

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2022-2023 Academic Year

Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director - Narrative

Scott Thatcher - Tables

8-10-2023

2023 Portfolio Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
· General Information about Portfolio Assessment	2
· Critical Thinking and Writing	5
· Interdisciplinary Thinking	13
· Self Discovery	19
· Most Personally Satisfying Experience	27
· Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	34
· Reader Information and Feedback	43
· Portfolio Collection Matters	47
· Future Plans and 2023 Summary	48

General Information about Portfolio Assessment (adapted from previously published work)

Who takes it?

All students must develop and submit a portfolio as a requirement for graduation. In the academic year 2022-2023, 782 students graduated and 777 students submitted portfolios.

When is it administered?

Most students complete the process as part of their capstone experience, so they 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 more recently only 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 2022-2023 academic year, student portfolios included works demonstrating 1) critical thinking and writing and 2) interdisciplinary thinking. Further prompts asked students about experiences they had which are titled 3) self-discovery, and 4) most personally satisfying. The final prompt in which students give summary thoughts about their experience with the Portfolio and at Truman is 5) Letter to Truman. An instrument titled 6) transformative learning experience questionnaire is an item which is not evaluated by the faculty portfolio readers but is still part of the required senior submissions. Other items may be included, but these are evaluated separately, if at all.

To whom are results regularly distributed?

Overall results of portfolio assessment are available to the Truman community through this Assessment Almanac. Some of the data collected in the portfolio is reported to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Occasional reports are given to governance, at strategic 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 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 2019–2023

School	Major	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Arts and Letters	ART	20	31	22	17	13
	CML	24	19	22	14	14
	CRWT	12	19	18	20	14
	ENG	68	71	46	47	33
	LING	11	14	15	13	7
	MUSI	24	20	21	19	15
	THEA	10	10	12	4	4
	TOTAL	169	184	156	134	100
Business	ACCT	63	69	60	53	34
	BSAD	136	119	92	87	102
	TOTAL	199	188	152	140	136
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	9	3			
	CMDS	27	42	40	32	25
	ES	101	105	90	77	65
	HLTH	71	77	59	46	32
	NU	45	46	55	50	55
	TOTAL	253	273	244	205	177
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	42	22	20	23	16
	BCMB		1	8	21	26
	BIOL	99	100	93	76	70
	CHEM	19	18	21	13	7
	CS	41	48	56	37	29
	MATH	15	28	19	19	16
	PHYS	9	10	7	6	10
	STTS	7	14	12	9	10
	TOTAL	232	241	236	204	184
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	47	43	31	23
	ECON	9	16	15	8	11
	HIST	32	29	33	20	15
	JUST	26	31	32	25	12
	PHRE	4	3	9	5	3
	POL	19	30	31	20	21
	PSYC	93	90	81	64	71
	SOAN	17	17	19	19	9
TOTAL	246	263	263	192	165	
IDSMS	IDSMS	4	15	6	6	8
LIBS	LIBS			3	9	7
ALL	ALL	1,103	1,164	1,060	890	777

The blank spaces related to new programs (LIBS-2021, BCMB-2020, STTS-2018)

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. This committee's university-wide sanctioned report (submitted October 30, 2012), 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. Students 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 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 (in italics) and the scoring rubric (in the grid) 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 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.

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

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.

Source of the this entry? (Truman course, Other Source)

In which year did you originally produce this work? (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior)

Which best describes this course? (LSP, Dialogues, Major, Minor, Elective)

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. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

Please comment on how you have grown in critical thinking skills since arriving at Truman. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to comment.

Please Check (box) if the work is related to any of the following: International Perspective, Race or Ethnicity, Class/Socio-economic Status, Environmental Issues, Service Learning, Collaborative Work.

Please comment on how you have grown in critical thinking skills since arriving at Truman. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to comment.

This self-assessment is as important to us as the work you submit, and we will read it with care.

Looking at the descriptors for this prompt, how would you rate your own submission for the (Issue, Context, Supporting Evidence, Conclusion Communication)

Reviewer Specific Question

Following the Portfolio Rubric for Critical Thinking and Writing, please assign scores to this paper:

- **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).**
- **Identifies and considers existing **context**, theory, and/or previous work in the field (literature reviews, world-views, contentions, interpretations, interdisciplinary approaches).**
- **Presents, interprets, analyses, and/or assesses appropriate **supporting evidence** (e.g. observations, data, information, citations, argumentation, proofs, etc.) using validated techniques.**

- Identifies and assesses **conclusions** (e.g. theses, contentions, hypothesis, answers, solutions, interpretations) and further **implications or consequences** (e.g. practical applications, policy implications, relevance to other issues or disciplines, discussions or future research).
- **Communicates** effectively (e.g. clarity and precision, organization, ease with use of medium, voice or palette, disciplinary conventions, stylistic and mechanical conventions).

Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Critical Thinking Framework

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

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

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

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 2023

School	Major	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
Arts and Letters	ART	11	2.23	2.45	2.27	1.68	8.55	36	2.59
	CML	12	2.96	3.17	2.92	2.42	11.75	75	3.12
	CRWT	11	2.55	2.55	2.41	2.14	10.09	36	2.77
	ENG	26	2.40	2.54	2.46	2.15	9.92	27	2.85
	LING	5	3.30	3.30	2.90	3.10	12.20	80	3.20
	MUSI	13	2.81	3.19	3.15	2.69	12.31	85	3.12
	THEA	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	13.00	100	3.00
	TOTAL	79	2.61	2.78	2.65	2.28	10.61	51	2.91
Business	ACCT	28	2.95	2.96	2.82	2.38	11.04	50	2.86
	BSAD	81	2.43	2.49	2.43	2.07	9.53	31	2.60
	TOTAL	109	2.56	2.61	2.53	2.15	9.92	36	2.67
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	21	2.64	2.60	2.60	2.21	10.05	43	2.76
	ES	49	2.59	2.55	2.58	2.14	9.88	37	2.81
	HLTH	30	3.12	2.95	2.70	2.12	10.97	60	2.88
	NU	49	3.01	3.00	2.89	2.45	11.45	69	3.11
	TOTAL	149	2.84	2.79	2.71	2.25	10.64	53	2.92
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	11	2.73	2.64	2.59	2.27	10.45	55	2.82
	BCMB	21	2.64	2.50	2.40	2.26	9.90	33	2.83
	BIOL	58	2.86	2.91	2.96	2.57	11.43	66	2.98
	CHEM	5	2.40	2.60	2.20	2.40	9.60	40	2.40
	CS	21	2.52	2.60	2.40	1.90	9.00	24	2.57
	MATH	12	2.62	2.42	2.50	1.92	9.25	25	2.50
	PHYS	9	3.11	3.11	3.11	2.94	11.78	56	3.11
	STTS	8	2.94	2.50	2.81	2.31	10.12	38	2.75
	TOTAL	145	2.76	2.72	2.71	2.36	10.49	48	2.82
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	21	2.55	2.52	2.60	2.00	9.48	38	2.43
	ECON	9	2.56	2.72	3.00	2.67	11.22	78	2.72
	HIST	12	2.46	2.96	2.92	2.50	10.92	50	3.08
	JUST	10	2.60	2.75	2.65	2.25	10.10	40	2.85
	PHRE	3	2.50	2.33	2.33	2.33	9.33	33	2.50
	POL	18	3.00	3.06	3.14	2.64	11.89	72	3.11
	PSYC	60	2.78	2.83	2.73	2.32	10.63	50	2.91
	SOAN	8	2.44	2.88	2.81	2.00	9.88	50	2.94
	TOTAL	141	2.69	2.80	2.79	2.33	10.57	52	2.85
IDSM	IDSM	7	2.64	2.64	2.57	2.29	10.14	57	2.57
LIBS	LIBS	2	1.25	1.50	1.50	1.50	6.00	0	2.00
ALL	ALL	632	2.70	2.74	2.68	2.27	10.44	48	2.83

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 is the average score for writing skill and acumen within each major.

The university average Sum4 score is 10.44 and all schools have an average Sum4 of 10 or above. On the departmental level, 11 departments showed a Sum4 average of less than 10. Last year there were 9. This is starting to look like a trend downward since in the recent past, only one or two departments were below 10%. The factors that lead to these lower scores are not clear and it is possible some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. Many departments scored at the high end of the range (>11), although some of the high scores are surely due to only a few papers being read. It is possible this is a result of the pandemic or it is possible that the “lower enrollment” and the discussion about of possibly moving away from “highly selective” issue is at play.

