

Chapter 6: Portfolio Assessment

Portfolio Assessment

Who takes it?

All students must develop and submit a portfolio as a requirement for graduation. In academic year 2015-2016, 1113 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 throughout their college career. Regardless of when students submit the portfolio, the work itself may have been completed at any time during their college career.

What office administers it?

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

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

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

When are results typically available?

The portfolios are read and scored in May and August. 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 2015-2016 academic year, a portfolio included works demonstrating 1) critical thinking and writing, 2) interdisciplinary thinking, 3) *civic engagement*, and 4) *self-discovery*. The portfolio also included a work or experience the student considered 5) most personally satisfying, and 6) a Letter to Truman in which students give summary thoughts about their experience with the Portfolio and at Truman. Other items may be included, but these are evaluated separately, if at all, including a 7) transformative learning experience questionnaire.

From whom are the results available?

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

Are the results available by school or department?

Yes.

To whom are results regularly distributed?

Overall results of portfolio assessment are available to the Truman community through this Assessment Almanac. Occasional reports are given to governance, planning workshops, and other forums. Most departments use the information to reform their curriculum, improve programs, and engage in self-study, as mandated by the Faculty Senate. Faculty who participate in reading sessions report changing their assignments and their teaching techniques based on their experience.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

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

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2015-2016 Academic Year
Anne Moody, Portfolio Director

2016 Portfolio Contents

• Critical Thinking and Writing	5
• Interdisciplinary Thinking	14
• Civic Engagement	19
• Self-Discovery	27
• Most Personally Satisfying Experience	35
• Letter to Truman	41

Counts of students by first major, 2012-2016

		First Major				
Major		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Arts and Letters	ART	29	30	43	39	29
	CML	26	8	18	27	17
	CWRT	6	11	10	8	8
	ENG	90	90	86	72	74
	LING	6	9	5	10	12
	MUS	36	38	29	28	16
	THEA	5	9	13	13	13
	AAL	198	195	204	197	169
Business	ACCT	69	68	63	70	56
	BSAD	91	105	95	93	118
	BUS	160	173	158	163	174
Health Sci. and Education	AT	4	5	5	8	7
	CMDS	40	45	46	40	43
	ES	74	97	79	123	111
	HLTH	53	61	69	78	63
	NU	42	40	49	54	43
	HSE	213	248	248	303	267
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	74	67	60	52	68
	ECON	13	8	14	20	17
	HIST	44	34	40	38	26
	JUST	27	45	40	40	40
	PHRE	13	14	7	6	2
	POL	41	29	35	21	20
	PSYC	102	86	115	101	91
	SOAN	20	16	20	20	16
	SCS	334	299	331	298	280
Science and Mathematics	AGSC	22	24	20	20	30
	BIOL	107	99	119	100	103
	CHEM	28	19	33	22	16
	CS	24	28	34	24	30
	MATH	23	22	25	26	31
	PHYS	7	15	8	9	5
	SAM	211	207	239	201	215
	IDSM	10	3	5	5	8
	All	1130	1125	1185	1167	1113

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 re-examined as part of the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) committee's charge. In the 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 components are the issue, the context, the supporting evidence, and the 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. Finally, they describe the instructor's assignment, reflect on their growth as a critical thinker, attach their document via their vault, and perform a self-evaluation with our scoring rubric.

Following the prompt and the rubric below are tables of CTW scores sorted by major and by course prefix. Following that is a short inter-rater reliability table that indicates that our readers are well calibrated in the scoring of these submissions; a random number of CTW submissions are scored by two different readers to double check this assertion. A final table shows the scores by year for the last 4 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.

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.

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.

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.

Portfolio Critical Thinking and Writing Rubric (adopted summer 2013)

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

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

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

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

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 - Emerging
Approaches issue with clear sense of scope and context. May consider multiple relevant contexts. Shows clear and nuanced understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of	Presents and explores relevant contexts in relation to issue, but with some limitations. Shows some clear understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context.	Presents context superficially or connects to issue in a limited way. Shows limited understanding of convergent or divergent aspects of context. Presents	Does not connect issue to context, or attempts but fails to do so. Shows little or no awareness of convergent or divergent aspects of context. Raises only

contexts. Engages multiple, convergent and divergent perspectives in nuanced ways that qualify or enrich own perspective.	Engages both convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, may be tentative, overstating, or too easily dismissive.	convergent and divergent or challenging perspectives, but with little engagement.	convergent or agreeable perspectives or conclusions; avoids challenging, divergent, or discomforting perspectives.
--	---	---	--

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

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

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

4 - Mastering	3 - Developing	2 - Growing	1 - Emerging
<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;</p>	<p>In general, language does not interfere with communication.</p> <p>Basic organization is clear; transitions connect most ideas, although some may</p>	<p>Language occasionally interferes with communication.</p> <p>Basic organization is apparent; some transitions connect ideas, but some</p>	<p>In many places, language (word choice) obscures meaning.</p> <p>Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection</p>

<p>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>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>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>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 2016

		N 2016	Issue	Context	Support. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	%10+	Comm.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	3.16	2.72	2.63	2.66	11.16	70%	2.81
	CML	17	1.75	1.67	1.87	1.76	7.04	88%	2.03
	CRWT	8	2.50	2.50	2.38	2.50	9.88	63%	3.25
	ENG	74	3.00	2.77	2.77	2.62	11.16	76%	3.00
	LING	12	2.83	2.67	2.50	2.75	10.75	67%	2.83
	MUSI	16	2.82	2.90	2.65	2.46	10.83	56%	3.03
	THEA	13	2.38	2.46	2.46	2.15	9.46	31%	2.31
	AAL	167	2.64	2.53	2.46	2.42	10.04	69%	2.75
Business	ACCT	55	2.64	2.38	2.31	2.22	9.55	49%	2.58
	BSAD	115	2.62	2.43	2.43	2.32	9.80	55%	2.54
	BUS	170	2.63	2.40	2.37	2.27	9.67	53%	2.56
Hlth. Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	2.71	2.43	2.57	2.00	9.71	57%	2.57
	CMD5	43	2.65	2.49	2.37	2.35	9.86	53%	2.65
	ES	109	2.62	2.38	2.40	2.21	9.61	53%	2.67
	HLTH	63	2.86	2.62	2.59	2.60	10.67	63%	2.73
	NU	43	3.07	3.00	3.05	2.60	11.72	77%	2.93
	HSE	265	2.78	2.58	2.60	2.35	10.32	60%	2.71
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	2.58	2.51	2.46	2.25	9.81	60%	2.57
	ECON	17	2.59	2.35	2.65	2.24	9.82	53%	2.29
	HIST	25	2.88	3.00	2.92	2.68	11.48	68%	3.08
	JUST	38	2.76	2.71	2.71	2.37	10.55	63%	2.92
	PHRE	2	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	12.50	100%	3.50
	POL	20	2.95	3.05	2.75	2.60	11.35	65%	3.15
	PSYC	91	2.74	2.53	2.55	2.27	10.09	62%	2.75
	SOAN	16	2.75	3.00	2.75	2.38	10.88	69%	2.75
	SCS	276	2.84	2.77	2.72	2.47	10.81	62%	2.88
Science and Math	AGSC	30	2.50	2.20	1.87	2.13	8.70	37%	2.33
	BIOL	102	2.91	2.75	2.82	2.53	11.01	70%	2.92
	CHEM	16	3.00	2.88	3.06	2.88	11.81	69%	3.31
	CS	30	2.50	2.40	2.27	2.00	9.17	40%	2.50
	MATH	30	2.60	2.57	2.40	2.23	9.80	57%	2.63
	PHYS	5	3.20	3.00	2.60	2.60	11.40	80%	3.00
	SAM	213	2.79	2.63	2.50	2.40	10.31	59%	2.78
	IDSM	8	3.25	3.13	3.25	2.75	12.38	100%	2.88
ALL	1099	2.77	2.64	2.59	2.42	10.41	61%	2.78	

Each rubric criterion can score up to 4 points. The average score of each criterion for the students within each major of each of the criteria are tabulated above. A sum of the four criteria for critical thinking of 10 or more is considered demonstration of competency in critical thinking, so the table also includes a “%10+” column that tells the percentage of students within that major who scored 10 or more. Most of the schools have overall averages for %10+ that are very similar to the university average. You will note that AAL has slightly higher average scores, and the School of Business has slightly lower average scores.

