

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2016-2017 Academic Year
Anne Moody, Portfolio Director
Submitted July 10, 2018

<u>2017 Portfolio Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
• General Information about Portfolio Assessment	2
• Critical Thinking and Writing	4
• Interdisciplinary Thinking	12
• Civic Engagement	17
• Self Discovery	24
• Most Personally Satisfying Experience	32
• Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	38
• Letter to Truman	45
• Reader Information and Feedback	50
• Portfolio Collection Matters	51
• Future Plans and 2017 Summary	52

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 academic year 2016-2017, 1170 students submitted portfolios.

When is it administered?

Most students complete the process as part of their capstone experience, so students usually submit portfolios during their senior year. Some submit earlier, while others have actually completed their Truman course work and submit after they have finished their time on campus. Since it is a graduation requirement, students who do not submit their portfolio 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 the faculty and staff readers who evaluate and score the portfolios. These readers work in groups of approximately twenty and also participate in faculty development and campus discussion.

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

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

When are results typically available?

The portfolios are read and scored in May and August interims. 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 2016-2017 academic year, student portfolios included works demonstrating 1) *critical thinking and writing*, 2) *interdisciplinary thinking*, 3) *civic engagement*, and 4) *self discovery*. The portfolio also included a work or experience the student considered 5) *most personally satisfying*, and 6) *a Letter to Truman* in which students give summary thoughts about their experience with the Portfolio and at Truman. Other items may be included, but these are evaluated separately, if at all, including a 7) *transformative learning experience questionnaire*.

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.

To whom are results regularly distributed?

Overall results of portfolio assessment are available to the Truman community through this [Assessment Almanac](#). Occasional reports are given to governance, planning workshops, 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. Faculty who participate in reading sessions report changing their assignments and their teaching techniques based on their experience.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

No. While some universities are using portfolios for assessment of general education or liberal studies, most do not use similar prompts or submission categories.

Counts of students by first major

	Major	First Major				
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Arts and Letters	ART	30	43	39	29	34
	CML	8	18	27	17	21
	CWRT	11	10	8	8	10
	ENG	90	86	72	74	65
	LING	9	5	10	12	10
	MUS	38	29	28	16	32
	THEA	9	13	13	13	16
	AAL	195	204	197	169	188
Business	ACCT	68	63	70	56	75
	BSAD	105	95	93	118	111
	BUS	173	158	163	174	186
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	AT	5	5	8	7	8
	CMDS	45	46	40	43	32
	ES	97	79	123	111	82
	HLTH	61	69	78	63	73
	NU	40	49	54	43	36
	HSE	248	248	303	267	231
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	60	52	68	64
	ECON	8	14	20	17	17
	HIST	34	40	38	26	46
	JUST	45	40	40	40	32
	PHRE	14	7	6	2	10
	POL	29	35	21	20	15
	PSYC	86	115	101	91	105
	SOAN	16	20	20	16	19
	SCS	299	331	298	280	308
Science and Math	AGSC	24	20	20	30	29
	BIOL	99	119	100	103	120
	CHEM	19	33	22	16	26
	CS	28	34	24	30	42
	MATH	22	25	26	31	26
	PHYS	15	8	9	5	9
	SAM	207	239	201	215	252
	IDSM	3	5	5	8	5
	All	1125	1185	1167	1113	1170

The Critical Thinking and Writing Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

Students are asked in this prompt to submit their best work that illustrates critical thinking. Usually, it is the student's strongest classic research-style paper. They note what year of their college experience that the work was done, and state whether the work came from a particular course, or some other source. Then, 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 and the rubric are tables of CTW scores sorted by major and by course prefix. Following that is a short inter-rater reliability table that indicates that 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. A final table shows the university-wide scores by year for the last 5 years.

Critical Thinking and Writing Prompt

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.

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: Do NOT submit a writing sample for ENG 190 ("Writing as Critical Thinking") simply because this course focuses on critical thinking and writing. Students typically compose their best critical writing later in college.

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

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

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

Reviewer Specific Questions

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

Portfolio Critical Thinking and Writing Rubric (adopted summer 2013)

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

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

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

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

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

qualify or enrich own perspective.			
------------------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by first major 2017

		N 2017	Issue	Context	Supp. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	%10+	Comm.
Arts & Letters	ART	34	2.09	2.30	2.39	2.01	8.79	44%	2.41
	CML	21	1.44	1.79	2.14	2.67	8.05	71%	3.23
	CRWT	10	2.80	2.80	2.56	2.50	10.66	60%	3.00
	ENG	65	2.75	2.67	2.70	2.51	10.63	68%	2.80
	LING	10	2.30	2.10	1.90	2.10	8.40	20%	2.00
	MUSI	32	2.25	2.56	2.48	2.08	9.37	66%	2.78
	THEA	16	2.88	2.81	2.94	2.31	10.94	81%	2.94
	AAL	188	2.36	2.43	2.44	2.31	9.55	62%	2.74
Business	ACCT	75	3.28	2.72	2.26	2.61	10.86	44%	2.75
	BSAD	111	2.61	2.32	2.30	2.27	9.50	51%	2.53
	BUS	186	2.94	2.52	2.28	2.44	10.18	48%	2.64
Hlth. Sci. & Ed.	ATHT	8	2.38	2.00	2.25	2.38	9.00	50%	2.38
	CMDS	32	2.69	2.28	2.25	2.22	9.44	50%	2.63
	ES	82	2.43	2.28	2.32	2.33	9.35	49%	2.54
	HLTH	73	2.88	2.60	2.62	2.42	10.52	64%	2.75
	NU	36	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.58	11.08	75%	2.92
	HSE	231	2.64	2.40	2.45	2.39	9.88	58%	2.64
Social & Cultural Studies	COMM	64	2.56	2.58	2.34	2.20	9.69	59%	2.53
	ECON	17	2.94	2.82	2.88	2.35	11.00	71%	2.76
	HIST	46	2.89	2.98	2.89	2.61	11.37	76%	3.09
	JUST	32	2.47	2.28	2.44	2.34	9.53	50%	2.63
	PHRE	10	3.10	2.90	3.10	2.80	11.90	70%	3.10
	POL	15	3.13	3.07	2.87	2.60	11.67	93%	2.93
	PSYC	105	2.75	2.67	2.62	2.30	10.34	61%	2.75
	SOAN	19	2.63	2.58	2.58	2.11	9.89	58%	2.84
	SCS	308	2.81	2.73	2.71	2.41	10.67	64%	2.83
Science & Math	AGSC	29	2.69	2.38	2.34	2.10	9.52	48%	2.62
	BIOL	120	2.83	2.71	2.84	2.61	10.98	76%	2.88
	CHEM	26	3.31	3.35	3.38	3.15	13.19	96%	3.35
	CS	42	2.52	2.48	2.43	2.36	9.79	55%	2.40
	MATH	26	2.46	2.42	2.31	2.19	9.38	54%	2.54
	PHYS	9	2.44	2.89	2.89	2.67	10.89	44%	3.22
	SAM	252	2.71	2.70	2.70	2.51	10.62	68%	2.84
	IDSM	5	3.40	3.40	3.20	3.20	13.20	100%	3.20
ALL	1170	2.68	2.61	2.59	2.43	10.31	61%	2.78	

As shown within the rubric, each rubric criterion can score up to 4 points. The average score of each criterion for the students within each major are tabulated above. Since the sum of the first four criteria can be considered an evaluation of the submission's demonstration of critical thinking, a column indicating the average sum of these four criteria for each major is also given. To demonstrate competence in this area, a submission should score at least 10 out of 16 for this "Sum4," so the table also includes a "%10+" column that tells the percentage of submissions within that major that scored 10 or more.

When looking at the SUM4 averages for each school, the schools of AAL (9.55), HSE (9.88), and BUS (10.18) show SUM 4 values that are lower than average (10.31), while the schools of SCS (10.67) and SAM (10.62) show averages that are greater than average.

Switching to the %10+ perspective shows a much lower value for the school of BUS (48%) and a somewhat lower value for HSE (58%) relative to the university average of 61%. The school of AAL has a %10+ value almost exactly the university average (62%), while SCS (64%) and SAM (68%), each show a higher percentage of students earning the score deemed competent for critical thinking.

Within the rubric categories, the university wide average student scores decline as you move from the issue through to the conclusion as has been seen before in our data. Students (on average) score better for describing the issue of their work than they do for delineating the context and supporting evidence. Their conclusions generally score lower still. When examining the data for the individual departments, however, you will notice that this trend is not always followed. Each department may want to look at its own data here to determine any action that might be taken.

The last rubric category is the writing quality component. The average scores for writing quality mirror that seen for the critical thinking values of SUM4 and %10+. This result could relate to the amount of practice students are required to do with writing these types of papers in the various schools on campus.

Critical Thinking and Writing: 2017 Scores by course prefix

Prefix	N 2017	Issue	Context	Supp. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	%10+	Comm.
ALL	1145	2.68	2.57	2.57	2.38	10.22	62%	2.71
JINS	161	2.73	2.63	2.56	2.38	10.29	61%	2.62
ENG	154	2.38	2.30	2.35	2.14	9.17	47%	2.49
PHRE	75	2.67	2.36	2.40	2.20	9.63	57%	2.57
BIOL	60	2.85	2.70	2.95	2.67	11.17	78%	2.95
BSAD	58	2.83	2.52	2.50	2.52	10.36	57%	2.76
HIST	55	2.87	2.96	2.91	2.51	11.25	69%	2.98
COMM	51	2.67	2.76	2.39	2.29	10.12	59%	2.63
HLTH	50	2.94	2.61	2.70	2.50	10.75	70%	2.84
PSYC	39	2.64	2.58	2.53	2.18	9.93	56%	2.69
ES	39	2.56	2.36	2.49	2.56	9.97	56%	2.67
NU	29	2.93	2.93	2.90	2.66	11.41	83%	2.97
CHEM	28	3.29	3.21	3.25	3.07	12.82	86%	3.25
ACCT	28	2.71	2.54	2.86	2.43	10.54	64%	2.75
ED	27	2.44	2.30	2.26	2.22	9.22	52%	2.81
POL	26	3.00	2.92	2.73	2.60	11.25	77%	2.69
AGSC	25	2.76	2.48	2.32	2.20	9.76	48%	2.52
CS	24	2.58	2.63	2.54	2.46	10.21	63%	2.63
JUST	22	2.59	2.55	2.59	2.27	10.00	59%	2.68
SOAN	21	2.71	2.76	2.52	2.38	10.38	62%	2.90
ART	20	2.10	2.30	2.20	2.05	8.65	50%	2.55
MUSI	19	2.79	2.47	2.84	2.16	10.26	68%	2.95
ECON	18	2.89	2.78	2.50	2.56	10.72	67%	2.72
SPAN	14	2.00	2.29	2.57	2.21	9.07	36%	2.14
CMDS	11	2.91	2.45	2.64	2.45	10.45	64%	2.73
CLAS	8	2.25	2.38	2.25	2.13	9.00	38%	2.75
LING	7	2.43	2.29	2.43	2.14	9.29	71%	2.71
RUSS	7	2.43	2.14	2.86	2.29	9.71	43%	2.86
ENVS	6	3.17	2.83	3.00	2.83	11.83	83%	2.83
THEA	6	2.60	2.60	2.40	2.20	9.80	67%	2.80
FREN	5	2.00	1.80	1.40	1.80	7.00	20%	1.80
<5	26	2.56	2.62	2.80	2.79	10.77	69%	2.92

Most submissions (1145 out of 1170) for this prompt result from course assignments. This table lists the average scores for this prompt according to course prefix, arranged in descending order of the number of papers with that prefix. These scores do not parallel the scores seen from the students within the major associated with that prefix. Again, faculty in the individual departments might want to consider whether any action should be taken.