Viewing the data through the lens of the percentage of students who earned 10 or more on the Sum4 for critical thinking gives a different perspective. University-wide, 48% of 2023 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is significantly lower than prior years. The School of Business is the lowest with 38% which is 12 points below the next lowest score of 48 for the School of Science and Math studies.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2023 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
ACCT	16	2.97	2.94	2.88	2.44	11.25	56	2.81
AGSC	9	2.61	2.56	2.56	2.11	10.33	56	2.83
ART	8	2.25	2.38	2.50	1.69	8.62	0	2.69
BIOL	35	3.19	3.16	3.27	2.86	12.40	80	3.20
BSAD	35	2.47	2.59	2.43	2.04	9.46	31	2.66
CHEM	6	2.50	2.67	2.92	2.67	10.33	33	2.75
CHIN	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.50	7.00	0	2.00
CLAS	6	2.50	3.00	2.92	2.00	10.50	33	2.75
CMDS	15	2.57	2.60	2.57	2.17	9.67	33	2.87
COMM	16	2.59	2.50	2.59	2.09	9.56	25	2.50
CS	10	2.50	2.70	2.50	2.00	9.50	30	2.70
DS	2	2.25	2.25	2.25	1.75	9.50	50	2.50
ECON	11	2.64	2.73	2.86	2.32	10.82	55	2.64
ED	9	2.28	2.33	2.28	2.00	9.33	56	2.72
ENG	60	2.33	2.36	2.28	2.00	9.27	25	2.62
ENVS	2	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.25	10.00	50	2.75
ES	21	2.88	2.74	2.69	2.10	10.43	52	2.76
HIST	24	2.50	2.79	2.73	2.44	10.67	50	2.88
HLTH	23	3.33	3.04	2.87	2.13	11.43	65	3.00
IDSM	1	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	7.00	0	2.00
INDV	3	3.83	3.50	3.17	2.33	13.33	100	2.83
ITAL	1	3.50	4.00	2.50	3.00	13.00	100	3.50
JINS	115	2.60	2.67	2.57	2.23	10.21	45	2.80
JUST	7	3.21	3.00	2.93	2.36	11.00	43	3.00
LIB	2	2.00	2.25	2.25	1.75	7.00	0	2.75
LING	6	3.50	3.67	3.25	3.17	13.50	100	3.50
MATH	3	2.67	2.83	3.17	2.00	9.67	33	2.83
MS	4	2.12	2.12	2.12	1.75	8.25	25	2.75
MUSI	12	2.75	3.04	3.00	2.58	11.58	67	2.92
NU	35	3.24	3.17	3.06	2.54	12.09	83	3.21
PHRE	30	2.47	2.45	2.52	2.20	9.70	37	2.68
PHYS	7	3.07	2.93	2.93	2.86	10.86	57	3.14
POL	24	2.92	3.06	2.98	2.67	11.46	67	3.06
PSYC	25	2.72	2.78	2.78	2.24	10.56	44	2.98
SOAN	15	2.43	2.60	2.57	2.03	9.67	40	2.77
SPAN	5	2.80	3.20	2.80	2.60	11.40	40	2.60
STAT	5	3.30	2.50	2.80	2.30	10.80	60	2.60
STEM	1	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	9.00	0	2.50
THEA	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	13.00	100	3.00
TRU	6	2.83	2.67	2.58	2.50	10.50	67	2.67
Missing	15	2.67	2.63	2.63	2.30	10.27	47	2.70

Table 3 shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular course prefix. As usual, JINS (115) and ENG (60) courses led to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%).

Table 4. CTW 2023 Inter-Rater Reliability

Abs. Diff.	Count	Percent
6 +	22	7
5	16	4
4	40	11
3	44	12
2	67	19
1	100	28
0	68	19
Total	357	100

Each year, some random number of CTW submissions are scored by a second reader. Note that the second reader cannot see the score of the previous reader! In 2023, 632 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 357 were scored by two readers.

Table 5. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-Wide Scores 2019–2023

CTW: University- Wide Scores			
Year	N	Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2019	1,103	10.60	89
2020	573	11.45	63
2021	984	10.99	56
2022	850	10.66	52
2023	632	10.44	48

Table 5 shows that the Sum4 and 10+ percentages are lower than the previous four 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 (in italics) 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 Prompt

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

Source of the this entry? (Truman course, Other Source)

In which year did you originally produce this work? (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior)

Which best describes this course? (LSP, Dialogues, Major, Minor, Elective)

Please Check (box) if the work is related to any of the following: International Perspective, Race or Ethnicity, Class/Socio-economic Status, Environmental Issues, Service Learning, Collaborative 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. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

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. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to reflect.

Looking at the *descriptors* for this prompt, how would you rate your own submission for Interdisciplinary Thinking? Remember that we are evaluating the work, not you or your potential, so it is fine if you do not think this work scores high in this area.

- 4 - Strong Competence
- 3 - Competence
- 2 - Minimal Competence
- 1 - Weak Competence
- 0 - No Competence Demonstrated

Reviewer Specific Question

Please rate the competence of interdisciplinary thinking as evidenced in the work based on the *descriptors* for this prompt.

- 4 - Strong Competence
- 3 - Competence
- 2 - Minimal Competence
- 1 - Weak Competence
- 0 - No Competence Demonstrated

Interdisciplinary Thinking

4 Strong Competences

The item may have some, many, or all of these features:

- 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 Competences

The item may have some, many, or all of these features:

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

2 Minimal Competences

The item may have some, many, or all of these features:

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

1 Weak Competence

The item may have some, many, or all of these features:

- 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 2019–2023

School	Major	N 2023	Mean					2+(%)				
			2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Arts and Letters	ART	11	1.60	2.04	1.93	1.74	1.64	50	74	55	59	27
	CML	12	2.08	2.29	2.61	2.21	2.17	71	76	84	79	67
	CRWT	11	1.50	1.89	2.21	1.85	1.73	58	72	71	60	55
	ENG	25	1.91	2.32	2.26	2.06	1.54	60	81	73	71	52
	LING	5	2.09	2.08	2.27	2.33	2.60	73	62	85	67	80
	MUSI	13	1.92	2.24	2.37	2.47	2.38	67	59	79	88	77
	THEA	1	1.50	2.00	2.45	1.75	2.00	50	57	70	50	100
	TOTAL	78	1.80	2.18	2.28	2.07	1.89	55	73	73	70	58
Business	ACCT	28	1.79	2.18	1.91	2.02	2.02	57	79	66	65	75
	BSAD	82	1.81	2.19	2.22	1.75	1.56	63	74	77	54	41
	TOTAL	110	1.80	2.19	2.09	1.85	1.68	53	75	72	58	50
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT		1.78	1.67				56	67			
	CMDS	21	1.74	2.06	2.28	2.15	1.90	56	71	69	71	57
	ES	50	1.60	2.16	2.05	2.10	1.66	56	74	67	66	50
	HLTH	30	1.87	2.39	2.30	2.00	2.10	62	78	75	70	67
	NU	50	2.02	2.40	2.42	1.89	1.96	69	81	75	62	72
	TOTAL	151	1.80	2.25	2.24	2.04	1.88	57	76	71	66	62
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	10	1.79	2.60	2.29	2.09	1.30	60	80	82	74	40
	BCMB	21		2.00	3.00	1.90	1.95		100	86	67	57
	BIOL	59	1.93	2.41	2.22	2.11	1.92	65	85	77	71	66
	CHEM	5	2.11	2.38	2.15	1.96	2.70	58	77	70	62	80
	CS	22	1.85	2.42	2.26	2.01	2.07	56	75	77	66	77
	MATH	12	2.07	1.77	1.92	2.05	1.58	73	64	50	74	58
	PHYS	9	1.22	2.00	2.42	1.67	1.11	22	62	83	33	33
	STTS	9	1.43	2.31	2.15	1.78	2.39	57	69	90	67	89
	TOTAL	147	1.77	2.33	2.23	2.03	1.88	55	78	76	68	64
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	20	1.93	2.22	2.44	1.88	1.73	65	78	86	54	45
	ECON	8	2.33	2.45	2.46	2.44	1.31	78	82	86	62	38
	HIST	12	1.88	2.13	2.53	2.15	2.67	66	83	81	70	83
	JUST	10	1.69	1.98	1.92	1.98	2.00	58	76	71	60	70
	PHRE	3	2.00	2.50	2.43	1.60	2.00	75	100	71	60	67
	POL	19	2.58	3.00	2.53	2.72	2.50	89	96	90	83	89
	PSYC	58	1.78	2.00	2.07	1.86	1.77	58	66	70	53	57
	SOAN	8	1.76	2.50	2.33	2.39	2.06	65	93	83	79	62
TOTAL	138	2.00	2.24	2.28	2.07	1.95	56	78	78	62	62	
IDSM	IDSM	7	1.50	2.36	2.42	2.20	1.71	50	79	83	80	57
LIBS	LIBS	3			1.50	2.25	1.00			67	75	0
ALL	ALL	634	1.78	2.24	2.23	2.02	1.86	55	76	74	65	59

Blank spaces are due to either new programs (STTS 2018, BCMB, 2020, LIBS in 2021) or 0 graduates for that year (ATHT, 2021).