Within the rubric categories, the average student scores decline as you move from the issue through to the conclusion. Students (on average) score better for describing the issue of their work than they do for delineating the context and supporting evidence. Their conclusions generally score lower still, and perhaps that is an area where all of our departments can help our students strengthen their work.

The last rubric category is the writing quality component. The average scores for writing quality are solid across all schools, with BUS scoring a bit lower than average and SCS scoring slightly higher than average. This seems to relate to the amount of practice students are required to do with writing these types of papers in the various schools on campus.

Critical Thinking and Writing: 2016 Scores by course prefix

Prefix	N 2016	Issue	Context	Support. Evid.	Concl.	Sum4	%10+	Comm.
ALL	1088	2.74	2.59	2.57	2.39	10.29	62%	2.75
ENG	154	2.69	2.46	2.51	2.38	10.04	60%	2.77
JINS	149	2.66	2.50	2.51	2.30	9.97	55%	2.69
BSAD	68	2.71	2.50	2.62	2.51	10.34	62%	2.62
COMM	61	2.67	2.67	2.54	2.38	10.26	67%	2.64
PHRE	61	2.69	2.59	2.52	2.33	10.13	59%	2.64
BIOL	60	2.97	2.75	3.07	2.78	11.57	80%	2.87
PSYC	54	2.87	2.56	2.52	2.26	10.20	57%	2.94
ES	38	2.74	2.42	2.37	2.08	9.61	55%	2.82
HIST	37	2.73	2.86	2.81	2.51	10.92	65%	2.86
ACCT	34	2.74	2.38	2.29	2.21	9.62	53%	2.59
HLTH	33	3.12	2.85	2.76	2.85	11.58	79%	2.94
POL	30	2.90	2.97	2.63	2.50	11.00	63%	3.00
JUST	29	2.90	2.86	2.79	2.55	11.10	66%	3.07
CMDS	28	2.64	2.46	2.36	2.36	9.82	50%	2.57
NU	24	3.38	3.29	3.25	2.79	12.71	88%	3.13
SOAN	23	2.87	2.91	2.57	2.35	10.70	61%	2.91
ED	20	2.85	2.50	2.55	2.60	10.50	70%	2.85
AGSC	20	2.55	2.10	1.75	2.15	8.55	30%	2.40
ART	19	2.74	2.53	2.63	2.32	10.21	74%	2.58
CS	17	2.35	2.53	2.47	2.18	9.53	47%	2.53
CHEM	16	3.25	2.94	3.00	2.88	12.06	75%	3.31
LING	10	2.10	2.40	2.40	2.50	9.40	60%	2.50
ECON	10	2.60	2.50	2.60	2.30	10.00	50%	2.30
SPAN	8	2.75	3.13	3.00	2.63	11.50	75%	3.00
ENVS	8	2.63	2.63	2.25	2.00	9.50	50%	2.75
MUSI	7	2.86	2.71	2.71	2.43	10.71	57%	2.86
<5	35	2.58	2.37	2.25	2.07	9.26	57%	2.40

This table lists the average scores for this prompt according to course prefix. These scores show similar trends to what is seen for the scores by major.

CTW Inter-rater Reliability

Abs. Diff.	2016 counts	2016 percent
6+	0	0.0%
5	2	1.1%
4	3	1.6%
3	16	8.5%
2	29	15.3%
1	73	38.6%
0	66	34.9%
total	189	100.0%

Each year some random number of random submissions in CTW are scored by a second reader. This table shows the agreement of the scores of the two different readers. Readers are not able to see the score of a previous reader. This CTW Inter-rater Reliability table shows that 73.5% of the scores of two different readers were either the same or within one unit from the each other. When you consider that this number is out of 16 possible points, then you can see that the readers are very much in sync with each other on the scoring of these submissions. Another 15.3% of the pairs of readers were within 2 units of each other.

Critical Thinking and Writing: University-wide Scores 2013-2016

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

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

The Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt Data and Discussion

The interdisciplinary thinking (IDS) prompt is one that informed the development of the Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar (JINS) courses in the late 1990s. Since the implementation of JINS courses, the scores on this prompt have held steady in the 60-70% range. It is another prompt that requires a research style paper, but in this instance, the subject of the paper must be explored using the perspectives of more than one discipline. Usually, a student's paper produced as part of their JINS course satisfies the criteria of our rubric well. The prompt defines these terms and asks for the source and time of completion of the document. Next the student must state a description of the assignment, a list of disciplines used in the work, and a reflection of their growth of this skill. As is usually the case, we ask for a self-evaluation using our scoring rubric, to encourage the student to choose their submitted paper that fits the rubric.

Following the prompt itself and the scoring rubric are the tables of data for this prompt. The first table includes scores by first major. The second table lists scores by course prefix for the submissions that were derived from coursework.