CTW Inter-rater Reliability

2017 Abs. Diff.	Percent
6+	0.4%
5	0.0%
4	1.6%
3	5.1%
2	24.4%
1	36.6%
0	31.9%

Each year some number of random submissions in CTW is scored by a second reader. Readers are not able to see the score of a previous reader. This CTW Inter-rater Reliability table shows the agreement of the SUM4 scores of the two different readers. This data shows that 68.5% of the scores of two different readers were either the same or within one unit from the each other. When you consider that this number is out of 16 possible points, then you can see that the readers are very much in sync with each other on the scoring of these submissions. Since another 24.4% of the pairs of readers were within 2 units of each other, then a total of almost 93% of readers agree within 2 points out of 16 possible points.

Critical Thinking and Writing: University-wide Scores 2013-2017

Year	N students	University Mean Sum4	%10+
2013	1114	10.2	60%
2014	1185	10.3	65%
2015	1157	10.4	64%
2016	1099	10.4	61%
2017	1170	10.3	61%

This final table shows the university mean for the sum of the four critical thinking categories and also the percentage of all university students who scored ten or more for this sum for the last five years. This time period includes all years that we have used the present university approved rubric for scoring this prompt. As you can see, these numbers are holding steady for this time period. This stable result over time suggests that our curriculum continues to provide our students with the necessary opportunities to learn and exercise the critical thinking and writing skills that will serve them well in their futures.

The Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The interdisciplinary thinking (IDS) prompt is the one that informed the development of the Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar (JINS) courses in the late 1990s. It is another prompt that 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. Usually, a student's paper produced as part of their JINS course satisfies 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 these terms and asks for the source and time of completion of the document. Next, the student must state a description of the assignment, a list of the disciplines used in the work, and a reflection of their growth of this skill. As is usually the case, we ask for a self-evaluation using our scoring rubric, which we hope encourages the student to choose their paper that best fits the rubric.

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

Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt

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

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

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

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

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

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

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

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

Interdisciplinary Thinking Rubric

Some Descriptors of Competence as an Interdisciplinary Thinker

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

4 Strong Competence

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

3 Competence

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

2 Some Competence

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

1 Weak Competence

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

0 No demonstration of competence as an interdisciplinary thinker

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

Interdisciplinary Thinking: Scores by first major 2013-2017

	Maj.	Mean Score					% 2+				
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Arts and Letters	ART	1.61	1.81	1.91	0.98	2.12	50%	60%	58%	51%	78%
	CML	1.75	2.22	1.87	1.15	1.89	63%	78%	58%	55%	65%
	CWRT*	2.00	1.00	2.50	1.38	2.50	64%	30%	75%	44%	100%
	ENG	2.13	1.83	1.92	2.23	2.05	77%	62%	68%	82%	74%
	LING	2.33	2.00	2.28	2.33	2.27	67%	80%	64%	88%	75%
	MUS	1.73	1.90	2.72	1.41	2.09	62%	69%	94%	54%	79%
	THEA	1.89	1.85	2.08	1.71	1.91	78%	62%	92%	56%	72%
	AAL	1.95	1.83	2.18	1.60	2.12	68%	63%	73%	61%	78%
Business	ACCT	1.72	1.59	1.62	1.76	1.91	64%	52%	57%	64%	84%
	BSAD	1.51	1.74	1.88	1.56	1.64	48%	61%	67%	51%	58%
	BUS	1.59	1.68	1.75	1.66	1.78	54%	58%	62%	57%	71%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT*	2.00	0.80	1.38	1.96	1.63	80%	20%	31%	66%	63%
	CMDS	1.96	1.70	2.00	1.80	1.59	66%	59%	65%	60%	48%
	ES	1.56	1.53	2.11	1.72	1.71	51%	56%	77%	58%	62%
	HLTH	1.92	1.93	2.31	1.78	2.14	61%	72%	76%	67%	75%
	NU	2.13	1.57	1.99	1.89	1.80	78%	53%	66%	68%	58%
	HSE	1.82	1.67	1.96	1.83	1.78	60%	60%	63%	64%	61%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	1.91	1.65	2.09	2.10	1.71	62%	60%	72%	72%	59%
	ECON	2.13	2.57	2.11	1.97	1.56	75%	86%	75%	67%	68%
	HIST	1.94	1.75	2.07	2.50	2.12	74%	63%	79%	80%	78%
	JUST	1.43	1.80	2.12	1.80	1.73	48%	65%	67%	59%	63%
	PHRE	1.77	1.86	2.50	1.50	1.99	69%	57%	83%	100%	60%
	POL	1.86	2.20	1.96	2.33	2.30	68%	83%	68%	65%	93%
	PSYC	2.00	1.63	2.07	1.82	2.05	72%	57%	66%	62%	73%
	SOAN	1.88	1.90	2.23	2.15	2.34	63%	55%	78%	73%	87%
	SCS	1.86	1.79	2.14	2.02	1.98	65%	63%	73%	72%	73%
Sciences and Math	AGSC	1.17	2.45	2.39	1.70	2.02	42%	85%	75%	48%	71%
	BIOL	1.95	2.04	1.98	2.14	2.12	68%	72%	69%	70%	74%
	CHEM	1.53	1.94	1.90	2.13	2.24	53%	58%	75%	71%	79%
	CS	1.71	2.00	1.83	2.19	2.17	61%	65%	58%	78%	77%
	MATH	2.18	1.92	2.38	1.77	1.86	73%	64%	90%	60%	65%
	PHYS	2.27	1.75	2.42	0.80	1.89	73%	50%	89%	60%	61%
	SAM	1.84	2.03	2.15	1.79	2.05	63%	69%	76%	65%	71%
	IDSM	3.67	2.60	1.50	2.71	2.60	100%	100%	30%	100%	100%
	ALL	1.82	1.81	2.07	1.84	2.00	63%	63%	70%	66%	72%

This table includes the mean of the scores of all students in each major during the years of 2013-2017. Over this five year period, the mean score for all Truman graduates' IDS submissions ranges from 1.8 to 2.1. In 2017, the university average is 2.0 and all of the Schools' average scores are within that five-year range. The 2017

scores for BUS and HSE are at the low end of that range, while the AAL scores are at the top end. It is satisfying to note that the students in the IDSM majors score excellently (2.6) on this prompt, as they should since their entire majors are developed to be interdisciplinary.

The score that is deemed “competent” for this prompt is 2 or more, so the final columns are the percentages of students scoring 2 or more in each major and school. University wide over the last five years, between 63 and 72% earned competent scores, this year coming in at 72%. Examining the 2017 percentages for the various schools shows that fewer of the HSE students score 2 or more (61%), while all of the IDSM scored at least a 2, and 78% of the AAL students scored above this expected level.

Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2017 Scores by course prefix

Prefix	2017 Count	Mean	%2+
JINS	800	2.09	77.50%
ENG	50	1.46	54.00%
BSAD	26	1.69	61.54%
COMM	22	1.77	68.18%
HIST	20	1.85	60.00%
PHRE	19	1.53	57.89%
PSYC	17	1.65	70.59%
ED	17	1.71	70.59%
BIOL	16	1.63	68.75%
ECON	16	1.19	50.00%
AGSC	14	1.93	71.43%
ART	13	1.62	61.54%
CS	12	1.83	75.00%
SOAN	11	1.82	63.64%
MUSI	9	1.56	55.56%
JUST	7	1.86	85.71%
POL	6	1.00	33.33%
SPAN	6	0.83	33.33%
ES	6	1.50	50.00%
IDSM	6	1.67	66.67%
CLAS	5	2.00	80.00%
ACCT	5	0.40	0.00%
<5	36	1.67	58.33%

This table gives the average scores and the %2+ organized by course prefix. The course prefixes are organized by descending number of submissions. Each prefix is followed by the count of submissions with that prefix, the mean score of the submissions with that prefix, and finally its percentage with a score of 2 or more. The student submissions drawn from JINS courses overwhelmingly outnumber those from any other course prefix here, and they do generally score favorably on this prompt. This result is not surprising, since this type of writing is a major focus of the JINS courses. Other prefixes result in a wide range of average scores.

IDS Inter-rater Reliability

2017 Abs Diff	%	N
4	0%	0
3	1%	6
2	6%	66
1	19%	220
0	74%	839
	100%	1131

Each year a second reader scores some random number of submissions in IDS. This table shows the level of agreement of the scores of the two different readers. Readers are not able to see the score of a previous reader. In 2017, 1131 total submissions were “double scored”, with 74% of them earning the same score from two different readers. Nineteen percent more of these papers earned scores that differ by only one unit. That adds up to 93% of these papers earning scores either the same or within one unit. This result indicates excellent agreement between different readers of the same papers.

Civic Engagement Prompt, Data, and Discussion

Truman's mission statement, vision statement, and its desired characteristics of graduates all mention civic mindedness, service, and engaged world citizens as important traits. To explore how these traits are encouraged on campus, the Civic Engagement prompt was implemented in its first form in 2013-2014, with a fairly extensive rubric patterned after the AAC&U Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric. The faculty discussions that resulted from reading student submissions in the summer of 2014 clarified our purpose for this prompt. We did not revise the prompt itself very much, but the rubric was streamlined for 2015 reading sessions to more closely match the questions that we asked in the prompt. In 2016, we added a reviewer context question to better understand where the opportunities for meaningful civic engagement were being offered. No further changes were made in 2017.

As you can see, this prompt defines for the students what we mean by the terms of civic engagement and community, and asks the student to describe their most meaningful and significant civic engagement experience while he/she was an undergraduate. We were especially interested in what the student learned about their communities and themselves through this experience.

Following the prompt itself and the scoring rubric are the tables of data for this prompt. The first table includes scores by first major. The second table lists scores by course prefix for the small subset (only 412 submissions) of Civic Engagement submissions that were derived from coursework. The final table includes the counts of the context of the experience as judged by the reader of the submission.

The Civic Engagement Prompt

What was your most meaningful and significant civic engagement experience during the years that you attended Truman?

"Civic Engagement is working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community [...]." (Excerpted from Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Erhlich)

** Civic engagement may begin with your own self-awareness, wherein you understand your own cultural or family origins, development, assumptions, and/or predispositions.*

** It might then be followed by exploring a civic understanding of other people or cultures, recognizing and appreciating how their circumstances are the same or different from your own.*

** Ultimately, your civic engagement should include actions that would improve the quality of life for people in a community. Community can be broadly defined here as a*

group of people who have common characteristics or bonds; some examples include your residence hall, neighborhood, student organization, major department, profession, internship site, town/city/state, church, nation, world, etc.

