Aggies Commit:
Reflections on Student Leadership
Fall 2014-Spring 2015

Background

The Texas A&M Division of Student Affairs has been an active participant in Texas A&M University Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) since it was established as part of the accreditation process with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS COC). A university committee was charged with developing the Quality Enhancement Plan, and according to the QEP website (http://provost.tamu.edu/initiatives/quality-enhancement-plan/qep), "The topic of the QEP will be centered on some aspect(s) of Aggies Commit which is based on the Aggie Core Values, our *Teaching and Learning Roadmap* of the *Academic Master Plan*, *Action 2015: Education First*, and nationally recognized student learning outcomes and high-impact education practices."

Additionally, the website explains the theme of the QEP "is *Aggies Commit to Learning for a Lifetime*. Our rapidly-changing world needs people who can learn and keep learning, adapt to change, and create new opportunities for themselves and others. Learning for a lifetime requires curiosity, initiative, and independence, as well as the ability to reflect, transfer knowledge to new contexts, and integrate knowledge from more than one domain. Our QEP focuses our efforts on creating learning environments and a campus culture that foster these qualities and abilities."

The Division of Student Affairs, and specifically the Student Leader Learning Outcomes (SLLO) project, is mentioned numerous times throughout the Aggies Commit literature. Furthermore, the website names the Division's role by stating, "Student Affairs and other support units will participate in the QEP efforts by providing or supporting experiences that help students grow as lifelong learners."

When addressing how the institution would assess progress and success of the QEP, as outlined in the frequently asked questions for Aggies Commit, "At the university level, we will evaluate student reflections and associated artifacts using the VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) rubric, Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning, developed by AAC&U. Additionally, results of college assessments will be used to evaluate the impact on student learning at individual colleges and collectively for the university." In August 2012, the SLLO committee developed an assessment project that would gather student reflections based on prompts related to integrated and lifelong learning. The project would include student organizations from throughout the Division of Student Affairs. This assessment project would be repeated every other academic year, with the second year being administered in 2014-2015.

The assessment project involved student leaders reflecting on prompts provided throughout the 2014-2015 year through their student organization. The four months during the academic year included October, November, March, and April. Paper form surveys were created by Student Life Studies and distributed to advisors of participating organizations and then returned to Student Life Studies. The Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team (formerly the SLLO Assessment Team) developed the reflection prompts and used the AAC&U Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric to score each reflection.

For this second iteration, a few changes were made in administering the assessment project. First, the student surveys were only administered to student leaders within the organization and not general members. The number of months involved in the project was shortened from seven in 2012-2013 to four in 2014-2015. Additionally, a survey was administered with the advisors for each participating organization to share how often and in what method students met with their advisor. Furthermore, the participating advisors also went through a training prior to the first reflection to gain information about the overall project and were given instructions on administering the surveys to ensure a more consistent manner was used throughout the year.

Method and Sample

The electronic survey for advisors was developed using Qualtrics®, survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The survey consisted of one quantitative question that allowed advisors to provide the UIN for each student in the organization related to how frequently the advisor and student met. The survey was initially sent to participating advisors on September 23, 2014. Non-respondents received up to four reminders before the survey closed in mid-November.

The four monthly paper surveys for students were developed using Teleform®, survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. Each survey included three demographic questions and the qualitative reflection prompt. Additional demographic information was pulled from the University student database.

The data for advisor and students surveys was analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, Microsoft Word® and Microsoft Excel®. The Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team did a formal analysis of the student reflections using portions of the AAC&U's Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric. Rubrics were adjusted to reflect the specific question each month by the Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team. Reflections received scores of 4=Capstone, 3=Milestones, 2=Milestones, 1=Benchmark, and 0=Evidence Not Provided. All reflections were reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers, if those reviewers had different scores, then a third review was used.

