Truman State University Portfolio Data

2019-2020 Academic Year

Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director

June 27, 2022

2020 Portfolio Table of Contents

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 2019-2020, 983 students submitted portfolios.

When is it administered?

Most students complete the process as part of their capstone experience, so students usually submit portfolios before the deadline during their senior year. Some submit earlier, while others complete their Truman course work and submit past the deadline after they have finished their time on campus. Since it is a graduation requirement, students who do not submit their portfolio by the deadline are subject to transcript/diploma/verification holds. Our present online portfolio submission system went online in August 2011, and it is specifically designed to allow students to store potential portfolio elements in their own portfolio vault throughout their college career. Regardless of when students submit the portfolio, the work itself may have been completed at any time during their college career.

What office administers it?

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

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

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

When are results typically available?

The portfolios have been read and scored in May and August interims. 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 2019-2020 academic year, student portfolios included works demonstrating 1) critical thinking and writing and 2) interdisciplinary thinking. Further prompts asked students about experiences they had which are titled 3) self-discovery. and 4) most personally satisfying. The final prompt in which students give summary thoughts about their experience with the Portfolio and at Truman is 5) Letter to Truman. An instrument titled 6) transformative learning experience questionnaire is an item which is not evaluated by the faculty portfolio readers but is still part of the required senior submissions. Other items may be included, but these are evaluated separately, if at all.

To whom are results regularly distributed?

Overall results of portfolio assessment are available to the Truman community through this Assessment Almanac. Some of the data collected in the portfolio is reported to the HLC. Occasional reports are given to governance, at planning workshops (SPAW), and other forums. Most departments use the information to reform their curriculum, improve programs, and engage in self-study, as mandated by the Faculty Senate. Portfolio data is particularly useful when departments are analyzing data in preparation for a 5-year review. Faculty who participate in reading sessions report that their interaction with colleagues from other disciplines on campus gives them new ideas and helps them modify assignments and teaching techniques for the next year.

From whom are the results available?

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

Are the results available by school or department?

Yes.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

No. Truman's portfolio is unique and while some universities are using portfolios for assessment of general education or liberal studies, most do not use similar prompts or submission categories.

Table 1. Counts of Students by First Major 2016–2020

School	Major	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Arts and Letters	ART	29	34	30	20	31
	CML	8	21	25	24	19
	CRWT	74	10	17	12	19
	ENG	17	65	61	68	71
	LING	12	10	7	11	14
	MUSI	16	32	28	24	20
	THEA	13	16	15	10	10
	TOTAL	169	188	183	169	184
Business	ACCT	56	75	56	63	69
	BSAD	118	111	124	136	119
	TOTAL	174	186	180	199	188
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	8	7	9	3
	CMDS	43	32	36	27	42
	ES	111	82	85	101	105
	HLTH	63	73	73	71	77
	NU	43	36	47	45	46
	TOTAL	267	231	248	253	273
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	30	29	20	42	22
	BCMB					1
	BIOL	103	120	104	99	100
	CHEM	16	26	18	19	18
	CS	30	42	33	41	48
	MATH	31	26	28	15	28
	PHYS	5	9	8	9	10
	STTS			3	7	14
	TOTAL	215	252	214	232	241
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	68	64	71	46	47
	ECON	17	17	11	9	16
	HIST	26	46	40	32	29
	JUST	40	32	26	26	31
	PHRE	2	10	8	4	3
	POL	20	15	24	19	30
	PSYC	91	105	89	93	90
	SOAN	16	19	19	17	17
	TOTAL	280	308	288	246	263
IDSM	IDSM	8	5	3	4	15
ALL	ALL	1,113	1,170	1,116	1,103	1,164

The Critical Thinking and Writing Prompt (CTW), Data, and Discussion

A Critical Thinking and Writing (CTW) Prompt has been in the portfolio for many years, but was seriously reexamined as part of the charge of the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) committee. This committee's university-wide sanctioned report (submitted October 30, 2012), included a rubric for evaluating any document for every element of its critical thinking. The portfolio committee attenuated that rubric to include four major components of critical thinking, as well as writing quality. These critical thinking

components are the *issue* of the document, its *context*, the supporting *evidence* of its argument, and the resulting *conclusion*. Since 2013, the Portfolio has used this attenuated HOTS rubric to score CTW submissions.

Students are asked in this prompt to submit their best work that illustrates critical thinking. Usually, it is the student's strongest classic research-style paper and the prompt specifically asks for such a paper. They note what year of their college experience the work was done, and state whether the work came from a particular course or some other source. They then describe the instructor's assignment, reflect on their growth as a critical thinker, attach their document via their vault, and perform a self-evaluation with our scoring rubric.

Following the prompt (in italics) and the scoring rubric (in the grid) are the tables of CTW scores sorted by major and course prefix. Following that is an inter-rater reliability table that indicates our readers are well calibrated in the scoring of these submissions; a random number of CTW submissions are scored by two different readers to double check this assertion each year. A final table shows the university-wide scores by year for the last 5 years.

Critical Thinking Prompt

Truman's Common Framework of Critical Thinking Pedagogy states that critical thinking includes the ability to understand and articulate well-reasoned arguments. It involves using evidence to determine the level of confidence you should have in a proposition. It demands comprehensively exploring issues and ideas before coming to conclusions.

In addition, good writing is a reflection of good thinking. Therefore, good writing communicates meaning and integrates ideas through analysis, evaluation, and the synthesis of ideas and concepts. Good writing also exhibits skill in language usage and clarity of expression through good organization.

NOTE: Please consider your best classic research-style paper from either your junior or senior year. Students typically compose their best critical writing later in college.

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

As you consider this category, you may find that a submission from another category demonstrates strong critical thinking and writing. If so, feel free to use that item for this category as well.

> *Source of the this entry? (Truman course, Other Source)*
>
> *In which year did you originally produce this work? (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior)*
>
> *Which best describes this course? (LSP, Major, Minor, Elective)*

Please describe the instructor's assignment, remembering that faculty and staff from all across campus should understand your explanation. If the work was not generated by an assignment, please describe your purpose and process in using this kind of thinking. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Critical Thinking Framework   Summer 2013

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2. Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by First Major 2020

School	Major	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
Arts and Letters	ART	20	2.90	2.40	2.50	2.30	10.10	50	2.75
	CML	10	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.30	13.80	90	3.70
	CRWT	16	3.12	2.62	2.94	2.62	11.31	62	3.19
	ENG	34	3.24	2.85	3.15	2.71	11.94	76	3.00
	LING	13	2.92	2.69	2.77	2.77	11.15	54	3.08
	MUSI	9	3.00	2.67	3.22	3.00	11.89	78	3.11
	THEA	8	2.50	2.38	1.88	2.25	9.00	12	2.75
	TOTAL	110	3.07	2.73	2.90	2.67	11.37	64	3.05
Business	ACCT	32	3.00	2.75	2.81	2.59	11.16	69	2.75
	BSAD	43	2.93	2.84	2.70	2.49	10.95	56	2.88
	TOTAL	75	2.96	2.80	2.75	2.53	11.04	61	2.83
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	2	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	13.50	100	3.50
	CMDS	22	2.82	2.64	2.77	2.32	10.55	55	2.95
	ES	39	2.95	2.74	2.59	2.33	10.62	46	3.08
	HLTH	36	3.56	3.06	3.28	2.83	12.72	78	3.28
	NU	21	3.38	3.29	3.48	2.71	12.86	81	3.48
	TOTAL	120	3.19	2.92	3.00	2.56	11.68	64	3.19
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	9	3.11	3.00	3.11	2.56	11.78	78	3.00
	BCMB	1	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	16.00	100	4.00
	BIOL	36	3.06	2.81	2.94	2.61	11.42	64	3.11
	CHEM	14	3.14	2.86	3.29	2.86	12.14	64	3.14
	CS	29	2.90	2.79	2.72	2.59	11.00	52	2.86
	MATH	10	3.20	2.90	3.10	2.90	12.10	80	3.20
	PHYS	9	2.78	2.67	2.78	2.44	10.67	56	2.67
	STTS	7	3.14	2.71	2.57	2.57	11.00	57	3.00
	TOTAL	115	3.03	2.83	2.93	2.65	11.44	63	3.02
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	20	3.30	3.10	2.90	2.75	12.05	70	3.10
	ECON	12	3.25	2.83	3.08	2.92	12.08	58	3.08
	HIST	16	2.69	2.62	2.75	2.50	10.56	50	2.88
	JUST	15	2.67	2.60	2.80	2.27	10.33	53	2.80
	PHRE	2	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	14.00	100	3.00
	POL	22	3.45	3.41	3.45	3.00	13.32	95	3.23
	PSYC	44	3.02	2.68	2.84	2.61	11.16	59	2.98
	SOAN	11	3.09	2.82	2.64	2.64	11.18	55	3.00
	TOTAL	142	3.08	2.87	2.94	2.68	11.58	65	3.01
IDSM	IDSM	11	2.82	2.91	2.73	2.45	10.91	36	3.18
ALL	ALL	573	3.07	2.84	2.91	2.62	11.45	63	3.04

* Due to Covid, a sampling of 573 was read.

Table 2 shows the number of students within the various majors and their average scores for the issue, context, evidence, and conclusions of their CTW submissions. Recall that each component can range from 1-4, with the sum of these 4 components (Sum4) leading to the overall score for critical thinking. A Sum4 total of 10 or more is deemed satisfactory for this prompt. The averages for the Sum4 for each major are shown here, as well as the percentage of students from each major whose

Sum4 was 10 or more. The final column in the table is the average score for writing skill and acumen within each major.

