Truman State University Portfolio Data

2021-2022 Academic Year

Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director - Narrative

Scott Thatcher - Tables

6-12-2023

2022 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 the academic year 2021-2022, 891 students graduated and 890 students submitted portfolios.

When is it administered?

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

What office administers it?

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

Who originates the submission requirements for portfolios?

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

When are results typically available?

The portfolios have been read and scored in May and August interims although more recently only in May. The results are usually available late in the fall or early in spring of the following year.

What type of information is sought?

Faculty evaluators and the Assessment Committee designate the types of works requested from students, but many of the requested items have remained constant for multiple years. In the 2021-2022

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 Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Occasional reports are given to governance, at strategic planning workshops (SPAW), and other forums. Most departments use the information to reform their curriculum, improve programs, and engage in self-study, as mandated by the Faculty Senate. Portfolio data is particularly useful when departments are analyzing data in preparation for a 5-year review. Faculty 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 2018–2022

School	Major	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Arts and Letters	ART	30	20	31	22	17
	CML	25	24	19	22	14
	CRWT	17	12	19	18	20
	ENG	61	68	71	46	47
	LING	7	11	14	15	13
	MUSI	28	24	20	21	19
	THEA	15	10	10	12	4
	TOTAL	183	169	184	156	134
Business	ACCT	56	63	69	60	53
	BSAD	124	136	119	92	87
	TOTAL	180	199	188	152	140
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	7	9	3		
	CMDS	36	27	42	40	32
	ES	85	101	105	90	77
	HLTH	73	71	77	59	46
	NU	47	45	46	55	50
	TOTAL	248	253	273	244	205
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	42	22	20	23
	BCMB			1	8	21
	BIOL	104	99	100	93	76
	CHEM	18	19	18	21	13
	CS	33	41	48	56	37
	MATH	28	15	28	19	19
	PHYS	8	9	10	7	6
	STTS	3	7	14	12	9
	TOTAL	214	232	241	236	204
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	71	46	47	43	31
	ECON	11	9	16	15	8
	HIST	40	32	29	33	20
	JUST	26	26	31	32	25
	PHRE	8	4	3	9	5
	POL	24	19	30	31	20
	PSYC	89	93	90	81	64
	SOAN	19	17	17	19	19
	TOTAL	288	246	263	263	192
IDSM	IDSM	3	4	15	6	6
LIBS	LIBS				3	9
ALL	ALL	1,116	1,103	1,164	1,060	890

The blank spaces related to new programs (LIBS-2021, BCMB-2020, STTS-2018)

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

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

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

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

Critical Thinking Prompt

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

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

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

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

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

> *Source of 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 2022

School	Major	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
Arts and Letters	ART	16	2.56	2.56	2.81	1.88	9.81	38	2.75
	CML	14	2.64	2.50	2.64	2.43	10.21	43	2.86
	CRWT	19	2.53	2.89	2.89	2.53	10.84	47	3.00
	ENG	44	2.84	2.75	2.80	2.45	10.84	52	2.86
	LING	12	3.00	3.08	3.08	2.75	11.92	67	3.08
	MUSI	17	2.65	2.94	2.65	2.18	10.41	53	2.82
	THEA	4	2.50	2.25	2.75	2.25	9.75	25	2.50
	TOTAL	126	2.71	2.76	2.80	2.37	10.65	49	2.87
Business	ACCT	50	2.78	2.70	2.80	2.30	10.58	52	2.60
	BSAD	81	2.49	2.74	2.72	2.28	10.23	44	2.72
	TOTAL	131	2.60	2.73	2.75	2.29	10.37	47	2.67
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	31	2.45	2.71	2.42	2.19	9.77	39	2.87
	ES	74	2.57	2.54	2.69	2.19	9.99	43	2.69
	HLTH	44	2.86	2.61	2.89	2.23	10.59	45	2.70
	NU	49	3.04	3.04	3.14	2.51	11.73	67	3.16
	TOTAL	198	2.73	2.71	2.80	2.28	10.52	49	2.84
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	2.74	2.61	2.39	2.22	9.96	43	2.78
	BCMB	20	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.20	9.55	45	2.50
	BIOL	74	2.69	2.76	2.97	2.42	10.84	53	2.80
	CHEM	13	3.38	3.08	3.38	3.15	13.00	85	3.46
	CS	36	2.61	2.72	2.72	2.58	10.64	56	2.67
	MATH	18	3.17	2.78	3.06	2.67	11.67	67	2.89
	PHYS	6	3.33	2.67	3.17	2.33	11.50	67	3.17
	STTS	9	2.56	2.22	2.56	2.33	9.67	33	2.67
	TOTAL	199	2.76	2.70	2.83	2.47	10.75	54	2.80
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	30	2.57	2.47	2.67	2.07	9.77	40	2.73
	ECON	8	2.75	3.50	3.38	2.75	12.38	75	3.00
	HIST	20	2.80	2.95	3.25	2.80	11.80	60	2.90
	JUST	22	2.36	2.50	2.55	1.95	9.36	45	2.55
	PHRE	5	2.20	2.40	2.60	2.00	9.20	40	2.40
	POL	18	3.06	3.11	3.17	2.83	12.17	72	3.22
	PSYC	59	2.88	2.88	2.90	2.49	11.15	63	2.93
	SOAN	19	2.74	2.89	2.95	2.42	11.00	58	2.95
	TOTAL	181	2.73	2.81	2.90	2.41	10.86	57	2.87
IDSM	IDSM	6	3.00	3.00	3.17	2.67	11.83	83	3.33
LIBS	LIBS	9	2.89	3.00	3.11	2.56	11.56	78	2.89
ALL	ALL	850	2.72	2.74	2.83	2.37	10.66	52	2.82

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

The university average Sum4 score is 10.66 and all schools have an average Sum4 above 10. On the departmental level, 9 departments showed a Sum4 average of less than 10. This is starting to look like a trend downward since in the past only one or two departments were below 10%. The factors that lead to these lower scores are not clear and it is possible some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. Many departments scored at the high end of the range (>11), although some of the high scores are surely due to only a few papers being read. It is possible this could be a result of the pandemic or it is possible that the "lower enrollment" versus maintaining the status of "highly selective" issue is at play.

Viewing the data through the lens of the percentage of students who earned 10 or more on the Sum4 for critical thinking gives a different perspective. University-wide, 52% of 2022 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is significantly lower than prior years.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2022 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
ACCT	26	3.38	3.04	3.19	2.65	12.27	88	2.92
AGSC	22	2.77	2.64	2.41	2.23	10.05	45	2.86
ART	18	2.39	2.61	2.89	2.17	10.06	44	2.72
BIOL	47	2.83	2.79	3.13	2.53	11.28	60	2.91
BSAD	36	2.53	2.94	3.03	2.19	10.69	47	2.78
CHEM	18	3.06	2.89	3.28	2.83	12.06	72	3.28
CLAS	4	2.25	2.25	3.00	2.25	9.75	25	3.00
CMDS	25	2.40	2.68	2.36	2.28	9.72	36	2.88
COMM	30	2.63	2.57	2.73	2.13	10.07	47	2.80
CS	21	2.76	2.90	2.86	2.76	11.29	62	2.86
ECON	15	2.93	3.33	3.27	2.87	12.40	80	3.07
ED	12	2.75	2.67	2.50	2.17	10.08	42	2.58
ENG	111	2.59	2.51	2.63	2.24	9.97	40	2.68
ENVS	2	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.50	12.50	100	3.00
ES	24	2.33	2.58	2.92	2.25	10.08	42	2.71
FREN	2	2.50	2.00	1.00	3.00	8.50	0	3.00
HIST	30	2.80	2.80	3.00	2.63	11.23	60	2.80
HLTH	25	3.28	2.92	3.12	2.32	11.64	64	2.88
IDSM	2	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	11.00	50	2.50
INDV	3	3.00	3.33	3.00	2.67	12.00	100	3.00
ITAL	1	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	10.00	0	3.00
JINS	112	2.47	2.69	2.71	2.29	10.17	41	2.67
JUST	23	2.43	2.57	2.65	2.09	9.74	48	2.48
LING	15	3.13	3.00	3.07	2.60	11.80	73	3.13
MATH	1	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	6.00	0	3.00
MS	2	3.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	9.50	50	3.00
MUSI	12	2.75	3.00	2.92	2.17	10.83	58	3.00
NU	37	3.08	3.22	3.27	2.51	12.08	70	3.30
PHRE	46	2.78	2.54	2.50	2.33	10.15	52	2.59
PHYS	8	3.25	2.50	3.00	2.00	10.75	62	3.25
POL	22	2.82	2.95	3.00	2.50	11.27	55	3.05
PSYC	33	2.88	2.85	2.88	2.55	11.15	64	2.94
SOAN	22	2.91	3.09	2.95	2.50	11.45	64	3.05
SPAN	10	2.90	2.70	2.80	2.50	10.90	70	2.90
STAT	3	2.33	2.00	2.67	2.33	9.33	0	3.00
STEM	2	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.50	12.50	50	3.00
THEA	1	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	9.00	0	2.00
TRU	8	2.00	1.88	2.00	1.62	7.50	12	2.25
Missing	19	2.58	2.58	2.84	2.63	10.63	53	2.63