University-wide, the 2023 average score is 1.86 which is again lower than last year and below the 5 year average of 2.02. The average score by school has changed little over the past 5 years. Recent downward trends may have something to do with the pandemic. It might be good to consider scores going back a bit further to see the 10 year trend: (2+%) 2014,63, 2015,70 2016,72, 2017,72, 2018,69, 2019,55, 2020,79, 2021,74, 2022,65 2023,59 with a ten year average of 67.5%. The average mean score

since 2014 is 1.99. It is possible that the circumstances of the pandemic led to higher scores in 2020 and 2021 since the readers were volunteering and everything was moved to the online format. Range finding sessions were run in the same way as they had been previously however the reading took place over the course of a week. Volunteers reading online over a week was not the same as a room full of paid readers focused on completing the task in 1.5 days. 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. One issue also might be that departments are not ultimately responsible for making sure the JINS course are evaluated or whether students are being encouraged to submit work from JINS courses as opposed to random courses for this prompt. An effort should be made to verify that each JINS instructor understands that at least one artifact from their class should fit this prompt well. The dean who is newly in charge of bolstering interdisciplinary thinking on campus was informed of this and some initiative should be taking place in the near future to help remedy, or at least ensure that everyone is on the same page.

Table 7. Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2023 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Mean	2+(%)
JINS	414	2.01	66
ENG	28	1.25	29
PHRE	21	1.57	52
NU	17	1.26	41
BSAD	15	1.10	27
None Given	14	1.61	64
TRU	10	1.50	40
HIST	9	2.33	89
ECON	9	1.94	56
JUST	8	1.62	38
SOAN	7	1.86	57
COMM	7	1.79	57
MUSI	6	1.58	50
ES	6	1.42	50
CHEM	6	2.17	67
< 5	57	1.61	49

As intended, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2023 (414). The submissions from JINS courses scored well with our rubric (66% at 2+) but the overall percentage is a lower than the average score for JINS for the last 5 years (2019-69%, 2020-83%, 2021-82%, 2022-74%, 2023-66%, 5 year average(75%). As mentioned above, this average could be a bit high if the years 2020-2021 were disrupted by the pandemic. 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. As mentioned above, it would be a good project to make sure that all JINS instructors are aware of the portfolio prompt and are

actually including the rubric in the course. Instructors should be aware that their course should produce at least one artifact with the rubric in mind. Up until this point there has not been a committee or administrator tasked with making sure JINS instructors are told all of this information. Prompts for final papers in individual courses could perhaps be improved by using the official ID rubric.

Table 8. IDS 2023 Inter-Rater Reliability

2023 Abs Diff	N	%
4	1	0
3	18	5
2	85	22
1	151	40
0	126	33
Total	381	100

In 2023, 634 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 381 were scored by two readers.

Self-Discovery Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Portfolio’s newest prompt is the Self-Discovery Prompt (Fall, 2015), which was envisioned as a way to explore how students are discovering their true selves with our present curriculum and circumstances.

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 Seminars. These Self and Society Seminars began in 2018.

The Self-Discovery prompt itself is given here (in italics), followed by the set of reviewer specific questions (in bold). 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.

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?

Source of the this entry? (Truman course, Other Source)

In which year did you originally produce this work? (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior)

Which best describes this course? (LSP, Dialogues, Major, Minor, Elective)

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? Use at least two well-thought-out sentences to reflect.

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. It is highly unlikely that the same faculty reader would read both prompts.

Reviewer Specific Question

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

- 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
- Achieved a personal best
- Especially challenging

- Engaged in significant intellectual risk
- Developed a sense of vocation
- Modeled working as a professional
- Demonstrated service to others
- Fruitful collaboration with other students or peers
- Fruitful collaboration with faculty, staff, mentor, other professional
- Built a special mentoring relationship

Reviewer Specific Question

If you find quotable quotes that you think should be used in the Assessment Almanac, please check the box and include some of the quote in the "Comment" box below: Contains quotable quotes.

Reviewer Specific Question

Why, according to the student, was this so satisfying (other)?

Reviewer Specific Question

If you find quotes could be forwarded to a person or office on campus, please check this box and include some of the quote in the "Comment" box below:

Contains forwardable material

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

Coursework	Other Academic	Student Organization
<input type="radio"/> LSP <input type="radio"/> Major <input type="radio"/> Capstone <input type="radio"/> Minor <input type="radio"/> Elective	<input type="radio"/> Research <input type="radio"/> Internship <input type="radio"/> Study Abroad <input type="radio"/> Resume / College Application / Professional Statement <input type="radio"/> Service Learning <input type="radio"/> Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Governance <input type="radio"/> Service Organization <input type="radio"/> Social Fraternity/Sorority <input type="radio"/> Professional/Major <input type="radio"/> Religious <input type="radio"/> Honor Society <input type="radio"/> Campus Media <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>
Athletics	Employment	
<input type="radio"/> Varsity Athletics <input type="radio"/> Club Sports Intramurals <input type="radio"/> Other Athletics	<input type="radio"/> Campus Employment <input type="radio"/> Volunteer Work <input type="radio"/> Off-Campus Job	
Performance/Creative Activity	Other	
<input type="radio"/> Public Performance/Recital <input type="radio"/> Other Creative Effort	<input type="radio"/> Relationships/Friendships <input type="radio"/> Residence Life <input type="radio"/> ROTC <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	

Table 9. Self-Discovery: University-Wide Student Rationales 2019–2023

Category	Reason	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	23	7	16	22	26
	New Perspective on Self	25	16	24	21	30
	Personal Growth	60	46	74	63	60
	Responsibility	20	10	13	13	16
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	6	2	3	4	3
Academic/Scholarship	Personal Best	10	5	5	4	9
	Especially Challenging	26	15	17	14	15
	Intellectual Risk	7	6	4	3	3
	Vocational Development	21	13	18	19	20
	Worked as Professional	12	9	8	8	10
Relationships	Service to Others	11	5	8	6	7
	Collaboration w/ Peers	21	16	16	18	17
	Collaboration w/ Professional	11	7	9	11	12
	Mentoring Internship	5	4	7	6	6

There is an issue here related to faculty identification of “why” a student’s experience was important. Faculty could check multiple-choice check-boxes to indicate one or more reasons, listed in the table above. However, it appears that faculty responses default to “N” for “no” for students who did not respond to the self-discovery prompt, rather than, say, “NA” for no value. In other words, it doesn’t appear that there is a method to determine which self-discovery prompts were evaluated by reviewers, and which were not, since “N” could indicate either that a submission wasn’t reviewed, or that it was reviewed and found not to exhibit that particular characteristic. We have to assume that any student response was rated by reviewers, and we’ll use the “Other Source/Truman Course” variable to determine whether a student responded.

The reasons that students could have expressed for significant self-discovery were categorized into three groups: **Risk/Challenge/Growth**, **Academic/Scholarship**, and **Relationships**.

The category **Risk/Challenge/Growth** offered the greatest potential for self-discovery university-wide. For all students, *Personal Growth* across the past 5 years is consistently the biggest reason for self-discovery (2019: 60%, 2020: 46%, 2021: 74%, 2022: 63, 2023: 60%). *New Perspective on Self* was the next most significant category (30%)

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, *Vocational Development* (2019: 21%, 2020: 13%, 2021:18%, 2022: 19%, 2023: 20%) was higher than *Especially Challenging* as a significant category of self-discovery (2019: 26%, 2020: 15%, 2021: 17%, 2022: 14%, 2023: 15%). Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration w/ Peers* (2019: 21%, 2020: 16%, 2021,16%, 2022: 18%, 2023, 17%).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2023 is tabulated in tables 10-12 below. How different majors’ students are motivated should be valuable information for the faculty as they craft changes within their majors.