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.*

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 2012-2016

	Maj.	Mean Score					% Competent				
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Arts and Letters	ART	2.14	1.61	1.81	1.91	0.98	79%	50%	60%	58%	51%
	CML	2.27	1.75	2.22	1.87	1.15	73%	63%	78%	58%	55%
	CWRT*	2.33	2	1	2.5	1.38	67%	64%	30%	75%	44%
	ENG	2.04	2.13	1.83	1.92	2.23	71%	77%	62%	68%	82%
	LING	1	2.33	2	2.28	2.33	17%	67%	80%	64%	88%
	MUS	2.06	1.73	1.9	2.72	1.41	75%	62%	69%	94%	54%
	THEA	2.2	1.89	1.85	2.08	1.71	80%	78%	62%	92%	56%
	AAL	2.07	1.95	1.83	2.18	1.60	72%	68%	63%	73%	61%
Business	ACCT	1.72	1.72	1.59	1.62	1.76	58%	64%	52%	57%	64%
	BSAD	1.68	1.51	1.74	1.88	1.56	51%	48%	61%	67%	51%
	BUS	1.7	1.59	1.68	1.75	1.66	54%	54%	58%	62%	57%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT*	3	2	0.8	1.38	1.96	100%	80%	20%	31%	66%
	CMDS	1.9	1.96	1.7	2	1.80	68%	66%	59%	65%	60%
	ES	1.76	1.56	1.53	2.11	1.72	62%	51%	56%	77%	58%
	HLTH	1.51	1.92	1.93	2.31	1.78	51%	61%	72%	76%	67%
	NU	1.93	2.13	1.57	1.99	1.89	62%	78%	53%	66%	68%
	HSE	1.78	1.82	1.67	1.96	1.83	61%	60%	60%	63%	64%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	1.92	1.91	1.65	2.09	2.10	62%	62%	60%	72%	72%
	ECON	2.23	2.13	2.57	2.11	1.97	85%	75%	86%	75%	67%
	HIST	2.14	1.94	1.75	2.07	2.50	66%	74%	63%	79%	80%
	JUST	1.48	1.43	1.8	2.12	1.80	56%	48%	65%	67%	59%
	PHRE	1.92	1.77	1.86	2.5	1.50	69%	69%	57%	83%	100%
	POL	2.02	1.86	2.2	1.96	2.33	63%	68%	83%	68%	65%
	PSYC	2	2	1.63	2.07	1.82	71%	72%	57%	66%	62%
	SOAN	2.55	1.88	1.9	2.23	2.15	90%	63%	55%	78%	73%
	SCS	2	1.86	1.79	2.14	2.02	68%	65%	63%	73%	72%
Science and Mathematics	AGSC	2	1.17	2.45	2.39	1.70	64%	42%	85%	75%	48%
	BIOL	2.25	1.95	2.04	1.98	2.14	76%	68%	72%	69%	70%
	CHEM	1.79	1.53	1.94	1.9	2.13	54%	53%	58%	75%	71%
	CS	1.96	1.71	2	1.83	2.19	63%	61%	65%	58%	78%
	MATH	1.52	2.18	1.92	2.38	1.77	52%	73%	64%	90%	60%
	PHYS	1.86	2.27	1.75	2.42	0.80	71%	73%	50%	89%	60%
	SAM	2.04	1.84	2.03	2.15	1.79	67%	63%	69%	76%	65%
	IDSM	2.4	3.67	2.6	1.5	2.71	80%	100%	100%	30%	100%
	ALL	1.94	1.82	1.81	2.07	1.84	65%	63%	63%	70%	66%

This table includes the average scores of all students in each major, as well as the percentage of students who earned a score of two or more. Last year, in 2015, the average score for all Truman graduates' IDS submissions had spiked to 2.1, but in 2016, it has returned to the 2013-2014 level of 1.8. The reason that the spike occurred in the previous year is unclear.

The score that is deemed “competent” for this prompt is 2 or more, so the final columns are the percentages of students scoring 2 or more in each major and school. As seen in the critical thinking and writing prompt, the BUS student submissions score a little lower than the school average. For this prompt, SCS student submissions score a bit higher, while all other schools’ students score very close to the university average.

Interdisciplinary Thinking: Scores by course prefix

Prefix	2016 Count	Mean	%2+
JINS	691	2.02	71%
ENG	49	1.80	61%
COMM	32	1.59	50%
PHRE	28	1.75	64%
BSAD	23	1.43	43%
PSYC	21	1.43	38%
JUST	20	2.00	75%
ART	18	1.94	72%
SOAN	17	2.35	94%
ED	15	1.07	40%
ECON	14	1.57	50%
BIOL	13	0.46	15%
NU	10	1.90	70%
MUSI	10	1.60	50%
POL	9	1.78	67%
CS	9	2.00	56%
ES	8	1.75	63%
AGSC	8	1.38	38%
SPAN	7	1.57	43%
LING	7	2.00	71%
ACCT	7	0.57	14%
CMDS	7	1.71	57%
THEA	6	1.83	67%
STAT	6	1.33	50%
IDSM	6	1.67	50%
CLAS	5	1.40	60%
ENVS	5	2.20	60%
MATH	5	1.80	60%
<5	20	2.00	60%

The course prefixes in this table are organized by descending number of submissions. Each prefix is followed by the count of submissions with that prefix, the mean score of the submissions with that prefix, and finally its percentage with a score of 2 or more. The student submissions drawn from JINS courses far outnumber those from any other course prefix here, and they do generally score favorably on this prompt. This result is

not surprising, since this type of writing is a major focus of the JINS courses. Other prefixes result in a wide range of average scores.

IDS Inter-rater Reliability

AbsDiff	2016 n	2016 %
4	4	1%
3	19	5%
2	45	13%
1	151	44%
0	128	37%
	347	100%

Each year a second reader scores some random number of random submissions in IDS. This table shows the agreement of the scores of the two different readers. Readers are not able to see the score of a previous reader. In 2016, 347 total submissions were “double scored”, with 37% of them earning the same score from two different readers. Forty-four percent of these papers earned scores that differ by only one unit. That adds up to 81% of these papers earning scores within one unit. This result indicates excellent agreement between different readers of the same papers.

Civic Engagement Prompt Data and Discussion

Truman's mission statement, vision statement, and its desired characteristics of graduates all mention civic mindedness, service, and engaged world citizens as important traits. To explore how these traits are encouraged on campus, the Civic Engagement prompt was implemented in its first form in 2013-2014, with a fairly extensive rubric patterned after the AAC&U Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric. The faculty discussions that resulted from reading student submissions in the summer of 2014 clarified our purpose for this prompt. We did not revise the prompt itself very much, but the rubric was streamlined for 2015 reading sessions to more closely match the questions that we asked in the prompt. In 2016, we added a reviewer context question to better understand where the opportunities for meaningful civic engagement were being offered.

This prompt defines the terms of civic engagement and community for our purposes, and asks the student to describe their most meaningful and significant civic engagement experience while he/she was an undergraduate. We were especially interested in what the student learned about their communities and themselves through this experience.

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

The Civic Engagement Prompt

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

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

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

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

You might include:

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

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

TRUMAN PORTFOLIO CIVIC ENGAGEMENT RUBRIC

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

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

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

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

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by first major: 2015 and 2016

	CIVIC	2015					2016				
	Major	2015 N	Act.	2+%	Refl.	2+%	2016 N	Act.	2+%	Ref.	2+%
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
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%	1.68	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
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
	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%

Because of the significant revision of the scoring rubric for this prompt for the 2015 submissions, data for the 2014 pilot is not included here. Direct comparison of 2015 and 2016 data is more reasonable since these data were scored with an identical rubric. For each year, the number of students in the major is listed, with the average score for action and reflection for that major. University-wide, average scores for action and reflection are similar. Examining scores for each department, though, reveals that some

majors scored on average much better for either the action or the reflection. This could be a result of so many students exploring civic engagement through their co-curricular activities, with no reflection required at the time of the activity. Students who engage in Civic activities within their coursework are usually asked to reflect on the activity. Majors that offer many opportunities within their required coursework to practice their crafts also ask students to reflect on them as part of the coursework. Each major may want to examine if their major exhibits a trend.

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. Overall, values for %2+ were slightly lower on the reflection part of this prompt than on the action, but there is a lot of variation by major.