The university average Sum4 score is 11.45 and all schools have an average Sum4 above 11. Only THEA (9.0) showed a Sum4 average of less than 10. The factors that lead to these lower scores are not clear and it is possible some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. 15 departments in all scored at the high end of the range (>11), although some of the high scores are due to only one or two papers being read so the sampling is really too small to draw significant conclusions.

Viewing the data through the lens of percentage of students who earned 10 or more on the Sum4 for critical thinking gives a different perspective. University-wide, 63% of 2020 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is more in line with prior years excepting 2019 which was significantly higher. Due to the smaller sampling of the prompt this year, any major conclusions drawn from the data would be dubious at best.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2020 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
ACCT	8	3.50	2.88	3.12	2.75	12.25	88	3.00
AGSC	10	3.10	2.70	3.00	2.60	11.40	70	2.90
ART	10	2.90	2.80	2.20	2.60	10.50	60	2.80
BIOL	9	3.44	3.22	3.11	3.11	12.89	78	3.33
BSAD	14	2.79	2.93	2.50	2.36	10.57	57	2.79
CHEM	5	3.00	2.40	3.40	2.40	11.20	40	3.20
CLAS	2	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.50	13.00	50	3.50
CMDS	9	2.56	2.78	2.89	2.33	10.56	56	2.89
COMM	16	3.38	2.94	2.94	2.69	11.94	56	3.06
CS	5	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.80	11.60	80	3.20
DS	1	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	6.00	0	3.00
ECON	7	3.00	2.57	3.00	2.71	11.29	43	3.14
ED	4	3.25	2.75	2.75	2.75	11.50	50	3.00
ENG	38	2.84	2.63	2.63	2.45	10.55	53	2.84
ENVS	2	1.50	1.50	2.00	1.50	6.50	0	2.50
ES	8	3.00	2.88	2.38	2.12	10.38	38	2.88
HIST	15	3.00	2.53	2.87	2.40	10.80	53	2.80
HLTH	11	3.55	2.73	3.18	2.91	12.36	73	3.09
IDSM	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	8.00	0	3.00
INDV	2	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	14.50	100	3.50
JINS	33	2.97	2.76	2.82	2.58	11.12	61	2.97
JUST	3	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.00	10.33	33	2.33
LING	5	3.20	2.60	3.00	2.80	11.60	80	3.00
MATH	1	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	11.00	100	3.00
MUSI	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	8.00	0	2.00
NU	12	3.42	3.42	3.58	2.75	13.17	92	3.50
PHRE	19	2.95	2.42	2.32	2.47	10.16	32	2.95
PHYS	1	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	12.00	100	3.00
POL	13	3.46	3.23	3.46	2.77	12.92	92	3.08
PSYC	7	3.14	3.00	3.14	3.14	12.43	86	3.14
SED	1	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	6.00	0	3.00
SOAN	9	2.78	2.44	2.56	2.22	10.00	33	2.89
SPAN	1	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	13.00	100	3.00
STAT	4	3.00	2.75	3.25	2.50	11.50	75	2.75
THEA	2	2.00	2.50	1.50	2.50	8.50	0	3.00
Missing	5	3.00	2.80	3.20	2.80	11.80	60	3.40

Table 3 shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular course prefix. As usual, ENG and JINS courses led to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%). Due to the sampling size as explained above, it is difficult to extrapolate meaningful results, especially since some of the larger departments only have a few submissions.

Table 4. CTW 2020 Inter-Rater Reliability

Due to the number of readers and constraints due to the Covid outbreak we were unable to complete a table displaying data for inter-rater reliability this year, as no paper was scored by more than one reader.

Table 5. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-Wide Scores 2016–2020

CTW: University-wide Scores			
Year	N	Mean Sum4	10+(%)
2016	1,099	10.40	61
2017	1,170	10.30	61
2018	1,117	10.10	61
2019	1,103	10.60	89
2020	573	11.45	63

Table 5 shows that the Sum4 and 10+ percentages are slightly above the range of the previous four years but not all submissions were evaluated due to Covid sampling.

The Interdisciplinary Thinking Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The earliest results from the interdisciplinary thinking (IDS) prompt motivated the campus to develop our Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar (JINS) courses in the late 1990s. This prompt also requires a research style paper, but in this instance, the subject of the paper must be explored using the perspectives of more than one discipline. A student's paper produced as part of their JINS course should satisfy the criteria of our rubric well. Since the implementation of JINS courses, the scores on this prompt have held steady with the mean score near 2 out of 4 and with 60-70% of the scores deemed above the competent score of 2.

The prompt defines the concept of interdisciplinary thinking, and asks for the source and time of completion of the submitted document. Next, the student must briefly describe the instructor's assignment, provide a list of the disciplines used in the work, and reflect on their growth of this skill. As is usually the case, we ask for a self-evaluation using our scoring rubric, which we hope encourages the student to choose their paper that best fits the rubric.

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

Interdisciplinary Prompt

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

- *You work in an interdisciplinary way when you integrate or synthesize ideas, materials, or processes across traditional disciplinary boundaries.*
- *You should not assume that you are generating interdisciplinary work if you merely use essential skills like writing, speaking, a second language, computation, percentages, or averages to explore content, perspectives and ideas in only one discipline.*

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

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

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

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

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

Please describe the instructor's assignment. If the work was not generated by an assignment, please describe your purpose and process in using this kind of thinking. Use at leasst two well-thought-out prose sentences to describe.

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

Please reflect on and specifically describe to faculty and staff from all across campus how this submission demonstrates interdisciplinary thinking. Use at least two well-thought-out prose sentences to reflect.

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

- *4 - Strong Competence*
- *3 - Competence*
- *2 - Minimal Competence*
- *1 - Weak Competence*
- *0 - No Competence Demonstrate*

Reviewer Specific Question

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

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

Interdisciplinary Thinking

4 Strong Competences

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

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

3 Competences

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

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

2 Minimal Competences

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

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

1 Weak Competence

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

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

0 No demonstration of competence as an interdisciplinary thinker

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

Table 6. Interdisciplinary Thinking: Scores by First Major 2016–2020

School	Major	N 2020	Mean 2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2+(%) 2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Arts and Letters	ART	27	0.98	2.12	2.13	1.60	2.04	51	78	73	50	74
	CML	17	1.15	1.89	2.12	2.08	2.29	55	65	76	71	76
	CRWT	18	1.38	2.50	2.29	1.50	1.89	44	100	88	58	72
	ENG	63	2.23	2.05	2.18	1.91	2.32	82	74	75	60	81
	LING	13	2.33	2.27	1.71	2.09	2.08	88	75	71	73	62
	MUSI	17	1.41	2.09	2.07	1.92	2.24	54	79	79	67	59
	THEA	7	1.71	1.91	1.87	1.50	2.00	56	72	60	50	57
	TOTAL	162	1.60	2.12	2.11	1.80	2.18	61	78	75	55	73
Business	ACCT	56	1.76	1.91	1.75	1.79	2.18	64	84	64	57	79
	BSAD	103	1.56	1.64	1.81	1.81	2.19	51	58	66	63	74
	TOTAL	159	1.66	1.78	1.79	1.80	2.19	57	71	66	53	75
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	1.96	1.63	2.29	1.78	1.67	66	63	86	56	67
	CMDS	35	1.80	1.59	2.14	1.74	2.06	60	48	67	56	71
	ES	92	1.72	1.71	1.80	1.60	2.16	58	62	6	56	74
	HLTH	74	1.78	2.14	2.15	1.87	2.39	67	75	73	62	78
	NU	42	1.89	1.80	2.04	2.02	2.40	68	58	68	69	81
	TOTAL	246	1.83	1.78	2.01	1.80	2.25	64	61	67	57	76
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	15	1.70	2.02	2.25	1.79	2.60	48	71	75	60	80
	BCMB	1					2.00					100
	BIOL	85	2.14	2.12	2.02	1.93	2.41	70	74	68	65	85
	CHEM	13	2.13	2.24	2.22	2.11	2.38	71	79	72	58	77
	CS	36	2.19	2.17	2.21	1.85	2.42	78	77	76	56	75
	MATH	22	1.77	1.86	2.18	2.07	1.77	60	65	68	73	64
	PHYS	8	0.80	1.89	0.75	1.22	2.00	60	61	25	22	62
	STTS	13			2.33	1.43	2.31			100	57	69
	TOTAL	193	1.79	2.05	2.07	1.77	2.33	65	71	69	55	78
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	41	2.10	1.71	2.13	1.93	2.22	72	59	70	65	78
	ECON	11	1.97	1.56	2.09	2.33	2.45	67	68	73	78	82
	HIST	23	2.50	2.12	2.24	1.88	2.13	80	78	80	66	83
	JUST	21	1.80	1.73	1.77	1.69	1.98	59	63	65	58	76
	PHRE	2	1.50	1.99	2.13	2.00	2.50	100	60	75	75	100
	POL	26	2.33	2.30	1.88	2.58	3.00	65	93	63	89	96
	PSYC	76	1.82	2.05	1.98	1.78	2.00	62	73	69	58	66
	SOAN	14	2.15	2.34	2.11	1.76	2.50	73	87	74	65	93
	TOTAL	214	2.02	1.98	2.04	2.00	2.24	72	73	71	56	78
IDSM	IDSM	14	2.71	2.06	2.00	1.50	2.36	100	100	67	50	79
ALL	ALL	988	1.84	2.00	2.01	1.78	2.24	72	72	69	55	76

University-wide, the 2020 average score is 2.24 which is slightly better than last year and above the 5 year average of 1.97. Note that the STTS major was added in 2018, so only three years of data are available and the BCMB was just added in 2020. The average score by school has changed little over the past 4 years but examination by department shows a bit more variability. Departments themselves might be able to better address why that might be so. Changes at the department level could surely get some of these scores higher. One issue also might be that departments are not

ultimately responsible for making sure the JINS course are evaluated or whether students are being encouraged to submit work from JINS courses as opposed to random courses for this prompt.