10. Self-Discovery: 2023 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Risk/Growth/Challenge									
			Deep Introspection		New Perspective on Self		Personal Growth		Responsibility		Moral/Ethical Dilemma	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	13	4	31	4	31	7	54	1	8	0	0
	CML	14	4	29	4	29	10	71	4	29	1	7
	CRWT	14	4	29	5	36	10	71	1	7	1	7
	ENG	31	9	29	12	39	20	65	8	26	0	0
	LING	7	3	43	1	14	4	57	1	14	0	0
	MUSI	14	6	43	4	29	9	64	3	21	1	7
	THEA	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	97	30	31	30	31	60	62	18	19	3	3
Business	ACCT	34	6	18	12	35	18	53	9	26	1	3
	BSAD	99	26	26	29	29	57	58	11	11	2	2
	TOTAL	133	32	24	41	31	75	56	20	15	3	2
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	24	4	17	5	21	15	62	3	12	1	4
	ES	63	13	21	13	21	32	51	11	17	2	3
	HLTH	32	9	28	10	31	20	62	4	12	0	0
	NU	53	13	25	15	28	40	75	11	21	1	2
	TOTAL	172	39	23	43	25	107	62	29	17	4	2
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	1	6	1	6	8	50	2	12	1	6
	BCMB	26	4	15	6	23	14	54	3	12	0	0
	BIOL	69	25	36	25	36	49	71	16	23	2	3
	CHEM	6	2	33	3	50	5	83	3	50	0	0
	CS	28	7	25	8	29	15	54	1	4	0	0
	MATH	15	6	40	8	53	9	60	4	27	1	7
	PHYS	10	2	20	0	0	4	40	1	10	0	0
	STTS	10	3	30	2	20	5	50	3	30	1	10
	TOTAL	180	50	28	53	29	109	61	33	18	5	3
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	22	7	32	8	36	16	73	1	5	1	5
	ECON	10	0	0	1	10	3	30	1	10	0	0
	HIST	14	4	29	4	29	7	50	2	14	1	7
	JUST	11	5	45	5	45	6	55	0	0	1	9
	PHRE	3	1	33	2	67	2	67	0	0	0	0
	POL	20	5	25	8	40	12	60	5	25	1	5
	PSYC	68	20	29	23	34	39	57	8	12	0	0
	SOAN	9	3	33	3	33	6	67	1	11	1	11
	TOTAL	157	45	29	54	34	91	58	18	11	5	3
IDSM	IDSM	8	3	38	4	50	6	75	0	0	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	2	29	1	14	1	14	0	0
ALL	ALL	754	199	26	227	30	449	60	119	16	20	3

Table 11. Self-Discovery: 2023 Student Academic/Scholarship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Academic/Scholarship									
			Personal Best		Especially Challenging		Intellectual Risk		Vocational Development		Worked as Professional	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	13	1	8	1	8	0	0	3	23	1	8
	CML	14	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	7	1	7
	CRWT	14	1	7	1	7	0	0	2	14	1	7
	ENG	31	3	10	2	6	0	0	6	19	2	6
	LING	7	0	0	1	14	0	0	1	14	0	0
	MUSI	14	0	0	2	14	1	7	1	7	2	14
	THEA	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25
TOTAL	97	5	5	8	8	1	1	14	14	8	8	
Business	ACCT	34	4	12	5	15	0	0	5	15	1	3
	BSAD	99	14	14	13	13	6	6	16	16	8	8
	TOTAL	133	18	14	18	14	6	5	21	16	9	7
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMD5	24	0	0	6	25	0	0	9	38	5	21
	ES	63	8	13	12	19	1	2	13	21	5	8
	HLTH	32	3	9	2	6	2	6	6	19	4	12
	NU	53	5	9	10	19	1	2	17	32	5	9
TOTAL	172	16	9	30	17	4	2	45	26	19	11	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	2	12	1	6	0	0	2	12	1	6
	BCMB	26	2	8	6	23	1	4	5	19	3	12
	BIOL	69	9	13	20	29	5	7	13	19	11	16
	CHEM	6	2	33	2	33	0	0	1	17	2	33
	CS	28	1	4	3	11	1	4	5	18	4	14
	MATH	15	1	7	2	13	0	0	2	13	0	0
	PHYS	10	2	20	1	10	1	10	2	20	0	0
	STTS	10	2	20	0	0	0	0	3	30	1	10
TOTAL	180	21	12	35	19	8	4	33	18	22	12	
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	22	1	5	3	14	0	0	4	18	2	9
	ECON	10	1	10	1	10	0	0	3	30	0	0
	HIST	14	1	7	1	7	1	7	3	21	3	21
	JUST	11	0	0	2	18	2	18	2	18	0	0
	PHRE	3	0	0	2	67	1	33	1	33	0	0
	POL	20	1	5	3	15	0	0	4	20	2	10
	PSYC	68	6	9	8	12	2	3	15	22	5	7
	SOAN	9	0	0	1	11	0	0	1	11	1	11
TOTAL	157	10	6	21	13	6	4	33	21	13	8	
IDSM	IDSM	8	1	12	1	12	0	0	1	12	1	12
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	
ALL	ALL	754	71	9	113	15	25	3	149	20	72	10

Table 12. Self-Discovery: 2023 Student Relationship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Relationships							
			Service to Others		Collaboration w/ Peers		Collaboration w/ Professional		Mentoring Internship	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	13	1	8	0	0	2	15	0	0
	CML	14	1	7	0	0	1	7	2	14
	CRWT	14	0	0	2	14	2	14	0	0
	ENG	31	1	3	8	26	2	6	1	3
	LING	7	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	14	2	14	1	7	3	21	2	14
	THEA	4	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	97	5	5	13	13	10	10	5	5	
Business	ACCT	34	2	6	10	29	7	21	0	0
	BSAD	99	5	5	16	16	7	7	5	5
	TOTAL	133	7	5	26	20	14	11	5	4
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	24	2	8	4	17	7	29	1	4
	ES	63	5	8	13	21	8	13	5	8
	HLTH	32	0	0	5	16	5	16	2	6
	NU	53	4	8	12	23	6	11	1	2
TOTAL	172	11	6	34	20	26	15	9	5	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	0	0	3	19	2	12	2	12
	BCMB	26	2	8	4	15	4	15	0	0
	BIOL	69	7	10	11	16	7	10	7	10
	CHEM	6	1	17	2	33	0	0	0	0
	CS	28	1	4	6	21	1	4	3	11
	MATH	15	1	7	2	13	1	7	2	13
	PHYS	10	0	0	2	20	1	10	0	0
	STTS	10	4	40	3	30	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	180	16	9	33	18	16	9	14	8
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	22	2	9	3	14	1	5	1	5
	ECON	10	1	10	1	10	3	30	2	20
	HIST	14	0	0	1	7	2	14	0	0
	JUST	11	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	9
	PHRE	3	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0
	POL	20	2	10	2	10	5	25	2	10
	PSYC	68	2	3	11	16	8	12	5	7
	SOAN	9	2	22	1	11	0	0	1	11
TOTAL	157	10	6	21	13	20	13	12	8	
IDSMS	IDSMS	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
LIBS	LIBS	7	1	14	2	29	1	14	1	14
ALL	ALL	754	50	7	129	17	87	12	47	6

Table 13. Self-Discovery: Context of the Experience 2021–2023

SELF Category	SELF Context	2021 N	2021%	2022 N	2022%	2023 N	2023%
Coursework	LSP	60	6	54	6	37	5
	Major	255	25	209	25	186	24
	Capstone	10	1	8	1	1	0
	Minor	44	4	35	4	14	2
	Elective	41	4	32	4	33	4
	All	410	39	338	38	271	35
Other Academic	Research	18	2	17	2	14	2
	Internship	21	2	24	3	12	2
	Study Abroad	32	3	11	1	7	1
	Resume/Prof. Statement	7	1	6	1	5	1
	Service Learning	5	0	4	0	4	1
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	26	3	6	1	9	1
	Other Academic	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	109	10	68	8	51	7	
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	4	0	3	0	1	0
	Service Organization	26	3	19	2	12	2
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	82	8	79	9	60	8
	Professional/Major	11	1	15	2	11	1
	Religious Organization	25	2	24	3	20	3
	Honor Society	2	0	2	0	1	0
	Campus Media	5	0	6	1	2	0
	Other Organization	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	155	15	148	17	107	14	
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	19	2	21	2	26	3
	Club Sports/Intramurals	4	0	6	1	5	1
	Other Athletics	5	0	4	0	3	0
	All	28	3	31	3	34	4
Employment	Campus Job	22	2	22	3	16	2
	Volunteer	3	0	4	0	4	1
	Off- Campus Job	6	1	6	1	8	1
	All	31	3	32	4	28	4
Performance Creative Activity	Public Performance/Recital	5	0	3	0	3	0
	Other Creative Activity	9	1	7	1	3	0
	All	14	1	10	1	6	1
Other	Relationships/Friendships	129	13	107	13	96	12
	Resident Life	12	1	10	1	9	1
	ROTC	2	0	6	1	6	1
	Other Misc.	113	11	92	11	29	4
	All	256	24	215	24	140	18
NA	All	57	5	48	5	140	18
All	All	1,060	100	890	100	777	100

Note: This table was generated from the column “Self-Discovery Context Reviewer 1”.