Your most meaningful and significant civic engagement experience while at Truman may be from activities that took place either in the classroom or outside of the classroom. This experience may have been for credit or pay, as an assignment in a course, tied to service learning, associated with a co-curricular activity, or just for fun.

It is not necessary to have a paper or artifact to submit with this prompt, but if you do, please attach it to the prompt from the vault...

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

For the items below, you may wish to refer to the [descriptors](#) of the civic engagement rubric and definitions.

In the box below, describe this most meaningful or significant civic engagement experience wherein you made a difference for a community in collaboration with others or on your own.

You might include:

- * how you (and/or your team) developed and implemented your approach to the civic engagement experience,*
- * how you evaluated (or would evaluate) the process, and*
- * if possible, the result of the endeavor.*

In this last box, describe what you learned about yourself and your community through this experience.

TRUMAN PORTFOLIO CIVIC ENGAGEMENT RUBRIC

(finalized September 2, 2014, Adapted from the AAC&U VALUE Rubric)

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

	4=Mastering	3=Developing	2=Growing	1=Emerging	0=Missing
Civic Action	Demonstrates innovation and independent experience in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement	Demonstrates independent experience or team leadership of civic action.	Reports clear and full participation in civically focused actions.	Has experimented with some civic activities.	No civic action described

	activities.				
Reflection about Civic Action (e.g., how it relates to personal civic identity and/or group commitment)	<p>Accompanies civic engagement with deep reflective insights or analysis about results of civic actions.</p> <p>Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes learning about self as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.</p> <p>Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community groups to achieve a civic aim</p>	<p>Includes some reflective insights or analysis about the results of civic actions.</p> <p>Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes learning about self as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.</p> <p>Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively within community groups to achieve a civic aim.</p>	<p>Begins to reflect on or describe how their civic actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.</p> <p>Evidence suggests that involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.</p> <p>Demonstrates experience pursuing intentional ways to participate in civic groups</p>	<p>Shows little internalized understanding of the potential benefits of civic activities and little commitment to future action.</p> <p>Provides little evidence of connection of civic engagement activities to civic identity.</p> <p>Exhibits awareness of civic groups; experiments with civic groups, tries out a few.</p>	No reflection.

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by first major: 2015 – 2017

	CIVIC	2015					2016					2017				
		Major	2015 N	Act.	2+%	Refl.	2+%	2016 N	Act.	2+%	Ref.	2+%	2017 N	Act.	2+%	Refl.
Arts and Letters	ART	39	1.53	59%	1.6	62%	27	1.78	52%	1.67	37%	34	1.80	56%	1.65	50%
	CML	27	2.23	74%	1.88	67%	17	1.77	82%	1.48	65%	21	1.84	71%	1.72	71%
	CRWT	8	1.75	63%	1.63	38%	8	1.75	50%	1.75	50%	10	2.30	70%	2.60	80%
	ENG	72	2.13	69%	2.18	72%	74	2.08	72%	2.22	78%	65	1.81	65%	1.72	60%
	LING	10	2.67	89%	2.44	89%	12	2.25	92%	2.58	92%	10	1.90	70%	1.80	70%
	MUS	28	1.46	54%	1.48	57%	16	1.31	75%	1.69	69%	32	2.09	66%	2.00	63%
	THEA	13	2.08	77%	2.08	62%	13	1.38	38%	1.38	38%	16	2.25	63%	1.88	56%
	AAL	197	1.98	69%	1.9	64%	167	1.76	66%	1.83	61%	188	2.00	66%	1.91	64%
Business	ACCT	70	1.56	50%	1.55	46%	55	1.75	67%	1.65	56%	75	2.61	45%	3.62	55%
	BSAD	93	1.73	54%	1.63	56%	115	1.7	59%	1.66	53%	111	1.44	45%	1.46	50%
	BUS	163	1.65	52%	1.59	51%	170	1.72	63%	1.66	55%	186	2.02	45%	2.54	52%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	2.29	63%	2.38	75%	7	2.14	71%	2.29	86%	8	1.63	50%	1.50	38%
	CMDS	40	2.05	80%	1.88	63%	43	2.3	81%	2.37	77%	32	1.81	63%	1.84	63%
	ES	123	1.68	55%	1.68	53%	109	1.8	64%	1.81	61%	82	1.68	60%	1.57	54%
	HLTH	78	2.37	83%	2.38	89%	63	2.33	86%	2.32	84%	73	2.04	66%	2.27	74%
	NU	54	2.02	78%	2	72%	43	1.86	70%	1.98	74%	36	2.00	69%	2.00	72%
	HSE	303	2.08	72%	2.06	70%	265	2.09	75%	2.15	76%	231	1.83	61%	1.84	60%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	52	1.56	46%	1.69	48%	67	1.79	61%	1.76	55%	64	1.84	56%	1.88	52%
	ECON	20	1.85	55%	1.8	50%	17	1.65	65%	1.47	47%	17	1.53	35%	1.53	41%
	HIST	38	1.59	53%	1.57	47%	25	1.72	60%	1.6	56%	46	1.65	48%	1.74	54%
	JUST	40	1.21	35%	1.35	41%	38	1.63	47%	1.5	42%	32	2.03	56%	1.78	56%
	PHRE	6	2.17	83%	1.67	67%	2	1.5	50%	2.5	100%	10	1.50	50%	1.70	60%
	POL	21	2.45	70%	2.4	70%	20	1.95	70%	1.7	50%	15	2.33	80%	2.07	80%
	PSYC	101	1.83	59%	1.85	59%	91	1.87	64%	1.98	68%	105	2.16	78%	1.94	68%
	SOAN	20	1.75	65%	2.05	70%	16	2.13	69%	2.5	75%	19	1.68	53%	1.58	58%
SCS	298	1.8	58%	1.8	57%	276	1.78	61%	1.88	62%	308	1.84	57%	1.78	59%	
Science and Math	AGSC	20	1.6	55%	1.7	65%	30	1.3	37%	1.67	57%	29	1.66	52%	1.55	41%
	BIOL	100	1.89	62%	1.97	68%	102	2.12	71%	2.12	74%	120	1.96	67%	1.98	65%
	CHEM	22	2.45	86%	2.5	82%	16	2	81%	2.13	81%	26	2.31	77%	2.27	81%
	CS	24	1.88	63%	1.83	67%	30	1.43	50%	1.5	50%	42	1.60	50%	1.79	57%
	MATH	26	1.92	65%	2.04	58%	30	1.57	60%	1.57	53%	26	1.50	42%	1.46	50%
	PHYS	9	1.89	78%	1.78	67%	5	1.2	60%	1.6	60%	9	1.67	44%	2.00	56%
	SAM	201	1.94	68%	1.97	68%	213	1.6	60%	1.76	62%	252	1.78	55%	1.84	58%
IDSM	5	2	80%	2.6	80%	8	2.25	88%	2.38	88%	5	3.00	80%	2.80	80%	
ALL	1167	1.92	66%	1.92	63%	1099	1.8	69%	1.89	67%	1170	2.08	61%	2.12	62%	

Because of the significant revision of the scoring rubric for this prompt for the 2015 submissions, the earlier data from the 2014 pilot is not included here. Direct comparison of 2015 -2017 data is more reasonable since these data were scored with an identical rubric. For each year, the number of students in the major is listed, with the average score for action and reflection for that major. An individual's score of 2 or more

on either of these criteria was deemed to be minimally satisfactory, so the percentage of students with a score of 2 or more is also listed for each major.

University wide average scores for the civic actions were 1.92 in 2015, 1.80 in 2016 and 2.08 in 2017. The civic reflection average scores were 1.92 in 2015, 1.89 in 2016, and 2.12 in 2017. All of these values are very close to the accepted satisfactory levels.

Consideration of the data by school shows that BUS has stayed consistently below the school average on both civic action and reflection. SCS and SAM scored closer to, but still somewhat less than, the university average. AAL scores have been close to the university average all three years, while HSE has been well above average until this year, when it scored comparable to average. HSE majors offer many opportunities within their required coursework to practice their crafts and also to reflect on them as part of the coursework. Now that we have three years of directly comparable data, variation over time for the various schools and majors is starting to become clearer.

2017 Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by course prefix

Prefix	2017 N	Action	2+%	Reflection	2+%
All	412	1.68	55%	1.50	52%
HLTH	40	2.20	70%	2.25	73%
COMM	38	2.03	61%	1.89	50%
ED	34	1.71	56%	1.53	59%
ENG	33	1.24	36%	0.88	21%
NU	33	1.97	67%	2.03	76%
PSYC	28	2.32	71%	2.00	68%
JINS	28	1.04	36%	0.79	21%
PHRE	24	1.96	63%	1.42	46%
ES	18	1.67	67%	1.50	50%
ENVS	15	2.60	87%	2.53	80%
BSAD	13	0.69	15%	0.46	15%
JUST	12	1.67	50%	1.42	58%
BIOL	12	1.25	33%	1.42	50%
IDSM	9	1.89	56%	2.11	67%
SOAN	8	1.25	25%	0.63	13%
DS	8	2.13	75%	2.13	63%
ART	8	1.38	50%	1.25	50%
CMDS	6	1.67	50%	1.50	33%
AGSC	6	1.50	33%	1.50	50%
ECON	6	0.67	17%	0.17	0%
HIST	5	1.60	60%	1.40	60%
MUSI	5	0.80	20%	0.60	20%
NASC	4	1.50	75%	2.00	100%
POL	4	2.50	75%	1.50	75%
CS	4	2.00	75%	2.00	75%
ACCT	3	2.67	67%	2.67	100%
AT	3	1.67	67%	1.33	33%

SPAN	2	1.50	50%	2.00	50%
CHIN	2	1.50	50%	0.00	0%
GERM	1	2.00	100%	2.00	100%

Only 412 of the 1170 (35.2%) scored Civic Engagement submissions were described as being from a class. This table lists these submissions in order of highest count to lowest count for any course prefix. As mentioned above, the majors from the school of HSE include many opportunities to engage with their communities through their courses, and the numbers of submissions from those departments are much larger than for other course prefixes. For these submissions, the reflections were generally strong, suggesting that the courses are requiring both activity and reflection on the assignment.

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Coursework

- LSP
- Major
- Capstone
- Minor
- Elective

Other Academic

- Research
- Internship
- Study Abroad
- Resume/Professional Statement
- Service Learning
- Tutoring/Teaching/Mentorship
- Other Academic

Student Organization

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

Athletics

- Varsity Athletics
- Club Athletics
- Other Athletics

Employment

- Campus Employment
- Volunteer Work
- Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

- Public Performance/Recital
- Other Creative Effort

Other

- Relationships/Friendships
- Residence Life
- ROTC
- Other Misc.

Knowing the context of these civic engagement experiences can help us understand how we can increase opportunities for such meaningful civic engagement activities, should we choose to do so. For this question, readers are allowed to choose only one of the context categories, and are instructed to choose the best fit for each submission. Coursework, especially in the major, and student organizations tied this year for greatest opportunities for meaningful civic engagement at 31% each. Employment, especially volunteer employment, is next at 17%. Comparing 2016 with 2017 shows remarkable consistency in these two years for the context of civic activity.