Table 3 shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular course prefix. As usual, JINS (112) and ENG (111f) courses led to the greatest number of submissions, but these are not the courses that led to the highest Sum4 or 10+(%).

Table 4. CTW 2022 Inter-Rater Reliability

Due to the large number of extra submissions that needed to be read from 2021 (due to the Covid outbreak and the second year of stipends being eliminated) we were unable to complete a table displaying data for inter-rater reliability this year.

Table 5. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-Wide Scores 2018–2022

CTW: University-Wide Scores			
Year	N	Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2018	1,117	10.10	61
2019	1,103	10.60	89
2020	573	11.45	63
2021	984	10.99	56
2022	850	10.66	52

Table 5 shows that the Sum4 and 10+ percentages are, for the second year in a row lower than the previous four years.

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.

13

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 2018–2022

School	Major	N 2022	Mean 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2+(%) 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Arts and Letters	ART	17	2.13	1.60	2.04	1.93	1.74	73	50	74	55	59
	CML	14	2.12	2.08	2.29	2.61	2.21	76	71	76	84	79
	CRWT	20	2.29	1.50	1.89	2.21	1.85	88	58	72	71	60
	ENG	45	2.18	1.91	2.32	2.26	2.06	75	60	81	73	71
	LING	12	1.71	2.09	2.08	2.27	2.33	71	73	62	85	67
	MUSI	17	2.07	1.92	2.24	2.37	2.47	79	67	59	79	88
	THEA	4	1.87	1.50	2.00	2.45	1.75	60	50	57	70	50
	TOTAL	129	2.11	1.80	2.18	2.28	2.07	75	55	73	73	70
Business	ACCT	52	1.75	1.79	2.18	1.91	2.02	64	57	79	66	65
	BSAD	84	1.81	1.81	2.19	2.22	1.75	66	63	74	77	54
	TOTAL	136	1.79	1.80	2.19	2.09	1.85	66	53	75	72	58
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT		2.29	1.78	1.67			86	56	67		
	CMDS	31	2.14	1.74	2.06	2.28	2.15	67	56	71	69	71
	ES	73	1.80	1.60	2.16	2.05	2.10	6	56	74	67	66
	HLTH	46	2.15	1.87	2.39	2.30	2.00	73	62	78	75	70
	NU	47	2.04	2.02	2.40	2.42	1.89	68	69	81	75	62
	TOTAL	197	2.01	1.80	2.25	2.24	2.04	67	57	76	71	66
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	2.25	1.79	2.60	2.29	2.09	75	60	80	82	74
	BCMB	21			2.00	3.00	1.90			100	86	67
	BIOL	76	2.02	1.93	2.41	2.22	2.11	68	65	85	77	71
	CHEM	13	2.22	2.11	2.38	2.15	1.96	72	58	77	70	62
	CS	35	2.21	1.85	2.42	2.26	2.01	76	56	75	77	66
	MATH	19	2.18	2.07	1.77	1.92	2.05	68	73	64	50	74
	PHYS	6	0.75	1.22	2.00	2.42	1.67	25	22	62	83	33
	STTS	9	2.33	1.43	2.31	2.15	1.78	100	57	69	90	67
	TOTAL	202	2.07	1.77	2.33	2.23	2.03	69	55	78	76	68
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	28	2.13	1.93	2.22	2.44	1.88	70	65	78	86	54
	ECON	8	2.09	2.33	2.45	2.46	2.44	73	78	82	86	62
	HIST	20	2.24	1.88	2.13	2.53	2.15	80	66	83	81	70
	JUST	25	1.77	1.69	1.98	1.92	1.98	65	58	76	71	60
	PHRE	5	2.13	2.00	2.50	2.43	1.60	75	75	100	71	60
	POL	18	1.88	2.58	3.00	2.53	2.72	63	89	96	90	83
	PSYC	60	1.98	1.78	2.00	2.07	1.86	69	58	66	70	53
	SOAN	19	2.11	1.76	2.50	2.33	2.39	74	65	93	83	79
	TOTAL	183	2.04	2.00	2.24	2.28	2.07	71	56	78	78	62
IDSM	IDSM	5	2.00	1.50	2.36	2.42	2.20	67	50	79	83	80
LIBS	LIBS	8				1.50	2.25				67	75
ALL	ALL	860	2.01	1.78	2.24	2.23	2.02	69	55	76	74	65

Blank spaces are due to either new programs (STTS 2018,BCMB, 2020, LIBS in 2021) or 0 graduates for that year (ATHT, 2021).

University-wide, the 2022 average score is 2.02 which is slightly lower than last year and just below the 5 year average of 2.05. 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. An effort should be made to verify that each JINS instructor understands that at least one artifact from their class should fit this prompt well. In one of the discussions during the reading session, one instructor who taught a JINS course remarked that they didn't have anything appropriate for students to submit for this prompt. The dean who is newly in charge of bolstering interdisciplinary thinking on campus was informed of this and some initiative should be taking place in the near future to help remedy this issue.

Table 7. Interdisciplinary Thinking: 2022 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Mean	2+(%)
JINS	551	2.22	74
PHRE	39	1.62	59
ENG	34	1.63	53
SOAN	20	2.05	60
BSAD	16	1.56	50
None Given	15	1.53	53
PSYC	14	1.32	36
HIST	13	2.31	77
ECON	12	1.92	50
JUST	11	1.59	36
IDSM	9	2.33	89
SPAN	8	1.12	38
COMM	8	1.50	25
CLAS	8	1.75	50
POL	7	2.21	71
ED	7	0.93	29
CMDS	7	1.29	29
BIOL	7	1.00	14
ART	7	1.93	71
HLTH	6	1.33	50
ES	6	0.50	0
CS	6	2.33	67
< 5	49	1.76	49

As intended, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2022 (551). The submissions from JINS courses scored quite well with our rubric (74% at 2+) and the overall percentage is a about the same as the average score for the last 5 years (74%). 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. As mentioned above, it would be a good project to make sure that all JINS instructors are aware of the portfolio prompt and are actually including the rubric in the course. Instructors should be aware that their course should produce at least one artifact with the rubric in mind. Up until this point there has not been a committee or administrator tasked with making sure JINS instructors are told all of this information. Prompts for final papers could perhaps be more specific if improved

Table 8. IDS 2022 Inter-Rater Reliability

2022 Abs Diff	N	%
3	2	4
2	8	16
1	22	45
0	17	35
Total	49	100

In 2022, 860 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 49 were scored by two readers. Double reading was at a minimum in 2022 due to the reading load generated by needing to make up for 2021 submissions

Self-Discovery Prompt, Data, and Discussion

The Portfolio's newest prompt is the Self-Discovery Prompt (Fall, 2015), which was envisioned as a way to explore how students are discovering their true selves with our present curriculum and circumstances.

