

Portfolio Report 2024

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2023-2024 Academic Year

Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director - Narrative

Scott Thatcher - Tables

10-22-2024

2024 Portfolio Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
· General Information about Portfolio Assessment	2
· Critical Thinking and Writing	5
· Interdisciplinary Thinking	14
· Self Discovery	21
· Most Personally Satisfying Experience	29
· Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	37
· Reader Information and Feedback	47
· Portfolio Collection Matters	50
· Future Plans and 2024 Summary	51

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 fiscal year 2023-2024, 674 students graduated, and 671 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 currently 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 2023-2024 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. An instrument titled 5) 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 participants 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 2020–2024

School	Major	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Arts and Letters	ART	31	22	17	13	21
	CML	19	22	14	14	9
	CRWT	19	18	20	14	14
	ENG	71	46	47	33	32
	LING	14	15	13	7	5
	MUBU					1
	MUSI	20	21	19	15	16
	THEA	10	12	4	4	6
	TOTAL	184	156	134	100	104
Business	ACCT	69	60	53	34	34
	BSAD	119	92	87	102	67
	TOTAL	188	152	140	136	101
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3				
	CMD5	42	40	32	25	23
	ES	105	90	77	65	55
	HLTH	77	59	46	32	28
	NU	46	55	50	55	50
	TOTAL	273	244	205	177	156
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	22	20	23	16	19
	BCMB	1	8	21	26	12
	BIOL	100	93	76	70	46
	CHEM	18	21	13	7	7
	CS	48	56	37	29	27
	MATH	28	19	19	16	23
	PHYS	10	7	6	10	5
	STTS	14	12	9	10	5
	TOTAL	241	236	204	184	144
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	47	43	31	23	11
	ECON	16	15	8	11	11
	HIST	29	33	20	15	22
	JUST	31	32	25	12	14
	PHRE	3	9	5	3	1
	POL	30	31	20	21	18
	PSYC	90	81	64	71	57
	SIA					1
	SOAN	17	19	19	9	14
	TOTAL	263	263	192	165	149
IDSM	IDSM	15	6	6	8	10
LIBS	LIBS		3	9	7	7
ALL	ALL	1,164	1,060	890	777	671

Note: The “CJST” major in 2023/24 has been grouped with “JUST” from previous years. Two students were listed as having the “INDS” major, which is an older previous version of the “IDSM” Interdisciplinary major code. Blank spaces indicate either a discontinued major or a new major.

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 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.

- 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.

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

Table 2. Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by First Major 2024

School	Major	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
Arts and Letters	ART	17	2.88	2.68	2.79	2.41	10.94	59	3.00
	CML	7	2.57	2.43	2.57	2.29	9.71	57	2.57
	CRWT	13	2.50	2.46	2.77	2.23	10.31	46	2.65
	ENG	26	2.79	2.75	2.79	2.48	10.77	65	2.90
	LING	4	3.25	3.38	3.38	2.50	11.50	75	3.25
	MUBU	1	2.00	2.50	3.00	2.50	10.00	0	3.00
	MUSI	13	2.73	2.69	2.65	2.31	10.31	54	2.88
	THEA	5	3.00	2.80	2.80	2.50	11.00	40	3.20
	TOTAL	86	2.76	2.69	2.78	2.39	10.62	57	2.89
Business	ACCT	30	2.97	2.78	2.83	2.43	10.60	57	2.87
	BSAD	64	2.63	2.45	2.53	2.22	9.56	39	2.77
	TOTAL	94	2.74	2.56	2.63	2.29	9.89	45	2.80
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	2.48	2.46	2.41	2.22	9.52	35	2.59
	ES	52	2.51	2.44	2.41	2.08	9.44	38	2.50
	HLTH	26	3.38	3.15	2.94	1.94	11.50	69	3.19
	NU	47	2.91	2.95	2.83	2.36	10.85	57	3.05
	TOTAL	148	2.79	2.73	2.64	2.17	10.26	49	2.81
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	17	2.71	2.38	2.59	2.35	10.06	35	2.76
	BCMB	10	2.85	2.60	2.90	2.80	11.40	60	2.80
	BIOL	40	2.95	2.83	2.88	2.42	11.00	55	2.91
	CHEM	5	2.40	2.40	2.50	2.00	9.80	20	2.70
	CS	25	2.98	2.84	2.60	2.44	10.80	56	2.90
	MATH	22	2.64	2.55	2.55	2.02	9.86	32	2.70
	PHYS	5	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.40	8.60	20	2.80
	STTS	5	2.30	2.30	2.80	2.40	9.20	20	3.00
	TOTAL	129	2.79	2.67	2.70	2.36	10.47	45	2.84
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	10	2.75	2.80	2.65	2.05	9.90	30	2.80
	ECON	9	3.00	3.00	3.17	2.83	12.67	100	3.06
	HIST	20	2.95	3.15	3.28	2.70	12.15	80	3.08
	JUST	12	2.54	2.54	2.71	2.42	10.08	33	2.62
	PHRE	1	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	9.00	0	3.00
	POL	18	3.06	3.03	2.69	2.33	10.94	50	2.83
	PSYC	53	2.63	2.56	2.58	2.17	9.83	45	2.84
	SIA	1	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	15.00	100	3.00
	SOAN	13	2.88	3.12	2.92	2.58	11.54	69	3.00
	TOTAL	137	2.79	2.81	2.79	2.38	10.72	55	2.88
IDSM	IDSM	10	3.05	2.50	2.70	2.65	10.70	40	3.05
LIBS	LIBS	5	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.40	10.20	40	2.40
ALL	ALL	609	2.78	2.70	2.71	2.31	10.41	50	2.84

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 10.41 and all schools have an average Sum4 of 10 or above. On the departmental level, 12 departments showed a Sum4 average of less than 10 although 7 were 9.5 or higher. The lowest Sum4 was 8.6 (Phys). The factors that lead to some of the lower scores are not clear but some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. Many departments scored at a higher end of the range (>11), although some of the high scores are due to only a few papers being read (SIA). Lower scores might be the result of the recent pandemic, or it is possible that the “lower enrollment” and the move away from “highly selective” status is at play. Of the 4 categories that are used to determine the Sum4, “Conclusions” has the lowest total score (2.31)

A view of 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, 50% of 2024 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is higher than last year but still below previous years. The School of Business and the School of Math and Sciences each have 45% which is lower than the other schools. The scores of this prompt can be easily affected by the attitude of the faculty towards making sure that students are submitting appropriate materials. I have met with both Business and Math and Sciences faculty in the past who feel that there is less of a focus on writing a research paper within their major however our curriculum can be designed to make sure at least one paper like this is written by each student, even if it is in courses outside the major. Some of the students in these majors still submit only a lab report or pages of computer code. While these types of assignments are certainly evidence of a type of critical thinking, they do not score well with this prompt.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-Wide Scores 2020–2024

CTW: University-Wide Scores			
Year	N	Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2020	573	11.45	63
2021	984	10.99	56
2022	850	10.66	52
2023	632	10.44	48
2024	609	10.41	50

Table 3 shows that the Sum4 and 10+ percentages are slightly lower than the previous four years.

