

Truman State University Portfolio Data

2020-2021 Academic Year

Brian Kubin, Portfolio Director - Narrative

Scott Thatcher - Tables

6-12-2023

2021 Portfolio Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
· General Information about Portfolio Assessment	2
· Critical Thinking and Writing	5
· Interdisciplinary Thinking	13
· Self Discovery	19
· Most Personally Satisfying Experience	28
· Transformative Experiences Questionnaire	35
· Letter to Truman (Discontinued)	44
· Reader Information and Feedback	45
· Portfolio Collection Matters	45
· Future Plans and 2021 Summary	46

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 2020-2021, 1057 students graduated and 1021 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 2020-2021 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. Due to the Covid pandemic the Letter to Truman Prompt was not evaluated in 2021. Further discussion can be found in the Letter to Truman section below.

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 2017–2021

School	Major	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Arts and Letters	ART	34	30	20	31	22
	CML	21	25	24	19	22
	CRWT	10	17	12	19	18
	ENG	65	61	68	71	46
	LING	10	7	11	14	15
	MUSI	32	28	24	20	21
	THEA	16	15	10	10	12
	TOTAL	188	183	169	184	156
Business	ACCT	75	56	63	69	60
	BSAD	111	124	136	119	92
	TOTAL	186	180	199	188	152
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT	8	7	9	3	
	CMDS	32	36	27	42	40
	ES	82	85	101	105	90
	HLTH	73	73	71	77	59
	NU	36	47	45	46	55
	TOTAL	231	248	253	273	244
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	29	20	42	22	20
	BCMB				1	8
	BIOL	120	104	99	100	93
	CHEM	26	18	19	18	21
	CS	42	33	41	48	56
	MATH	26	28	15	28	19
	PHYS	9	8	9	10	7
	STTS		3	7	14	12
	TOTAL	252	214	232	241	236
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	64	71	46	47	43
	ECON	17	11	9	16	15
	HIST	46	40	32	29	33
	JUST	32	26	26	31	32
	PHRE	10	8	4	3	9
	POL	15	24	19	30	31
	PSYC	105	89	93	90	81
	SOAN	19	19	17	17	19
TOTAL	308	288	246	263	263	
IDSMS	IDSMS	5	3	4	15	6
LIBS	LIBS					3
ALL	ALL	1,170	1,116	1,103	1,164	1,060

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

Table 2. Critical Thinking and Writing: Scores by First Major 2021

School	Major	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
Arts and Letters	ART	18	2.44	2.39	2.44	2.22	9.50	44	2.72
	CML	18	2.78	2.89	2.94	2.44	11.06	67	3.06
	CRWT	18	3.06	2.94	2.83	2.44	11.28	44	3.00
	ENG	44	2.93	2.86	2.91	2.59	11.30	57	3.09
	LING	15	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.47	10.67	47	2.80
	MUSI	18	2.67	2.94	2.89	2.50	11.00	44	3.17
	THEA	12	2.83	2.75	2.58	2.25	10.42	50	2.83
	TOTAL	143	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.45	10.86	52	2.99
Business	ACCT	59	2.97	2.76	2.83	2.46	11.02	53	2.80
	BSAD	80	2.70	2.75	2.66	2.35	10.46	49	2.76
	TOTAL	139	2.81	2.76	2.73	2.40	10.70	50	2.78
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	35	2.74	2.66	2.86	2.54	10.80	54	2.83
	ES	83	2.55	2.48	2.47	2.20	9.71	35	2.70
	HLTH	51	2.82	2.88	2.98	2.47	11.16	67	2.98
	NU	52	2.87	2.87	2.92	2.35	11.00	50	2.87
	TOTAL	221	2.72	2.69	2.76	2.35	10.52	49	2.82
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	17	2.94	3.06	2.94	2.47	11.41	65	2.76
	BCMB	8	3.12	3.12	3.00	2.62	11.88	75	2.88
	BIOL	89	2.71	2.76	2.87	2.47	10.81	53	2.92
	CHEM	19	3.32	2.95	3.37	2.84	12.47	68	2.89
	CS	50	2.86	2.62	2.52	2.36	10.36	50	2.76
	MATH	19	2.68	2.74	2.79	2.47	10.68	58	2.84
	PHYS	7	3.29	3.29	3.29	2.86	12.71	100	3.00
	STTS	12	3.25	2.83	3.33	2.83	12.25	83	3.08
	TOTAL	221	2.87	2.80	2.87	2.52	11.06	59	2.87
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	42	3.07	2.79	2.90	2.43	11.19	57	2.90
	ECON	14	3.00	2.86	3.14	2.79	11.79	79	3.07
	HIST	32	3.16	3.16	3.19	2.69	12.19	69	3.25
	JUST	31	2.87	2.94	2.97	2.77	11.55	65	2.94
	PHRE	8	3.38	3.25	3.00	3.00	12.62	75	3.25
	POL	31	3.26	3.39	3.23	2.68	12.55	77	3.10
	PSYC	75	2.91	2.73	2.69	2.44	10.77	55	2.93
	SOAN	18	2.83	3.22	2.94	2.72	11.72	67	2.94
TOTAL	251	3.02	2.96	2.94	2.60	11.52	64	3.01	
IDSM	IDSM	6	3.17	3.00	3.00	2.50	11.67	50	3.17
LIBS	LIBS	3	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.67	12.67	100	3.33
ALL	ALL	984	2.86	2.82	2.84	2.47	10.99	56	2.90

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 10.99 and all schools have an average Sum4 above 10. On the departmental level, only ART (9.50) and ES (9.71) showed a Sum4 average of less than 10. The factors that lead to these lower scores are not clear and it is possible some of the students simply chose submissions poorly. 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.

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, 62% of 2021 graduates earned a Sum4 score of 10 or more which, as you will see in Table 5, is in line with prior years.