Table 13 shows the context for the Self Discovery submissions since 2021. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. As usual, the majority (35% in 2023) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (24% in 2023) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. This year "Other" is the next highest area with 18% and it is important to note that Relationships/Friendships was the highest of those at 12%. All others fall under 10%. Student Organizations scored 14% with Social Fraternities/Sororities the highest in this group (8%)

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Most Personally Satisfying (MPS) prompt (in italics) 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. It will be interesting to see if and how the data from these categories evolves in the future.

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 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.

Source of the this entry? (Truman course, Other Source)

In which year did you originally produce this work? (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior)

Which best describes this course? (LSP, Dialogues, Major, Minor, Elective)

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? Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

Whether or not this was as an assignment, please describe your most personally satisfying submission. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

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
- Other

Reviewer Specific Question

Why, according to the student, was this so satisfying (other)?

Reviewer Specific Question

If you find quotable quotes that you think should be used in the Assessment Almanac, please check the box and include some of the quote in the "Comment" box below: Contains quotable quotes

Reviewer Specific Question

If you find quotes could be forwarded to a person or office on campus, please check this box and include some of the quote in the "Comment" box below:

Contains forwardable material.

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

Coursework	Other Academic	Student Organization
<input type="radio"/> LSP	<input type="radio"/> Research	<input type="radio"/> Governance
<input type="radio"/> Major	<input type="radio"/> Internship	<input type="radio"/> Service Organization
<input type="radio"/> Capstone	<input type="radio"/> Study Abroad	<input type="radio"/> Social Fraternity/Sorority
<input type="radio"/> Minor	<input type="radio"/> Resume / College Application / Professional Statement	<input type="radio"/> Professional/Major
<input type="radio"/> Elective	<input type="radio"/> Service Learning	<input type="radio"/> Religious
	<input type="radio"/> Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring	<input type="radio"/> Honor Society
	<input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Campus Media
		<input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>
		<input type="text"/>
Athletics	Employment	
<input type="radio"/> Varsity Athletics	<input type="radio"/> Campus Employment	
<input type="radio"/> Club Sports Intramurals	<input type="radio"/> Volunteer Work	
<input type="radio"/> Other Athletics	<input type="radio"/> Off-Campus Job	
Performance/Creative Activity	Other	
<input type="radio"/> Public Performance/Recital	<input type="radio"/> Relationships/Friendships	
<input type="radio"/> Other Creative Effort	<input type="radio"/> Residence Life	
	<input type="radio"/> ROTC	
	<input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	

Table 14. Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2019–2023

Reason	Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)				
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Personal Growth	46	32	21	21	22
Enjoyable	56	33	22	21	18
Challenging	40	20	11	13	12
Professional	27	15	8	8	10
Personal Goals	28	11	10	8	10
Personal Best	11	3	7	10	10
Lots of Time	27	14	9	9	5
Collaborative	17	13	8	6	6
Problem Solving	11	3	3	3	3
Other	0	0	2	1	2
No Indication	0	0	0	0	0

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 2022, “Enjoyable” (21%) was tied with “Personal Growth” (21%) for student satisfaction, however this year “Personal Growth” (22%) is higher than “Enjoyable” (18 %) and “Challenging” (12%) was next. For the last three years, “Personal Goals”, “Enjoyable” and “Challenging” have been the top categories. It is still clear that Truman students do generally enjoy being pushed to excel. “Collaborative” has been on a downward trend and remains 6% in 2023 . It is important to note that in the self-discovery prompt, the top **Academic/Scholarship** category was *collaboration w/others* (see table 9). It would seem that even though the collaborative work drives self-discovery it has become less satisfying to the students. Perhaps departments might review where collaborative work occurs in their curriculum and try to find out how they might modify things to be more satisfying or enjoyable although some might argue that student struggles or dissatisfaction can contribute significantly to student growth.

Table 15. Most Personally Satisfying 2023: Scores Sorted by First Major

School	Major	N	Personal Best		Personal Goals		Personal Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	13	3	23	3	23	6	46	3	23	2	15
	CML	14	7	50	3	21	8	57	4	29	1	7
	CRWT	14	4	29	4	29	7	50	4	29	1	7
	ENG	32	7	22	4	12	15	47	10	31	5	16
	LING	7	1	14	2	29	4	57	3	43	0	0
	MUSI	14	5	36	6	43	10	71	6	43	1	7
	THEA	4	1	25	0	0	1	25	1	25	1	25
TOTAL	98	28	29	22	22	51	52	31	32	11	11	
Business	ACCT	34	7	21	9	26	16	47	8	24	5	15
	BSAD	98	16	16	22	22	43	44	17	17	16	16
	TOTAL	132	23	17	31	23	59	45	25	19	21	16
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	8	35	4	17	13	57	6	26	12	52
	ES	63	12	19	11	17	26	41	18	29	10	16
	HLTH	32	12	38	12	38	17	53	6	19	8	25
	NU	54	12	22	15	28	32	59	14	26	25	46
	TOTAL	172	44	26	42	24	88	51	44	26	55	32
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	0	0	3	19	5	31	1	6	3	19
	BCMB	25	7	28	6	24	12	48	10	40	8	32
	BIOL	70	10	14	14	20	34	49	15	21	22	31
	CHEM	6	0	0	1	17	5	83	2	33	0	0
	CS	28	7	25	2	7	11	39	6	21	6	21
	MATH	15	3	20	1	7	5	33	6	40	4	27
	PHYS	10	0	0	2	20	6	60	3	30	0	0
	STTS	9	3	33	4	44	5	56	1	11	5	56
	TOTAL	179	30	17	33	18	83	46	44	25	48	27
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	23	4	17	5	22	10	43	5	22	5	22
	ECON	10	3	30	2	20	6	60	3	30	1	10
	HIST	14	5	36	3	21	7	50	3	21	0	0
	JUST	12	1	8	2	17	7	58	2	17	1	8
	PHRE	3	2	67	2	67	3	100	2	67	1	33
	POL	20	6	30	4	20	12	60	9	45	1	5
	PSYC	70	17	24	15	21	33	47	18	26	14	20
	SOAN	9	4	44	2	22	4	44	2	22	0	0
TOTAL	161	42	26	35	22	82	51	44	27	23	14	
IDSM	IDSM	8	2	25	1	12	3	38	2	25	2	25
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	0	0	2	29	0	0	1	14
ALL	ALL	757	169	22	164	22	368	49	190	25	161	21

Table 15 cont. Most Personally Satisfying 2023: Scores Sorted by First Major, Continued

School	Major	N	Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Problem Solving		Lots of Time	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	13	2	15	6	46	0	0	1	8	0	0
	CML	14	2	14	7	50	0	0	1	7	2	14
	CRWT	14	0	0	8	57	0	0	0	0	1	7
	ENG	32	6	19	9	28	0	0	1	3	4	12
	LING	7	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	3	43
	MUSI	14	2	14	6	43	0	0	1	7	4	29
	THEA	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25
TOTAL	98	12	12	37	38	0	0	4	4	15	15	
Business	ACCT	34	9	26	13	38	0	0	1	3	5	15
	BSAD	98	14	14	39	40	0	0	3	3	11	11
	TOTAL	132	23	17	52	39	0	0	4	3	16	12
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	4	17	10	43	0	0	2	9	3	13
	ES	63	11	17	21	33	0	0	5	8	10	16
	HLTH	32	4	12	22	69	0	0	5	16	5	16
	NU	54	9	17	24	44	0	0	2	4	4	7
TOTAL	172	28	16	77	45	0	0	14	8	22	13	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	2	12	5	31	0	0	1	6	3	19
	BCMB	25	2	8	8	32	0	0	1	4	1	4
	BIOL	70	11	16	27	39	1	1	10	14	9	13
	CHEM	6	1	17	1	17	0	0	1	17	0	0
	CS	28	7	25	13	46	0	0	3	11	2	7
	MATH	15	1	7	3	20	0	0	2	13	1	7
	PHYS	10	1	10	4	40	0	0	3	30	1	10
	STTS	9	2	22	4	44	0	0	4	44	0	0
	TOTAL	179	27	15	65	36	1	1	25	14	17	9
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	23	3	13	9	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ECON	10	0	0	5	50	0	0	1	10	1	10
	HIST	14	1	7	7	50	0	0	0	0	2	14
	JUST	12	1	8	3	25	0	0	2	17	0	0
	PHRE	3	0	0	1	33	0	0	0	0	1	33
	POL	20	2	10	6	30	0	0	0	0	6	30
	PSYC	70	7	10	22	31	0	0	7	10	8	11
	SOAN	9	2	22	5	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	161	16	10	58	36	0	0	10	6	18	11	
IDSM	IDSM	8	0	0	4	50	0	0	0	0	2	25
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	ALL	757	106	14	294	39	1	0	57	8	90	12

