

**Division of Student Affairs
Committee on Student Learning
Aggies Commit: Reflections on Student Leadership
Fall 2016-Spring 2017**

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 (DSA), and specifically the Student Leader Learning Outcomes (SLLO) project, now the DSA Committee on Student Learning, 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 DSA Committee on Student Learning 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. When first initiated in the 2012-2013 year, this assessment project would be repeated every other academic year; the second year being administered was in 2014-2015, and the third cycle was this past year in 2016-2017.

The assessment project involved student leaders reflecting on prompts provided throughout the 2016-2017 year through their student organization. The four months during the academic year included October, November, before spring break (February/March), and after spring break (March/April). Paper form surveys were created by Student Life Studies and distributed to advisors of participating student organizations, and then returned back 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 third iteration, we continued with changes made in administering the assessment project the second time in 2014-2015: the student surveys were only administered to student leaders within the organization, there were reflection prompts four different months, an advisor survey was administered, and the participating advisors went through a training prior to the first reflection. There were two changes made for this 2016-2017 cycle. The first was that the spring reflection prompts were split around spring break. One prompt was sent out and completed prior to spring break, and the second prompt was sent out after spring break. The second change was piloting organizations participating in the project on different recruitment cycles. These students generally are in their leadership based on a calendar year (January to December) rather than the academic year (August to May). These students were given the opposite reflection prompts throughout the year; meaning that in October these students responded to the prompt administered before spring break for the other organizations.

Method and Sample

The electronic survey for advisors was developed using Qualtrics®, survey design software that creates web-based surveys. The survey consisted of three quantitative questions and one qualitative question. The survey was initially sent to the 44 participating advisors on September 23, 2016. Non-respondents received up to six reminders before the survey closed in mid-November. Advisors working with more than one student organization received the survey more than once to respond to it based on the students involved in each organization. When the survey closed, 42 advisors had completed some part of the survey for a 95% response rate.

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, one quantitative question, and the qualitative reflection prompt. Additional demographic information was pulled from the University student database. 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 2016-2017 academic school year, 41 student organizations expressed interest in participating in this assessment project, which represented almost 400 student leaders. However, not all student organizations continued with the project the entire year. Additionally, within each individual student organization, the number of students varied throughout the year from what organizations 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 unique 558 students who completed a survey at some point during the academic year, and 179 students who completed reflections for all four months with the same organization. Additionally, 0.5% of the students (n=7) were in multiple organizations participating in the project. For comparison, in 2012-2013 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. In the 2014-2015 year, there were 50 organizations with 441 students at the beginning and 41 organizations with 271 students by the end.

Month	Number of Students Participating	Number of Participating Organizations
October	388	40
November	376	41
Before Spring Break	355	37
After Spring Break	307	33

Table 1: Student and Group Participation

The 41 student organizations that participated in at least one month of the project had advisors from nine departments in the Division of Student Affairs: Disability Services, Memorial Student Center, Music Activities, Offices of the Dean of Student Life, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, Recreational Sports, Residence Life, Student Activities, and Veteran Resource and Support Center. The participating student organizations are listed below; those with an asterisk (*) were new organizations for the 2016-2017 year.

2016-2017 Participating Student Organizations

Academic Peer Mentors*	Freshmen Leaders Advisory Committee	Peer Leadership & Service Project
Aggie Eco Representatives	Freshmen Leaders On-Campus*	Phi Delta Theta*
Aggie Muster	Gilbert Leadership Conference*	Replant*
Aggie Orientation Leader Program	Graduate & Professional Student Council*	Residence Hall Association
Aggie Shields	Hall Council – Hullabaloo	Resident Assistant Staff – Hullabaloo
Aggie Transition Camps	Insightful Connections	SGA Executive Team
Aggie Wranglers	L3C Peer Mentors	SGA Student Senate
American Association of University Women at TAMU	Maroon & White Advisory Board*	Student Anti-Violence Educators
CARPOOL	MSC Bethancourt*	Student Media Staff*
Class Councils Exec Team	MSC FISH	Symphonic Band*
Diabetic Echoes*	MSC LEAD	TAMU Connect*
Family Weekend Committee	MSC Programs Team	Texas A&M Legacies*
Fish Aides	MSC SCONA	The Big Event
Fish Camp		The Sex Project*

The data from advisor and student 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.