Civic Engagement Context 2016-2017

Civic Context Categories	Civic Context Specifics	2016 N	2016%	2017 N	2017%
Coursework	LSP	65	6.30%	73	6.44%
Coursework	Major	226	21.92%	193	17.02%
Coursework	Capstone	10	0.97%	7	0.62%
Coursework	Minor	24	2.33%	27	2.38%
Coursework	Elective	40	3.88%	53	4.67%
Coursework	ALL Coursework	365	35.40%	353	31.13%
Other Academic	Research	3	0.29%	9	0.79%
Other Academic	Internship	36	3.49%	42	3.70%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	16	1.55%	12	1.06%
Other Academic	Resume/Prof. Statement	2	0.19%	0	0.00%
Other Academic	Service Learning	18	1.75%	24	2.12%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach Mentor	22	2.13%	39	3.44%
Other Academic	Other Academic	11	1.07%	12	1.06%
Other Academic	ALL Other Academic	118	11.45%	138	12.17%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	1	0.10%	7	0.62%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	68	6.60%	87	7.67%
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	103	9.99%	123	10.85%
Student Organizations	Professional/Major	29	2.81%	40	3.53%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	32	3.10%	45	3.97%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	8	0.78%	14	1.23%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	4	0.39%	0	0.00%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	34	3.30%	32	2.82%
Student Organizations	ALL Student Organizations	279	27.06%	348	30.69%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	17	1.65%	26	2.29%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	3	0.29%	4	0.35%
Athletics	Other Athletic	10	0.97%	10	0.88%
Athletics	ALL Athletics	30	2.91%	40	3.53%
Employment	Campus job	28	2.72%	31	2.73%
Employment	Volunteer	121	11.74%	128	11.29%
Employment	Off Campus Job	29	2.81%	31	2.73%
Employment	ALL Employment	178	17.26%	190	16.75%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	7	0.68%	12	1.06%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	1	0.10%	7	0.62%
Performance/Creative Activity	ALL Performance/Creative Activity	8	0.78%	19	1.68%
Other (Misc.)	Relationships	8	0.78%	9	0.79%
Other (Misc.)	Residence Life	10	0.97%	8	0.71%
Other (Misc.)	ROTC	2	0.19%	0	0.00%
Other (Misc.)	Other	43	4.17%	29	2.56%
Other (Misc.)	ALL Other (Misc.)	53	5.14%	46	4.06%
	Total	1031	100.00%	1134	100%

Self-Discovery Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

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

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

The Self-Discovery Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Risk/Challenge/Growth

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

Academic/Scholarship

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

Relationships

- *Demonstrated service to others.*
- *Fruitful collaboration with other students or peers.*
- *Fruitful collaboration with faculty, staff, mentor, other professional.*
- *Built a special mentoring relationship.*

- *No indication*
- *Other*

SELF DISCOVERY: University-wide Student Rationales 2016-2017

	<i>Year</i>	2016	2017
Categories	Reasons		
Risk/Challenge/Growth	<i>Deep Introspection</i>	28%	35%
	<i>New Perspective on Self*</i>	0%	6%
	<i>Personal Growth</i>	46%	43%
	<i>Responsibility</i>	17%	15%
	<i>Moral/ethical Dilemma</i>	3%	3%
Academic/Scholarship	<i>Personal Best</i>	6%	5%
	<i>Especially Challenging</i>	18%	15%
	<i>Intellectual Risk</i>	4%	3%
	<i>Vocational Development</i>	18%	17%
	<i>Worked as Professional</i>	11%	8%
Relationships	<i>Service to others</i>	9%	8%
	<i>Collaboration w/ Peers</i>	19%	20%
	<i>Collaboration w/ Professional*</i>	0%	2%
	<i>Mentoring relationship</i>	3%	3%

*NOTE: the 2016 data for *New Perspective on Self* and *Collaboration with a Professional* was lost in a downloading error, which was found and corrected for the 2017 data.

The reasons that students could have expressed for significant self-discovery were categorized into three groups: **Risk/Challenge/Growth**, **Academic/Scholarship**, and **Relationships**. As a category, **Risk/Challenge/Growth** offered the greatest potential for self-discovery university-wide. For all students, *Personal growth* was the biggest reason for self-discovery in both years (2016: 46% and 2017: 43%). *Deep Introspection* also spurred a lot of self-discovery, with it being a much greater factor in 2017 (2016: 28% vs. 2017: 35%). *Demonstration of Responsibility* was also a great factor (2016: 17% and 2017: 15%).

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, students found *Vocational Development* (2016: 18% and 2017: 17%) and *Especially Challenging* activities (2016: 18% and 2017: 15%) to be great sources of self-discovery. Within the **Relationships** category, students learned a lot about themselves during *Collaboration with Peers* in both years (2016: 17% and 2017: 15%).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2017 is tabulated in the following three tables. How different majors' students are motivated could be valuable information for the faculty to use as they craft improvements within their majors. Since coursework, especially within the majors, is the largest context for self-discovery for all Truman students (as shown in the fourth table in this section), we can tailor more appropriate opportunities for self-discovery within each of our majors.

SELF DISCOVERY: 2017 Student Rationales by major

		2017 N	Risk/Growth/Challenge									
			Introspection		Perspective		P.growth		Responsibility		Dilemma	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	14	41%	2	6%	18	53%	2	6%	0	0%
	CRWT	10	4	40%	1	10%	5	50%	1	10%	0	0%
	ENG	65	26	40%	3	5%	20	31%	4	6%	3	5%
	CML	21	11	52%	0	0%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%
	LING	10	3	30%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
	MUSI	32	16	50%	0	0%	20	63%	6	19%	1	3%
	THEA	16	7	44%	0	0%	9	56%	3	19%	1	6%
	AAL	188	81	43%	6	3%	77	41%	17	9%	5	3%
Business	ACCT	75	25	33%	3	4%	40	53%	9	12%	1	1%
	BSAD	111	31	28%	6	5%	47	42%	16	14%	1	1%
	BUS	186	56	30%	9	5%	87	47%	25	13%	2	1%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	2	25%	0	0%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%
	CMDS	32	9	28%	0	0%	15	47%	6	19%	2	6%
	ES	82	28	34%	4	5%	35	43%	16	20%	4	5%
	HLTH	73	25	34%	5	7%	36	49%	14	19%	2	3%
	NU	36	12	33%	1	3%	16	44%	9	25%	1	3%
	HSE	231	76	33%	10	4%	105	45%	45	19%	9	4%
Social and Cultural Studies	COM M	64	21	33%	3	5%	31	48%	8	13%	3	5%
	ECON	17	11	65%	3	18%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%
	HIST	46	19	41%	3	7%	24	52%	13	28%	2	4%
	JUST	32	6	19%	0	0%	15	47%	4	13%	1	3%
	PHRE	10	5	50%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%
	POL	15	4	27%	0	0%	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%
	PSYC	105	37	35%	8	8%	43	41%	14	13%	2	2%
	SOAN	19	7	37%	1	5%	11	58%	3	16%	1	5%
SCS	308	110	36%	19	6%	134	44%	46	15%	10	3%	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	10	34%	2	7%	9	31%	1	3%	1	3%
	BIOL	120	40	33%	9	8%	49	41%	21	18%	2	2%
	CHEM	26	10	38%	2	8%	10	38%	4	15%	1	4%
	CS	42	15	36%	4	10%	12	29%	9	21%	0	0%
	MATH	26	12	46%	3	12%	12	46%	3	12%	0	0%
	PHYS	9	1	11%	1	11%	4	44%	1	11%	1	11%
	SAM	252	88	35%	21	8%	96	38%	39	15%	5	2%
	IDSM	5	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%
ALL	1170	413	35%	66	6%	500	43%	173	15%	33	3%	

SELF DISCOVERY: 2017 Student Rationales by major (continued)

		2017 N	Academic/Scholarship									
			P. Best		Challenging		Intel. Risk		Vocation		Professional	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	6	18%	3	9%	1	3%	6	18%	2	6%
	CML	21	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3	14%	2	10%
	CRWT	10	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%
	ENG	65	4	6%	6	9%	6	9%	15	23%	5	8%
	LING	10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%
	MUSI	32	4	13%	8	25%	0	0%	7	22%	3	9%
	THEA	16	2	13%	4	25%	1	6%	5	31%	3	19%
	AAL	188	18	10%	22	12%	9	5%	38	20%	16	9%
Business	ACCT	75	5	7%	14	19%	2	3%	7	9%	8	11%
	BSAD	111	3	3%	12	11%	3	3%	15	14%	3	3%
	BUS	186	8	4%	26	14%	5	3%	22	12%	11	6%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	2	25%
	CMDS	32	3	9%	8	25%	2	6%	9	28%	4	13%
	ES	82	2	2%	18	22%	1	1%	9	11%	4	5%
	HLTH	73	10	14%	12	16%	1	1%	14	19%	12	16%
	NU	36	2	6%	15	42%	1	3%	12	33%	7	19%
	HSE	231	17	7%	53	23%	6	3%	48	21%	29	13%
	SOS	100	10	10%	25	25%	10	10%	20	20%	10	10%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	2	3%	6	9%	3	5%	6	9%	3	5%
	ECON	17	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%	3	18%	0	0%
	HIST	46	5	11%	9	20%	3	7%	4	9%	3	7%
	JUST	32	0	0%	5	16%	0	0%	6	19%	4	13%
	PHRE	10	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	2	20%
	POL	15	1	7%	2	13%	1	7%	4	27%	3	20%
	PSYC	105	2	2%	8	8%	2	2%	13	12%	4	4%
	SOAN	19	0	0%	2	11%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%
	SCS	308	10	3%	35	11%	12	4%	39	13%	19	6%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	9	31%	4	14%
	BIOL	120	4	3%	20	17%	3	3%	21	18%	12	10%
	CHEM	26	1	4%	8	31%	0	0%	6	23%	2	8%
	CS	42	1	2%	4	10%	0	0%	9	21%	3	7%
	MATH	26	1	4%	5	19%	3	12%	4	15%	0	0%
	PHYS	9	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	252	8	3%	39	15%	8	3%	49	19%	21	8%
IDSM	5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	
ALL	1170	61	5%	175	15%	40	3%	197	17%	96	8%	

SELF DISCOVERY: 2017 Student Rationales by major (continued)

		2017 N	Relationships							
			Service		Collaboration Peers		Collaboration Professional		Mentoring	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	0	0%	2	6%	2	6%	1	3%
	CML	21	1	5%	3	14%	1	10%	1	5%
	CRWT	10	1	10%	1	10%	4	6%	0	0%
	ENG	65	4	6%	10	15%	0	0%	1	2%
	LING	10	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%
	MUSI	32	1	3%	4	13%	1	3%	2	6%
	THEA	16	0	0%	3	19%	0	0%	3	19%
	AAL	188	8	4%	25	13%	9	5%	8	4%
Business	ACCT	75	4	5%	19	25%	3	4%	1	1%
	BSAD	111	7	6%	34	31%	3	3%	5	5%
	BUS	186	11	6%	53	28%	6	3%	6	3%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	1	13%
	CMDS	32	4	13%	10	31%	0	0%	3	9%
	ES	82	8	10%	18	22%	0	0%	2	2%
	HLTH	73	13	18%	18	25%	2	3%	3	4%
	NU	36	3	8%	6	17%	0	0%	1	3%
	HSE	231	29	13%	54	23%	2	1%	10	4%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	7	11%	16	25%	1	2%	3	5%
	ECON	17	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
	HIST	46	3	7%	9	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	JUST	32	4	13%	9	28%	0	0%	1	3%
	PHRE	10	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	15	1	7%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	PSYC	105	13	12%	19	18%	1	1%	0	0%
	SOAN	19	2	11%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%
	SCS	308	32	10%	63	20%	2	1%	4	1%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	3	10%	6	21%	1	3%	0	0%
	BIOL	120	6	5%	19	16%	4	3%	3	3%
	CHEM	26	4	15%	8	31%	0	0%	2	8%
	CS	42	4	10%	9	21%	0	0%	0	0%
	MATH	26	1	4%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%
	PHYS	9	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%
	SAM	252	18	7%	44	17%	7	3%	5	2%
IDSM	5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
ALL	1170	98	8%	239	20%	26	2%	33	3%	

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Coursework

- LSP
- Major
- Capstone
- Minor
- Elective

Other Academic

- Research
- Internship
- Study Abroad
- Resume/Professional Statement
- Service Learning
- Tutoring/Teaching/Mentorship
- Other Academic

Student Organization

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

Athletics

- Varsity Athletics
- Club Athletics
- Other Athletics

Employment

- Campus Employment
- Volunteer Work
- Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

- Public Performance/Recital
- Other Creative Effort

Other

- Relationships/Friendships
- Residence Life
- ROTC
- Other Misc.

