VALENCIA

LEARNING LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
LAKE NONA CAMPUS, ROOM 148

JANUARY 18, 2017
2:00 – 5:00 PM

PRESENT: Susan Ledlow (Co-chair), Suzette Dohany (Co-chair), Kari Makepeace (Council Coordinator), Ruby Alvarez, Robyn Brighton (Guest), Karen Borglum, Christy Cheney (Guest), Kris Christian, Diana Ciesko, Diane Dalrymple, Wendi Dew, Suzette Dohany, Michelle Foster, Nasser Hedayat, Linda Herlocker, Stacey Johnson, Sonya Joseph, Celine Kavalec, Rita Luther (Guest), Linda Neal, Neal Phillips, Kathleen Plinske, Beth Renn, Joyce Romano, Nichole Segarra, Laura Sessions, Landon Shephard, John Slot

MEETING SUMMARY

I.   DISCUSSION ITEMS

A.   Update on the Academic Initiative Review (AIR) of the Learning in Communities (LinC) Initiative

Robyn Brighton and Christy Cheney provided a recap of the findings and recommendations from the Academic Initiative Review on the Learning in Communities (LinC) Initiative in 2015 and shared the strategies that have been implemented since that first review.

1.   Findings

- Professional development enables faculty to be better prepared to teach in a learning community setting
- LinCs can be an effective strategy for infusing learning support services throughout the curriculum
- LinC success in courses that fall within the Front Door Alignment are higher than their non-LinC equivalent
- Students enrolled in LinC reported having increased engagement with their faculty and peers, heightened motivation to learn, and less stress

2.   Recommendations

- Require all faculty to obtain a certificate of completion from the LinC development course or it's equivalency
- Revise the curriculum integration template faculty complete to include strategies to infuse learning support services
- Develop cluster communities that align with the limited range of front-door, general education course options
- Intentionally pair courses that have higher success rates, when offered as a LinC, and encourage faculty across disciplines to team teach an integrated curriculum

3.   Strategies Implemented as a Result of Recommendations

- Redesigned the curriculum integration template to include support services and college success skills
- Identified high-risk Start Right courses by campus

- Sequenced cluster Learning Communities over multiple terms (East & West Campuses)
  - Looked for common themes across curriculum
  - Mapped out Gen. Ed. courses over multiple terms, which align with meta majors
  - Utilized the math pathways diagram to identify math courses students need by meta major and LinCed to SLS 1122
  - Coordinated meetings with academic and non-academic divisions to discuss pairings on each campus
  - Utilized Career Program Advisors as Success Coaches by meta major

4. Overview of First 30

The First 30 model offers students a clear academic pathway and a plan to graduate in their college career. Students are guaranteed courses for their declared major and are pre-registered in thirty college-level credits throughout the first three terms. Through co-curricular and community-based learning, students engage in real-world application of content to strengthen their academic, pre-professional and personal learning goals.

5. Essential Components of First 30

- Faculty & Career Program Advisors complete the Destination track for LinC/First 30
- The same cohort of students enroll in a block schedule over three consecutive terms
- Faculty integrate curriculum across disciplines
- Faculty sit in on each other's classes and team teach
- Co-curricular integrated within the curriculum
- Community-based learning, including Service Learning

6. Course Offerings for First 30

- Highest enrolled courses that showed the lowest success rates
- Start Right and general education requirements
- Senate Bill 1720 – Students opting out of developmental education
- Pathways by meta major
- Past success rates that were reflected in AIR data

7. Professional Development

- Destinations 2016
- Campus teams
  - Faculty
  - Career Program Advisors
  - Campus mentors: Christy Cheney & Joshua Guillemette
- Campus Action Plans
  - Overarching theme
    - East: Social Entrepreneurship
    - West: Social Awareness & Social Justice
  - Student learning objectives & outcomes
  - Co-curricular activities
  - Community engagement experiences
  - Faculty and student communication plan
  - Student retention strategy

8. **Success by Course: Fall 2016**

Campus Cohort	Course	Percent Successful	Comparison Group
East	ENC 1101	84.62%	74.85%
West	ENC 1101	91.67%	
East	HUM 1020	73.08%	78.77%
West	HUM 1020	87.50%	
East	SLS 1122	69.23%	77.89%
West	SLS 1122	75.00%	
East	MAT 1033	61.54%	61.73%
West	STA 1001C	50.00%	73.39%

9. **Fall 2016 to Spring 2017 Retention**

Campus Cohort	Percent Retained in First 30	Percent Retained in College (non-First 30)	Comparison Group
East	57.69%	84.62%	79.32%
West	45.83%	91.67%	

10. **Next Steps**

- 2017-18 First 30 Cohorts by Meta Major
  - East Campus
    - Business
    - STEM*
  - West Campus
    - Social Behavioral Sciences & Human Services
    - Business*
- On-going data collection
  - Professional development course
  - End-of-year student success & retention

11. **Small Group Discussion Feedback from the Council**

We learned…

- Collecting excellent data.
- Expanding to 2 classes per campus.
- ENC 1101 and HUM 1020 link.
- Findings from AIR found that it was effective in LinC to infuse learning support services throughout the curriculum.
- First 30 is awesome!

