

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2017-2018 Academic Year
Anne Moody, Portfolio Director
March 12, 2019

2018 Portfolio Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
· General Information about Portfolio Assessment	2
· Critical Thinking and Writing	5
· Interdisciplinary Thinking	15
· Civic Engagement	20
· Self Discovery	31
· Most Personally Satisfying Experience	39
· Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	45
· Letter to Truman	52
· Reader Information and Feedback	57
· Portfolio Collection Matters	59
· Future Plans and 2018 Summary	60

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 2017-2018, 1117 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 groups of readers also participate in faculty development and campus discussion during reading sessions.

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

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

When are results typically available?

The portfolios 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 2017-2018 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.

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.

From whom are the results available?

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

Are the results available by school or department?

Yes.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

No. 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 2014-2018

	Major	First Major				
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Arts and Letters	ART	43	39	29	34	30
	CML	18	27	8	21	25
	CRWT	10	8	74	10	17
	ENG	86	72	17	65	61
	LING	5	10	12	10	7
	MUSI	29	28	16	32	28
	THEA	13	13	13	16	15
	AAL	204	197	169	168	183
Business	ACCT	63	70	56	75	56
	BSAD	95	93	118	111	124
	BUS	158	163	174	186	180
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	5	8	7	8	7
	CMDS	46	40	43	32	36
	ES	79	123	111	82	85
	HLTH	69	78	63	73	73
	NU	49	54	43	36	47
	HSE	248	303	267	231	248
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	60	52	68	64	71
	ECON	14	20	17	17	11
	HIST	40	38	26	46	41
	JUST	40	40	40	32	26
	PHRE	7	6	2	10	8
	POL	35	21	20	15	24
	PSYC	115	101	91	105	89
	SOAN	20	20	16	19	19
	SCS	331	298	280	308	289
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	20	30	29	20
	BIOL	119	100	103	120	104
	CHEM	33	22	16	26	18
	CS	34	24	30	42	33
	MATH	25	26	31	26	28
	PHYS	8	9	5	9	8
	STTS	*	*	*	*	3
	SAM	239	201	215	252	214
IDSM	5	5	8	5	3	
ALL	1185	1167	1113	1170	1117	

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 (highlighted in purple in the online document) and the rubric (highlighted in blue in the online document) shown below are the 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 each year. 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
<p>Approaches issue with clear sense of scope and context. May consider multiple relevant contexts.</p> <p>Shows clear and nuanced understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of contexts.</p> <p>Engages multiple, convergent and divergent perspectives in nuanced ways that qualify or enrich own perspective.</p>	<p>Presents and explores relevant contexts in relation to issue, but with some limitations.</p> <p>Shows some clear understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Engages both convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, may be tentative, overstating, or too easily dismissive.</p>	<p>Presents context superficially or connects to issue in a limited way.</p> <p>Shows limited understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Presents convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, but with little engagement.</p>	<p>Does not connect issue to context, or attempts but fails to do so.</p> <p>Shows little or no awareness of convergent or divergent aspects of context.</p> <p>Raises only convergent or agreeable perspectives or conclusions; avoids challenging, divergent, or discomforting perspectives.</p>

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 2018

Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by First Major 2018									
	Major	N 2018	Issue	Context	Supp. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	10+ (%)	Comm.
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2.53	2.53	2.60	1.97	9.63	57%	2.57
	CML	25	2.68	2.36	2.48	2.32	9.84	64%	2.84
	CRWT	17	2.71	2.88	2.59	2.29	10.47	65%	3.00
	ENG	61	2.79	2.69	2.70	2.44	10.62	70%	2.93
	LING	7	2.71	3.00	3.29	2.71	11.71	71%	3.29
	MUSI	28	2.64	2.71	2.82	2.18	10.36	64%	3.00
	THEA	15	2.40	2.40	2.20	2.20	9.20	53%	2.73
	AAL	183	2.67	2.63	2.64	2.28	10.22	64%	2.87
Business	ACCT	56	2.61	2.57	2.73	2.16	10.07	68%	2.61
	BSAD	124	2.37	2.26	2.33	2.08	9.04	45%	2.47
	BUS	180	2.44	2.36	2.46	2.11	9.36	52%	2.51
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	2.00	1.86	1.43	1.57	6.86	14%	2.71
	CMDS	36	2.64	2.61	2.56	2.22	10.03	67%	2.72
	ES	85	2.38	2.31	2.34	2.13	9.15	48%	2.62
	HLTH	73	2.86	2.70	2.64	2.36	10.56	68%	2.85
	NU	47	3.26	3.11	3.00	2.57	11.94	83%	3.09
	HSE	248	2.71	2.60	2.56	2.28	10.15	63%	2.79
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	2.89	2.69	2.68	2.52	10.78	77%	3.00
	ECON	11	3.00	2.73	2.82	2.55	11.09	64%	3.00
	HIST	41	2.83	2.78	2.63	2.56	10.81	66%	2.61
	JUST	26	2.73	2.77	2.73	2.35	10.58	65%	2.85
	PHRE	8	2.63	2.63	2.75	2.75	10.75	50%	2.63
	POL	24	3.13	2.96	3.17	2.54	11.79	92%	3.13
	PSYC	89	2.64	2.62	2.55	2.20	10.01	51%	2.78
	SOAN	19	2.58	2.42	2.42	2.21	9.63	47%	2.79
	SCS	289	2.79	2.69	2.67	2.40	10.55	64%	2.85
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	2.90	2.70	2.50	2.50	10.60	65%	2.65
	BIOL	104	2.66	2.68	2.62	2.24	10.20	63%	2.76
	CHEM	18	2.78	2.89	3.11	2.78	11.56	89%	3.11
	CS	33	2.79	2.61	2.64	2.64	10.67	55%	2.73
	MATH	28	2.36	2.43	2.39	2.00	9.18	39%	2.39
	PHYS	8	2.63	2.75	2.75	2.63	10.75	50%	3.13
	STTS	3	3.33	2.33	3.00	2.00	10.67	67%	2.67
	SAM	214	2.68	2.65	2.63	2.35	10.31	60%	2.74
	IDSM	3	3.33	3.00	3.33	2.67	12.33	100%	2.67
ALL	1117	2.68	2.60	2.60	2.30	10.17	61%	2.76	

This table shows the number of students within the various majors and their average scores for the issue, context, evidence, and conclusions of their CTW submissions. Recall that each component can range from 1-4, with the sum of these 4 components leading to the overall score for critical thinking. A Sum4 total of 10 or more is deemed satisfactory for this prompt. The averages for the Sum4 for each major are shown here, as well as the percentage of students from each major whose Sum4 was 10 or more. The final column in the table is the average score for writing skill and acumen within each major.

The university average Sum4 score is 10.17, and most schools have an average Sum4 above 10; only the School of Business averaged less than 10, at 9.36. Several

departments (ATHT, BSAD, ES, MATH, and THEA) showed a Sum4 average of less than 9.5. These lower scoring majors could be those requiring less writing than others, but some do a great deal of writing that is more technical in nature, so the factors that lead to these lower scores are not clear. Perhaps some of their students simply chose their particular submissions poorly. The department that scored the highest on the Sum4 value was IDSM, with an average score of 12.3. Other departments that scored at the high end of the range (>11) include NU, POL, LING, CHEM, and ECON.

Viewing the data through the lens of percentage of students who earned 10 or more on the Sum4 for critical thinking gives a subtly different perspective. University-wide, 61% of 2018 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more. As you will see below, this value is consistent with the university-wide percentage seen in recent years. Again, the School of Business deviated the most from this average at 52%. Departments that had the least percentage of their students scoring 10 or more are ATHT, MATH, BSAD, SOAN, and ES. Departments with the largest percentage of students scoring 10 or more are IDSM, POL, CHEM, NU, and COMM.

Critical Thinking and Writing: 2018 Scores by course prefix

Critical Thinking and Writing: 2018 Scores by Course Prefix								
Prefix	N 2018	Issue	Context	Supp. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	10+(%)	Comm.
ALL	1063	2.70	2.59	2.61	2.29	10.20	62%	2.79
ENG	142	2.50	2.44	2.49	2.25	9.67	54%	2.68
JINS	139	2.57	2.62	2.46	2.17	9.81	56%	2.65
PHRE	68	2.47	2.26	2.24	2.10	9.07	40%	2.54
BSAD	63	2.65	2.67	2.75	2.44	10.51	62%	2.81
COMM	58	2.90	2.74	2.67	2.50	10.81	79%	3.02
HIST	50	2.72	2.78	2.74	2.38	10.62	68%	2.66
HLTH	48	3.02	2.71	2.71	2.46	10.90	73%	2.83
NU	43	3.33	3.23	3.02	2.63	12.21	86%	3.19
BIOL	38	2.61	2.58	2.76	2.47	10.42	74%	2.74
PSYC	38	2.71	2.66	2.66	2.18	10.21	55%	2.92
ES	37	2.41	2.35	2.54	2.27	9.57	59%	2.59
POL	32	2.94	2.91	2.97	2.38	11.19	84%	2.88
SOAN	27	2.70	2.59	2.52	2.15	9.96	59%	2.81
CS	26	2.85	2.54	2.69	2.62	10.69	58%	2.69
ART	24	2.63	2.67	2.79	2.04	10.13	67%	2.75
JUST	23	2.74	2.83	2.87	2.43	10.87	70%	2.87
CMDS	22	2.86	2.91	2.95	2.50	11.23	86%	2.95
ACCT	20	2.70	2.70	3.00	2.35	10.75	75%	2.85
AGSC	18	3.00	2.56	2.44	2.33	10.33	50%	2.78
SPAN	18	2.56	2.44	2.56	2.28	9.83	67%	2.67
CHEM	17	2.76	2.82	3.29	2.71	11.59	82%	3.12
MUSI	17	2.94	3.12	3.00	2.47	11.53	71%	3.18
ECON	13	2.77	2.15	2.46	2.15	9.54	46%	2.62
ED	9	2.33	2.44	2.11	1.89	8.78	44%	2.56
LING	9	3.11	3.11	3.22	2.56	12.00	89%	3.22
STAT	8	2.63	2.38	2.38	2.25	9.63	50%	2.50
MS	7	2.43	2.29	2.14	2.14	9.00	43%	2.71
PHYS	7	2.86	2.86	3.29	2.57	11.57	71%	3.14
THEA	7	2.14	2.43	1.71	1.86	8.14	43%	2.29
ENVS	5	2.80	2.20	2.00	1.80	8.80	40%	2.60
FREN	5	2.20	1.80	2.00	1.80	7.80	20%	2.80
<5	25	2.64	2.24	2.16	2.16	9.20	48%	2.76

In 2018, 1063 out of 1117 submissions (95%) came from Truman courses. This table shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular course prefix. By count, ENG and JINS courses lead to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%). NU, LING, CHEM, PHYS, and MUSI led to the highest Sum4 scores, while LING, NU, CMDS, POL, and CHEM coursework led to the highest percentages of scores of 10 or more.