As can be seen from the summary table on the following page, 30% of our graduates enjoy significant self-discovery within Truman’s coursework, with most of that (21%) being within the student’s major. Student organizations (21%) and Other Academic (17%) also were important categories of contexts for self-discovery. With this in mind, we should be able to construct more opportunities in these contexts for this important aspect of liberal arts and sciences education.

SELF DISCOVERY: Context of the Experience (continued)

SELF Context Category	SELF Context Specifics	2016 N	2016%	2017 N	2017%
Coursework	LSP	57	5.50%	44	3.96%
Coursework	Major	239	23.30%	229	20.63%
Coursework	Capstone	3	0.30%	1	0.09%
Coursework	Minor	20	2.00%	24	2.16%
Coursework	Elective	17	1.70%	33	2.97%
Coursework	All Coursework	336	32.70%	331	29.82%
Other Academic	Research	11	1.10%	20	1.80%
Other Academic	Internship	33	3.20%	40	3.60%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	61	5.90%	64	5.77%
Other Academic	Resume/Prof. Statement	4	0.40%	1	0.09%
Other Academic	Service Learning	1	0.10%	4	0.36%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	7	0.70%	20	1.80%
Other Academic	Other Academic	51	5.00%	36	3.24%
Other Academic	All Other Academic	168	16.30%	185	16.67%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	3	0.30%	5	0.45%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	31	3.00%	19	1.71%
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	111	10.80%	139	12.52%
Student Organizations	Professional/Major	12	1.20%	11	0.99%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	16	1.60%	26	2.34%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	3	0.30%	8	0.72%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	2	0.20%	5	0.45%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	19	1.90%	20	1.80%
Student Organizations	All Student Organizations	197	19.20%	233	20.99%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	41	4.00%	43	3.87%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	5	0.50%	7	0.63%
Athletics	Other Athletic	4	0.40%	4	0.36%
Athletics	All Athletics	50	4.90%	54	4.86%
Employment	Campus job	27	2.60%	11	0.99%
Employment	Volunteer	20	2.00%	10	0.90%
Employment	Off Campus Job	15	1.50%	22	1.98%
Employment	All Employment	62	6.00%	43	3.87%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	3	0.30%	8	0.72%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	6	0.60%	4	0.36%
Performance/Creative Act.	All Perform./Creative Act.	9	0.90%	12	1.08%
Other	Relationships/Friendships	98	9.50%	123	11.08%
Other	Resident Life	20	2.00%	22	1.98%
Other	ROTC	4	0.40%	8	0.72%
Other	Other Misc.	84	8.20%	99	8.92%
Other	All Other	206	20.00%	252	22.70%
	Total	1028	100.00%	1110	100.00%

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

The readers also categorize the submission for where the submission came from, e.g., from coursework, student organizations, athletics, etc. While this data has been collected for some time, we have only started downloading this data in 2016. It will be interesting to see if and how the data from these categories evolves in the future.

The Most Personally Satisfying Prompt

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

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

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

- It represented a personal best*
- The student achieved personal goals*
- The student achieved significant personal growth*

- *It was especially challenging*
- *It modeled working as a professional*
- *It was a collaborative effort*
- *It was enjoyable*
- *No indication*
- *The student solved a problem*
- *It too a lot of work and/or time*

Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2013-2017

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Reasons					
Enjoyable	43%	46%	47%	42%	52%
Personal Growth	36%	48%	45%	48%	47%
Challenging	32%	34%	27%	35%	39%
Professional	23%	25%	26%	26%	29%
Personal Goals	19%	21%	24%	21%	27%
Lots of Time*	*	*	*	17%	26%
Collaborative	10%	15%	16%	18%	23%
Personal Best	27%	23%	20%	21%	20%
Problem Solving	3%	8%	1%	7%	6%

The table above shows the percentage of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why the submission was so satisfying for them. In 2017, “enjoyable” work (at 52%) edged out “personal growth” (at 47%) as the greatest factor for our students’ satisfaction. “Challenging” work was the third most popular reason for student satisfaction again this year. These three reasons have been the top three reasons for many years now. Perhaps because Truman attracts such a highly capable cohort of students, they do seem to enjoy stretching their skill sets and being challenged significantly. Other data and surveys indicate that many of our students are very stressed, however. Truman faculty should clearly keep pushing our students to grow and learn, while simultaneously offering the support that they need to maintain their sanity. It is critical to maintain our lofty goals while being mindful of the sensitive nature of our over-achievers!

The two tables below show the 2017 data broken down by major. The data for each reason is indicated as a raw number of students from within that major and as a percentage of that major’s total students. The reasons within a particular major vary greatly, so it might be worthwhile for each department to see what motivates their own students.

Most Personally Satisfying: Scores sorted by first major

		2017 N	Pers. Best		Pers. Goals		Pers. Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	8	24%	8	24%	20	59%	9	26%	6	18%
	CML	21	4	19%	6	29%	14	67%	7	33%	6	29%
	CRWT	10	2	20%	2	20%	5	50%	5	50%	4	40%
	ENG	65	15	23%	17	26%	30	46%	20	31%	18	28%
	LING	10	2	20%	1	10%	5	50%	8	80%	1	10%
	MUSI	32	8	25%	13	41%	15	47%	14	44%	19	59%
	THEA	16	4	25%	6	38%	9	56%	6	38%	12	75%
	AAL	188	43	23%	53	28%	98	52%	69	37%	66	35%
Business	ACCT	75	12	16%	18	24%	24	32%	33	44%	21	28%
	BSAD	111	17	15%	25	23%	51	46%	30	27%	30	27%
	BUS	186	29	16%	43	23%	75	40%	63	34%	51	27%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	0	0%	6	75%	3	38%	3	38%	4	50%
	CMDS	32	9	28%	11	34%	13	41%	15	47%	11	34%
	ES	82	14	17%	20	24%	42	51%	27	33%	20	24%
	HLTH	73	8	11%	16	22%	39	53%	26	36%	25	34%
	NU	36	7	19%	5	14%	16	44%	13	36%	15	42%
	HSE	231	38	16%	58	25%	113	49%	84	36%	75	32%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	16	25%	16	25%	36	56%	25	39%	15	23%
	ECON	17	5	29%	4	24%	5	29%	4	24%	5	29%
	HIST	46	14	30%	16	35%	20	43%	27	59%	9	20%
	JUST	32	6	19%	5	16%	16	50%	13	41%	6	19%
	PHRE	10	3	30%	1	10%	5	50%	2	20%	1	10%
	POL	15	2	13%	1	7%	5	33%	8	53%	2	13%
	PSYC	105	16	15%	29	28%	64	61%	40	38%	27	26%
	SOAN	19	6	32%	6	32%	8	42%	9	47%	3	16%
	SCS	308	68	22%	78	25%	159	52%	128	42%	68	22%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	4	14%	9	31%	12	41%	8	28%	14	48%
	BIOL	120	32	27%	42	35%	55	46%	54	45%	25	21%
	CHEM	26	3	12%	7	27%	11	42%	13	50%	4	15%
	CS	42	7	17%	16	38%	14	33%	20	48%	10	24%
	MATH	26	5	19%	6	23%	12	46%	10	38%	6	23%
	PHYS	9	3	33%	1	11%	3	33%	4	44%	4	44%
	SAM	252	54	21%	81	32%	107	42%	109	43%	63	25%
IDSM	5	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	3	60%	1	20%	
ALL	1170	232	20%	314	27%	555	47%	456	39%	324	28%	

Most Personally Satisfying: Scores sorted by first major, continued

		2017 N	Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Prob. Solv.		Lots of time	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	3	9%	20	59%	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%
	CML	21	4	19%	10	48%	0	0%	0	0%	4	19%
	CRWT	10	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	4	40%
	ENG	65	10	15%	35	54%	0	0%	0	0%	16	25%
	LING	10	1	10%	5	50%	0	0%	1	10%	4	40%
	MUSI	32	4	13%	19	59%	1	3%	4	13%	9	28%
	THEA	16	6	38%	8	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
	AAL	188	28	15%	100	53%	1	1%	6	3%	41	22%
Business	ACCT	75	22	29%	36	48%	0	0%	6	8%	25	33%
	BSAD	111	32	29%	60	54%	0	0%	5	5%	19	17%
	BUS	186	54	29%	96	52%	0	0%	11	6%	44	24%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	1	13%	3	38%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%
	CMDS	32	6	19%	14	44%	1	3%	2	6%	9	28%
	ES	82	19	23%	41	50%	0	0%	4	5%	16	20%
	HLTH	73	18	25%	40	55%	0	0%	1	1%	11	15%
	NU	36	5	14%	10	28%	0	0%	1	3%	6	17%
	HSE	231	49	21%	108	47%	1	0%	10	4%	42	18%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	15	23%	32	50%	0	0%	3	5%	20	31%
	ECON	17	3	18%	6	35%	0	0%	1	6%	3	18%
	HIST	46	4	9%	20	43%	0	0%	2	4%	13	28%
	JUST	32	5	16%	15	47%	0	0%	1	3%	6	19%
	PHRE	10	1	10%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	3	30%
	POL	15	2	13%	7	47%	0	0%	3	20%	5	33%
	PSYC	105	25	24%	58	55%	0	0%	6	6%	28	27%
	SOAN	19	4	21%	13	68%	0	0%	0	0%	6	32%
	SCS	308	59	19%	153	50%	2	1%	17	6%	84	27%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	8	28%	14	48%	0	0%	1	3%	11	38%
	BIOL	120	25	21%	57	48%	3	3%	13	11%	39	33%
	CHEM	26	6	23%	9	35%	1	4%	3	12%	10	38%
	CS	42	11	26%	16	38%	0	0%	6	14%	9	21%
	MATH	26	3	12%	10	38%	0	0%	2	8%	6	23%
	PHYS	9	3	33%	3	33%	0	0%	2	22%	3	33%
	SAM	252	56	22%	109	43%	4	2%	27	11%	78	31%
IDSM	5	2	40%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	
ALL	1170	248	21%	570	49%	8	1%	71	6%	291	25%	

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Coursework

- LSP
- Major
- Capstone
- Minor
- Elective

Other Academic

- Research
- Internship
- Study Abroad
- Resume/Professional Statement
- Service Learning
- Tutoring/Teaching/Mentorship
- Other Academic

Student Organization

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

Athletics

- Varsity Athletics
- Club Athletics
- Other Athletics

Employment

- Campus Employment
- Volunteer Work
- Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

- Public Performance/Recital
- Other Creative Effort

Other

- Relationships/Friendships
- Residence Life
- ROTC
- Other Misc.