Table 3. Critical Thinking and Writing: 2021 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Issue	Context	Evidence	Concl	Sum 4	10+ (%)	Comm
ACCT	31	3.16	3.00	3.03	2.71	11.90	65	2.87
AGSC	16	2.94	3.00	3.00	2.56	11.50	62	2.75
ART	18	2.72	2.72	2.94	2.39	10.78	50	2.78
BIOL	44	2.82	2.80	2.91	2.50	11.02	57	2.89
BSAD	51	3.00	2.82	2.82	2.51	11.16	57	2.92
CHEM	39	2.97	2.82	3.10	2.59	11.49	67	2.87
CHIN	1	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	7.00	0	2.00
CLAS	12	3.00	2.83	2.92	2.42	11.17	50	3.00
CMDS	25	2.72	2.60	2.80	2.52	10.64	48	2.88
COMM	34	3.12	2.88	2.97	2.44	11.41	62	2.97
CS	31	2.74	2.52	2.42	2.26	9.94	42	2.68
DS	1	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	0	3.00
ECON	15	2.93	2.87	3.13	2.53	11.47	80	3.00
ED	13	2.92	2.92	2.54	2.31	10.69	38	2.69
ENG	100	2.78	2.66	2.68	2.39	10.51	46	2.88
ENVS	2	3.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	9.50	50	3.00
ES	30	2.77	2.67	2.63	2.40	10.47	37	2.77
FREN	1	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	9.00	0	2.00
GEOG	1	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	11.00	100	2.00
GERM	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	12.00	100	3.00
HIST	48	3.06	3.06	3.17	2.62	11.92	67	3.19
HLTH	32	2.94	2.78	3.03	2.59	11.34	72	2.94
IDS	4	1.50	2.00	1.50	1.50	6.50	0	2.75
INDV	2	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	16.00	100	4.00
ITAL	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	12.00	100	3.00
JINS	124	2.67	2.69	2.65	2.35	10.35	51	2.85
JUST	22	2.91	2.73	2.77	2.59	11.00	50	2.82
LING	16	2.44	2.62	2.69	2.19	9.94	44	2.81
MATH	4	2.25	2.75	2.75	2.50	10.25	75	3.00
MS	2	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	10.50	50	2.50
MUSI	13	2.38	2.77	2.85	2.31	10.31	46	3.00
NU	36	3.00	3.11	3.19	2.56	11.86	64	3.00
PHRE	42	2.69	2.64	2.50	2.38	10.21	43	2.79
PHYS	5	2.60	2.80	2.60	2.60	10.60	60	2.60
POL	45	3.18	3.33	3.20	2.67	12.38	78	3.13
PSYC	36	3.14	2.97	2.81	2.56	11.47	69	3.00
RUSS	1	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	9.00	0	3.00
SOAN	34	2.85	3.06	2.94	2.59	11.44	59	3.00
SPAN	20	2.85	2.90	3.00	2.70	11.45	60	3.10
STAT	7	3.29	2.86	3.43	2.86	12.43	100	3.00
THEA	4	2.75	3.25	2.75	2.25	11.00	50	2.75
Missing	20	2.65	2.65	2.45	2.20	9.90	30	2.60

Table 3 shows the average scores for the submissions from the particular course prefix. As usual, JINS (124) and ENG (100) 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 2021 Inter-Rater Reliability

Due to the low number of readers and constraints due to the Covid outbreak we were unable to complete a table displaying data for inter-rater reliability this year, as only a handful were scored by more than one reader.

Table 5. Critical Thinking and Writing: University-Wide Scores 2017–2021

CTW: University-Wide Scores			
Year	N	Mean Sum4	10+ (%)
2017	1,170	10.30	61
2018	1,117	10.10	61
2019	1,103	10.60	89
2020	573	11.45	63
2021	984	10.99	56

Table 5 shows that the Sum4 and 10+ percentages are 5% 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.

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 least 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 2017–2021

		N	Mean					2+(%)				
School	Major	2021	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Arts and Letters	ART	20	2.12	2.13	1.60	2.04	1.93	78	73	50	74	55
	CML	19	1.89	2.12	2.08	2.29	2.61	65	76	71	76	84
	CRWT	17	2.50	2.29	1.50	1.89	2.21	100	88	58	72	71
	ENG	45	2.05	2.18	1.91	2.32	2.26	74	75	60	81	73
	LING	13	2.27	1.71	2.09	2.08	2.27	75	71	73	62	85
	MUSI	19	2.09	2.07	1.92	2.24	2.37	79	79	67	59	79
	THEA	10	1.91	1.87	1.50	2.00	2.45	72	60	50	57	70
	TOTAL	143	2.12	2.11	1.80	2.18	2.28	78	75	55	73	73
Business	ACCT	58	1.91	1.75	1.79	2.18	1.91	84	64	57	79	66
	BSAD	86	1.64	1.81	1.81	2.19	2.22	58	66	63	74	77
	TOTAL	144	1.78	1.79	1.80	2.19	2.09	71	66	53	75	72
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	ATHT		1.63	2.29	1.78	1.67		63	86	56	67	
	CMDS	39	1.59	2.14	1.74	2.06	2.28	48	67	56	71	69
	ES	82	1.71	1.80	1.60	2.16	2.05	62	6	56	74	67
	HLTH	57	2.14	2.15	1.87	2.39	2.30	75	73	62	78	75
	NU	51	1.80	2.04	2.02	2.40	2.42	58	68	69	81	75
	TOTAL	229	1.78	2.01	1.80	2.25	2.24	61	67	57	76	71
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	17	2.02	2.25	1.79	2.60	2.29	71	75	60	80	82
	BCMB	7				2.00	3.00				100	86
	BIOL	87	2.12	2.02	1.93	2.41	2.22	74	68	65	85	77
	CHEM	20	2.24	2.22	2.11	2.38	2.15	79	72	58	77	70
	CS	52	2.17	2.21	1.85	2.42	2.26	77	76	56	75	77
	MATH	18	1.86	2.18	2.07	1.77	1.92	65	68	73	64	50
	PHYS	6	1.89	0.75	1.22	2.00	2.42	61	25	22	62	83
	STTS	10		2.33	1.43	2.31	2.15		100	57	69	90
	TOTAL	217	2.05	2.07	1.77	2.33	2.23	71	69	55	78	76
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	42	1.71	2.13	1.93	2.22	2.44	59	70	65	78	86
	ECON	14	1.56	2.09	2.33	2.45	2.46	68	73	78	82	86
	HIST	31	2.12	2.24	1.88	2.13	2.53	78	80	66	83	81
	JUST	31	1.73	1.77	1.69	1.98	1.92	63	65	58	76	71
	PHRE	7	1.99	2.13	2.00	2.50	2.43	60	75	75	100	71
	POL	31	2.30	1.88	2.58	3.00	2.53	93	63	89	96	90
	PSYC	76	2.05	1.98	1.78	2.00	2.07	73	69	58	66	70
	SOAN	18	2.34	2.11	1.76	2.50	2.33	87	74	65	93	83
	TOTAL	250	1.98	2.04	2.00	2.24	2.28	73	71	56	78	78
IDSMS	IDSMS	6	2.06	2.00	1.50	2.36	2.42	100	67	50	79	83
LIBS	LIBS	3				1.50					67	
ALL	ALL	992	2.00	2.01	1.78	2.24	2.23	72	69	55	76	74