Table 4. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2024 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
ACCT	16	3.25	2.97	3.09	2.56	11.69	88	3.03
AGSC	14	2.86	2.39	2.75	2.43	10.21	43	2.82
ART	12	2.67	2.67	2.75	2.50	10.50	58	3.00
BIOL	22	3.23	3.02	3.23	2.66	12.27	77	3.05
BSAD	34	2.84	2.66	2.69	2.35	10.18	38	2.79
CHEM	7	2.86	2.29	2.29	2.21	10.00	43	2.64
CLAS	4	2.88	2.88	3.12	1.88	10.50	50	2.88
CMDS	18	2.33	2.39	2.22	2.14	9.00	28	2.58
COMM	8	2.62	2.50	2.38	2.00	9.62	25	2.75
CS	20	2.83	2.60	2.38	2.17	9.95	35	2.85
DS	1	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	14.00	100	3.00
ECON	12	2.92	2.83	2.83	2.62	11.17	75	3.04
ED	22	2.66	2.77	2.84	2.23	10.68	77	2.66
ENG	54	2.52	2.42	2.52	2.19	9.69	43	2.70
ENVS	1	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	9.00	0	3.00
ES	16	2.56	2.38	2.31	1.91	8.88	31	2.50
FREN	1	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	14.00	100	3.00
HIST	31	2.68	2.85	3.05	2.56	11.00	61	2.98
HLTH	23	3.39	3.17	2.98	1.93	11.57	70	3.22
IDSM	2	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	10.50	50	2.50
INDV	1	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	0	3.00
ITAL	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	12.00	100	3.00
JINS	103	2.63	2.63	2.62	2.29	10.16	45	2.76
JUST	11	3.00	2.73	2.77	2.59	11.36	64	2.73
LING	8	2.88	2.88	2.94	2.69	10.88	50	3.12
MATH	2	3.00	3.00	2.75	2.25	10.50	50	2.75
MS	3	2.17	2.33	2.50	2.17	8.67	33	2.33
MUSI	9	2.50	2.67	2.94	2.33	10.22	44	2.89
NU	29	3.17	3.19	2.95	2.43	11.38	66	3.21
PHRE	14	2.71	2.50	2.50	2.50	9.79	29	2.79
PHYS	1	2.50	2.00	2.00	1.50	9.00	0	3.00
POL	23	2.80	2.89	2.63	2.13	10.22	39	2.78
PSYC	22	2.91	2.50	2.70	2.34	10.23	50	2.86
SED	2	2.50	2.25	1.75	2.25	9.00	0	2.50
SOAN	13	3.00	3.12	3.04	2.54	11.92	62	3.08
SPAN	2	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	13.00	100	3.00
SSTE	1	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.50	11.00	100	2.50
STAT	4	2.62	2.25	2.75	2.12	8.75	25	2.88
THEA	2	2.50	2.00	3.00	2.00	9.50	50	2.50
TRU	19	2.45	2.42	2.39	2.03	9.16	21	2.55
Missing	21	2.81	2.83	2.76	2.50	10.81	52	3.02

Table 4 shows the average scores for the submissions from each course prefix. As usual, JINS (103) and ENG (54) courses led to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%).

Table 5. CTW 2024 Inter-Rater Reliability

Abs. Diff.	Count	Percent
11	1	0
9	1	0
7	7	2
6	15	4
5	17	5
4	31	9
3	54	16
2	68	20
1	100	30
0	40	12
Total	334	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 2024, 609 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 334 were scored by two readers.

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. Table 6 organizes the mean scores and the percentage of students scoring 2 or more by department. Table 7 lists scores by course prefix for the submissions that were derived from coursework. Table 8 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 2020–2024

School	Major	N 2024	Mean					2+ (%)				
			2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Arts and Letters	ART	17	2.04	1.93	1.74	1.64	2.21	74	55	59	27	71
	CML	7	2.29	2.61	2.21	2.17	1.29	76	84	79	67	43
	CRWT	13	1.89	2.21	1.85	1.73	1.77	72	71	60	55	54
	ENG	25	2.32	2.26	2.06	1.54	1.96	81	73	71	52	64
	LING	4	2.08	2.27	2.33	2.60	2.62	62	85	67	80	100
	MUBU	1					3.50					100
	MUSI	13	2.24	2.37	2.47	2.38	2.15	59	79	88	77	85
	THEA	5	2.00	2.45	1.75	2.00	2.20	57	70	50	100	80
	TOTAL	85	2.18	2.28	2.07	1.89	2.02	73	73	70	58	68
Business	ACCT	30	2.18	1.91	2.02	2.02	1.82	79	66	65	75	67
	BSAD	65	2.19	2.22	1.75	1.56	1.81	74	77	54	41	52
	TOTAL	95	2.19	2.09	1.85	1.68	1.81	75	72	58	50	57
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT		1.67					67				
	CMDS	23	2.06	2.28	2.15	1.90	1.59	71	69	71	57	48
	ES	51	2.16	2.05	2.10	1.66	1.74	74	67	66	50	55
	HLTH	26	2.39	2.30	2.00	2.10	2.29	78	75	70	67	77
	NU	48	2.40	2.42	1.89	1.96	2.02	81	75	62	72	67
	TOTAL	148	2.25	2.24	2.04	1.88	1.90	76	71	66	62	61
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	17	2.60	2.29	2.09	1.30	1.82	80	82	74	40	53
	BCMB	10	2.00	3.00	1.90	1.95	2.40	100	86	67	57	80
	BIOL	41	2.41	2.22	2.11	1.92	2.00	85	77	71	66	68
	CHEM	5	2.38	2.15	1.96	2.70	1.50	77	70	62	80	20
	CS	26	2.42	2.26	2.01	2.07	2.04	75	77	66	77	62
	MATH	22	1.77	1.92	2.05	1.58	1.66	64	50	74	58	50
	PHYS	5	2.00	2.42	1.67	1.11	2.10	62	83	33	33	80
	STTS	5	2.31	2.15	1.78	2.39	2.30	69	90	67	89	80
	TOTAL	131	2.33	2.23	2.03	1.88	1.95	78	76	68	64	62
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	10	2.22	2.44	1.88	1.73	2.45	78	86	54	45	70
	ECON	10	2.45	2.46	2.44	1.31	2.25	82	86	62	38	90
	HIST	21	2.13	2.53	2.15	2.67	2.40	83	81	70	83	86
	JUST	12	1.98	1.92	1.98	2.00	2.38	76	71	60	70	58
	PHRE		2.50	2.43	1.60	2.00		100	71	60	67	
	POL	18	3.00	2.53	2.72	2.50	2.39	96	90	83	89	72
	PSYC	54	2.00	2.07	1.86	1.77	2.09	66	70	53	57	74
	SIA	1					3.50					100
	SOAN	13	2.50	2.33	2.39	2.06	2.88	93	83	79	62	100
	TOTAL	139	2.24	2.28	2.07	1.95	2.32	78	78	62	62	78
IDSMS	IDSMS	10	2.36	2.42	2.20	1.71	2.15	79	83	80	57	90
LIBS	LIBS	5		1.50	2.25	1.00	1.70		67	75	0	40
ALL	ALL	613	2.24	2.23	2.02	1.86	2.01	76	74	65	59	66