This final table below shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, data that we began downloading in 2016. Faculty could choose only one context that best fits the submission, so the total percentage here reflects that. As seen in 2016, well over half (57%) of the submissions are from coursework, and over a third (36%) are from the course work of the student’s major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. This year, student organizations (14%) edged out other academic activities (13%) with the next two highest percentages here.

Most Personally Satisfying Context 2016-2017

MOST Context Categories	MOST Context Specifics	2016 N	2016_%	2017 N	2017_%
Coursework	LSP	102	9.70%	90	8.15%
Coursework	Major	384	36.50%	396	35.87%
Coursework	Capstone	16	1.52%	22	1.99%
Coursework	Minor	42	3.99%	58	5.25%
Coursework	Elective	48	4.56%	68	6.16%
Coursework	ALL Coursework	592	56.27%	634	57.42%
Other Academic	Research	36	3.42%	22	1.99%
Other Academic	Internship	18	1.71%	30	2.72%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	44	4.18%	38	3.44%
Other Academic	Resume/Professional Stmtnt	1	0.10%	10	0.91%
Other Academic	Service Learning	3	0.29%	4	0.36%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	11	1.05%	8	0.72%
Other Academic	Other Academic	26	2.47%	26	2.36%
Other Academic	ALL Other Academic	147	13.97%	138	12.50%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	4	0.38%	4	0.36%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	21	2.00%	28	2.54%
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	54	5.13%	80	7.25%
Student Organizations	Professional/Major	10	0.95%	14	1.27%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	15	1.43%	16	1.45%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	7	0.67%	1	0.09%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	5	0.48%	3	0.27%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	16	1.52%	9	0.82%
Student Organizations	ALL Student Organizations	132	12.55%	155	14.05%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	41	3.90%	28	2.54%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	12	1.14%	15	1.36%
Athletics	Other Athletic	6	0.57%	3	0.27%
Athletics	ALL Athletics	59	5.61%	46	4.17%
Employment	Campus job	17	1.62%	14	1.27%
Employment	Volunteer	24	2.28%	22	1.99%
Employment	Off Campus Job	11	1.05%	14	1.27%
Employment	ALL Employment	52	4.94%	50	4.53%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	15	1.43%	24	2.17%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	12	1.14%	16	1.45%
Performance/Creative Activity	ALL Perform./Creative Act.	27	2.57%	40	3.62%
Other Misc	Relationships/Friendships	15	1.43%	15	1.36%
Other Misc	Residence Life	8	0.76%	5	0.45%
Other Misc	ROTC	2	0.19%	4	0.36%
Other Misc	Other Misc	26	2.47%	17	1.54%
Other Misc	ALL Other Misc	43	4.09%	41	3.71%
	TOTAL	1052	100.00%	1104	100.00%

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 defined Transformative Learning as follows:

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

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

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

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

2013-2017 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

Acad. Yr.	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.4	52%	3.5	53%	3.5	56%	3.5	56%	3.6	57%
BUS	3.0	33%	3.1	37%	3.2	41%	3.0	33%	3.1	40%
HSE	3.3	49%	3.5	53%	3.5	54%	3.5	58%	3.5	53%
SCS	3.4	52%	3.4	52%	3.4	53%	3.5	56%	3.6	59%
SAM	3.4	52%	3.5	52%	3.4	52%	3	52%	2.9	50%
IDS	3.7	60%	3.4	60%	4.2	100%	3.4	50%	3.6	50%
All students	3.3	49%	3.3	49%	3.4	52%	3.3	52%	3.3	53%

Overall, about half of students answered “Totally” or “Very” transformative to this question, a value that has been remarkably consistent over the last 5 years.

2017 Counts of Scores, Sorted by Major, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

		2017 N	1	2	3	4	5	Avg.	% 4 & 5
Arts and Letters	ART	34	1	1	9	14	9	3.85	68%
	CWRT	10	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	50%
	ENG	65	1	8	20	25	11	3.57	55%
	CML	21	0	0	7	13	1	3.71	67%
	LING	10	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	50%
	MUS	32	2	0	13	14	3	3.50	53%
	THEA	16	0	2	6	7	1	3.44	50%
	AAL	188	4	14	62	81	27	3.60	57%
Business	ACCT	75	5	16	24	26	4	3.11	40%
	BSAD	111	14	18	35	32	12	3.09	40%
	BUS	186	19	34	59	58	16	3.10	40%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	38%
	CMDS	32	1	2	8	18	3	3.63	66%
	ES	82	4	14	26	25	13	3.35	46%
	HLTH	73	2	3	31	35	2	3.44	51%
	NU	36	0	4	9	21	2	3.58	64%
	HSE	231	8	23	78	101	21	3.45	53%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	2	2	13	38	9	3.78	73%
	ECON	17	1	3	6	6	1	3.18	41%
	HIST	46	1	5	11	25	4	3.57	63%
	JUST	32	1	6	12	8	5	3.31	41%
	PHRE	10	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	60%
	POL	15	0	2	1	12	0	3.67	80%
	PSYC	105	1	12	33	45	14	3.56	56%
	SOAN	19	0	4	6	4	5	3.53	47%
	SCS	308	7	36	83	140	42	3.56	59%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	2	4	7	12	4	3.41	55%
	BIOL	120	1	18	41	49	11	3.43	50%
	CHEM	26	0	3	7	13	3	3.62	62%
	CS	42	1	1	1	1	1	0.36	40%
	MATH	26	0	4	13	7	2	3.27	35%
	PHYS	9	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	44%
	SAM	252	5	30	73	85	22	2.91	50%
	IDSM	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	60%
	ALL	1170	43	138	356	467	129	3.33	53%

Examining the counts for each score and the average score for each discipline in the table above reveals very few significant differences, although the percentage of students within each major who scored 4 & 5 does vary widely.

Next, students were asked:

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

In all, 423 students (36%) listed one or more courses as transformational. This percentage for all Truman students is exactly the same as last year. The percentages of students within each major however vary widely, and are included in a table below.

Students were next asked if they had an experience with writing that they would report as transformational. This year, 241 (21%) students reported such an experience, again with exactly the same percentage as reported last year.

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. 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.

The table below shows the percentages of all Truman students who reported each of these kinds of activities in the last 6 years. Again, you will notice that the percentages are remarkably consistent over time for most kinds of activities. Note that the large variation in the courses category resulted from fixing a downloading error (introduced in 2014 and fixed in 2015).

2012-2017 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Experience	% Reporting Activity					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Study Abroad	23%	19%	20%	18%	21%	20%
Service Learning	23%	18%	23%	24%	23%	17%
Research	31%	27%	29%	29%	31%	31%
Internship	33%	26%	35%	33%	33%	35%
Leadership	40%	36%	38%	38%	42%	41%
Student-led	9%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%
Writing*	25%	21%	21%	22%	21%	21%
Other*	7%	7%	7%	8%	7%	8%
Course*	45%	42%	16%	78%	77%	75%
Any (Big 4)	65%	65%	69%	67%	68%	70%
Any	82%	79%	83%	87%	83%	85%

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

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

2013-2017 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Experience	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Study Abroad	24%	13%	25%	10%	20%	14%	25%	15%	24%	14%
Service Learn.	25%	9%	29%	14%	28%	17%	28%	15%	21%	11%
Research	29%	26%	30%	29%	30%	26%	35%	24%	33%	29%
Internship	38%	30%	35%	34%	32%	35%	35%	30%	38%	31%
Leadership	37%	37%	41%	33%	41%	33%	46%	36%	45%	34%
Student-led	8%	6%	9%	5%	9%	6%	7%	8%	8%	5%
Course*	46%	38%	17%	15%	41%	27%	40%	30%	40%	31%
Writing*	23%	19%	22%	20%	22%	20%	23%	18%	24%	16%
Other*	8%	6%	7%	7%	8%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2017, women participated in these types of activities at frequencies ranging from 0 to 12 percentage points more than men. Men did not participate at a higher rate than women in any category this year.

2017 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

		2017 N	Participation by Experience								
Major	StAbr		ServL	UGRes	Intern	Ldrshp	Stuled	Writing	Course	Other	
Arts and Letters	ART	34	29%	3%	3%	56%	26%	3%	18%	29%	12%
	CWRT	10	40%	0%	30%	10%	60%	0%	70%	70%	20%
	ENG	65	25%	14%	18%	20%	35%	9%	54%	52%	6%
	CML	21	71%	19%	29%	10%	43%	10%	19%	67%	10%
	LING	10	50%	20%	0%	40%	60%	10%	20%	50%	10%
	MUS	32	16%	6%	22%	0%	31%	9%	22%	44%	9%
	THEA	16	6%	0%	0%	50%	44%	44%	6%	25%	0%
	AAL	188	30%	10%	15%	25%	37%	11%	33%	47%	9%
Business	ACCT	75	19%	8%	11%	47%	43%	0%	17%	21%	9%
	BSAD	111	31%	6%	12%	42%	39%	5%	14%	22%	5%
	BUS	186	26%	7%	11%	44%	40%	3%	16%	22%	6%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed	ATHT	8	0%	50%	63%	25%	25%	0%	13%	38%	0%
	CMDS	32	22%	41%	56%	13%	63%	9%	22%	34%	9%
	ES	82	12%	26%	39%	50%	30%	10%	11%	37%	9%
	HLTH	73	5%	86%	44%	41%	45%	7%	10%	29%	7%
	NU	36	33%	19%	14%	53%	42%	8%	28%	36%	11%
	HSE	231	14%	47%	40%	42%	41%	8%	15%	34%	8%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	25%	9%	17%	38%	48%	8%	27%	44%	11%
	ECON	17	24%	6%	18%	35%	24%	0%	24%	41%	12%
	HIST	46	33%	7%	37%	50%	41%	4%	30%	37%	7%
	JUST	32	3%	16%	6%	16%	44%	3%	13%	41%	9%
	PHRE	10	20%	10%	30%	10%	50%	20%	40%	60%	0%
	POL	15	47%	0%	20%	67%	40%	0%	27%	47%	20%
	PSYC	105	10%	14%	65%	32%	37%	7%	22%	38%	8%
	SOAN	19	26%	0%	84%	37%	47%	0%	5%	37%	0%
	SCS	308	19%	10%	40%	36%	41%	6%	23%	41%	8%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	3%	10%	14%	24%	59%	17%	17%	24%	10%
	BIOL	120	18%	13%	50%	18%	39%	3%	17%	43%	9%
	CHEM	26	12%	8%	65%	35%	46%	8%	27%	31%	8%
	CS	42	12%	7%	21%	52%	31%	2%	14%	21%	2%
	MATH	26	12%	12%	12%	31%	46%	4%	12%	35%	8%
	PHYS	9	11%	0%	78%	33%	44%	0%	22%	44%	0%
	SAM	252	13%	11%	40%	28%	42%	5%	17%	35%	8%
IDSM	5	20%	60%	40%	60%	80%	60%	40%	60%	0%	
ALL	1170	20%	17%	31%	35%	41%	7%	21%	36%	8%	

When participation rates are examined by the students' first majors, most of the differences are unsurprising. For example, language majors study abroad more than most, while pre-professional majors (in both BUS and HSE) take internships. As we saw in the Civic Engagement prompt data, the School of Health Science and Education does a significant amount of service learning in their curricula. Science majors do a lot of research, etc.