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 2021 average score is 2.23 which is similar to last year and above 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: 2021 Scores by Course Prefix

Prefix	N	Mean	2+(%)
JINS	621	2.41	82
ENG	44	1.91	59
PHRE	29	1.88	66
BSAD	27	1.93	70
HIST	22	2.70	86
None Given	21	1.50	48
SOAN	20	2.25	70
POL	12	2.54	75
ECON	12	2.08	58
NU	11	2.14	64
JUST	11	1.27	36
ART	11	2.05	55
ES	10	0.85	20
CS	10	1.95	60
BIOL	10	1.80	60
SPAN	9	1.78	67
PSYC	9	1.83	67
LING	9	1.83	78
COMM	8	1.94	75
ACCT	8	1.75	38
MUSI	7	2.36	86
ED	7	1.43	43
THEA	6	3.00	83
STAT	6	1.25	33
CMDS	6	1.67	50
CLAS	6	2.67	100
< 5	40	1.77	52

As intended, the JINS courses provide the greatest number of submissions of any course prefix in 2021 (621). The submissions from JINS courses scored quite well with our rubric (82% at 2+) and the overall percentage is a bit higher than 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.

Table 8. IDS 2021 Inter-Rater Reliability

2021 Abs Diff	N	%
3	1	1
2	28	15
1	84	45
0	72	39
Total	185	100

In 2021, 992 submissions were scored by at least one reader, and 185 were scored by two readers. In the 2022 reading session we were able to do some double reading for 2021.

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
<input type="radio"/> LSP <input type="radio"/> Major <input type="radio"/> Capstone <input type="radio"/> Minor <input type="radio"/> Elective	<input type="radio"/> Research <input type="radio"/> Internship <input type="radio"/> Study Abroad <input type="radio"/> Resume / College Application / Professional Statement <input type="radio"/> Service Learning <input type="radio"/> Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Governance <input type="radio"/> Service Organization <input type="radio"/> Social Fraternity/Sorority <input type="radio"/> Professional/Major <input type="radio"/> Religious <input type="radio"/> Honor Society <input type="radio"/> Campus Media <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>
Athletics	Employment	
<input type="radio"/> Varsity Athletics <input type="radio"/> Club Sports Intramurals <input type="radio"/> Other Athletics	<input type="radio"/> Campus Employment <input type="radio"/> Volunteer Work <input type="radio"/> Off-Campus Job	
Performance/Creative Activity	Other	
<input type="radio"/> Public Performance/Recital <input type="radio"/> Other Creative Effort	<input type="radio"/> Relationships/Friendships <input type="radio"/> Residence Life <input type="radio"/> ROTC <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	

Table 9. Self-Discovery: University-Wide Student Rationales 2017–2021

Category	Reason	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Risk/Challenge/Growth	Deep Introspection	35	31	23	7	16
	New Perspective on Self	6	29	25	16	24
	Personal Growth	43	57	60	46	74
	Responsibility	15	19	20	10	13
	Moral/Ethical Dilemma	3	4	6	2	3
Academic/Scholarship	Personal Best	5	6	10	5	5
	Especially Challenging	15	21	26	15	17
	Intellectual Risk	3	6	7	6	4
	Vocational Development	17	23	21	13	18
	Worked as Professional	8	14	12	9	8
Relationships	Service to Others	8	10	11	5	8
	Collaboration w/ Peers	20	24	21	16	16
	Collaboration w/ Professional	2	12	11	7	9
	Mentoring Internship	3	8	5	4	7

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. During reading sessions, the faculty are told to choose at least one. 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 (2017: 43%, 2018: 57%, 2019: 60%, 2020: 46%, 2021: 74%). In 2021 *New Perspective on Self* was the next most significant category (24 %) Deep Introspection has dropped significantly over the last three years (2017: 35, 2018: 31%, 2019: 23%, 2020: 7%, 2021, 16%).

Within the category of **Academic/Scholarship**, *Vocational Development* (2017: 17%, 2018: 23%, 2019: 21%, 2020: 13%, 2021:18%) edged out *Especially Challenging* as a significant category of self-discovery (2017: 15%, 2018: 21%, 2019: 26%, 2020: 15%, 2021: 17%). Within the **Relationships** category, students learned the most about themselves during *Collaboration w/Peers* (2017: 20%, 2018: 24%, 2019: 21%, 2020: 16%, 2021,16%).

Variation by major on all of these rationales for 2021 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: 2021 Student Risk/Growth/Challenge Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Risk/Growth/Challenge									
			Deep Introspection		New Perspective on Self		Personal Growth		Responsibility		Moral/Ethical Dilemma	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	22	8	36	7	32	14	64	1	5	1	5
	CML	22	3	14	6	27	16	73	3	14	0	0
	CRWT	18	6	33	5	28	11	61	2	11	1	6
	ENG	46	11	24	9	20	27	59	4	9	0	0
	LING	15	1	7	3	20	13	87	2	13	0	0
	MUSI	21	5	24	8	38	18	86	4	19	1	5
	THEA	12	1	8	2	17	10	83	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	156	35	22	40	26	109	70	17	11	3	2
Business	ACCT	60	5	8	18	30	46	77	11	18	0	0
	BSAD	91	11	12	17	19	66	73	14	15	5	5
	TOTAL	151	16	11	35	23	112	74	25	17	5	3
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	10	25	10	25	31	78	7	18	3	8
	ES	90	9	10	23	26	67	74	8	9	3	3
	HLTH	59	11	19	14	24	44	75	11	19	2	3
	NU	53	6	11	13	25	43	81	5	9	2	4
	TOTAL	242	36	15	60	25	185	76	31	13	10	4
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	1	5	1	5	17	85	2	10	1	5
	BCMB	8	3	38	1	12	6	75	2	25	0	0
	BIOL	93	16	17	25	27	72	77	16	17	6	6
	CHEM	21	2	10	6	29	12	57	1	5	1	5
	CS	55	13	24	13	24	41	75	5	9	0	0
	MATH	19	2	11	4	21	14	74	2	11	0	0
	PHYS	7	4	57	3	43	5	71	2	29	0	0
	STTS	12	1	8	2	17	10	83	2	17	0	0
	TOTAL	235	42	18	55	23	177	75	32	14	8	3
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	3	7	9	21	30	70	7	16	2	5
	ECON	15	4	27	5	33	11	73	1	7	0	0
	HIST	33	5	15	10	30	23	70	4	12	0	0
	JUST	32	6	19	6	19	20	62	6	19	1	3
	PHRE	9	2	22	1	11	4	44	0	0	0	0
	POL	31	2	6	6	19	25	81	8	26	2	6
	PSYC	81	17	21	20	25	63	78	9	11	3	4
	SOAN	19	3	16	4	21	14	74	1	5	2	11
	TOTAL	263	42	16	61	23	190	72	36	14	10	4
IDSMS	IDSMS	6	1	17	2	33	4	67	1	17	0	0
LIBS	LIBS	3	0	0	2	67	2	67	0	0	0	0
ALL	TOTAL	1,056	172	16	255	24	779	74	142	13	36	3