Table 15 shows the 2023 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 16. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2021–2023

SELF		2021 N	2021%	2022 N	2022%	2023 N	2023%
Category	SELF Context						
Coursework	LSP	105	11	116	14	62	8
	Major	361	36	302	36	232	30
	Capstone	20	2	28	3	17	2
	Minor	51	5	58	7	35	5
	Elective	73	7	60	7	59	8
	All	610	58	564	63	405	52
Other Academic	Research	25	3	25	3	16	2
	Internship	23	2	18	2	14	2
	Study Abroad	22	2	6	1	3	0
	Resume/Prof. Statement	5	1	2	0	7	1
	Service Learning	5	1	3	0	1	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	6	1	2	0	2	0
	Other Academic	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	86	8	56	6	43	6	
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	4	0	4	0	0	0
	Service Organization	25	3	15	2	9	1
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	61	6	45	5	38	5
	Professional/Major	6	1	9	1	11	1
	Religious Organization	14	1	10	1	6	1
	Honor Society	5	1	2	0	1	0
	Campus Media	5	1	2	0	3	0
	Other Organization	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	120	11	87	10	68	9	
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	27	3	20	2	29	4
	Club Sports/Intramurals	13	1	10	1	9	1
	Other Athletics	5	1	3	0	1	0
	All	45	4	33	4	39	5
Employment	Campus Job	20	2	21	2	15	2
	Volunteer	10	1	3	0	9	1
	Off- Campus Job	1	0	0	0	2	0
	All	31	3	24	3	26	3
Performance Creative Activity	Public Performance/Recital	16	2	13	2	9	1
	Other Creative Activity	12	1	9	1	6	1
	All	28	3	22	2	15	2
Other	Relationships/Friendships	15	2	8	1	16	2
	Resident Life	6	1	3	0	1	0
	ROTC	2	0	2	0	1	0
	Other Misc.	51	5	46	5	23	3
	All	74	7	59	7	41	5
NA	All	66	6	45	5	140	18
All	All	1,060	100	890	100	777	100

Note: This table was generated from the column “Most Personally Satisfying Context Reviewer 1”.

Table 16 shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, since 2021. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. Just over half (52% in 2023) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (30% in 2023) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Every other area shows less than 10%.

Transformative Learning Experiences Questionnaire (TEQ)

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 define 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 17. 2019–2023 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.0	43	3.7	60	3.6	63	3.5	57	3.5	54
BUS	2.7	36	3.2	38	3.1	33	3.2	42	3.1	40
HSE	3.1	50	3.6	56	3.5	54	3.4	51	3.6	53
SAM	3.0	40	3.3	46	3.5	56	3.5	53	3.5	50
SCS	3.0	46	3.5	53	3.6	57	3.6	58	3.6	58
IDSM	3.5	75	3.5	53	3.5	50	3.8	67	3.6	38
LIBS					2.7	0	3.5	44	2.9	14
ALL	3.0	43	3.5	51	3.5	53	3.5	53	3.5	51

Note that these percentages have been historically calculated out of all students who submitted a portfolio, not out of all who have data for this question. That’s not a problem as long as most students do have data for this question, but might require adjustments in a year where we don’t have full data.

From 2019 to 2023 about half of students answered “Totally” (5) or “Very” (4) Transformative to this question. The 2019 average (43%) is a bit of an outlier since it is considerably lower than the previous 3 years. The average for scores of 4 or 5 over the last 5 years continues to be around 50%.

Table 18. 2023 Counts of Scores, Sorted by Major, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	Major	N	1	2	3	4	5	No. Ans.	AVE	% 4 or 5
Arts and Letters	ART	13	0	1	7	3	2	0	3.46	38
	CML	14	0	2	3	6	3	0	3.71	64
	CRWT	14	0	1	3	9	1	0	3.71	71
	ENG	33	0	6	10	15	1	1	3.34	48
	LING	7	0	2	3	0	1	1	3.00	14
	MUSI	15	0	1	0	11	2	1	4.00	87
	THEA	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	3.00	0
TOTAL		100	0	13	30	44	10	3	3.53	54
Business	ACCT	34	2	5	12	10	2	3	3.16	35
	BSAD	102	5	23	28	37	5	4	3.14	41
	TOTAL	136	7	28	40	47	7	7	3.15	40
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	25	0	1	8	13	2	1	3.67	60
	ES	65	0	11	20	23	7	4	3.43	46
	HLTH	32	0	1	12	14	5	0	3.72	59
	NU	55	1	3	20	25	5	1	3.56	55
	TOTAL	177	1	16	60	75	19	6	3.56	53
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	0	4	7	3	2	0	3.19	31
	BCMB	26	0	4	3	13	4	2	3.71	65
	BIOL	70	4	6	22	25	11	2	3.49	51
	CHEM	7	1	1	2	2	1	0	3.14	43
	CS	29	1	5	8	9	4	2	3.37	45
	MATH	16	0	2	7	5	2	0	3.44	44
	PHYS	10	0	3	1	4	2	0	3.50	60
	STTS	10	0	0	4	3	2	1	3.78	50
TOTAL	184	6	25	54	64	28	7	3.47	50	
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	23	1	1	6	8	7	0	3.83	65
	ECON	11	1	0	1	7	1	1	3.70	73
	HIST	15	0	3	4	6	1	1	3.36	47
	JUST	12	0	3	4	4	0	1	3.09	33
	PHRE	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	4.33	67
	POL	21	0	1	10	7	2	1	3.50	43
	PSYC	71	1	8	17	33	11	1	3.64	62
	SOAN	9	1	1	1	4	2	0	3.56	67
TOTAL	165	4	17	44	69	26	5	3.60	58	
IDSM	IDSM	8	0	0	5	1	2	0	3.62	38
LIBS	LIBS	7	1	0	5	1	0	0	2.86	14
ALL	ALL	777	19	99	238	301	92	28	3.46	51

Note: Similar to Table 18, percentages in this table are calculated out of all students with a portfolio submission, not out of only those who responded to this question.

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 3.00 (0% 4 or 5 for THEA, 14% 4 or 5 for LING and) to 4.00 (MUSI 87% 4 OR 5) with the mean average score of 3.46.

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?”

Table 19. 2023 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	28	3.60
Service Learning	84	10.81
Research	196	25.23
Internship	196	25.23
Leadership	284	36.55
Student-Led Education	45	5.79
Writing	166	21.36
Other	57	7.34
Course	580	74.65
Any (Big 4)	376	48.39
Any	677	87.13
Total 2023 N	777	

Note: Again, percentages are calculated out of all students who submitted a portfolio, not out of all who had data for this question. That could be a problem if a substantial number had no data for this question, but historically, that’s how it’s been calculated. Also note that the “Course” line has increased greatly from 2019 because prior to 2020, several response columns in the database were ignored in the analysis due to the way that data was stored in the database (although it appears that prior to 2018, perhaps entries were counted correctly).

In 2023, 580 Truman students (75%) listed one or more courses as transformational. The percentages of students within each major vary widely.

Students were asked if they had “an experience with writing that they would report as transformational.” This year, 166 (22%) students reported such an experience which is consistent with 2022.

