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Executive Summary

A particular type of learning program is the Living Learning Program (LLP) where members of residential halls participate in a structured learning community. Living Learning Programs have become so popular as retention mechanisms that most universities are instituting them or at least piloting their effectiveness. LLPs are purported to produce many positive outcomes and serve a very useful function for early career students. LLPs offer students a mechanism to transition into various phases of their academic career and they act as a means for learning maturation. LLP students report that they became more self-reliant for key responsibilities such as advising and self-directed learning. LLPs can enhance a student’s overall university experience by infusing a cohesive, communal living environment with core academic standards and institutional values. Students involved with learning communities are more likely to persist through graduation, attain greater academic success, connect with peers and develop social networks, communicate with faculty and staff, and overall claim to have more successfully made the transition from secondary education to post-secondary (Tinto, 2003).

Living learning communities have played a role at UK since the 1960's when sections of dorms were identified as “Honors floors.” Beginning in the late 1980’s, a variety of options of residential experiences have emerged as an important part of UK’s strategy for retention and student success. The benefits of linking living and learning have been well documented (Inkelas, et al. 2007; Brower and Inkelas 2010). Well-designed living-learning environments can bring together several “high-impact educational practices” identified by the Association of American Colleges & Universities such as; connected courses or a series of courses, first-year seminars, service learning, and common intellectual experiences and/or co-curricular activities. Individually or in combination these practices promote student engagement with faculty and staff as well as foster peer networking.

The opportunity presented by the construction of 9000 new beds by 2018 represents an unprecedented, perhaps never to be repeated, opportunity to redefine undergraduate education at UK using the living-learning model. At the same time, this is an extremely complex undertaking. Successful implementation at any scale will require changes to the way we recruit students, process their applications, assign student housing, design courses, create course schedules, conduct advising, train staff, evaluate faculty, and handle an array of student services too numerous to mention.

A task force was convened by Provost Christine Riordan in Fall 2013 to (a) examine carefully the Living Learning Program landscape on the UK campus, and (b) investigate best practices from well established and highly regarded LLPs at other campuses. The report that follows is a description of the analysis and deliberation of the task force with specific recommendations for making the UK Living Learning Community one of the finest in the world.

What follows this section are recommendations from the task force. Recommendations are advanced in four areas; (a) academic standards, (b) assessment and measurement, (c) staffing and structure, and (d) financial issues. Subsequent sections of the report provide background and analyses undergirding the recommendation. An extensive set of appendices represents a compendium of resources that were invaluable to the task force’s work.
LLP Recommendations

The following recommendations are reflective of the suggestions generated by the task force and represent current thinking based on extensive deliberation, a synthesis of benchmarking and best practices of LLPs nationwide, and consultation with experts who conduct research on LLPs and their students. The recommendations are organized according to four key areas: academic standards, assessment and measurement, staffing and structure, and financial issues. All areas are essential for designing, implementing and evaluating LLPs.

Academic Standards

Academic standards are statements about what students are expected to know or be able to do as a result of participation in an organized learning program. LLPs are most successful when academic influence is exerted as part of the strategic planning process and when active involvement of faculty is fully realized. Every effort must be encouraged to ensure that faculty members take an active role in the delivery of academic excellence in the LLPs.

- Well-designed LLPs have strategic organizational links that connect the required courses embedded within formal academic settings and those courses created to involve and engage students with people in a community. The standards also should be linked to UK’s strategic plan, as well as to the competencies established for UK Core. Therefore, each LLP should develop academic standards and measures of outcomes.

- Well-designed LLPs have defined academic outcomes through well-articulated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). These SLOs should be few in numbers in order to facilitate measurement and assessment. We recommend that when feasible, the SLOs be linked to those of the college or department for which the LLP is designed.

- Well-designed LLPs are structured to pursue and promote active learning between students peers, faculty and staff, and account for the variety of UK’s student population and their respective needs, including students in transition, first generation students, and at risk students.

- Well-designed LLPs recognize the diversity of the student population and effectively address those needs through a mix of residential environments, including smaller living-learning communities, larger living-learning programs, and residential colleges.

- Well-designed LLPs insist on collaboration across many units particularly Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Admissions.
Assessment and Measurement

The educational process inherent in a Living Learning Program is complex, and success must be measured on many levels. The following are overarching recommendations as a basis for creating an assessment plan for the Living-Learning Program.

- LLPs should have a comprehensive assessment process that includes standard measures of student success and demographics, environmental and engagement measures, as well as student-oriented data to assess and rank their perceived learning experiences and development.

- LLPs should be assessed both at the macro level, where individual communities and the program as a whole are assessed based on universal criteria, and at the micro level, where individual communities assess tailored outcomes and strategies unique to their populations.

- Collaboration between Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and associated units should be assessed with support from the Assessment Office.

- LLPs should strengthen partnerships with campus experts to effectively and efficiently plan assessment efforts and, where appropriate, use national assessment and benchmarking tools (NSSE, RSSIE, SILLE, etc.).

- LLPs should develop a report card that assesses outcomes frequently associated with successful LLPs and related assessment instruments to measure the extent to which the outcomes are achieved.

Staffing and Structure

The inherent partnership between offices of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs brings a number of unique opportunities that LLP conjoin.

- Create a university LLP Steering Committee to carry on the work of the LLP Task Force. The committee should be composed similar to the current task force with representatives of deans, provost staff, vice president for Student Affairs staff, current LLP students, and former LLP students, among other individuals suitable to the provost.

- Create a LLP External Advisory Board that would review the LLPs annually. The board would consist of both academicians and industrial/corporate representatives. They would visit the University for a two-day event where the LLPs would present their programs/activities with the board providing feedback and suggestions for improvement.

- Assessment of LLPs will be the responsibility of the colleges and the Assessment Office in the provost’s area. In general, these two entities will collect student success data, monitor LLP participation and oversee annual reporting. Costs for assessment should be analyzed periodically.

- UK should host a periodic, regional LLP conference — a two-day event where UK invites schools in the region that host LLPs. The conference could offer both oral and poster presentations where ideas are shared on various aspects of LLPs. UK would establish itself as the “leader” in Living Learning Programs’ excellence.

- Colleges should develop external relations/development campaigns to secure sponsorships for UK’s LLPs. Similar to other universities, colleges would develop relationships with
corporate and private organizations that have vested interests in the success of students who major in areas relevant to their interests.

- As resources evolve, additional positions in academic affairs could be established to accommodate the growth of students and appropriate services needing delivery. These positions include LLP director, academic director; recruiter, academic advisors, and graduate assistants. Similarly, Residence Life may need to add positions as student participation in LLPs grow.

**Financial Issues**

- The task force strongly recommends that clarity be established for the financial support of the Living Learning Program at UK. Explicit and concrete support must be articulated from the provost’s office.

- Pursuant to the first point, the task force recommends that a mixed-model funding approach be pursued that benefits both provost office goals and college’s/unit’s capacity for funding the expansion of LLPs.

- In accordance with a new values-based budget model, requests for new LLPs or continuance/growth of existing LLPs should be based on income projections calculated on the expected revenue associated with the LLP.

- Costs, services and amenities vary widely among the current LLPs. It is recommended that all LLPs be surveyed to determine the range of costs and services delivered and annual, normalized operating expenses.
Introduction

Institutions of higher education across the nation are experiencing persistence and retention trends of their first year students that do not mirror expectations of parents, legislators, or even the students themselves. Research from the American College Testing (ACT) service report that approximately 45% of students in two-year colleges and more than one out of every four students in four-year colleges or universities do not return for their second year.

The Policy Center on the First Year of College developed criteria to facilitate college and universities plans for improving retention rates, especially in that critical first year of study. Criteria for Excellence include:

- Evidence of an intentional, comprehensive approach to the first year that is appropriate to the institution type;
- Evidence of assessment regarding the various initiatives that constitute this approach;
- Evidence of broad impact on significant numbers of first-year students, including, but not limited to, special student populations;
- Strong administrative support for first-year initiatives;
- Institutionalization and durability over time;
- Involvement of a wide range of faculty, student affairs professionals, academic administrators, and other constituent groups.

To address these goals, a number of universities and colleges have implemented a range of first-year and summer bridge programs to stem the tide of factors that lead to low persistence. Universities are motivated to retain their first-year students through various means including extended welcome weeks (K Week), common reading experiences, expanded residential life programs, peer to peer tutoring, peer advisement and/or mentoring, and special undergraduate colleges. An increasingly popular form of persistence program is the learning communities.