Civic Engagement: Scores sorted by course prefix

Course	2016 N	Action	2+%	Reflect.	2+%
All	459	1.56	54%	1.67	57%
HLTH	54	2.30	89%	2.43	81%
ED	39	1.56	56%	1.87	64%
ES	36	1.83	58%	1.83	61%
COMM	33	1.52	45%	1.58	45%
ENG	31	0.97	29%	1.13	29%
NU	30	1.67	60%	1.77	63%
BSAD	25	1.20	44%	1.16	36%
PSYC	23	1.65	52%	1.65	52%
CMDS	17	2.41	88%	2.35	82%
PHRE	16	1.19	31%	1.50	31%
SOAN	16	1.81	69%	2.31	69%
JUST	15	1.53	60%	1.60	53%
AGSC	14	1.00	21%	1.36	43%
NASC	14	2.14	79%	2.14	79%
JINS	12	0.58	17%	0.67	17%
DS	11	2.27	91%	2.45	82%
BIOL	10	2.00	70%	2.10	80%
POL	9	1.11	33%	1.44	44%
ART	8	0.88	25%	1.00	38%
HIST	6	0.67	33%	0.83	33%
IDSM	6	2.50	83%	2.50	83%
ENVS	5	2.40	60%	2.00	60%
CS	4	0.50	25%	0.75	25%
ECON	4	0.75	25%	1.00	25%
MS	3	2.00	67%	1.67	67%
MUSI	3	0.67	33%	1.33	33%
SPAN	3	1.33	33%	2.00	67%
ACCT	2	1.00	0%	1.50	50%
AT	2	2.00	50%	2.00	50%
CHIN	2	3.00	100%	2.50	100%
LING	2	2.50	100%	2.00	100%
THEA	2	2.00	100%	2.50	100%
AFR	1	2.00	100%	2.00	100%
GERM	1	0.00	0%	0.00	0%

Only 459 of the 1167 (39%) scored Civic Engagement submissions were described as being from a class. This table lists the scores of these submissions in order of highest count to lowest count for any course prefix. The majors from the school of HSE include many opportunities to engage with their communities through their courses, and the numbers of submissions from those departments are much larger than for other course

prefixes. For these submissions, the reflections were generally strong, suggesting that the courses are requiring both activity and reflection on the assignment.

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Coursework

LSP
Major
Capstone
Minor
Elective

Other Academic

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

Student Organization

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

Athletics

Varsity Athletics
Club Athletics
Other Athletics

Employment

Campus Employment
Volunteer Work
Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

Public Performance/Recital
Other Creative Effort

Other

Relationships/Friendships
Residence Life
ROTC
Other Misc.

Knowing the context of these civic engagement experiences can help us understand how we can increase opportunities for such meaningful civic engagement activities, should we choose to do so. For this question, readers are allowed to choose only one of the context categories, and are instructed to choose the best fit for each submission. As you can see in the summary table on the next page, coursework, especially in the major, tops the list for greatest opportunities for civic engagement at 35%, mirroring the count from the course listing data above. The next highest count was from student organizations at 27%. Employment, especially volunteer employment, is next at 17%. Since this information was not collected prior to 2016, we do not yet have any longitudinal insights.

Civic Engagement Context

Civic Context Categories	Civic Context Specifics	2016 N	%
Coursework	LSP	65	6.30%
Coursework	Major	226	21.92%
Coursework	Capstone	10	0.97%
Coursework	Minor	24	2.33%
Coursework	Elective	40	3.88%
ALL Coursework		365	35.40%
Other Academic	Research	3	0.29%
Other Academic	Internship	36	3.49%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	16	1.55%
Other Academic	Resume/Prof. Statement	2	0.19%
Other Academic	Service Learning	18	1.75%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	22	2.13%
Other Academic	Other Academic	11	1.07%
ALL Other Academic		118	11.45%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	1	0.10%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	68	6.60%
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	103	9.99%
Student Organizations	Professional/Major	29	2.81%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	32	3.10%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	8	0.78%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	4	0.39%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	34	3.30%
ALL Student Organizations		279	27.06%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	17	1.65%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	3	0.29%
Athletics	Other Athletic	10	0.97%
ALL Athletics		30	2.91%
Employment	Campus job	28	2.72%
Employment	Volunteer	121	11.74%
Employment	Off Campus Job	29	2.81%
ALL Employment		178	17.26%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	7	0.68%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	1	0.10%
ALL Performance/Creative...		8	0.78%
Other (Misc.)	Relationships/Friends	8	0.78%
Other (Misc.)	Residence Life	10	0.97%
Other (Misc.)	ROTC	2	0.19%
Other (Misc.)	Other	43	4.17%
ALL Other (Misc.)		53	5.14%
	Total	1031	100.00%

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 first to include evaluation of this issue.

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

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

The Self-Discovery Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

Risk/Challenge/Growth

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

Academic/Scholarship

- *Achieved a personal best.*
- *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: Student Rationales

		2016 Count	Risk/Challenge/Growth							
			Introspection		Perspective		P.growth		Reponsibility	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	11	41%	N/A	N/A	14	52%	3	11%
	CRWT	8	2	25%	N/A	N/A	4	50%	0	0%
	ENG	74	28	38%	N/A	N/A	36	49%	13	18%
	CML	17	2	12%	N/A	N/A	7	41%	3	18%
	LING	12	3	25%	N/A	N/A	2	17%	2	17%
	MUSI	16	5	31%	N/A	N/A	9	56%	1	6%
	THEA	13	3	23%	N/A	N/A	6	46%	1	8%
	AAL	167	54	32%	N/A	N/A	78	47%	23	14%
Business	ACCT	55	11	20%	N/A	N/A	26	47%	14	25%
	BSAD	115	28	24%	N/A	N/A	53	46%	16	14%
	BUS	170	39	23%	N/A	N/A	79	46%	30	18%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	2	29%	N/A	N/A	6	86%	1	14%
	CMDS	43	11	26%	N/A	N/A	16	37%	6	14%
	ES	109	26	24%	N/A	N/A	60	55%	25	23%
	HLTH	63	18	29%	N/A	N/A	33	52%	15	24%
	NU	43	13	30%	N/A	N/A	20	47%	9	21%
	HSE	265	70	26%	N/A	N/A	135	51%	56	21%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	20	30%	N/A	N/A	35	52%	11	16%
	ECON	17	9	53%	N/A	N/A	6	35%	2	12%
	HIST	25	6	24%	N/A	N/A	10	40%	2	8%
	JUST	38	8	21%	N/A	N/A	15	39%	5	13%
	PHRE	2	1	50%	N/A	N/A	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	20	4	20%	N/A	N/A	9	45%	1	5%
	PSYC	91	26	29%	N/A	N/A	43	47%	13	14%
	SOAN	16	7	44%	N/A	N/A	6	38%	1	6%
SCS	276	81	29%	N/A	N/A	124	45%	35	13%	
Science and Math	AGSC	30	5	17%	N/A	N/A	9	30%	5	17%
	BIOL	102	35	34%	N/A	N/A	42	41%	15	15%
	CHEM	16	6	38%	N/A	N/A	10	63%	5	31%
	CS	30	5	17%	N/A	N/A	14	47%	8	27%
	MATH	30	6	20%	N/A	N/A	8	27%	3	10%
	PHYS	5	1	20%	N/A	N/A	2	40%	1	20%
	SAM	213	58	27%	N/A	N/A	85	40%	37	17%
IDSM	8	1	13%	N/A	N/A	6	75%	1	13%	
ALL	1099	303	28%	N/A	N/A	507	46%	182	17%	

SELF DISCOVERY: Student Rationales (continued)