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*

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 20. 2018–2023 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Activity	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Study Abroad	20	18	19	12	4	4
Service Learning	20	17	17	12	11	11
Research	29	29	25	28	24	25
Internship	32	33	32	25	25	25
Leadership	42	40	40	38	40	37
Student-Led Education	6	5	5	4	4	6
Writing	22	23	23	23	22	21
Other	8	8	10	9	8	7
Course	47	48	78	77	76	75
Any (Big 4)	70	67	63	56	50	48
Any	84	83	94	91	90	87

Table 20 shows the percentages of all Truman students who reported each of these types 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. Study Abroad and Internships were likely lower due to travel restrictions and personal interaction was limited during the pandemic.

Table 21. 2019–2023 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Activity	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Study Abroad	18	17	24	10	14	9	5	4	5	2
Service Learning	24	8	20	10	16	7	14	6	14	5
Research	31	25	28	18	30	24	27	20	28	21
Internship	32	33	33	31	27	22	25	25	28	21
Leadership	44	33	45	30	42	31	43	35	42	27
Student-Led Education	6	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	6	5
Writing	26	20	26	19	26	18	23	19	22	20
Other	6	10	10	8	8	9	8	9	6	9
Course	51	41	80	75	80	71	81	68	79	68

Note: Because there may have been a systematic analysis problem with the analysis of “Course” columns in previous years, we are only certain that 2020 includes students who specified one course as transformative. Also note that there are discrepancies in past reports between the “Course” category in Table 21 and the break-down by sex in Table 22, specifically in 2015–2017.

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2023, females again participated in almost all of these types of activities at frequencies higher than males.

**Table 22. 2023 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities
Sorted by Major**

School	Major	N	StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Course
Arts and Letters	ART	13	0	0	8	31	23	0	38	0	92
	CML	14	21	14	21	7	29	14	36	7	79
	CRWT	14	0	0	0	29	7	0	57	7	93
	ENG	33	0	6	6	12	30	15	24	6	70
	LING	7	14	43	14	0	43	0	29	0	57
	MUSI	15	0	0	20	7	47	13	33	7	80
	THEA	4	0	0	0	25	75	0	0	0	75
TOTAL	100	4	7	10	15	31	9	33	5	78	
Business	ACCT	34	0	6	18	29	26	0	12	6	62
	BSAD	102	9	2	3	23	34	2	16	9	61
	TOTAL	136	7	3	7	24	32	1	15	8	61
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	25	12	36	36	0	40	12	56	12	96
	ES	65	0	25	20	37	35	5	18	11	69
	HLTH	32	0	50	34	34	44	6	16	3	91
	NU	55	0	15	15	58	42	7	15	0	80
	TOTAL	177	2	28	23	38	40	7	22	6	80
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	0	19	25	19	25	12	19	19	75
	BCMB	26	4	4	77	23	35	8	8	8	81
	BIOL	70	4	6	31	11	46	4	26	3	76
	CHEM	7	29	0	43	14	29	0	14	29	86
	CS	29	0	0	7	45	38	3	7	0	62
	MATH	16	6	0	12	6	31	0	19	25	62
	PHYS	10	0	0	70	20	40	0	0	0	70
	STTS	10	0	10	10	40	30	10	20	10	80
TOTAL	184	4	5	33	21	38	5	17	8	73	
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	23	4	9	9	39	39	9	9	17	74
	ECON	11	0	0	36	27	36	0	18	27	64
	HIST	15	0	13	53	13	33	13	7	0	80
	JUST	12	0	0	8	33	42	0	17	17	83
	PHRE	3	0	0	33	33	0	33	67	33	100
	POL	21	0	10	38	33	33	5	38	10	86
	PSYC	71	3	10	61	18	41	6	24	3	75
	SOAN	9	0	11	67	33	44	11	22	0	100
TOTAL	165	2	8	44	25	38	7	22	8	78	
IDSM	IDSM	8	12	12	12	0	50	12	50	12	100
LIBS	LIBS	7	14	0	14	14	29	14	43	14	71
ALL	ALL	777	4	11	25	25	37	6	21	7	75

Table 22 cont. 2023 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

School	Major	N	Big 4		Any	
			Count	%	Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	13	4	31	13	100
	CML	14	5	36	12	86
	CRWT	14	4	29	13	93
	ENG	33	6	18	29	88
	LING	7	4	57	6	86
	MUSI	15	3	20	14	93
	THEA	4	1	25	4	100
	TOTAL	100	27	27	91	91
Business	ACCT	34	15	44	26	76
	BSAD	102	31	30	77	75
	TOTAL	136	46	34	103	76
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	25	15	60	24	96
	ES	65	35	54	53	82
	HLTH	32	23	72	32	100
	NU	55	38	69	53	96
	TOTAL	177	111	63	162	92
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	6	38	14	88
	BCMB	26	21	81	24	92
	BIOL	70	28	40	61	87
	CHEM	7	4	57	7	100
	CS	29	14	48	21	72
	MATH	16	4	25	12	75
	PHYS	10	8	80	10	100
	STTS	10	4	40	9	90
	TOTAL	184	89	48	158	86
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	23	10	43	19	83
	ECON	11	7	64	10	91
	HIST	15	10	67	13	87
	JUST	12	4	33	11	92
	PHRE	3	2	67	3	100
	POL	21	13	62	20	95
	PSYC	71	45	63	65	92
	SOAN	9	7	78	9	100
	TOTAL	165	98	59	150	91
IDSMS	IDSMS	8	2	25	8	100
LIBS	LIBS	7	3	43	5	71
ALL	ALL	777	376	48	677	87

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. It is pretty

clear that building Transformational Experiences into departmental curriculum is important.

Table 23. Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2019–2023)

School	Year	N	Percent Participation by Activity									
			StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Any
AAL	2019	169	25	13	13	15	56	34	7	39	9	84
	2020	183	25	8	7	16	45	38	8	37	13	96
	2021	156	20	8	15	13	42	34	4	43	14	95
	2022	134	7	4	9	15	31	40	5	37	12	94
	2023	100	4	7	10	15	27	31	9	33	5	91
BUS	2019	199	23	5	6	38	60	32	3	14	5	76
	2020	188	19	9	9	37	54	40	2	19	8	87
	2021	152	15	7	3	26	45	39	3	18	9	84
	2022	140	5	4	5	30	36	35	3	14	8	81
	2023	136	7	3	7	24	34	32	1	15	8	76
HSE	2019	253	11	38	30	40	80	38	6	12	7	87
	2020	273	17	40	31	39	79	41	6	18	10	96
	2021	244	8	30	25	36	66	39	4	14	11	91
	2022	205	4	34	23	34	66	38	3	16	4	92
	2023	177	2	28	23	38	63	40	7	22	6	92
SAM	2019	232	15	8	38	28	68	37	5	17	5	83
	2020	241	11	8	32	25	60	41	5	21	12	93
	2021	236	8	6	42	22	60	37	5	19	6	91
	2022	204	1	3	38	25	56	41	4	15	9	91
	2023	184	4	5	33	21	48	38	5	17	8	86
SCS	2019	246	13	12	35	25	62	36	2	26	7	80
	2020	262	23	10	35	39	67	37	3	25	6	95
	2021	263	11	8	39	24	59	38	5	25	6	93
	2022	192	5	6	36	22	51	43	6	30	10	92
	2023	165	2	8	44	25	59	38	7	22	8	91
IDSM	2019	4	0	50	50	0	75	25	25	50	0	100
	2020	15	33	40	40	27	67	53	20	20	13	100
	2021	6	0	17	33	33	50	50	17	17	0	100
	2022	6	0	17	33	0	33	50	17	33	0	100
	2023	8	12	12	12	0	25	50	12	50	12	100
LIBS	2021	3	33	0	33	0	67	33	0	33	0	100
	2022	9	22	11	11	0	22	44	11	22	22	89
	2023	7	14	0	14	14	43	29	14	43	14	71
ALL	2019	1,103	17	16	26	30	66	36	5	21	7	82
	2020	1,162	19	17	25	32	63	40	5	23	10	94
	2021	1,060	12	12	28	25	56	38	4	23	9	91
	2022	890	4	11	24	25	50	40	4	22	8	90
	2023	777	4	11	25	25	48	37	6	21	7	87

Note: This table does not seem to have included “Course” as a source of transformative experience, but the calculation in our previous code does seem to have included “Course” in the “Any” category. We continue to do that here.

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 (although the 2023 vision statement still has the old language). Campus-wide, 48% of all students report having at least one of the "Big 4" which continues a downward trend from 2018 (70) and 87% report having some transformative experience.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2023 reading sessions and the stipends continued so there was an ample number of readers although quite a few people read for both of the sessions. With a smaller number of graduates each year it is quite likely we will need fewer numbers of readers for 2024. Technical issues have arisen in the past few years and it is definitely a challenge if something happens during a Friday reading session since staff hasn't been working on Fridays in the summer. Due to the entire school being hacked, the entire computer lab was no longer working. Thanks to the laptops in the science department we were still able to continue with the reading online.