During the spring of 2015, at the request of President Troy Paino, the campus participated in Action Teams that explored the ways that a Truman education could be made more distinctive for recruiting purposes. One of the Action Teams read and discussed **Why Choose the Liberal Arts** by Mark William Roche. Roche proposes three pillars of Liberal Education: 1) Intrinsic learning (learning for its own sake), 2) practical learning (learning related to career preparation), and 3) character formation, especially in connection to a higher purpose or calling. This final pillar was the motivation behind the Self-Discovery prompt. The character formation pillar also moved the Blueprint and Next Step teams to develop proposed common Freshman Seminars. These Self and Society Seminars began in 2018.

The Self-Discovery prompt itself is given here (in italics), followed by the set of reviewer specific questions (in bold). Reviewers are asked to tally all the reasons that led the student to report self-discovery, and that data is given in the first set of tables. Note that 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	Other Academic	Student Organization
○ LSP	○ Research	○ Governance
○ Major	○ Internship	○ Service Organization
○ Capstone	○ Study Abroad	○ Social Fraternity/Sorority
○ Minor	○ Resume / College Application / Professional Statement	○ Professional/Major
○ Elective	○ Service Learning	○ Religious
	○ Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring	○ Honor Society
	○ Other: [ ]	○ Campus Media
		○ Other: [ ]

Athletics	Employment
○ Varsity Athletics	○ Campus Employment
○ Club Sports Intramurals	○ Volunteer Work
○ Other Athletics	○ Off-Campus Job

Performance/Creative Activity	Other
○ Public Performance/Recital	○ Relationships/Friendships
○ Other Creative Effort	○ Residence Life
	○ ROTC
	○ Other: [ ]

Table 9. Self-Discovery: University-Wide Student Rationales 2018–2022

Category	Reason	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	31	23	7	16	22
	New Perspective on Self	29	25	16	24	21
	Personal Growth	57	60	46	74	63
	Responsibility	19	20	10	13	13
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	4	6	2	3	4
Academic/Scholarship	Personal Best	6	10	5	5	4
	Especially Challenging	21	26	15	17	14
	Intellectual Risk	6	7	6	4	3
	Vocational Development	23	21	13	18	19
	Worked as Professional	14	12	9	8	8
Relationships	Service to Others	10	11	5	8	6
	Collaboration w/ Peers	24	21	16	16	18
	Collaboration w/ Professional	12	11	7	9	11
	Mentoring Internship	8	5	4	7	6

There is an issue here related to faculty identification of "why" a student's experience was important. Faculty could check multiple-choice check-boxes to indicate one or more reasons, listed in the table above. However, it appears that faculty responses default to "N" for "no" for students who did not respond to the self-discovery prompt, rather than, say, "NA" for no value. In other words, it doesn't appear that there is a method to determine which self-discovery prompts were evaluated by reviewers, and which were not, since "N" could indicate either that a submission wasn't reviewed, or that it was reviewed and found not to exhibit that particular characteristic. We have to assume that any student response was rated by reviewers, and we'll use the "Other Source/Truman Course" variable to determine whether a student responded.

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

The category **Risk/Challenge/Growth** offered the greatest potential for self-discovery university-wide. For all students, *Personal Growth* across the past 5 years is consistently the biggest reason for self-discovery (2018: 57%, 2019: 60%, 2020: 46%, 2021: 74%, 2022: 63). In 2022 *Deep Introspection* was the next most significant category (21 %)

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, *Vocational Development* (2018: 23%, 2019: 21%, 2020: 13%, 2021:18%, 2022) was higher than *Especially Challenging* as a significant category of self-discovery (2018: 21%, 2019: 26%, 2020: 15%, 2021: 17%, 2022: 14%). Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration w/* Peers (2018: 24%, 2019: 21%, 2020: 16%, 2021,16%, 2022: 18).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2022 is tabulated in tables 10-12 below. How different majors' students are motivated should be valuable information for the faculty as they craft improvements within their majors.

Table 10. Self-Discovery: 2022 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Deep Introspection Yes	Deep Introspection Percent	New Perspective on Self Yes	New Perspective on Self Percent	Personal Growth Yes	Personal Growth Percent	Responsibility Yes	Responsibility Percent	Moral/Ethical Dilemma Yes	Moral/Ethical Dilemma Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	17	3	18	6	35	12	71	3	18	1	6
	CML	14	5	36	3	21	7	50	1	7	1	7
	CRWT	20	6	30	4	20	10	50	0	0	0	0
	ENG	47	11	23	12	26	37	79	8	17	1	2
	LING	13	3	23	1	8	4	31	0	0	0	0
	MUSI	19	4	21	2	11	12	63	4	21	0	0
	THEA	4	1	25	2	50	3	75	1	25	0	0
	TOTAL	134	33	25	30	22	85	63	17	13	3	2
Business	ACCT	53	9	17	12	23	37	70	10	19	2	4
	BSAD	87	12	14	18	21	52	60	13	15	2	2
	TOTAL	140	21	15	30	21	89	64	23	16	4	3
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	11	34	10	31	23	72	6	19	3	9
	ES	77	19	25	10	13	49	64	9	12	2	3
	HLTH	46	11	24	6	13	29	63	8	17	0	0
	NU	50	9	18	7	14	29	58	9	18	1	2
	TOTAL	205	50	24	33	16	130	63	32	16	6	3
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	3	13	4	17	15	65	3	13	0	0
	BCMB	21	8	38	5	24	16	76	2	10	1	5
	BIOL	76	14	18	15	20	48	63	8	11	3	4
	CHEM	13	5	38	3	23	10	77	3	23	2	15
	CS	37	6	16	7	19	26	70	2	5	1	3
	MATH	19	6	32	2	11	12	63	4	21	2	11
	PHYS	6	2	33	0	0	3	50	1	17	1	17
	STTS	9	2	22	3	33	5	56	1	11	0	0
	TOTAL	204	46	23	39	19	135	66	24	12	10	5
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	4	13	5	16	13	42	3	10	0	0
	ECON	8	2	25	0	0	8	100	0	0	1	12
	HIST	20	4	20	9	45	10	50	3	15	1	5
	JUST	25	4	16	7	28	14	56	4	16	2	8
	PHRE	5	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0
	POL	20	5	25	4	20	12	60	3	15	1	5
	PSYC	64	19	30	17	27	40	62	5	8	2	3
	SOAN	19	5	26	7	37	10	53	2	11	1	5
	TOTAL	192	43	22	49	26	112	58	20	10	8	4
IDSM	IDSM	6	1	17	2	33	3	50	1	17	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	9	5	56	2	22	5	56	0	0	1	11
ALL	ALL	890	199	22	185	21	559	63	117	13	32	4