		2016 Count	Risk/Challenge/ Growth		Academic/Scholarship					
			Dilemma		P. best		Challenging		Risk	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	2	7%	1	4%	2	7%	2	7%
	CRWT	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%
	ENG	74	2	3%	8	11%	17	23%	3	4%
	CML	17	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	1	6%
	LING	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	MUSI	16	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
	THEA	13	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%
	AAL	167	6	4%	10	6%	25	15%	7	4%
Business	ACCT	55	0	0%	3	5%	11	20%	6	11%
	BSAD	115	5	4%	4	3%	18	16%	8	7%
	BUS	170	5	3%	7	4%	29	17%	14	8%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	1	14%	0	0%	2	29%	0	0%
	CMDS	43	0	0%	3	7%	5	12%	1	2%
	ES	109	4	4%	6	6%	20	18%	1	1%
	HLTH	63	1	2%	9	14%	13	21%	0	0%
	NU	43	1	2%	4	9%	8	19%	1	2%
	HSE	265	7	3%	22	8%	48	18%	3	1%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	1	1%	5	7%	15	22%	1	1%
	ECON	17	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%
	HIST	25	0	0%	3	12%	7	28%	0	0%
	JUST	38	3	8%	1	3%	2	5%	3	8%
	PHRE	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	20	0	0%	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%
	PSYC	91	3	3%	1	1%	18	20%	1	1%
	SOAN	16	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SCS	276	7	3%	11	4%	45	16%	6	2%	
Science and Math	AGSC	30	3	10%	2	7%	4	13%	1	3%
	BIOL	102	5	5%	5	5%	25	25%	6	6%
	CHEM	16	0	0%	2	13%	6	38%	2	13%
	CS	30	1	3%	4	13%	4	13%	2	7%
	MATH	30	1	3%	0	0%	6	20%	2	7%
	PHYS	5	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%
	SAM	213	10	5%	14	7%	46	22%	13	6%
IDSM	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	
ALL	1099	35	3%	64	6%	194	18%	44	4%	

SELF DISCOVERY: Student Rationales (continued)

		Academic/Scholarship					Relationships			
		2016 Count	Vocation		Professional		Service		Collaboration Peers	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	2	7%	2	7%	2	7%	4	15%
	CRWT	8	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%
	ENG	74	14	19%	8	11%	10	14%	10	14%
	CML	17	5	29%	2	12%	3	18%	3	18%
	LING	12	2	17%	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%
	MUSI	16	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	3	19%
	THEA	13	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%
	AAL	167	30	18%	16	10%	16	10%	25	15%
Business	ACCT	55	8	15%	8	15%	7	13%	12	22%
	BSAD	115	18	16%	11	10%	7	6%	25	22%
	BUS	170	26	15%	19	11%	14	8%	37	22%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	2	29%
	CMDS	43	13	30%	6	14%	9	21%	7	16%
	ES	109	18	17%	10	9%	11	10%	29	27%
	HLTH	63	17	27%	15	24%	10	16%	18	29%
	NU	43	15	35%	10	23%	6	14%	5	12%
	HSE	265	65	25%	42	16%	36	14%	61	23%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	10	15%	7	10%	3	4%	12	18%
	ECON	17	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%
	HIST	25	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%	3	12%
	JUST	38	6	16%	3	8%	0	0%	5	13%
	PHRE	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	20	3	15%	1	5%	1	5%	3	15%
	PSYC	91	14	15%	3	3%	11	12%	19	21%
	SOAN	16	4	25%	0	0%	2	13%	2	13%
SCS	276	43	16%	17	6%	18	7%	45	16%	
Science and Math	AGSC	30	3	10%	3	10%	1	3%	8	27%
	BIOL	102	18	18%	12	12%	10	10%	15	15%
	CHEM	16	0	0%	3	19%	1	6%	3	19%
	CS	30	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	6	20%
	MATH	30	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	4	13%
	PHYS	5	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	213	32	15%	25	12%	14	7%	36	17%
IDSM	8	2	25%	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	
ALL	1099	198	18%	120	11%	99	9%	205	19%	

SELF DISCOVERY: Student Rationales (continued)

		2016 Count	Relationships			
			Collaboration Professional		Mentoring	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	CRWT	8	N/A	N/A	1	13%
	ENG	74	N/A	N/A	3	4%
	CML	17	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	LING	12	N/A	N/A	1	8%
	MUSI	16	N/A	N/A	1	6%
	THEA	13	N/A	N/A	2	15%
	AAL	167	N/A	N/A	8	5%
Business	ACCT	55	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	BSAD	115	N/A	N/A	7	6%
	BUS	170	N/A	N/A	7	4%
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	CMDS	43	N/A	N/A	2	5%
	ES	109	N/A	N/A	6	6%
	HLTH	63	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	NU	43	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	HSE	265	N/A	N/A	8	3%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	N/A	N/A	2	3%
	ECON	17	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	HIST	25	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	JUST	38	N/A	N/A	2	5%
	PHRE	2	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	POL	20	N/A	N/A	1	5%
	PSYC	91	N/A	N/A	1	1%
	SOAN	16	N/A	N/A	1	6%
	SCS	276	N/A	N/A	7	3%
Science and Math	AGSC	30	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	BIOL	102	N/A	N/A	3	3%
	CHEM	16	N/A	N/A	1	6%
	CS	30	N/A	N/A	2	7%
	MATH	30	N/A	N/A	2	7%
	PHYS	5	N/A	N/A	0	0%
	SAM	213	N/A	N/A	8	4%
	IDSM	8	N/A	N/A	0	0%
ALL	1099	N/A	N/A	38	3%	

The reasons that students could have expressed for significant self discovery were categorized into three groups: Risk/Challenge/Growth, Academic/Scholarship, and Relationships. For all students, “Personal growth” was the biggest reason for self discovery with 46% of students indicating this reason. “Introspection” also spurred a lot

(28%) of self-discovery. Students also indicated significant self-discovery from Responsibility (17%), Academic Challenge (18%), and Collaboration with Peers (19%). You will note that two columns show “N/A” for all responses; unfortunately, a downloading error occurred for these responses, and the data was lost.

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, a third of students enjoy significant self discovery while doing work within Truman’s coursework, with most of that (23%) being within the student’s major. Much of the reported self-discovery did not fit very well within our context categories (20% in “other”), but student organizations (19%) and Other Academic (16%) also were important contexts for self-discovery.

SELF DISCOVERY: Context of the Experience (continued)

Self Context Category	Self Context Specifics	2016 N	%
Coursework	LSP	57	5.5%
Coursework	Major	239	23.3%
Coursework	Capstone	3	0.3%
Coursework	Minor	20	2.0%
Coursework	Elective	17	1.7%
All Coursework		336	32.7%
Other Academic	Research	11	1.1%
Other Academic	Internship	33	3.2%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	61	5.9%
Other Academic	Resume/Prof. Statement	4	0.4%
Other Academic	Service Learning	1	0.1%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	7	0.7%
Other Academic	Other Academic	51	5.0%
All Other Academic		168	16.3%
Student Organizations	Fraternity/Sorority	111	10.8%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	31	3.0%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	19	1.9%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	16	1.6%
Student Organizations	Professional Major	12	1.2%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	3	0.3%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	3	0.3%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	2	0.2%
All Student Organizations		197	19.2%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	41	4.0%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	5	0.5%
Athletics	Other Athletic	4	0.4%
All Athletics		50	4.9%
Employment	Campus job	27	2.6%
Employment	Volunteer	20	2.0%
Employment	Off Campus Job	15	1.5%
All Employment		62	6.0%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	6	0.6%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	3	0.3%
All Performance/Creative Act.		9	0.9%
Other (Misc.?)	Relationships	98	9.5%
Other (Misc.?)	Other other!	84	8.2%
Other (Misc.?)	Resident Life	20	2.0%
Other (Misc.?)	ROTC	4	0.4%
All Other (Misc.)		206	20.0%
	Total	1028	100.0%