Here are some of the things readers had to say about the sessions based on an anonymous survey given at the end of each session.

"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."

I was reminded of the importance of providing students with critical thinking and interdisciplinarity rubrics when teaching JINS

Exposure to rubrics

It's always great to meet people from across campus and hear what they are doing in their classes. It also helps when needing assistance with a student. For example, one of my advisees is finishing up a spring AGSC course, and I could talk directly with the professor about their agreement to finish her course. So much easier in person than over email!

Based on reading artifacts that were produced based on assignments I have developed new ideas for incorporating assignments in my classes. I am also going to make a more concerted effort in my classes to have students think about the best types of artifacts to submit with interdisciplinary and critical thinking prompts.

Collaboration with peers helps me chat with them about courses. Established collaborations over the summer.

Reading portfolios is always a beneficial experience in reminding me what qualities we're looking for in graduates, what types of assignments might work well, and giving me an opportunity to meet other faculty members from across campus.

I met faculty from different disciplines and was able to learn about techniques they use in class. Seeing and using the rubrics has made an impact about the type of assignments I assign to students - I am more aware of what a "good" paper should have for critical thinking and interdisciplinary components. I am more cognizant of my assignment directions. I enjoy the collaboration and interactions with faculty I do not usually see. It is beneficial and make connections that will last. Reading the student work makes me realize the importance of clear rubrics and instructions provided for each assignment. I realize the need to discuss with my advisees and students what types of works should go into the portfolio.

Reading portfolios helps me learn and reevaluate how I can offer the best opportunities for the students I work with throughout the year. Every student that is working in the pollinator garden at Truman learns and grows from this position. Many of the students use the garden as a job reference for future careers in biology, education, conservation, and agriculture. The garden provides an opportunity for student workers to be interdisciplinary with their interests. It has been used by artists, writers and photographers to promote the use of native plants in their work. The garden has been used by future teachers for lesson plans explaining how pollinators play a crucial part of a flowering plants reproduction.

Before I read the portfolios, I have no idea of what my students learned outside business classes. Now I know that they received rigid liberal arts trainings. In addition, the rubrics for critical thinking and interdisciplinary thinking are very informative. I am glad I went through to process. I would like to integrate them into my future curriculum designs.

A number of the criteria for interdisciplinary- and critical thinking will be incorporated into my JINS 380 course.

In addition to reading portfolios, this time provides an opportunity to connect with colleagues across campus. It is helpful to hear different perspectives and gain new ideas on assignments. Seeing the rubrics used for evaluating the submissions provides ideas for clearer rubrics in my classes. This is also helpful in guiding students in submitting their portfolios to see the other side.

Portfolio Reading is one of my favorite faculty development activities. I like to hear how faculty from all across campus view interdisciplinary and critical thinking writing assignments. We have so much more in common that we realize! In addition, it is fun to read about topics that are outside of my usual course subjects; I always learn new things at the reading sessions from the work of our bright students.

I use aspects of the critical thinking rubric in the rubric that I use for the writing assignment for one of my courses. While this course is generally too early in a student's career to be appropriate for submission for portfolio, but it gives the students some early exposure to the type of thinking and writing that we hope that they gain over their time at Truman. This session I also found a couple of assignments that utilize questions (that were included with the artifact) to help the student guide their own review of their writing

assignment. I feel this would be useful in helping the students to guide and then revise their own work. I am planning to include something similar in future assignments.

My class research assignments will incorporate a much greater emphasis on two elements of the Critical Thinking Framework...."supporting evidence and conclusion"

I always glean ideas to take into my classes, especially my JINS classes, from these sessions.

Through collaborating (meaningful professional development) I have a better understanding of other majors and how to better incorporate assignments into my courses. The rubrics are especially helpful when putting thoughtful design into assignments. This creates meaningful assignments that are not just busy work. I am able to make connections with other faculty that I normally would not reach out to due to not knowing their major. This is a very valuable experience.

Best session ever!!! I will be using prompts and rubrics from portfolio materials in my future classes.

Reading portfolios always gives me ideas to revise my syllabi and incorporate activities related to the goals assessed in these sessions.

Exposure to the rubrics and reading student work provided insight into the level of writing I can expect from my students and how to evaluate their work. I also enjoyed the opportunity to meet and work with colleagues from other departments.

I already use the rubrics when I teach upper level courses. I have redesigned assignments in the past following portfolio reading. I will watch for opportunities to do this again.

I plan to create an interdisciplinary related homework project. My class topics lend themselves to a substantial opportunity.

I have a lot of ideas about how to better guide students to write better work, achieve outcomes we are looking for in specific ways, etc. I also have some thoughts about interdisciplinary structures and the goals of the liberal arts in general, but those are big picture ideas and I'm not sure what will come of those ideas. Every time I read I have new ideas for assignments, and find ways I want to tweak essay assignments and rubrics

Reading portfolios offers a chance to see other assignments and gain ideas. Helpful to connect with colleagues. This is a big part of reading experience. Can't express how important the interaction aspect is. That's one of the main reasons I do this. University should provide snacks. It's ridiculous the university doesn't.

The need to promote the portfolio to students is more vital than ever, especially, to provide them with a working frame in concert with the rubrics. I benefited from re-acquainting myself with them and I hope to integrate them more in my courses. Interactions with colleagues were invaluable. During the semester, it's all too easy to lead a somewhat monastic academic existence. The sessions offer a chance to visit with colleagues we already know and to meet new colleagues. In sum, portfolio reading is an enriching professional- and personal experience, i.e., an opportunity to view Truman from many perspectives, discuss the current state of academia, and renew old acquaintances. The sessions work and are productive precisely due to the right balance between a structured, systematic approach and a casual, friendly working

atmosphere. Your organizing and "shepherding," Brian, provide a comfortable, harmonious working environment. Thank you and Kudos!

Feedback was given for week 1 - this week definitely reinforced the positive impact of the experience!

Sodexo needs to provide greater selection of tea!

Maybe improve on the mold in the classroom (university issue)

It is clear that students do not select the best artifacts to include with prompts. I will work with my department to try to improve that for our majors.

The rubrics are helpful in not only evaluating student work, but also my own work and the work of peers

The room was sometimes loud when I needed to focus.

Being paid to do this

I am grateful for the opportunity to offer my talents over several decades to provide Truman's Portfolio Process with my analytical skills to continue to improve this fine University. I would like to see "Letter to Truman" reinstated. Brian Kubin is a "perfect fit" to organize, direct and entertain faculty to achieve a fruitful and successful mission.

I love reading portfolios because it gives me a chance to meet and converse with colleagues across campus, gives me a much broader idea of student work (& issues) across campus--not just in my department--and gives me new ideas for teaching. I come away from these sessions not only with new ideas for assignments but also with refinements for classes and assignments, and a better idea of what I want students to accomplish in my classes by the end of the semester. It is also quite helpful to be able to compare the work I'm seeing in my own classes with student work across campus; it provides a healthy benchmark for both my work and my students'. Also--it's fun! I get to read interesting work across a wide variety disciplines, and I always learn new things. The atmosphere is collegial, friendly, and comfortable.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our 2023 office staff included 3-5 students. Each year their primary task is to verify that student submissions are complete and that linked documents are readable. They provide many classes with live presentations and some via ZOOM to help instruct students (and professors) on accessing and using the portfolio system (see more on this below). They also staff the graduation fair each semester to help students complete

their graduation checklists. During office hours they answer student questions via email or make face-to-face appointments for individuals. The student Office Manager organizes our worker's office hours, trains new workers, and performs many 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 the online vault 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.

My work on the portfolio this year has been supported in a tremendous way by former portfolio directors. This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members:), Anne Moody (SAM, since 2013), Rebecca Dierking (AAL, since 2014), Emily Costello (SAM, since 2014), and Dereck Daschke (SCS, since 2015) and Roberta Donahue (HES, since 2022). 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.

This is the first year (in a long time) that the portfolio report tables were sent to me soon enough that the report could be written in the summer before the next semester starts. The previous few years have been difficult with all the disruption of the pandemic and changes of personnel. Scott Thatcher has worked diligently over the last year to streamline and improve the report and the result is that I can get a clean copy of the tables in an extremely timely manner.

Portfolio Report Summary and Future Plans

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.
- **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?