Table 11. Self-Discovery: 2021 Student Academic/Scholarship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Academic/Scholarship									
			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	22	0	0	2	9	0	0	2	9	2	9
	CML	22	1	5	6	27	1	5	3	14	0	0
	CRWT	18	1	6	3	17	1	6	4	22	1	6
	ENG	46	4	9	9	20	1	2	12	26	3	7
	LING	15	2	13	5	33	2	13	1	7	0	0
	MUSI	21	1	5	5	24	0	0	3	14	3	14
	THEA	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	33	2	17
	TOTAL	156	9	6	30	19	6	4	29	19	11	7
Business	ACCT	60	0	0	4	7	5	8	8	13	4	7
	BSAD	91	2	2	12	13	2	2	19	21	11	12
	TOTAL	151	2	1	16	11	7	5	27	18	15	10
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	1	2	3	8	2	5	7	18	5	12
	ES	90	2	2	14	16	4	4	21	23	3	3
	HLTH	59	3	5	15	25	3	5	16	27	3	5
	NU	53	3	6	10	19	2	4	10	19	6	11
	TOTAL	242	9	4	42	17	11	5	54	22	17	7
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	1	5	0	0	1	5	5	25	4	20
	BCMB	8	0	0	1	12	1	12	0	0	0	0
	BIOL	93	4	4	24	26	4	4	16	17	9	10
	CHEM	21	2	10	3	14	1	5	4	19	1	5
	CS	55	4	7	12	22	4	7	8	15	6	11
	MATH	19	2	11	6	32	0	0	3	16	1	5
	PHYS	7	0	0	1	14	1	14	1	14	0	0
	STTS	12	2	17	3	25	1	8	3	25	1	8
	TOTAL	235	15	6	50	21	13	6	40	17	22	9
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	5	12	5	12	0	0	7	16	4	9
	ECON	15	0	0	1	7	2	13	1	7	0	0
	HIST	33	2	6	10	30	1	3	5	15	2	6
	JUST	32	0	0	4	12	0	0	7	22	2	6
	PHRE	9	1	11	2	22	0	0	2	22	1	11
	POL	31	0	0	4	13	1	3	6	19	4	13
	PSYC	81	6	7	12	15	5	6	11	14	4	5
	SOAN	19	1	5	5	26	1	5	4	21	1	5
	TOTAL	263	15	6	43	16	10	4	43	16	18	7
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	1	17	0	0	1	17	1	17
LIBS	LIBS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ALL	TOTAL	1,056	50	5	182	17	47	4	194	18	84	8

Table 12. Self-Discovery: 2021 Student Relationship Rationales by Major

School	Major	N	Relationships							
			Service to Others		Collaboration w/ Peers		Collaboration w/ Professional		Mentoring Internship	
			Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	22	0	0	2	9	4	18	1	5
	CML	22	1	5	3	14	2	9	0	0
	CRWT	18	3	17	1	6	1	6	1	6
	ENG	46	1	2	6	13	3	7	5	11
	LING	15	0	0	1	7	3	20	2	13
	MUSI	21	2	10	5	24	5	24	5	24
	THEA	12	1	8	3	25	1	8	0	0
	TOTAL	156	8	5	21	13	19	12	14	9
Business	ACCT	60	2	3	9	15	2	3	1	2
	BSAD	91	6	7	14	15	6	7	5	5
	TOTAL	151	8	5	23	15	8	5	6	4
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	9	22	8	20	2	5	3	8
	ES	90	4	4	8	9	3	3	5	6
	HLTH	59	7	12	8	14	4	7	6	10
	NU	53	7	13	14	26	5	9	4	8
	TOTAL	242	27	11	38	16	14	6	18	7
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	0	0	3	15	2	10	2	10
	BCMB	8	1	12	0	0	2	25	1	12
	BIOL	93	11	12	15	16	15	16	7	8
	CHEM	21	1	5	7	33	3	14	3	14
	CS	55	2	4	5	9	4	7	4	7
	MATH	19	1	5	1	5	1	5	0	0
	PHYS	7	0	0	2	29	1	14	0	0
	STTS	12	0	0	4	33	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	235	16	7	37	16	28	12	17	7
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	5	12	13	30	4	9	2	5
	ECON	15	1	7	2	13	2	13	2	13
	HIST	33	1	3	6	18	2	6	1	3
	JUST	32	4	12	7	22	2	6	3	9
	PHRE	9	1	11	1	11	1	11	1	11
	POL	31	4	13	5	16	0	0	0	0
	PSYC	81	8	10	14	17	12	15	11	14
	SOAN	19	1	5	2	11	3	16	0	0
	TOTAL	263	25	10	50	19	26	10	20	8
IDSMS	IDSMS	6	0	0	1	17	0	0	1	17
LIBS	LIBS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	TOTAL	1,056	84	8	170	16	95	9	76	7