University-wide, the 2024 average score for the Interdisciplinary Thinking prompt is 2.01 which is slightly higher than last year, but below the 5-year average of 2.07. Recent downward trends are likely linked to the disruption in education caused by the pandemic. Therefore, It might be better to consider scores going back a bit further to

see the 10 year trend: (2+%) 2015-70%, 2016-72%, 2017-72%, 2018-69%, 2019-55%, 2020-79%, 2021-74%, 2022-65%, 2023-59%, 2024-66%, with a ten year average of 68.1%. Examination by department shows substantially more variability. Departments themselves might be better able to address why results are so variable and then make changes that could improve scores. One issue also might be that departments are not ultimately responsible for making sure that JINS courses are evaluated or whether students are being encouraged to submit work from JINS courses as opposed to artifacts created in other 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. Structurally, the former dean in charge of interdisciplinary activities retired and the university was reorganized. Consequently, there is now a director of interdisciplinary studies. A meeting will be scheduled soon to discuss the above-mentioned issue. The new director hopefully will have some insights in to how things might improve.

Table 7. Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2024 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Mean	2+(%)
JINS	415	2.15	72
TRU	19	1.29	37
None Given	19	2.05	63
ENG	19	1.63	53
PHRE	15	1.13	27
HIST	13	2.12	69
SOAN	10	2.25	80
NU	10	2.10	70
BSAD	10	1.75	50
IDSM	7	2.29	100
ED	7	1.57	29
CMDS	7	1.43	43
JUST	6	2.17	50
CS	6	2.00	50
COMM	6	1.25	33
< 5	44	1.66	50

As intended, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2024 (415). The submissions from JINS courses scored well with our rubric (72% at 2+) but the overall percentage is lower than the average score for JINS for the last 5 years (2020-83%, 2021-82%, 2022-74%, 2023-66%, 2024-72%, 5 year average-75%) but higher than last year. As mentioned above, this average could be a bit elevated due to the disruption of the pandemic from 2020-2021 were disrupted by the pandemic. The preponderance of JINS submissions is completely logical, since the JINS courses were created 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 ensure that all JINS instructors are aware of the portfolio prompt and are including the rubric in the course so that students produce at least one artifact with the rubric in mind.

Table 8. IDS 2024 Inter-Rater Reliability

2024 Abs Diff	N	%
3	9	2
2	55	14
1	199	50
0	135	34
Total	398	100

In 2024, 613 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 398 were scored by two readers. The data indicate that training provided to portfolio readers is sufficient to producing reliable results as nearly 85% of the artifacts that were double read produced scores that were within the value of one score.”

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 given 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 students may select several of the reasons 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 <input type="radio"/> LSP <input type="radio"/> Major <input type="radio"/> Capstone <input type="radio"/> Minor <input type="radio"/> Elective	Other Academic <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"/>	Student Organization <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 <input type="radio"/> Varsity Athletics <input type="radio"/> Club Sports Intramurals <input type="radio"/> Other Athletics	Employment <input type="radio"/> Campus Employment <input type="radio"/> Volunteer Work <input type="radio"/> Off-Campus Job	
Performance/Creative Activity <input type="radio"/> Public Performance/Recital <input type="radio"/> Other Creative Effort	Other <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 2020–2024

Category	Reason	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	7	16	22	26	19
	New Perspective on Self	16	24	21	30	27
	Personal Growth	46	74	63	60	63
	Responsibility	10	13	13	16	13
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	2	3	4	3	3
Academic/Scholarship	Personal Best	5	5	4	9	9
	Especially Challenging	15	17	14	15	13
	Intellectual Risk	6	4	3	3	5
	Vocational Development	13	18	19	20	18
	Worked as Professional	9	8	8	10	11
Relationships	Service to Others	5	8	6	7	8
	Collaboration w/ Peers	16	16	18	17	17
	Collaboration w/ Professional	7	9	11	12	12
	Mentoring Internship	4	7	6	6	7

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 (2020-46%, 2021-74%, 2022-63%, 2023-60%, 2024-63%). *New Perspective on Self* was the next most identified category (27%)

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, *Vocational Development* (2020-13%, 2021-18%, 2022-19%, 2023-20%, 2024-18%) had the highest score. Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration w/ Peers* (2019-21%, 2020-16%, 2021-16%, 2022-18%, 2023-17%, 2024-17%).

Variation by major on all these rationales for 2024 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.