Student surveys were administered four different times through student organization meetings. Advisors distributed, collected, and returned the surveys to Student Life Studies. At the start of the 2014-2015 academic school year, 63 student organizations expressed interest in participating in this assessment project, which represented approximately 700 student leaders. However, not all student organizations started or continued with the project the entire year. Additionally, within each individual student organization, the number of students varied throughout the year from what they initially indicated. Therefore, a response rate was not able to be determined. Table 1 demonstrates the breakdown of the number of students and organizations participating each month. There were 522 students who completed a survey at some point during the academic year, and 179 students who completed each of the four months. Additionally, 3% of the students were in multiple organizations. Compared to the 2012-2013 year, there were 69 organizations that started in September and 58 by April and the number of students involved started with 1,010 and ended with 669 students.

Month	Number of Students Participating	Number of Participating Organizations
October	441	50
November	393	47
March	313	45
April	271	41

Table 1: Student and Group Participation

The 50 student organizations that participated in at least one month of the project represented eight departments in the Division of Student Affairs: Corps of Cadets, Disability Services, Multicultural Services, Memorial Student Center, Offices of the Dean of Student Life, Residence Life, Student Activities, and Veteran Resource and Support Center. Additionally, there was one group from International Student Services, and one recognized student organization with an advisor who was a DSA staff member. The participating student organizations are listed on the following page. Those with an asterisk (*) were new organizations for the 2014-2015 year.

2014-2015 Participating Student Organizations
*new organization for 2014-2015

Aggie Adaptive Sports*
Aggie Orientation Leader
    Program
Aggie Transition Camps
Aggie Women in Leadership*
Aggie Wranglers
Aggies2Aggies
Alternative Spring Break*
CARPOOL*
Chronicles*
Class Councils Exec Team*
Class Councils Freshmen
    Council*
Corps of Cadets Staff
Conference on Student
    Government Association
Council of Residence Hall
    Community Presidents
Delta Company*

ERASE*
Fish Aides
Fish Camp
Freshmen Leadership
    Development Retreat
Hall Council – Eppright*
Hall Council – Hobby*
Hall Council – Hullabaloo*
Hall Council – Moses*
Hall Council – Rudder
Hall Council – Underwood*
Hispanic Presidents' Council*
Insightful Connections*
Interfraternity Council*
International Student Assoc.
LeaderShape*
MSC ALOT
MSC FISH
MSC FLI

MSC LEAD
MSC Marketing*
MSC OPAS
MSC Programs Team
MSC SCONA
MSC WBAC
Off Campus Aggies
Parents' Weekend Committee
Peer Leadership & Service
    Project*
Residence Hall Staff Council
Residence Hall Association
SGA Executive Team
SGA J-Court*
Student Anti-Violence
    Educators*
Student Veteran Association
The Big Event
Traditions Council*

The reflection prompts were developed by the Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team and used a portion of the AAC&U VALUE rubrics in scoring each question. Table 2 displays the reflection prompt and the VALUE rubric used for each month.

Month	VALUE Rubric	Reflection Prompt
October	Integrative Learning (Connection)	How does this leadership experience relate to your major, classes, and/or career goals? Why is this important?
November	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	What assumptions did you make about this leadership experience? How were those assumptions challenged and how did this broaden your perspective?
March	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	Describe a challenge you or your organization faced and how you overcame it. How would you apply the lessons learned from this experience in the future?
April	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	Describe what you learned in this leadership experience and how it changed you. How would you apply this in your major, classes, and/or career goals?

Table 2: Reflection Prompts and Rubrics

Results

Results will be reported as means, standard deviations (sd), and frequency percentages for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Tables are in descending mean, frequency, or change order, unless otherwise specified. Qualitative themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document. This report is broken into six sections: demographics, October, November, March, April, advisor survey, and overall.

Demographics

Several demographics were gathered from students while responding to the reflection prompts. Table 3 illustrates the results for each month and the overall total. Missing or unknown information was removed from the analysis. There was a slight decrease in U1 classification and students in their first year at Texas A&M in the spring semester compared to the fall semester. Alternatively, there was a slight increase in students who have been at Texas A&M for two years or listed as U2.