CTW 2018 Inter-rater Reliability

CTW Inter-rater Reliability		
Abs. Diff	Percentage	Observed
6+	3%	1
5	8%	3
4	5%	2
3	24%	9
2	16%	6
1	22%	8
0	22%	8
N Total Observed		37

Each year, some random number of CTW submissions are scored by a second reader. Note that the second reader of a submission cannot see the score of the previous reader! In 2018, we only had 37 papers that were read by more than one person, because we had fewer days to read and fewer readers as well. In the years since complete implementation of this new rubric, the number of “double-reads” that we recorded ranged from a low of 189 in 2016 to a high of 589 in 2015, so this number of double-reads is low. If you consider this enough for a comparison, then you can see from the table above that 44% of those papers were scored identically or within one unit of each other. Another 16% of the scores were within 2 units of each other, and a final 24% were within 3 points of each other. Recall that these scores are out of 16 possible points.

Critical Thinking and Writing: University-wide Scores 2014-2018

CTW: University-wide Scores 2014-2018			
Year	N Students	University Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2014	1185	10.3	65%
2015	1157	10.4	64%
2016	1099	10.4	61%
2017	1170	10.3	61%
2018	1117	10.1	61%

This final table shows the Truman university mean Sum4 and the 10+(%) for the last 5 years. As you can see, these values are holding steady, so we must still be offering students the opportunities they need to hone their critical thinking and writing skills well.

The Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The earliest results from the interdisciplinary thinking (IDS) prompt motivated the campus to develop our Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar (JINS) courses in the late 1990s. This prompt also requires a research style paper, but in this instance, the subject of the paper must be explored using the perspectives of more than one discipline. 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 the concept of interdisciplinary thinking, and asks for the source and time of completion of the submitted document. Next, the student must briefly describe the instructor's assignment, provide a list of the disciplines used in the work, and reflect on their growth of this skill. As is usually the case, we ask for a self-evaluation using our scoring rubric, which we hope encourages the student to choose their paper that best fits the rubric.

Following the prompt itself (highlighted in purple in the online document) and the scoring rubric (highlighted in blue in the online document) 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 2014-2018

	Major	Mean Score					2+ (%)				
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Arts and Letters	ART	1.81	1.91	0.98	2.12	2.13	60	58	51	78	73
	CML	2.22	1.87	1.15	1.89	2.12	78	58	55	65	76
	CRWT	1	2.5	1.38	2.5	2.29	30	75	44	100	88
	ENG	1.83	1.92	2.23	2.05	2.18	62	68	82	74	75
	LING	2	2.28	2.33	2.27	1.71	80	64	88	75	71
	MUSI	12.9	2.72	1.41	2.09	2.07	69	94	54	79	79
	THEA	1.85	2.08	1.71	1.91	1.87	62	92	56	72	60
	AAL	1.83	2.18	1.6	2.12	2.11	63	73	61	78	75
Business	ACCT	1.59	1.62	1.76	1.91	1.75	52	57	64	84	64
	BSAD	1.74	1.88	1.56	1.64	1.81	61	67	51	58	66
	BUS	1.68	1.75	1.66	1.78	1.79	58	62	57	71	66
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	0.8	1.38	1.96	1.63	2.29	20	31	66	63	86
	CMDS	1.7	2	1.8	1.59	2.14	59	65	60	48	67
	ES	1.53	2.11	1.72	1.71	1.8	56	77	58	62	6
	HLTH	1.93	2.31	1.78	2.14	2.15	72	76	67	75	73
	NU	1.57	1.99	1.89	1.8	2.04	53	66	68	58	68
	HSE	1.67	1.96	1.83	1.78	2.01	60	63	64	61	67
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	1.65	2.09	2.1	1.71	2.13	60	72	72	59	70
	ECON	2.57	2.11	1.97	1.56	2.09	86	75	67	68	73
	HIST	1.75	2.07	2.5	2.12	2.24	63	79	80	78	80
	JUST	1.8	2.12	1.8	1.73	1.77	65	67	59	63	65
	PHRE	1.86	2.5	1.5	1.99	2.13	57	83	100	60	75
	POL	2.2	1.96	2.33	2.3	1.88	83	68	65	93	63
	PSYC	1.63	2.07	1.82	2.05	1.98	57	66	62	73	69
	SOAN	1.9	2.23	2.15	2.34	2.11	55	78	73	87	74
	SCS	1.79	2.14	2.02	1.98	2.04	63	73	72	73	71
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	2.45	2.39	1.7	2.02	2.25	85	75	48	71	75
	BIOL	2.04	1.98	2.14	2.12	2.02	72	69	70	74	68
	CHEM	1.94	1.9	2.13	2.24	2.22	58	75	71	79	72
	CS	2	1.83	2.19	2.17	2.21	65	58	78	77	76
	MATH	1.92	2.38	1.77	1.86	2.18	64	90	60	65	68
	PHYS	1.75	2.42	0.8	1.89	0.75	50	89	60	61	25
	STTS	*	*	*	*	2.33	*	*	*	*	100
	SAM	2.03	2.15	1.79	2.05	2.07	69	76	65	71	69
IDSM	2.6	1.5	2.71	2.6	2	100	30	100	100	67	
ALL	1.81	2.07	1.84	2	2.01	63	70	72	72	69	

University-wide, the 2018 average score is 2.01, which is near the high end of the 5 year range of 1.8-2.1. Note that the statistics major is newly added this year, so only this year's data is available. The average score by school changed little from last

year, but examination by department shows a bit more variability. Departments themselves might be able to better address why that might be so.

Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2018 Scores by course prefix

Prefix	2018 N	Mean	2+ (%)
JINS	769	2.18	76.33%
ENG	31	1.65	54.84%
PHRE	27	1.63	51.85%
BSAD	26	1.58	42.86%
ART	19	1.63	63.16%
HIST	18	2.06	72.22%
COMM	17	1.65	58.82%
PSYC	17	1.53	52.94%
MUSI	13	1.23	38.46%
NU	13	1.62	46.15%
BIOL	11	1.63	45.45%
JUST	11	1.45	45.45%
SOAN	11	2	63.64%
AGSC	10	2.4	80.00%
ECON	10	2.1	80.00%
ACCT	8	1.88	75.00%
CLAS	7	1.25	42.86%
IDSM	7	1.71	71.43%
POL	7	1.86	71.43%
ENVS	6	1.67	50.00%
ES	6	0.83	16.67%
CS	5	1.4	40.00%
ED	5	1.6	40.00%
<5	54	1.3	38.89%

As is usually the case, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2018, with 769 submissions. Only ENG, PHRE, and BSAD had more than 20 and most other prefixes had many fewer than that. Additionally, the submissions from JINS courses scored quite well with our rubric; in 2018, JINS submissions average 2.18, with 76% of them scoring at the satisfactory score of 2 or more. Only four other prefixes (HIST, SOAN, AGSC, and ECON) also had mean scores of 2 or more. The preponderance of JINS submissions is completely logical, since the JINS courses were invented as a way to promote interdisciplinary thinking and many faculty who teach these courses include the Portfolio's IDS rubric as part of their course.

IDS 2018 Inter-rater Reliability

2018 Abs Diff	%	N
4	0.63%	2
3	2.51%	8
2	9.40%	30
1	49.84%	159
0	37.62%	120
	100.00%	319

In 2018, 319 submissions were scored by a second reader, with 38% of those giving identical scores to the first reader. Another 50% of second readers assigned a score that differed by only one unit. These consistent scores assigned by different readers suggest that calibration among scorers remains excellent.

Civic Engagement Prompt, Data, and Discussion

Civic mindedness, community service, and engagement with the world's problems are important aspects of the well educated citizen. These attributes are highlighted in Truman's mission statement, its vision statement, and its Desired Characteristics of Graduates. To explore how these attributes 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. As a result, we revised the prompt itself very little, but the rubric was greatly streamlined for the 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 or 2018.

As you can see below (highlighted in purple), this prompt defines for the students what we mean by the words "civic engagement" and "community", and then asks them to describe their most meaningful and significant civic

engagement experience while he/she was an undergraduate. We are especially interested in what the students learn about their communities and themselves through their experiences.

Following the prompt itself and the scoring rubric (highlighted in blue) are the tables of data for this prompt. The first two tables include scores by first major for 2015-2016 and 2017-2018. The next table pulls out the scores of the schools for all four years together. A third table shows lists scores by course prefix for the small subset (only 395 submissions) of Civic Engagement submissions that were derived from coursework this year. 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 Erlich)

** 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
--	--------------------	---------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------

<p>Civic Action</p>	<p>Demonstrates innovation and independent experience in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities.</p>	<p>Demonstrates independent experience or team leadership of civic action.</p>	<p>Reports clear and full participation in civically focused actions.</p>	<p>Has experimented with some civic activities.</p>	<p>No civic action described</p>
----------------------------	--	--	---	---	----------------------------------

<p>Reflection about Civic Action (e.g., how it relates to personal civic identity and/or group commitment)</p>	<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>	<p>No reflection.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	-----------------------

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by first major 2015 – 2016

	CIVIC	2015					2016				
		Major	2015 N	Act.	2+%	Refl.	2+%	2016 N	Act.	2+%	Refl.
Arts and Letters	ART	39	1.53	59%	1.6	62%	27	1.78	52%	1.67	37%
	CML	27	2.23	74%	1.88	67%	17	1.77	82%	1.48	65%
	CRWT	8	1.75	63%	1.63	38%	8	1.75	50%	1.75	50%
	ENG	72	2.13	69%	2.18	72%	74	2.08	72%	2.22	78%
	LING	10	2.67	89%	2.44	89%	12	2.25	92%	2.58	92%
	MUS	28	1.46	54%	1.48	57%	16	1.31	75%	1.69	69%
	THEA	13	2.08	77%	2.08	62%	13	1.38	38%	1.38	38%
	AAL	197	1.98	69%	1.9	64%	167	1.76	66%	1.83	61%
Business	ACCT	70	1.56	50%	1.55	46%	55	1.75	67%	1.65	56%
	BSAD	93	1.73	54%	1.63	56%	115	1.70	59%	1.66	53%
	BUS	163	1.65	52%	1.59	51%	170	1.72	63%	1.66	55%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	8	2.29	63%	2.38	75%	7	2.14	71%	2.29	86%
	CMDS	40	2.05	80%	1.88	63%	43	2.30	81%	2.37	77%
	ES	123	1.68	55%	1.88	53%	109	1.80	64%	1.81	61%
	HLTH	78	2.37	83%	2.38	89%	63	2.33	86%	2.32	84%
	NU	54	2.02	78%	2	72%	43	1.86	70%	1.98	74%
	HSE	303	2.08	72%	2.06	70%	265	2.09	75%	2.15	76%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	52	1.56	46%	1.69	48%	67	1.79	61%	1.76	55%
	ECON	20	1.85	55%	1.8	50%	17	1.65	65%	1.47	47%
	HIST	38	1.59	53%	1.57	47%	25	1.72	60%	1.60	56%
	JUST	40	1.21	35%	1.35	41%	38	1.63	47%	1.50	42%
	PHRE	6	2.17	83%	1.67	67%	2	1.50	50%	2.50	100%
	POL	21	2.45	70%	2.4	70%	20	1.95	70%	1.70	50%
	PSYC	101	1.83	59%	1.85	59%	91	1.87	64%	1.98	68%
	SOAN	20	1.75	65%	2.05	70%	16	2.13	69%	2.50	75%
	SCS	298	1.8	58%	1.8	57%	276	1.78	61%	1.88	62%
Science and Mathematics	AGSC	20	1.6	55%	1.7	65%	30	1.30	37%	1.67	57%
	BIOL	100	1.89	62%	1.97	68%	102	2.12	71%	2.12	74%
	CHEM	22	2.45	86%	2.5	82%	16	2.00	81%	2.13	81%
	CS	24	1.88	63%	1.83	67%	30	1.43	50%	1.50	50%
	MATH	26	1.92	65%	2.04	58%	30	1.57	60%	1.57	53%
	PHYS	9	1.89	78%	1.78	67%	5	1.20	60%	1.60	60%
	SAM	201	1.94	68%	1.97	68%	213	1.60	60%	1.76	62%
IDSM	5	2	80%	2.6	80%	8	2.25	88%	2.38	88%	
ALL	1167	1.92	66%	1.92	63%	1099	1.80	69%	1.89	67%	