There are four common models of learning communities:

1. Linked or clustered courses,
2. Cohorts in large courses of FIGs (Freshmen Interest Groups),
3. Team-taught or coordinated studies programs,
4. Residence-based learning communities that link to residential life programs (Ward & Commander, 2011-12).

A particular type of learning program is the Living Learning Program where members of residential halls participate in a structured learning community. Living Learning Programs have become so popular as retention mechanisms that most universities are instituting them or at least piloting their effectiveness. LLPs are purported to produce many positive outcomes and serve a very useful function for early career students. LLPs offer students a mechanism to transition into various phases of their academic career and they act as a means for learning maturation. LLP students report that they became more self-reliant for key responsibilities such as advising and self-directed learning.
At the University of Kentucky, the success of Living Learning Programs has been established and impact on freshmen is strong. For example,

- Students who participated in Living Learning Programs were more academically successful than their corresponding cohort peers. LLP students had higher first fall GPA, first year GPA, 1st to 2nd fall retention, and 1st to 3rd fall retention.*

- LLP participants were more likely to:
  - be successful in adjusting to academic demands of college,
  - declare a major during their freshman year,
  - find their academic work interesting.*

- LLP participants reported greater academic self-confidence and more meaningful interaction with faculty. In this regard, LLP students also reported that faculty had a greater effect on their career goals and aspirations, their personal growth, and value and attitudes.*

- Freshmen enrolled in the Living Learning Program reported more interaction with diverse students and were more likely to develop close friendships or personal relationships with other students.*


The calculated expansion of LLPs at the University of Kentucky precipitated a strategic initiative to ensure that new LLPs were thoughtfully planned and executed, with appropriate care given to assessment issues, standards by which to gauge academic excellence, and leadership characteristics that would ensure quality.
Background and Methodology

This section details the process and procedures undertaken by the task force in 2013-14. Figure 1 provides a graphical flow chart of the process. To begin, in Summer 2013 a working group was convened by Interim Provost Tim Tracy to develop general principles for the existing Living Learning Program at UK. From that group came a set of design principles that were presented to the deans for their review (see Appendix B). These principles were intended to serve as guideposts in moving forward with the development of LLPs in light of existing and new resident halls coming on line. Some of the key elements included definitions and recommendations. For example, as the practices of engaged living-learning have grown, the term “community” and “program” have often been used loosely and interchangeably in the scholarly literature and everyday practice. Emergent practice tends to use the term “Living Learning Communities” (LLCs) to refer to smaller groups, or less formally designed arrangements; “Living Learning Programs” are often on a larger scale, with an intentionally-designed curriculum and co-curriculum. “Residential Colleges” are medium to large-sized communities, with embedded faculty or scholarly fellows living or working in the same space as students; often students live in the same dorm for two or more years as members of the community. (For the types and typologies of living-learning environments, see Inkelas and Associates, 2008; Inkelas and Longerbeam, 2008). Several of the design principles advanced by that early document included the following: LLPs should address key transitions in students’ academic careers, by 2018 all first-year students should have the opportunity to live in an LLPs, sophomores should be afforded the chance to participate in LLPs, a mix of large and small LLPs should be offered to students, close collaboration between colleges and Students Affairs should exists at all levels, and a stable funding system should be put into place to enrich and stabilize resources supporting LLPs.

Early in the Fall 2013 semester Provost Christine Riordan convened a Living Learning Program Task Force composed of deans, associate deans, student affairs personnel, and students. Two deans, Ike Adams and Dan O’Hair, were asked to co-chair the task force. The provost delivered the task force charge to the co-chairs and task force members in late September 2013 (see Appendix A), and the task force held its first meeting in October. [It should be noted at this point that a SharePoint site was established for the task force to read and analyze dozens of reports and analyses pertaining to LLPs, and the best practices associated with these communities.] It was decided at that planning meeting that much information was available for analysis but that integration of those data could more easily occur if a LLP Conference was held where many stakeholders and subject matter experts could jointly discuss issues, challenges, data, and emerging ideas for LLPs in a unique campus such as UK’s. The UK LLP Conference was held in November 2013 with dozens of participants including the provost, the executive vice president for Financial Affairs, members of the task force, and students who were members of LLPs or former participants. See Appendix E for a copy of the conference agenda. Presentations were made by subject matter experts including a national leading expert Julie Inkelas, who Skyped in. Breakout sessions were an important segment of the agenda and groups were divided into areas specific to the provost’s charge. See Appendix F for their reports. Highlights from the conference include the following: (a) extensive best-practice and benchmarking data were presented based on aspirational universities regarding their own LLPs, (b) in-depth and lively discussions ensued from diverse and unique individuals participating in the conference, (c) networking opportunities were established and synergies created for moving subsequent discussions to a new level, and (d) the student panel was a highlight that created a reality-check for faculty and staff. The conference was captured on video compliments of
the College of Communication and Information and placed on the SharePoint site for those who could not attend the conference.

Following the conference, members of the task force assembled notes and minutes to develop some coherence and integration of the various data points (see Appendix F for these materials). Following winter break a smaller committee of the task force met January 6 and conducted an analysis of the materials from the conference and elsewhere and delivered to the task force a synthesis for review (see Appendix A). The task force met January 31 and determined that another meeting was needed to review drafts from three writing teams. The areas assigned to the writing teams were (a) academic standards, (b) assessment and measures of success, and (c) structure, staff and leadership. Appendices F are available for review that chronicles the background that lead to the work of the teams. The task force met again on February 24 to review drafts from the writing teams and made a number of suggestions and provided input on recommendations. The task force co-chairs began assembly of all material to produce a draft report for task force member review.

The remainder of this report reflects a synthesis of the research conducted by the task force and recommendations for moving forward with a rapid expansion of LLPs at UK. The four sections that follow include (a) academic standards, (b) assessment and measures of success, (c) program staffing and structure, and (d) LLP historical costs.

**Figure 1**
Academic Standards

Living Learning Programs can enhance a student’s overall university experience by infusing a cohesive, communal living environment with core academic standards and institutional values. Students involved with learning communities are more likely to persist through graduation, attain greater academic success, connect with peers and develop social networks, communicate with faculty and staff, and overall claim to have more successfully made the transition from secondary education to post-secondary (Tinto, 2003). Academic components of active learning and reflection and assessment are identified as parts of the five core practices of successful LLP communities identified by Smith et al. (2004), alongside sense of community, diversity and integration.

Implicit and Explicit Curriculum

Academic standards are statements about what students are expected to know or be able to do as a result of participation in an organized learning program. The expectations for Living Learning Programs include what might be called the university’s implicit and explicit curriculum. The explicit curriculum is the formal academic setting of courses required, embedded or linked to the LLP courses which may fulfill general education requirements or those for academic majors, minors or certificates. The implicit curriculum is linked to the “lessons” learned through involvement and engagement with the people in a community and may include leadership, sense of safety, and/or self-efficacy, among others. In well-designed LLPs the explicit and implicit curriculum intersect, as intentionally-chosen, for-credit courses encourage the thoughtful behavior and out-of-classroom conversations necessary for an academically and socially engaged community.

As Brower and Inkelas (2010) have argued, LLPs function as a microcosm for the institutions that form them. The academic standards of any learning community reflect and reinforce the mission of the university. For example, the UK’s 2009-2014 Strategic Plan establishes that the university should prepare students to lead within an innovation-driven economy and global society; to aspire to diversity and inclusion; and to contribute to the quality of life in Kentucky and beyond. Because UK is currently engaged in the strategic planning process, there is an excellent opportunity to link proactively the academic standards for LLPs to the goals the university chooses to pursue during this next cycle.

Another source of academic standards for LLPs are the competencies established for UK Core. Students who complete UK Core courses successfully will be able to demonstrate:

- An understanding of and ability to employ the processes of intellectual inquiry;
- Competent written, oral and visual communication skills both as producers and consumers of information;
- An understanding of and ability to employ methods of quantitative reasoning;
- An understanding of the complexities of citizenship and the processes for making informed choices as engaged citizens in a diverse, multilingual world. (University of Kentucky Bulletin, 2013).
Depending on the particular focus of the living learning community, outcomes could be taken from any of the areas of UK Core. For instance, the Leadership and Service LLP could borrow the SLOs from the UK Core areas for inquiry and citizenship. More discipline or college-specific LLPs may wish to link SLOs to program-level outcomes established for particular disciplines. In addition to SLOs that are derived from the explicit curriculum (UK Core or other academic programs), individual LLPs should develop outcomes that pertain to personal development and community building, such as leadership, engagement, personal responsibility, and citizenship.