Table 7. Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2020 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Mean	2+(%)
JINS	652	2.39	83
ENG	54	1.92	65
PHRE	32	1.47	41
BSAD	26	2.00	62
None Given	21	2.14	67
COMM	18	2.28	78
HIST	15	1.80	67
SOAN	13	2.08	77
NU	12	2.50	75
IDSM	11	2.09	73
ED	10	1.70	70
ECON	10	2.20	60
BIOL	10	1.60	60
MUSI	9	1.44	33
CS	9	2.78	89
SPAN	8	2.25	75
ART	8	2.12	75
PSYC	7	1.29	29
POL	7	2.57	86
ES	7	1.29	43
< 5	49	2.00	61

As intended, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2020, with 652 submissions. ENG, BSAD, and PHRE had 20 or more while others had quite a bit fewer. Additionally, the submissions from JINS courses scored quite well with our rubric and the number is higher than the average score for the last 5 years (68.8%); in 2020, JINS submissions average 2.39, with 83% of them scoring at the satisfactory score of 2 or more. Quite a few prefixes also 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.

Table 8. IDS 2020 Inter-Rater Reliability

Due to the number of readers and constraints due to the Covid outbreak we were unable to complete a table displaying data for inter-rater reliability this year, as no paper was scored by more than one reader.

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.

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 began in 2018.

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

Self-Discovery Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: You may find that you have included some discussion of this self-discovery in the Transformative Experiences Questionnaire. In that prompt, we focus on each particular experience, and here we want you to focus more deeply on its particular effects on you. It is highly unlikely that the same faculty reader would read both prompts.

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

Engaged in deep introspection
Examined her/himself from a new perspective (historical, artistic, philosophical...)
Achieved significant personal growth
Demonstrated responsibility
Explored a moral or ethical dilemma
Achieved a personal best
Especially challenging
Engaged in significant intellectual risk
Developed a sense of vocation
Modeled working as a professional
Demonstrated service to others
Fruitful collaboration with other students or peers
Fruitful collaboration with faculty, staff, mentor, other professional
Built a special mentoring relationship

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

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

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

Contains forwardable material

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

Coursework

○ LSP
○ Major
○ Capstone
○ Minor
○ Elective

Other Academic

○ Research
○ Internship
○ Study Abroad
○ Resume / College Application /
   Professional Statement
○ Service Learning
○ Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring
○ Other: _____

Student Organization

○ Governance
○ Service Organization
○ Social Fraternity/Sorority
○ Professional/Major
○ Religious
○ Honor Society
○ Campus Media
○ Other:
_____

Athletics

○ Varsity Athletics
○ Club Sports Intramurals
○ 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: _____

Table 9. Self-Discovery: University-wide Student Rationales 2016-2020

Categories	Reasons	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Academic/Scholarship	Especially Challenging	18	15	21	26	15
	Intellectual Risk	4	3	6	7	6
	Personal Best	6	5	6	10	5
	Vocational Development	18	17	23	21	13
	Worked as Professional	11	8	14	12	9
Relationships	Collaboration w/ Peers	19	20	24	21	16
	Collaboration w/ Professional	0	2	12	11	7
	Mentoring Internship	3	3	8	5	4
	Service to Others	9	8	10	11	5
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	28	35	31	23	7
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	3	3	4	6	2
	New Perspective on Self	0	6	29	25	16
	Personal Growth	46	43	57	60	46
	Responsibility	17	15	19	20	10

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

The category **Risk/Challenge/Growth** offered the greatest potential for self-discovery university-wide. For all students, *Personal Growth* was the biggest reason for self-discovery in all years although it lost 14% so it is significantly lower this year (2018: 57%, 2019: 60%, 2020: 46%). *New Perspective on Self* was the next most significant category (*New Perspective on Self* - 2018: 29%, 2019: 25%, 2020: 16%). Deep Introspection dropped significantly over the last three years (*Deep Introspection* - 2018: 31%, 2019: 23%, 2020: 7%)

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, *Especially Challenging* was a significant category of self-discovery (2018: 19%, 2019: 20%, 2020: 15%).Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration w/* Peers (2018: 24%, 2019: 21%, 2020: 16%). It is important to point out that compared to 2019, every indicator of significant self-discovery trended downward.

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2020 is tabulated in tables 10-12. How different majors' students are motivated should be valuable information for the faculty as they craft improvements within their majors.

Table 10. Self-Discovery: 2020 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Introspection Yes	Introspection Pct	Perspective Yes	Perspective Pct	Pers. Growth Yes	Pers. Growth Pct	Responsibility Yes	Responsibility Pct	Dilemma Yes	Dilemma Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	7	8	27	14	47	4	13	0	0
	CML	18	2	11	3	17	8	44	3	17	1	6
	CRWT	16	1	6	4	25	7	44	1	6	0	0
	ENG	54	7	13	8	15	22	41	5	9	1	2
	LING	14	1	7	3	21	8	57	0	0	1	7
	MUSI	15	2	13	6	40	9	60	2	13	0	0
	THEA	8	0	0	1	12	3	38	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	**155**	**15**	**10**	**33**	**21**	**71**	**46**	**15**	**10**	**3**	**2**
Business	ACCT	61	2	3	9	15	27	44	6	10	2	3
	BSAD	105	8	8	17	16	55	52	7	7	1	1
	TOTAL	**166**	**10**	**6**	**26**	**16**	**82**	**49**	**13**	**8**	**3**	**2**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	0	0
	CMDS	38	1	3	6	16	15	39	4	11	0	0
	ES	94	11	12	12	13	45	48	8	9	0	0
	HLTH	66	6	9	7	11	36	55	7	11	1	2
	NU	37	2	5	6	16	22	59	8	22	2	5
	TOTAL	**238**	**20**	**8**	**31**	**13**	**119**	**50**	**28**	**12**	**3**	**1**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	2	12	1	6	4	25	0	0	0	0
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BIOL	92	7	8	17	18	44	48	10	11	2	2
	CHEM	14	0	0	1	7	6	43	1	7	0	0
	CS	40	1	2	3	8	16	40	3	8	0	0
	MATH	23	1	4	4	17	8	35	1	4	0	0
	PHYS	9	0	0	0	0	3	33	1	11	0	0
	STTS	12	1	8	2	17	4	33	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	**207**	**12**	**6**	**28**	**14**	**85**	**41**	**17**	**8**	**2**	**1**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	1	3	6	16	16	43	6	16	0	0
	ECON	13	0	0	2	15	5	38	2	15	0	0
	HIST	20	4	20	6	30	8	40	3	15	2	10
	JUST	26	0	0	1	4	8	31	3	12	0	0
	PHRE	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	24	3	12	3	12	9	38	3	12	1	4
	PSYC	73	5	7	20	27	45	62	11	15	1	1
	SOAN	13	2	15	3	23	3	23	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	**208**	**15**	**7**	**41**	**20**	**94**	**45**	**29**	**14**	**4**	**2**
	IDSM	9	0	0	2	22	5	56	0	0	0	0
	ALL	**983**	**72**	**7**	**161**	**16**	**456**	**46**	**102**	**10**	**15**	**2**

Table 11. Self-Discovery: 2020 Student Academic/Scholarship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	P Best		Challenging		Intel Risk		Vocation		Professional	
			Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	1	3	3	10	7	23	6	20	4	13
	CML	18	1	6	1	6	1	6	3	17	2	11
	CRWT	16	2	12	4	25	3	19	2	12	1	6
	ENG	54	2	4	8	15	2	4	6	11	1	2
	LING	14	3	21	4	29	2	14	3	21	1	7
	MUSI	15	0	0	3	20	1	7	3	20	5	33
	THEA	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	1	12
	TOTAL	**155**	**9**	**6**	**23**	**15**	**16**	**10**	**25**	**16**	**15**	**10**
Business	ACCT	61	3	5	8	13	3	5	5	8	5	8
	BSAD	105	5	5	9	9	4	4	2	2	5	5
	TOTAL	**166**	**8**	**5**	**17**	**10**	**7**	**4**	**7**	**4**	**10**	**6**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CMDS	38	1	3	4	11	2	5	2	5	2	5
	ES	94	2	2	10	11	2	2	17	18	8	9
	HLTH	66	4	6	12	18	3	5	15	23	7	11
	NU	37	0	0	7	19	2	5	10	27	7	19
	TOTAL	**238**	**7**	**3**	**33**	**14**	**9**	**4**	**44**	**18**	**24**	**10**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	1	6	1	6	0	0	3	19	1	6
	BCMB	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100	1	100
	BIOL	92	7	8	17	18	5	5	11	12	7	8
	CHEM	14	0	0	2	14	1	7	1	7	0	0
	CS	40	3	8	7	18	1	2	10	25	6	15
	MATH	23	0	0	2	9	0	0	2	9	3	13
	PHYS	9	2	22	2	22	2	22	2	22	1	11
	STTS	12	1	8	3	25	0	0	0	0	2	17
	TOTAL	**207**	**14**	**7**	**35**	**17**	**9**	**4**	**30**	**14**	**21**	**10**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	1	3	8	22	3	8	2	5	4	11
	ECON	13	1	8	3	23	1	8	2	15	2	15
	HIST	20	1	5	1	5	1	5	3	15	1	5
	JUST	26	2	8	4	15	1	4	3	12	2	8
	PHRE	2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	24	1	4	5	21	3	12	4	17	2	8
	PSYC	73	5	7	11	15	7	10	4	5	5	7
	SOAN	13	1	8	1	8	1	8	3	23	1	8
	TOTAL	**208**	**12**	**6**	**34**	**16**	**17**	**8**	**21**	**10**	**17**	**8**
	IDSM	9	0	0	1	11	1	11	2	22	1	11