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by first major 2017 – 2018

	Major	2017					2018				
		2017 N	Act.	2+ (%)	Ref	2+ (%)	2018 N	Act.	2+ (%)	Ref	2+ (%)
Arts and Letters	ART	34	1.8	56%	1.65	50%	30	1.9	60%	1.7	43%
	CML	21	1.84	71%	1.72	71%	25	2	72%	1.88	56%
	CRWT	10	2.3	70%	2.6	80%	17	1.76	59%	2.11	71%
	ENG	65	1.81	65%	1.72	60%	61	2.1	69%	2	67%
	LING	10	1.9	70%	1.8	70%	7	2.43	100%	2.29	71%
	MUSI	32	2.09	66%	2	63%	28	1.96	68%	1.75	57%
	THEA	16	2.25	63%	1.88	56%	15	2.07	73%	1.8	67%
	AAL	188	2	66%	1.91	64%	183	2.01	68%	1.9	61%
Business	ACCT	75	2.61	45%	3.62	55%	56	1.56	45%	1.61	54%
	BSAD	111	1.44	45%	1.46	50%	124	1.99	64%	1.83	60%
	BUS	186	2.02	45%	2.54	62%	180	1.85	58%	1.76	58%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	1.63	50%	1.5	38%	7	2.14	71%	2.14	71%
	CMDS	32	1.81	63%	1.84	63%	36	2.33	75%	2.39	81%
	ES	82	1.68	60%	1.57	54%	85	2.02	64%	1.86	59%
	HLTH	73	2.04	66%	2.27	74%	73	2.16	81%	2.08	77%
	NU	36	2	69%	2	72%	47	1.96	66%	1.96	66%
		HSE	231	1.83	61%	1.84	60%	248	2.1	71%	2.03
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	1.84	56%	1.88	52%	71	2.13	73%	1.94	59%
	ECON	17	1.53	35%	1.53	41%	11	1.91	55%	1.64	36%
	HIST	46	1.65	48%	1.74	54%	41	1.88	68%	1.76	59%
	JUST	32	2.03	56%	1.78	56%	26	1.61	54%	1.81	62%
	PHRE	10	1.5	50%	1.7	60%	8	1.71	50%	2.29	63%
	POL	15	2.33	80%	2.07	80%	24	2.42	83%	1.96	63%
	PSYC	105	2.16	78%	1.94	68%	89	2.02	71%	1.97	66%
	SOAN	19	1.68	53%	1.58	58%	19	1.74	58%	1.84	53%
		SCS	308	1.84	57%	1.78	59%	289	1.99	69%	1.9
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	1.66	52%	1.55	41%	20	1.75	60%	1.8	60%
	BIOL	120	1.96	67%	1.98	65%	104	2.13	82%	2.2	75%
	CHEM	26	2.31	77%	2.27	81%	18	2.67	83%	2.61	83%
	CS	42	1.6	50%	1.79	57%	33	1.87	58%	1.71	48%
	MATH	26	1.5	42%	1.46	50%	28	1.88	57%	1.88	54%
	PHYS	9	1.67	44%	2	56%	8	2	63%	2	63%
	STTS	*	*	*	*	*	3	2	67%	1	33%
		SAM	252	1.78	55%	1.84	58%	214	2.06	72%	2.06
	IDSM	5	3	80%	2.8	80%	3	2	67%	2	67%
	ALL	1170	2.08	61%	2.12	62%	1117	2	68%	1.93	76%

Because of the significant revision of the scoring rubric for this prompt for the 2015 submissions, only the data from 2015-2018 (that were scored using the same rubric) are included here. 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.

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by School 2015 – 2018

School	2015				2016				2017				2018			
	Action	2+%	Reflect.	2+%	Act.	2+%	Ref	2+%	Act.	2+%	Ref	2+%	Act.	2+%	Ref	2+%
AAL	1.98	69%	1.90	64%	1.76	66%	1.83	61%	2.00	66%	1.91	64	2.01	68%	1.90	61%
BUS	1.65	52%	1.59	51%	1.72	63%	1.66	55%	2.02	45	2.54	62	1.85	58%	1.76	58%
HSE	2.08	72%	2.06	70%	2.09	75%	2.15	76%	1.83	61	1.84	60	2.10	71%	2.03	69%
SCS	1.80	58%	1.80	57%	1.78	61%	1.88	62%	1.84	57	1.78	59	1.99	69%	1.90	61%
SAM	1.94	68%	1.97	68%	1.60	60%	1.76	62%	1.78	55	1.84	58	2.06	72%	2.06	66%
IDSM	2.00	80%	2.60	80%	2.25	88%	2.38	88%	3.00	80	2.80	80	2.00	67%	2.00	67%
ALL	1.92	66%	1.92	63%	1.80	69%	1.89	67%	2.08	61	2.12	62	2.00	68%	1.93	76%

In this smaller table, all 4 years of scores are shown without the counts for each school, along with the overall university scores. University wide average scores for the civic actions were 1.92 in 2015, 1.80 in 2016, 2.08 in 2017, and 2.00 in 2018. The civic reflection average scores were 1.92 in 2015, 1.89 in 2016, 2.12 in 2017, and 1.93 in 2018. All of these values are very close to the accepted satisfactory levels. Looking at the percentages of students in each school who scored at or above the acceptable level of 2, usually about two thirds of our students score at that level.

Now that we have four years of directly comparable data, variation over time for the various schools and majors is starting to become clearer. Consideration of the data by school shows that BUS has scored consistently below the school average on both civic action and reflection. IDSM scores have been above the university average every year except 2018; since there are few IDSM majors, variability is not unexpected. HSE has also been well above average except for 2017, 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. AAL scores have been close to the university average all three years, while SCS and SAM scores have varied considerably relative to the university average over the years.

2018 Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by course prefix

Prefix	2018 N	Action	2+ (%)	Reflection	2+ (%)
ALL	395	2	54.4%	1.93	54.9%
HLTH	49	2.04	73.5%	2.04	75.5%
COMM	42	1.69	52.4%	1.6	45.2%
NU	30	1.67	53.3%	1.83	60.0%
ENG	28	1.36	39.3%	1.32	39.3%
ES	26	1.54	46.2%	1.58	53.8%
PHRE	23	1.74	65.2%	2	69.6%
ED	21	1.9	81.0%	2.05	66.7%
JINS	19	1	31.6%	1.26	31.6%
JUST	19	1.58	47.4%	1.95	73.7%
POL	14	1.93	64.3%	1.64	42.9%
SOAN	13	0.92	15.4%	1	23.1%
DS	12	2.5	83.3%	2.58	83.3%
PSYC	12	1.83	66.7%	1.75	50.0%
BSAD	9	1	33.3%	1.22	44.4%
HIST	9	0.56	11.1%	0.89	11.1%
CMDS	8	2.38	87.5%	2.34	87.5%
ENVS	8	2.25	75.0%	1.88	37.5%
ACCT	7	0.86	14.3%	1	28.6%
AGSC	7	1.71	42.9%	2	57.1%
LING	7	2.43	85.7%	2.57	71.4%
BIOL	6	1.5	50.0%	1.67	50.0%
ART	5	1.6	60.0%	1.8	80.0%
MUSI	5	1	20.0%	1.6	60.0%
CHIN	3	1	33.3%	0.67	0.0%
ECON	3	1	0.0%	1.33	33.3%
IDSM	2	2.5	100.0%	2.5	100.0%
INDV	2	2.5	50.0%	2.5	50.0%
SPAN	2	2	50.0%	1.5	50.0%
FREN	1	2	100.0%	3	100.0%
MS	1	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
SED	1	2	100.0%	1	0.0%
STAT	1	4	100.0%	4	100.0%

In 2018, only 395 of the 1117 (35.4%) 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. This question was added in 2016, so that readers could indicate the one context category that best fit for each submission. The table below indicates those designations for years 2016-2018. Coursework (especially in the major) and student organizations continue to offer the greatest opportunities for

meaningful civic engagement. Employment, especially volunteer employment, is also a strong source of meaningful civic engagement. Comparing the three years shows remarkable consistency for the context of civic activity.