Each LLP will in this sense define its own academic standards through well-articulated student learning outcomes. The SLOs for each community should include both broad and specific competencies. Broad competencies should reflect general, campus-wide goals that are applicable to all LLPs. More specific SLOs will derive from the particular theme or disciplinary focus of the community. It is possible that specific SLOs may “nest” or relate directly to the more general campus-wide outcomes. It is recommended that SLOs be few in number in order to facilitate measurement and assessment. This assessment of SLOs could be one way to understand if an LLP is successful or not.

**Academic Standards and Principles of Design**

The academic standards established for learning communities are more likely to be achieved when the structure of the programs interweave content across courses and with peer-to-peer learning, active learning, and personal connections among students, faculty, and staff (Jaffee, 2004). To promote institutional goals and achievement of academic standards we make the following recommendations:

LLPs at UK should include at least one for-credit academic course (Brower and Inkelas, 2010). It is even better when two courses (perhaps one content or theme focused, the other skill-based such as Composition & Communication in the UK Core). Courses should be linked to the theme and purpose of the LLP in an intentional way. Ideally co-curricular activities also would be dovetailed with curricular matters so that faculty and staff enable students a seamless educational experience. When possible courses offered in conjunction with LLPs should integrate pedagogical practices of active learning (seminars, “flipped” classrooms, etc.) and/or high impact practices such as inquiry-based learning, service-learning or undergraduate research.

Active, integrated learning requires a high-level of coordination among all faculty and staff involved in the teaching enterprise. Living learning community members support one another in developing articulate curricula to support intentional integration, delivery of high-level instruction, and quality learning. This necessitates collaborations between Student Affairs and an academic unit, with specific sponsorship by a college or colleges. This involvement should be determined with careful attention to emerging scholarly understanding of learning environments, designed to address particular issues involving retention and academic progress of students, such as the use of ‘block programming’ of students into common first year UK Core classes.

LLPs should be designed to address key transitions in students’ academic careers and social development (e.g. first year) and as intervention strategies for at-risk students. The structural elements of any LLP must be chosen deliberately in order to achieve specific, desired results.
by addressing the documented needs of students in transition, developing or expanding cross-college or centralized programs focusing on transfer students, the sophomore experience, First Generation, etc. Successful proposals for new or expanded programs will make use of the data and current scholarship to ensure that the academic, co-curricular, and experiential elements intentionally support the integration of academic and social activities, peer-to-peer and faculty engagement, and academic success. A campus-wide discussion about the best ways to meet student needs and interests should inform decisions about what is or is not approved as an LLP.

Recognizing the diversity of our student population and students’ needs, a mix of residential environments, including smaller living learning communities, larger living learning programs, and residential colleges, is needed. The scale or size of programs must be such that they can achieve a balance of student needs, programmatic effectiveness, and required resources. Certainly, there are efficiencies to be gained by developing larger LLPs of 200-300 students. However, there will be times when smaller LLPs are appropriate and effective, particularly as these efforts can be flexible, more responsive to changes in student interests, and more moderately resourced.

Diversity should also inform the programmatic aspects of LLPs. The size, scope and focus of the programs should accommodate applications/admittance of diverse populations to the LLPs and avoid creating overly homogenous populations within a community. Some LLPs may develop based on specific academic interests/units/majors (e.g. CI Connect, Engineering, Education, Healthcare), interests or themes (A&S Wired, iNET, Leadership and Service) or based on background experiences or abilities (Honors, First Generation, transfer). While some LLPs may rely on the resources of one college, others will likely involve a partnership across two or more colleges. In developing LLPs, attention should be paid to the fact that many students enter UK as undecided as to major and many more change majors. Thus, there is an advantage to LLPs that are not rigidly tied to specific majors, and which help individual students understand and define academic courses of study that work best for them. Equally important, in developing LLPs, it is important to understand the course of study that first-year students undertake and explore linkages to those UK Core courses that are central to the first-year experience.

The opportunity presented by the construction of new residence halls represents an unprecedented, perhaps never to be repeated, opportunity to redefine undergraduate education at UK using the living learning model. At the same time, this is an extremely complex undertaking. In addition to defining academic standards, the successful implementation of LLPs at any scale will require greater collaboration across many units. LLPs will change how this campus recruits students, processes their applications, assigns student housing, designs courses, creates course schedules, conducts advising, trains staff, evaluates faculty, and handles an array of student services too numerous to mention. Coordination of these efforts is essential. Strong leadership is required.
References:
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Assessment and Measures of Success

But, here’s the rub: what makes learning communities so powerful is exactly what makes them so difficult to assess. —Aaron Bower & Karen Inkelas (2007)

The purpose of living learning communities is to help students be more successful in college than they otherwise would have been. These communities are not just for the best and brightest students, but for all students who are interested. Therefore, we can’t simply use G.P.A.s as a yardstick by which to measure each community’s success. We don’t want to create an environment in which community directors only want to select the highest achieving students as members, or the goal of pushing retention rates higher might be undermined. The educational process inherent in a Living Learning Program is multifaceted, and success must be measured on many levels.

In general, all communities attempt to positively impact student learning and student success. However, despite some similarities, living learning communities differ on the community level. They have different levels of support and serve different student populations. As we create a process for assessing our Living Learning Program, particularly during this period of rapid growth and expansion, maintaining a focus on student success and quality will be an ongoing concern.

What emerges from the literature on Living Learning Programs is a need for a comprehensive assessment plan that includes the following:

- Student demographics, such as pre-college characteristics, that might influence student success,
- Experience oriented data (environmental measures and measures of engagement),
- Students’ ratings of their perceived learning and development,
- Course evaluations, revised when appropriate to assess more engaging learning environments,
- Standard measures of student success (retention, G.P.A., time to degree),
- A structure for future planning based on assessment outcomes.

Before outlining a report card by which communities could be measured, the LLP Task Force submits the following overarching recommendations as a basis for creating an assessment plan for the Living Learning Program:
Assessment of living learning communities should take place on multiple levels:

- The “macro” level, on which the individual communities and the program as a whole are assessed based on universal criteria. This level would include what would become the annual LLP report card. A sample “report card” is provided later in this report. Items to review in order to complete the report card include national and established instruments, internal surveys, course evaluations from connected courses, data from SAP, programming/activity reports from Residence Life and academic partners. These criteria should be assessed annually by the proposed steering committee.

- A “micro” level, on which individual communities assess tailored student learning outcomes and strategies unique to their populations. These would include focus groups with student members, community-specific assessments designed to pull out attributes unique to a particular LLP concept, hall programming reports, etc.

Assessment efforts should be the result of collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, with support from a central unit such as the recommended LLP Steering Committee.

We should strengthen partnerships with existing campus experts in assessment to utilize national assessment instruments (for program review, publication, etc.), and to plan our assessment efforts in a way that avoids survey fatigue among our students.

As mentioned briefly above, assessment tools should include national benchmarking instruments, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Education Benchmarking Inc.’s (EBI) Residence Assessment, to disaggregate and explore performance based on place of residence and subsequently by LLC participation. Internally developed assessment instruments, such as the UK Campus Climate survey, course evaluations that utilize or mirror the assessment infrastructure from UK Core, the Resident-Student Staff Interaction and Engagement (RSSIE) survey, and the Survey of Undergraduate Living Learning Environments (SULLE).

And focus groups, which can track students’ experience within the living learning communities and can help us better understand how students interact with the curricular and co-curricular aspects of the LLP, including academic and social transitions.

**Recommended Role of the LLP Steering Committee**

Given the scale of the growth of the Living Learning program on UK’s campus, centralized support for assessment is essential to support the mission of the Program. A central unit or person should play the following roles in regard to assessing measures common to all LLPs:

- Collect student data (G.P.A., retention, student characteristics, Time-to-degree) in conjunction with UK Analytics,
- Monitor LLP participation on annual assessments, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Education Benchmarking Inc.’s (EBI) Resident Assessment,
- Oversee annual reporting, including the report cards for all LLCs.
Collaborative Roles of Residence Life and Academic Partners

Despite the annual reporting functions to be located within the LLP Steering Committee, the Office of Residence Life and the various academic partners engaged in the Living Learning Program should assume responsibility to help develop tailored programmatic goals and learning outcomes relevant to individual communities. As mentioned earlier, these might “nest” or relate directly to the more general campus-wide outcomes, such as specific outcomes related to the UK Core. Assessment methodologies should encourage data-driven decision-making processes, a culture of continuous improvement, and innovative practice. Combined with overall programmatic assessment, local assessment measures empower the Office of Residence Life and the Living Learning Program’s academic partners to participate in strategic planning and local assessment that guide day-to-day operations.