Table 13. Self-Discovery: Context of the Experience 2019–2021

SELF		2019 N	2019 %	2020 N	2020%	2021 N	2021%
Category	SELF Context						
Coursework	LSP	81	7	78	7	60	6
	Major	247	22	259	24	255	25
	Capstone	5	0	18	2	10	1
	Minor	26	2	33	3	44	4
	Elective	41	4	41	4	41	4
	All	400	36	429	38	410	39
Other Academic	Research	14	1	17	2	18	2
	Internship	29	3	39	4	21	2
	Study Abroad	53	5	52	5	32	3
	Resume/Prof. Statement	6	1	6	1	7	1
	Service Learning	7	1	4	0	5	0
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	19	2	17	2	26	3
	Other Academic	30	3	28	3		
All	158	14	163	15	109	10	
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	2	0	3	0	4	0
	Service Organization	27	2	29	3	26	3
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	100	9	84	8	82	8
	Professional/Major	14	1	17	2	11	1
	Religious Organization	33	3	27	2	25	2
	Honor Society	4	0	2	0	2	0
	Campus Media	3	0	2	0	5	0
	Other Organization	9	1	29	3		
All	192	17	193	17	155	15	
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	35	3	31	3	19	2
	Club Sports/Intramurals	11	1	11	1	4	0
	Other Athletics	7	1	3	0	5	0
	All	53	5	45	4	28	3
Employment	Campus Job	21	2	13	1	22	2
	Volunteer	7	1	3	0	3	0
	Off-Campus Job	17	2	7	1	6	1
	All	45	4	23	2	31	3
Performance/Creative	Public Performance/Recital	5	0	7	1	5	0
	Other Creative Activity	17	2	11	1	9	1
	All	22	2	18	2	14	1
Other	Relationships/Friendships	139	13	112	10	129	13
	Resident Life	25	2	18	2	12	1
	ROTC	9	1	3	0	2	0
	Other Misc.	60	5	95	9	113	11
	All	233	21	228	20	256	24
NA	All	0	0	17	2	57	5
All	All	1,103	100	1,116	100	1,060	100

Note: This table was generated from the column “Self-Discovery Context Reviewer 1”. The column for Reviewer 2 was empty.

Table 13 shows the context for the Self Discovery submissions, since 2019. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. As usual, the majority (39% in 2021) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (25% in 2021) 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 2021) is the next highest area with all others falling under 10%.

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-thought-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	Other Academic	Student Organization
<input type="radio"/> LSP <input type="radio"/> Major <input type="radio"/> Capstone <input type="radio"/> Minor <input type="radio"/> Elective	<input type="radio"/> Research <input type="radio"/> Internship <input type="radio"/> Study Abroad <input type="radio"/> Resume / College Application / Professional Statement <input type="radio"/> Service Learning <input type="radio"/> Tutoring/Teaching/Mentoring <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Governance <input type="radio"/> Service Organization <input type="radio"/> Social Fraternity/Sorority <input type="radio"/> Professional/Major <input type="radio"/> Religious <input type="radio"/> Honor Society <input type="radio"/> Campus Media <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>
Athletics	Employment	
<input type="radio"/> Varsity Athletics <input type="radio"/> Club Sports Intramurals <input type="radio"/> Other Athletics	<input type="radio"/> Campus Employment <input type="radio"/> Volunteer Work <input type="radio"/> Off-Campus Job	
Performance/Creative Activity	Other	
<input type="radio"/> Public Performance/Recital <input type="radio"/> Other Creative Effort	<input type="radio"/> Relationships/Friendships <input type="radio"/> Residence Life <input type="radio"/> ROTC <input type="radio"/> Other: <input type="text"/>	

Table 14. Most Personally Satisfying: Percentages of Reasons for All Students 2017–2021

Most Personally Satisfying Reasons (%)					
Reason	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Personal Growth	47	50	46	32	21
Enjoyable	52	47	56	33	22
Challenging	39	38	40	20	11
Professional	29	32	27	15	8
Personal Goals	27	31	28	11	10
Personal Best	20	26	11	3	7
Lots of Time	26	25	27	14	9
Collaborative	23	22	17	13	8
Problem Solving	6	9	11	3	3
No Indication					0
MOST_WHY_Other					2

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 2021, “Enjoyable” (22%) continued as the top reason for student satisfaction, “Personal Growth” (21%) was second highest and “Challenging” (11%) was third. 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” has been on a downward trend for the last three years. It is important to note that in the self-discovery prompt, the top **Academic/Scholarship** category was *collaboration w/others* (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 2021: Scores Sorted by First Major

			Personal Best		Personal Goals		Personal Growth		Challenging		Professional	
School	Major	N	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	22	5	23	6	27	10	45	6	27	5	23
	CML	22	3	14	3	14	14	64	6	27	0	0
	CRWT	18	4	22	2	11	9	50	4	22	3	17
	ENG	46	10	22	6	13	25	54	14	30	8	17
	LING	15	3	20	5	33	8	53	4	27	1	7
	MUSI	21	8	38	9	43	10	48	3	14	3	14
	THEA	12	2	17	6	50	6	50	4	33	4	33
	TOTAL	156	35	22	37	24	82	53	41	26	24	15
Business	ACCT	60	9	15	4	7	21	35	13	22	16	27
	BSAD	91	13	14	15	16	40	44	22	24	16	18
	TOTAL	151	22	15	19	13	61	40	35	23	32	21
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMD5	40	6	15	15	38	22	55	13	32	12	30
	ES	89	9	10	16	18	36	40	12	13	18	20
	HLTH	59	6	10	17	29	31	53	8	14	14	24
	NU	55	5	9	14	25	28	51	14	25	21	38
	TOTAL	243	26	11	62	26	117	48	47	19	65	27
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	3	15	5	25	11	55	2	10	1	5
	BCMB	8	4	50	2	25	4	50	4	50	2	25
	BIOL	93	19	20	18	19	53	57	24	26	22	24
	CHEM	21	4	19	8	38	11	52	7	33	4	19
	CS	56	13	23	13	23	22	39	17	30	9	16
	MATH	19	4	21	3	16	11	58	7	37	2	11
	PHYS	7	1	14	2	29	4	57	2	29	1	14
	STTS	12	1	8	3	25	1	8	3	25	3	25
	TOTAL	236	49	21	54	23	117	50	66	28	44	19
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	4	9	7	16	19	44	8	19	7	16
	ECON	15	1	7	3	20	7	47	3	20	1	7
	HIST	33	6	18	10	30	13	39	11	33	8	24
	JUST	32	5	16	8	25	17	53	10	31	4	12
	PHRE	9	1	11	3	33	3	33	2	22	0	0
	POL	31	7	23	8	26	14	45	14	45	4	13
	PSYC	81	11	14	20	25	40	49	15	19	10	12
	SOAN	19	3	16	4	21	14	74	8	42	0	0
	TOTAL	263	38	14	63	24	127	48	71	27	34	13
IDSM	IDSM	6	2	33	2	33	4	67	2	33	1	17
LIBS	LIBS	3	3	100	2	67	2	67	2	67	1	33
ALL	TOTAL	1,058	175	17	239	23	510	48	264	25	201	19

Table 15 cont. Most Personally Satisfying 2021: Scores Sorted by First Major, Continued