2017 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

	Major	Big4 Participation				All Participation		
		2017 N	One or More	Two or More	Big4 Avg.	One or More	Two or More	All Avg.
Arts and Letters	ART	34	68%	32%	0.87	79%	47%	1.40
	CWRT	10	80%	30%	0.88	100%	80%	2.50
	ENG	65	52%	20%	0.78	80%	51%	1.84
	CML	21	76%	48%	0.92	90%	57%	1.39
	LING	10	60%	40%	1.10	90%	60%	2.10
	MUS	32	44%	13%	0.53	75%	38%	1.23
	THEA	16	50%	6%	0.56	94%	38%	1.50
	AAL	188	58%	24%	0.81	83%	49%	1.71
Business	ACCT	75	67%	33%	0.84	83%	56%	1.53
	BSAD	111	68%	34%	0.95	79%	57%	1.61
	BUS	186	68%	34%	0.89	81%	56%	1.57
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	88%	38%	1.38	88%	50%	1.75
	CMDS	32	75%	44%	1.31	100%	72%	2.34
	ES	82	80%	41%	1.30	87%	59%	1.90
	HLTH	73	93%	62%	1.76	96%	78%	2.44
	NU	36	78%	31%	1.19	92%	64%	2.08
	HSE	231	84%	46%	1.39	92%	67%	2.10
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	59%	31%	0.89	86%	59%	1.84
	ECON	17	71%	24%	0.80	82%	41%	1.33
	HIST	46	80%	39%	1.25	89%	72%	2.09
	JUST	32	41%	6%	0.42	63%	38%	1.13
	PHRE	10	60%	10%	0.70	80%	50%	1.80
	POL	15	80%	40%	1.33	93%	67%	2.20
	PSYC	105	81%	37%	1.20	90%	63%	1.92
	SOAN	19	100%	37%	1.47	100%	58%	2.00
	SCS	308	72%	31%	1.01	86%	59%	1.79
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	45%	17%	0.52	93%	55%	1.63
	BIOL	120	68%	29%	0.99	79%	51%	1.67
	CHEM	26	81%	38%	1.19	92%	69%	2.08
	CS	42	76%	19%	0.95	83%	43%	1.48
	MATH	26	54%	12%	0.54	77%	46%	1.25
	PHYS	9	89%	33%	1.22	89%	89%	1.89
	SAM	252	67%	25%	0.90	83%	53%	1.67
IDSMT	5	80%	60%	1.80	100%	80%	3.60	
ALL	1170	68%	31%	1.94	85%	57%	2.07	

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. In 2017, four majors have 100% participation in one of these kinds of experiences, and ten others of our majors have at least 90% of their students reporting it. This total of 14 majors with >90% participation is a big increase over the eight majors reporting such last year. Campus-wide, 68% of all

students report having at least one of the “Big 4” and 85% reporting having some transformative experience.

Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time (2013-2017)

School/Yr	N	Percent Participation by Experience									
		StAbr	ServL	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Ldrshp	StuLed	Writing	Other	Any
AAL											
2013	201	22%	6%	15%	20%	48%	23%	9%	35%	9%	72%
2014	204	0%	9%	19%	20%	55%	34%	7%	38%	11%	77%
2015	196	26%	12%	10%	26%	52%	40%	7%	37%	9%	82%
2016	169	33%	14%	11%	20%	55%	36%	8%	33%	8%	79%
2017	188	30%	10%	15%	25%	58%	37%	11%	33%	9%	83%
BUS											
2013	171	20%	10%	8%	44%	61%	42%	2%	11%	9%	74%
2014	158	17%	13%	6%	43%	60%	47%	7%	13%	6%	76%
2015	163	18%	13%	7%	39%	56%	34%	7%	15%	6%	73%
2016	174	23%	9%	11%	42%	63%	47%	4%	16%	6%	80%
2017	186	26%	7%	11%	44%	68%	40%	3%	16%	6%	81%
HSE											
2013	247	16%	47%	40%	44%	80%	38%	9%	12%	6%	87%
2014	248	23%	50%	37%	46%	86%	40%	8%	14%	6%	92%
2015	300	14%	47%	39%	38%	82%	38%	8%	18%	11%	90%
2016	267	18%	51%	42%	40%	83%	43%	7%	15%	8%	90%
2017	231	14%	47%	40%	42%	84%	41%	8%	15%	8%	92%
SAM											
2013	204	19%	10%	41%	25%	67%	34%	7%	22%	6%	78%
2014	239	17%	9%	38%	26%	63%	36%	7%	16%	5%	79%
2015	201	27%	10%	38%	28%	69%	41%	5%	15%	10%	84%
2016	215	14%	14%	40%	31%	65%	42%	9%	13%	5%	80%
2017	252	13%	11%	40%	28%	67%	42%	5%	17%	8%	83%
SCS											
2013	288	19%	14%	26%	3%	64%	41%	6%	24%	6%	82%
2014	331	18%	27%	36%	39%	90%	35%	7%	24%	9%	86%
2015	290	25%	24%	37%	32%	68%	36%	10%	23%	6%	81%
2016	281	21%	15%	37%	30%	65%	41%	7%	28%	8%	82%
2017	308	19%	10%	40%	36%	72%	41%	6%	23%	8%	86%
IDS											
2013	3	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	67%	33%	66%
2014	5	60%	40%	20%	40%	100%	40%	40%	40%	0%	100%
2015	5	60%	40%	0%	20%	60%	60%	40%	20%	0%	80%
2016	8	38%	38%	38%	50%	88%	63%	50%	38%	38%	88%
2017	5	20%	60%	40%	60%	80%	80%	60%	40%	0%	100%
ALL											
2013	1114	19%	18%	27%	26%	65%	36%	7%	21%	7%	79%
2014	1185	20%	23%	29%	35%	69%	38%	7%	21%	7%	83%
2015	1155	22%	24%	29%	33%	67%	38%	8%	21%	8%	83%
2016	1114	21%	23%	31%	33%	68%	42%	7%	21%	7%	83%
2017	1170	20%	17%	31%	35%	68%	41%	7%	21%	8%	85%

This table shows the reported participation rates for students from each school over the last five years. University-wide, these participation numbers have not changed much.

However, examination by school shows that some schools are very slowly edging these numbers upward.

The Letter to Truman Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

These submissions are the favorites of the readers, since many of the students say wonderful things about their experiences and the people at Truman. Sometimes, a student reveals alarming details, so much that someone should contact the student and/or report the problem to officials. Readers are able to indicate that in their evaluation of the submission. Sometimes, a student heaps accolades on one individual or a department; readers flag such instances, and if the student has given us permission to do so, we try to report this praise to the parties involved. This prompt is traditionally read on the last day of each reading session, and parts of representative letters are shared with the group.

The Letter to Truman Prompt

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

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

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

Points that you might include are:

- * The process you used in putting together the portfolio, including the total amount of time (in hours) you spent in assembling your portfolio.*
- * Anything you may have learned or affirmed about yourself through the portfolio process.*
- * Your thoughts on the portfolio assessment process.*
- * Did you hear about the portfolio ahead of time? Which methods of communication worked best?*
- * Your thoughts on other assessment instruments or practices here at Truman.*
- * Your thoughts on your experiences and education while at Truman in your major, other classes, and out-of-class experiences.*
- * Your plans for the future.*
- * Anything else you want to tell us.*

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

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

Reviewer Specific Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hours Spent on the Portfolio Project

2017 Percentile	2017 Hours
99%	35
90%	11
75%	8
50%	5
25%	3
10%	2
0%	1

In 2017, students spent a similar amount of time as in 2016 compiling their Portfolio prompt responses, with a mode of 5 hours. Perhaps our small but steady increase in time spent on the Portfolio is leveling out.

Student Attitudes Toward the Portfolio and other Assessment at Truman in 2017

	N 2017	Attitude toward Portfolio					Attitude toward Assessment					
		Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W%Pos	Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W%Pos	
Arts and Letters	ART	34	1	7	12	14	78%	0	5	8	20	81%
	CML	21	2	6	6	6	64%	2	3	5	10	65%
	CRWT	10	2	2	1	4	40%	1	0	0	8	0%
	ENG	65	5	15	22	21	70%	5	9	8	41	57%
	LING	10	0	4	4	2	75%	0	1	5	4	92%
	MUSI	32	5	11	9	6	58%	2	7	3	20	54%
	THEA	16	5	6	1	4	33%	1	1	2	11	63%
	AAL	188	20	51	55	57	64%	11	26	31	114	65%
Business	ACCT	75	11	13	23	24	63%	4	9	13	43	67%
	BSAD	111	17	23	32	38	60%	6	11	19	73	68%
		BUS	186	28	36	55	62	61%	10	20	32	116
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	1	0	1	6	50%	1	0	1	6	50%
	CMDS	32	3	12	11	6	65%	3	4	3	21	50%
	ES	82	6	19	23	31	68%	5	17	13	44	61%
	HLTH	73	3	14	37	18	81%	4	9	11	48	65%
	NU	36	6	8	10	12	58%	0	4	7	25	82%
		HSE	231	19	53	82	73	70%	13	34	35	144
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	7	17	11	28	56%	1	12	16	33	76%
	ECON	17	0	2	8	7	90%	0	0	9	8	100%
	HIST	46	2	8	13	23	74%	3	9	6	27	58%
	JUST	32	7	5	10	10	57%	2	4	9	17	73%
	PHRE	10	0	5	1	4	58%	1	1	0	7	25%
	POL	15	0	3	4	7	79%	0	1	2	12	83%
	PSYC	105	14	26	32	31	63%	8	16	21	58	64%
		SOAN	19	3	2	2	11	43%	0	2	4	13
	SCS	308	33	68	81	121	63%	15	45	67	175	70%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	2	2	5	20	67%	0	2	6	21	88%
	BIOL	120	11	24	43	41	71%	5	14	31	69	76%
	CHEM	26	0	2	12	12	93%	0	4	4	18	75%
	CS	42	6	6	10	18	59%	0	3	6	31	83%
	MATH	26	5	9	8	4	57%	0	8	8	9	75%
	PHYS	9	1	3	0	4	38%	0	0	0	8	0%
		SAM	252	25	46	78	99	68%	5	31	55	156
	IDSM	5	0	1	1	3	75%	2	0	1	2	33%
	ALL	1170	125	255	352	415	64%	56	156	221	707	64%

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

This year, Truman students report the same somewhat positive attitude (64%) to the Portfolio and to Truman's total assessment processes. The School of Health Science and Education has the highest Portfolio approval rating, which seems to be because of their departments' support to students while they compile their submissions within their capstone courses.