Table 10. Self-Discovery: 2024 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	21	4	19	5	24	16	76	2	10	1	5
	CML	8	1	12	1	12	4	50	1	12	0	0
	CRWT	14	2	14	6	43	9	64	0	0	2	14
	ENG	32	6	19	4	12	21	66	3	9	0	0
	LING	4	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0
	MUBU	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	16	1	6	2	12	8	50	1	6	1	6
	THEA	6	1	17	1	17	4	67	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	102	16	16	20	20	65	64	7	7	4	4
Business	ACCT	34	7	21	13	38	19	56	4	12	2	6
	BSAD	67	16	24	18	27	43	64	15	22	4	6
	TOTAL	101	23	23	31	31	62	61	19	19	6	6
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	5	22	3	13	17	74	2	9	1	4
	ES	54	10	19	16	30	35	65	6	11	0	0
	HLTH	28	5	18	4	14	16	57	10	36	3	11
	NU	50	12	24	18	36	36	72	5	10	2	4
	TOTAL	155	32	21	41	26	104	67	23	15	6	4
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	2	11	3	16	12	63	2	11	0	0
	BCMB	12	1	8	2	17	7	58	1	8	0	0
	BIOL	45	8	18	12	27	27	60	7	16	0	0
	CHEM	6	0	0	2	33	2	33	0	0	0	0
	CS	27	6	22	7	26	19	70	3	11	1	4
	MATH	23	4	17	10	43	18	78	3	13	0	0
	PHYS	5	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	0	0
	STTS	5	1	20	1	20	4	80	1	20	0	0
	TOTAL	142	22	15	37	26	91	64	18	13	1	1
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	10	1	10	3	30	8	80	0	0	1	10
	ECON	11	3	27	3	27	6	55	0	0	0	0
	HIST	22	2	9	6	27	9	41	3	14	0	0
	JUST	14	3	21	4	29	10	71	3	21	0	0
	PHRE	1	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	POL	18	2	11	6	33	11	61	4	22	2	11
	PSYC	56	13	23	15	27	30	54	4	7	2	4
	SIA	1	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	0	0
	SOAN	14	3	21	4	29	10	71	4	29	0	0
	TOTAL	147	28	19	42	29	86	59	19	13	5	3
IDSMD	IDSMD	10	3	30	3	30	4	40	0	0	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	7	2	29	2	29	4	57	1	14	0	0
ALL	ALL	664	126	19	176	27	416	63	87	13	22	3

Table 11. Self-Discovery: 2024 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	21	2	10	5	24	0	0	3	14	1	5
	CML	8	0	0	1	12	0	0	2	25	2	25
	CRWT	14	3	21	2	14	1	7	2	14	1	7
	ENG	32	4	12	4	12	3	9	5	16	1	3
	LING	4	0	0	1	25	0	0	2	50	1	25
	MUBU	1	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	16	4	25	0	0	0	0	3	19	2	12
	THEA	6	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	17	1	17
	TOTAL	102	14	14	13	13	5	5	18	18	9	9
Business	ACCT	34	3	9	1	3	2	6	4	12	1	3
	BSAD	67	4	6	8	12	1	1	10	15	6	9
	TOTAL	101	7	7	9	9	3	3	14	14	7	7
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	3	13	5	22	4	17	6	26	6	26
	ES	54	2	4	3	6	0	0	12	22	4	7
	HLTH	28	4	14	5	18	1	4	6	21	5	18
	NU	50	8	16	8	16	2	4	13	26	9	18
	TOTAL	155	17	11	21	14	7	5	37	24	24	15
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	0	0	1	5	0	0	3	16	3	16
	BCMB	12	0	0	2	17	1	8	6	50	3	25
	BIOL	45	2	4	8	18	3	7	10	22	8	18
	CHEM	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CS	27	4	15	4	15	2	7	4	15	4	15
	MATH	23	0	0	5	22	2	9	1	4	0	0
	PHYS	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	0	0
	STTS	5	1	20	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	20
	TOTAL	142	7	5	21	15	8	6	26	18	19	13
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	10	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	10
	ECON	11	3	27	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0
	HIST	22	3	14	1	5	2	9	3	14	2	9
	JUST	14	0	0	2	14	1	7	3	21	3	21
	PHRE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	18	3	17	3	17	1	6	5	28	1	6
	PSYC	56	1	2	10	18	3	5	7	12	3	5
	SIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SOAN	14	2	14	1	7	0	0	2	14	0	0
	TOTAL	147	13	9	17	12	8	5	21	14	10	7
IDS	IDS	10	0	0	2	20	0	0	5	50	1	10
LIBS	LIBS	7	2	29	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	ALL	664	60	9	84	13	31	5	121	18	70	11

Table 12. Self-Discovery: 2024 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	21	0	0	2	10	4	19	2	10
	CML	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	1	12
	CRWT	14	1	7	3	21	1	7	1	7
	ENG	32	0	0	3	9	1	3	2	6
	LING	4	0	0	0	0	1	25	1	25
	MUBU	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	16	2	12	2	12	3	19	0	0
	THEA	6	0	0	1	17	3	50	0	0
	TOTAL	102	3	3	11	11	14	14	7	7
Business	ACCT	34	3	9	7	21	5	15	1	3
	BSAD	67	7	10	14	21	9	13	5	7
	TOTAL	101	10	10	21	21	14	14	6	6
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	2	9	2	9	2	9	2	9
	ES	54	4	7	8	15	3	6	2	4
	HLTH	28	4	14	6	21	4	14	2	7
	NU	50	5	10	13	26	8	16	4	8
	TOTAL	155	15	10	29	19	17	11	10	6
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	1	5	2	11	4	21	3	16
	BCMB	12	0	0	1	8	1	8	2	17
	BIOL	45	4	9	8	18	2	4	2	4
	CHEM	6	1	17	2	33	1	17	0	0
	CS	27	1	4	5	19	1	4	1	4
	MATH	23	3	13	9	39	4	17	4	17
	PHYS	5	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20
	STTS	5	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	142	10	7	30	21	15	11	13	9
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	10	0	0	3	30	4	40	3	30
	ECON	11	0	0	3	27	4	36	0	0
	HIST	22	3	14	2	9	3	14	1	5
	JUST	14	3	21	3	21	0	0	1	7
	PHRE	1	1	100	1	100	0	0	0	0
	POL	18	2	11	2	11	2	11	2	11
	PSYC	56	4	7	8	14	5	9	3	5
	SIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SOAN	14	1	7	1	7	2	14	2	14
	TOTAL	147	14	10	23	16	20	14	12	8
IDS	IDS	10	0	0	1	10	1	10	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0
ALL	ALL	664	52	8	116	17	81	12	48	7