Civic Engagement Contexts 2016-2018

Civic Contexts	2016 N	2016 %	2017 N	2017 %	2018 N	2018 %
Coursework						
LSP	65	6.3%	73	6.4%	48	4.3%
Major	226	21.9%	193	17.0%	214	19.2%
Capstone	10	1.0%	7	2.4%	8	0.7%
Minor	24	2.3%	27	0.6%	21	1.9%
Elective	40	3.9%	53	4.7%	27	2.4%
All Coursework	365	35.4%	353	31.1%	318	28.5%
Other Academic						
Research	3	0.3%	9	0.8%	7	0.6%
Internship	36	3.5%	42	3.7%	32	2.9%
Study Abroad	16	1.6%	12	1.1%	13	1.2%
Resume/Prof. Statement	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Service Learning	18	1.8%	24	2.1%	15	1.3%
Tutor/Teach Mentor	22	2.1%	39	3.4%	13	1.2%
Other Academic	11	1.1%	12	1.1%	10	0.9%
All Other Academic	118	11.5%	138	12.2%	90	8.1%
Student Organizations						
Governance Organization	1	0.1%	7	0.6%	5	0.4%
Service Organization	68	6.6%	87	7.7%	101	9.0%
Social Fraternity/Sorority	103	10.0%	123	10.9%	125	11.2%
Professional/Major	29	2.8%	40	3.5%	36	3.2%
Religious Organization	32	3.1%	45	4.0%	35	3.1%
Honor Society	8	0.8%	14	1.2%	10	0.9%
Campus Media	4	0.4%	0	0.0%	5	0.4%
Other Organization	34	3.3%	32	2.8%	35	3.1%
All Student Organizations	279	27.1%	348	30.7%	352	31.5%
Athletics						
Varsity Athletic	17	1.7%	26	2.3%	25	2.2%
Club Sports Intramurals	3	0.3%	4	0.4%	4	0.4%
Other Athletic	10	1.0%	10	0.9%	4	0.4%
All Athletic	30	2.9%	40	3.5%	33	3.0%
Employment						
Campus Job	28	2.7%	31	2.7%	39	3.5%
Volunteer	121	11.7%	128	11.3%	167	15.0%
Off Campus Job	29	2.8%	31	2.7%	40	3.6%
All Employment	178	17.3%	190	16.8%	246	22.0%
Performance/Creative Activity						
Public Performance/Recital	7	0.7%	12	1.1%	9	0.8%
Other Creative	1	0.1%	7	0.6%	10	0.9%
All Performance/Creative Activity	8	0.8%	19	1.7%	19	1.7%
Other (Misc.)						
Relationship	8	0.8%	9	0.8%	12	1.1%
Residence Life	10	1.0%	8	0.7%	13	1.2%
ROTC	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.5%
Other	43	4.2%	29	2.6%	28	2.5%
All Other (Misc.)	53	5.1%	46	4.1%	59	5.3%
Total	1031	100.0%	1134	100.0%	1117	100.0%

Self-Discovery Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

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

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

The Self-Discovery Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Risk/Challenge/Growth

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

Academic/Scholarship

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

Relationships

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

- *No indication*
- *Other*

SELF DISCOVERY: University-wide Student Rationales 2016-2018

Categoriees	Reasons	2016	2017	2018
Risk/Challenge/Growth	<i>Deep Introspection</i>	28%	35%	31%
	<i>New Perspective on Self*</i>	0%	6%	29%
	<i>Personal Growth</i>	46%	43%	57%
	<i>Resonsibility</i>	17%	15%	19%
	<i>Moral/Ethical Delimma</i>	3%	3%	4%
Academic/Scholarship	<i>Personal Best</i>	6%	5%	6%
	<i>Especially Challenging</i>	18%	15%	21%
	<i>Intellectual Risk</i>	4%	3%	6%
	<i>Vocational Development</i>	18%	17%	23%
	<i>Worked as Professional</i>	11%	8%	14%
Relationships	<i>Service to Others</i>	9%	8%	10%
	<i>Collaboration w/Peers</i>	19%	20%	24%
	<i>Collaboration w/ Professional*</i>	0%	2%	12%
	<i>Mentoring Internship</i>	3%	3%	8%

*Note: the 2016 data for two of the reasons, *New Perspective on Self* and *Collaboration with a Professional*, was lost in a downloading error. The error was corrected in the subsequent 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 all years (2016: 46%, 2017: 43%, 2018: 57%). *Deep Introspection* also spurred a lot of self-discovery (2016: 28%, 2017: 35%, 2018: 31%). *Demonstration of Responsibility* was also a significant factor (2016: 17%, 2017: 15%, 2018: 19%).

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, students found *Vocational Development* (2016: 18%, 2017: 17%, 2018: 23%) and *Especially Challenging* activities (2016: 18%, 2017: 15%, 2018: 21%) to be great sources of self-discovery. Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration with Peers* in all years (2016: 17%, 2017: 15%, 2018: 24%).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2018 is tabulated in the following three tables. How different majors' students are motivated should be valuable information for the faculty 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 should work to optimize appropriate opportunities for self-discovery within each of our majors.

SELF DISCOVERY: 2018 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by major

	Major	2018 N	Risk/Growth/Challenge										
			Introspection		Perspective		P. Growth		Responsibility		Dilemma		
			Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	
Arts and Letters	ART	30	9	30%	12	40%	14	47%	2	7%	2	7%	
	CML	25	12	48%	10	40%	13	52%	4	16%	2	8%	
	CRWT	17	7	41%	4	24%	6	35%	0	0%	2	12%	
	ENG	61	21	34%	22	36%	36	59%	9	15%	1	2%	
	LING	7	5	71%	1	14%	6	86%	3	43%	1	14%	
	MUSI	28	5	18%	9	32%	15	54%	8	29%	3	11%	
	THEA	15	6	40%	5	33%	5	33%	1	7%	1	7%	
	AAL	183	65	36%	63	34%	95	52%	27	15%	12	7%	
	Business	ACCT	56	12	21%	19	34%	30	54%	12	21%	3	5%
		BSAD	124	29	23%	28	23%	73	59%	33	27%	3	2%
BUS		180	41	23%	47	26%	103	57%	45	25%	6	3%	
Health, Sci. and Ed.		AHTH	7	0	0%	2	29%	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%
	CMDS	36	13	36%	9	25%	27	75%	11	31%	0	0%	
	ES	85	29	34%	18	21%	38	45%	12	14%	3	4%	
	HLTH	73	24	33%	24	33%	43	59%	18	25%	2	3%	
	NUJ	47	15	32%	16	34%	29	62%	17	36%	2	4%	
	HSE	248	81	33%	69	28%	142	57%	59	24%	8	3%	
	Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	23	32%	20	28%	49	69%	13	18%	3	4%
ECON		11	4	36%	1	9%	6	55%	1	9%	1	9%	
HIST		41	12	29%	12	29%	25	61%	7	17%	2	5%	
JUST		26	7	27%	10	38%	13	50%	5	19%	1	4%	
PHRE		8	3	38%	4	50%	6	75%	0	0%	0	0%	
POL		24	10	42%	9	38%	12	50%	5	21%	0	0%	
PSYC		89	30	34%	28	31%	62	70%	16	18%	6	7%	
SOAN		19	6	32%	10	53%	9	47%	4	21%	1	5%	
SCS		289	95	33%	94	33%	182	63%	51	18%	14	5%	
Sci. and Math Studies		AGSC	20	3	15%	6	30%	9	45%	3	15%	0	0%
		BIOL	104	37	36%	21	20%	57	55%	17	16%	7	7%
		CHEM	18	9	50%	5	28%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%
		CS	33	8	24%	7	21%	13	39%	2	6%	1	3%
	MATH	28	6	21%	10	36%	18	64%	3	11%	0	0%	
	PHYS	8	3	38%	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	1	13%	
	STTS	3	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	
	SAM	214	67	31%	53	25%	111	52%	26	12%	9	4%	
	IDSM	3	2	67%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	
	ALL	1117	351	31%	327	29%	635	57%	208	19%	49	4%	

SELF DISCOVERY: 2018 Student Academic/Scholarship Rationales by major

		Academic/Scholarship										
		P. Best		Challenging		Intel Risk		Vocation		Professional		
Major	2018 N	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	7%	6	20%	2	7%	5	17%	3	10%
	CML	25	0	0%	5	20%	1	4%	4	16%	1	4%
	CRWT	17	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	2	12%	2	12%
	ENG	61	5	8%	15	25%	3	5%	12	20%	5	8%
	LING	7	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%
	MUSI	28	6	21%	7	25%	1	4%	11	39%	7	25%
	THEA	15	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	2	13%	1	7%
	AAL	183	16	9%	38	21%	9	5%	37	20%	19	10%
Business	ACCT	56	3	5%	6	11%	1	2%	9	16%	6	11%
	BSAD	124	12	10%	34	27%	12	10%	17	14%	18	15%
	BUS	180	15	8%	40	22%	13	7%	26	14%	24	13%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%
	CMDS	36	3	8%	7	19%	2	6%	14	39%	10	28%
	ES	85	2	2%	19	22%	3	4%	17	20%	7	8%
	HLTH	73	6	8%	12	16%	2	3%	29	40%	18	25%
	NU	47	1	2%	12	26%	2	4%	18	38%	14	30%
	HSE	248	12	5%	51	21%	9	4%	79	32%	50	20%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	3	4%	16	23%	4	6%	15	21%	9	13%
	ECON	11	1	9%	2	18%	1	9%	2	18%	0	0%
	HIST	41	4	10%	12	29%	1	2%	7	17%	7	17%
	JUST	26	1	4%	4	15%	2	8%	8	31%	6	23%
	PHRE	8	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%
	POL	24	0	0%	4	17%	3	13%	7	29%	4	17%
	PSYC	89	7	8%	16	18%	9	10%	19	21%	13	15%
	SOAN	19	0	0%	4	21%	1	5%	5	26%	2	11%
	SCS	289	16	6%	60	21%	22	8%	64	22%	41	14%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	0	0%	4	20%	3	15%	7	35%	5	25%
	BIOL	104	5	5%	21	20%	7	7%	19	18%	9	9%
	CHEM	18	2	11%	7	39%	2	11%	4	22%	2	11%
	CS	33	3	9%	6	18%	1	3%	7	21%	5	15%
	MATH	28	0	0%	3	11%	2	7%	8	29%	2	7%
	PHYS	8	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%
	STTS	3	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%
	SAM	214	12	6%	45	21%	15	7%	48	22%	25	12%
IDSM	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	
ALL	1117	71	6%	234	21%	68	6%	255	23%	159	14%	

SELF DISCOVERY: 2018 Student Relationship Rationales by major

		Relationships								
		Service			Collab'n Peers		Collab'n Professional		Mentoring	
Major	2018 N	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	
Arts and Letters	ART	30	1	3%	6	20%	4	13%	2	7%
	CML	25	0	0%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	CRWT	17	1	6%	6	35%	0	0%	2	12%
	ENG	61	4	7%	16	26%	9	15%	5	8%
	LING	7	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%
	MUSI	28	2	7%	6	21%	5	18%	6	21%
	THEA	15	1	7%	5	33%	0	0%	1	7%
	AAL	183	9	5%	45	25%	19	10%	16	9%
	Business	ACCT	56	6	11%	16	29%	3	5%	5
BSAD		124	12	10%	39	31%	13	10%	13	10%
BUS		180	18	10%	55	31%	16	9%	18	10%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%
	CMDS	36	8	22%	8	22%	8	22%	5	14%
	ES	85	11	13%	13	15%	6	7%	5	6%
	HLTH	73	11	15%	19	26%	11	15%	8	11%
	NU	47	8	17%	5	11%	7	15%	3	6%
	HSE	248	38	15%	45	18%	34	14%	22	9%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	9	13%	20	28%	10	14%	3	4%
	ECON	11	1	9%	4	36%	1	9%	0	0%
	HIST	41	2	5%	9	22%	6	15%	4	10%
	JUST	26	4	15%	3	12%	3	12%	3	12%
	PHRE	8	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%	1	13%
	POL	24	1	4%	3	13%	3	13%	2	8%
	PSYC	89	9	10%	22	25%	14	16%	9	10%
	SOAN	19	0	0%	7	37%	2	11%	2	11%
	SCS	289	26	9%	70	24%	40	14%	24	8%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	3	15%	6	30%	3	15%	0	0%
	BIOL	104	13	13%	23	22%	10	10%	5	5%
	CHEM	18	3	17%	8	44%	2	11%	2	11%
	CS	33	0	0%	5	15%	1	3%	1	3%
	MATH	28	2	7%	5	18%	4	14%	2	7%
	PHYS	8	0	0%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%
	STTS	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	214	21	10%	49	23%	22	10%	12	6%
IDSM	3	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	
ALL	1117	112	10%	265	24%	131	12%	92	8%	

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, in 2018, 33% of our graduates enjoyed significant self-discovery within Truman's coursework, with most of that (24%) being within the student's major. Student organizations (21%) and Other Academic (14%) also were important categories of contexts for self-discovery. These proportions have stayed roughly the same over the 3 years that we have monitored them. With this in mind, we should be able to construct more opportunities in these contexts for this important aspect of liberal arts and sciences education.