Table 12. Self-Discovery: 2020 Student Relationship Rationales by Major

| | | | Relationships | | | | | | | |
| | | | Service | | Collab | | Collab | | Mentoring | |
School	Major	N	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	7	6	20	2	7	6	20
	CML	18	0	0	2	11	3	17	3	17
	CRWT	16	0	0	3	19	3	19	2	12
	ENG	54	5	9	10	19	2	4	6	11
	LING	14	1	7	1	7	3	21	3	21
	MUSI	15	1	7	4	27	2	13	3	20
	THEA	8	0	0	1	12	0	0	2	25
	TOTAL	**155**	**9**	**6**	**27**	**17**	**15**	**10**	**25**	**16**
Business	ACCT	61	3	5	15	25	1	2	5	8
	BSAD	105	4	4	16	15	5	5	2	2
	TOTAL	**166**	**7**	**4**	**31**	**19**	**6**	**4**	**7**	**4**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CMDS	38	1	3	4	11	3	8	2	5
	ES	94	3	3	13	14	10	11	17	18
	HLTH	66	8	12	18	27	1	2	15	23
	NU	37	5	14	8	22	3	8	10	27
	TOTAL	**238**	**17**	**7**	**43**	**18**	**17**	**7**	**44**	**18**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	0	0	3	19	2	12	3	19
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
	BIOL	92	5	5	14	15	7	8	11	12
	CHEM	14	0	0	2	14	1	7	1	7
	CS	40	1	2	4	10	2	5	10	25
	MATH	23	1	4	3	13	1	4	2	9
	PHYS	9	0	0	1	11	2	22	2	22
	STTS	12	0	0	1	8	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	**207**	**7**	**3**	**28**	**14**	**16**	**8**	**30**	**14**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	1	3	4	11	2	5	2	5
	ECON	13	1	8	1	8	2	15	2	15
	HIST	20	2	10	1	5	2	10	3	15
	JUST	26	0	0	3	12	1	4	3	12
	PHRE	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	24	1	4	4	17	3	12	4	17
	PSYC	73	3	4	11	15	5	7	4	5
	SOAN	13	1	8	1	8	0	0	3	23
	TOTAL	**208**	**9**	**4**	**25**	**12**	**15**	**7**	**21**	**10**
	IDSM	9	0	0	1	11	0	0	2	22
	ALL	**983**	**49**	**5**	**155**	**16**	**69**	**7**	**129**	**13**

Table 13. Self-Discovery: Context of the Experience 2018–2020

SELF Category	SELF Context	2018 N	2018 %	2019 N	2019 %	2020 N	2020%
Coursework	Major	253	24	247	22	259	24
	LSP	57	5	81	7	78	7
	Elective	23	2	41	4	41	4
	Minor	20	2	26	2	33	3
	Capstone	2	0	5	0	18	2
	All	355	33	400	36	429	38
Other Academic	Study Abroad	50	5	53	5	52	5
	Internship	35	3	29	3	39	4
	Research	11	1	14	1	17	2
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	14	1	19	2	17	2
	Resume/Prof. Statement	5	0	6	1	6	1
	Service Learning	3	0	7	1	4	0
	Other Academic	33	3	30	3	28	3
	All	151	14	158	14	163	15
Student Organizations	Social Fraternity/Sorority	113	11	100	9	84	8
	Service Organization	21	2	27	2	29	3
	Religious Organization	37	3	33	3	27	2
	Professional/Major	15	1	14	1	17	2
	Governance Organizations	5	0	2	0	3	0
	Campus Media	3	0	3	0	2	0
	Honor Society	4	0	4	0	2	0
	Other Organization	22	2	9	1	29	3
	All	220	21	192	17	193	17
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	41	4	35	3	31	3
	Club Sports/Intramurals	5	0	11	1	11	1
	Other Athletics	6	1	7	1	3	0
	All	52	5	53	5	45	4
Employment	Campus Job	14	1	21	2	13	1
	Off-Campus Job	23	2	17	2	7	1
	Volunteer	8	1	7	1	3	0
	All	45	4	45	4	23	2
Performance/ Creativ	Public Performance/Recital	3	0	5	0	7	1
	Other Creative Activity	5	0	17	2	11	1
	All	8	1	22	2	18	2
Other	Relationships/Friendships	140	13	139	13	112	10
	Resident Life	18	2	25	2	18	2
	ROTC	6	1	9	1	3	0
	Other Misc.	72	7	60	5	95	9
	All	236	22	233	21	228	20
NA	All	0	0	0	0	17	2
All	All	1,067	100	1,103	100	1,116	100

As can be seen from Table 13, in 2020, 38% of our graduates enjoyed significant self-discovery within Truman's coursework, with most of that (59%) being within the

student's major. Other important categories of contexts for self-discovery include Other - Relationships/Friendships (10%), Student organizations – Social Fraternity/Sorority (8%), and LSP (7%). 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. There was an issue with the data for this prompt originally and no context was indicated. In 2022 these were reread in their entirety to capture all of the data.

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt, Data, and Discussion

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

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

Most Personally Satisfying Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

We are especially interested in why this item was so important and/or impactful to you, out of all of your experiences at Truman. Why, specifically, is it so meaningful to you? Use at least two well-though-out prose sentences to describe.

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

Reviewer Specific Question

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

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

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

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

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

Contains forwardable material.

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

Coursework

○ LSP
○ Major
○ Capstone
○ Minor
○ Elective

Other Academic

○ Research
○ Internship
○ Study Abroad
○ Resume / College Application / Professional Statement
○ Service Learning
○ Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring
○ Other: [_____]

Student Organization

○ Governance
○ Service Organization
○ Social Fraternity/Sorority
○ Professional/Major
○ Religious
○ Honor Society
○ Campus Media
○ Other:
[_____]

Athletics

○ Varsity Athletics
○ Club Sports Intramurals
○ 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: [_____]

Table 14. Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2016–2020

Reason	Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Personal Growth	48	47	50	46	32
Enjoyable	42	52	47	56	33
Challenging	35	39	38	40	20
Professional	26	29	32	27	15
Personal Goals	21	27	31	28	11
Personal Best	21	20	26	11	3
Lots of Time	17	26	25	27	14
Collaborative	18	23	22	17	13
Problem Solving	7	6	9	11	3

Table 14 shows the percentages of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why their submission was so satisfying for them. In 2020, "Enjoyable" (33%) continued as the top reason for student satisfaction, "Challenging" (19%) was second highest and "Professional" (14%) was third. For the last three years, "Personal Goals", "Enjoyable" and "Challenging" have been the top categories so it is definitely a change that "Professional" has replaced "Personal Goals". This may be due to recent push for an emphasis on the importance of professional skills in our curriculum. It is still clear that Truman students do generally enjoy being pushed to excel, even though there is strong evidence that some students feel stressed by the challenging workload. Therefore, it is critical to continue to provide services that can help students deal with their stress while they are being asked to work so hard. "Collaborative" has been on a downward trend for the last three years. It is important to note that in the self-discovery prompt, the top **Academic/Scholarship** category was *collaboration w/others.* It would seem that even though the collaborative work drives self-discovery it has become more recently less satisfying to the students. Perhaps departments might review where collaborative works occur in their curriculum and try to find out how they might modify things to be more satisfying or enjoyable although some might argue that student struggles or dissatisfaction can contribute significantly to student growth. Group work may also have been more disorganized and difficult with the advent of the pandemic and the move to online learning

