

		Counts of Each Score by Major								
		Major	N 2019	1	2	3	4	5	AVG	% 4&5
Arts and Letters	ART	20	1	1	9	8	1	3.35	45%	
	CML	24	0	2	8	10	4	3.67	58%	
	CRWT	12	0	2	7	2	1	3.17	25%	
	ENG	68	0	9	24	26	7	3.37	49%	
	LING	11	0	1	7	2	1	3.27	27%	
	MUSI	24	0	3	5	10	6	3.79	67%	
	THEA	10	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	70%	
	AAL	169	2	18	62	64	21	3.46	50%	
Business	ACCT	63	6	17	18	21	1	2.90	35%	
	BSAD	136	8	28	44	46	10	3.16	41%	
	BUS	199	14	45	62	67	11	3.08	39%	
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	22%	
	CMDS	27	1	2	7	16	0	3.33	59%	
	ES	101	5	16	27	42	8	3.23	50%	
	HLTH	71	0	6	20	37	8	3.66	63%	
	NU	45	0	12	11	16	6	3.36	49%	
	HSE	253	7	39	68	113	22	3.36	53%	
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	0	10	11	16	9	3.52	54%	
	ECON	9	1	0	2	5	0	3.00	56%	
	HIST	32	1	3	9	11	7	3.53	56%	
	JUST	26	2	3	12	7	2	3.15	35%	
	PHRE	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	50%	
	POL	19	0	1	4	11	3	3.84	74%	
	PSYC	93	4	11	27	39	10	3.37	53%	
	SOAN	17	0	0	8	8	1	3.59	53%	
	SCS	246	8	29	74	97	34	3.44	53%	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2	10	14	14	1	2.98	36%	
	BIOL	99	4	20	31	36	8	3.24	44%	
	CHEM	19	0	4	3	9	3	3.58	63%	
	CS	41	3	6	15	12	5	3.24	41%	
	MATH	15	0	3	3	9	0	3.40	60%	
	PHYS	9	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	33%	
	STTS	7	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	57%	
	SAM	232	9	48	70	83	21	3.24	45%	
	IDSMT	4	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	75%	
ALL	1103	40	180	336	427	109	3.32	49%		

Examining the counts for each score and the average score for each discipline in the table above reveals very few significant differences. The range of average scores varies between 2.67 to 3.79 with the mean average score as 3.32. Examination of the

percentage of students within each major who scored 4 & 5 does vary widely, with its range from 22% to 75%.

Next, students were asked:

“Now, please think about particular courses. We would like to hear about the traditional courses that you found to be most transformational. If you did not find any to be transformational, please skip this section. Please do not include experiences such as undergraduate research, study abroad, or internships, even if they were technically taken for Truman Credit or were embedded in a course experience (we ask about them below). Have you had any courses that you would be able to describe as transformative?”

In 2019, 524 Truman students (47%) listed one or more courses as transformational. The percentages of students within each major vary widely and are included in table 23 showing the data by major below.

Students were next asked if they had an experience with writing that they would report as transformational. This year, 256 (23%) students reported such an experience which shows an increase of one percentage point per year over the last two years .

Finally, students were asked to report any of these activities that they might have completed:

- 1) *Study Abroad*
- 2) *Service Learning*
- 3) *Undergraduate Research*
- 4) *Internship*
- 5) *Leadership*
- 6) *Student-Led Learning*
- 7) *Other Transformative Activity*

Table 20. 2019 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

2019 Various Activity Counts		
Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	198	18.03%
Service	192	17.49%
Research	317	28.87%
Internship	364	33.15%
Leadership	437	39.80%
Student-Led Education	58	5.28%
Writing	256	23.32%
Other	85	7.74%
Course	524	47.72%
Total 2019 N	1098	100.00%

As stated above, the first 4 of these are considered the “Big 4”, since they are quite often transformational. When the students check that they have done any of these seven activities, follow-up questions appear in the prompt. First, we offer radio buttons for the student to tell us how transformative the experience was, with the options being

- Not at all
- A Little
- Somewhat
- Transformative

Then we ask the student to describe the activity and how the activity was transformative for them. While these more detailed descriptions of these activities have been solicited from the first year that we used the survey, we have not further mined this data. If the University decided to focus on any of these activities, it could be interesting to see these student reports in more detail. The language of the new curriculum is moving away from the word “transformative” and changing it to “high-impact” so it might be good to change the language of this prompt as well.

Table 21 shows the percentages of all Truman students who reported each of these kinds of activities in the last 6 years. Again, you will notice that the percentages are remarkably consistent over time for most kinds of activities, except the courses category.