SELF DISCOVERY: Context of the Experience 2016-2018

SELF Context Specifics	2016 N	2016%	2017 N	2017%	2018 N	2018 %
Coursework						
LSP	57	5.50%	44	3.96%	57	5.34%
Major	239	23.30%	229	20.63%	253	23.71%
Capstone	3	0.30%	1	0.09%	2	0.19%
Minor	20	2.00%	24	2.16%	20	1.87%
Elective	17	1.70%	33	2.97%	23	2.16%
All Coursework	336	32.70%	331	29.82%	355	33.27%
Other Academic						
Research	11	1.10%	20	1.80%	11	1.03%
Internship	33	3.20%	40	3.60%	35	3.28%
Study Abroad	61	5.90%	64	5.77%	50	4.69%
Resume/Prof. Statement	4	0.40%	1	0.09%	5	0.47%
Service Learning	1	0.10%	4	0.36%	3	0.28%
Tutor/Teach/Mentor	7	0.70%	20	1.80%	14	1.31%
Other Academic	51	5.00%	36	3.24%	33	3.09%
All Other Academic	168	16.30%	185	16.67%	151	14.15%
Student Organizations						
Governance Organization	3	0.30%	5	0.45%	5	0.47%
Service Organization	31	3.00%	19	1.71%	21	1.97%
Social Fraternity/Sorority	111	10.80%	139	12.52%	113	10.59%
Professional/Major	12	1.20%	11	0.99%	15	1.41%
Religious Organization	16	1.60%	26	2.34%	37	3.47%
Honor Society	3	0.30%	8	0.72%	4	0.37%
Campus Media	2	0.20%	5	0.45%	3	0.28%
Other Organization	19	1.90%	20	1.80%	22	2.06%
All Student Organizations	197	19.20%	233	20.99%	220	20.62%
Athletics						
Varsity Athletic	41	4.00%	43	3.87%	41	3.84%
Club Sports Intramurals	5	0.50%	7	0.63%	5	0.47%
Other Athletic	4	0.40%	4	0.36%	6	0.56%
All Athletics	50	4.90%	54	4.86%	52	4.87%
Employment						
Campus job	27	2.60%	11	0.99%	14	1.31%
Volunteer	20	2.00%	10	0.90%	8	0.75%
Off Campus Job	15	1.50%	22	1.98%	23	2.16%
All Employment	62	6.00%	43	3.87%	45	4.22%
Performance/Creative Activity						
Public Performance/ Recital	3	0.30%	8	0.72%	3	0.28%
Other Creative	6	0.60%	4	0.36%	5	0.47%
All Perform./Creative Act.	9	0.90%	12	1.08%	8	0.75%
Other						
Relationships/Friendships	98	9.50%	123	11.08%	140	13.12%
Resident Life	20	2.00%	22	1.98%	18	1.69%
ROTC	4	0.40%	8	0.72%	6	0.56%
Other Misc.	84	8.20%	99	8.92%	72	6.75%
All Other	206	20.00%	252	22.70%	236	22.12%
Total	1028	100.00%	1110	100.00%	1067	100.00%

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Most Personally Satisfying (MPS) prompt (shown in purple below) 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 only started downloading this data in 2016. In the last table below in this section, the 2016-2018 context data has been consistent over this time period. It will be interesting to see if and how the data from these categories evolves in the future.

The Most Personally Satisfying Prompt

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

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

What is the source of this entry?

What year did you originally produce this work?

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

- It represented a personal best*
- The student achieved personal goals*
- The student achieved significant personal growth*
- It was especially challenging*
- It modeled working as a professional*
- It was a collaborative effort*
- It was enjoyable*
- No indication*
- The student solved a problem*
- It took a lot of work and/or time*

Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2014-2018

Year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Most... Reasons					
Personal Growth	48%	45%	48%	47%	50%
Enjoyable	46%	47%	42%	52%	47%
Challenging	34%	27%	35%	39%	38%
Professional	25%	26%	26%	29%	32%
Personal Goals	21%	24%	21%	27%	31%
Personal Best	23%	20%	21%	20%	26%
Lots of Time	*	*	17%	26%	25%
Collaborative	15%	16%	18%	23%	22%
Problem Solving	8%	1%	7%	6%	9%

The table above shows the percentages of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why their submission was so satisfying for them. In 2018, “personal growth” (at 50%) returned to the top reason for student satisfaction, although “enjoyable” work (at 47%) was a close second. “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. Truman students do generally enjoy being pushed to excel, however we do have strong evidence that some students are really

stressed by this. It is critical to help students deal with their stress while we are asking them to work so hard.

Interestingly, over the last several years we are seeing a steady increase in students reporting that accomplishing professional or personal goals, and working collaboratively are satisfying to them. It may be that the uncertain job market is a factor for this increase. Being outstanding in their professional skills and knowing how to work well with others to accomplish mutual goals are important for their success in the “real world”. It is good to know that students find those traits satisfying.

The two tables below show the 2018 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 2018

	Major	2018 N	Pers. Best		Pers. Goals		Pers Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	30	13	43%	4	13%	14	47%	14	47%	7	23%
	CML	25	9	36%	13	52%	12	48%	10	40%	7	28%
	CRWT	17	7	41%	8	47%	9	53%	7	41%	5	29%
	ENG	61	16	26%	13	21%	34	56%	21	34%	12	20%
	LING	7	1	14%	3	43%	4	57%	3	43%	2	29%
	MUSI	28	10	36%	11	39%	17	61%	8	29%	16	57%
	THEA	15	6	40%	3	20%	8	53%	4	27%	7	47%
	AAL	183	62	34%	55	30%	98	54%	67	37%	56	31%
Business	ACCT	56	13	23%	13	23%	21	38%	28	50%	19	34%
	BSAD	124	30	24%	30	24%	54	44%	47	38%	33	27%
	BUS	180	43	24%	43	24%	75	42%	75	42%	52	29%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	1	14%	1	14%	4	57%	4	57%	2	29%
	CMDS	36	6	17%	10	28%	15	42%	12	33%	14	39%
	ES	85	18	21%	25	29%	45	53%	23	27%	22	26%
	HLTH	73	13	18%	22	30%	38	52%	20	27%	22	30%
	NU	47	10	21%	16	34%	21	45%	15	32%	25	53%
	HSE	248	48	19%	74	30%	123	50%	74	30%	85	34%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	20	28%	24	34%	42	59%	22	31%	28	39%
	ECON	11	5	45%	5	45%	5	45%	5	45%	4	36%
	HIST	41	16	39%	14	34%	19	46%	19	46%	11	27%
	JUST	26	5	19%	9	35%	15	58%	11	42%	5	19%
	PHRE	8	4	50%	4	50%	2	25%	3	38%	4	50%
	POL	24	10	42%	5	21%	10	42%	14	58%	10	42%
	PSYC	89	20	22%	25	28%	46	52%	27	30%	29	33%
	SOAN	19	3	16%	7	37%	7	37%	10	53%	2	11%
	SCS	289	83	29%	93	32%	146	51%	111	38%	93	32%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	1	5%	7	35%	8	40%	7	35%	10	50%
	BIOL	104	27	26%	33	32%	58	56%	48	46%	31	30%
	CHEM	18	5	28%	8	44%	12	67%	13	72%	7	39%
	CS	33	4	12%	14	42%	17	52%	14	42%	16	48%
	MATH	28	7	25%	10	36%	15	54%	13	46%	4	14%
	PHYS	8	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	4	50%	3	38%
	STTS	3	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	214	48	22%	75	35%	112	52%	99	46%	71	33%
	IDSM	3	1	33%	1	33%	3	100%	2	67%	0	0%
ALL	1117	285	26%	341	31%	557	50%	428	38%	357	32%	

Most Personally Satisfying: Scores sorted by first major, continued

	Major	2018 N	Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Problem Solv.		Lots of Time	
			Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	6.7%	14	46.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	20.0%
	CML	25	2	8.0%	13	52.0%	0	0.0%	3	12.0%	6	24.0%
	CRWT	17	3	17.6%	11	64.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	8	47.1%
	ENG	61	5	8.2%	38	62.3%	0	0.0%	2	3.3%	14	23.0%
	LING	7	2	28.6%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%
	MUSI	28	4	14.3%	21	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	25.0%
	THEA	15	5	33.3%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	7	46.7%
	AAL	183	23	12.6%	109	59.6%	0	0.0%	7	3.8%	51	27.9%
Business	ACCT	56	14	25.0%	21	37.5%	1	1.8%	5	8.9%	17	30.4%
	BSAD	124	36	29.0%	55	44.4%	5	4.0%	12	9.7%	36	29.0%
	BUS	180	50	27.8%	76	42.2%	6	3.3%	17	9.4%	53	29.4%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%
	CMDS	36	7	19.4%	11	30.6%	0	0.0%	1	2.8%	6	16.7%
	ES	85	21	24.7%	44	51.8%	0	0.0%	9	10.6%	18	21.2%
	HLTH	73	28	38.4%	42	57.5%	0	0.0%	6	8.2%	13	17.8%
	NU	47	5	10.6%	19	40.4%	0	0.0%	4	8.5%	13	27.7%
	HSE	248	64	25.8%	119	48.0%	0	0.0%	21	8.5%	51	20.6%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	19	26.8%	40	56.3%	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	16	22.5%
	ECON	11	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	4	36.4%
	HIST	41	9	22.0%	20	48.8%	0	0.0%	3	7.3%	13	31.7%
	JUST	26	3	11.5%	6	23.1%	0	0.0%	3	11.5%	8	30.8%
	PHRE	8	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%
	POL	24	4	16.7%	4	16.7%	0	0.0%	2	8.3%	10	41.7%
	PSYC	89	21	23.6%	40	44.9%	0	0.0%	10	11.2%	18	20.2%
	SOAN	19	3	15.8%	12	63.2%	0	0.0%	4	21.1%	3	15.8%
	SCS	289	61	21.1%	131	45.3%	0	0.0%	27	9.3%	74	25.6%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	9	45.0%	15	75.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	2	10.0%
	BIOL	104	21	20.2%	47	45.2%	2	1.9%	12	11.5%	30	28.8%
	CHEM	18	3	16.7%	5	27.8%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	3	16.7%
	CS	33	11	33.3%	12	36.4%	0	0.0%	10	30.3%	8	24.2%
	MATH	28	6	21.4%	9	32.1%	1	3.6%	3	10.7%	6	21.4%
	PHYS	8	2	25.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	4	50.0%
	STTS	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	SAM	214	52	24.3%	92	43.0%	3	1.4%	31	14.5%	53	24.8%
	IDSM	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
ALL	1117	250	22.4%	529	47.4%	9	0.8%	103	9.2%	282	25.2%	

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.