Student Demographics	October (n=425)	November (n=375)	March (n=305)	April (n=264)	Total (n=522)
Classification					
U1	9%	7%	5%	5%	11%
U2	21%	21%	25%	24%	22%
U3	28%	30%	28%	30%	27%
U4	40%	41%	39%	39%	38%
G7	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Years at A&M					
First Year	11%	11%	6%	6%	13%
2 Years	27%	27%	32%	31%	30%
3 Years	35%	35%	34%	33%	32%
4 Years	24%	26%	26%	26%	24%
5 or More Years	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Ethnicity					
African American/Black	5%	3%	4%	5%	5%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	5%	4%	5%	6%	5%
Caucasian/White	68%	66%	70%	68%	68%
Hispanic/Latino	15%	13%	14%	14%	15%
Native American/American Indian	<1%	1%	<1%	--	1%
Other	1%	1%	--	--	<1%
Unknown	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Gender					
Male	49%	45%	47%	48%	49%
Female	51%	55%	53%	52%	51%
First Generation					
Yes	20%	18%	18%	18%	20%
No	75%	77%	77%	78%	75%
Unknown	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%

Table 3: Student Demographics

October

The first question of the semester focused on students' reflecting on why this organization was a good fit for them by asking: "How does this leadership experience relate to your major, classes, and/or career goals? Why is this important?" The rubric rating scale, adapted from the Integrative Learning VALUE rubric portion relating to connection, was:

0 (Benchmark) = Sample does not provide evidence.
1 (Benchmark) = Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic/career experiences and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests.
2 (Milestones) = Compares life experiences and academic/career knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.
3 (Milestones) = Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, to apply concepts/ theories/ frameworks of fields of study or career field.
4 (Capstone) = Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom to deepen understanding of fields of study or career field and to broaden own points of view.

Student leaders provided a total of 441 responses that articulated their leadership experience in relation to their academic experience and career aspirations. The majority of the students who participated scored a (1) benchmark level, where they were able to make some connections but were not able to fully synthesize them. In these varied responses, we found students were able to relate some of their leadership skills being helpful in the classroom, some referenced direct connections with information learned in the classroom that related to their specific leadership position in their organization, and others made connections with the leadership skills gained in their organizations being beneficial in their career aspirations. Students in the milestone levels were able to compare life experiences and effectively select and develop examples of those experiences. For example:

> Being the chair of <organization> I get much experience in regards to leadership, personal management, strategic planning, and risk management. I am a political science major who will be attending law school next fall. The skills I develop here help me develop critical thinking skills that have improved my ability to analyze by laws, procedures, and risk management policies; all of which are critical to the practice of law. It has also instilled the value of selfless service into me. Due directly to <organization> I care immensely for my fellow Aggies. This passion and drive to serve others will be the basis of my reasons for opening a law practice devoted to serving others and protecting those who cannot protect themselves. (Senior, Hispanic, Male)

A capstone participant could effectively integrate connections to have a better understanding of their field of study and/or their career aspirations.

> This experience relates to my major, classes, and career goals because it helps me learn how to manage work in a team setting and teaches me what a successful team looks like. As a business major, I need to learn communication skills, teamwork, and how to manage my time well. I have learned these skills best through <organization>. In finance, you learn the formulas and how to apply certain knowledge to solve a problem, but there are few avenues in classes to team interpersonal skills that are vital to the business world. As for my career goals, <organization> has taught me that I love working in teams and working for a common purpose. Because of this, I decided to intern as a management consultant because I have loved the structure of <organization> and I know that I want my future career to have the same structure. The <organization> has given me the skills and the vision I need for the future. (Junior, White, Female)

The majority of students, as mentioned before, could make connections between their leadership experiences and career aspirations and/or academic experiences. Although fewer of the responses were at the upper level (3) milestone level and just three of them were at the capstone level, one of which created a well-orchestrated flow chart to relate his/her experiences. Furthermore, students have a difficult time articulating how they integrate all of their experiences to have a deeper understanding of their field of study and/or their career aspirations.

November

The students were prompted to respond to the question: "What assumptions did you make about this leadership experience? How were those assumptions challenged and how did this broaden your perspective?" The rubric rating scale, adapted from the Integrative Learning VALUE rubric portion relating to reflection and self-assessment, was:

0 (Benchmark) = Sample does not provide evidence level performance.
1 (Benchmark) = Describes own assumptions with general descriptors of success and/or failure.
2 (Milestones) = Articulates strengths and/or challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).
3 (Milestones) = Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).
4 (Capstone) = Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.