In the report card at the end of this section, we have identified, from a sampling of LLP literature*, outcomes that are frequently associated with successful Living Learning Programs. Next to each outcome, we note an assessment instrument that can be used to measure the extent to which that outcome has been achieved. After the report card, we make recommendations regarding what steps we should take going forward.

Important Steps Moving Forward

• Program assessment will serve to coordinate all community-specific assessment efforts for living learning communities. Coordinated through normal college assessment processes, results would be reported to the LLP Steering Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

• Continue collaborative work with Admissions and UK Analytics to produce SAP Status Identifiers for LLP students that enables dynamic participation tracking between groups and between terms (i.e. SAP “flags” that are date dependent like we do with Honors students and First Generation students). These will help us collect information without the need to survey students.

• Create standardized end-of-term reports for each living learning community similar to what is created for colleges. These reports should include G.P.A. and retention data in addition to the information about “at risk” students mentioned in the report card (where applicable). This information should be disaggregated by gender, race and LLP.

• Identify and assess LLP-specific connected courses. This could include revisions or addendum to current course evaluations so that we can assess prominent strategies and pedagogical techniques utilized by living-learning communities, such as:
  • Integrative assignments across courses,
  • Service/experiential learning,
  • Flipped classrooms,
  • Block scheduling by cohort.
* Sampling of literature referenced: Tinto & Goodsell, 1994; Terenzini et al., 1996; Magolda, 2004; MacGregor & Smith, 1992; Edwards et al., 2002; Matthews et al., 1997; Tinto, 1998 & 2003; Smith et al., 2004; Jaffee, 2004
# LLP Report Card

## Leadership & Service Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit Curriculum Academic Partners</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Quality of Student/Faculty Interactions</td>
<td>NSSE and Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quality of Connected Courses, including the use of more engaging learning techniques and environments</td>
<td>Course Evaluations; UK Core and Programmatic assessment, as applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Perceptions of Faculty and Staff investment in academic success</td>
<td>NSSE and RSSIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Active learning, reflection, and assessment</td>
<td>Course Evaluations; UK Core and Programmatic assessment, as applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Advanced moral reasoning &amp; gains in critical thinking</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit/Co-Curriculum Student Affairs</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Engagement in educationally purposeful activities</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Formation of a supportive community of peers, faculty, and staff and a sense of belonging</td>
<td>Campus Climate, EBI, and RSSIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Successful transition into post-secondary education (transition measures)</td>
<td>NSSE, EBI, and RSSIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Meaningful interactions with a diverse population of peers.</td>
<td>Campus Climate, NSSE, and RSSIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Increased engagement outside of the classroom &amp; leadership development</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Data</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Support for vulnerable or “at risk” students (using data about pre-college characteristics, we can utilize regression adjusted performance measures (RAPMs) to help determine programmatic impact)</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 First fall to second fall retention rate</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 G.P.A.s</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Time to Degree</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing, Structure and Program Leadership

In this section recommendations are offered for suitable organizational and leadership structures at the provost and individual community levels to ensure sustainability and success of the living learning program based on expected growth and involvement.

Research

A review of community types, enrollment, services, responsibilities, resources, and leadership structure of our SEC partner schools and our research benchmark institutions with Living Learning Programs was conducted. In addition, all suggestions / recommendations reflect the concepts and LLP models discussed in the work of Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas and various other researchers who have explored staffing models for Living Learning Programs.

Organizational Structure

Approval for expansion and additional financial support would offer the Living Learning Program an opportunity to provide an out of the classroom education that would support the mission and core values of the University of Kentucky. As we’ve heard over and over again from national research and from our day-long retreat in the fall semester, Academic and Student Affairs partnerships are essential to a strong Living Learning Program. The Academic and Student Affairs partnership programs have been championed as a means of bridging the academic, social and affective elements of students’ experiences by creating seamless learning environments and engaging students in their own learning. (AAHE et al., 1998; Blinding et al., 1999; Kezar et al., 2001; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schroeder, 1999a, 1999b). By their very nature, partnerships require educators from both inside and outside the classroom to collaborate and consider students’ educational experiences. Thus, partnerships create cross-functional, interdepartmental linkages that combine resources and expertise to address the learning needs of students.

Given the scale of the UK LLP expansion as well as the resources required to facilitate such growth, one example of a staffing model has been provided below. This is only one possible example of a structure that includes both new positions and incorporates existing roles. Additional conversation and planning should occur among the newly formed LLP Steering Committee, provost, and any other key administrators to determine the best staffing plan for UK LLP, given available resources and articulated goals for the program. In light of this, consideration should be given to incorporating a phased staffing plan to evolve with the progressive program expansion. See below for suggestions of critical roles to be incorporated at key phases:

**Phase 1** (immediate):

- (EXISTING) Reconstitute the LLP Task Force into the UK LLP Steering committee with representation from the colleges (Academic Affairs) and Student Affairs as well as administration.

- (EXISTING) Continued involvement of **LLP partners** involved in various aspects of UK LLP (Residence Life, academic college partners including faculty and staff, etc.)
• (NEW) Incorporation of any **newly developed LLP roles and function** as approved by the administration for immediate appointment.

**Phase 2** (in 1+ years, once new construction is complete, more communities are brought online, and existing communities expanded):
• Incorporation of **additional LLP support roles** as needed.

**LLP Steering Committee**
A new LLP Steering Committee should be established to work on the overarching goals and vision of the Living Learning Program at UK. It is the committee’s mission to ensure that all LLPs at the University of Kentucky support the academic mission of the university. Through the creation of LLP standards and compliance, the LLP Steering Committee will hold all communities accountable for meeting the minimum requirements of an LLP. In addition, the committee will review and approve all new community proposals and any additional LLP funding requests. The LLP Steering Committee will also be expected to secure faculty incentives, develop a marketing and recruitment strategy and conduct assessment/strategic planning for the LLP program. Members of the Living Learning Program Steering Committee will consist of key UK administrators and other stakeholders appointed by the provost.

**LLP Partners Coalition**
The LLP Partners Coalition (LLPPC) should be established to work on the day-to-day operations of the Living Learning Program. LLPPC members will consist of LLP partner directors and LLP resident directors. The director of the Living Learning Program will assist in the coordination and facilitation of these joint meetings. This group will meet on a monthly basis to discuss LLP programs and community-wide goals.

**LLP Student Council**
The LLP Student Council will consist of a student representative from each living learning community. The council will provide an additional leadership opportunity for any LLP student. LLP Student Council members will also hold a position within their respective residence hall government. Throughout the academic year members of the council will assist the LLP Steering Committee, LLP Partners Coalition and the Residence Hall Association in making program decisions with the LLP student perspective in mind. In addition this group will have primary responsibility in planning the LLP Showcase and other LLP specific student events.

**Academic Roles and Functions**
Colleges and academic programs (Academic Affairs) provide academic support and assistance to their community through robust and focused community leadership and an equally strong academic core. This will be accomplished by creating linked academic courses which incorporate active and collaborative learning, encouraging high quality faculty-student interactions, and working with Residence Life staff members to create out-of-class activities that complement in-class experiences. The specific roles and staffing structure of each living learning community will depend on the size of that community and the resources available to those specific partners. The recommendations below would apply to the largest of our communities. Fewer staff members in smaller communities, though, could
accomplish the tasks fulfilled by each position. We expect that the larger LLPs will require the following roles to work for their community:

- **LLP Director (Existing & New)** – This position will be tasked with overseeing the executive functions of the community. The LLP director will be responsible for the community budget, securing faculty involvement, working in collaboration with the Residence Life staff, establishing peer mentor positions/expectations, providing stipends for peer mentors and providing supervision for faculty director(s). This position does not always exist across the program. This position is optional for smaller communities and the duties outlined could be performed by the appointed academic director for the community. Responsibilities of this suggested position and the academic director (see next section) for the community could be integrated into the DOE of 1-2 persons who may already be supporting the community and its structure.

- **Academic Director (Existing & New)** – This position’s current assignments and responsibilities should be taken into account prior to appointing a faculty member. This position will be responsible for the day-to-day duties within the community, which include, but are not limited to: communication with students, monthly one-on-one meetings with the LLP director, LLP student selection meetings, interviewing peer mentor candidates, attendance at LLP development opportunities, assistance in planning the academic LLP student experience, participation in programs, recruiting other faculty members to participate in the LLP student experience, and other administrative tasks related to the community. This position does not currently exist across the program. This position would be the primary leadership of a smaller community and could be filled by a staff or faculty member. This position would be responsible for the duties outlined above, in addition to the responsibilities listed under the suggested position of LLP director and the LLP academic advisor. Since this position would be acting as the community director, recruiter and advisor, we strongly recommend that this position be a full-time dedicated staff member, since its various tasks and responsibilities are many and would not be compatible with a faculty member, if s/he did not have additional support.