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt Data and Discussion

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

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

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 2012-2016

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Reasons					
Personal Growth	39%	36%	48%	45%	48%
Enjoyable	74%	43%	46%	47%	42%
Challenging	34%	32%	34%	27%	35%
Professional	22%	23%	25%	26%	26%
Personal Best	27%	27%	23%	20%	21%
Personal Goals	22%	19%	21%	24%	21%
Collaborative	11%	10%	15%	16%	18%
Problem Solving	0%	3%	8%	1%	7%
Lots of Time*	*	*	*	*	17%

The table above shows the percentage of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why the submission was so satisfying for them. In 2016, “personal growth” is the greatest factor for our students’ satisfaction. “Enjoyable” work and “challenging” work also contribute significantly. Perhaps because Truman attracts such a highly capable cohort of students, they do seem to enjoy stretching their skill sets and being challenged significantly. Other data and surveys indicate that many of our students are very stressed, however. Truman faculty should clearly keep pushing our students to grow and learn, while simultaneously offering the support that they need to maintain their sanity. It is critical to maintain our lofty goals while being mindful of the sensitive nature of our over-achievers!

The two tables below show the same 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

		2016 Count	Pers. Best		Pers. Goals		Pers. Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	6	22%	3	11%	13	48%	6	22%	5	19%
	CML	17	2	12%	2	12%	10	59%	6	35%	3	18%
	CRWT	8	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%
	ENG	74	25	34%	18	24%	38	51%	28	38%	13	18%
	LING	12	0	0%	5	42%	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%
	MUSI	16	4	25%	3	19%	10	63%	6	38%	4	25%
	THEA	13	6	46%	3	23%	4	31%	9	69%	4	31%
	AAL	167	44	26%	35	21%	79	47%	61	37%	32	19%
Business	ACCT	55	9	16%	13	24%	18	33%	23	42%	12	22%
	BSAD	115	21	18%	24	21%	50	43%	36	31%	31	27%
	BUS	170	30	18%	37	22%	68	40%	59	35%	43	25%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	1	14%	3	43%	5	71%	1	14%	5	71%
	CMDS	43	9	21%	17	40%	20	47%	18	42%	22	51%
	ES	109	15	14%	26	24%	49	45%	32	29%	29	27%
	HLTH	63	11	17%	14	22%	34	54%	17	27%	16	25%
	NU	43	3	7%	10	23%	29	67%	14	33%	13	30%
	HSE	265	39	15%	70	26%	137	52%	82	31%	85	32%
	SCS	276	70	25%	56	20%	142	51%	96	35%	66	24%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	16	24%	9	13%	38	57%	19	28%	18	27%
	ECON	17	2	12%	4	24%	10	59%	2	12%	2	12%
	HIST	25	12	48%	6	24%	13	52%	10	40%	6	24%
	JUST	38	10	26%	5	13%	13	34%	13	34%	9	24%
	PHRE	2	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
	POL	20	6	30%	1	5%	10	50%	13	65%	3	15%
	PSYC	91	19	21%	27	30%	46	51%	32	35%	25	27%
	SOAN	16	4	25%	4	25%	11	69%	7	44%	3	19%
	SCS	276	70	25%	56	20%	142	51%	96	35%	66	24%
Science and Mathematics	AGSC	30	5	17%	5	17%	14	47%	11	37%	7	23%
	BIOL	102	24	24%	17	17%	48	47%	39	38%	25	25%
	CHEM	16	4	25%	4	25%	12	75%	10	63%	6	38%
	CS	30	7	23%	3	10%	10	33%	15	50%	8	27%
	MATH	30	6	20%	6	20%	10	33%	12	40%	6	20%
	PHYS	5	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%
	SAM	213	46	22%	35	16%	96	45%	87	41%	53	25%
IDSM	8	2	25%	3	38%	5	63%	1	13%	2	25%	
ALL	1099	231	21%	236	21%	527	48%	386	35%	281	26%	

Most Personally Satisfying: Scores sorted by first major, continued

		2016 Count	Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Prob. Solv		Lots of time	
			Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.	Yes	Pct.
Arts and Letters	ART	27	1	4%	9	33%	0	0%	1	4%	3	11%
	CML	17	0	0%	11	65%	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%
	CRWT	8	2	25%	6	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	ENG	74	6	8%	36	49%	0	0%	3	4%	7	9%
	LING	12	0	0%	8	67%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%
	MUSI	16	3	19%	8	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	31%
	THEA	13	1	8%	4	31%	0	0%	2	15%	5	38%
	AAL	167	13	8%	82	49%	0	0%	8	5%	22	13%
Business	ACCT	55	14	25%	18	33%	0	0%	6	11%	13	24%
	BSAD	115	22	19%	45	39%	1	1%	10	9%	14	12%
	BUS	170	36	21%	63	37%	1	1%	16	9%	27	16%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	1	14%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
	CMDS	43	5	12%	14	33%	0	0%	6	14%	14	33%
	ES	109	42	39%	56	51%	0	0%	5	5%	18	17%
	HLTH	63	20	32%	39	62%	0	0%	1	2%	11	17%
	NU	43	4	9%	19	44%	0	0%	0	0%	8	19%
	HSE	265	72	27%	131	49%	0	0%	12	5%	52	20%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	7	10%	34	51%	0	0%	5	7%	12	18%
	ECON	17	3	18%	7	41%	0	0%	1	6%	2	12%
	HIST	25	5	20%	12	48%	0	0%	1	4%	4	16%
	JUST	38	2	5%	17	45%	0	0%	2	5%	7	18%
	PHRE	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
	POL	20	0	0%	5	25%	0	0%	1	5%	6	30%
	PSYC	91	18	20%	37	41%	0	0%	5	5%	8	9%
	SOAN	16	0	0%	6	38%	0	0%	0	0%	3	19%
	SCS	276	35	13%	118	43%	0	0%	15	5%	43	16%
Science and Math	AGSC	30	2	7%	8	27%	1	3%	5	17%	12	40%
	BIOL	102	23	23%	36	35%	0	0%	8	8%	18	18%
	CHEM	16	5	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3	19%
	CS	30	8	27%	10	33%	0	0%	4	13%	5	17%
	MATH	30	5	17%	12	40%	0	0%	4	13%	6	20%
	PHYS	5	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	SAM	213	44	21%	67	31%	2	1%	22	10%	44	21%
IDSM	8	0	0%	6	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	
ALL	1099	200	18%	467	42%	3	0%	73	7%	189	17%	

Reviewer Specific Question**In what context did the experience occur (choose one)?****Coursework**

LSP
Major
Capstone
Minor
Elective

Other Academic

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

Student Organization

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

Athletics

Varsity Athletics
Club Athletics
Other Athletics

Employment

Campus Employment
Volunteer Work
Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity

Public Performance/Recital
Other Creative Effort

Other

Relationships/Friendships
Residence Life
ROTC
Other Misc.

This final table below shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions. Faculty could choose only one context that best fits the submission, so the total percentage here reflects that. Well over half (56.3%) of the submissions are from coursework, and over a third (36.5%) are from the course work of the student's major. I must say that I found this data to be particularly satisfying! Other academic activities, such as study abroad and research, account for 14.0% of the submissions, and student organizations account to 12.6%. Again, our students really do enjoy learning and stretching themselves within their courses, and we seem to be offering them opportunities to invest personally into their work.