			Collaborative		Enjoyable		No Indication		Problem Solving		Lots of Time	
School	Major	N	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
Arts and Letters	ART	22	2	9	12	55	1	5	1	5	3	14
	CML	22	1	5	13	59	0	0	1	5	3	14
	CRWT	18	1	6	7	39	0	0	2	11	7	39
	ENG	46	8	17	19	41	0	0	2	4	12	26
	LING	15	2	13	12	80	0	0	2	13	4	27
	MUSI	21	4	19	11	52	0	0	2	10	3	14
	THEA	12	2	17	8	67	0	0	0	0	3	25
	TOTAL	156	20	13	82	53	1	1	10	6	35	22
Business	ACCT	60	25	42	31	52	0	0	5	8	13	22
	BSAD	91	22	24	39	43	1	1	5	5	19	21
	TOTAL	151	47	31	70	46	1	1	10	7	32	21
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	3	8	15	38	0	0	2	5	9	22
	ES	89	15	17	50	56	1	1	4	4	11	12
	HLTH	59	10	17	29	49	0	0	5	8	5	8
	NU	55	6	11	27	49	0	0	4	7	9	16
	TOTAL	243	34	14	121	50	1	0	15	6	34	14
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	2	10	9	45	0	0	3	15	2	10
	BCMB	8	3	38	6	75	0	0	0	0	4	50
	BIOL	93	19	20	46	49	1	1	8	9	21	23
	CHEM	21	3	14	10	48	0	0	6	29	6	29
	CS	56	18	32	30	54	1	2	7	12	9	16
	MATH	19	1	5	9	47	0	0	3	16	6	32
	PHYS	7	1	14	5	71	0	0	0	0	2	29
	STTS	12	2	17	10	83	0	0	0	0	4	33
	TOTAL	236	49	21	125	53	2	1	27	11	54	23
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	10	23	28	65	0	0	3	7	4	9
	ECON	15	1	7	4	27	0	0	1	7	5	33
	HIST	33	4	12	17	52	0	0	2	6	8	24
	JUST	32	7	22	19	59	0	0	2	6	9	28
	PHRE	9	1	11	5	56	0	0	1	11	3	33
	POL	31	3	10	16	52	0	0	4	13	10	32
	PSYC	81	15	19	44	54	0	0	3	4	14	17
	SOAN	19	0	0	7	37	0	0	3	16	7	37
	TOTAL	263	41	16	140	53	0	0	19	7	60	23
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	0	4	67	0	0	0	0	2	33
LIBS	LIBS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	
ALL	TOTAL	1,058	191	18	542	51	5	0	81	8	219	21

Table 15 shows the 2021 data broken down by major. The data for each reason is indicated as a raw number of students from within that major and as a percentage of that major's total students. The reasons chosen within a particular major vary greatly, so it would be worthwhile for each department to see what motivates their own students.

Table 16. Most Personally Satisfying Context 2019–2021

SELF		2019 N	2019 %	2020 N	2020%	2021 N	2021%
Category	SELF Context						
Coursework	LSP	81	7	74	13	105	11
	Major	247	22	180	31	361	36
	Capstone	5	0	17	3	20	2
	Minor	26	2	42	7	51	5
	Elective	41	4	41	7	73	7
	All	400	36	354	61	610	58
Other Academic	Research	14	1	12	2	25	3
	Internship	29	3	18	3	23	2
	Study Abroad	53	5	27	5	22	2
	Resume/Prof. Statement	6	1	0	0	5	1
	Service Learning	7	1	2	0	5	1
	Tutor/Teach/Mentor	19	2	6	1	6	1
	Other Academic	30	3	8	1		
All	158	14	73	13	86	8	
Student Organizations	Governance Organizations	2	0	1	0	4	0
	Service Organization	27	2	8	1	25	3
	Social Fraternity/Sorority	100	9	31	5	61	6
	Professional/Major	14	1	10	2	6	1
	Religious Organization	33	3	13	2	14	1
	Honor Society	4	0	2	0	5	1
	Campus Media	3	0	3	1	5	1
	Other Organization	9	1	16	3		
All	192	17	84	14	120	11	
Athletics	Varsity Athletics	35	3	9	2	27	3
	Club Sports/Intramurals	11	1	9	2	13	1
	Other Athletics	7	1	0	0	5	1
	All	53	5	18	3	45	4
Employment	Campus Job	21	2	7	1	20	2
	Volunteer	7	1	2	0	10	1
	Off-Campus Job	17	2	5	1	1	0
	All	45	4	14	2	31	3
Performance/Creative	Public Performance/Recital	5	0	13	2	16	2
	Other Creative Activity	17	2	6	1	12	1
	All	22	2	19	3	28	3
Other	Relationships/Friendships	139	13	13	2	15	2
	Resident Life	25	2	0	0	6	1
	ROTC	9	1	3	1	2	0
	Other Misc.	60	5	4	1	51	5
	All	233	21	20	3	74	7
NA	All	0	0	0	0	66	6
All	All	1,103	100	582	100	1,060	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 2019. Faculty Reviewers can choose only one context that best fits the submission and the total percentage is reflected here. As usual, well over half (58% in 2021) of the submissions are from coursework, with most of that (36% in 2021) being from course work within the student's major. The satisfaction that our students feel from their majors is very gratifying. Student organizations (11% in 2021) is the only other area that shows greater than 10% 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. 2017–2021 Average Scores, Sorted by School, for Whether Truman Education as a Whole was Transformative

School	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5	Ave	% 4 or 5
AAL	3.6	57	3.4	52	3.0	43	3.7	60	3.6	63
BUS	3.1	40	3.1	41	2.7	36	3.2	38	3.1	33
HSE	3.5	53	3.4	47	3.1	50	3.6	56	3.5	54
SAM	2.9	50	3.4	49	3.0	40	3.3	46	3.5	56
SCS	3.6	59	3.4	53	3.0	46	3.5	53	3.6	57
IDSM	3.6	50	3.3	33	3.5	75	3.5	53	3.5	50
LIBS									2.7	0
ALL	3.3	53	3.4	49	3.0	43	3.5	51	3.5	53

Note: 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 2017 to 2021 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. In 2020, the university was far more prepared to meet the difficulties of the pandemic and overall things were much more consistent for the students. The average for scores of 4 or 5 over the last 5 years continues to be 50%.