- Impressed with level of analysis and research to be able to report on this initiative.
- Robyn rocks!
- More detail than what we heard – preliminary data – lots of potential for retention.
- No requirement to enroll beyond minimum.
- Seek financial aid funding for next summer
- Double cohorts on East and West
- Overall retention rates and grades higher for students in the program.
- The data is very favorable for this project.
- Outcomes of fall semester.
- Analysis method.
- There are many components.
- Evolution of the AIR process.

We wonder…

- How does this data compare to REACH data?
- How do demographics impact data – single parents, not available to take 4 courses, etc.? Are we seeing only traditional students?
- Cost and ROI?
- What does co-curricular look like? Does it lead to a distinction?
- Maximize training, etc. for IDH faculty.
- Fall to fall retention rates.
- Consider new faculty.
- Attend the end of the year retreat
- Can the Foundation provide scholarships if Financial Aid doesn't come through?
- Why add new themes until we have better data on success of Entrepreneurship and Social Justice?
- How much training is provided on interpersonal dynamics and team teaching?
- What's the appeal to participate scheduling meta majors?
- Would this be popular with international students?
- When it grows, how do you put students together? Relationships. Team building. Intentionality. Strategies to develop cohort during the years.
- Grade benefits to being in LinC.
- Why pair English and Humanities? Why pair Math and SLS?
- Why was English the course students did so well in?
- Wonder why East decided on STEM?
- Student preparation for meta- wonder if academic refreshers can help prepare students for appropriate courses.
- Are we going to do any "up front" conversations to prepare faculty for "partnerships"?
- If this trend will continue..
- Would this be as successful at Winter Park and Lake Nona?
- Are the CPA's for next year from Business or just any CPA?
- Could A.S. students commit to these 4 courses?
- Is there a plan to scale?
- What co-curricular activities were being offered by learning support/library to support student learning?
- When there is/will be a significant sample size.
- Persistence related to 12-hour completion?
- Carefully recruited? Student choice to join (early registration).
- Diversity of population – gender and ethnicity – comparison group.

We suggest…

- Broadening data collection – slice the data to drill down.
- Continue to track to graduation (5 years?)
- Could we possibly consider beginning recruitment in August? This type of wrap-around services and course planning are needed for the late comers.
- Increase academic learning support – writing mentor.
- Focus groups with students.
- Looking for funding to scale.
- Case by case qualitative analysis.
- Data definition – the 57% slide.
- A cohort that is half international and half domestic students.
- Look at decision-making models – Susan Ledlow can help with this.
- Team building for faculty and students.
- East STEM – more preparation with faculty and students on STEM. Consider a Summer A "pre-prep" to prepare faculty for partnerships and students for cohort work.
- Suggest STEM cohort enroll in LSAMP.
- Having conversations with learning support/librarians to find programs/materials to support both students and faculty.
- Compare early registration groups in First 30.
- Value of cohort method? Momentum phase – propensity analysis.
- Integration of cohort faculty – REACH, Camino, First 30.
- Look at cohort components – deconstructed.

B. Undergraduate Research (UR) Work Plan Update

Laura Sessions and Rita Luther provided an update on the Undergraduate Research (UR) Work Plan that was endorsed by LLC.

1. Work Teams

The three (3) groups that have been formed to complete this work and the status of those teams is below.

- Course Design/Course Implementation Work Team: This team has named three models: course embedded; research course; and mentoring. This group will be starting with the course embedded model and piloting it in the fall. The structure of the embedded model will be finished by March. Along with this, a training will be developed for faculty interested in the embedded model. A framework for the mentoring model will also be developed this year

- Measurable Goals/Assessment Work Team: This team has been provided an inventory by Laura Blasi that will help this team to monitor reporting progress on the program goals.

- Student Recruitment/Community Partnership Work Team: This team is working on an extensive survey that will be sent to faculty on Undergraduate Research. The survey will focus on finding out what faculty currently doing in UR. This is will be a more extensive and formal survey than one previously sent out. Long term this group is focused on creating partnership with both internal and external groups.