- **Recruiting (Existing)** – This function would be responsible for participating in recruitment events sponsored by Admissions and the university. This would involve travel and attending all fall Preview Nights, spring Come See for Yourself events, Merit Weekends, and Summer Advising Conferences. This role would market the particular community to current and prospective students. The responsibilities of this position could be fulfilled by peer mentors within the community or primary leadership of the community depending on availability. Peer mentors have already participated in Preview Nights and Come See for Yourself Events hosted by the University in past recruitment cycles. The basic responsibilities for the student leadership would be to attend recruitment events and share the student perspective regarding involvement with the LLP. The Living Learning Program has representatives from the Undergraduate Housing and Residence Life departments at all events.

- **LLP Academic Advising (Existing)** – This role would be responsible for registering students for the connected courses associated with the community and would provide academic advising for LLP students, secure classroom space for connected courses, and work with the LLP director and faculty director to secure connected courses for the community. This
position does not currently exist across the program. For smaller communities, the primary leadership can work with the Office of Residence Life to enroll students in the connected course and secure teaching space. Smaller communities could also work with a representative from their college or sponsoring department to enroll students in connected courses and also work with the aforementioned groups to locate suitable connected courses. Students would rely on their assigned advisor to obtain academic advising and additional support regarding academic decisions.

- Graduate Assistant (New) – This position would be responsible for assisting with administrative tasks associated with the community, supervision and communication with peer mentors, keeping community rosters, and also assisting the faculty director, recruiter and/or the LLP academic advisor in their tasks. The position could be staffed with a candidate in a particular field or professional program that may align with the theme/academic orientation of the community. The tasks of this position could be absorbed by the primary leadership of the community. If the sponsoring department or college already has graduate assistants (GAs), tasks could be passed to these GAs when needed. Smaller communities would have the opportunity to select positions that are essential to the success of their community and secure positions if funding is available. GAs could also assist with data collection and analysis for program assessment.

- Peer Mentors (Existing) – These positions would be responsible for working directly with the students in each community. These student leadership positions provide students with a peer-to-peer relationship, assist with recruitment efforts, plan and participate in curricular and co-curricular activities, and serve as role models for their peers. Peer mentors are vital to the success of the community. These positions are primarily supervised by the academic partner in collaboration with the residence hall staff. It is imperative that every community have at least one peer mentor. However, we would recommend a 30 student to 1 peer mentor breakdown for optimal success.

**Student Affairs/Residence Life**

Under the Division of Student Affairs, the Office of Residence Life would partner with colleges and academic programs (Academic Affairs) in the following ways:

- Representation on the LLP Steering Committee,
- Supporting individual communities, particularly smaller communities, in all of the ways mentioned above (ex. securing course enrollment and teaching space and assisting in marketing and recruitment),
- Oversight of the joint application process and housing assignments in partnership with EdR,
- Large scale marketing and recruitment efforts (in partnership with Admissions and UK PR),
- Coordinate selection, interviews, and training for student leadership positions (peer mentors, RAs, GAs),
- Coordinate classroom scheduling for connected courses and shared spaces in the residence halls,
• Coordinate and plan, in conjunction with the LLP Partners Coalition and the LLP Student Council, major program-wide events such as the LLP Induction Ceremony and the LLP Showcase,
• Coordinate monthly meetings with the LLP Partners Coalition and the LLP Student Council,
• Provides support with other Living Learning Program initiatives and programming. Within the Division of Student Affairs, multiple units contribute to the day-to-day operations of the program through support with co-curricular training and programming.

Residence Life
Director of Living Learning Programs (New) – This position will serve to coordinate all of the functions associated with the management of a Living Learning Program, specifically from the co-curricular perspective. This position will work directly with LLP academic directors to coordinate day-to-day operations, including professional development activities and monthly LLP directors meetings. In addition, the director will be responsible for providing guidance and assistance with the implementation of new communities and training for Residence Life staff and LLP coordinators. The director of Living Learning Programs will have direct supervision of the following positions.

Living Learning Coordinators (New) – LLP coordinators will work collaboratively with each community partner regarding the coordination of: monthly one-on-one meetings, communication, development opportunities, marketing of community leadership positions, peer mentor selection and shared supervision, and the creation of cross community co-curricular opportunities. These positions do not currently exist across the program and the number of coordinators needed will depend on the projected growth of the LLP.

Resident Directors/Hall Directors (Existing) – These staff members supervise a residence hall and have direct supervision over the resident advisor staff. RDs and HDs support the Living Learning Program in the following ways: working collaboratively with the faculty and campus partners to develop a yearly schedule of events and programs, participate in monthly meeting with LLP partners, monitor RA programming and student engagement, assist in the supervision of peer mentors, and regularly attend LLP activities.

Resident Advisors (Existing) – These student positions have direct supervision over a group of students in a section or floor of a residence hall. In addition to their responsibilities unrelated to the Living Learning Program, RAs support the LLP in the following ways: student engagement, helping students connect to the University of Kentucky and other resources, creating supportive environments that focuses on academic success, conducting programming and fulfilling responsibilities defined within each LLP community, collaborating with peer mentors to plan co-curricular programming, and maintaining a safe environment within the residence hall community.

UK and Local Partners/Staffing
The proposed Living Learning Program leadership structure supports LLP students, peer mentors and student staff through joint leadership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as well as collaboration from a variety of campus and community partners. One of
the best ways to reach students and strengthen their sense of community is through an active and knowledgeable group of student mentors and student staff. These student leaders are often the first a student will turn to when in need, whether personal or academic. We recommend expanding the current student mentor training program to include more academic support strategies, critical life skills and crisis training.

Consideration should also be given to new potential UK community partners to provide special training and support to LLP students and student staff. UK community partners should include and not be limited to: UK Libraries, Presentation U, the Writing Center, Analytics and Technologies, and Academic Enhancement.

Additionally, local community partners can provide student mentors and student staff with awareness of resources and services in the Lexington area to further strengthen and educate the LLP community, as well as partner with communities as additional sources of support. As a result, the introduction of a sponsorship coordinator specific to LLPs is also recommended.

**LLP Sponsorship**

The LLP Sponsorship function would be responsible for developing partnerships with community services and vendors to provide information and promotional items to support LLP activities. For example, the Leadership & Service Community has received donation dollars from Ale-8-One to assist with leadership opportunities within the community. These funds have helped with supporting co-curricular activities and provided scholarship funding to sponsor student participation in the university’s alternate spring break program. This is similar to development that is the responsibility of the college’s development officer or the Office of Development. Through the LLP sponsorships local and global businesses can partner to provide support toward enhancing the academic experience provided for LLP students both in and outside of the classroom. Colleges and Academic Programs will work closely with the Office of Development in exploring new partnerships.
Estimated Costs (Existing Programs)

Members of the task force volunteered estimated costs for operating their LLP on an annual basis. As one can immediately observe, costs and amenities vary widely among just a few of the LLPs. It is recommended that all LLP be surveyed to determine the range of costs and services delivered and annual, normalized operating expenses.

**Wired Residential College**
- 171 freshmen Fall 2011 and the last two years have had 231 plus 20 peer mentors
- Estimate Fall 2014, 267 freshmen/sophomores/peer mentors
- 3 Faculty Directors and 1 Administrative Director
- 21 sections of A&S 100 for 2 credit hours each fall and spring (25 students)
- 18 sections of WRD 110, 111 or 112 (combined) for 3 credit hours (25 students)
- 3 sections of CHE 105 recitations in the fall semesters (25 students)
- 4 hours a week of math tutoring each fall and spring

**Costs/Budget for Wired**
- $98,000 Ipad2 purchase
- $13,000 Programming Budget
- $63,000 Salary + Benefits, Administrative Director
- $36,000 3 Faculty Directors
- $20,000 20 Peer Mentors
- $1,150 Housing Fee for early move-in for Peer Mentors
- $700 Math tutoring in the hall, fall & spring

$231,850 Total

**Honors**
UGE has two LLPs, Honors and 1G.

It is difficult to disentangle Honors LLP funding from support for the entire program since our advisors, admin staff, the Program Director (me) and instructional support for courses serve both the LLP students and non-students as well. A good estimate might be:

**Honors LLP**
- 320 students
- Growing to 420 students next year + 170 or so upper-classmen living in New Central
Cost/Budget for Honors

- $23,000 LLP Coordinator (half of a FT staff advisor) (not including benefits)
- $10,000 Co-curricular support
- $17,000 Peer mentors 17@ $1000 (growing to 24 next year)
- $75,000 Connected Courses = approx. 24 (with payments for overloads (growing smaller), PTI, and small salary supplements (to cover expected service) and course development grants for first time instructors, etc.)