Table 11. Self-Discovery: 2022 Student Academic/Scholarship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Personal Best		Especially Challenging		Intellectual Risk		Vocational Development		Worked as Professional	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	17	2	12	0	0	2	12	1	6	2	12
	CML	14	0	0	2	14	1	7	6	43	0	0
	CRWT	20	1	5	4	20	4	20	1	5	1	5
	ENG	47	3	6	3	6	2	4	7	15	4	9
	LING	13	0	0	2	15	1	8	2	15	0	0
	MUSI	19	2	11	4	21	0	0	4	21	0	0
	THEA	4	1	25	0	0	1	25	1	25	0	0
	TOTAL	134	9	7	15	11	11	8	22	16	7	5
Business	ACCT	53	2	4	5	9	1	2	6	11	6	11
	BSAD	87	4	5	12	14	3	3	11	13	9	10
	TOTAL	140	6	4	17	12	4	3	17	12	15	11
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	1	3	2	6	0	0	6	19	3	9
	ES	77	1	1	14	18	0	0	19	25	9	12
	HLTH	46	0	0	6	13	0	0	11	24	5	11
	NU	50	0	0	7	14	2	4	20	40	7	14
	TOTAL	205	2	1	29	14	2	1	56	27	24	12
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	0	0	1	4	0	0	8	35	1	4
	BCMB	21	1	5	5	24	2	10	3	14	4	19
	BIOL	76	4	5	15	20	0	0	8	11	2	3
	CHEM	13	1	8	2	15	0	0	3	23	2	15
	CS	37	1	3	6	16	3	8	7	19	1	3
	MATH	19	1	5	2	11	0	0	1	5	1	5
	PHYS	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0
	STTS	9	1	11	4	44	1	11	1	11	0	0
	TOTAL	204	9	4	35	17	6	3	32	16	11	5
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	2	6	9	29	3	10	7	23	1	3
	ECON	8	0	0	3	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
	HIST	20	1	5	3	15	2	10	3	15	1	5
	JUST	25	1	4	4	16	1	4	10	40	2	8
	PHRE	5	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	20
	POL	20	2	10	2	10	0	0	2	10	1	5
	PSYC	64	3	5	5	8	0	0	10	16	2	3
	SOAN	19	1	5	2	11	1	5	5	26	2	11
	TOTAL	192	10	5	29	15	7	4	37	19	10	5
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	3	50	1	17	1	17	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	9	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	ALL	890	36	4	129	14	31	3	165	19	67	8

Table 12. Self-Discovery: 2022 Student Relationship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Service to Others		Collaboration w/ Peers		Collaboration w/ Professional		Mentoring Internship	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	17	0	0	4	24	1	6	1	6
	CML	14	0	0	3	21	3	21	3	21
	CRWT	20	0	0	5	25	3	15	3	15
	ENG	47	2	4	6	13	6	13	3	6
	LING	13	0	0	3	23	3	23	0	0
	MUSI	19	0	0	1	5	4	21	1	5
	THEA	4	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
	TOTAL	134	3	2	23	17	21	16	12	9
Business	ACCT	53	7	13	10	19	4	8	3	6
	BSAD	87	6	7	19	22	5	6	2	2
	TOTAL	140	13	9	29	21	9	6	5	4
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	1	3	5	16	2	6	1	3
	ES	77	4	5	17	22	10	13	5	6
	HLTH	46	3	7	10	22	7	15	6	13
	NU	50	6	12	5	10	5	10	3	6
	TOTAL	205	14	7	37	18	24	12	15	7
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	0	0	2	9	2	9	2	9
	BCMB	21	1	5	5	24	2	10	2	10
	BIOL	76	4	5	20	26	11	14	2	3
	CHEM	13	3	23	3	23	5	38	3	23
	CS	37	1	3	5	14	3	8	1	3
	MATH	19	0	0	4	21	1	5	1	5
	PHYS	6	0	0	4	67	1	17	0	0
	STTS	9	1	11	2	22	1	11	2	22
	TOTAL	204	10	5	45	22	26	13	13	6
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	1	3	2	6	3	10	0	0
	ECON	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
	HIST	20	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0
	JUST	25	1	4	5	20	4	16	2	8
	PHRE	5	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0
	POL	20	1	5	4	20	1	5	1	5
	PSYC	64	6	9	9	14	3	5	3	5
	SOAN	19	1	5	3	16	3	16	0	0
	TOTAL	192	11	6	24	12	16	8	7	4
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	2	33	1	17	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	9	0	0	2	22	3	33	1	11
ALL	ALL	890	51	6	162	18	100	11	53	6

Table 13. Self-Discovery: Context of the Experience 2020–2022

SELF Category	SELF Context	2020 N	2020%	2021 N	2021%	2022 N	2022%
Coursework	LSP	78	7	60	6	54	6
	Major	259	24	255	25	209	25
	Capstone	18	2	10	1	8	1
	Minor	33	3	44	4	35	4
	Elective	41	4	41	4	32	4
	All	429	38	410	39	338	38
Other Academic	Research	17	2	18	2	17	2
	Internship	39	4	21	2	24	3
	Study Abroad	52	5	32	3	11	1
	Resume/Prof. Statement	6	1	7	1	6	1
	Service Learning	4	0	5	0	4	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	17	2	26	3	6	1
	Other Academic	28	3	NA	NA		
	All	163	15	109	10	68	8
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	3	0	4	0	3	0
	Service Organization	29	3	26	3	19	2
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	84	8	82	8	79	9
	Professional/Major	17	2	11	1	15	2
	Religious Organization	27	2	25	2	24	3
	Honor Society	2	0	2	0	2	0
	Campus Media	2	0	5	0	6	1
	Other Organization	29	3	NA	NA		
	All	193	17	155	15	148	17
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	31	3	19	2	21	2
	Club Sports/Intramurals	11	1	4	0	6	1
	Other Athletics	3	0	5	0	4	0
	All	45	4	28	3	31	3
Employment	Campus Job	13	1	22	2	22	3
	Volunteer	3	0	3	0	4	0
	Off-Campus Job	7	1	6	1	6	1
	All	23	2	31	3	32	4
Performance/Creative	Public Performance/Recital	7	1	5	0	3	0
	Other Creative Activity	11	1	9	1	7	1
	All	18	2	14	1	10	1
Other	Relationships/Friendships	112	10	129	13	107	13
	Resident Life	18	2	12	1	10	1
	ROTC	3	0	2	0	6	1
	Other Misc.	95	9	113	11	92	11
	All	228	20	256	24	215	24
NA	All	17	2	57	5	48	5
All	All	1,116	100	1060	100	890	100

Note: This table was generated from the column "Self-Discovery Context Reviewer 1".

Table 13 shows the context for the Self Discovery submissions since 2020. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total

percentage is reflected here. As usual, the majority (38% in 2022) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (25% in 2022) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Student organizations (17% in 2022) is the next highest area with all others falling under 10%.Social Fraternities/Sororities rate the highest in this group (9%)

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 2018–2022

Reason	Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)				
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Personal Growth	50	46	32	21	21
Enjoyable	47	56	33	22	21
Challenging	38	40	20	11	13
Professional	32	27	15	8	8
Personal Goals	31	28	11	10	8
Personal Best	26	11	3	7	10
Lots of Time	25	27	14	9	9
Collaborative	22	17	13	8	6
Problem Solving	9	11	3	3	3
Other				2	1
No Indication				0	0

Table 14 shows the percentages of all Truman students who indicated each of these reasons for why their submission was so satisfying for them. In 2022, "Enjoyable" (21%) was tied with "Personal Growth" (21%) for student satisfaction and "Challenging" (10%) was next. For the last three years, "Personal Goals", "Enjoyable" and "Challenging" have been the top categories. It is still clear that Truman students do generally enjoy being pushed to excel, even though there is strong evidence that some students feel stressed by the challenging workload. 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" continues to be on a downward trend. It is important to note that in the self-discovery prompt, the top **Academic/Scholarship** category was *collaboration w/others* (see table 9). 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 work occurs in their curriculum and try to find out how they might modify things to be more satisfying or enjoyable although some might argue that student struggles or dissatisfaction can contribute significantly to student growth. 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 2022: Scores Sorted by First Major