Nearly 400 (n=393) students provided insight about their assumptions and how they were challenged. Several students admitted not having any assumptions starting their leadership position and did not articulate how their experiences broadened their perspectives. Students who scored at the lower level (1) could articulate their assumptions and their experiences, but did not make a connection to, or were very general in, how it broadened their perspectives. Students who scored in the milestone categories recognized some of their own strengths and limitations working in ever-changing organizations. As one student stated:

> I assumed that this leadership experience would be both very rewarding and very challenging at the same time. Very rewarding because of the people that I get to interact with and the experience that I am getting. I get some real hands on, real life experience. I assumed that it would be a little easier than in previous years. The assumption was challenged because I made assumptions about things that my team would know that they didn't. It broadened my perspective because it taught me to lead differently and not be so set in just thinking that everyone thinks the same way that I do. It has been challenging to change the way that I think, but it's definitely taught me to grow as a person. (Senior, White, Female)

The capstone respondents could succinctly articulate assumptions, describe an experience, and project how they will act in the future.

> Right now, I'm applying for Graduate School programs that revise (sic) around Student Affairs, student development, and higher education. While at <experience>, I had a vision that people would all know their strengths and be able to use them in a way that is most productive to themselves and society. As my time in <organization> and grad school search progresses, I can see my vision progressing. The skills of communication and asking for help were taught to me at <experience>! When I went to the camp, I was nervous and excited because I wanted to expand my horizons, but being put in a situation where I don't know others can always be nerve-wracking. I assumed we would just be going through lectures and discussions. I had no idea of the simulation. I figured we'd just do the <activity> and talk about it. I did not realize how effected I would be by <activity>, but it really opened my eyes to wealth distributions I now know what is going on to improve. (Senior, White, Female)

Overall, students had an easier time describing their assumptions and some of their experiences, but did not always reflect deeply on how their involvement has changed their perspective or will impact them in the future. Students learned that their experiences were not going to be the same as last year, nor the same as the person who was in the role previously.

March
In March, students were asked to respond to the question: "Describe a challenge you or your organization faced and how you overcame it. How would you apply the lessons learned from this experience in the future?" The rubric rating scale, adapted from the Integrative Learning VALUE rubric portion relating to reflection and self-assessment, was:

0 (Benchmark) = Sample does not provide evidence level performance.
1 (Benchmark) = Describes own assumptions with general descriptors of success and/or failure.
2 (Milestones) = Articulates strengths and/or challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).
3 (Milestones) = Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).
4 (Capstone) = Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.

Responses from 313 student leaders ranged in depth and organizational versus individual reflection. From the variety of responses, student leaders who received a lower score provided answers such as "Last minute weather issues affected out event. Solution: communication, adaptability, innovation, and action." (Senior, White, Female) and "Lack of organized leadership. Leader relinquished position. Better vetting process for leadership." (Senior, White, Male) which spoke to organizational challenges and general organizational response, but not to the individual's learning or growth from the experience. Alternately, students who scored at the capstone level emphasized not only the challenges, but also the personal development and possible future applications of those transferrable skills, such as:

> This year I faced several challenges with communication in the team setting. None of them were big and each one was different but it was always frustrating. However, I did learn how to tell when the problem occurred because of a breakdown in communication. Once I realized this I was able to address the solution. I believe that I will be able to use this in my future by knowing how to spot when communication is the source of a problem. Creating better communication will help in my work and personal life, and the lessons I learned this year will help guide me in the future. (Junior, White, Female)

> I had to deal with a deputy director who was not completing the tasks assigned to her. To be blunt she wasn't doing her job. I had to talk to her twice before finally deciding to make an executive decision to cut her workload down significantly. I expressed to her that we expected excellent work from her remaining assignments but also I made it clear that I was available to help. Basically I learned to better support a struggling subordinate. I can use this experience in the future when people are not doing their assigned jobs at work because I know now how to effectively listen and form a supportive environment that ensures the work is accomplished for the good of the organization. (Senior, White, Female)

For many students, the challenges they faced revolved around navigating interpersonal relationships and the challenges of leading peers. Many spoke to skills they have developed, or resources sought, and learning how to set aside emotions to make hard decisions on behalf of the best interest of the organization.