Table 18. 2021 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	22	3	3	7	5	4	0	3.18	41
	CML	22	0	1	5	12	4	0	3.86	73
	CRWT	18	0	5	4	7	2	0	3.33	50
	ENG	46	3	3	12	21	7	0	3.57	61
	LING	15	0	1	2	10	2	0	3.87	80
	MUSI	21	0	1	4	13	3	0	3.86	76
	THEA	12	1	2	1	6	2	0	3.50	67
TOTAL		156	7	16	35	74	24	0	3.59	63
Business	ACCT	60	7	9	23	13	6	2	3.03	32
	BSAD	92	8	14	38	25	6	1	3.08	34
	TOTAL		152	15	23	61	38	12	3	3.06
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	0	4	8	20	8	0	3.80	70
	ES	90	6	11	28	35	6	4	3.28	46
	HLTH	59	0	5	18	28	8	0	3.66	61
	NU	55	2	6	18	24	3	2	3.38	49
TOTAL		244	8	26	72	107	25	6	3.48	54
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	0	3	9	7	0	1	3.21	35
	BCMB	8	0	1	1	2	4	0	4.12	75
	BIOL	93	2	10	23	44	14	0	3.62	62
	CHEM	21	1	3	5	9	3	0	3.48	57
	CS	56	2	6	21	24	3	0	3.36	48
	MATH	19	0	1	8	5	5	0	3.74	53
	PHYS	7	1	0	1	3	2	0	3.71	71
	STTS	12	0	3	3	4	2	0	3.42	50
	TOTAL		236	6	27	71	98	33	1	3.53
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	0	3	12	24	4	0	3.67	65
	ECON	15	0	1	6	2	6	0	3.87	53
	HIST	33	0	3	11	12	5	2	3.61	52
	JUST	32	2	1	12	12	5	0	3.53	53
	PHRE	9	0	2	2	2	3	0	3.67	56
	POL	31	1	4	7	12	7	0	3.65	61
	PSYC	81	2	11	26	33	8	1	3.42	51
	SOAN	19	0	0	5	12	2	0	3.84	74
TOTAL		263	5	25	81	109	40	3	3.59	57
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	1	2	2	1	0	3.50	50
LIBS	LIBS	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	2.67	0
ALL	ALL	1,060	41	119	324	428	135	13	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 3.03 to 4.12 with the mean average score as 3.47. Examination of the percentage of students within each major who scored 4 & 5 does vary widely, with its range from 32% to 80%.

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. 2021 Counts of Students who Participated in these Transformative Activities.

Activity	N Participated	%
Study Abroad	123	11.60
Service Learning	128	12.08
Research	294	27.74
Internship	263	24.81
Leadership	399	37.64
Student-Led Education	45	4.25
Writing	242	22.83
Other	92	8.68
Course	811	76.51
Any (Big 4)	595	56.13
Any	966	91.13
Total 2021 N	1,060	

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 2021, 811 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, 242 (23%) students reported such an experience which is consistent with 2020.

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. 2016–2021 Percentages of all Truman Students Reporting Activities Over Time

Activity	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Study Abroad	21	20	20	18	19	12
Service Learning	23	17	20	17	17	12
Research	31	31	29	29	25	28
Internship	33	35	32	33	32	25
Leadership	42	41	42	40	40	38
Student-Led Education	7	7	6	5	5	4
Writing	21	21	22	23	23	23
Other	7	8	8	8	10	9
Course	77	75	47	48	78	77
Any (Big 4)	68	70	70	67	63	56
Any	83	85	84	83	94	91

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

Table 21. 2016–2021 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities by Gender

Activity	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Study Abroad	24	14	26	9	18	17	24	10	14	9
Service Learning	21	11	25	12	24	8	20	10	16	7
Research	33	29	34	23	31	25	28	18	30	24
Internship	38	31	31	35	32	33	33	31	27	22
Leadership	45	34	46	35	44	33	45	30	42	31
Student-Led Education	8	5	6	5	6	4	5	4	5	3
Writing	24	16	24	19	26	20	26	19	26	18
Other	8	8	6	10	6	10	10	8	8	9
Course	40	31	51	41	51	41	80	75	80	71

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 2021, females again participated in almost all of these types of activities at

frequencies higher than males, with the differences ranging from 1 to 11 percentage points. 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. 2021 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	22	14	0	18	23	18	0	27	9	59
	CML	22	59	14	9	9	32	9	27	27	95
	CRWT	18	17	11	11	22	39	0	78	0	94
	ENG	46	11	2	15	9	35	2	57	15	83
	LING	15	33	33	13	0	33	0	27	0	87
	MUSI	21	5	5	19	14	57	10	33	24	100
	THEA	12	8	0	17	17	17	17	33	17	83
	TOTAL	156	20	8	15	13	34	4	43	14	85
Business	ACCT	60	15	10	2	27	38	2	22	7	58
	BSAD	92	15	4	4	25	39	3	16	10	66
	TOTAL	152	15	7	3	26	39	3	18	9	63
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	8	18	38	8	58	0	28	8	85
	ES	90	9	20	29	48	38	7	10	7	68
	HLTH	59	8	73	20	34	46	5	12	19	85
	NU	55	7	7	13	38	18	0	15	13	67
	TOTAL	244	8	30	25	36	39	4	14	11	75
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	10	5	30	30	30	5	20	5	80
	BCMB	8	12	0	88	25	62	0	12	0	62
	BIOL	93	10	12	56	12	46	4	17	10	77
	CHEM	21	5	0	67	10	38	0	29	5	81
	CS	56	7	2	20	39	20	4	9	5	66
	MATH	19	16	0	16	16	32	16	42	5	79
	PHYS	7	0	0	57	29	57	14	14	0	71
	STTS	12	0	0	25	33	42	8	33	0	75
	TOTAL	236	8	6	42	22	37	5	19	6	75
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	16	12	12	35	49	5	35	5	79
	ECON	15	20	0	33	27	27	7	20	7	80
	HIST	33	15	3	39	30	27	9	39	6	73
	JUST	32	3	12	12	12	31	0	9	9	84
	PHRE	9	11	0	22	33	22	0	33	0	78
	POL	31	10	0	35	42	58	3	32	3	87
	PSYC	81	2	10	63	11	38	5	16	6	84
	SOAN	19	32	11	63	26	32	5	26	5	89
	TOTAL	263	11	8	39	24	38	5	25	6	82
IDSM	IDSM	6	0	17	33	33	50	17	17	0	83
LIBS	LIBS	3	33	0	33	0	33	0	33	0	100
ALL	ALL	1,060	12	12	28	25	38	4	23	9	77

Table 22 cont. 2021 Percentages of Truman Students Reporting Activities Sorted by Major (cont.)