Table 21. 2014-2019 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Experience	% Reporting Activity					
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Study Abroad	20%	18%	21%	20%	20%	18%
Service Learning	23%	24%	23%	17%	20%	17%
Research	29%	29%	31%	31%	29%	29%
Internship	35%	33%	33%	35%	32%	33%
Leadership	38%	38%	42%	41%	42%	40%
Student-led	7%	8%	7%	7%	6%	5%
Writing*	21%	22%	21%	21%	22%	23%
Other*	7%	8%	7%	8%	8%	8%
Course*	16%	78%	77%	75%	47%	48%
Any (Big 4)	69%	67%	68%	70%	70%	67%
Any	83%	87%	83%	85%	84%	83%

* Some issues with the TEQ instrument for comparison purposes include:

- 1) Some terms are not fully defined in the survey or campus-wide, so students may have different ideas of “Research,” “Service-learning,” and other terms used in this study.
- 2) For “Writing,” “Course,” and “Other” only those students with transformative experiences give a report. (Presumably all students did some writing and took a variety of courses). For the other categories of activities, students who had any experience, transformative or not, were asked to respond either way, so average ratings may be artificially low.
- 3) A downloading error for the course category was fixed in 2015 and led to the large jump in participation in that category that year.

Table 22. 2015-2019 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Experience	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Study Abroad	20%	14%	25%	15%	24%	14%	26%	9%	18%	17%
Service	28%	17%	28%	15%	21%	11%	25%	12%	24%	8%
Research	30%	26%	35%	24%	33%	29%	34%	23%	31%	25%
Internship	32%	35%	35%	30%	38%	31%	31%	35%	32%	33%
Leadership	41%	33%	46%	36%	45%	34%	46%	35%	44%	33%
Student-Led Education	9%	6%	7%	8%	8%	5%	6%	5%	6%	4%
Course	41%	27%	40%	30%	40%	31%	51%	41%	51%	41%
Writing	22%	20%	23%	18%	24%	16%	24%	19%	26%	20%
Other	8%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%	6%	10%	6%	10%

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2019, women again participated in almost all of these types of activities at frequencies higher than men, with the differences ranging from 1 to 17 percentage points. It is interesting to notice that men did participate at a slightly higher rate than women in the internship category in 2015, 2018 and 2019 even if the difference is only as much as 7% (2017) or less. Men also reported more “other” transformational experiences (10% for men and 6% for women).

Table 23. 2019 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

	Major	N 2019	StudAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	Leader	Stul-Led	Writing	Course	Other
Arts and Letters	ART	20	40%	10%	15%	35%	30%	5%	25%	45%	10%
	CML	24	71%	25%	25%	21%	42%	8%	42%	67%	13%
	CRWT	12	8%	0%	8%	50%	42%	0%	92%	67%	17%
	ENG	68	16%	12%	9%	4%	37%	10%	53%	60%	10%
	LING	11	45%	45%	0%	9%	9%	0%	27%	45%	9%
	MUSI	24	33%	8%	25%	8%	50%	0%	33%	67%	13%
	THEA	10	10%	0%	20%	50%	30%	20%	20%	60%	10%
	AAL	169	30%	14%	14%	17%	37%	7%	44%	60%	11%
Business	ACCT	63	13%	5%	11%	41%	33%	5%	14%	25%	0%
	BSAD	136	29%	6%	7%	43%	38%	3%	15%	35%	10%
	BUS	199	24%	6%	9%	43%	36%	4%	15%	32%	7%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	0%	11%	33%	11%	56%	33%	11%	22%	11%
	CMDS	27	7%	44%	67%	7%	74%	4%	15%	56%	0%
	ES	101	8%	28%	31%	55%	35%	4%	16%	50%	7%
	HLTH	71	11%	83%	32%	42%	41%	8%	15%	45%	11%
	NU	45	29%	7%	16%	44%	31%	4%	7%	49%	4%
	HSE	253	12%	41%	32%	43%	41%	6%	14%	48%	7%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	11%	24%	13%	39%	61%	4%	35%	61%	13%
	ECON	9	22%	0%	22%	33%	44%	0%	33%	56%	0%
	HIST	32	16%	6%	25%	25%	22%	3%	22%	44%	9%
	JUST	26	4%	12%	4%	4%	23%	4%	19%	35%	12%
	PHRE	4	25%	0%	25%	25%	75%	0%	75%	50%	0%
	POL	19	16%	5%	32%	63%	53%	5%	26%	53%	11%
	PSYC	93	12%	15%	56%	23%	37%	3%	28%	52%	9%
	SOAN	17	35%	12%	88%	35%	59%	0%	29%	47%	0%
	SCS	246	14%	13%	37%	28%	41%	3%	28%	50%	9%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	2%	17%	33%	33%	36%	10%	19%	31%	10%
	BIOL	99	18%	8%	55%	20%	47%	9%	19%	58%	7%
	CHEM	19	21%	0%	63%	26%	42%	0%	21%	37%	0%
	CS	41	20%	2%	17%	61%	32%	0%	20%	41%	5%
	MATH	15	7%	7%	33%	20%	33%	7%	7%	60%	0%
	PHYS	9	22%	0%	67%	11%	22%	0%	11%	44%	0%
	STTS	7	14%	29%	0%	14%	29%	0%	29%	14%	0%
	SAM	232	15%	8%	42%	30%	40%	6%	19%	47%	6%
	IDS	4	0%	50%	50%	0%	25%	25%	50%	25%	0%
ALL	1103	18%	17%	28%	33%	39%	5%	23%	47%	8%	

When participation rates are examined by the students' first majors, most of the differences are unsurprising. For example, language majors study abroad more than most, Creative Writing majors are transformed by their writing activities, and social science and natural science majors do more undergraduate research. As we saw in the Civic Engagement prompt data a few years ago, the School of Health Science and Education does a significant amount of service learning in their curricula.