2. **Timeline**

February:

- Define courses
- Complete survey of faculty (Survey focus is on discovering faculty interested in undergraduate research and in those already conducting undergraduate research.
- Update IAC
- Draft a budget
- Look into securing Student Activities dollars
- Develop and advertise poster showcase

March:

- Identify faculty volunteers to pilot
- Identify courses piloting embedded course model in Fall
- Develop content of course workshop for embedding undergraduate research
- Finalize approval for coordinator

April:

- College-wide poster showcase: April 21
- Training workshop on embedding undergraduate research
- Notify Deans of embedded courses piloting undergraduate research
- "R" designation process completed and approved
- Identify coordinator

May:

- Update LLC

June:

- Onboard coordinator
- Extend recruitment of faculty
- Begin finding community partners
- Follow-up on funding

3. **Budget Needs**

- Two-course release time for one faculty to act as coordinator - $4,586.78
- Poster Session Supplies for April 21 (posters/food/keynote speaker) - $1,056.40*
- Travel for 10 students to visit the Florida Undergraduate Research Council (FURC) - $2,539.60*
- Membership to the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR) - $880.00
- Materials/supplies for student UR projects (mini-grants by application) - $5,000.00

    Kathleen Plinske will cover the $1,056.40 Poster Showcase on April 21. Also, in March/February a request for conference travel funds for students can be submitted to Student Affairs for consideration as a student activity fee expenditure.

4. **Moving forward**

   The Council provisionally endorsed this work moving forward based upon the meeting with the sponsors, LLC Co-chairs, and the Chairs of the work. At that meeting, the following will be addressed:

   - There needs to be more detail added to the budget. Specifically, the faculty development component needs to be added including approximately how many people may go through, how many stipends will need to be provided, if there will be a need for a Destinations track and if so what is the approximate cost of stipends for that, etc.
   - The outcomes need to be clarified and measurable objectives need to be identified.
   - There needs to be a discussion about coordination with Honors and/or LSAMP.

5. **Small Group Discussion Feedback from the Council**

   We learned…

   - The plan for implementation.
   - About the initiative overall.
   - There is a faculty development component.
   - Strong tie to project management skills.
   - A budget request has been developed.
   - Some UR courses will have an "R" designation.
   - There are 3 distinct models in the developmental stage.
   - Students will have "poster session/trip" opportunities.
   - There is an overlap with Honors.
   - Need for college-wide student activity funds.
   - 3 organized work teams were created.
   - This is a worthy project.
   - The role of the work teams.

   We wonder…

   - How to make sure the program is supported?
   - Whether a 5-year plan would help the longer view of this work.
   - Use of EDGAR archives – do we have the library support resources for the initiative?
   - About for profit research teams.
   - Student access to resources.
   - How will multiplicity of the plan be coordinated?
   - What student demand is for this type of thing?
   - If faculty are engaged and have expressed desire.
   - What will the compensation model look like?
   - What are we learning from the data we are collecting?
   - Could there be a poster session at Learning Day or Academic Assembly during breakfast??
   - Will a student pass the course only if he/she has a successful research project in the course – embedded model? Is the course-embedded model one big research project? Is each course going to look the same?
   - Does mentoring and course-embedded really go together?
   - How will one coordinator college-wide outreach to each campus?
   - Will the students experience be different?
   - Can it be integrated into part of research?

- If course scheduler can search by attribute.
- How we advise students of the value added to doing Undergraduate Research?
- How does this compare to other community college research programs (if any)?

We suggest…

- Executive Sponsor advocate on the budget request.
- Connect the activities suggested to the approved work plan (process for CLC).
- AIR Review once implemented.
- Clarifying outcomes – what they are and how we know they have been achieved.
- Coordinator for each campus (eventually??)
- Purposefully identifying incentives/advertising value to students.
- Co-chairs and Sponsors collaborate on the final proposal.
- Sharing successes collaborating with Rollins and UCF.
- Keep going – you are on the right track.
- Involve Marketing to find out how to market this to students.
- Suggest the language change from "R" designation to "R" attribute.
- Crowd funding for students to go to conferences – Go Fund Me.
- Build connection with UCF Undergraduate Research Program, in particular Downtown.

II. FOLLOW-UPS

A. Kari Makepeace will compile the feedback from the small group discussions on AIR for LinC and Undergraduate Research and provide that information to Robyn Brighton and Nick Bekas.

B. Susan Ledlow and Suzette Dohany will follow-up with Nick Bekas and Falecia Williams (and other folks identified by Falecia and/or Nick) to discuss next steps for the Undergraduate Research work.

III. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED

The Learning Leadership Council will meet again on Wednesday, March 22, 2017 at the Winter Park Campus in the Room 225-226 from 2:00pm-5:00pm.