Table 13. Self-Discovery: Context of the Experience 2022–2024

SELF Category	SELF Context	2022 N	2022%	2023 N	2023%	2024 N	2024%
Coursework	LSP/Dialogues	54	6	37	5	55	8
	Major	209	25	186	24	169	25
	Capstone	8	1	1	0	0	0
	Minor	35	4	14	2	23	3
	Elective	32	4	33	4	26	4
	All	338	38	271	35	273	41
Other Academic	Research	17	2	14	2	13	2
	Internship	24	3	12	2	19	3
	Study Abroad	11	1	7	1	9	1
	Resume/Prof. Statement	6	1	5	1	3	0
	Service Learning	4	0	4	1	1	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	6	1	9	1	9	1
	Other Academic	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All	68	8	51	7	54	8
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	3	0	1	0	6	1
	Service Organization	19	2	12	2	7	1
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	79	9	60	8	45	7
	Professional/Major	15	2	11	1	12	2
	Religious Organization	24	3	20	3	21	3
	Honor Society	2	0	1	0	2	0
	Campus Media	6	1	2	0	1	0
	Other Organization	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All	148	17	107	14	94	14
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	21	2	26	3	37	6
	Club Sports/Intramurals	6	1	5	1	7	1
	Other Athletics	4	0	3	0	4	1
	All	31	3	34	4	48	7
Employment	Campus Job	22	3	16	2	18	3
	Volunteer	4	0	4	1	2	0
	Off-Campus Job	6	1	8	1	7	1
	All	32	4	28	4	27	4
Perform/ Creative Activity	Public Performance/Recital	3	0	3	0	6	1
	Other Creative Activity	7	1	3	0	5	1
	All	10	1	6	1	11	2
Other	Relationships/Friendships	107	13	96	12	71	11
	Resident Life	10	1	9	1	6	1
	ROTC	6	1	6	1	3	0
	Other Misc.	92	11	29	4	31	5
	All	215	24	140	18	111	17
NA	All	48	5	140	18	53	8
All	All	890	100	777	100	671	100

Note: This table was generated from the column “Self-Discovery Context Reviewer 1”. The column for Reviewer 2 was empty.

Table 13 shows the context for the Self Discovery submissions since 2022. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission, and the total

percentage is reflected here. As usual, the majority (41%-2024) of the submissions are from coursework, and within that category (25%-2024) course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is clearly very gratifying. This year "Other" is the next highest area (17%-2024) and it is important to note that Relationships/Friendships was the highest of those (11%-2024). All others fall under 10%. Student Organizations (14%-2024) with Social Fraternities/Sororities the highest in this group (7%-2024)

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 an artifact or 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 pertaining to 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 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 that 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"/>
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 2020–2024

Reason	Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Personal Growth	32	21	21	22	20
Enjoyable	33	22	21	18	20
Challenging	20	11	13	12	12
Professional	15	8	8	10	11
Personal Goals	11	10	8	10	12
Personal Best	3	7	10	10	5
Lots of Time	14	9	9	5	8
Collaborative	13	8	6	6	6
Problem Solving	3	3	3	3	3
Other	0	2	1	2	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. “Enjoyable” (20%-2024) was tied with “Personal Growth” (20%-2024) for student satisfaction. “Challenging” and “Personal Goals” (12%) were tied for the next place. 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 2024. It is important to note that in the self-discovery prompt, the top **Academic/Scholarship** category was *collaboration w/others* (see table 9). Even though 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 2024: 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	21	0	0	5	24	9	43	4	19	4	19
	CML	8	1	12	1	12	0	0	2	25	1	12
	CRWT	13	2	15	2	15	6	46	1	8	3	23
	ENG	32	5	16	4	12	15	47	7	22	4	12
	LING	4	1	25	1	25	3	75	3	75	0	0
	MUBU	1	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	16	2	12	3	19	7	44	6	38	6	38
	THEA	6	0	0	1	17	1	17	0	0	1	17
	TOTAL	101	11	11	17	17	42	42	23	23	19	19
Business	ACCT	34	2	6	8	24	13	38	9	26	8	24
	BSAD	67	8	12	19	28	26	39	17	25	11	16
	TOTAL	101	10	10	27	27	39	39	26	26	19	19
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	2	9	10	43	8	35	9	39	12	52
	ES	54	7	13	14	26	15	28	14	26	8	15
	HLTH	28	1	4	11	39	10	36	5	18	4	14
	NU	50	2	4	9	18	19	38	7	14	19	38
	TOTAL	155	12	8	44	28	52	34	35	23	43	28
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	1	5	4	21	9	47	6	32	4	21
	BCMB	12	1	8	2	17	3	25	2	17	3	25
	BIOL	45	5	11	6	13	12	27	7	16	4	9
	CHEM	6	2	33	1	17	2	33	2	33	1	17
	CS	27	1	4	5	19	10	37	8	30	5	19
	MATH	23	1	4	2	9	9	39	1	4	4	17
	PHYS	5	3	60	3	60	2	40	2	40	3	60
	STTS	5	0	0	0	0	3	60	1	20	2	40
	TOTAL	142	14	10	23	16	50	35	29	20	26	18
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	11	0	0	1	9	5	45	1	9	0	0
	ECON	11	2	18	3	27	2	18	3	27	1	9
	HIST	22	1	5	5	23	9	41	2	9	4	18
	JUST	14	1	7	3	21	6	43	3	21	6	43
	PHRE	1	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0	0	0
	POL	18	4	22	3	17	5	28	8	44	3	17
	PSYC	56	3	5	11	20	17	30	9	16	3	5
	SIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
	SOAN	14	0	0	3	21	6	43	4	29	1	7
	TOTAL	148	11	7	30	20	51	34	31	21	18	12
IDS	IDS	10	2	20	1	10	4	40	2	20	3	30
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	0	1	14	3	43	2	29	0	0
ALL	ALL	664	60	9	143	22	241	36	148	22	128	19

Table 15 shows the 2024 data broken down by major and each reason is indicated as a raw number of students from within that major and as a percentage of that major's total students. The reasons chosen within a particular major vary greatly, so it would be worthwhile for each department to see what motivates their own students.

Table 15. Most Personally Satisfying 2024: Scores Sorted by First Major (cont.)