Table 24. 2019 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

	Major	N 2019	Big 4		Any	
			Count	%	Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	20	13	65.00%	17	85.00%
	CML	24	21	87.50%	24	100.00%
	CRWT	12	8	66.67%	12	100.00%
	ENG	68	24	35.29%	52	76.47%
	LING	11	8	72.73%	9	81.82%
	MUSI	24	16	66.67%	21	87.50%
	THEA	10	5	50.00%	7	70.00%
	AAL	169	95	56.21%	142	84.02%
Business	ACCT	63	37	58.73%	48	76.19%
	BSAD	136	83	61.03%	103	75.74%
	BUS	199	120	60.30%	151	75.88%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	3	33.33%	7	77.78%
	CMDS	27	23	85.19%	26	96.30%
	ES	101	79	78.22%	82	81.19%
	HLTH	71	67	94.37%	70	98.59%
	NU	45	31	68.89%	34	75.56%
	HSE	253	203	80.24%	219	86.56%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	26	56.52%	42	91.30%
	ECON	9	5	55.56%	6	66.67%
	HIST	32	15	46.88%	21	65.63%
	JUST	26	5	19.23%	13	50.00%
	PHRE	4	2	50.00%	4	100.00%
	POL	19	16	84.21%	18	94.74%
	PSYC	93	69	74.19%	78	83.87%
	SOAN	17	15	88.24%	15	88.24%
	SCS	246	153	62.20%	197	80.08%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	25	59.52%	33	78.57%
	BIOL	99	69	69.70%	84	84.85%
	CHEM	19	13	68.42%	15	78.95%
	CS	41	30	73.17%	35	85.37%
	MATH	15	10	66.67%	12	80.00%
	PHYS	9	7	77.78%	7	77.78%
	STTS	7	4	57.14%	6	85.71%
	SAM	232	158	68.10%	192	82.76%
IDSM	4	3	75.00%	4	100.00%	
ALL	1103	732	66.36%	905	82.05%	

Truman's Vision Statement includes several references to transformative experiences, and our strategic goals state that all students will have at least one high impact learning experience while here. As mentioned above, this language will be changing with the new curriculum. In 2019, 4 majors have 100% participation in at least one of these types of experiences and 4 others have at least 90% of their students reporting it. In 2019 a total of 8 majors with >90% is similar to previous years: In 2018 there were 11 majors with >90% participation, in 2017, 13, in 2016 7, in 2015 8. Campus-wide, 66% of all students report having at least one of the "Big 4" and 83% reporting having some transformative experience.

Table 25. Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2015-2019)

School/Yr	N	Percent Participation by Experience									
		StAbr	ServL	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Ldrshp	StuLed	Writing	Other	Any
AAL											
2015	196	26%	12%	10%	26%	52%	40%	7%	37%	9%	82%
2016	169	33%	14%	11%	20%	55%	36%	8%	33%	8%	79%
2017	188	30%	10%	15%	25%	58%	37%	11%	33%	9%	83%
2018	183	23%	8%	11%	18%	48%	38%	6%	39%	7%	78%
2019	169	25%	13%	13%	15%	56%	34%	7%	39%	9%	84%
BUS											
2015	163	18%	13%	7%	39%	56%	34%	7%	15%	6%	73%
2016	174	23%	9%	11%	42%	63%	47%	4%	16%	6%	80%
2017	186	26%	7%	11%	44%	68%	40%	3%	16%	6%	81%
2018	180	17%	7%	7%	44%	55%	43%	2%	16%	8%	73%
2019	199	23%	5%	6%	38%	60%	32%	3%	14%	5%	76%
HSE											
2015	300	14%	47%	39%	38%	82%	38%	8%	18%	11%	90%
2016	267	18%	51%	42%	40%	83%	43%	7%	15%	8%	90%
2017	231	14%	47%	40%	42%	84%	41%	8%	15%	8%	92%
2018	248	19%	50%	38%	35%	86%	45%	8%	17%	8%	91%
2019	253	11%	38%	30%	40%	80%	38%	6%	12%	7%	87%
SAM											
2015	201	27%	10%	38%	28%	69%	41%	5%	15%	10%	84%
2016	215	14%	14%	40%	31%	65%	42%	9%	13%	5%	80%
2017	252	13%	11%	40%	28%	67%	42%	5%	17%	8%	83%
2018	214	18%	12%	36%	28%	69%	43%	6%	16%	8%	83%
2019	232	15%	8%	38%	28%	68%	37%	5%	17%	5%	83%
SCS											
2015	290	25%	24%	37%	32%	68%	36%	10%	23%	6%	81%
2016	281	21%	15%	37%	30%	65%	41%	7%	28%	8%	82%
2017	308	19%	10%	40%	36%	72%	41%	6%	23%	8%	86%
2018	289	20%	15%	42%	35%	72%	39%	6%	25%	9%	88%
2019	246	13%	12%	35%	25%	62%	36%	2%	26%	7%	80%
IDS											
2015	5	60%	40%	0%	20%	60%	60%	40%	20%	0%	80%
2016	8	38%	38%	38%	50%	88%	63%	50%	38%	38%	88%
2017	5	20%	60%	40%	60%	80%	80%	60%	40%	0%	100%
2018	3	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%
2019	4	0%	50%	50%	0%	75%	25%	25%	50%	0%	100%
ALL											
2015	1155	22%	24%	29%	33%	67%	38%	8%	21%	8%	83%
2016	1114	21%	23%	31%	33%	68%	42%	7%	21%	7%	83%
2017	1170	20%	17%	31%	35%	68%	41%	7%	21%	8%	85%
2018	1117	20%	20%	29%	32%	70%	42%	6%	22%	8%	84%
2019	1103	17%	16%	26%	30%	66%	36%	5%	21%	7%	82%