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, on the following page, 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 connect to your major/classes <u>and</u> career goals? How will you integrate the skills you'll develop to your future pursuits?
November	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	What assumptions did you make about your leadership experience and how have those assumptions been challenged? How will you apply what you've learned from your assumptions in the future?
Before Spring Break	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	Describe a challenge you or your organization faced? How did you overcome it? How will you apply the lessons learned from the experience in the future?
After Spring Break	Integrative Learning (Reflection & Self-Assessment)	Describe what you have learned from your leadership experience and how it changed you. How will you apply this learning in your major/classes <u>and</u> career goals?

Table 2: Reflection Prompts and Rubrics Used

Results

Results will be reported as mean rubric score 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%. Summary themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document. This report is divided into seven sections: Demographics, October, November, Before Spring Break, After Spring Break, Advisor Survey, and Overall.

Demographics

Some demographics were gathered from students while responding to the reflection prompts: years at Texas A&M and participation in the M&W Leadership Program. Additionally, students were asked for their UIN to allow us to pull other demographics including classification, ethnicity, gender, and first generation status. Table 3, on the following page, illustrates the results for each of the four months. The overall total includes the demographics for all the unique students who completed a reflection prompt at any time during the year. Some categories were combined due to a very low number of responses. A majority of the student leaders were White, juniors or seniors, female students who were not first generation and not in the Maroon & White Leadership Program.

Student Demographics	October (n=371)	November (n=354)	Before Spring Break (n=330)	After Spring Break (n=292)	Total (n=490)
Classification					
Freshman	11%	10%	11%	13%	12%
Sophomore	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Junior	39%	38%	43%	43%	39%
Senior	36%	37%	33%	33%	34%
Masters	5%	5%	5%	2%	5%
Other: Doctoral, Medical, Non-degree	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Ethnicity					
American Indian, Native Hawaiian, Unknown	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Asian	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%
Black and Multiethnic with Black	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%
Hispanic	19%	21%	20%	22%	20%
International	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Multiethnic non Black	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
White	68%	65%	66%	65%	67%
Sex					
Male	44%	43%	45%	44%	45%
Female	56%	57%	55%	56%	55%
First Generation Status					
First Generation	20%	20%	21%	21%	20%
Continuing Generation	77%	77%	76%	76%	77%
Unknown	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Self-Reported Demographics*	(n=383)	(n=372)	(n=344)	(n=301)	(n=547)
Maroon & White Leadership Program					
Yes	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%
No	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%
Years at A&M*					
First Year	10%	10%	11%	13%	13%
2 Years	30%	30%	34%	33%	34%
3 Years	32%	32%	30%	30%	34%
4 Years	25%	25%	23%	22%	25%
5 or More Years	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%

Table 3: Student Demographics

* Respondents are able to change their self-reported demographics, a person will select they have been at A&M 2 years in the fall, and select 3 years in the spring. Their responses only count once in the month column, but twice in the total column. The total will add to more than 100% in this instance.

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 connect to your major/classes and career goals? How will you integrate the skills you'll develop to your future pursuits?" 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 388 responses that articulated their leadership experience in relation to their academic experience and career aspirations. Nearly half (44%) scored as (2) Milestone, while 39% scored as (1) Benchmark. About 14% scored as (3) Milestone, 1% scored (4) Capstone, and 2% scored (0) Benchmark (overall mean=1.73). Some students were able to relate their leadership skills being helpful in the classroom, some referenced direct connections with information learned in the classroom that related to their leadership position, and others made connections with the leadership skills gained in their organizations and 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:

I am a biology major here at Texas A&M. The reason I wanted this leadership position was to serve others and find a greater passion for service. I one day hope to achieve the status of becoming a medical doctor. <Organization> is all about putting others before yourself and serving selflessly. Besides the knowledge aspect of becoming a doctor, I believe the real goal is putting others before yourself and setting them up for success in any endeavor. A doctor heals and tries to set patients down a healthier <path?>. Someone in <organization> serves and tries to brighten/change someone else's day. A life filled with service is a life worth living. <Organization> is selfless service. The knowledge, passion, and people skills I gain here with <organization> will propel me further in the medical field to serve others whole heartedly.
(Senior, White, Male)

A Capstone participant could effectively integrate connections to have a better understanding of their field of study and/or their career aspirations. One student wrote:

I am a psychology major and I plan on pursuing a master's degree in industrial and organizational psychology. My future job will entail working with groups and organizations of people to make the workplace more efficient and have employees be more satisfied. Being in leadership in <organization> has taught me so much about dealing with people, delegating tasks, dealing with conflict, and so much more. The skills and experiences I have had from <organization> continues to prepare me for my future career. I plan to integrate what I have learned by consciously thinking about decisions we make for the best possible outcome. Once decisions have been made and the outcomes occur, I will reflect over them and see if there was something we could have done better. I want to be able to help the people who will be leaders in the future by giving them advice on problems they are having in the organization. I strongly

believe that helping and teaching younger members will help me learn more about the functions of an organization, people, groups, and businesses. Being vice president of <organization> has strengthened my desire to pursue I/O psychology.... The opportunities I've had here have been a catalyst in the development in my leadership, social, and interpersonal skills. It has given me confidence in knowing that I'm capable in excelling outside of schoolwork and prepared me for my future career. (Senior, White, Female)

The majority of students could make connections between their leadership experiences and career aspirations and/or academic experiences, often mentioning communication, working in teams, and event planning/project management. Students may still need assistance making specific connections between their leadership position, their coursework, and their future careers (if they know their desired field).

November

The students were prompted to respond to the question: "What assumptions did you make about your leadership experience and how have those assumptions been challenged? How will you apply what you've learned from your assumptions 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.

1 (Benchmark) = Describes own assumptions with general or vague 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 376 completed the November prompt, with the majority of students (n=174) scoring at (1) Benchmark describing assumptions with vague descriptors. A few students admitted not having any assumptions starting their leadership position and a few did not articulate how their experiences were challenged; however, many were not able to articulate how they would apply it in the future. Nearly half (46%) scored as (1) Benchmark, while 42% scored as (2) Milestone. Additionally, 9% scored as (3) Milestone, 1% scored (4) Capstone, and 2% scored (0) Benchmark (overall mean=1.59). Students who scored at the lower level (1) could articulate their assumptions and their experiences, but did not make strong connection to, or were very general in, how it help them learn over time or how it would manifest in their future. Students who scored in the (2) Milestone categories recognized some of their own strengths and limitations and were able to see change in learning over time. For example:

I assumed that going into my director year was going to be an easier transition, with straight forward guidelines and to do lists set in stone before the beginning of the year. However, due to the restructuring of <organization>, bad communication for needed materials from last year's staff, and our chair being dropped for grades, this year has definitely had its challenges. But these obstacles have taught me more about how to handle difficult situations with grace and has better revealed to me what kind of leader I am. The challenges and seemingly failures have been invaluable to my growth. (Senior, Hispanic, Female)

The Capstone respondents could succinctly articulate assumptions, describe an experience, and project how they will act in the future. One student wrote:

Initially I came into college thinking that I had great leadership experience and that I knew what being on a team was all about. This has certainly been challenged as I have grown leaps and bounds and truly began to learn what leadership is all about. I can predict that in 5 years I will again smile at my naivety as I continue to learn and seek leadership experience. In the future, I hope to apply my experiences in everything I do. I involve myself in things I love so that I can grow into a better person and I hope as I grow and learn I can carry my knowledge and newly developed skills into any situation I face. Additionally, I hope to engage reflective learning along the way by stopping to consider my experiences and engaging in solitude with my trusted advisors. I have learned through my involvement in <organization> that reflective learning is critical. We don't learn from experiences nearly as much as we learn from reflecting on these experiences. For this reason, I have consciously and purposefully thought about my actions and decisions and in many instances written about them. This helps to ensure that no time or experience goes to waste. (Junior, 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 may need support in reflecting on the value of the challenges occurring in their involvement and help them identify the change in learning that will be relevant or helpful in the future (i.e., other activities, professional career, life at home, etc.).