School	Major	N	Personal Best		Personal Goals		Personal Growth		Challenging		Professional	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	17	7	41	5	29	10	59	6	35	4	24
	CML	14	4	29	1	7	6	43	4	29	3	21
	CRWT	20	5	25	4	20	8	40	7	35	3	15
	ENG	47	11	23	7	15	22	47	12	26	3	6
	LING	13	2	15	2	15	5	38	3	23	4	31
	MUSI	19	5	26	4	21	4	21	4	21	6	32
	THEA	4	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
	TOTAL	134	35	26	24	18	56	42	37	28	24	18
Business	ACCT	53	9	17	10	19	22	42	14	26	5	9
	BSAD	87	19	22	13	15	39	45	24	28	12	14
	TOTAL	140	28	20	23	16	61	44	38	27	17	12
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	9	28	9	28	18	56	10	31	15	47
	ES	77	8	10	13	17	45	58	23	30	8	10
	HLTH	46	8	17	9	20	26	57	9	20	11	24
	NU	50	14	28	10	20	20	40	11	22	12	24
	TOTAL	205	39	19	41	20	109	53	53	26	46	22
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	4	17	6	26	11	48	5	22	2	9
	BCMB	21	6	29	4	19	8	38	6	29	5	24
	BIOL	76	15	20	14	18	43	57	23	30	17	22
	CHEM	13	4	31	3	23	2	15	7	54	3	23
	CS	37	5	14	6	16	15	41	13	35	5	14
	MATH	19	7	37	4	21	9	47	4	21	3	16
	PHYS	6	3	50	1	17	1	17	1	17	2	33
	STTS	9	3	33	3	33	3	33	1	11	1	11
	TOTAL	204	47	23	41	20	92	45	60	29	38	19
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	7	23	5	16	15	48	8	26	7	23
	ECON	8	5	62	2	25	2	25	4	50	3	38
	HIST	20	8	40	6	30	11	55	4	20	1	5
	JUST	25	4	16	5	20	9	36	9	36	6	24
	PHRE	5	0	0	1	20	4	80	2	40	0	0
	POL	20	11	55	4	20	7	35	12	60	1	5
	PSYC	64	14	22	7	11	24	38	16	25	13	20
	SOAN	19	4	21	2	11	9	47	8	42	3	16
	TOTAL	192	53	28	32	17	81	42	63	33	34	18
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	0	0	3	50	0	0	1	17
LIBS	LIBS	9	3	33	2	22	4	44	0	0	1	11
ALL	ALL	890	205	23	163	18	406	46	251	28	161	18

Table 15 cont.. Most Personally Satisfying 2022: Scores Sorted by First Major, Continued

School	Major	N	Collaborative Yes	Collaborative Percent	Enjoyable Yes	Enjoyable Percent	No Indication Yes	No Indication Percent	Problem Solving Yes	Problem Solving Percent	Lots of Time Yes	Lots of Time Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	17	1	6	8	47	0	0	1	6	5	29
	CML	14	1	7	6	43	0	0	1	7	4	29
	CRWT	20	0	0	8	40	0	0	0	0	4	20
	ENG	47	6	13	23	49	0	0	0	0	9	19
	LING	13	2	15	7	54	0	0	0	0	1	8
	MUSI	19	5	26	11	58	0	0	0	0	2	11
	THEA	4	0	0	2	50	0	0	1	25	1	25
	TOTAL	134	15	11	65	49	0	0	3	2	26	19
Business	ACCT	53	12	23	27	51	0	0	3	6	11	21
	BSAD	87	17	20	35	40	2	2	5	6	16	18
	TOTAL	140	29	21	62	44	2	1	8	6	27	19
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	1	3	9	28	0	0	2	6	8	25
	ES	77	10	13	36	47	1	1	6	8	14	18
	HLTH	46	8	17	18	39	0	0	1	2	4	9
	NU	50	6	12	26	52	0	0	4	8	11	22
	TOTAL	205	25	12	89	43	1	0	13	6	37	18
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	0	0	14	61	0	0	1	4	2	9
	BCMB	21	1	5	8	38	0	0	2	10	4	19
	BIOL	76	10	13	31	41	0	0	7	9	14	18
	CHEM	13	3	23	3	23	0	0	2	15	2	15
	CS	37	11	30	18	49	1	3	1	3	8	22
	MATH	19	2	11	6	32	0	0	1	5	6	32
	PHYS	6	1	17	4	67	0	0	0	0	2	33
	STTS	9	1	11	5	56	1	11	2	22	3	33
	TOTAL	204	29	14	89	44	2	1	16	8	41	20
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	7	23	16	52	0	0	1	3	7	23
	ECON	8	3	38	3	38	0	0	0	0	2	25
	HIST	20	2	10	9	45	0	0	0	0	3	15
	JUST	25	2	8	14	56	0	0	2	8	3	12
	PHRE	5	0	0	4	80	0	0	1	20	0	0
	POL	20	1	5	9	45	0	0	3	15	7	35
	PSYC	64	5	8	30	47	0	0	5	8	10	16
	SOAN	19	2	11	10	53	0	0	2	11	6	32
	TOTAL	192	22	11	95	49	0	0	14	7	38	20
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	4	67	0	0	0	0	1	17
LIBS	LIBS	9	1	11	5	56	0	0	0	0	3	33
ALL	ALL	890	121	14	409	46	5	1	54	6	173	19

Table 15 shows the 2022 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 student.

Table 16. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2020–2022

SELF Category	SELF Context	2020 N	2020%	2021 N	2021%	2022 N	2022%
Coursework	LSP	74	13	105	11	116	14
	Major	180	31	361	36	302	36
	Capstone	17	3	20	2	28	3
	Minor	42	7	51	5	58	7
	Elective	41	7	73	7	60	7
	All	354	61	610	58	564	63
Other Academic	Research	12	2	25	3	25	3
	Internship	18	3	23	2	18	2
	Study Abroad	27	5	22	2	6	1
	Resume/Prof. Statement	0	0	5	1	2	0
	Service Learning	2	0	5	1	3	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	6	1	6	1	2	0
	Other Academic	8	1	NA	NA		
	All	73	13	86	8	56	6
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	1	0	4	0	4	0
	Service Organization	8	1	25	3	15	2
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	31	5	61	6	45	5
	Professional/Major	10	2	6	1	9	1
	Religious Organization	13	2	14	1	10	1
	Honor Society	2	0	5	1	2	0
	Campus Media	3	1	5	1	2	0
	Other Organization	16	3	NA	NA		
	All	84	14	120	11	87	10
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	9	2	27	3	20	2
	Club Sports/Intramurals	9	2	13	1	10	1
	Other Athletics	0	0	5	1	3	0
	All	18	3	45	4	33	4
Employment	Campus Job	7	1	20	2	21	2
	Volunteer	2	0	10	1	3	0
	Off-Campus Job	5	1	1	0		
	All	14	2	31	3	24	3
Performance/Creative	Public Performance/Recital	13	2	16	2	13	2
	Other Creative Activity	6	1	12	1	9	1
	All	19	3	28	3	22	2
Other	Relationships/Friendships	13	2	15	2	8	1
	Resident Life	0	0	6	1	3	0
	ROTC	3	1	2	0	2	0
	Other Misc.	4	1	51	5	46	5
	All	20	3	74	7	59	7
NA	All	0	0	66	6	45	5
All	All	582	100	1060	100	890	100

Note: This table was generated from the column "Most Personally Satisfying Context Reviewer 1".

Table 16 shows the context for the Most Personally Satisfying submissions, since 2020. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. As usual, well over half (63% in 2022) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (36% in 2022) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Student organizations (10% in 2022) is the only other area that shows greater 10% or more of the submissions.

Transformative Learning Experiences Questionnaire (TEQ)

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

We define Transformative Learning as follows:

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

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

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

5 – Totally Transformative

4 – Very Transformative

3 – Transformative

2 – Somewhat Transformative

1 – Not Particularly Transformative

Table 17. 2018–2022 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	2018 Ave	2018 % 4 or 5	2019 Ave	2019 % 4 or 5	2020 Ave	2020 % 4 or 5	2021 Ave	2021 % 4 or 5	2022 Ave	2022 % 4 or 5
AAL	3.4	52	3.0	43	3.7	60	3.6	63	3.5	57
BUS	3.1	41	2.7	36	3.2	38	3.1	33	3.2	42
HSE	3.4	47	3.1	50	3.6	56	3.5	54	3.4	51
SAM	3.4	49	3.0	40	3.3	46	3.5	56	3.5	53
SCS	3.4	53	3.0	46	3.5	53	3.6	57	3.6	58
IDSM	3.3	33	3.5	75	3.5	53	3.5	50	3.8	67
LIBS							2.7	0	3.5	44
ALL	3.4	49	3.0	43	3.5	51	3.5	53	3.5	53

Note that these percentages have been historically calculated out of all students who submitted a portfolio, not out of all who have data for this question. That's not a problem as long as most students do have data for this question, but might require adjustments in a year where we don't have full data.