Table 25 shows the reported participation rates for students from each school over the last five years. University-wide, these participation numbers have not changed much and the mean number for the last 5 years for ALL schools is 83%

The Letter to Truman Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Letter to Truman Prompt asks the students to compose a letter to Truman, telling us whatever they think we should hear before they leave. We suggest that they might tell us their perspectives on the Portfolio process (including how long it took), other assessment at Truman, their overall education at Truman, and their experience in their major. Did they learn anything about themselves during their portfolio process and what are their plans when they leave Truman?

Portfolio readers generally love reading these, since many of the students say wonderful things about their experiences and the people at Truman. Sometimes, a student heaps accolades on one individual or a department; readers flag such instances, and if the student has given us permission to do so, we try to report this praise to the parties involved.

On the other hand, students do sometimes reveal alarming details which can be upsetting for readers. Clearly, such letters should be reviewed and usually answered by someone. Some readers are comfortable enough with some situations that they contact students themselves, but sometimes not. Readers are able to indicate that someone needs to address a critical need in their evaluation of the submission. In the 2019 reading session, we had several concerning cases that were forwarded to appropriate on-campus offices for review.

Thankfully, the majority of the letters are have at least some positive aspects. We usually read this prompt on the last day of the reading session as a nice way to wrap up the week. Each reader saves a couple of representative letters and shares parts of them with the group. Similar to the previous prompts shown in this report, the prompt itself is given here followed by the datasets of information that readers gleaned from the letters.

The Letter to Truman Prompt

Thank you for completing your Truman Portfolio! As a final submission, please compose and submit a reflective letter or essay addressed to Truman.

You can tell us anything you think that we as an institution should hear.

Absolutely every letter is read by a faculty or staff reader, and while we cannot promise to solve every problem you tell us about, we are very interested in what you have to say.

Points that you might include are:

** The process you used in putting together the portfolio, including the total amount of time (in hours) you spent in assembling your portfolio.*

** Anything you may have learned or affirmed about yourself through the portfolio process.*

** Your thoughts on the portfolio assessment process.*

** Did you hear about the portfolio ahead of time? Which methods of communication worked best?*

** Your thoughts on other assessment instruments or practices here at Truman.*

** Your thoughts on your experiences and education while at Truman in your major, other classes, and out-of-class experiences.*

** Your plans for the future.*

** Anything else you want to tell us.*

Approximately how many hours did you spend working on your Portfolio?

Please submit your Letter to Truman as a document uploaded through the Vault.

Reviewer Specific Questions

How many hours did it take the student to create the portfolio?

Assess the student's attitude toward the following items (radio buttons allow the reader to choose from no indication, negative, positive, or mixed attitudes):

- Portfolio Project*
- Assessment at Truman*
- Education at Truman (generally speaking)*
- Major at Truman*

Does the student engage in self-reflection in the letter?

Should someone follow up with the student about this Cover Letter?

Quotables: Could something from this Cover Letter be quoted in the Assessment Almanac or another public venue?

Forwardables: Could something from this Cover Letter be forwarded to a person or office on campus?

Table 26. Hours Spent on the Portfolio Project

2019 Percentile	2019 Hours
99	10+
80	8
75	7
50	5
25	3
10	2

In 2019, students spent a similar amount of time as in 2017 and 2018 compiling their Portfolio prompt responses, with a mode of 5 hours.