April

For the final reflection prompt in April, students were asked to respond to the question: "Describe what you learned in this leadership experience and how it changed you. How would you apply this in your major, classes, and/or career goals?" The rubric rating scale, adapted from the Integrative Learning VALUE rubric portion relating to reflection and self-assessment, was:

0 (Benchmark) = Sample does not provide evidence level performance.
1 (Benchmark) = Describes own assumptions with general descriptors of success and/or failure.
2 (Milestones) = Articulates strengths and/or challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).
3 (Milestones) = Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).
4 (Capstone) = Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.

A total of 271 students completed the April reflection prompt, with the majority of those students scoring a milestone of (2) being able to articulate strengths and/or challenges. For those students who scored a (1), many responded that they learned skills regarding communication, working with others, time management, and leadership. Students who scored higher were able to not only articulate what they learned, but connected it to their academics or future career. For example:

> I learned how to effectively communicate with the people that I work with. It has helped me learn how to be more patient with people and how they handle with situations. This will help me when I get into my upper level classes because I have a lot of group project and I will know how to handle the situations that will be presented. (Freshmen, African American/Black, Female)

> My leadership experience this year has taught me so much about leadership and so much about myself. I have learned how to effectively lead and motivate others in a team and organization setting. Currently, I am applying for medical school this summer and plan to take these motivational and teamwork skills with me both in studying in medical school and as a doctor because as a doctor you will always be in a team, whether that be fellow doctors or with other allied health professionals. Understanding different people and their backgrounds will help me better take care of my patients in the future as well. (Senior, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Male)

In general, students were able to describe what they learned in their leadership experience, and many could associate these skills with another aspect of their experience, such as their classes. However, there were far fewer upper level (3) milestone answers and only two capstone answers, which shows that students lack a degree of depth in reflecting upon their learning and how experiences can serve as a catalyst for their own development, ultimately affecting their actions in the future.

Advisors

Advisors were asked about how frequently they met individually with the student leaders of the organization they advised and were asked to provide the UIN of these students. Not all students in each organization met regularly with the advisor and therefore the number of students involved with this project is different than the number of students being reported by the advisor. Based on the information from advisors and the students they meet individually with, 42% of the advisors met with students weekly, 43% met with students twice a month, and 15% met monthly. Advisors were provided the opportunity to write in a response if they met with students different than these options; however, no one selected this option.

The frequency of meetings with advisors were analyzed specifically for the 179 students who completed reflections all four months. The individual UINs of these students and the frequency students met with their advisors were matched with the students' rubric scores. Table 4 indicates that students who met with their advisor had higher scores overall than those students who did not have individual meetings with an advisor. Furthermore, students who met weekly had an average of .23 higher score than students who did not meet with an advisor. Those students who met every other week averaged a .15 higher score than students who did not have individual meetings with an advisor. There were variations month to month for the students who met monthly with an advisor, yet their overall scores were slightly higher than students who did not meet with advisors.

Frequency Students Met with their Advisor	October (n=179)	November (n=179)	March (n=179)	April (n=179)	Total (n=179)
Weekly	1.52	1.75	1.71	2.02	1.75
Every Other Week	1.53	1.63	1.65	1.86	1.67
Monthly	1.40	1.40	1.20	2.40	1.60
No Meeting Reported	1.39	1.59	1.42	1.68	1.52

Table 4: Mean Rubric Score by Frequency of Meeting with Advisor

Overall

Table 5 reveals the mean rubric score by demographics for each month and the overall total. Patterns in the results indicate that the overall mean score improved each month throughout the year. Additionally, there were increases by classification and years at Texas A&M overall, indicating the length of time for students made a difference. Specifically, students who have been at Texas A&M three or four years, had statistically significant higher overall scores than students who have been at Texas A&M one or two years (t (838)=7.966, p<.00). Some of the traditionally under-represented ethnic populations had an average mean score higher than the overall average. While these patterns are similar to what was seen during the 2012-2013 year, the mean scores where higher for the 2014-2015 year. In 2012-2013, the overall mean score was 1.27 compared to 1.57 this year.