Most Personally Satisfying Context 2016-2018

Most Satisfying Contexts	2016 N	2016 %	2017 N	2017 %	2018 N	2018 %
Coursework						
LSP	102	9.7%	90	8.2%	97	8.7%
Major	384	36.5%	396	35.9%	453	40.6%
Capstone	16	1.5%	22	2.0%	22	2.0%
Minor	42	4.0%	58	5.3%	42	3.8%
Elective	48	4.6%	68	6.2%	52	4.7%
ALL Coursework	592	56.3%	634	57.4%	666	59.6%
Other Academic						
Research	36	3.4%	22	2.0%	37	3.3%
Internship	18	1.7%	30	2.7%	28	2.5%
Study Abroad	44	4.2%	38	3.4%	50	4.5%
Resume/Professional Statement	1	0.1%	10	0.9%	13	1.2%
Service Learning	3	0.3%	4	0.4%	0	0.0%
Tutor/Teach/Mentor	11	1.1%	8	0.7%	4	0.4%
Other Academic	26	2.5%	26	2.4%	10	0.9%
ALL Other Academic	147	14.0%	138	12.5%	142	12.7%
Student Organizations						
Governance Organization	4	0.4%	4	0.4%	5	0.4%
Service Organization	21	2.0%	28	2.5%	22	2.0%
Social Fraternity/Sorority	54	5.1%	80	7.2%	62	5.6%
Professional/Major	10	1.0%	14	1.3%	11	1.0%
Religious Organization	15	1.4%	16	1.4%	7	0.6%
Honor Society	7	0.7%	1	0.1%	4	0.4%
Campus Media	5	0.5%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%
Other Organization	16	1.5%	9	0.8%	11	1.0%
ALL Student Organizations	132	12.6%	155	14.0%	125	11.2%
Athletics						
Varsity Athletic	41	3.9%	28	2.5%	37	3.3%
Club Sports Intramurals	12	1.1%	15	1.4%	7	0.6%
Other Athletic	6	0.6%	3	0.3%	9	0.8%
ALL Athletics	59	5.6%	46	4.2%	53	4.7%
Employment						
Campus job	17	1.6%	14	1.3%	14	1.3%
Volunteer	24	2.3%	22	2.0%	20	1.8%
Off Campus Job	11	1.1%	14	1.3%	13	1.2%
ALL Employment	52	4.9%	50	4.5%	47	4.2%
Performance/Creative Activity						
Public Performance/ Recital	15	1.4%	24	2.2%	31	2.8%
Other Creative	12	1.1%	16	1.4%	12	1.1%
ALL Performance/Creative Activity	27	2.6%	40	3.6%	43	3.8%
Other (Misc.)						
Relationships/Friendships	15	1.4%	15	1.4%	23	2.1%
Residence Life	8	0.8%	5	0.5%	6	0.5%
ROTC	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	1	0.1%
Other Misc	26	2.5%	17	1.5%	11	1.0%
ALL Other Misc	43	4.1%	41	3.7%	41	3.7%
TOTAL	1052	100.0%	1104	100.0%	1117	100.0%

This final MPS table shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, data that we began downloading in 2016. Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission, so the total percentage here reflects that. Consistently, well over half (59.6% in 2018) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (40.6% in 2018) being from the course work of the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Other academic activities (12.7% in 2018) and student organizations (11.2% in 2018) are the other areas that show greater than 10% counts.

Transformative Learning Experiences Questionnaire (TEQ) 2018

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

2014-2018 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative (table as of 1/23/19)

Acad. Yr.	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.5	53%	3.5	56%	3.5	56%	3.6	57%	3.4	52%
BUS	3.1	37%	3.2	41%	3	33%	3.1	40%	3.1	41%
HSE	3.5	53%	3.5	54%	3.5	58%	3.5	53%	3.4	47%
SCS	3.4	52%	3.4	53%	3.5	56%	3.6	59%	3.4	53%
SAM	3.5	52%	3.4	52%	3	52%	2.9	50%	3.4	49%
IDS	3.4	60%	4.2	100%	3.4	50%	3.6	50%	3.3	33%
All	3.3	49%	3.4	52%	3.3	52%	3.3	53%	3.3	49%

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.

2018 Counts of Scores, Sorted by Major, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative (table as of 1/23/19)

	Major	N2018	Counts of Each Score, by Major					AVG	% 4&5
			1	2	3	4	5		
Arts and Letters	ART	30	1	2	9	15	3	3.57	60.0%
	CML	25	1	5	6	10	3	3.36	52.0%
	CRWT	17	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	64.7%
	ENG	61	1	7	24	25	4	3.39	47.5%
	LING	7	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	57.1%
	MUSI	28	0	7	8	10	3	3.32	46.4%
	THEA	15	1	2	4	5	3	3.47	53.3%
	AAL	183	5	25	57	77	19	3.44	52.5%
Business	ACCT	56	7	10	13	21	5	3.13	46.4%
	BSAD	124	9	26	41	38	10	3.11	38.7%
	BUS	180	16	36	54	59	15	3.12	41.1%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	42.9%
	CMDS	36	0	3	11	19	3	3.61	61.1%
	ES	85	2	20	27	27	9	3.25	42.4%
	HLTH	73	0	14	25	24	10	3.41	46.6%
	NU	47	0	4	21	20	2	3.43	46.8%
	HSE	248	3	41	87	93	24	3.38	47.2%
	SAM	214	8	30	72	81	23	3.38	48.6%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	2	10	23	28	8	3.42	50.7%
	ECON	11	1	2	1	7	0	3.27	63.6%
	HIST	41	3	6	11	16	5	3.34	51.2%
	JUST	26	2	4	8	10	2	3.23	46.2%
	PHRE	8	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	62.5%
	POL	24	1	4	3	13	3	3.54	66.7%
	PSYC	89	3	21	23	32	10	3.28	47.2%
	SOAN	19	1	4	1	6	7	3.74	68.4%
	SCS	289	14	52	71	115	37	3.38	52.6%
	SAM	214	8	30	72	81	23	3.38	48.6%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	2	1	7	9	1	3.30	50.0%
	BIOL	104	4	14	36	42	8	3.35	48.1%
	CHEM	18	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	77.8%
	CS	33	0	10	12	7	4	3.15	33.3%
	MATH	28	2	3	7	12	4	3.46	57.1%
	PHYS	8	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	25.0%
	STTS	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	33.3%
	SAM	214	8	30	72	81	23	3.38	48.6%
IDSMT	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	33.3%	
ALL	1117	46	184	343	426	118	3.35	48.7%	

Examining the counts for each score and the average score for each discipline in the table above reveals very few significant differences, with most average scores ranging between 3.0 and 4.1. Ironically, Chemistry (my own department!) has the highest average score! Examination of the percentage of students within each major who scored 4 & 5 does vary widely, with its range from 25% to 78%.

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 2018, 524 Truman students (47%) listed one or more courses as transformational. This percentage for all Truman students is significantly lower than the previous three years that all hovered around 77%. The percentages of students within each major however vary widely, and are included in a larger table showing the data by major below.

Students were next asked if they had an experience with writing that they would report as transformational. This year, 248 (22%) students reported such an experience, up only a single percentage point from that 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*

2018 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	2018 Various Activity Counts	
	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	218	20%
Service	220	20%
Research	328	29%
Internship	361	32%
Leadership	464	42%
Student-Led Education	62	6%
Writing	248	22%
Course	524	47%
Other	88	8%
Total	1117	100%

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. While these more detailed descriptions of these activities have been solicited from the first year that we used the survey, we have not further mined this data. If the University decided to focus on any of these activities, it could be interesting to see these student reports in more detail.

The 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, except the courses category.

2013-2018 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Experience	% Reporting Activity					
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Study Abroad</i>	19%	20%	18%	21%	20%	20%
<i>Service Learning</i>	18%	23%	24%	23%	17%	20%
<i>Research</i>	27%	29%	29%	31%	31%	29%
<i>Internship</i>	26%	35%	33%	33%	35%	32%
<i>Leadership</i>	36%	38%	38%	42%	41%	42%
<i>Student-led</i>	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	6%
<i>Writing*</i>	21%	21%	22%	21%	21%	22%
<i>Other*</i>	7%	7%	8%	7%	8%	8%
<i>Course*</i>	42%	16%	78%	77%	75%	47%
<i>Any (Big 4)</i>	65%	69%	67%	68%	70%	68%
<i>Any</i>	79%	83%	87%	83%	85%	84%

* 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.

2014-2018 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Experience	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Study Abroad	25%	10%	20%	14%	25%	15%	24%	14%	26%	9%
Service Learning	29%	14%	28%	17%	28%	15%	21%	11%	25%	12%
Research	30%	29%	30%	26%	35%	24%	33%	29%	34%	23%
Internship	35%	34%	32%	35%	35%	30%	38%	31%	31%	35%
Leadership	41%	33%	41%	33%	46%	36%	45%	34%	46%	35%
Student-led Education	9%	5%	9%	6%	7%	8%	8%	5%	6%	5%
Course*	17%	15%	41%	27%	40%	30%	40%	31%	51%	41%
Writing*	22%	20%	22%	20%	23%	18%	24%	16%	24%	19%
Other*	7%	7%	8%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%	6%	10%

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2018, women again participated in most of these types of activities at frequencies higher than men, with the differences ranging from 1 to 17 percentage points. Men did participate at a slightly higher rate than women in the internship category this year (35% for men and 31% for women); they also reported more “other” transformational experiences (10% for men and 6% for women).