Table 27. 2019 Student Attitudes Toward Portfolio/other Assessment at Truman

	Major	2019	Attitude Towards Portfolio					Attitude Towards Assessment				
			Negative	Mixed	Positive	No Indication	W% Pos	Negative	Mixed	Positive	No Indication	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	18	2	0	4	12	67%	3	0	2	13	40%
	CML	18	0	7	3	8	65%	1	2	0	15	33%
	CRWT	10	2	2	2	4	50%	0	1	1	8	75%
	ENG	68	7	11	20	30	67%	2	7	3	55	50%
	LING	10	4	3	2	1	39%	0	1	2	7	83%
	MUSI	18	2	3	6	7	68%	2	2	2	12	50%
	THEA	8	1	2	2	3	60%	0	2	1	5	67%
	AAL	150	18	28	39	65	62%	8	15	11	115	53%
Business	ACCT	50	12	4	12	22	50%	2	4	5	39	64%
	BSAD	118	14	17	19	68	55%	8	10	14	86	59%
	BUS	168	26	21	31	90	53%	10	14	19	125	60%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	0	1	1	6	75%	1	0	2	5	67%
	CMDS	24	2	10	7	5	63%	1	3	6	13	68%
	ES	88	19	11	17	41	48%	3	4	5	77	64%
	HLTH	66	3	9	30	24	82%	1	7	10	48	75%
	NU	43	12	5	7	19	40%	3	7	5	29	61%
	HSE	229	36	36	62	95	60%	9	21	28	172	68%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	2	8	10	17	70%	0	6	4	27	70%
	ECON	7	1	1	2	3	63%	0	0	1	6	100%
	HIST	24	4	5	4	11	50%	1	1	4	18	75%
	JUST	23	1	5	8	9	75%	0	0	2	21	100%
	PHRE	2	0	0	0	2	*	0	1	0	1	50%
	POL	16	2	4	3	7	56%	0	1	3	11	70%
	PSYC	85	10	13	21	41	63%	0	12	11	62	74%
	SOAN	17	3	0	3	11	50%	2	3	1	11	42%
	SCS	211	23	36	51	101	63%	3	24	26	157	70%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	38	3	10	5	20	56%	3	7	1	27	41%
	BIOL	88	9	17	18	44	60%	3	11	10	64	65%
	CHEM	16	0	3	4	9	79%	0	2	3	11	80%
	CS	39	3	7	4	25	54%	1	4	2	32	57%
	MATH	15	2	3	1	9	42%	0	0	2	13	100%
	PHYS	9	1	2	3	3	67%	0	1	2	6	83%
	STTS	5	0	0	2	3	100%	1	0	0	4	0%
	SAM	210	18	42	37	113	60%	8	25	20	157	61%
IDSM	4	0	0	0	4	*	0	0	0	4	*	
ALL	972	121	163	220	468	60%	38	99	104	730	63%	

Note: $W\%Pos = [(\#positive + \frac{1}{2} \# mixed)/total]*100$

In 2019, Truman students as a whole were less enthusiastic about the Portfolio (W%Pos=60%) than they are about assessment at Truman in general (W%Pos=63%). This is similar to 2018 where the totals were 64% in 2017, so students in 2018 were less enthusiastic about the portfolio, but more positive toward Truman's total assessment processes. The School of Science and Math had the highest Portfolio approval rating, and Arts and Letters students had the lowest. The students in the School of Business were the most positive about Truman's overall assessment program.

Many students continue to be amazed at how fulfilling it is to review their work from throughout their undergraduate coursework and projects, noting obvious improvement in their thinking and writing skills over the years. While some do still say they have misplaced some of their work or it was lost from a computer hard drive crash, this problem seems to be less each year. Most of them say they have heard of the portfolio in advance, but have not thought deeply about it before their senior year.

Table 28. Student Attitudes Toward Education at Truman and in their Major for 2019

	Major	2019	Attitude Towards Education					Attitude Towards Major Education				
			Negative	Mixed	Positive	No Indication	W% Pos	Negative	Mixed	Positive	No Indication	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	18	2	5	9	2	72%	0	5	7	6	79%
	CML	18	1	4	11	2	81%	2	4	5	7	64%
	CRWT	9	0	4	5	0	78%	0	0	5	5	125%
	ENG	68	2	25	35	6	77%	2	8	28	30	84%
	LING	10	0	2	7	1	89%	0	0	8	2	100%
	MUSI	18	0	5	12	1	85%	0	2	13	3	93%
	THEA	8	1	1	4	2	75%	0	0	4	4	100%
	AAL	149	6	46	83	14	79%	4	19	70	57	86%
Business	ACCT	50	1	10	33	6	86%	2	7	19	22	80%
	BSAD	118	12	37	55	14	71%	6	18	33	60	72%
	BUS	168	13	47	88	20	75%	8	25	52	82	75%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	0	5	3	0	69%	1	2	3	1	57%
	CMDS	24	0	9	12	3	79%	1	3	13	7	85%
	ES	89	7	26	47	9	75%	3	12	49	25	86%
	HLTH	66	0	12	49	5	90%	0	5	47	14	95%
	NU	44	3	14	21	6	74%	6	11	18	9	67%
	HSE	231	10	66	132	23	79%	11	33	130	56	84%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	1	12	21	3	79%	0	6	17	14	87%
	ECON	7	0	2	3	2	80%	1	1	2	3	63%
	HIST	24	2	6	15	1	78%	1	3	11	9	83%
	JUST	23	2	3	16	2	83%	1	1	9	12	86%
	PHRE	2	0	2	0	0	50%	0	2	0	0	50%
	POL	16	0	1	13	2	96%	0	0	9	7	100%
	PSYC	85	5	32	40	8	73%	2	11	30	42	83%
	SOAN	17	0	5	10	2	83%	0	2	9	6	91%
	SCS	211	10	63	118	20	78%	5	26	87	93	85%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	39	4	12	18	5	71%	2	3	24	10	88%
	BIOL	88	7	37	41	3	70%	9	22	31	26	68%
	CHEM	16	0	5	11	0	84%	0	4	10	2	86%
	CS	39	1	13	22	3	79%	2	13	13	11	70%
	MATH	15	0	4	10	1	86%	0	4	7	4	82%
	PHYS	9	1	1	7	0	83%	0	1	8	0	94%
	STTS	5	0	2	3	0	80%	0	0	4	1	100%
	SAM	211	13	74	112	12	75%	13	47	97	54	77%
IDSM	4	0	3	0	1	50%	0	1	1	2	75%	
ALL	974	52	299	533	90	77%	41	151	437	344	81%	