*We could work on pro-rating the salaries of the advisors, student coordinator, admin support, and director but that would involve making a lot of assumptions.*

1st Generation

- 1G LLP accommodates approximately 70 students.
- LLP coordinator $32,000 (not including benefits)
- Pro-rate salary of 1G Director (who coordinates 1G initiatives across campus in his day job)
- Peer Mentors= 3
- Co-curricular support= approx. $5000

Engineering LLP

Currently we have 100 students. We have no peer mentors but have a graduate student as Engineer in Residence who is in charge of programming and teaching the connected course, etc. We have covered all programming costs and the cost for the Engineer in Residence.

Cost/Budget for Engineering

- $5000 Engineer in Residence ($250/month + meal plan)
- $5000 Housing for Engineer in Residence
- $6000 Programming Costs

$16,000 Total paid by us

Future Engineering LLP

- We will have 400 students

Projected Costs:

- $40,000 Director salary
- $17,000 for room and $4000 for support 2 junior/senior students serving as Engineers in Residence
- $18,000 18 peer mentors
• $40,000  Faculty release time to teach a connected course
• $20,000  Costs for LLP Activities
• $20,000  Costs for Tutors

$161,000  Approximate TOTAL

AG

1) Agriculture Residential College, F14—56 students, 8 peer mentors, one staff member at 15% commitment (overload) to co-teach a three-credit course and coordinate activities. I’m the other co-teacher; we have two sections. Total costs are $8K for instruction (well, I don’t get paid, but anybody else would), plus $200/semester for each pm, plus $5K for programming. Roughly $16K/56 students, about $285/student for the academic year.

2) Greenhouse, F14—160 students, assuming we fill, and hunching what Mark pays his faculty. ~100K for the following: a staff LLP coordinator, 12 peer mentors, 5 UIAs, programming, tees, bikes (details below). Plus about $20K/year of some sort of negotiated support for each of four faculty members on the team. Total cost about $180K/academic year. About $1125/student.

Cost/Budget for AG

• $ 42-45,000  Administrative Director
• $        9,000  Programming/field trips
• $        2,000  T-shirts
• $    15,000  Bicycles as incentive
• $       5,000  Undergrad Inst. Assistants
• $    12,000  Peer Mentors (1 per 12 students)

iNET Entrepreneurial Studies

21 Students

First year costs (2013-14)

• $ 34,000  iNET Director (.3 FTE incl FB)
• $ 24,600  Academic Director (.2 FTE incl FB)
• $  8,250  Entrepreneur-in- Residence (.25 FTE)
• $       500  Peer Mentor
Appendices
Appendix A: Provost Charge

Dear [Recipient],

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the new Live and Learn Program (LLP) Task Force. Dan O’Hair, Dean of Communications and Ike Adams, Dean of Social Work will serve as co-chairs. Members of the task force are on the attached list. A few more members as noted in the document will be added to this group.

This task force replaces all former task forces related to LLPs with the exception of the Project Implementation Team (PIT), which still exists. Penny Cox and Robert Mock serve on both groups to ensure a smooth connection. Additionally, Mark O’Bryan, Associate Dean from the College of Design serves on PIT.

I have asked Dan and Ike to convene the LLP Task Force to discuss and make recommendations around the following areas:

1. Academic standards and Quality of LLPs
2. Academic leadership and support structure needed for LLPs
3. Issues to Consider in Growth of LLPs
4. Assessment and Measures of Success of LLPs
5. Costs and sustainability of LLPs
6. Other Issues

To also be clear, this task force is not charged with evaluating the LLP proposals from the Colleges. The proposals from the Colleges, which are due on October 1st, will be evaluated initially by me and Eric Monday, EVP for Finance and Administration. We will then work directly and collaboratively with the deans involved with the proposals to determine what can (and cannot) be accomplished.

Thank you again for agreeing to serve in this important role! Dan and Ike will be in touch to convene this group.

We look forward to creating strong, high quality LLPs across our campus with your help and leadership.

Have a great weekend!
All the best,
Chris

Christine N. Roritan, Ph.D.
Provost and Professor of Management
University of Kentucky
105 Main Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0032
Executive Assistant: Chloe Tiber: chrn@uky.edu (859-257-2911)
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST: http://www.uky.edu/Provost/
PERSONAL WEBSITE: www.christineroritan.com
Appendix B: Living and Learning at UK - 10 Design Principles

Living and Learning at the University of Kentucky

Living-Learning communities have played a role at UK since the 1960’s when sections of dorms were identified as “Honors floors.” Beginning in the late 1980’s, a variety of options of residential experiences have emerged as an important part of UK’s strategy for retention and student success. The benefits of linking living and learning have been documented (Inkelas, et al. 2007; Brower and Inkelas 2010). Well-designed living-learning environments can bring together several “high-impact educational practices” identified by the AAC&U such as: connected courses or a series of courses, first-year seminars, service learning, and common intellectual experiences and/or co-curricular activities. Individually or in combination these practices promote student engagement with faculty and staff as well as foster peer-networking. As the practices of engaged living/learning have grown, the term “community” and “program” have often used loosely and interchangeably in the scholarly literature and everyday practice. Emergent practice tend to use the term “Living Learning Communities” (LLCs) to refer to smaller groups, or less formally designed arrangements; “Living Learning Programs” are often on a larger scale, with an intentionally-designed curriculum and co-curriculum. “Residential Colleges” are medium to large-sized communities, with embedded faculty or scholarly fellows living or working in the same space as students; often students live in the same dorm for two or more years as members of the community. (For the types and typologies of living-learning environments, see Inkelas and Associates, 2008; Inkelas and Longerbeam, 2008)

The opportunity presented by the construction of 9000 new beds by 2018 represents an unprecedented, perhaps never to be repeated, opportunity to redefine undergraduate education at UK using the living-learning model. At the same time, this is an extremely complex undertaking. Successful implementation at any scale will require changes to the way we recruit students, process their applications, assign student housing, design courses, create course-schedules, conduct advising, train staff, evaluate faculty, and handle an array of student services too numerous to mention. For this reason, we need to immediately establish a Task Force to design and plan for this new campus culture. While led by a senior administrative officer, this Task Force should include staff, faculty, and students who have detailed and specific knowledge of the processes, people, and planning impacted by this initiative. This Task Force will be guided by Design Principles, such as those below, that the campus agrees will guide the decisions as we move forward.

Ten Design Principles

1. LLP’s should be designed to address key transitions in student’s academic careers (first year) and as intervention strategies for subsets of students with lower retention rates. This broader discussion about the best ways to meet student needs and interests should inform decisions about what is or is not approved as an LLP.
The LLP’s currently offered at UK are designed to assist students with transitional issues, particularly those of the first year. As the program is expanded, particular attention should be given to continuing this emphasis. The structural elements of any LLC or LLP must be chosen deliberately in order to achieve specific, desired results by addressing the documented needs of students in transition, developing or expand cross-college or centralized programs focusing on transfer students, sophomore experience, First Generation, etc. Successful proposals for new or expanded programs will make use of the data and current scholarship to ensure that the academic, co-curricular, and experiential elements intentionally support the integration of academic and social activities, peer-to-peer and faculty engagement, and academic success.

2. **All first-year, unmarried students will live on-campus.**

The first year of college presents unique intellectual, emotional, educational, and personal challenges to students who are experiencing the transition to adult responsibilities. A first-year residence requirement will help students at this stage adapt to their changing circumstance and adopt patterns of behavior beneficial to their academic success. It’s likely that a residency requirement might only capture about 5% more of the first-year students than we presently, and appropriate mechanisms for appeal to the residency rule for financial hardship, family issues as well as consideration of the needs of part-time and non-traditional students must be included.