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	21	0	0	6	29	0	0	1	5	1	5
	CML	8	1	12	5	62	0	0	0	0	1	12
	CRWT	13	1	8	4	31	0	0	1	8	1	8
	ENG	32	1	3	15	47	0	0	0	0	6	19
	LING	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25
	MUBU	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	16	3	19	5	31	0	0	0	0	5	31
	THEA	6	1	17	3	50	0	0	0	0	1	17
	TOTAL	101	7	7	39	39	0	0	2	2	16	16
Business	ACCT	34	5	15	12	35	0	0	2	6	6	18
	BSAD	67	11	16	26	39	0	0	4	6	8	12
	TOTAL	101	16	16	38	38	0	0	6	6	14	14
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	3	13	8	35	0	0	0	0	9	39
	ES	54	3	6	20	37	0	0	3	6	8	15
	HLTH	28	2	7	7	25	0	0	4	14	5	18
	NU	50	6	12	11	22	1	2	2	4	6	12
	TOTAL	155	14	9	46	30	1	1	9	6	28	18
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	3	16	7	37	0	0	0	0	2	11
	BCMB	12	1	8	7	58	0	0	0	0	2	17
	BIOL	45	2	4	23	51	0	0	2	4	8	18
	CHEM	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0
	CS	27	7	26	12	44	0	0	2	7	4	15
	MATH	23	3	13	7	30	0	0	0	0	4	17
	PHYS	5	1	20	1	20	0	0	3	60	0	0
	STTS	5	0	0	1	20	0	0	1	20	1	20
	TOTAL	142	17	12	58	41	0	0	9	6	21	15
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	11	1	9	3	27	0	0	1	9	0	0
	ECON	11	4	36	5	45	0	0	0	0	4	36
	HIST	22	1	5	10	45	0	0	3	14	2	9
	JUST	14	1	7	7	50	0	0	0	0	1	7
	PHRE	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	18	1	6	5	28	0	0	1	6	6	33
	PSYC	56	4	7	18	32	1	2	6	11	7	12
	SIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SOAN	14	0	0	5	36	0	0	1	7	1	7
	TOTAL	148	13	9	53	36	1	1	12	8	21	14
IDSM	IDSM	10	2	20	4	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	7	1	14	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	ALL	664	70	11	239	36	2	0	38	6	100	15

Table 16. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2022–2024

SELF Category	SELF Context	2022 N	2022%	2023 N	2023%	2024 N	2024%
Coursework	LSP/Dialogues	116	14	62	8	51	8
	Major	302	36	232	30	205	31
	Capstone	28	3	17	2	10	1
	Minor	58	7	35	5	43	6
	Elective	60	7	59	8	44	7
	All	564	63	405	52	353	53
Other Academic	Research	25	3	16	2	15	2
	Internship	18	2	14	2	11	2
	Study Abroad	6	1	3	0	7	1
	Resume/Prof. Statement	2	0	7	1	4	1
	Service Learning	3	0	1	0	1	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	2	0	2	0	1	0
	Other Academic	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All	56	6	43	6	39	6
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	4	0	0	0	3	0
	Service Organization	15	2	9	1	5	1
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	45	5	38	5	27	4
	Professional/Major	9	1	11	1	6	1
	Religious Organization	10	1	6	1	5	1
	Honor Society	2	0	1	0	1	0
	Campus Media	2	0	3	0	0	0
	Other Organization	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All	87	10	68	9	47	7
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	20	2	29	4	11	2
	Club Sports/Intramurals	10	1	9	1	3	0
	Other Athletics	3	0	1	0	7	1
	All	33	4	39	5	21	3
Employment	Campus Job	21	2	15	2	6	1
	Volunteer	3	0	9	1	1	0
	Off-Campus Job	0	0	2	0	1	0
	All	24	3	26	3	8	1
Performance/ Creative Activity	Public Performance/Recital	13	2	9	1	9	1
	Other Creative Activity	9	1	6	1	9	1
	All	22	2	15	2	18	3
Other	Relationships/Friendships	8	1	16	2	12	2
	Resident Life	3	0	1	0	1	0
	ROTC	2	0	1	0	3	0
	Other Misc.	46	5	23	3	18	3
	All	59	7	41	5	34	5
NA	All	45	5	140	18	151	23
All	All	890	100	777	100	671	100

Note: This table was generated from the column “Most Personally Satisfying Context Reviewer 1”. The Reviewer 2 column was empty.

Table 16 shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions since 2022. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission with the total percentage reflected here. Just over half (53%-2024) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (31%2024) 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. 2020–2024 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.7	60	3.6	63	3.5	57	3.5	54	3.7	57
BUS	3.2	38	3.1	33	3.2	42	3.1	40	3.2	41
HSE	3.6	56	3.5	54	3.4	51	3.6	53	3.4	51
SAM	3.3	46	3.5	56	3.5	53	3.5	50	3.3	43
SCS	3.5	53	3.6	57	3.6	58	3.6	58	3.5	58
IDSM	3.5	53	3.5	50	3.8	67	3.6	38	3.8	70
LIBS			2.7	0	3.5	44	2.9	14	3.4	57
ALL	3.5	51	3.5	53	3.5	53	3.5	51	3.4	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 if most students do have data for this question but might require adjustments in a year where we don’t have full data.

From 2020 to 2024 about half of students answered “Totally” (5) or “Very” (4) Transformative to this question. The average for scores of 4 or 5 over the last 5 years continues to be around 50%.

Table 18. 2024 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	21	0	0	9	8	2	2	3.63	48
	CML	9	0	1	3	2	2	1	3.62	44
	CRWT	14	0	0	4	7	1	2	3.75	57
	ENG	32	1	1	13	12	5	0	3.59	53
	LING	5	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.75	60
	MUBU	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	0
	MUSI	16	0	0	4	10	2	0	3.88	75
	THEA	6	0	1	0	4	1	0	3.83	83
	TOTAL	104	1	3	35	46	13	6	3.68	57
Business	ACCT	34	1	10	9	12	2	0	3.12	41
	BSAD	67	2	14	24	18	9	0	3.27	40
	TOTAL	101	3	24	33	30	11	0	3.22	41
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	0	1	6	11	5	0	3.87	70
	ES	55	4	10	19	20	2	0	3.11	40
	HLTH	28	1	3	9	12	3	0	3.46	54
	NU	50	1	5	16	20	7	1	3.55	54
	TOTAL	156	6	19	50	63	17	1	3.43	51
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	2	2	6	6	2	1	3.22	42
	BCMB	12	0	2	5	4	1	0	3.33	42
	BIOL	46	2	5	14	16	7	2	3.48	50
	CHEM	7	0	2	1	3	0	1	3.17	43
	CS	27	0	6	10	8	2	1	3.23	37
	MATH	23	1	8	10	4	0	0	2.74	17
	PHYS	5	0	0	0	3	2	0	4.40	100
	STTS	5	0	0	1	4	0	0	3.80	80
	TOTAL	144	5	25	47	48	14	5	3.29	43
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	11	0	0	2	6	1	2	3.89	64
	ECON	11	1	1	2	6	1	0	3.45	64
	HIST	22	1	2	6	9	4	0	3.59	59
	JUST	14	1	2	2	6	3	0	3.57	64
	PHRE	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	100
	POL	18	1	2	5	9	1	0	3.39	56
	PSYC	57	5	5	18	23	4	2	3.29	47
	SIA	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	100
	SOAN	14	0	1	1	10	2	0	3.93	86
	TOTAL	149	9	13	36	71	16	4	3.50	58
IDSM	IDSM	10	0	1	2	5	2	0	3.80	70
LIBS	LIBS	7	0	3	0	2	2	0	3.43	57
ALL	ALL	671	24	88	203	265	75	16	3.43	51