Student Demographics	October (n=441)	November (n=393)	March (n=313)	April (n=271)	Total (n=1418)
Average Rubric Score	1.43	1.55	1.58	1.80	1.57
Classification					
U1	1.26	1.17	1.25	1.75	1.29
U2	1.27	1.49	1.56	1.68	1.48
U3	1.44	1.65	1.65	1.78	1.61
U4	1.55	1.59	1.54	1.90	1.63
G7	1.44	1.83	2.14	1.75	1.77
G8	--	1.00	--	--	1.00
Years at A&M					
First Year	1.33	1.24	1.48	1.76	1.38
2 Years	1.28	1.47	1.52	1.68	1.47
3 Years	1.54	1.67	1.60	1.80	1.64
4 Years	1.51	1.61	1.69	1.97	1.67
5 or More Years	1.22	1.83	1.00	1.50	1.38
Ethnicity					
African American/Black	1.36	1.85	2.00	2.00	1.74
Asian American/Pacific Islander	1.36	1.61	1.53	1.80	1.56
Caucasian/White	1.42	1.54	1.54	1.76	1.55
Hispanic/Latino	1.55	1.67	1.72	1.95	1.70
Native American/ American Indian	2.00	.50	1.00	--	1.00
Other	2.00	2.50	--	--	2.20
Unknown	1.29	1.33	1.36	1.74	1.40
Gender					
Male	1.37	1.48	1.48	1.72	1.49
Female	1.49	1.62	1.66	1.88	1.64
First Generation					
Yes	1.36	1.49	1.62	1.84	1.54
No	1.46	1.57	1.55	1.80	1.58
Unknown	1.32	1.59	1.73	1.64	1.54

Table 5: Mean Rubric Score by Demographics

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, the mean scores for each demographic population and all students combined increased from the 2012-2013 year, however, scores were still fairly low. Between the two years, more training opportunities were provided to Division staff, specifically about incorporating reflection with students, and advisors have been encouraged to incorporate reflection into the students' experiences. From the increase in scores, it may appear that has happened, however, more could be done to provide opportunities for students to reflect on their experiences. Another change for the 2014-2015 year was only to focus on student leaders in the project rather than members. It could also be that advisors are able to work closer with the student leaders and provide opportunities for reflection, which may not be as feasible to do with all members of the organization. Student leaders were able to make stronger connections this year from their student leadership experience to other areas.

Student and Advisor Recommendations

The DSA Committee on Student Learning should continue to work with Division of Student Affairs staff to provide resources and opportunities for incorporating more intentional reflection time with students. Reflection should be done on a regular basis so it becomes easier and more natural for individual students, as well as the organization. The DSA Committee on Student Learning will continue to create resources and share information with advisors.

Advisors should challenge students more frequently to reflect and help students make connections to various parts of their life such as future self, job, relationships, and academics.

Project Recommendations

This division-wide initiative focused on areas related to the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan, specifically integrative learning. The rubric and scoring method were consistent throughout the project.

It is recommended for this project to continue to be repeated every two years to determine if providing students opportunities for reflection would help in integrating what they learn from one situation to another. However, it is also recommended that future projects be designed to have the spring reflections administered slightly earlier. The first one should be run from the middle of February until spring break, and the second one should be administered after spring break.

The planning committee may want to look at seperating the questions in a manner that allows students to answer all parts of the prompt. Often students would comment on one part of the prompt but not the entire prompt. Additionally, the planning committee should consider the advisor training and what information is provided to advisors about the project and scoring, as well as what information advisors should share with students. Advisors could share the rubric with students in advance of completing the reflection or after the reflection, when organizations could discuss the prompt with the rubric available.

In the future the planning committee will ask advisors at the end of the spring semester to indicate the frequency of the students they actually met with individually throughout the year. This feedback was gathered in the fall semester, but may not reflect changes that occurred during the year or that new students joined an organization.