Student attitudes toward their majors (77%) and to their education overall (81%) were overwhelmingly positive again in 2019. While many students do have negative things to say about particular courses or requirements, they are generally satisfied that they have earned a valuable degree that will serve them well in the future.

Table 29. Evidence of Students' Self-Reflection in their 2019 Letters to Truman

		Evidence of Self-Reflection				
	Major	2019	No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
Arts and Letters	ART	14	8	8	2	56%
	CML	22	5	8	5	72%
	CRWT	10	3	7	0	70%
	ENG	64	21	32	15	69%
	LING	10	4	5	1	60%
	MUSI	18	3	11	4	83%
	THEA	8	5	2	1	38%
	AAL	146	49	73	28	67%
Business	ACCT	50	21	22	7	58%
	BSAD	118	54	50	14	54%
	BUS	168	75	72	21	55%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	2	5	1	75%
	CMDS	24	10	11	3	58%
	ES	89	45	32	11	49%
	HLTH	67	13	41	12	80%
	NU	44	21	22	1	52%
	HSE	232	91	111	28	60%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	8	21	8	78%
	ECON	7	5	1	1	29%
	HIST	25	11	7	6	54%
	JUST	23	5	14	4	78%
	PHRE	3	1	1	0	50%
	POL	16	6	7	3	63%
	PSYC	85	35	35	14	58%
	SOAN	17	6	9	2	65%
	SCS	213	77	95	38	63%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	39	17	16	6	56%
	BIOL	88	37	39	11	57%
	CHEM	17	2	14	0	88%
	CS	39	15	19	5	62%
	MATH	15	6	5	4	60%
	PHYS	9	5	3	1	44%
	STTS	6	1	3	1	80%
	SAM	213	83	99	28	60%
IDSM	4	2	2	0	50%	
ALL	976	377	452	143	61%	

Table 29 shows that 61 percent of graduates reveal sincere reflections about their experiences and growth during their time here at Truman. The results by discipline show a range of 29% to 88%. One trend that has continued for a three years now is that many of the letters mention some aspect of mental health support as an issue. After the

suicides of several Truman students in 2017, the Truman community worked hard support students, especially to those directly affected by those losses. However, the last three year's graduates reported that they were still strongly feeling the effects from these events. While Truman's campus culture provides intense pressure to excel in all aspects of life: academic, personal, and extracurricular, it is becoming clear that the stress that our students are feeling is not unique. Universities across the nation are wrestling with the mental health needs of their students. This issue remains a critical need, with Truman wellness strategies including the ongoing JED campus initiative and a newly developed positive peers organization.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2019 we returned to the two week format in the spring and read the weeks of May 20-23 and 28-31 with 24 readers planned per session. We read in the main computer lab of Magruder and then had a snack/break room next door. Coffee and tea were provided by Sodexo.

With a final total of 47 readers we were able to comfortably "double-read" a significant portion of the Interdisciplinary (649) and Critical Thinking (646) submissions. The readers were drawn from most schools across campus: nineteen from Arts and Letters, none from Business, six from Health Sciences and Education, six from Science and Mathematics, eleven from Social and Cultural Studies, and five from Academic Support and Student Affairs. Faculty readers are purposely chosen to have varying experience with the reading process, and this year, eleven of the readers had never read before. One of the best parts of portfolio reading is getting to know people from all across campus and realizing that our priorities and goals are the same: we aim to help our students achieve at their highest potential.

The main purpose of the change to having all reading in May was to allow more timely processing of the data. The portfolio director does not get release time during the academic year, and always has a full schedule of courses to teach. Therefore, the summer provides more time to download the submissions scores, combine it with demographics from Banner, and prepare the tables of results. With the tables of results in hand, summer also could allow large blocks of time to make sense of those results and complete the report. Last year, the data processing has moved more smoothly because of the availability of large blocks of time for the work, but it was still not completed before the Fall semester began. In 2019 there was a student worker assigned to help with the preparation of the data, however due to a conflict with the student worker's summer internship the data was once again not available until the fall semester of 2019. In the Spring semester of 2020 a student who is doing an internship in CASE will be dedicated to automating this process even further so that the data should be completed right after the reading sessions. As recommended in 2018 the 2019 reading sessions continued the use Socrative, an online quizzing program that allowed the readers to submit anonymously their scoring for our range-finders during calibration.

At the end of the reading sessions readers are asked to fill out an anonymous survey about the reading experience and 18 people chose to respond. Questions about the adequacy of the room, utility of range-finding discussions, use of Socratic, discussions about curriculum and prompts, size of the group and networking time all show a high level of usefulness and satisfaction.