Note: Like Table 17, 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 mean average score for 2024 is 3.43%.

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. 2024 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	55	8.20
Service Learning	69	10.28
Research	179	26.68
Internship	215	32.04
Leadership	254	37.85
Student-Led Education	35	5.22
Writing	139	20.72
Other	36	5.37
Course	504	75.11
Any (Big 4)	372	55.44
Any	599	89.27
Total 2024 N	671	

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 weird way that data was stored in the database (although it appears that prior to 2018, perhaps entries were counted correctly).

In 2024, 599 Truman students (89%) 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, 139 (21%) students reported such an experience which is consistent with 2023.

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. 2020–2024 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Activity	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Study Abroad	18	19	12	4	4	8
Service Learning	17	17	12	11	11	10
Research	29	25	28	24	25	27
Internship	33	32	25	25	25	32
Leadership	40	40	38	40	37	38
Student-Led Education	5	5	4	4	6	5
Writing	23	23	23	22	21	21
Other	8	10	9	8	7	5
Course	48	78	77	76	75	75
Any (Big 4)	67	63	56	50	48	55
Any	83	94	91	90	87	89

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 limitations during the pandemic.

Table 21. 2020–2024 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Activity	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Study Abroad	24	10	14	9	5	4	5	2	11	5
Service Learning	20	10	16	7	14	6	14	5	14	6
Research	28	18	30	24	27	20	28	21	30	23
Internship	33	31	27	22	25	25	28	21	33	31
Leadership	45	30	42	31	43	35	42	27	42	32
Student-Led Education	5	4	5	3	4	5	6	5	6	4
Writing	26	19	26	18	23	19	22	20	23	18
Other	10	8	8	9	8	9	6	9	6	5
Course	80	75	80	71	81	68	79	68	78	72

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 these types of activities at frequencies higher than males.

**Table 22. 2024 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	21	24	5	14	24	43	10	29	14	76
	CML	9	44	22	22	11	22	0	33	0	78
	CRWT	14	21	7	14	29	21	14	71	14	79
	ENG	32	19	9	6	12	41	9	50	9	91
	LING	5	0	0	40	20	40	0	20	0	80
	MUBU	1	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100
	MUSI	16	0	0	38	12	50	12	19	0	88
	THEA	6	17	0	17	17	50	33	0	0	67
	TOTAL	104	18	7	18	18	38	11	38	8	83
Business	ACCT	34	3	3	3	38	35	9	12	3	47
	BSAD	67	13	3	1	39	39	0	18	6	72
	TOTAL	101	10	3	2	39	38	3	16	5	63
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	9	13	30	4	48	4	22	0	83
	ES	55	2	29	31	53	35	2	13	4	76
	HLTH	28	0	7	36	25	46	11	14	4	86
	NU	50	2	16	22	70	40	4	12	4	68
	TOTAL	156	3	19	29	46	40	4	14	3	76
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	5	11	32	37	26	0	5	11	58
	BCMB	12	0	0	58	33	50	8	17	25	83
	BIOL	46	7	9	39	17	43	2	24	4	85
	CHEM	7	0	0	14	14	14	0	29	0	86
	CS	27	7	4	26	41	30	4	11	0	74
	MATH	23	0	4	9	22	30	4	13	0	57
	PHYS	5	0	0	40	60	80	0	40	20	80
	STTS	5	0	0	20	60	40	20	40	20	80
	TOTAL	144	4	6	31	29	37	3	18	6	74
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	11	18	9	27	27	27	18	45	9	73
	ECON	11	0	0	36	27	36	0	18	0	82
	HIST	22	18	0	36	32	23	9	41	5	77
	JUST	14	7	7	14	64	36	0	7	0	86
	PHRE	1	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100
	POL	18	11	6	39	50	50	0	28	11	78
	PSYC	57	5	21	54	9	39	4	11	7	74
	SIA	1	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	SOAN	14	7	14	57	29	29	14	21	7	93
	TOTAL	149	9	12	42	27	36	5	21	6	79
IDSMD	IDSMD	10	20	30	50	10	40	10	20	0	70
LIBS	LIBS	7	14	14	14	29	43	0	43	0	57
ALL	ALL	671	8	10	27	32	38	5	21	5	75

Table 22. 2024 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major (cont.)

School	Major	N	Big 4		Any	
			Count	%	Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	21	11	52	18	86
	CML	9	5	56	8	89
	CRWT	14	7	50	12	86
	ENG	32	9	28	31	97
	LING	5	2	40	4	80
	MUBU	1	1	100	1	100
	MUSI	16	6	38	15	94
	THEA	6	2	33	6	100
	TOTAL	104	43	41	95	91
Business	ACCT	34	15	44	28	82
	BSAD	67	30	45	59	88
	TOTAL	101	45	45	87	86
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	23	11	48	21	91
	ES	55	41	75	50	91
	HLTH	28	14	50	27	96
	NU	50	38	76	45	90
	TOTAL	156	104	67	143	92
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	19	12	63	16	84
	BCMB	12	7	58	11	92
	BIOL	46	25	54	41	89
	CHEM	7	2	29	6	86
	CS	27	17	63	22	81
	MATH	23	6	26	16	70
	PHYS	5	4	80	5	100
	STTS	5	4	80	5	100
	TOTAL	144	77	53	122	85
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	11	6	55	8	73
	ECON	11	4	36	11	100
	HIST	22	11	50	20	91
	JUST	14	10	71	14	100
	PHRE	1	0	0	1	100
	POL	18	12	67	17	94
	PSYC	57	39	68	52	91
	SIA	1	1	100	1	100
	SOAN	14	10	71	13	93
	TOTAL	149	93	62	137	92
IDSM	IDSM	10	7	70	9	90
LIBS	LIBS	7	3	43	6	86
ALL	ALL	671	372	55	599	89

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 while back, the School of Health Science and Education does a significant amount of service learning in their curricula. It is clear that building Transformational Experiences into departmental curriculum is important.