Table 15. Most Personally Satisfying: Scores Sorted by First Major 2020

School	Major	N	Pers. Best		Pers. Goals		Pers. Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	7	3	10	8	27	6	20	4	13
	CML	18	1	6	3	17	5	28	4	22	2	11
	CRWT	16	1	6	2	12	6	38	3	19	1	6
	ENG	54	2	4	1	2	19	35	11	20	5	9
	LING	14	0	0	3	21	4	29	3	21	1	7
	MUSI	15	1	7	5	33	6	40	6	40	2	13
	THEA	8	0	0	1	12	2	25	1	12	1	12
	TOTAL	**155**	**7**	**5**	**18**	**12**	**50**	**32**	**34**	**22**	**16**	**10**
Business	ACCT	61	1	2	3	5	17	28	10	16	5	8
	BSAD	105	5	5	8	8	30	29	17	16	14	13
	TOTAL	**166**	**6**	**4**	**11**	**7**	**47**	**28**	**27**	**16**	**19**	**11**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CMDS	38	1	3	7	18	8	21	7	18	7	18
	ES	94	3	3	10	11	28	30	11	12	18	19
	HLTH	66	2	3	6	9	29	44	14	21	9	14
	NU	37	1	3	2	5	17	46	7	19	9	24
	TOTAL	**238**	**7**	**3**	**26**	**11**	**82**	**34**	**39**	**16**	**43**	**18**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	1	6	0	0	2	12	2	12	2	12
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
	BIOL	92	2	2	15	16	33	36	19	21	17	18
	CHEM	14	0	0	2	14	5	36	1	7	2	14
	CS	40	2	5	7	18	13	32	10	25	6	15
	MATH	23	0	0	2	9	8	35	2	9	2	9
	PHYS	9	0	0	1	11	2	22	3	33	0	0
	STTS	12	0	0	1	8	2	17	4	33	2	17
	TOTAL	**207**	**5**	**2**	**28**	**14**	**66**	**32**	**41**	**20**	**32**	**15**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	2	5	5	14	9	24	5	14	5	14
	ECON	13	1	8	1	8	3	23	3	23	2	15
	HIST	20	0	0	2	10	4	20	6	30	4	20
	JUST	26	1	4	1	4	6	23	4	15	3	12
	PHRE	2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
	POL	24	1	4	1	4	6	25	6	25	6	25
	PSYC	73	1	1	8	11	34	47	21	29	6	8
	SOAN	13	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	15	1	8
	TOTAL	**208**	**6**	**3**	**19**	**9**	**65**	**31**	**47**	**23**	**27**	**13**
	IDSM	9	1	11	1	11	6	67	1	11	2	22
	ALL	**983**	**32**	**3**	**103**	**10**	**316**	**32**	**189**	**19**	**139**	**14**

School	Major	N	Collaborative		Enjoyable		Prob. Solving		Lots of Time		No Indication	
			Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct	Yes	Pct
Arts and Letters	ART	30	2	7	11	37	0	0	3	10	0	0
	CML	18	3	17	7	39	1	6	1	6	0	0
	CRWT	16	2	12	5	31	1	6	4	25	0	0
	ENG	54	7	13	16	30	0	0	9	17	0	0
	LING	14	2	14	8	57	4	29	2	14	0	0
	MUSI	15	3	20	7	47	0	0	6	40	0	0
	THEA	8	1	12	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	**155**	**20**	**13**	**56**	**36**	**6**	**4**	**25**	**16**	**0**	**0**
Business	ACCT	61	9	15	22	36	0	0	7	11	0	0
	BSAD	105	13	12	32	30	5	5	13	12	1	1
	TOTAL	**166**	**22**	**13**	**54**	**33**	**5**	**3**	**20**	**12**	**1**	**1**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CMDS	38	0	0	7	18	1	3	3	8	0	0
	ES	94	12	13	30	32	3	3	6	6	2	2
	HLTH	66	15	23	23	35	1	2	9	14	0	0
	NU	37	9	24	13	35	0	0	4	11	0	0
	TOTAL	**238**	**36**	**15**	**73**	**31**	**5**	**2**	**22**	**9**	**2**	**1**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	16	1	6	4	25	0	0	3	19	0	0
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BIOL	92	17	18	32	35	4	4	16	17	2	2
	CHEM	14	3	21	6	43	0	0	1	7	0	0
	CS	40	7	18	12	30	3	8	8	20	0	0
	MATH	23	0	0	4	17	0	0	2	9	0	0
	PHYS	9	0	0	2	22	1	11	3	33	0	0
	STTS	12	0	0	2	17	1	8	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	**207**	**28**	**14**	**62**	**30**	**9**	**4**	**34**	**16**	**2**	**1**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	37	6	16	12	32	2	5	4	11	0	0
	ECON	13	2	15	7	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
	HIST	20	2	10	6	30	1	5	5	25	0	0
	JUST	26	1	4	8	31	0	0	4	15	0	0
	PHRE	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	POL	24	2	8	8	33	2	8	5	21	0	0
	PSYC	73	10	14	33	45	4	5	11	15	0	0
	SOAN	13	1	8	5	38	1	8	2	15	0	0
	TOTAL	**208**	**24**	**12**	**79**	**38**	**10**	**5**	**31**	**15**	**0**	**0**
	IDSM	9	1	11	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ALL	**983**	**131**	**13**	**326**	**33**	**35**	**4**	**132**	**13**	**5**	**1**

Table 15 shows the 2020 data broken down by major. The data for each reason is indicated as a raw number of students from within that major and as a percentage of that major's total students. The reasons chosen within a particular major vary greatly, so it would be worthwhile for each department to see what motivates their own students.

Table 16. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2017-2020

	Most Satisfying Contexts	2017 (N)	2017 (%)	2018 (N)	2018 (%)	2019 (N)	2019 (%)	2020 (N)	2020 (%)
Coursework	LSP	44	4	57	5	81	7	74	12.71
	Major	229	21	253	24	247	22	180	30.93
	Capstone	1	0	2	0	5	0	17	2.92
	Minor	24	2	20	2	26	2	42	7.22
	Elective	33	3	23	2	41	4	41	7.04
	ALL Coursework	**331**	**30**	**335**	**33**	**400**	**36**	**354**	**60.82**
Other Academic	Research	20	2	11	1	14	1	12	2.06
	Internship	40	4	35	3	29	3	18	3.09
	Study Abroad	64	6	50	5	53	5	27	4.64
	Resume/Prof. Statement	1	0	5	0	6	1	0	0.00
	Service Learning	4	0	3	0	7	1	2	0.34
	Tutor/Teacher/Mentor	20	2	14	1	19	2	6	1.03
	Other Academic	36	3	33	3	30	3	8	1.37
	ALL Other Academic	**185**	**17**	**151**	**14**	**158**	**14**	**73**	**12.54**
Student Organizations	Governance Organization	5	0	5	0	2	0	1	0.17
	Service Organization	19	2	21	2	27	2	8	1.37
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	139	13	113	11	100	9	31	5.33
	Professional/Major	11	1	15	1	14	1	10	1.72
	Religious Organization	26	2	37	3	33	3	13	2.23
	Honor Society	8	1	4	0	4	0	2	0.34
	Campus Media	5	0	3	0	3	0	3	0.52
	Other Organization	20	2	22	2	9	1	16	2.75
	ALL Student	**233**	**21**	**220**	**21**	**192**	**17**	**84**	**14.43**
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	43	4	41	4	35	3	9	1.55
	Club Sports/Intramurals	7	1	5	0	11	1	9	1.55
	Other Athletics	4	0	6	1	7	1	0	0.00
	ALL Athletics	**54**	**5**	**52**	**5**	**53**	**5**	**18**	**3.09**
Employment	Campus Job	11	1	14	1	21	2	7	1.20
	Volunteer	10	1	8	1	7	1	2	0.34
	Off Campus Job	22	2	23	2	17	2	5	0.86
	ALL Employment	**43**	**4**	**45**	**4**	**45**	**4**	**14**	**2.41**
Performance/ Creative	Public	8	1	3	0	5	0	13	2.23
	Other Creative	4	0	5	0	17	2	6	1.03
	ALL	**12**	**1**	**8**	**1**	**22**	**2**	**19**	**3.26**
Other (Misc.)	Relationships/Friendships	123	11	140	13	139	13	13	2.23
	Residence Life	22	2	18	2	25	2	0	0.00
	ROTC	8	1	6	1	9	1	3	0.52
	Other Misc	99	9	72	7	60	5	4	0.69
	ALL Other Misc	**252**	**23**	**236**	**22**	**233**	**21**	**20**	**3.44**
	TOTAL	**1110**	**100**	**1067**	**100**	**1103**	**100**	**582**	**100.00**

Table 16 shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, since 2017. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. As usual, well over half (61% in 2020) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (31% in 2020) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Other academic activities (13% in 2020) and student organizations (13% in 2020) are the other areas that show greater than 10% of the submissions.

Transformative Learning Experiences Questionnaire (TEQ) 2020

Many learning opportunities (such as study abroad, undergraduate research, service learning, and internships, often called the "Big 4") have a tremendous potential to lead to transformational changes in a student. In 2010, the portfolio project started administering a survey that asks about many of these experiences together with the goal of assessing not only participation but also how transformative they were for our students.

We define Transformative Learning as follows:

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

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

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

5 – Totally Transformative

4 – Very Transformative

3 – Transformative

2 – Somewhat Transformative

1 – Not Particularly Transformative

Table 17. 2016–2020 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	AVE	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.5	56	3.6	57	3.4	52	3.0	43	3.7	60
BUS	3.0	33	3.1	40	3.1	41	2.7	36	3.2	38
HSE	3.5	58	3.5	53	3.4	47	3.1	50	3.6	56
SAM	3.0	52	2.9	50	3.4	49	3.0	40	3.3	46
SCS	3.5	56	3.6	59	3.4	53	3.0	46	3.5	53
IDSM	3.4	50	3.6	50	3.3	33	3.5	75	3.5	53
ALL	3.3	52	3.3	53	3.4	49	3.0	43	3.5	51

From 2016 to 2018 about half of students answered "Totally" (5) or "Very" (4) Transformative to this question however there has been a downward trend since 2017. The 2019 average (43%) is a bit of an outlier since it is considerably lower than the previous 3 years and it is quite likely that the chaos of the Spring semester with the outbreak of Covid was to blame. In 2020, the university was far more prepared to meet the difficulties of the pandemic and overall things were much more consistent for the students. The average for scores of 4 or 5 over the last 5 years is 50%.