Before Spring Break

In the weeks prior to Spring Break, students were asked to respond to the question: "Describe a challenge you or your organization faced. How did you overcome it? How will you apply the lessons learned from the 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 355 student leaders ranged in depth and organizational versus individual reflection, and 92% of the responses were scored as (1) Benchmark or (2) Milestones. Specifically, 57% scored as (1) Benchmark, 35% scored as (2) Milestones, 6% scored as (3) Milestones, and 1% each scored as (4) Capstone and (0) Benchmark (overall mean=1.48). From the variety of responses, student leaders who received a lower score provided answers such as:

A problem that my organization faced this semester was receiving bold criticism from people in the community. As a team we overcame this obstacle by explaining to those who made comments what our goals are as an organization. We explained that we needed to make necessary changes in order to be successful. Although none of the changes we made were not seen as a positive by everyone. We learned that you must take criticism with a grain of salt. (Junior, White, Female)

Lower scoring responses did not, however, address the individual's learning or growth from the experience. Alternately, students who scored at the (3) Milestones and (4) Capstone levels emphasized not only the challenges, but also the personal development and possible future applications of those transferrable skills, such as:

The most important, or impactful, challenge that I have experienced in this organization was a week after my friend and I created the organization two years ago. The context of the situation revolved around defining the purpose of the organization and defining a process to ensure that the constancy of purpose isn't disrupted. We both had a disagreement on the purpose of the organization. The reason why this challenge was impactful is because our friendship was genuine, and this sever hurt both of us because we cared immensely. To overcome this we had to have a serious conversation about the goals and services that we believed this organization should provide, and compromise extensively on both our views. The result of this compromise, which took a week, was something that was much more profound than both of our original ideas. But that moment taught me a lot. Firstly it taught me that 1) people argue because they care, conflict comes from care, and to resolve conflict you need to understand that other people care. It also taught me that there is no object or concept that should ever compromise the relationship that you have with another person, and that together the product of your effort will be greater than the product of your own isolated effort. It also taught me the importance of listening, genuine listening and concern for another person's perspectives and without the ability to listen intently no partnership or team based effort will succeed. I believe all of the lessons I learned throughout that moment that will be concepts that I will need to revisit in my future. Nothing that we do in ourselves is the product of just our effort alone. We will always be working with others on everything and without recognizing that the individual goals that I have for myself won't be achieved. (Senior, White, Male)

For many students, the challenges they faced revolved around navigating interpersonal relationships and the challenges of leading peers. Others shared additional common themes when they 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.

After Spring Break

For the final reflection prompt after Spring Break, students were asked to respond to the question: "Describe what you have learned from your leadership experience and how it changed you. How would you apply this in your major/classes and 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. Describes own learning with general descriptors.

2 (Milestones) = Articulates strengths and/or challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness). Articulates learning in general application in different contexts.

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 307 students completed the after Spring Break reflection prompt, with half of those students (50%) scoring a (2) Milestone being able to articulate strengths and/or challenges. For those students (28%) who scored a (1) Benchmark, many responded that they learned how to work with different types of people, manage their time better, and improve decision making skills. Additionally, 16% scored as (3) Milestone, 2% scored as (4) Capstone, and 4% scored as (0) Benchmark (overall mean=1.85). Students who scored a (2) Milestone were able to identify what they learned and also connect it to their academics or future career. For example:

I've learned to take into account the opinions and thoughts of others, and that they're all valuable no matter how big or small they are. The <organization> has taught me to have an open mind and to always be attentive in any environment. In the future, I will use these experiences in order to better by future relationships with my fellow classmates and employees. (Freshmen, Asian, Male)

Those students who scored a (3) Milestone were able to further evaluate their learning by connecting it to multiple areas of their life or making broader inferences about a particular topic, such as leadership or diversity.

I have learned that the focus of leadership should not be focused solely on the accomplishment of a task/goal. It should also include the intentional development of the members of the team. I anticipate applying this idea to every facet of my life: formal leadership positions, informal situations, personal, religious, etc. (Junior, White, Male)

Overall, students were able to articulate certain aspects of what they learned from their leadership role, such as delegation, decision making, conflict management, working with diverse groups, and adjusting their leadership styles. Nevertheless, most students struggled to reflect at a deeper level and go beyond the specific skills they learned. Many were unable to connect various roles in their lives or apply these lessons to their future endeavors specifically; instead, they made overarching generalizations in their limited applications.

Advisor Survey

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 who completed a reflection for 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 with individually, 41% of the advisors met with students weekly, 29% met with students every other week or twice a month, and 19% met monthly. In addition, 12% of advisors selected the "other" response option; they were provided the opportunity to write in a response to indicate the UIN and how often they met with these students. Of the nine who wrote in a response, four talked about meeting with students as needed and three said once a semester (which represented 18 students). Additionally, one advisor met monthly with one student and one advisor indicated the student met with the secondary advisor.