Table 23. Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2020–2024)

School	Year	N	Percent Participation by Activity									
			StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Any
AAL	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
	2024	104	18	7	18	18	41	38	11	38	8	91
BUS	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
	2024	101	10	3	2	39	45	38	3	16	5	86
HSE	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
	2024	156	3	19	29	46	67	40	4	14	3	92
SAM	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
	2024	144	4	6	31	29	53	37	3	18	6	85
SCS	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
	2024	149	9	12	42	27	62	36	5	21	6	92
IDSM	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
	2024	10	20	30	50	10	70	40	10	20	0	90
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
	2024	7	14	14	14	29	43	43	0	43	0	86
ALL	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
	2024	671	8	10	27	32	55	38	5	21	5	89

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 2024 vision statement still has the old language). Campus-wide, 55% of students report having at least one of the "Big 4" which continues a downward trend from 2018 (70) and 89% report having some transformative experience.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2024, enough faculty were recruited so that each faculty member was required to read portfolios for only one of the two-week sessions. Faculty who participated were compensated for their time and effort with stipends. In 2025, we will likely need fewer readers due to the decrease in spring graduates.

In contrast to prior years, there were no significant technical issues in 2024. Although there were no technical issues, it is important to remember that Truman staff does not work on Fridays during the summer. Consequently, it is difficult to obtain help when problems occur during a Friday reading session.

Faculty who participated were asked to comment on their experience reading portfolios in an anonymous survey given at the end of the session. The question prompt is shown below followed by responses provided by faculty.

"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."

It has helped me think about and potentially improve my own teaching, particularly in terms of preparing students well for meeting these guidelines (e.g., critical thinking, interdisciplinary thinking, etc.) in their papers.

If I were to continue at Truman, my participation in the reading session/s would directly impact my "Portfolio" conversations with students. I didn't know anything about Portfolio prior to this experience. I think every new professor should be invited to do summer reading, I believe professor participation would improve student submissions, quality and reports. Portfolio feels like orientation to me, the size, group dynamics, the time, etc. If it would be a couple hour (2-3) portion of orientation, AND if the pay were bumped up, I think more professors would participate. I did it because of the money and I am glad I signed up but when I had lunch with a fellow professor, they said, "four days of work for \$600 isn't worth their time" I think it's an investment and it's totally worth professor's time long term.

Evaluating portfolios has provided me the insight into how I can help students successfully submit materials to the vault. I feel certain not all students submit the most appropriate artifact for the interdisciplinary and critical thinking prompts. In my position at Truman I teach roughly 5% of the university student population and I can help clarify this process. Also, interacting with

faculty from all over campus and engaging in discussions about how each of us think about student work and their learning and Truman's goals for them is inspiring and fulfilling.

I have a better understanding of critical thinking and interdisciplinarity here and can help focus my classes in those directions.

It is beneficial both as a teacher and as an advisor, as it allows us to better orient students in completing their assignments.

I think there were prompts in a few papers which kind of helped me to think and reflect on how I can incorporate that into my own research course.

meet other colleagues, share ideas, being able to see that students are able to think critically

As I prepare to teach my summer classes, I plan to more intentionally emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of our coursework and critical thinking required for the "big issues" addressed in the class. I will also make a point that our "book report" is not likely to be an appropriate portfolio artifact.

I teach a JINS class and I will be making some adjustments in my assignments and how I present them to the class. I will be using the Critical Thinking rubric to tune up some of my assignments. I will bring both rubrics into my discussions with my colleagues as we head into the fall.

Reading portfolios is a good reminder about how assignment structure matters and what elements of critical thinking are important for the portfolio. I have already adapted most assignments and use the rubric with students in a few classes.

Please write additional comments here. You might discuss in more detail your perspective on any of the above-mentioned components. Also, you could comment on other aspects of the reading session that you valued or would like improved. Again, all of this feedback is anonymous!8 responses

Brian seems "burnt out" on Portfolio or jaded? or frustrated, or something, he could bump up his "customer service"

I would revisit some of the rubrics (i.e. one that rates 1,2,5,6,7...) to all make more sense. It seems some of the necessary documents haven't been updated for over a decade. This is valuable faculty development opportunity and the stipend helps to engage more of us.

The rangefinders desperately need updating. Also, I would like to see some of the full range of scores, not just those in the middle.

It was a good session, the reduced group (as compared to previous years, in my experience), allowed for better conversations without things getting out of control. Thanks for everything!

This was my first time going through the portfolios. Overall, it was a great opportunity to interact with other faculty and to get an insight into the prompts for research papers in other courses.

The interactions with colleagues from across campus/other disciplines are invaluable. They just don't seem to happen otherwise except intermittently in various meetings/committee situations.

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 now 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 monadic 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!

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly this year - the first time since before the pandemic. Our 2024 office staff included 3 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. 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. Now that the freshmen are no longer submitting anything to the system related to the first-year experience, students are beginning to claim more that they have not 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 (SSM, since 2013), Rebecca Dierking (SAH, since 2014), Emily Costello (SSM, since 2014), Ernst Hintz (SAH, since 2023), John Grutsch (SSM, since 2023) and Roberta Donahue (SBPS, since 2022). I am grateful for the long-term dedication to our assessment process from some and for the new faces that bring new perspectives to the 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 second year (in a long time) that the portfolio report tables were sent to me soon enough that the report could be written quickly. 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. With the academic reorganization the tables will need to be rearranged and he will also be helping with that.

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?

In the academic year 2024-2025 the committee will be working to begin the process of evaluating the dialogues curriculum. There will be a brief presentation at the September faculty senate meeting to determine where things will go next and how we will develop new rubrics and prompts. We may also stop collecting information for the Self Discovery prompt since it was initiated with President Paino.