Most Satisfying Context Categories	Most Satisfying Context Specifics	2016 N	%
Coursework	LSP	102	9.70%
Coursework	Major	384	36.50%
Coursework	Capstone	16	1.52%
Coursework	Minor	42	3.99%
Coursework	Elective	48	4.56%
ALL Coursework		592	56.27%
Other Academic	Research	36	3.42%
Other Academic	Internship	18	1.71%
Other Academic	Study Abroad	44	4.18%
Other Academic	Resume/Prof. Statement	1	0.10%
Other Academic	Service Learning	3	0.29%
Other Academic	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	11	1.05%
Other Academic	Other Academic	26	2.47%
ALL Other Academic		147	13.97%
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	4	0.38%
Student Organizations	Service Organization	21	2.00%
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	54	5.13%
Student Organizations	Professional Major	10	0.95%
Student Organizations	Religious Organization	15	1.43%
Student Organizations	Honor Society	7	0.67%
Student Organizations	Campus Media	5	0.48%
Student Organizations	Other Organization	16	1.52%
ALL Student Organizations		132	12.55%
Athletics	Varsity Athletic	41	3.90%
Athletics	Club Sports Intramurals	12	1.14%
Athletics	Other Athletic	6	0.57%
ALL Athletics		59	5.61%
Employment	Campus job	17	1.62%
Employment	Volunteer	24	2.28%
Employment	Off Campus Job	11	1.05%
ALL Employment		52	4.94%
Performance/Creative Activity	Public Performance/ Recital	15	1.43%
Performance/Creative Activity	Other Creative	12	1.14%
ALL Performance/Creative		27	2.57%
Other Misc	Relationships/Friends	15	1.43%
Other Misc	Residence Life	8	0.76%
Other Misc	ROTC	2	0.19%
Other Misc	Other	26	2.47%
ALL Other Misc		43	4.09%
	Total	1052	100.00%

The Letter to Truman Prompt Data and Discussion

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

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

The Letter to Truman Prompt

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

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

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

Points that you might include are:

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

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

Reviewer Specific Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hours Spent on the Portfolio Project

2016 Percentile	2016 Hours
99%	30
90%	10
75%	7
50%	5
25%	3
10%	2
0%	1

In 2016, students spent a bit more time than previous years compiling their Portfolio prompt responses, with a mode of 5 hours. This number is consistent with a small but steady increase in time spent on the Portfolio in the last several years.

Student Attitudes toward the Portfolio and other Assessment at Truman

		Count 2016	Attitude toward Portfolio					Attitude toward Assessment				
			Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W% Pos	Neg.	Mix	Pos.	None	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	27	2	2	6	17	70%	0	2	3	22	80%
	CRWT	8	2	2	3	1	57%	2	2	0	4	25%
	ENG	74	5	15	28	25	74%	3	9	14	47	71%
	CML	17	3	3	2	9	44%	1	2	1	13	50%
	LING	12	4	3	2	3	39%	3	0	1	8	25%
	MUSI	16	4	2	4	6	50%	1	2	1	12	50%
	THEA	13	5	1	3	4	39%	0	0	1	12	100%
	AAL	167	25	28	48	65	61%	10	17	21	118	61%
Business	ACCT	55	4	15	17	19	68%	1	3	7	44	77%
	BSAD	115	15	27	25	48	57%	2	10	14	88	73%
	BUS	170	19	42	42	67	61%	3	13	21	132	74%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	0	2	3	2	80%	1	0	1	5	50%
	CMDS	43	8	7	17	11	64%	1	3	7	32	77%
	ES	109	7	23	25	54	66%	4	14	12	79	63%
	HLTH	63	3	11	34	15	82%	1	5	10	47	78%
	NU	43	1	10	18	14	79%	1	7	8	27	72%
	HSE	265	19	53	97	96	73%	8	29	38	190	70%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	7	12	18	30	65%	3	3	9	51	70%
	ECON	17	1	2	3	11	67%	0	1	2	14	83%
	HIST	25	4	3	7	11	61%	1	0	4	20	80%
	JUST	38	8	9	8	13	50%	1	4	8	25	77%
	PHRE	2	0	0	0	2	0%	0	1	0	1	50%
	POL	20	5	2	4	9	45%	1	0	2	17	67%
	PSYC	91	17	19	32	22	61%	6	8	13	63	63%
	SOAN	16	2	3	7	4	71%	0	1	4	11	90%
	SCS	276	44	50	79	102	60%	12	18	42	202	71%
Science and Math	AGSC	30	4	8	7	10	58%	0	3	4	22	79%
	BIOL	102	11	24	36	30	68%	3	10	18	71	74%
	CHEM	16	1	3	6	6	75%	1	0	5	10	83%
	CS	30	4	6	8	12	61%	0	4	1	25	60%
	MATH	30	2	6	14	7	77%	0	3	2	25	70%
	PHYS	5	1	0	4	0	80%	0	0	2	3	100%
	SAM	213	23	47	75	65	68%	4	20	32	156	75%
IDSM	8	1	3	1	3	50%	0	1	0	7	50%	
ALL	1099	131	223	342	398	61%	37	98	154	805	69%	

Note: $W\% \text{ Pos} = [(\# \text{ positive responses} + \frac{1}{2} \# \text{ mixed responses}) / \text{number who discussed the issue}] * 100$

Even with the slight increase in time needed to prepare their portfolios, Truman students report a somewhat positive attitude (61%) to the Portfolio, and a slightly more positive attitude to Truman's total assessment processes (69%). The School of HSE has the highest Portfolio approval rating, with SAM also showing approval greater than the

average This result could be seems to be because several of their departments' strong support to students while they compile their submissions within their capstone courses.

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

Student Attitudes toward Education at Truman and Education in their Major

		Count 2016	Attitude: Education at Truman					Attitude: Education in the Major				
			Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos	Neg	Mix	Pos	None	W% Pos
Arts and Letters	ART	27	2	8	16	1	77%	2	7	12	6	74%
	CRWT	8	0	2	5	1	86%	0	2	2	4	75%
	ENG	74	5	15	49	4	82%	3	14	32	24	80%
	CML	17	2	1	12	2	83%	0	2	5	10	86%
	LING	12	1	4	4	3	67%	0	2	2	8	75%
	MUSI	16	0	6	8	2	79%	1	3	7	5	77%
	THEA	13	1	6	5	1	67%	1	2	5	5	75%
	AAL	167	11	42	99	14	79%	7	32	65	62	78%
Business	ACCT	55	2	9	43	1	88%	4	10	25	15	77%
	BSAD	115	3	30	73	8	83%	3	26	41	44	77%
		BUS	170	5	39	116	9	85%	7	36	66	59
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	0	0	7	0	100%	0	0	5	2	100%
	CMDS	43	0	5	37	1	94%	2	3	24	14	88%
	ES	109	4	21	75	9	86%	3	19	56	31	84%
	HLTH	63	0	8	49	6	93%	1	5	35	22	91%
	NU	43	0	7	30	6	91%	2	13	23	5	78%
		HSE	265	4	41	198	22	90%	8	40	143	74
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	2	12	47	6	87%	3	7	32	25	85%
	ECON	17	1	2	14	0	88%	0	1	5	11	92%
	HIST	25	3	5	17	0	78%	1	2	10	12	85%
	JUST	38	0	16	19	3	77%	0	5	14	19	87%
	PHRE	2	0	0	2	0	100%	0	0	1	1	100%
	POL	20	0	6	12	2	83%	0	3	10	6	88%
	PSYC	91	1	20	59	10	86%	5	12	36	37	79%
	SOAN	16	1	2	12	1	87%	0	0	13	3	100%
		SCS	276	8	63	182	22	84%	9	30	121	114
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	30	1	3	20	5	90%	1	2	19	7	91%
	BIOL	102	0	21	77	4	89%	1	12	53	36	89%
	CHEM	16	0	4	11	1	87%	0	6	7	3	77%
	CS	30	3	4	20	3	81%	2	6	12	10	75%
	MATH	30	0	5	22	3	91%	1	4	13	12	83%
	PHYS	5	0	1	3	1	88%	0	0	3	2	100%
		SAM	213	4	38	153	17	88%	5	30	107	70
	IDSM	8	1	2	5	0	75%	0	1	4	3	90%
	ALL	1099	33	225	753	84	85%	36	169	506	382	85%