The frequency of meetings with advisors was analyzed specifically for the 178 students who completed reflections all four months and the advisor reported the frequency of meetings. The individual UINs of these students and the frequency students met with their advisors were matched with the students' rubric scores. Table 4, on the following page, indicates that students who met with advisors on any frequency had overall higher scores than students who did not meet individually with an advisor. Furthermore, students who met with their advisor weekly had higher scores than students who met less frequently (every other week or monthly).

Frequency Students Met with their Advisor	October	November	Before Spring Break	After Spring Break	Total
Weekly (n=55)	2.09	1.98	1.71	1.95	1.93
Every Other Week (n=37)	1.92	1.59	1.46	1.68	1.66
Monthly (n=21)	1.90	1.71	1.43	1.67	1.68
No Meeting Reported (n=65)	1.55	1.40	1.42	1.83	1.55

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

When advisors were asked about any connection they had with the Maroon & White Leadership Program, 46% indicated they were currently a coach, while 10% said they had been a coach before, but were not currently matched with a student. Additionally, 44% reported that they had not ever been a coach for the program. Table 5 shows all participating students' rubric scores based on their advisor being a Maroon & White coach. Overall, students had higher scores when their advisor was a coach or had been a coach compared to students whose advisors had not been a Maroon & White Coach. This also was the case for each individual month with the exception of the reflection after spring break.

Advisors as Maroon & White Coach	October (n=388)	November (n=376)	Before Spring Break (n=355)	After Spring Break (n=307)	Total (n=1,426)
Currently a M&W Coach	1.87	1.88	1.59	1.69	1.76
Have been a M&W Coach	2.15	1.97	1.59	1.64	1.85
Not a M&W Coach	1.62	1.44	1.43	1.94	1.59

Table 5: Mean Rubric Score by Advisors as Maroon & White Coach

The final question on the advisor survey asked about the number of student leaders who bring a computer or tablet with them to the meeting in which the paper reflection surveys were typically distributed. Almost half of the advisors reported that all or most of the students brought a computer or tablet with them (12% said all participating students and 37% stated most participating students). Additionally, 20% of the advisors reported that about half of the participating students brought a computer or tablet to the meeting, 15% indicated that a few students did, and 7% said none of the participating students brought a computer or tablet. Furthermore, 10% selected the "other" response option and wrote in that all the students could bring a computer or tablet if asked to, that the advisor had not administered the first survey when completing the advisor survey, or that they did not know.

Overall

Table 6, on the following page, reveals the mean rubric score by demographics for each of the four months. The overall total includes the mean rubric score by demographic for all reflections completed throughout the year. Some categories were combined due to a very low number of responses. Patterns in the results indicate that the overall mean score starts high, then drops, but then ends with the highest score of all four months. Some of the traditionally under-represented ethnic populations had an average mean score higher than the overall average. While some of these patterns are similar to what was seen in the previous two cycles, the mean scores were higher for the 2016-2017 year. In 2012-2013, the overall mean score was 1.27, and in the 2014-2015 year the mean score was 1.57, compared to 1.66 this year.

Demographics	October (n=388)	November (n=376)	Before Spring Break (n=355)	After Spring Break (n=307)	Total (n=1,426)
Average Rubric Score	1.73	1.59	1.48	1.85	1.66
Classification					
Freshman	1.34	1.26	1.43	1.95	1.50
Sophomore	1.66	1.56	1.25	2.40	1.68
Junior	1.78	1.57	1.39	1.89	1.65
Senior	1.84	1.71	1.64	1.66	1.72
Masters	1.65	1.72	1.56	1.86	1.67
Other: Doctoral, Medical, Non-degree	1.50	1.50	2.00	2.33	1.80
Invalid UIN Provided	1.67	1.40	1.50	1.54	1.51
Years at A&M					
First Year	1.33	1.16	1.41	1.97	1.47
2 Years	1.81	1.64	1.34	2.02	1.69
3 Years	1.72	1.61	1.55	1.84	1.67
4 Years	1.83	1.70	1.68	1.60	1.71
5 or More Years	1.67	1.45	1.20	1.33	1.47
No Response	2.00	1.00	1.50	1.33	1.50
Ethnicity					
Black only + Multiethnic with Black	1.73	1.43	1.38	2.15	1.67
Asian Only	1.53	1.56	1.50	1.85	1.60
White Only	1.73	1.61	1.50	1.84	1.67
Hispanic	1.82	1.64	1.41	1.88	1.69
American Indian, Native Hawaiian, Unknown	1.00	.50	1.33	.50	0.89
Multiethnic non Black	1.73	1.70	1.70	1.88	1.74
International	2.00	1.20	1.50	2.75	1.78
Invalid UIN Provided	1.67	1.40	1.50	1.54	1.51
Gender					
Female	1.83	1.65	1.50	1.87	1.71
Male	1.62	1.53	1.46	1.86	1.64
Invalid UIN Provided	1.67	1.40	1.50	1.54	1.51
First Generation Status					
First Generation	1.75	1.61	1.37	1.87	1.65
Continuing Generation	1.73	1.60	1.52	1.86	1.67
Unknown	1.89	1.50	1.36	2.00	1.66
Invalid UIN Provided	1.67	1.40	1.50	1.54	1.51
Maroon & White Leadership Program					
Yes	1.63	2.06	1.40	1.88	1.75
No	1.74	1.58	1.49	1.85	1.66
No Response	1.40	1.21	1.50	1.67	1.41