From 2018 to 2022 about half of students answered "Totally" (5) or "Very" (4) Transformative to this question. 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. The average for scores of 4 or 5 over the last 5 years continues to be around 50%.

Table 18. 2022 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	17	1	1	4	9	1	1	3.50	59
	CML	14	0	0	5	8	1	0	3.71	64
	CRWT	20	1	3	2	11	3	0	3.60	70
	ENG	47	0	9	13	18	7	0	3.49	53
	LING	13	0	2	7	1	3	0	3.38	31
	MUSI	19	1	1	6	7	4	0	3.63	58
	THEA	4	0	0	1	3	0	0	3.75	75
	TOTAL	134	3	16	38	57	19	1	3.55	57
Business	ACCT	53	4	11	14	19	2	3	3.08	40
	BSAD	87	3	15	30	27	11	1	3.33	44
	TOTAL	140	7	26	44	46	13	4	3.24	42
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	0	4	4	16	8	0	3.88	75
	ES	77	6	12	28	22	7	2	3.16	38
	HLTH	46	1	5	16	18	6	0	3.50	52
	NU	50	0	5	17	23	5	0	3.56	56
	TOTAL	205	7	26	65	79	26	2	3.45	51
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	0	5	10	5	3	0	3.26	35
	BCMB	21	0	2	4	12	3	0	3.76	71
	BIOL	76	1	9	23	32	10	1	3.55	55
	CHEM	13	0	0	2	9	1	1	3.92	77
	CS	37	1	8	8	16	3	1	3.33	51
	MATH	19	1	4	10	3	1	0	2.95	21
	PHYS	6	0	2	0	2	2	0	3.67	67
	STTS	9	0	0	2	6	1	0	3.89	78
	TOTAL	204	3	30	59	85	24	3	3.48	53
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	0	1	12	16	2	0	3.61	58
	ECON	8	0	0	1	5	2	0	4.12	88
	HIST	20	0	3	2	11	2	2	3.67	65
	JUST	25	0	2	9	9	5	0	3.68	56
	PHRE	5	0	0	1	4	0	0	3.80	80
	POL	20	0	1	4	12	3	0	3.85	75
	PSYC	64	2	7	21	27	6	1	3.44	52
	SOAN	19	0	1	10	8	0	0	3.37	42
	TOTAL	192	2	15	60	92	20	3	3.60	58
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	1	1	2	2	0	3.83	67
LIBS	LIBS	9	0	2	2	2	2	1	3.50	44
ALL	ALL	890	22	116	269	363	106	14	3.47	53

Note: Similar to Table 17, percentages in this table are calculated out of all students with a portfolio submission, not out of only those who responded to this question.

Examining the counts for each score and the average score for each discipline in the table above reveals very few significant differences. The range of average scores varies between 3.08 (40%) to 4.12 (88%) with the mean average score of 3.47.

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. 2022 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	38	4.27
Service Learning	99	11.12
Research	215	24.16
Internship	224	25.17
Leadership	354	39.78
Student-Led Education	38	4.27
Writing	193	21.69
Other	74	8.31
Course	679	76.29
Any (Big 4)	444	49.89
Any	803	90.22
Total 2022 N	890	

Note: Again, percentages are calculated out of all students who submitted a portfolio, not out of all who had data for this question. That could be a problem if a substantial number had no data for this question, but historically, that's how it's been calculated. Also note that the "Course" line has increased greatly from 2019 because prior to 2020, several reponse columns in the database were ignored in the analysis due to the weird way that data was stored in the database (although it appears that prior to 2018, perhaps entries were counted correctly).

In 2022, 679 Truman students (77%) 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, 193 (22%) students reported such an experience which is consistent with 2021.

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. 2017–2022 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Activity	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Study Abroad	20	20	18	19	12	4
Service Learning	17	20	17	17	12	11
Research	31	29	29	25	28	24
Internship	35	32	33	32	25	25
Leadership	41	42	40	40	38	40
Student-Led Education	7	6	5	5	4	4
Writing	21	22	23	23	23	22
Other	8	8	8	10	9	8
Course	75	47	48	78	77	76
Any (Big 4)	70	70	67	63	56	50
Any	85	84	83	94	91	90

Table 20 shows the percentages of all Truman students who reported each of these types of activities in the last 6 years. Again, you will notice that the percentages are remarkably consistent over time for most kinds of activities, except the courses category. Study Abroad and Internships would likely be lower due to no travel and personal interaction being limited during the pandemic.

Table 21. 2017–2022 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Activity	2018 F	2018 M	2019 F	2019 M	2020 F	2020 M	2021 F	2021 M	2022 F	2022 M
Study Abroad	26	9	18	17	24	10	14	9	5	4
Service Learning	25	12	24	8	20	10	16	7	14	6
Research	34	23	31	25	28	18	30	24	27	20
Internship	31	35	32	33	33	31	27	22	25	25
Leadership	46	35	44	33	45	30	42	31	43	35
Student-Led Education	6	5	6	4	5	4	5	3	4	5
Writing	24	19	26	20	26	19	26	18	23	19
Other	6	10	6	10	10	8	8	9	8	9
Course	51	41	51	41	80	75	80	71	81	68

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

Also note that there are discrepancies in past reports between the "Course" category in Table 21 and the break-down by sex in Table 22, specifically in 2015–2017.

Within these potentially transformative activities, large differences continue to be found by gender. In 2022, females again participated in almost all of these types of activities at frequencies higher than males.It is interesting to note that males did participate at a

slightly higher rate than females in the Internship category in 2018 and 2019 but in 2020-22 females are again higher.

Table 22. 2022 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	17	6	0	0	18	24	6	0	0	82
	CML	14	36	14	21	0	43	7	21	14	100
	CRWT	20	0	0	15	25	45	0	85	15	85
	ENG	47	4	4	0	13	43	6	45	17	89
	LING	13	8	8	15	23	38	0	23	8	100
	MUSI	19	0	0	16	11	42	5	21	11	84
	THEA	4	0	0	25	25	50	25	50	0	75
	TOTAL	134	7	4	9	15	40	5	37	12	89
Business	ACCT	53	2	2	4	30	26	2	19	9	57
	BSAD	87	7	5	6	30	40	3	10	7	55
	TOTAL	140	5	4	5	30	35	3	14	8	56
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	9	25	34	0	47	0	34	3	94
	ES	77	3	36	23	44	36	4	16	3	66
	HLTH	46	4	50	26	35	43	2	9	4	74
	NU	50	2	20	12	40	28	4	10	6	78
	TOTAL	205	4	34	23	34	38	3	16	4	75
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	4	4	35	35	39	13	22	9	83
	BCMB	21	0	0	76	19	67	0	10	0	95
	BIOL	76	0	8	47	12	49	3	13	12	78
	CHEM	13	0	0	54	15	23	0	46	15	92
	CS	37	0	0	11	57	30	5	14	14	68
	MATH	19	0	0	11	16	37	0	5	0	53
	PHYS	6	0	0	50	17	33	0	33	0	83
	STTS	9	11	0	11	22	11	11	0	0	56
	TOTAL	204	1	3	38	25	41	4	15	9	76
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	3	0	6	29	52	16	32	10	90
	ECON	8	0	0	38	25	38	0	62	12	88
	HIST	20	5	0	25	15	35	10	35	20	70
	JUST	25	4	16	0	20	36	8	32	12	88
	PHRE	5	20	0	0	20	40	0	20	40	80
	POL	20	10	0	45	50	50	5	45	5	85
	PSYC	64	3	9	56	16	44	2	22	6	81
	SOAN	19	11	5	74	11	42	0	16	5	84
	TOTAL	192	5	6	36	22	43	6	30	10	83
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	17	33	0	50	17	33	0	83
LIBS	LIBS	9	22	11	11	0	44	11	22	22	89
ALL	ALL	890	4	11	24	25	40	4	22	8	76