Table 18. 2020 Counts of Scores, Sorted by Major, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	Major	N	1	2	3	4	5	No. Ans.	AVE	% 4 or 5
Arts and Letters	ART	31	0	4	10	13	4	0	3.55	55
	CML	19	0	3	5	7	4	0	3.63	58
	CRWT	19	0	1	6	7	5	0	3.84	63
	ENG	70	0	7	19	31	13	0	3.71	63
	LING	14	0	0	2	8	4	0	4.14	86
	MUSI	20	0	4	5	8	3	0	3.50	55
	THEA	10	0	2	5	1	2	0	3.30	30
	TOTAL	183	0	21	52	75	35	0	3.68	60
Business	ACCT	69	1	16	28	20	4	0	3.14	35
	BSAD	119	7	19	46	38	9	0	3.19	39
	TOTAL	188	8	35	74	58	13	0	3.18	38
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3.00	0
	CMDS	42	1	2	12	19	8	0	3.74	64
	ES	105	3	14	31	47	10	0	3.45	54
	HLTH	77	0	7	27	36	7	0	3.56	56
	NU	46	1	3	17	15	10	0	3.65	54
	TOTAL	273	5	26	90	117	35	0	3.55	56
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	22	1	4	7	7	3	0	3.32	45
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	100
	BIOL	100	2	17	38	33	10	0	3.32	43
	CHEM	18	0	5	3	8	2	0	3.39	56
	CS	48	2	12	14	14	6	0	3.21	42
	MATH	28	2	3	6	14	3	0	3.46	61
	PHYS	10	0	1	5	3	1	0	3.40	40
	STTS	14	0	1	6	5	2	0	3.57	50
	TOTAL	241	7	43	79	85	27	0	3.34	46
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	2	4	16	16	8	0	3.52	52
	ECON	16	0	1	5	6	4	0	3.81	62
	HIST	29	2	4	9	9	4	1	3.32	45
	JUST	31	4	4	9	12	2	0	3.13	45
	PHRE	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	4.00	67
	POL	30	0	2	8	14	6	0	3.80	67
	PSYC	90	0	12	33	34	11	0	3.49	50
	SOAN	17	1	3	3	9	1	0	3.35	59
	TOTAL	262	9	30	84	101	37	1	3.49	53
IDSM	IDSM	15	0	4	3	5	3	0	3.47	53
ALL	ALL	1,162	29	159	382	441	150	1	3.45	51

Examining the counts for each score and the average score for each discipline in the table above reveals very few significant differences. The range of average scores varies between 3.00 to 4.14 with the mean average score as 3.45. Examination of the percentage of students within each major who scored 4 & 5 does vary widely, with its range from 32% to 86%. The two programs have a very small number of students and are the outliers with 0% (3 student - ATHT) and 100% (1 student - BCMB).

Next, students were asked:

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

Table 19. 2020 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	219	18.85
Service Learning	192	16.52
Research	287	24.70
Internship	373	32.10
Leadership	459	39.50
Student-Led Education	55	4.73
Writing	269	23.15
Other	111	9.55
Course	905	77.88
Total 2020 N	1,162	

In 2020, 904 Truman students (78%) listed one or more courses as transformational. The percentages of students within each major vary widely.

Students were asked if they had *"an experience with writing that they would report as transformational."* This year, 269 (23%) students reported such an experience which is consistent with 2019.

Finally, students were asked to report any of these activities that they might have completed:

1) *Study Abroad*

2) *Service Learning*

3) *Undergraduate Research*

4) *Internship*

5) *Leadership*

6) *Student-Led Learning*

7) *Other Transformative Activity*

As stated above, the first 4 of these are considered the "Big 4", since they are quite often transformational. When the students check that they have done any of these seven activities, follow-up questions appear in the prompt. First, we offer radio buttons for the student to tell us how transformative the experience was, with the options being

- *Not at all*
- *A Little*
- *Somewhat*
- *Transformative*

Then we ask the student to describe the activity and how the activity was transformative for them. While these more detailed descriptions of these activities have been solicited from the first year that we used the survey, we have not further mined this data. If the University decided to focus on any of these activities, it could be interesting to see these student reports in more detail. The language of the new curriculum is moving away from the word "transformative" and changing it to "high-impact" so it might be good to change the language of this prompt as well.

Table 20. 2015–2020 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Activity	% Reporting Activity					
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Study Abroad	18	21	20	20	18	19
Service Learning	24	23	17	20	17	17
Research	29	31	31	29	29	25
Internship	33	33	35	32	33	32
Leadership	38	42	41	42	40	40
Student-Led Education	8	7	7	6	5	5
Writing	22	21	21	22	23	23
Other	8	7	8	8	8	10
Course	78	77	75	47	48	78
Any (Big 4)	67	68	70	70	67	63
Any	87	83	85	84	83	94

Table 20 shows the percentages of all Truman students who reported each of these types of activities in the last 6 years. Again, you will notice that the percentages are remarkably consistent over time for most kinds of activities, except the courses category.

Table 21. 2015–2020 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Activity	2016 F	2016 M	2017 F	2017 M	2018 F	2018 M	2019 F	2019 M	2020 F	2020 M
Study Abroad	25	15	24	14	26	9	18	17	24	10
Service Learning	28	15	21	11	25	12	24	8	20	10
Research	35	24	33	29	34	23	31	25	28	18
Internship	35	30	38	31	31	35	32	33	33	31
Leadership	46	36	45	34	46	35	44	33	45	30
Student-Led Education	7	8	8	5	6	5	6	4	5	4
Writing	23	18	24	16	24	19	26	20	26	19
Other	7	8	8	8	6	10	6	10	10	8
Course	40	30	40	31	51	41	51	41	80	75

Note: Because there may have been a systematic analysis problem with the analysis of "Course" columns in previous years, we are only certain that 2020 includes students who specified one course as transformative.

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2020, females again participated in almost all of these types of activities at frequencies higher than males, with the differences ranging from 1 to 15 percentage points. It is interesting to note that males did participate at a slightly higher rate than females in the Internship category in 2015, 2018, 2019 and 2020 and the Leadership category every year by at least 10% more.

Table 22. 2020 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

School	Major	N	StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Course
Arts and Letters	ART	31	29	6	10	26	42	3	26	16	81
	CML	19	58	32	0	11	42	16	26	21	89
	CRWT	19	11	0	0	5	21	5	74	16	89
	ENG	70	19	10	9	19	34	7	44	7	86
	LING	14	50	0	14	14	50	14	29	7	100
	MUSI	20	10	0	10	10	45	5	15	20	75
	THEA	10	10	0	0	20	40	10	20	10	70
	TOTAL	183	25	8	7	16	38	8	37	13	85
Business	ACCT	69	12	16	7	35	38	0	22	6	59
	BSAD	119	24	4	10	39	41	3	17	9	66
	TOTAL	188	19	9	9	37	40	2	19	8	63
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	33	33	67	0	67	0	33	0	33
	CMDS	42	21	26	57	5	52	5	24	10	88
	ES	105	12	43	30	51	41	7	15	8	75
	HLTH	77	9	64	18	39	35	8	16	13	79
	NU	46	37	4	26	46	39	2	20	11	76
	TOTAL	273	17	40	31	39	41	6	18	10	78
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	22	14	32	23	32	36	0	18	14	77
	BCMB	1	100	100	100	100	100	0	0	0	100
	BIOL	100	11	11	45	10	55	3	24	15	83
	CHEM	18	17	0	44	17	33	0	39	11	72
	CS	48	12	2	8	60	27	8	8	6	73
	MATH	28	11	0	18	18	32	11	21	14	75
	PHYS	10	0	0	60	10	40	0	10	0	60
	STTS	14	0	0	14	36	21	7	36	7	79
	TOTAL	241	11	8	32	25	41	5	21	12	78
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	20	7	2	48	39	2	20	15	85
	ECON	16	31	12	31	50	69	0	19	6	81
	HIST	29	18	4	43	25	29	11	36	4	86
	JUST	31	19	6	6	39	19	0	10	0	87
	PHRE	3	33	0	0	33	33	0	33	0	67
	POL	30	27	3	37	53	30	0	43	0	93
	PSYC	90	21	16	50	31	39	4	27	6	78
	SOAN	17	35	24	88	41	47	0	12	12	88
	TOTAL	262	23	10	35	39	37	3	25	6	84
IDSM	IDSM	15	33	40	40	27	53	20	20	13	87
ALL	ALL	1,162	19	17	25	32	40	5	23	10	78

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

Table 22 (cont.) 2020 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

School	Major	N	Big 4 Count	%	Any Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	31	17	55	30	97
	CML	19	16	84	19	100
	CRWT	19	3	16	19	100
	ENG	70	29	41	69	99
	LING	14	9	64	14	100
	MUSI	20	6	30	17	85
	THEA	10	3	30	8	80
	TOTAL	183	83	45	176	96
Business	ACCT	69	35	51	58	84
	BSAD	119	67	56	106	89
	TOTAL	188	102	54	164	87
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	2	67	3	100
	CMDS	42	30	71	40	95
	ES	105	82	78	102	97
	HLTH	77	64	83	72	94
	NU	46	37	80	46	100
	TOTAL	273	215	79	263	96
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	22	19	86	22	100
	BCMB	1	1	100	1	100
	BIOL	100	59	59	96	96
	CHEM	18	10	56	15	83
	CS	48	33	69	44	92
	MATH	28	11	39	25	89
	PHYS	10	6	60	8	80
	STTS	14	6	43	14	100
	TOTAL	241	145	60	225	93
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	46	26	57	44	96
	ECON	16	12	75	15	94
	HIST	29	16	57	26	93
	JUST	31	16	52	28	90
	PHRE	3	2	67	2	67
	POL	30	22	73	28	93
	PSYC	90	65	72	87	97
	SOAN	17	16	94	17	100
	TOTAL	262	175	67	247	95
IDSM	IDSM	15	10	67	15	100
ALL	ALL	1,162	730	63	1,090	94

Truman's Vision Statement includes several references to transformative experiences, and our strategic goals state that all students will have at least one high impact learning experience while here. As mentioned above, this language will be changing with the new curriculum. In 2020, 2 majors have 100% participation in at least one of these types of experiences and 9 others have at least 90% of their students reporting it. In 2020 a total of 8 majors with >90% is similar to previous years: In 2019 there were 8 majors

with >90%: In 2018 there were 11 majors with >90% participation, in 2017, 13, in 2016 7, in 2015, 8. Campus-wide, 63% of all students report having at least one of the "Big 4" and 94% report having some transformative experience.