2018 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

	Major	N 2018	StudAbrod	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	Leader	Stu-Led	Writing	Course	Other
Arts and Letters	ART	30	17%	10%	7%	30%	30%	0%	33%	47%	7%
	CML	25	80%	16%	4%	4%	60%	12%	32%	56%	0%
	CRWT	17	12%	12%	12%	29%	29%	0%	65%	59%	12%
	ENG	61	13%	7%	18%	18%	31%	8%	48%	69%	3%
	LING	7	14%	0%	14%	14%	57%	0%	29%	43%	29%
	MUSI	28	21%	4%	11%	4%	39%	11%	25%	64%	11%
	THEA	15	0%	7%	7%	33%	40%	0%	27%	47%	7%
	AAL	183	23%	8%	11%	18%	38%	6%	39%	59%	7%
Business	ACCT	56	11%	11%	13%	45%	39%	2%	21%	18%	7%
	BSAD	124	19%	6%	5%	44%	44%	2%	14%	40%	8%
	BUS	180	17%	7%	7%	44%	43%	2%	16%	33%	8%
Hlth, Soc. and Ed.	ATH	7	0%	14%	86%	57%	29%	0%	14%	29%	0%
	CMDS	36	42%	44%	58%	6%	69%	17%	17%	53%	11%
	ES	85	6%	42%	31%	59%	35%	6%	12%	40%	11%
	HLTH	73	16%	90%	44%	19%	44%	12%	18%	48%	7%
	NU	47	30%	11%	19%	38%	47%	0%	23%	55%	4%
HSE	248	19%	50%	38%	35%	45%	8%	17%	47%	8%	
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	20%	18%	20%	44%	48%	6%	32%	46%	10%
	ECON	11	9%	0%	18%	9%	18%	9%	27%	36%	0%
	HIST	41	22%	7%	20%	32%	24%	7%	29%	46%	10%
	JUST	26	4%	15%	12%	27%	42%	12%	15%	54%	8%
	PHRE	8	25%	13%	25%	25%	36%	0%	38%	50%	13%
	POL	24	25%	13%	42%	75%	42%	4%	33%	46%	17%
	PSYC	89	20%	17%	73%	29%	39%	3%	16%	46%	8%
	SOAN	19	42%	21%	74%	16%	42%	5%	26%	68%	0%
	SCS	289	20%	15%	42%	35%	39%	6%	25%	48%	9%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	5%	15%	50%	40%	35%	10%	15%	50%	5%
	BIOL	104	25%	13%	42%	13%	44%	8%	18%	51%	7%
	CHEM	18	17%	6%	67%	22%	44%	6%	6%	44%	22%
	CS	33	15%	3%	18%	81%	30%	3%	12%	24%	9%
	MATH	28	11%	21%	7%	39%	50%	0%	25%	64%	7%
	PHYS	8	0%	0%	50%	13%	63%	0%	0%	38%	0%
	STTS	3	33%	0%	0%	67%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	SAM	214	18%	12%	36%	28%	43%	6%	16%	47%	8%
	IDSM	3	67%	0%	33%	0%	67%	0%	33%	33%	0%
ALL	1117	20%	20%	29%	32%	42%	6%	22%	47%	8%	

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

2018 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

	Major	N 2018	Big 4		Any	
			Count	%	Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	30	17	57%	23	77%
	CML	25	20	80%	22	88%
	CRWT	17	8	47%	16	94%
	ENG	61	25	41%	46	75%
	LING	7	3	43%	6	86%
	MUSI	28	9	32%	18	64%
	THEA	15	5	33%	11	73%
	AAL	183	87	48%	142	78%
Business	ACCT	56	32	57%	42	75%
	BSAD	124	67	54%	90	73%
	BUS	180	99	55%	132	73%
Htn. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	6	86%	6	86%
	CMD5	36	30	83%	34	94%
	ES	85	73	86%	77	91%
	HLTH	73	71	97%	72	99%
	NU	47	33	70%	36	77%
	HSE	248	213	86%	225	91%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	47	66%	62	87%
	ECON	11	4	36%	5	45%
	HIST	41	26	63%	32	78%
	JUST	26	11	42%	24	92%
	PHRE	8	5	63%	7	88%
	POL	24	23	96%	23	96%
	PSYC	89	77	87%	83	93%
	SOAN	19	16	84%	18	95%
SCS	289	209	72%	254	88%	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	17	85%	18	90%
	BIOL	104	67	64%	83	80%
	CHEM	18	14	78%	16	89%
	CS	33	24	73%	28	85%
	MATH	28	18	64%	23	82%
	PHYS	8	5	63%	8	100%
	STTS	3	2	67%	2	67%
	SAM	214	147	69%	178	83%
IDSM	3	3	100%	3	100%	
ALL	1117	785	70%	934	84%	

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 2018, only PHYS and IDSM majors have 100% participation in one of these kinds of experiences, but nine others of our majors have at least 90% of their students reporting it. This 2018 total of 11 majors with >90% participation is

compares to 13 majors in 2017, 7 majors in 2016, and 8 majors in 2015 reporting such levels of participation. Campus-wide, 70% of all students report having at least one of the “Big 4” and 84% reporting having some transformative experience.

Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2014-2018)

School/Yr	N	StAbr	ServL	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Ldrshp	StuLed	Writing	Other	Any
AAL											
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%
2018	183	23%	8%	11%	18%	48%	38%	6%	39%	7%	73%
BUS											
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%
2018	180	17%	7%	7%	44%	55%	43%	2%	16%	8%	63%
HSE											
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%
2018	248	19%	50%	38%	35%	86%	45%	8%	17%	8%	82%
SAM											
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%
2018	289	18%	12%	36%	28%	69%	43%	6%	16%	8%	75%
SCS											
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%
2018	214	20%	15%	42%	35%	72%	39%	6%	25%	9%	82%
IDS											
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%
2018	3	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%
ALL											
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%
2018	1117	20%	20%	29%	32%	70%	42%	6%	22%	8%	76%

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?

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

On the other hand, students do sometimes reveal alarming details, which can be upsetting for readers. Clearly, such letters should be reviewed and usually answered by someone. Some readers are comfortable enough with some situations that they contact students themselves, but sometimes not. Readers are able to indicate that someone needs to address a critical need in their evaluation of the submission. In the 2018 reading session, we had several concerning cases that were forwarded to appropriate on-campus offices for review.

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

The Letter to Truman Prompt

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

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

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

Points that you might include are:

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

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

* *Your thoughts on the portfolio assessment process.*

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

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

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

* *Your plans for the future.*

* *Anything else you want to tell us.*

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

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

Reviewer Specific Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hours Spent on the Portfolio Project

2018 Percentile	2018 Hours
99	27
90	10
75	8
50	5
25	3
10	2

In 2018, students spent a similar amount of time as in 2016 and 2017 compiling their Portfolio prompt responses, with a mode of 5 hours.

Student Attitudes Toward the Portfolio and other Assessment at Truman in 2018

	Major	2018 N	Attitude towards portfolio					Attitude towards assessment				
			Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos	Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	30	1	2	2	25	60.0%	0	1	0	29	50.0%
	CML	25	3	5	9	8	67.6%	0	2	3	20	80.0%
	CRWT	17	3	3	1	10	35.7%	2	0	1	14	33.3%
	ENG	61	8	9	9	35	51.9%	2	5	3	51	55.0%
	LING	7	1	3	1	2	50.0%	0	2	1	4	66.7%
	MUSI	28	8	4	8	8	50.0%	1	1	4	22	75.0%
	THEA	15	1	1	0	13	25.0%	0	3	0	12	50.0%
	AAL	183	25	27	30	101	53.0%	5	14	12	152	61.3%
Business	AOCT	56	7	10	10	29	55.6%	1	4	5	46	70.0%
	BSAD	124	17	24	28	55	58.0%	3	11	23	87	77.0%
	BUS	180	24	34	38	84	57.3%	4	15	28	133	75.5%
Hth. Sci. and E	ATHT	7	1	1	2	3	62.5%	0	0	2	5	100.0%
	CMDS	36	6	4	16	10	69.2%	0	2	4	30	83.3%
	ES	85	17	7	15	46	47.4%	4	2	5	74	54.5%
	HLTH	73	5	13	22	33	71.3%	3	4	11	55	72.2%
	NU	47	7	6	12	22	60.0%	4	2	4	37	50.0%
	HSE	248	36	31	67	114	61.6%	11	10	26	201	66.0%
Social and Cultural Stud	COMM	71	6	6	17	42	69.0%	1	4	10	56	80.0%
	ECON	11	1	2	4	4	71.4%	0	0	3	8	100.0%
	HIST	41	9	4	6	22	42.1%	3	5	3	30	50.0%
	JUST	26	3	6	10	7	68.4%	1	0	4	21	80.0%
	PHRE	8	1	1	0	4	12.5%	0	2	0	6	50.0%
	POL	24	2	2	23	17	342.9%	1	0	3	20	75.0%
	PSYC	89	19	8	3	39	14.0%	2	7	12	68	73.8%
	SOAN	19	0	2	3	14	80.0%	0	2	0	17	50.0%
SCS	289	41	31	66	149	58.2%	8	20	35	226	71.4%	
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	4	2	7	7	61.5%	0	2	2	16	75.0%
	BIOL	104	12	15	33	44	67.5%	7	6	18	73	67.7%
	CHEM	18	2	3	9	4	75.0%	0	1	2	15	83.3%
	CS	33	3	6	9	15	66.7%	0	4	3	26	71.4%
	MATH	28	2	4	5	17	63.6%	0	2	3	23	80.0%
	PHYS	8	2	2	3	4	100.0%	0	2	0	6	50.0%
	STTS	3	0	1	0	2	50.0%	0	0	0	3	0.0%
	SAM	214	25	33	66	93	68.2%	7	17	28	162	70.2%
IDSM	3	0	0	1	2	100.0%	0	0	0	3	0.0%	
ALL	1117	151	150	267	543	59.6%	35	76	129	877	69.6%	

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

In 2018, Truman students as a whole were less enthusiastic about the Portfolio (W%Pos=59%) than they are about assessment at Truman in general (W%Pos=70%).

Both attitudes were reported at 64% in 2017, so students in 2018 were less enthusiastic about the portfolio, but more positive toward Truman’s total assessment processes. The School of Science and Math had the highest Portfolio approval rating, and Arts and Letters students had the lowest. The students in the School of Business were the most positive about Truman’s overall assessment program.