Faculty development is an important aspect of the portfolio reading process. When we put a wide range of faculty with varying levels of experience and diverse backgrounds great and important discussions invariably happen. At the bottom of the survey, faculty are asked the following question: "Please provide feedback about how your participation in the reading session/s (interactions with colleagues, exposure to rubrics, reading student work, etc.) has directly impacted your teaching or future course preparation. Be as specific as you can." The responses to that question are posted below and do a great job of summarizing the strength of the portfolio as a faculty development resource:

- This helped me so much as a relatively new professor still (3 years). I learned a lot about other departments and their policies - I feel the strong need for a writing across the curriculum focus and from my participation in the workshop will help me rethink the ways I include writing in my own courses.
- Portfolio readings, as well as the discussions with colleagues from across campus, always give me good ideas to be a better advisor and help students make the most of their time at Truman.
- I will be teaching JINS this fall for the first time in >10 years so it was useful to work with the critical thinking and interdisciplinary rubrics again prior to designing the assignments.
- I really enjoy this process each time I do it because I feel I am walking away with something new I can apply to my courses. This year I particularly feel that my understanding of what constitutes critical thinking has been complicated. I feel I have done a reasonable job of teaching critical thinking in the classroom, but listening to my colleagues discuss different papers prompts, student work, and the questions they have has given me new angles for helping students develop this skill. Seeing the depth of research performed by some of our students has also given me some ideas for how to pursue actual research in my classroom and for our department. I have always struggled with the fact that I feel I cannot ask students to perform original research in my major and am left with the option of either a) artifact criticism (which is valid research in my discipline certainly), or b) Papers which rely on journal articles to amalgamate information. After reading a few different research projects from other majors, I really want to find a way to get students performing their own quantitative and qualitative research projects and I intend to push my departmental colleagues toward discussions of how to incorporate that into our methodology courses.
- Based off of portfolio reading sessions, I plan to integrate more of a focus on the university-wide vocabulary we discussed, having conversations with students where both I and they work through definitions and ideas surrounding terms and thinking behind phrases such as "interdisciplinary" and "critical thinking."
- We have used portfolio results as an important part of changing the content and approach of some of the courses that we offer as well as the faculty who teach those classes.
- Participation has given me valuable tools to incorporate in the classroom. Specifically, using the rubrics from the critical thinking and interdisciplinary prompts will allow me to directly address these concepts with students in my Self and Society course, sophomore writing enhanced seminar, and upper level electives.

- I came up with several assignment ideas but most importantly I think I will be utilizing the critical thinking rubric more often and trying to use that language with my students to get them primed for what the university means when they say critical thinking.
- I have started using the rubrics in my courses to give the students exposure to them as well as experience for me using the rubrics for grading.
- Helps me rethink directions for assignments and feedback methods.
- I work with students that need a scholarship job. My goal is for them to learn how to manage time and stress and find a balance when working under stress. Grading portfolios helps me learn how the students define stress; mentally, physically and emotionally.
- Portfolio gives me 1. a better sense of how much people know about curriculum development and the various department- and school-level projects taking place; 2. a chance to gather concerns, ideas, and potential recruits I can take into my committees; 3. a better idea of how colleagues define "good writing" and "critical thinking"; and 4. a chance to give colleagues a better sense of what we're trying to do in the teams I'm on (e.g. Self & Society). All of this takes place in a fairly informal atmosphere. People are willing to take chances with ideas; the semiotic conditions are somewhat free range (little governing communication). We're there because we want to do better, and we spend the week confronting the results of our work. Great conditions for institutional progress.
- Reading portfolios continues to be a useful exercise in all of the above aspects, especially through Interacting with colleagues in other disciplines. In addition, I am now making a point of informing my students to prepare their Portfolio in a more circumspect fashion by submitting papers more selectively such as JINS papers for the interdisciplinary and critical thinking prompts.
- I always use the discussion of interdisciplinary thinking when teaching my JINS course. Having the perspective of different disciplines and professors expands my understanding of what JINS can and should be.
- I have found this to be an extremely important part of my faculty development. It gives me a chance to examine where students are "at" across the university and in ways that are not available elsewhere.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our 2019 office staff included 3-5 students, whose primary task is to verify that student submissions are complete and that their submitted documents are readable. They provided many classes with presentations to help instruct students (and professors) on accessing and using the portfolio system (see more on this below). They also staffed the graduation fair each semester to help students complete their graduation checklists. During their office hours they answer student questions via email or make face-to-face appointments for individuals. This year, Mahima Thapa was the Office Manager and, with the help of the former Office Manager Juliette Miller she organized our worker's office hours, trained new workers, and performed other activities.