3. **By 2018, UK should provide the opportunity for all first-year students to participate in an LLP. We should establish an achievable goal for the percentage of students (80%?) who participate.**

Recent scholarship has emphasized that living-learning communities establish real and meaningful relationship for students between the academic and social, the individual and communal. They intentionally support learning and the sense of belonging to a network of peers and adults. They make large universities “feel” smaller, more friendly and welcoming. These communities are especially helpful for students undertaking key transitions or who are likely to experience academic, social, or personal challenges in college because they provide a ready network of peers, trained staff, and dedicated faculty. UK must establish a goal for student participation. Nationally, approximately 20% of first-year students participate in learning communities while some universities (e.g. UC San Diego) have a universal requirement. Our campus goal must recognize that an LLP is but one element in a comprehensive strategy for retention. We need to balance the benefits of LLPs with the cost and the presence of other on-campus options for student involvement and engagement that may better meet their needs, especially for students who are NOT residential, full time, single, or who have health or other family issues.
4. **We should further study how to encourage sophomores and upper-classmen to take advantage of the on-campus environment to improve their on-time graduation.**

Students beyond the first year often face problems and concerns that impact decisions to stay at the university. The new dorms offer an unparalleled opportunity to address these concerns, because, when construction is complete, UK will have approximately 9000 beds in modern, first-rate dorms. Only half of these will be necessary to accommodate the incoming cohort of first-year students. We need a plan to make on-campus living desirable for students who will have a growing number of off-campus options available to them; we also need a plan to address recruitment, retention and completion. The creation of four-year residential colleges, in particular, would also be a significant attraction that could aid UK in recruiting more top students. The new dorms provide the opportunity, for the first time at UK, to develop several residential programs designed to smooth other transitions points such as “the sophomore slump” or the entry into upper-level courses or a new major. Again, these decisions must be made with an overall strategy in mind. For example, it may be less costly to encourage the formation of cohort groups or non-residential learning communities in the majors or degree programs or to promote active and collaborative learning in the classroom, and intensive advising to gauge students’ needs. Further examination of engagement and attrition is needed for the University to determine the proper mix of programs that will meet the needs of students beyond the first-year.

5. **Recognizing the diversity of our student population and student’s needs, UK will develop a mix of residential environments, including smaller living-learning communities, larger living-learning programs, and residential colleges.**

These programs need to impact student success AND be cost efficient. This means that they should be scaled or sized to achieve a balance of student needs, programmatic effectiveness, and required resources in mind. There are efficiencies to be gained by developing larger LLPs of 200-300 students. These LLP’s must be comprehensively resourced and supported through an academic/student affairs collaboration. However, there will be times when smaller LLC’s are appropriate and effective, particularly as these efforts can be flexible, more responsive to changes in student interests, and more moderately resourced. There should be only a limited number of these smaller communities; most attention and resources should be directed to the larger LLPs. In some appropriate cases, established LLPs may evolve into Residential Colleges. When considering diversity and applications/admittance to the LLPs, the needs of the programs (size and scope) may warrant consideration for the need to avoid creating homogenous populations within a community.

6. **Diversity should also inform the programmatic aspects of LLP’s. UK will develop LLP’s based on specific academic interests/units/majors (e.g. Engineering; Healthcare), interests or themes (A&S Wired; Leadership and Service) or based on**
background experiences or abilities (Honors, First Generation). LLP’s may involve one academic college or be a partnership across two or more colleges.

Diversity of thought and interdisciplinary co-curricular involvement strengthens a program. The diversity of faculty and student interests demand that a variety of programs develop on this campus. Programs must clearly communicate whether non-majors are welcome (would a Fine Arts dorm be only for Music/Art/Theatre/AA or could non-majors who appreciate the arts be a part?). All proposals will have to make clear whether non-participants can room with students in a program (a frequent request). In developing LLPS, attention should be paid to the fact that many students enter UK as undecided as to major and many more change major. Thus, there is an advantage to LLPs that are not rigidly tied to specific majors, and which help individual students understand and define academic courses of study that work best for them. Equally important, in developing LLPs, it is important to understand the course of study that first-year students undertake and explore linkages to those UK core courses that are central to the first-year experience.

7. **All LLP’s must be designed as collaborations between Student Affairs and an academic unit, with specific sponsorship by a college or colleges.**

UK’s Office of Student Affairs has a long history of organizing living-learning activities on this campus. This expertise must be leveraged, with SA continuing in its role of providing consistent campus-wide training for RA’s and Peer Mentors. At the same time, living-learning communities, especially LLP’s, must have an academic home, with faculty responsible for the creation and supervision of the academic program or activities of the learning communities. Faculty involvement is essential, providing a vital link between students and faculty. Faculty involvement will vary according to the program type and needs of the students, though all programs should include at least one common course designed around the specific focus of the LLP. This involvement should be determined with careful attention to emerging scholarly understanding of learning environments, designed to address particular issues involving retention and academic progress of students, such as the use of ‘block programming’ of students into common first year UK Core classes.

8. **An adequate and stable funding model for the LLP’s will be developed, using a combination of college-based resources and central investment.**

Resources for LLPs may be redirected from those that college’s currently dedicate to undergraduate advising, co-curricular activities, and student affairs (among others). Linking courses to LLPs may generate other support as Colleges receive funding for SCHs. Similarly, current resources utilized by Student Affairs (RAs, etc.) will be available to be repackaged to support LLPs. In addition, funds from new tuition revenue be set aside for the LLCs at the central level to supplement expected contributions from the colleges from their portion of new tuition revenue. This additional central investment
will be needed, particularly for colleges which do not have significant undergraduate revenues. Central investment will pay off substantially in increased student success.

9. **We recognize that some LLP’s require specialized spaces (that is, beyond the standard classroom/study room found in most of the new dorms). For this reason, faculty/college administration must be involved in the design of programming space from the initial stages of new dorms.**

This will require that as soon as possible, LLPs with special space requirements for programming or conditions be identified. Examples of these communities may include (but are not limited to): Sustainability or the Environment (which should be placed in a dorm with a green roof, near spaces for organic gardens); International Village (with enlarged kitchens or other cultural amenities), Fine Arts (with dedicated, specialized performance/practice/teaching spaces). Once these programs are identified they should be associated with specific spaces in one of the new dorms, most likely in Phase III since these spaces have not been designed. Academic staff and faculty from the units leading the development of the programs must be part of the design of the facilities from the initial steps.

10. **Responsibility development, creation, and oversight of the LLP’s should reside within the Office for Student Success.**

For UK to reach the goal of 80% of first-year participation, we will require close collaboration across several units ranging from recruitment, enrollment management, housing, residential life training, academic advising, and course scheduling. As many of the units responsible for these activities now reside under the roof of Student Success, it makes sense that responsibility for this collaboration should be placed with the Senior ViceProvost who may delegate and supervise as is appropriate. This level of coordination will require that we change aspects of our institutional culture and operations.
Glossary of Terms

Learning Communities (LC): LC’s are a purposefully-designed educational experience aimed at creating networks of support, usually for groups of peers. Many LCs promote student learning, though some are dedicated to faculty or staff professional development. LC’s incorporate co-curricular activities with dedicated learning experiences. This may involve integrated a course (for credit or non-credit), linking two or more courses, and/or co-curricular activities. Learning Communities may be formed around a variety of interactions including regular face-to-face meetings, on-line communication, or by living in close proximity. (Schapiro and Levine, 1999; Lenning and Ebbers, 1999)

Living-Learning Communities (LLC): LLCs are a subset of the more general learning communities, in which participants of the learning community reside in close proximity, most usually (though not always) in the same dorm or same part of a dorm. LLC is often used interchangeably with “Living-Learning Program.” For our purposes, I propose we use this term to refer to

A) the people that make up the peer group (the “community” formed by students, faculty, and staff)

B) or to a residential environment characterized by a loosely integrated residential, academic and co-curricular organization. An LLC would have a more “boutique” feel than an LLP.

Living Learning Environment (LLE): Do we need a new term that would encompass all the options of LLC/LLP/RC? The term is used at U. Texas (http://cns.utexas.edu/community/women-in-natural-sciences/living-learning-environment).

Living-Learning Programs (LLPs): This is the term most commonly used at UK. I suggest that in the future we use the term to describe carefully, designed, faculty-directed and well-resourced educational programs. An LLP differs from an LLC in that specific, academically-based courses, co-curricular activities, and other experiences are especially designed for this community and required of all participants (as opposed to communities which may require an orientation course such as UK 101, or that make certain courses or activities optional). As an educational program, an LLP should have a clearly defined mission, be targeted at particular student interests and needs, and be conduct activities that are assessable.