Student attitudes toward their majors (85%) and to their education overall (85%) is overwhelmingly positive. While many students do have negative things to say about particular courses or requirements, they are generally satisfied that they have earned a valuable degree that will serve them well in their futures.

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

		Count 2016	Evidence of Self-reflection			
			No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
Arts and Letters	ART	27	6	11	9	77%
	CRWT	8	1	3	4	88%
	ENG	74	15	31	27	79%
	CML	17	7	6	4	59%
	LING	12	5	4	3	58%
	MUSI	16	8	4	4	50%
	THEA	13	5	4	4	62%
	AAL	167	47	63	55	68%
Business	ACCT	55	19	25	11	65%
	BSAD	115	39	46	29	66%
	BUS	170	58	71	40	66%
Health Sci. and Education	ATHT	7	0	4	3	100%
	CMDS	43	11	17	14	74%
	ES	109	42	43	24	61%
	HLTH	63	18	24	19	70%
	NU	43	11	18	14	74%
	HSE	265	82	106	74	76%
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	67	24	21	21	64%
	ECON	17	11	4	2	35%
	HIST	25	5	12	8	80%
	JUST	38	12	17	8	68%
	PHRE	2	1	0	1	50%
	POL	20	8	2	8	56%
	PSYC	91	28	33	27	68%
	SOAN	16	2	7	6	87%
	SCS	276	91	96	81	63%
Sci. and Math	AGSC	30	12	12	5	59%
	BIOL	102	31	41	29	69%
	CHEM	16	4	6	6	75%
	CS	30	15	10	5	50%
	MATH	30	6	15	6	78%
	PHYS	5	1	3	1	80%
	SAM	213	69	87	52	68%
	IDSM	8	2	2	4	75%
ALL	1099	349	425	306	68%	

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

Portfolio Reader Feedback

In 2016, forty-nine total readers read in two different weeks: May 16-20, and August 11-12 and 15-16. One faculty member read both weeks. This year, we were no longer allowed to read in the week immediately following commencement, since most readers were still under regular contract that week. This change was imposed after reader assignments had been made and reassignment to different weeks led to uneven distribution between the two weeks: thirty readers read in May and twenty in August. Because of these numbers changes, the May reading session was held in a larger room, VH 1232, but the August one was still held in MG 2005 as has been done for several years. Previous years, we have had about 60 readers evenly distributed in the three weeks of reading; in spite of the reduction in readers, we did complete our reading of all submissions.

The portfolio readers are drawn from all across campus. In 2016, readers came from these academic associations: fourteen from Arts and Letters (one of these read both weeks), one from business, seven from Health Sciences and Education, thirteen from Science and Mathematics, eight from Social and Cultural Studies, and six from academic support and student affairs departments. 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 their academic and personal goals at their highest potential.

Portfolio reading is thus a significant faculty development opportunity: many people get useful ideas to take back to their classrooms and 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. Faculty readers are purposely chosen to have varying experience with the reading process, and this year, twelve of the readers had never read before. Reducing the number of readers reduces these mentoring interactions, unfortunately. Changes to the Liberal Studies program (LSP) were a top discussion item this year. As described above, the Civic Engagement prompt and the Self Discovery prompt were included this year as a way of measuring these aspects of our present curriculum, in order to have a baseline perspective in case we implement new approaches.

Portfolio Collection Issues

The portfolio collection process is running smoothly with few problems. My office staff this year includes 4-5 students who verify that student submissions are complete and that their submitted documents are readable. They also provide classes with presentations (23 fall, 11 spring) to help instruct students on the portfolio system (see more on this below).

As Director, I communicate extensively with the Truman community. Every student receives an email describing the portfolio, although at different levels of detail for different levels of students. Students with 0-90 accumulated credit hours receive a brief

missive that reminds them of the existence of the portfolio and that they should store their academic treasures in their portfolio vault. Students with more than 90 hours receive a much more detailed missive that describes explicitly how to complete the portfolio process during the year that they plan to graduate. Even with so many emails from me, some students claim not to have heard of this requirement. This year, we have posted promotional folders asking “What is in your Vault?” to remind students to put their treasures there.

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

Our portfolio submission system works well, but it was developed by a series of student workers (under the direction of Greg Marshall), and it does have its quirks. This year we briefly explored the idea of purchasing a more polished commercial system that might offer a more inviting interface. The report was submitted to the Provost entitled “Report of Possible Providers of ePortfolio Systems”. Ultimately the provost, in collaboration with the assessment committee, decided that the very large price for such a system and the ongoing cost to the students prohibited this move. It was hoped that our system could be re-written in a more modern language during the summer of 2016, but other programming technology priorities took precedence over that goal.

Truman has participated since spring of 2015 in a Multi-State Collaborative on portfolio style evaluations of student work from multiple institutions. Several of us (Scott Alberts, Melissa Holcomb, others, and I) have served as readers for this group, and we have submitted student work to their pilot project. Some of these student submissions were drawn from the Portfolio, while others have been drawn from particular faculty courses whose classes were doing work that meshed with an evaluation rubric. My office staff and I have worked to extract submissions with appropriate permissions.

The Philosophy and Religion department joined HES and SOAN in embedding its own major specific prompt related to critical thinking into the Portfolio System. It will take some time to collect the documents from students to be able to assess how they are improving their skills over the course of the major’s work.

Future Plans for the Truman Portfolio

The guiding principles for the portfolio project are:

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

The prompts for the upcoming 2016-17 year will stay the same as 2015-16. We hope that the baseline assessments that we are collecting will allow an understanding of how potential proposed changes in the LSP curriculum, as well as in various majors, are helping the students to grow academically.

Portfolio Report Summary

Our students continue to demonstrate competence at Critical Thinking and Writing and Interdisciplinary Thinking, both 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 solid platform for collecting our data. The portfolio project is well-placed to continue to function as a valued component of Truman’s assessment program. In addition, the portfolio reading weeks are valuable faculty development tools, initiating new readers into the culture of our institution, reinvigorating the dedication of more senior readers, and building bridges between readers from all across campus. Truman is recognized as a national leader in using portfolio assessment data to improve our curriculum, and with our guiding principles in mind, we should be able to continue to make a Truman education ever more valuable to our students.