School	Major	N	Big 4		Any	
			Count	%	Count	%
Arts and Letters	ART	22	9	41	18	82
	CML	22	17	77	22	100
	CRWT	18	9	50	18	100
	ENG	46	14	30	44	96
	LING	15	7	47	15	100
	MUSI	21	7	33	21	100
	THEA	12	3	25	10	83
	TOTAL	156	66	42	148	95
Business	ACCT	60	27	45	48	80
	BSAD	92	41	45	80	87
	TOTAL	152	68	45	128	84
Hlth. Sci. and Ed.	CMDS	40	22	55	37	92
	ES	90	60	67	78	87
	HLTH	59	50	85	59	100
	NU	55	28	51	48	87
	TOTAL	244	160	66	222	91
Sci. and Math Studies	AGSC	20	11	55	19	95
	BCMB	8	7	88	8	100
	BIOL	93	61	66	85	91
	CHEM	21	14	67	21	100
	CS	56	29	52	49	88
	MATH	19	7	37	16	84
	PHYS	7	5	71	6	86
	STTS	12	7	58	11	92
	TOTAL	236	141	60	215	91
Social and Cultural Studies	COMM	43	22	51	42	98
	ECON	15	8	53	15	100
	HIST	33	21	64	28	85
	JUST	32	11	34	29	91
	PHRE	9	5	56	8	89
	POL	31	20	65	30	97
	PSYC	81	53	65	74	91
	SOAN	19	15	79	18	95
	TOTAL	263	155	59	244	93
IDSMS	IDSMS	6	3	50	6	100
LIBS	LIBS	3	2	67	3	100
ALL	ALL	1,060	595	56	966	91

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 (2017–2021)

School	Year	N	Percent Participation by Activity									
			StdAbrd	ServLrn	UGRes	Intern	AnyBig4	Leader	StuLedEd	Writing	Other	Any
AAL	2017	188	30	10	15	25	58	37	11	33	9	83
	2018	183	23	8	11	18	48	38	6	39	7	78
	2019	169	25	13	13	15	56	34	7	39	9	84
	2020	183	25	8	7	16	45	38	8	37	13	96
	2021	156	20	8	15	13	42	34	4	43	14	95
BUS	2017	186	26	7	11	44	68	40	3	16	6	81
	2018	180	17	7	7	44	55	43	2	16	8	73
	2019	199	23	5	6	38	60	32	3	14	5	76
	2020	188	19	9	9	37	54	40	2	19	8	87
	2021	152	15	7	3	26	45	39	3	18	9	84
HSE	2017	231	14	47	40	42	84	41	8	15	8	92
	2018	248	19	50	38	35	86	45	8	17	8	91
	2019	253	11	38	30	40	80	38	6	12	7	87
	2020	273	17	40	31	39	79	41	6	18	10	96
	2021	244	8	30	25	36	66	39	4	14	11	91
SAM	2017	252	13	11	40	28	67	42	5	17	8	83
	2018	214	18	12	36	28	69	43	6	16	8	83
	2019	232	15	8	38	28	68	37	5	17	5	83
	2020	241	11	8	32	25	60	41	5	21	12	93
	2021	236	8	6	42	22	60	37	5	19	6	91
SCS	2017	308	19	10	40	36	72	41	6	23	8	86
	2018	289	20	15	42	35	72	39	6	25	9	88
	2019	246	13	12	35	25	62	36	2	26	7	80
	2020	262	23	10	35	39	67	37	3	25	6	95
	2021	263	11	8	39	24	59	38	5	25	6	93
IDSM	2017	5	20	60	40	60	80	80	60	40	0	100
	2018	3	67	0	33	0	100	67	0	33	0	100
	2019	4	0	50	50	0	75	25	25	50	0	100
	2020	15	33	40	40	27	67	53	20	20	13	100
	2021	6	0	17	33	33	50	50	17	17	0	100
LIBS	2021	3	33	0	33	0	67	33	0	33	0	100
ALL	2017	1,170	20	17	31	35	68	41	7	21	8	85
	2018	1,117	20	20	29	32	70	42	6	22	8	84
	2019	1,103	17	16	26	30	66	36	5	21	7	82
	2020	1,162	19	17	25	32	63	40	5	23	10	94
	2021	1,060	12	12	28	25	56	38	4	23	9	91

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, 56% of all students report having at least one of the "Big 4" which continues a downward trend from 2018 (70) and 91% report having some transformative experience.

The Letter to Truman

Although students submitted this prompt in 2021, it was no longer read or scored in the same way by a group of faculty readers. Administrative concerns about legal issues regarding access to the information led to the suspension of reading the letters at the sessions so the 2021 Letter to Truman prompt was read by an administrator instead of the faculty readers. Access to the letters has been restricted for all but the highest level administrators of the portfolio. For this reason the letters will no longer be a part of this report.

Due to the Covid pandemic there was a need to move reading sessions completely online and the stipend for the reading sessions was discontinued in an effort to move the reading to an all-volunteer service mode. In 2020 there were quite a few volunteers since it was an emergency situation although we were only able to read a statistical sampling of the submissions with no double reading. The number of volunteers decreased significantly for the 2021 reading sessions so some submissions were actually left to evaluate in the 2022 reading session. A good deal of Interdisciplinary as well as most of the Self-Discovery and Most Personally Satisfying were captured by the 2022 effort.

Portfolio Reader Information and Feedback

In 2021 we did two, 1 week reading sessions online through Zoom. The budget continued to be eliminated for the reading session so we were required to ask for volunteers to complete the reading which left us with only 18 readers total. As in 2020, there were not enough readers to complete everything so we created a plan for sampling. Instead of doing a random sampling, Dean De Cock created a spreadsheet so that we could be sure that all departments (especially the small ones) were represented. Although two weeks of reading occurred, the small number of readers did not get through nearly what was hoped. It is clear that live sessions where the readers can interact with one another is an important part of the process. Even though I assigned due dates to have reading done, readers at home took a far longer time to finish and it seemed they did not all stay on task. A few even simply told me they were done after a week or two and hadn't read very much. Faculty development has been an

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

Portfolio Collection Matters

The portfolio collection process ran smoothly with few problems this year. Our 2021 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 Manager 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.

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 only to never receive feedback about that work.
- **Technology Improvements:** allow greater opportunities and flexibility.
- **Student Buy-in and Motivation:** Can we convince more of them to care?
- **Faculty Buy-In and Motivation:** Can we convince more of them to care?
- **Baselines:** As our curriculum evolves, what do we need to measure now so that we will recognize changes once they happen?