Table 22 cont. 2022 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major

School	Major	N	Big 4 Count	%	Any Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	17	4	24	14	82
	CML	14	6	43	14	100
	CRWT	20	8	40	19	95
	ENG	47	10	21	45	96
	LING	13	6	46	13	100
	MUSI	19	5	26	17	89
	THEA	4	2	50	4	100
	TOTAL	134	41	31	126	94
Business	ACCT	53	18	34	42	79
	BSAD	87	33	38	71	82
	TOTAL	140	51	36	113	81
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	32	16	50	31	97
	ES	77	57	74	70	91
	HLTH	46	36	78	44	96
	NU	50	27	54	43	86
	TOTAL	205	136	66	188	92
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	23	14	61	21	91
	BCMB	21	16	76	21	100
	BIOL	76	43	57	70	92
	CHEM	13	7	54	12	92
	CS	37	23	62	34	92
	MATH	19	5	26	14	74
	PHYS	6	3	50	6	100
	STTS	9	3	33	7	78
	TOTAL	204	114	56	185	91
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	31	11	35	30	97
	ECON	8	4	50	8	100
	HIST	20	6	30	16	80
	JUST	25	8	32	22	88
	PHRE	5	2	40	4	80
	POL	20	13	65	20	100
	PSYC	64	39	61	59	92
	SOAN	19	15	79	18	95
	TOTAL	192	98	51	177	92
IDSM	IDSM	6	2	33	6	100
LIBS	LIBS	9	2	22	8	89
ALL	ALL	890	444	50	803	90

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. It is pretty

clear that building Transformational Experiences into departmental curriculum is important.

Table 23. Percentages of Truman Students by School Reporting Activities Over Time (2018–2022)

School	Year	N	StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Any
							Percent Participation by Activity					
AAL	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
	2021	156	20	8	15	13	42	34	4	43	14	95
	2022	134	7	4	9	15	31	40	5	37	12	94
BUS	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
	2021	152	15	7	3	26	45	39	3	18	9	84
	2022	140	5	4	5	30	36	35	3	14	8	81
HSE	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
	2021	244	8	30	25	36	66	39	4	14	11	91
	2022	205	4	34	23	34	66	38	3	16	4	92
SAM	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
	2021	236	8	6	42	22	60	37	5	19	6	91
	2022	204	1	3	38	25	56	41	4	15	9	91
SCS	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
	2021	263	11	8	39	24	59	38	5	25	6	93
	2022	192	5	6	36	22	51	43	6	30	10	92
IDSM	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
	2021	6	0	17	33	33	50	50	17	17	0	100
	2022	6	0	17	33	0	33	50	17	33	0	100
LIBS	2021	3	33	0	33	0	67	33	0	33	0	100
	2022	9	22	11	11	0	22	44	11	22	22	89
ALL	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
	2021	1,060	12	12	28	25	56	38	4	23	9	91
	2022	890	4	11	24	25	50	40	4	22	8	90

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

Truman's Vision Statement includes several references to transformative experiences, and our strategic goals state that all students will have at least one high impact learning experience while here. As mentioned above, this language will be changing with the new curriculum (although the 2023 vision statement still has the old language). Campus-wide, 50% of all students report having at least one of the "Big 4" which continues a downward trend from 2018 (70) and 90% report having some transformative experience.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2022 we returned to live reading sessions and the stipends were restored so there was an ample number of readers. As mentioned above, the impact of Covid meant that readers needed to read a large number of 2021 submissions in the IDS, SD and MPS prompts. For this reason there was very little double reading. We were able to power through and got everything read that was needed. In 2023 there will be more double reading for sure. It was refreshing for the readers to finally return to the live format.

Initially it was determined that there would still not be a stipend so I tried to have portfolios read throughout the academic year. When this issue was presented to the Faculty Senate, there was fairly unanimous agreement to return to reading sessions with stipends. It would not work very well for a number of reasons to try to spread the reading sessions throughout the academic year.

Here are some of the things readers had to say about the sessions based on an anonymous survey.

Please provide feedback about how your participation in the reading session/s (interactions with colleagues, exposure to rubrics, reading student work, etc) has directly impacted your teaching or future course preparation. Be as specific as you can.24 responses

I always gain ideas for teaching my JINS course better
ideas for rubrics for classes, awareness of Truman curriculum
I am the garden educator and caretaker for the Gaber Solar Clock Garden. Each year, myself and a number of students (ranging from 3 to 10 students) work together to maintain the beauty of the garden and to fulfill the mission of the garden. The mission of the garden is to feature a diverse mixture of plants, with emphasis on native species, that provide food for pollinators and to provide education and inspiration for the Truman and Kirksville community. The garden is a nature preserve and a sanctuary for plants, and an area designated to provide adequate food, water, and habitat for native pollinators. We do not use herbicides and pesticides and do not have plants that produce neonicotinoid insecticides. Every student that is working in the garden learns and grows from this position. Many of the students use the garden as a job reference for future careers in biology, education, art, conservation, and agriculture. The garden provides an opportunity for student workers to be interdisciplinary with their interests. It has been used by artists, writers and photographers to promote the use of native plants in their work. The garden has been used by

future teachers for lesson plans explaining how pollinators play a crucial part of a flowering plants reproduction. Often students will propose research ideas or outreach plans that include utilizing the garden. Reading portfolios gives me the opportunity to understand the critical thinking framework or interdisciplinary studies adopted by Truman. Therefore, I can better support to my students!

I'm going to recommit to discussing the portfolio in classes below the senior level. I'm going to incorporate the critical thinking and interdisciplinary rubrics into more assignments.
good reference materials for future writing rubrics

I will definitely clarify assignment guidelines in general, and specifically the "why" of assignments. I will also emphasize with students and advisees, of all levels, the importance of "goodness of fit" for portfolio submissions.

I find it especially helpful to talk to colleagues from across campus, outside of my "usual" areas, to see how they think and teach about writing using interdisciplinary and critical thinking. We had lots of reading to do this week, so I understand our focus was more on "getting it done", but more time to reflect and commune about the prompts and what we are seeing in the submissions really helps me update and revise my courses.

My JINS course has benefited directly. Introducing the rubrics for the interdisciplinary- and critical thinking categories during the first week provides guidelines for students in structuring and clarifying their thoughts. In addition, I am able to give guidance to students in regard to submitting their JINS' papers to the vault.

While I don't know that the critical thinking rubric would be a good replacement for the one I currently use, I have an assignment in one of my classes that could potentially be a good fit for the CT submission, so I'll be sure to remind my students of that.
Having an idea of what the rubrics look like will help in future classes when assigning writing projects to students.

I've seen what other courses require outside of STEM, and it's given me ideas on how to approach the writing in my lab course and my special topics course.

I graded portfolios before the pandemic and before Truman stopped paying professors; as soon as I saw that they were compensating professors again and that we could return to working together as a group, I immediately signed-up. Reading portfolios has been and continues to be one of the most invigorating and worthwhile endeavors we have here on campus. The interactions with colleagues I have never met and across disciplines has been phenomenal. I have learned SO much about the wonderful projects and programs we have here on campus and what others are doing with students in their programs. I leave this portfolio experience with new friends and walking away with some very solid and productive conversations about programs and ways to better my teaching. From asking questions about programs I did not know, I have learned a ton about the campus community. The work and fruitful discussions about rubrics have also been extremely helpful for me - I will take the critical thinking rubric and use it more in

class as a result. I will also really focus on explaining to students interdisciplinarity and working on how to better my teaching as a result.