Table 6: 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 and 2014-2015 cycles; however, scores were still fairly low. After three years of administered this project with student leaders we have learned that advisors having time with individual students or small groups of students on a consistent schedule increases students' scores when they reflect on their experiences. While probably tied to this, we also know that student leaders have higher scores than general members, and third and fourth year students have higher scores than first and second year students. This comparison between years can be seen in Table 7.

	2012-2013	2014-2015	2016-2017
Average Rubric Score	1.27	1.57	1.66
Years at A&M			
First Year	1.16	1.38	1.47
2 Years	1.23	1.47	1.69
3 Years	1.30	1.64	1.67
4 Years	1.36	1.67	1.71
5 or More Years	1.24	1.38	1.47

Table 7: Project Scores 2012-2013 through 2016-2017

Since 2012-2013, 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. For the 2016-2017 cycle, advisors were encouraged to talk about the reflection prompts with their students after they had completed the survey. 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. The committee could consider developing resources for advisors to share what the Texas A&M University learning outcomes are for students and discussion points about the value of these learning outcomes and how they could develop some through their co-curricular experiences. Additionally, the committee may look at creating resources for advisors on marketable skills and how to help students develop and articulate these skills. There might be resources from the M&W Leadership Program that could be shared with all advisors; or the DSA Committee on Student Learning may partner with the M&W Leadership Program to provide training on incorporating reflection into a student leader experience.

Advisors are encouraged to meet with students individually or in small groups on a consistent basis. Additionally, 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. Advisors could also have intentional conversations with students about the marketable skills they are developing through their student organization involvement and how to articulate this information on a resume or interview. An easy exercise to do is asking students about the "what" related to something that happened, but then going deeper by asking about the "so what" to understand why it was important, and the "now what" to have students think how to apply something or what to do next.

Advisors are encouraged to train top student leaders within student organizations to implement reflection opportunities to followers and build a culture of reflection throughout the organization. Advisors work with the top student leaders (directors, presidents, chairs, etc.) and those students work with the next level of student leaders (executives, committee members, etc.) and those students work with the next level of students (general members). Each layer of the organization works with other students to ask reflective questions and encourages this to become the normal part of the organizational culture.

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 the DSA Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team decide if this project should continue or if a different assessment should be done in the future. Regardless, the Assessment Team is encouraged to help advisors create opportunities for students to reflect and integrate what they learn from one situation to another.

If this project, or a similar project is continued, the planning committee should continue separating the questions in a manner that allows students to answer all parts of the 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.

If information continues to be gathered from advisors regarding how often they meet with students, the planning committee should also build in a process to 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 has only been gathered in the fall semester, but may not reflect changes that occurred during the year or that new students joined an organization.

Report prepared for: Division of Student Affairs, Texas A&M University
Report prepared by: Kelly Cox, Sarah Edwards, Sarah Jaks, Cruz Rios, Darby Roberts, and Eric Webb,
Committee on Student Learning Assessment Team
Report prepared on: November 9, 2017
Analysis prepared by: Katie Reed, Dan Yin, Sabrina Yao, and Eric Webb, Student Life Studies
Surveys designed by: Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies

***Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fee.
Find Student Life Studies on Facebook!***