As Director, I communicate regularly with our undergraduate students. Each semester, every undergraduate degree-seeking student received an email describing

the portfolio project, although at different levels of detail for different levels of students. All students with 0-90 accumulated credit hours received a brief missive that reminds them of the existence of the portfolio and that they should store their academic treasures in their portfolio vault. The freshman email specifically provided instructions for how to submit answers to new fall and spring semester Work-Life prompts that were developed recently. These new prompts forced students to open the portfolio to create profiles and then interact with it at least twice as a requirement for the freshman year experience. Students with more than 90 hours receive a much more detailed missive that describes explicitly how to complete the portfolio process during the year that they plan to graduate. It is becoming more rare for students to claim not to have heard of this requirement. We continue to publicize the portfolio using our promotional posters asking "What is in your Vault?" to remind students to put their treasures there.

I also communicate predominantly by email with Truman faculty for several purposes. I like to remind faculty who teach freshman level classes that they may invite one of the portfolio office staff to give a very short presentation to get students to log into our system; many of these faculty require the freshmen to place some document in their vaults as an assignment. I like to remind faculty who teach writing enhanced classes (including JINS courses) to encourage their students to store their excellent assigned papers in their vaults. Those who teach senior seminars or other capstone courses may want our portfolio office workers to visit their classes to give a very detailed portfolio system orientation to their students. Finally, each spring around mid-term break, I invite faculty to sign up to participate in portfolio reading sessions in May. I try to make the assignments of the reading weeks by mid-April by issuing official invitations to read by email.

In 2019 I met with all of the deans one-on-one in order to start some better communication about what the portfolio can be doing better for our university assessment. I invited all of the deans as well as the Provost to the reading sessions and just about everyone participated for either a morning or a full day. It was decided based on the visits to plan on bringing all of the deans together in the next academic year to spend some time reading and discussing the Letters to Truman. I also met with a few department chairs about portfolios.

Still in 2019 our portfolio submission system works well, but it was developed by a series of student workers (under the excellent direction of Greg Marshall). Because it is "homemade", we do still continue to tweak it for continual improvement. Greg and Anne (Moody) worked out many improvements to the downloading component of the system during June and July of 2018. It is important to note that the clock is ticking on our legacy technology which is getting more difficult to support. We really need to look into using someone from IT with a significant time allotted for rewriting the system in a more modern language or we might need to hire someone from outside the campus to help with this. Perhaps the computer science department could create a class that would work on rewriting things. It is always difficult to predict with legacy technology just precisely when it will become fully obsolete (unsupported) and it would not be good for that to happen for instance right in the middle of the spring semester as seniors are trying to complete the process for graduation.

My work on the portfolio this year has been supported in a tremendous way by the outgoing director Anne Moody. Anne continues to be an important consultant for me and other former portfolio directors including Scott Alberts and Karen Vittengl have also been extremely generous in giving me their time and thoughts. This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members: Liz Jorn (HSE, since 2008), Anne Moody (SAM, since 2013), Rebecca Dierking (AAL, since 2014), Emily Costello (SAM, since 2014), and Dereck Daschke (SCS, since 2015). I am grateful for their long-term dedication to our assessment process. These people meet with me once or twice per semester to plan schedules and update procedures and most of them have been available for the reading sessions as well.

2019 Report Summary and Future Plans

Using these prompts, we have found that our students consistently demonstrate solid competence at “Critical Thinking and Writing” and “Interdisciplinary Thinking”, both of which are long term, valued indications of success in our curriculum. The portfolio project is well placed to continue to function as an important component of Truman’s assessment program although budget and software issues will become an issue in the near future.

The senior prompts for the upcoming 2019-20 year will stay the same. One area that is expanding as a result of the new Dialogues curriculum is at the freshman level. Required freshman Work-Life prompts have been added this year so that we can better assess students approaches and attitudes towards lifestyle balance. It would be good to try to create a similar tool for seniors in the next year so that we have something to compare the 2019 results to in the future. A committee that created the new “Self and Society” seminars also created three new required freshman prompts which include civic engagement, a problem solving assignment and a 6 page paper. These prompts will be read by a committee related to the Self and Society seminars and are indicative of the ways that the portfolio can expand.

In addition, the portfolio reading weeks provide valuable faculty growth opportunities, initiating new readers into the culture of our institution, reinvigorating the dedication of more senior readers, and building bridges between readers from all across campus. Truman is recognized as a national leader in using portfolio assessment data to improve our curriculum, and we should be able to continue to make a Truman education ever more valuable to our students. It would be good to make an effort to refresh the importance of the portfolio as one of the central assessment tools of our institution and it would also serve us well to make sure that more faculty are invested in using the data that comes from the portfolio every year aside from only the 5 year review. Perhaps junior faculty and any staff who are an integral part to the academic side of student success could be compelled to participate in reading sessions early on.

The primary goal of the Truman Portfolio continues to be the collection of feedback that allows continuous improvement of our courses and our curriculum. With that in mind, the guiding principles for the portfolio project continue to be:

- Efficiency: Everything in the portfolio should be used for campus assessment and anything not useful should be removed.
- Feedback: Evolve the portfolio away from being perceived as a “black hole” where students submit work but never receive feedback about that work.
- Technology Improvements: allow greater opportunities and flexibility.
- Student Buy-in and Motivation: Can we convince more of them to care?
- Faculty Buy-In and Motivation: Can we convince more of them to care?
- Baselines: As our curriculum evolves, what do we need to measure now so that we will recognize changes once they happen?