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

Student Attitudes Toward Education at Truman and in their Major for 2018

	Major	2018 N	Attitude towards truman education					Attitude towards major education				
			Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos	Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	30	0	4	17	9	90.5%	1	4	8	17	76.9%
	CML	25	0	4	18	3	90.9%	3	3	14	5	77.5%
	CRWT	17	0	6	8	3	78.6%	0	4	3	10	71.4%
	ENG	61	3	11	41	6	84.5%	3	5	22	31	81.7%
	LING	7	0	1	5	1	91.7%	1	0	5	1	83.3%
	MUSI	28	2	4	20	2	84.6%	2	6	16	4	79.2%
	THEA	15	2	3	9	1	75.0%	2	2	6	5	70.0%
	AAL	183	7	33	118	25	85.1%	12	24	74	73	78.2%
Business	ACCT	56	3	9	38	6	85.0%	1	10	21	24	81.3%
	BSAD	124	6	28	76	14	81.8%	5	19	44	56	78.7%
	BUS	180	9	37	114	20	82.8%	6	29	65	80	79.5%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	0	0	6	1	100.0%	0	1	5	1	91.7%
	CMDS	36	0	3	27	6	95.0%	0	1	23	12	97.9%
	ES	85	3	18	55	9	84.2%	5	6	40	34	84.3%
	HLTH	73	1	11	60	1	91.0%	2	4	48	19	92.6%
	NU	47	0	12	28	7	85.0%	5	8	20	14	72.7%
	HSE	248	4	44	176	24	88.4%	12	20	136	80	86.9%
Social and Cultural Studie	COMM	71	3	17	48	3	83.1%	3	10	30	28	81.4%
	ECON	11	0	2	9	0	90.9%	0	3	3	5	75.0%
	HIST	41	2	10	22	7	79.4%	2	5	15	19	79.5%
	JUST	26	2	3	18	3	84.8%	2	2	10	12	78.6%
	PHRE	8	0	2	3	3	80.0%	0	1	7	0	93.8%
	POL	24	1	6	11	6	77.8%	0	2	9	13	90.9%
	PSYC	89	7	13	59	10	82.9%	4	11	39	35	82.4%
	SOAN	19	0	3	14	2	91.2%	0	2	8	9	90.0%
	SCS	289	15	56	184	34	83.1%	11	36	121	121	82.7%
	Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	1	2	12	5	86.7%	1	2	9	8
BIOL		104	6	24	67	7	81.4%	2	20	48	34	82.9%
CHEM		18	0	4	12	2	87.5%	0	1	14	3	96.7%
CS		33	0	6	18	9	87.5%	0	7	17	9	85.4%
MATH		28	2	1	21	4	89.6%	2	2	15	9	84.2%
PHYS		8	0	5	3	0	68.8%	2	3	2	1	50.0%
STTS		3	1	0	1	1	50.0%	0	1	0	2	50.0%
SAM		214	10	42	134	28	83.3%	7	36	105	66	83.1%
IDSM		3	0	0	2	1	100.0%	0	1	1	1	75.0%
ALL	1117	45	212	728	132	84.7%	48	146	502	421	82.6%	

Student attitudes toward their majors (83%) and to their education overall (85%) were overwhelmingly positive again in 2018. 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 2018 Letters to Truman

	Major	2018	Evidence of Self-Reflection			
			No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
Arts and Letters	ART	30	15	10	5	50.0%
	CML	25	10	5	10	60.0%
	CRWT	17	6	10	1	64.7%
	ENG	61	19	30	12	68.9%
	LING	7	5	1	1	28.6%
	MUSI	28	15	10	3	46.4%
	THEA	15	7	6	2	53.3%
	AAL	183	77	72	34	57.9%
Business	ACCT	56	28	22	6	50.0%
	BSAD	124	65	37	21	46.8%
	BUS	180	93	59	27	47.8%
Hlt. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	3	2	2	57.1%
	CMDS	36	17	15	4	52.8%
	ES	85	42	32	10	49.4%
	HLTH	73	24	33	16	67.1%
	NU	47	24	14	9	48.9%
	HSE	248	110	96	41	55.2%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	33	30	8	53.5%
	ECON	11	3	5	3	72.7%
	HIST	41	20	18	2	48.8%
	JUST	26	10	14	2	61.5%
	PHRE	8	4	3	1	50.0%
	POL	24	11	5	8	54.2%
	PSYC	89	46	32	11	48.3%
	SOAN	19	9	8	2	52.6%
	SCS	289	136	115	37	52.6%
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	5	12	3	75.0%
	BIOL	104	46	39	19	55.8%
	CHEM	18	9	8	1	50.0%
	CS	33	17	11	5	48.5%
	MATH	28	16	9	2	39.3%
	PHYS	8	6	2	0	25.0%
	STTS	3	2	1	0	33.3%
	SAM	214	101	82	30	52.3%
	IDSM	3	2	1	0	33.3%
	ALL	1117	519	425	169	53.2%

Fifty-three percent of graduates reveal sincere reflections about their experiences and growth during their time here at Truman. As noted above, many of the letters mentioned some aspect of mental health support as an issue. After the suicides of several Truman students in 2017, the Truman community worked hard support students, especially to those directly affected by those losses. However, this year's

graduates reported that they were still reeling from these events. While Truman's campus culture provides intense pressure to excel in all aspects of life: academic, personal, and extracurricular, it is becoming clear that the stress that our students are feeling is not unique. Universities across the nation are wrestling with the mental health needs of their students. This issue remains a critical need, with Truman wellness strategies including the ongoing JED campus initiative and a newly developed positive peers organization.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2018, only one reading session was held in one week in May, and readers served for only a four-day week: May 21-24. We read in the BT 2219 computer classroom, because we invited fifty readers for the single session, which was more readers than the computer rooms that we had previously used could hold.

Due to a variety of last minute personal and professional conflicts, only forty-six people participated in this portfolio reading session. In addition, one of them served only two days and another only served three days. This total number of readers is one less than last year's headcount of forty-seven, but is much less than previous years when we had sixty or more readers. With fewer readers and fewer days, we were unable to "double-score" as many CTW and IDS submissions, leading to less clear inter-rater reliability.

On the other hand, these forty-six readers were drawn from most schools across campus: fifteen from Arts and Letters, none from Business, six from Health Sciences and Education, eleven from Science and Mathematics, eleven from Social and Cultural Studies, and three from Academic Support and Student Affairs. Faculty readers are purposely chosen to have varying experience with the reading process, and this year, eleven of the readers had never read before. One of the best parts of portfolio reading is getting to know people from all across campus and realizing that our priorities and goals are the same: we aim to help our students achieve at their highest potential.

The main purpose of the change to having all reading in May was to allow more timely processing of the data. The portfolio director does not get release time during the academic year, and always has a full schedule of courses to teach. Therefore, the summer provides more time to download the submissions scores, combine it with demographics from Banner, and prepare the tables of results. With the tables of results in hand, summer also could allow large blocks of time to make sense of those results and complete the report. This year, the data processing has moved more smoothly because of the availability of large blocks of time for the work, but it was still not completed before the Fall semester began. Hopefully that can be better optimized in

the summer of 2019. Note that without the August reading session, some August graduates' portfolios will be scored next May with the 2018-19 academic year submissions. Overall, this move to reading only at the beginning of the summer is a good move.

Because all of these forty-six readers read together during one week, adjustments were made in how scoring calibration was conducted. One very positive adjustment was to use Socrative, an online quizzing program that allowed the readers to submit their scoring for our range-finders during calibration. The readers liked this change, and so did I. It eliminated the counting for the scoring during calibration that would have been prohibitively time consuming for so many readers. It also allowed the readers to submit their scores anonymously, which several readers said relieved their anxiety about scoring "correctly" during range-finding. This program should be used again in the 2019 reading sessions.

The large number of readers also affected the group dynamics of the reading session. Fewer people participated in the conversations about range-finding and also about the results of reading student submissions. I did not expect this with a group of faculty readers, but even some of these seasoned academics are hesitant to speak up in large groups. Furthermore, we never had enough time for all of us to speak during these discussion times. Several readers commented on these issues in the reading session evaluation. I believe that we need to move the size of the group back to 25-30 in order to bring all voices into the conversations.

Additionally, the reduction of the reading session to only 4 days gave us less time to get the reading done! We did not read all the submissions in all categories during the week, as we did not have enough time. Some of the Critical Thinking and Writing submissions had to be scored in the next week by portfolio committee members. Furthermore, our conversation time was shortened. 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. If we are going to have only 4 days, we definitely need to have more than 46 readers to get the work done.

When we did have discussion, 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 as we implement new approaches to these issues. With these baselines established, these prompts could be removed from the portfolio to allow

room for new assessments. Civic Engagement was removed from the 2018 submission list, and we should consider whether we have enough data about the Self Discovery to remove it after 2019.

In summary, portfolio reading is 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 that mission as it is represented by each section of the portfolio. Maximizing that opportunity for as many readers as we can should be done.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our office staff this year included 3-5 students, whose primary task is to verify that student submissions are complete and that their submitted documents are readable. They provided many classes with presentations (19 in the Fall, 12 in the Spring) to help instruct students on accessing and using the portfolio system (see more on this below). They also staffed the graduation fair each semester to help students complete their graduation checklists. This year, Juliette Miller was my Office Manager, organizing our worker's office hours, training new workers, and other activities.

As Director, I communicate regularly with our undergraduate students. Each semester, every undergraduate degree-seeking student receives an email describing the portfolio project, 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. It is becoming more rare for students to claim not to have heard of this requirement. We continue to publicize the portfolio using our promotional posters asking "What is in your Vault?" to remind students to put their treasures there.

I also communicate predominantly by email with Truman faculty for several purposes. I like to remind faculty who teach freshman level classes that they may invite one of 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 mid-term 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. One area that Brian Kubin (incoming Portfolio Director) has already improved upon is communication with Deans and Chairs about how the portfolio can serve departments better.

Our portfolio submission system works well, but it was developed by a series of student workers (under the excellent direction of Greg Marshall). Because it is “homemade”, we do still continue to tweak it for continual improvement. For example, Greg and I worked out many improvements to the downloading component of the system during June and July of 2018. Until someone from IT has a significant time allotted for rewriting the system in a more modern language, we will keep tweaking it to serve our purpose.

This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members: Liz Jorn (HSE, since 2008), Brian Kubin (AAL, since 2013), Michelle Blakely (Student Affairs, since 2014), Rebecca Dierking (AAL, since 2014), Emily Costello (SAM, since 2014), and Dereck Daschke (SCS, since 2015). I am grateful for their long-term dedication to our assessment process. These people meet with me once or twice per semester to plan schedules and update our procedures.

During the 2015-2017 academic years, Truman participated in a Multi-State Collaborative on portfolio-style evaluations of student work from multiple institutions. This three year pilot project was organized through the American Association of Colleges and Universities. Several of us (Scott Alberts, Melissa Holcomb, Amanda Medlock Klyukovski, and myself) served as readers for this group. In the 2018 academic year, the project matured, and increased its fees. In return, Truman did not get very useful data for a variety of reasons. The assessment committee, in consultation with the Provost, decided not to participate as a university this year, however we may want to submit student work again in the future.

2018 Portfolio Report Summary and Future Plans

Using these prompts, we have found that our students consistently demonstrate solid competence at Critical Thinking and Writing and Interdisciplinary Thinking, both of which are long term, valued indications of success in our curriculum. The 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 an important component of Truman’s assessment program.

Most of the prompts for the upcoming 2018-19 year will stay the same as 2016-17, with the removal of only the Civic Engagement prompt. The data from the Civic Engagement from 2014-2018 offer a steady baseline for understanding this issue, should we choose to explore it again in the future. As we launch the new Self and Society seminars and update the liberal studies curriculum, it will be interesting to see how it helps the students to grow academically.

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

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

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