Many students express surprise at how fulfilling it is to review their work from throughout their undergraduate course work and projects, stating that they see clearly their improvement in thinking and writing skills over the years. While some do still say

they have misplaced some of their work or it was lost from a computer hard drive crash, this problem seems to be less each year. Most of them say they have heard of the portfolio in advance, but have not thought deeply about it before their senior year. One student said that yes, she had indeed received emails from Dr. Moody every semester, but no, she never read them until she had to complete the portfolio to graduate.

Student Attitudes Toward Education at Truman and in their Major for 2017

		N 2017	Attitude toward Truman Education					Attitude toward Major Education				
			Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W%Pos	Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W%Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	34	0	11	22	1	83%	1	8	16	9	80%
	CRWT	10	0	2	7	0	89%	0	2	4	3	83%
	ENG	65	2	13	40	9	85%	0	18	27	19	80%
	CML	21	0	5	13	1	86%	1	4	8	7	77%
	LING	10	0	2	7	1	89%	1	1	4	4	75%
	MUSI	32	0	13	18	1	79%	1	5	19	7	86%
	THEA	16	1	6	5	4	67%	1	4	7	4	75%
	AAL	188	3	52	112	17	83%	5	42	85	53	80%
Business	ACCT	75	2	11	52	6	88%	3	8	26	34	81%
	BSAD	111	4	23	65	18	83%	6	15	39	50	78%
	BUS	186	6	34	117	24	85%	9	23	65	84	79%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed	ATHT	8	1	1	4	2	75%	1	0	3	4	75%
	CMDS	32	1	5	21	4	87%	0	3	15	14	92%
	ES	82	3	18	52	6	84%	0	15	31	32	84%
	HLTH	73	0	12	53	8	91%	3	7	43	20	88%
	NU	36	0	4	23	9	93%	2	3	23	7	88%
	HSE	231	5	40	153	29	87%	6	28	115	77	87%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	0	13	43	7	88%	0	8	24	32	88%
	ECON	17	0	1	11	4	96%	0	2	6	8	88%
	HIST	46	2	8	29	6	85%	1	5	23	17	88%
	JUST	32	3	7	17	5	76%	1	4	12	15	82%
	PHRE	10	1	2	6	1	78%	1	3	4	2	69%
	POL	15	1	3	9	2	81%	0	0	6	9	100%
	PSYC	105	1	25	66	11	85%	3	23	37	40	77%
	SOAN	19	0	2	13	4	93%	0	3	11	5	89%
	SCS	308	8	61	194	40	85%	6	48	123	128	83%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	1	6	16	5	83%	1	2	17	9	90%
	BIOL	120	5	28	71	14	82%	4	10	55	50	87%
	CHEM	26	0	8	13	5	81%	0	6	18	2	88%
	CS	42	1	7	26	7	87%	2	8	21	10	81%
	MATH	26	1	7	13	5	79%	1	3	9	13	81%
	PHYS	9	0	3	4	1	79%	0	2	4	2	83%
	SAM	252	8	59	143	37	82%	8	31	124	86	86%
IDSM	5	1	1	2	1	63%	0	1	3	1	88%	
ALL	1170	31	247	721	148	83%	34	173	515	429	83%	

Student attitudes toward their majors (83%) and to their education overall (83%) is overwhelmingly positive. While many students do have negative things to say about particular courses or requirements, they are generally satisfied that they have earned a valuable degree that will serve them well in their futures.

Evidence of Students' Self-Reflection in their 2017 Letters to Truman

		N 2017	Evidence of Self-reflection			
			No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
Arts and Letters	ART	34	12	9	12	64%
	CRWT	10	3	5	1	67%
	ENG	65	18	28	17	71%
	CML	21	10	7	3	50%
	LING	10	1	7	2	90%
	MUSI	32	12	12	8	63%
	THEA	16	7	5	3	53%
	AAL	188	63	73	46	65%
Business	ACCT	75	33	22	14	52%
	BSAD	111	54	42	13	50%
	BUS	186	87	64	27	51%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	2	1	5	75%
	CMDS	32	11	12	8	65%
	ES	82	39	26	13	50%
	HLTH	73	21	29	23	71%
	NU	36	17	8	11	53%
	HSE	231	90	76	60	63%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	16	32	15	75%
	ECON	17	4	7	6	76%
	HIST	46	19	20	5	57%
	JUST	32	16	11	5	50%
	PHRE	10	3	3	4	70%
	POL	15	6	4	5	60%
	PSYC	105	44	36	23	57%
	SOAN	19	9	5	4	50%
	SCS	308	117	118	67	62%
Science and Math	AGSC	29	15	9	4	46%
	BIOL	120	50	43	25	58%
	CHEM	26	6	11	9	77%
	CS	42	19	0	0	0%
	MATH	26	14	7	4	44%
	PHYS	9	4	2	1	43%
	SAM	252	108	72	43	45%
	IDSM	5	0	2	3	100%
	ALL	1170	465	405	246	60%

Sixty percent of graduates reveal sincere reflections about their experiences and growth during their time here at Truman.

Anecdotally, about 20% of the letters mentioned some aspect of mental health support as an issue. After the suicides of several Truman students, we did rally around students directly affected by those losses, but the students report that the root causes of stress for many students are still not well addressed. Our campus culture is unique in its pressure to excel in all aspects of life: academic, personal, and extracurricular. Because

our students are generally highly successful as high school students, they expect that to continue. Yet the level of challenge is much greater than they have ever experienced, and their regular home support systems are not here. They have to figure this out, and most of them do not have any experience in doing that on their own.

The students offered ideas to alleviate this problem ranging from the obvious to the whimsical. For example, students suggested more support in learning time management skills, better consistency in expectations across multiple sections of courses, and more puppy-petting time. Some students still do not understand how to access support at the Counseling Center, even though we have worked hard to make it more transparent. Undergraduate mental health support requires multiple approaches, because each student's needs are unique.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2017, reading sessions were held in two different weeks. One of these sessions was a five-day week: May 22-26 and the other was a split four-day week: August 10-11 & 14-15. We read in the VH 1304 computer classroom, because we invited 25 readers for each session, more readers than the MG 2005 computer room could hold.

This year, 47 people participated in the portfolio reading sessions. This compares favorably to last year's headcount of 49, but is less than previous years. These readers were drawn from all across campus: 17 from Arts and Letters, 1 from business, 8 from Health Sciences and Education, 11 from Science and Mathematics, 6 from Social and Cultural Studies, and 4 from Academic Support and Student Affairs. Faculty readers are purposely chosen to have varying experience with the reading process, and this year, fourteen of the readers had never read before. One of the best parts of portfolio reading is getting to know people from all across campus, and realizing that our priorities and goals are the same: we aim to help our students achieve at their highest potential.

Many faculty get useful ideas to take back to their classrooms both from the reading itself and also from the group discussions. The issues of advancing our liberal education priorities are explored in-depth during our conversations about each prompt. Because we are together for the whole week, we can build bridges across departmental lines and develop deeper understanding of each other. These aspects of reading are especially advantageous for new faculty.

Changes to the Liberal Studies program (LSP) continued to be top discussion items, as they have been for several years. As described above, the Civic Engagement prompt and the Self-Discovery prompt were developed as a way of measuring these aspects of our present curriculum, in order to have a baseline perspective in case we implement new approaches.

Portfolio reading is thus a significant faculty and staff development opportunity: portfolio reading enables deeper understanding of the university's mission, as well as more comprehensive and in-depth comprehension of the various components of the mission represented by each section of the portfolio.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process is running smoothly with few problems. My office staff this year included 4-6 students, whose primary task is to verify that student submissions are complete and that their submitted documents are readable. They also provide classes with presentations (27 Fall, 11 spring) to help instruct students 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. This year, Stephanie Parkhurst was my Office Manager, and she helped to organize our worker's office hours and other activities.

As Director, I communicate extensively with the Truman community. Every student receives an email describing the portfolio, although at different levels of detail for different levels of students. Students with 0-90 accumulated credit hours receive 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. Even with so many emails from me, some students claim not to have heard of this requirement. We continue to post promotional folders 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 my portfolio office staff to give a very short presentation to get students to log into our system; many of these faculty require the freshmen to place some document in their vaults as an assignment. I like to remind faculty who teach writing enhanced classes (including JINS courses) to encourage their students to store their excellent assigned papers in their vaults. Those who teach senior seminars or other capstone courses may want our portfolio office workers to visit their classes to give a very detailed portfolio system orientation to their students. Finally, each spring around midterm break, I invite faculty to sign up to participate in portfolio reading sessions in May and/or August. I try to make the assignments of the reading weeks by mid-April by issuing official invitations to read by email.

Our portfolio submission system works well, but it was developed by a series of student workers (under the direction of Greg Marshall), and it still does have its quirks. Since Greg has not been able to carve out the time to update our system, we work regularly with him to fine tune it and improve its functions.

This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members: Liz Jorn (HSE), Brian Kubin (AAL), Michelle Blakely (Student Affairs), Rebecca Dierking (AAL), Emily Costello (SAM), and Derreck Daschke (SCS). These people meet with me once or twice per semester to plan schedules and update our procedures.

Many old student portfolios from the days that we collected them on paper and on compact discs had been stored in a locked room in Greenwood School. Plans are underway for the school to house the Greenwood Center: an inter-professional health care facility to serve people with autism and other neurodevelopmental disorders. In preparation for the renovation of the school for this purpose, all of the old portfolios were shredded during the Fall of 2016.

Truman has participated since spring of 2015 in a Multi-State Collaborative on portfolio style evaluations of student work from multiple institutions organized through the American Association Colleges and Universities. Several of us (Scott Alberts,

Melissa Holcomb, others, and myself) have served as readers for this group, and we again submitted student work to their pilot project, now in its third year. Only student submissions for which the student gave permission were used, and their personal information was redacted by my office staff. Karen Vittengl uploaded our submissions into their system, along with demographic data that was collected by Nancy Asher.

2017 Portfolio Report Summary

Using these prompts, we have found that our students consistently demonstrate solid competence at Critical Thinking and Writing and Interdisciplinary Thinking, both of which are long term, valued indications of success in our curriculum. The newer portfolio elements of Civic Engagement and Self-Discovery have achieved stability, and our submission system continues to provide a quirky but stable platform for collecting our data. The portfolio project is well placed to continue to function as a valued component of Truman's assessment program.

The prompts for the upcoming 2017-18 year will stay the same as 2016-17. We hope that the baseline assessments that we are collecting will allow an understanding of how changes in the LSP curriculum, as well as in various majors, are helping the students to grow academically.

The guiding principles for the portfolio project continue to be:

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

In addition, the portfolio reading weeks are valuable faculty development tools, initiating new readers into the culture of our institution, reinvigorating the dedication of more senior readers, and building bridges between readers from all across campus. Truman is recognized as a national leader in using portfolio assessment data to improve our curriculum, and with our guiding principles in mind, we should be able to continue to make a Truman education ever more valuable to our students.