Being a new faculty member, I knew practically nothing about the Dialogues program and the portfolios. Now, I can better prepare the majors in my department to complete their portfolios. I will put something in my syllabus for sure. It was also wonderful meeting new colleagues.
I have taught JINS, but did not realize that students' measure of interdisciplinary thinking should be represented in a succinct paper. If I teach the class again, I now know how to better prepare them for this.

I will be putting more focus into my assignments to help better meet the critical thinking and other prompts; I gained insight into appropriate prompts and the specifics needed in the assignment prompt; it helped me to grow as a faculty member

I have consistently asserted that reading portfolios is one of the best professional development experiences I have had over my 20 years at Truman. The opportunity to gather ideas and to engage in meaningful discourse with colleagues across disciplines has informed a number of modifications to existing assignments, incorporation of new ones into my own courses, and curricular discussions that I bring back to my department. Whether it be ways to address issues like interdisciplinarity in a more explicit way - or use of rubrics (whether for evaluative purposes or even for helping students to understand what critical thinking is and what the expectations are).

There are so many benefits that are gained from reading portfolios and it's by far one of the best professional development activity I've had the opportunity to do. It's solidified my own understanding of critical thinking and interdisciplinary thinking, given me an appreciation of students' work from across campus, provided me with possible assignments that I can incorporate into my own classes, and allowed for me to meet and get to know other faculty from other disciplines. It was suggested that reading portfolios at least once should be a requirement (or at least strongly encouraged) for every JINS professor and those who will be up for tenure/promotion. I'm so glad that the Truman administration is now reading the Letters to Truman so that real change can be implemented to the many systemic issues raised by graduating students.

I use language from the Portfolio rubrics in my own prompts for assignments, so students are exposed to the University-level benchmarking. I get ideas for assignments from seeing examples of student works, and having discussions with colleagues about the types of assignments they're creating. I think it's so important to connect with my colleagues across campus to hear what's going on in their programs - what is successful, what needs improvement. We very much learn from each other.

I enjoyed the opportunity to read and evaluate student work outside of my discipline. The insights I gained from the experience along with the rubrics provided will enrich my teaching in the future by influencing how I design assignments and assessments. I also enjoyed meeting and working with colleagues from other departments within the university. Mostly, I gained valuable insight into the students who I interact with and how I can be of better service to them in the future.

Reading student portfolio helped me to grasp a sense on how to help students in formal writing of critical thinking, and interdisciplinary area. In interdisciplinary writing, one of the common mistakes that students made was that students just touched or mentioned a term in a discipline and considered that it was one of disciplines that they used. But knowledge/theory or methods/analysis in a discipline should be used for it to be considered as one of disciplines in interdisciplinary writing. This type of mistake was observed often with statistics, as students just provided statistics such as percentages and thought that statistics is one of disciplines they used. Instead of merely providing statistics, if statistical theory or statistical model or statistical analysis was used as a perspective, for example as a perspective of quantitative reasoning, then statistics can be taken into account as one of disciplines.

This is the first time I have read portfolios, and I found it really useful to meet colleagues from across campus to discuss issues of interdisciplinarity and critical thinking. Reading the work of students from many different disciplines was also helpful to see how the various disciplines think about critical thinking. Reading student submissions from JINS courses was also helpful to see how other JINS instructors structure their assignments, and how effective students in other JINS courses are at achieving interdisciplinarity. This will help me, in turn, to tinker with how I present material in my own JINS course. I would recommend this to any faculty interested in meeting faculty across campus and for improving their own teaching, and for just learning about the the ability of Truman students to achieve high-level work in all the disciplines.

I will be revisiting these rubrics as I revise and polish how I introduce papers to students. The ideas shouldn't be new, but reviewing what we mean by critical thinking and helping students identify when/where/how they are utilizing each of the five points we looked for in our sessions will be helpful. Also, it was great to read and discuss academic papers from outside my department. We have things to learn from one another, and seeing each others' strengths and weaknesses, commonalities and differences, provides fertile ground for growth across campus. An example: we don't want an English paper to sound like a science research paper or lab report, but noting the format can certainly offer insights into how to formulate, analyze, and draw conclusions about a topic.

Reading student work and exposure to rubrics was very helpful for me to get an idea about what is expected from student submissions of critical thinking and writing and interdisciplinary thinking. It made me realize that I have one assignment that can be used for critical thinking and writing with few changes to the rubric I used in the past. Participation in portfolio reading made me realize that interdisciplinary thinking in science/STEM is slightly different from other disciplines. I can use this knowledge to design an assignment for my class that would improve interdisciplinary thinking.

I will be using some of the various assessment ideas that I learned about through reading student prompts.

Please write additional comments here. You might discuss in more detail your perspective on any of the above mentioned components. Also, you could comment on other aspects of the reading session that you valued or would like improved. Again, all of this feedback is anonymous!21 responses

Sodexo needs to clean their beverage dispensers better. I took the plunger out of the hot water canister and the water was GROSS!

Brian is excellent

Thank you Brian! I truly enjoyed working together and getting to know you and the faculty more this week. You are a great human being and your sense of humor is fun! Cheers.
This was a very valuable experience. It helps faculty connect not only with colleagues but also with students from across campus. It's essential for us to understand the types of work that our students produce in other courses besides the ones we teach. We also get new pedagogical ideas from reading the assignments given by our peers.
really nice to get together with colleagues to talk about similar experiences

I do like the MG rooms better than the VH rooms for this purpose. It was a good opportunity for a direct comparison this week.

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our 2022 office staff included 3-5 students. Each year their primary task is to verify that student submissions are complete and that linked documents are readable. They provide many classes with presentations via ZOOM to help instruct students (and professors) on accessing and using the portfolio system (see more on this below). They also staff the graduation fair each semester to help students complete their graduation checklists. During office hours they answer student questions via email or make face-to-face appointments for individuals. The Office Manger organizes our worker's office hours, trains new workers, and performs many other activities.

As Director, I communicate regularly with our undergraduate students. Each semester, every undergraduate degree-seeking student received an email describing the portfolio project, although at different levels of detail for different levels of students. All students with 0-90 accumulated credit hours received a brief missive that reminds them of the existence of the portfolio and that they should store their academic treasures in their portfolio vault. 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 the online vault as an assignment. I like to remind faculty who teach writing enhanced classes (including JINS courses) to encourage their students to store their excellent assigned papers in their vaults. Those who teach senior seminars or other capstone courses may want our portfolio office workers to visit their classes to give a very detailed portfolio system orientation to their students. Finally, each spring around mid-term break, I invite faculty to sign up to participate in portfolio reading sessions in May. I try to make the assignments of the reading weeks by mid-April by issuing official invitations to read by email.

My work on the portfolio this year has been supported in a tremendous way by former portfolio directors. This year, the Portfolio committee included these faculty and staff members: 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.

I will say that the past three years have been very stressful with the elimination and subsequent restoration of the stipends, the online reading difficulties and difficulty receiving data reports in a timely manner. With the help of Scott Thatcher I am hoping that I will receive the report for 2023 much faster. He has been a tremendous help in cleaning up the data tables and making them more standardized.

Portfolio Report Summary and Future Plans

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

- Efficiency: Everything in the portfolio should be used for campus assessment and anything not useful should be removed.
- Feedback: Evolve the portfolio away from being perceived as a "black hole" where students submit work.
- Technology Improvements: allow greater opportunities and flexibility.
- Student Buy-in and Motivation: Can we convince more of them to care?
- Faculty Buy-In and Motivation: Can we convince more of them to care?
- Baselines: As our curriculum evolves, what do we need to measure now so that we will recognize changes once they happen?