Table 23. Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2016–2020)

School	Year	N	StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Any
							Percent Participation by Activity					
AAL	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	78
	2019	169	25	13	13	15	56	34	7	39	9	84
	2020	183	25	8	7	16	45	38	8	37	13	96
BUS	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	73
	2019	199	23	5	6	38	60	32	3	14	5	76
	2020	188	19	9	9	37	54	40	2	19	8	87
HSE	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	91
	2019	253	11	38	30	40	80	38	6	12	7	87
	2020	273	17	40	31	39	79	41	6	18	10	96
SAM	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	214	18	12	36	28	69	43	6	16	8	83
	2019	232	15	8	38	28	68	37	5	17	5	83
	2020	241	11	8	32	25	60	41	5	21	12	93
SCS	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	289	20	15	42	35	72	39	6	25	9	88
	2019	246	13	12	35	25	62	36	2	26	7	80
	2020	262	23	10	35	39	67	37	3	25	6	95
IDSM	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
	2019	4	0	50	50	0	75	25	25	50	0	100
	2020	15	33	40	40	27	67	53	20	20	13	100
ALL	2016	1,114	21	23	31	33	68	42	7	21	7	83
	2017	1,170	20	17	31	35	68	41	7	21	8	85
	2018	1,117	20	20	29	32	70	42	6	22	8	84
	2019	1,103	17	16	26	30	66	36	5	21	7	82
	2020	1,162	19	17	25	32	63	40	5	23	10	94

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

Table 23 shows the reported participation rates for students from each school over the last five years. University-wide, these participation numbers have not changed much and the mean number for the last 5 years for ALL schools is 94%

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, 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 are 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 (in italics) as well as the reviewer specific questions (in bold), followed by the datasets of information that readers gleaned from the letters.

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 note this field only accepts numeric values)

Please submit the letter in the box below. Do not include your address or name in the letter. DO NOT UPLOAD THE FILE INTO THE VAULT. You may compose the document in a different application like Word an then cut and paste here if you wish.

Reviewer Specific Question

How many hours did it take the student to create the portfolio?
If they gave a range, like "2-3 hours" please give the average, "2.5"
If they gave something unmeasurable, like "A long time," just leave this blank.
Please do not write the word hours, just the naked number.

Reviewer Specific Question

Assess the student's attitude toward the following items (check the appropriate box):

Reviewer Specific Question

Portfolio Project

- No Indication
- Negative
- Mixed
- Positive

Reviewer Specific Question

Assessment at Truman

- No Indication
- Negative
- Mixed
- Positive

Reviewer Specific Question

     Education at Truman (generally speaking)

- No Indication
- Negative
- Mixed
- Positive

Reviewer Specific Question

     Major at Truman

- No Indication
- Negative
- Mixed
- Positive

Reviewer Specific Question

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

- No
- Yes
- Yes, with findings

Reviewer Specific Question

     Follow-up: Should someone follow up with the student about this letter? (If no then skip).

- Yes - but not me
- Yes - I e-mailed the student

Reviewer Specific Question

     Quotables: Could something from this Cover Letter be quoted in the *Assessment Almanac* or another public venue? Yes - contains Quotable Material

Reviewer Specific Question

     For "Quotables," please use the "General Comments" box at the bottom to describe or to paste/type the beginning phrase of the quotable remarks so that we can find it easily:

Reviewer Specific Question

     Forwardables: Could something from this Cover Letter forwarded to a person or office on campus? (Please don't forward cranky comments to offices or people on-campus - the Portfolio Office will do that).

Table 24. Hours Spent on the Portfolio Project

2020 Percentile	2020 Hours
99	22
90	10
75	7
50	5
25	3
10	2

In 2020, students spent a similar amount of time as in 2018 and 2019 compiling their Portfolio prompt responses, with a mode of 5 hours.

Table 25. Student Attitudes Toward the Portfolio and other Assessment in 2020

School	Major	N	Attitude Towards Portfolio					Attitude Towards Assessment				
			Neg	Mix	Pos	No	W%	Neg	Mix	Pos	No	W%
Arts and Letters	ART	21	1	3	4	13	69	1	1	1	18	50
	CML	16	1	5	1	9	50	0	2	0	14	50
	CRWT	14	0	0	5	9	100	0	1	0	13	50
	ENG	47	4	16	11	16	61	4	6	6	31	56
	LING	11	0	2	0	9	50	0	0	0	11	0
	MUSI	13	2	4	2	5	50	1	3	0	9	38
	THEA	8	3	2	1	2	33	0	1	0	7	50
	TOTAL	**130**	**11**	**32**	**24**	**63**	**60**	**6**	**14**	**7**	**103**	**52**
Business	ACCT	48	8	15	14	11	58	2	8	7	31	65
	BSAD	96	8	22	11	55	54	6	9	13	68	62
	TOTAL	**144**	**16**	**37**	**25**	**66**	**56**	**8**	**17**	**20**	**99**	**63**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	1	2	100	0	0	1	2	100
	CMDS	32	5	5	13	9	67	1	4	0	27	40
	ES	88	9	24	18	37	59	5	20	8	55	55
	HLTH	62	4	9	17	32	72	3	6	8	45	65
	NU	36	1	7	11	17	76	2	7	2	25	50
	TOTAL	**221**	**19**	**45**	**60**	**97**	**67**	**11**	**37**	**19**	**154**	**56**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	15	3	2	1	9	33	1	2	1	11	50
	BCMB	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	BIOL	77	4	13	23	37	74	2	14	6	55	59
	CHEM	9	0	1	3	5	88	0	0	3	6	100
	CS	32	2	4	8	18	71	1	2	2	27	60
	MATH	19	1	4	6	8	73	1	1	2	15	62
	PHYS	8	1	0	4	3	80	0	2	0	6	50
	STTS	10	1	1	0	8	25	0	1	0	9	50
	TOTAL	**171**	**12**	**25**	**45**	**89**	**70**	**5**	**22**	**14**	**130**	**61**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	34	6	6	7	15	53	0	4	3	27	71
	ECON	10	0	2	3	5	80	0	0	1	9	100
	HIST	17	3	4	2	8	44	1	3	0	13	38
	JUST	21	4	4	4	9	50	3	0	1	17	25
	PHRE	1	0	0	1	0	100	0	0	1	0	100
	POL	22	2	4	7	9	69	0	3	2	17	70
	PSYC	54	3	15	14	22	67	6	7	5	36	47
	SOAN	8	0	3	0	5	50	0	1	0	7	50
	TOTAL	**167**	**18**	**38**	**38**	**73**	**61**	**10**	**18**	**13**	**126**	**54**
	IDSM	8	0	3	0	5	50	1	0	0	7	0
	ALL	**841**	**76**	**180**	**192**	**393**	**63**	**41**	**108**	**73**	**619**	**57**

*Note: W%Pos = [(#positve + ½ # mixed)/total]*100*

In 2020, Truman students as a whole were more enthusiastic about the Portfolio (W%Pos=63%) than they were about assessment at Truman in general (W%Pos=57%). The School of Science and Math had the highest Portfolio approval rating (70%) and Business had the lowest (56%). The students in the School of Business were the most positive (63%) about the overall assessment program and students in Arts and Letters were the least positive (52%).

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.

Table 26. Student Attitudes Toward Education at Truman and in their Major for 2020

School	Major	N	Education					Major				
			Neg	Mix	Pos	No	W%	Neg	Mix	Pos	No	W%
Arts and Letters	ART	21	3	9	8	1	62	3	8	3	7	50
	CML	16	1	6	9	0	75	1	5	8	2	75
	CRWT	14	2	7	5	0	61	1	3	6	4	75
	ENG	48	2	17	22	7	74	2	10	20	16	78
	LING	12	1	6	5	0	67	0	3	8	1	86
	MUSI	13	1	2	10	0	85	1	1	9	2	86
	THEA	8	1	1	2	4	62	0	1	2	5	83
	TOTAL	**132**	**11**	**48**	**61**	**12**	**71**	**8**	**31**	**56**	**37**	**75**
Business	ACCT	47	1	8	35	3	89	0	5	29	13	93
	BSAD	97	8	24	54	11	77	10	20	34	33	69
	TOTAL	**144**	**9**	**32**	**89**	**14**	**81**	**10**	**25**	**63**	**46**	**77**
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	0	0	2	1	100	0	0	2	1	100
	CMDS	32	1	9	20	2	82	3	4	18	7	80
	ES	89	4	29	52	4	78	1	16	38	34	84
	HLTH	62	3	16	39	4	81	0	5	39	18	94
	NU	36	1	9	24	2	84	2	10	23	1	80
	TOTAL	**222**	**9**	**63**	**137**	**13**	**81**	**6**	**35**	**120**	**61**	**85**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	15	1	9	5	0	63	0	5	8	2	81
	BCMB	1	0	0	1	0	100	0	0	0	1	0
	BIOL	77	5	21	45	6	78	4	19	37	17	78
	CHEM	8	1	3	3	1	64	2	3	3	0	56
	CS	31	0	10	15	6	80	4	2	13	12	74
	MATH	19	2	8	7	2	65	0	3	11	5	89
	PHYS	8	0	0	7	1	100	0	0	5	3	100
	STTS	11	1	5	3	2	61	0	1	5	5	92
	TOTAL	**170**	**10**	**56**	**86**	**18**	**75**	**10**	**33**	**82**	**45**	**79**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	34	1	13	16	4	75	1	7	12	14	78
	ECON	10	0	6	4	0	70	0	3	6	1	83
	HIST	17	1	4	9	3	79	0	3	4	10	79
	JUST	21	2	7	12	0	74	0	4	9	8	85
	PHRE	1	0	0	1	0	100	0	0	1	0	100
	POL	22	0	12	8	2	70	0	3	12	7	90
	PSYC	54	2	15	33	4	81	0	7	25	22	89
	SOAN	8	0	7	1	0	56	0	1	4	3	90
	TOTAL	**167**	**6**	**64**	**84**	**13**	**75**	**1**	**28**	**73**	**65**	**85**
	IDSM	8	0	3	4	1	79	0	2	3	3	80
	ALL	**843**	**45**	**266**	**461**	**71**	**77**	**35**	**154**	**397**	**257**	**81**

Student attitudes toward their majors (77%) and to their education overall (81%) were overwhelmingly positive again in 2020. 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 the future.

Table 27. Evidence of Students' Self-Reflection in their 2020 Letters to Truman

School	Major	N	No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
Arts and Letters	ART	21	6	10	5	71
	CML	15	0	8	7	100
	CRWT	15	2	10	3	87
	ENG	47	10	27	10	79
	LING	12	3	9	0	75
	MUSI	13	0	9	4	100
	THEA	8	6	2	0	25
	TOTAL	**131**	**27**	**75**	**29**	**79**
Business	ACCT	48	17	25	6	65
	BSAD	97	31	53	13	68
	TOTAL	145	48	78	19	67
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	3	1	2	0	67
	CMDS	32	4	16	12	88
	ES	86	18	52	16	79
	HLTH	62	8	40	14	87
	NU	37	5	26	6	86
	TOTAL	**220**	**36**	**136**	**48**	**84**
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	15	3	10	2	80
	BCMB	1	1	0	0	0
	BIOL	77	20	45	12	74
	CHEM	9	1	8	0	89
	CS	32	15	14	3	53
	MATH	19	7	8	4	63
	PHYS	8	2	4	2	75
	STTS	11	4	5	2	64
	TOTAL	**172**	**53**	**94**	**25**	**69**
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	34	8	15	11	76
	ECON	9	1	6	2	89
	HIST	17	6	6	5	65

School	Major	N	No	Yes	Findings	%Reflect
	JUST	21	8	8	5	62
	PHRE	1	0	1	0	100
	POL	21	5	13	3	76
	PSYC	52	8	35	9	85
	SOAN	8	1	5	2	88
	TOTAL	**163**	**37**	**89**	**37**	**77**
	IDSM	8	1	6	1	88
	ALL	**839**	**202**	**478**	**159**	**76**

Table 27 shows that 71 percent of graduates reveal sincere reflections about their experiences and growth during their time here at Truman. The results by discipline show a range of 25% to 89% although there were. One trend that has continued for four years now is that many of the letters mention 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, the last four year's graduates reported that they were still strongly feeling the effects 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.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2020 we planned to continue the two week, live format in the spring, however, due to the covid outbreak plans were changed at the last minute and everything was moved online through Zoom. The budget was also eliminated for the reading session so we were required to ask for volunteers to complete the reading which left us with only 23 readers total; half of what we normally would expect. There were not enough readers to complete everything so we created a plan for sampling. Instead of doing a random sampling, Dean DeCook created a spreadsheet so that we could be sure that all departments (especially the small ones) were represented Two weeks of reading occurred in May starting on the 7th and 18th. These two sessions covered the Critical Thinking, Interdisciplinary, and Letters to Truman Prompts. An additional session with 8 volunteers was created in the spring semester during the MLK break on January 18, 2021 to read the Self Discovery prompt. The Deans and Provost also helped read the Letters to Truman since we promise the students that we will read every letter. No double reading occurred for 2020 due to the small number of volunteers. While I was grateful for the people who did read with no compensation, my fear is that if there is no

budget again in 2021 the number of readers will diminish further and something new will need to be tried.

Faculty development has been an important aspect of the portfolio reading process however this aspect of the experience was quite diminished in the online format. While some discussion took place in between the range-finding, everyone read asynchronously with no discussion. Another difficulty was that some of the readers lost energy and motivation as the week wore on. It was difficult to get even the sample reading done. Periodically technical issues come up with the way the prompts are organized and when everyone is in the same room reading it is easy to fix issues quickly. For example, there was an issue with the Self Discovery prompt which went undetected until the reports were run in the fall. For some reason the data was not saving as the reading occurred and the prompt was out of order so everything needed to be re-read at a future date.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our 2020 office staff 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 to help instruct students (and professors) 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. During their office hours they answer student questions via email or make face-to-face appointments for individuals. This year, Mahima Thapa was the Office Manager and, with the help of the former Office Manager Juliette Miller she organized our worker's office hours, trained new workers, and performed other activities.

As Director, I communicate regularly with our undergraduate students. Each semester, every undergraduate degree-seeking student received an email describing the portfolio project, although at different levels of detail for different levels of students. All students with 0-90 accumulated credit hours received a brief missive that reminds them of the existence of the portfolio and that they should store their academic treasures in their portfolio vault. The freshman email specifically provided instructions for how to submit answers to new fall and spring semester Work-Life prompts that were developed recently. These new prompts forced students to open the portfolio to create profiles and then interact with it at least twice as a requirement for the freshman year experience. Students with more than 90 hours receive a much more detailed missive that describes explicitly how to complete the portfolio process during the year that they plan to graduate. It is becoming more rare for students to claim not to have heard of this requirement. We continue to publicize the portfolio using our promotional posters asking "What is in your Vault?" to remind students to put their treasures there.

I also communicate predominantly by email with Truman faculty for several purposes. I like to remind faculty who teach freshman level classes that they may invite one of the portfolio office staff to give a very short presentation to get students to log

into our system; many of these faculty require the freshmen to place some document in 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. I try to make the assignments of the reading weeks by mid-April by issuing official invitations to read by email.

I lead a reading session for the Letters to Truman for the provost and all of the deans which led to the decision to try to determine some new ways to analyze the letters. This session was instrumental in helping our administration realize even more the importance of the data collected in the portfolio, especially the LTT prompt. Aside from simply reading the letters there are plans to create a block of text that will be searchable and used for other types of text mining research.

My work on the portfolio this year has been supported in a tremendous way by former portfolio directors. This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members: Liz Jorn (HSE, since 2008), Anne Moody (SAM, since 2013), 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 procedures and most of them have been available for the reading sessions as well.

2020 Portfolio Report Summary and Future Plans

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

- Efficiency: Everything in the portfolio should be used for campus assessment and anything not useful should be removed.
- Feedback: Evolve the portfolio away from being perceived as a "black hole" where students submit work 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?

Using our current 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 portfolio project is well placed to continue to function as an important component of Truman's assessment program although budget and software issues will potentially become an issue in the near future. The senior prompts for the upcoming 2020-21 academic year will stay the same. The new freshman prompts that started last year are already doing a good job of introducing students to the portfolio right when they get here.

The portfolio reading weeks provide valuable faculty growth opportunities, initiate new readers into the culture of our institution, reinvigorate the dedication of more senior readers, and build bridges between readers from all across campus. It is a concern that the Covid crisis has moved the senior portfolio process to all-online with only volunteers. While there are many volunteers this year that are willing to help in an emergency situation as the crisis unfolds, I fear that there will be a continual decline in participation if there are no longer stipends offered. If there are fewer readers then we are no longer able to read all of everything as we have in years past and inter-rater reliability will be difficult to maintain if we don't have enough people to double read some of the submissions. A statistical sampling of the prompts worked this year but it creates more work to organize. I also found that readers lost interest over time as they were reading things on their own over the course of a week. When reading sessions are live there is a "team effort" vibe in the room and everyone stays on task for 4-5 hours working to get things done. Some of the volunteer readers were able to do about half of what they were asked but then lost initiative to continue and simply didn't complete a whole list as assigned. When we do sessions live, the faster readers are able to make up for the slower readers and everything usually gets read. Also, when reading live, if there are any technical issues or problems with the prompts it is easy to fix issues as they come up. When online, if an issue doesn't get identified by someone quickly it is more likely to be discovered only when the reading is done. It is definitely much easier to handle issues when everyone is in the room together.

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. It would be good to make an effort to refresh the importance of the portfolio as one of the central assessment tools of our institution and it would also serve us well to make sure that more faculty are invested in using the data that comes from the portfolio every year aside from only the 5 year review. Perhaps junior faculty and any staff who are an integral part to the academic side of student success could be compelled to participate in reading sessions early on.