Residential College (RC): In the most common definition, an RC is location where students live in close proximity to faculty. In many cases, (a small liberal-art campus or the residential colleges at UC San Diego) students share common curricular requirements, often tied to general education. Faculty involvement is intensely programmed, sometimes by providing living arrangements or permanent office space. On some campuses (LSU, for example), the term “residential college” is used for dorms that are closely connected to particular majors or academic colleges, in some cases dedicated only to the first year experience. (Blimling, 1998; Chaddock, 2008).
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Publishes the results of a meta-analysis of over 30 studies of residential colleges. Blimling categorizes RC into three types: 1. Living learning centers, which have some academic programming and may have live-in faculty; 2. Honors living units for superior students, which often incorporate classes and seminars; 3. Specialized academic residences dedicated to specific academic disciplines. The study contends that “there is a high probability that residential colleges increase student’s academic performance, retention, and living unit social climate” (p.57). The study also concludes that “only 2.73 percent of the variance in academic performance could be attributed to the place of residence and “students in living learning communities are about 2 percent more likely to remain in college than students in conventional residence halls (p. 58).


“The strongest LLPs were those that produced the strongest learning outcomes in students. Strong LLPs demonstrated a clear presence for their student affairs–academic affairs partnership; had well-conceptualized, academically oriented learning objectives; and took full advantage of their community setting to promote learning whenever and wherever it occurred.”

LLPs with the strongest outcomes are most likely to:

1. Have a strong student affairs–academic affairs presence and partnership:
   - Program objectives value vital, well-defined, multiple roles for faculty, staff, and graduate students.
   - Communication among all faculty and staff leaders is excellent and frequent.
   - Budget and program oversight are shared.

2. Identify clear learning objectives with strong academic focus throughout the program:
   - At least one credit-bearing course taught specifically for LLP participants is offered as part of the program.
   - Study space is provided as part of physical facilities.
• A healthy dose of co-curricular activities is academically focused—internships, service learning, collaborative research, career-focused workshops.

3. Capitalize on community settings to create opportunities for learning wherever and whenever it occurs:
• High engagement and intentionality are key, throughout all aspects of the program.
• Learning by doing—through programming, staff training, budget decisions, student discipline, hall governance, etc.
• Physical characteristics of the program mirror objectives.
• Faculty, staff, and students can take on variety of roles—instructor, mentor, advisor, etc.
• Faculty and teaching assistants are helped to make best use of the residence-hall environment, which can be an unfamiliar setting for them.


Chaddock surveys the history of residential learning from Pythagoras to contemporary arrangements. The bulk of the study is historical with only the final page and half summarizing the contemporary situations.


“The essential functions of the residential college, even if provided only at a minimum level should be included in the initial design.”


Noting that there is not “even a consensus on terms used to represent” residential or living-learning programs, this study introduces “two preliminary typologies of L/L programs based on data collected by the 2004 National Study of Living-Learning Programs (NSLLP)” (29). The 2004 NSLLP study collected data from 34 different institutions with 274 L/L programs on their campus. Inkelas and Longerbeam identify two typologies: 1. By theme such as “Disciplinary Programs,” “Cultural Programs,” Transitions Programs, “Honors Programs,” “Fine & Creative Arts Programs.” 14 primary thematic categories were identifies. 2. By characteristics such as size, types of resources, and programming. The authors put forward three typologies: Small Academic Affairs Programs (average size 92 students, directed from academic departments or central academic administrative units); Small Student Affairs Programs (average 81 students, funded and directed through Student Affairs); Large Mixed Student and Academic Affairs Programs (average 294 participants, funded jointly by AA and SA, directed variously by RL staff, academic departments, central AA). The authors provide a brief analysis of outcomes based on these two typologies. “Instead, different types of programs excel and are limited in various ways. Thus, there is truly no one-size fits all phenomenon in L/L programming. Campus practitioners and leaders, then should carefully consider what their ultimate objectives are and then design programs that work toward those goals” (40).


Inkelas, K. K., ed.(2008). Special issue on living-learning programs. Journal of College and University Student Housing 35 (1).


Locates residential-based programs as one of the four basic types of learning communities (the others being paired/clustered courses, classroom cohorts, and team-taught courses).


A wide-ranging book that explores the forces in higher education shaping the development of living-learning communities, the history, growth, and examples of LLCs. Chapter 3 identifies three basic “structures” for LLCs. Chapter four identifies five “core practices” of successful communities: community, diversity, reflection and assessment, integration, and active learning. Chapters 5-7 deal with institutional contexts for LLCs, including general education and assessment. Chapters 8 and 9 focus on implementation, including faculty recruitment and the development of goals and missions. Chapter 10 examines the future of these educational communities.
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Appendix D: LLP Task Force Considerations

Brief review of the literature:
- LLP students drink less than their counterparts, and for different reasons when they did
- LLP students experience a smoother transition with lasting effects
- LLPs need buy-in from faculty and staff for greatest success
- Strong LLPs create clear presence for student and academic partnership
- Faculty and staff achieve a sense of job satisfaction by participating

Questions to consider:
1. Academic Standards and Quality of LLPs
   - How are the LLPs being improved from year to year?
   - Are evaluations taken at all levels and what training are we providing to promote their success?

2. Academic Leadership and Support Structure needed for LLPs
   - How do we show faculty and staff the intrinsic value of being involved?
   - How do we create an equal playing field of contribution from faculty and staff?
   - How do we enhance the lines of communication between academic and student affairs?

3. Issues to Consider in Growth of LLPs
   - Should all new LLP be academically based and sponsored?
   - What LLPs “themes” are we not exploring?
   - Should we have more LLPs in more halls for the secondary benefits?
   - How do we keep LLPs thriving (recall the GREEN community)?

4. Assessment and Measures of Success of LLPs
   - How are we assessing the LLPs now and can it be better?
   - Do we have a “gold” standard to place ours against?
   - How are we measuring success?

5. Costs and sustainability of LLPs
   - While none of the articles mentioned extrinsic benefits as playing a role, we know that many students
     are hooked by the extrinsic. How do we amplify the value of the intrinsic values of the LLP to cut
     cost on the extrinsic gimmicks?
   - How are we preventing struggling communities from losing numbers?

Popular LLP themes: Civic and social leadership, disciplinary, fine and creative arts, general academic, honors,
sophomores, cultural, leisure, political interest, residential college, research, upper division, reserve officers’
training corps, first-year transition, umbrella (multiple themes), wellness or health, and women.

Going forward: As our campus continues to grow, more LLPs will provide desirable effects in plethora of areas.
However, there must be buy-in from faculty and staff regarding LLPs because it is a mutually beneficial
partnership. Evaluation must be provided at all levels of the LLP from the design, from the faculty and staff
involvement to the course content associated with the class.
Appendix E: LLP Conference Agenda

Conference: Intentionality in Planning and Design of UK’s Living-Learning Programs

November 16, 2013
Central Residence Hall Classrooms

Themes: UK’s investment in LLPs should reward proposals that attend to the emerging scholarly understanding of learning environments. The structural elements of any LLP must be chosen deliberately in order to achieve specific, desired results:

- Establish real and meaningful relationships for students between the academic and social, the individual and communal aspects of their college experiences.
- Incorporate academic programming intentionally support student learning and promote a sense of belonging to a network of peers and adults.

8:00 am Light Breakfast

8:30 am Welcome and Introductions
Dean Dan O’Hair, College of Communication and Information
Dean Ike Adams, College of Social Work

8:45-9:15 Panel Discussion: Next Steps in Expanding LLPs and New LLPs
Provost Chris Riordan, EVPFA Eric Monday, VPSA Robert Mock, Penny Cox, Jim Wims

9:30-10:45 am What Can we learn from UK’s History and Core Practices of Successful LLP’s?
Justin Blevins (Student Affairs), Joe Fields-Elswich (College of Comm & Info), and Leslie Woltenberg (College of Ed)

- What can we learn from UK’s learning community history? What have we done well? What concepts did not flourish & why?
- Where haven’t we gone that we want to go (in terms of variety of community concepts, partnerships, programming, class offerings, etc? 
- What does a careful review of the lit asks us to think about and answer for our campus context?

11:00-12:00 Skype Discussion: Future Directions for LLPs
Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, PhD
Associate Professor and Director, Center for Advanced Study of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education
Curry School of Education  
University of Virginia

12:00-1:00  Lunch and LLP Poster Session

1:00-2:00  Student Panel Discussion
  Jake Ingram, moderator

2:00-3:00  Small groups work on the following topics

  Stakeholders and Participants: Who needs to be involved in the design and execution of a plan for an LLP?

  Who is responsible for making a community successful?

    SA: “too few faculty aren't willing to help.” Faculty: “there's little academic connection in SA programming.” What does it take to generate a true academic/student affairs partnership?

  Common metrics: By what data and results should all LLPs be measured?

  Learning Outcomes for LLPs

3:00-4:00  Closing Reflections: Intentionality in Planning and Design
Appendix F: LLP Task Force Conference Notes (by Dr. Randa Rejmer-Eskridge)

LLP Task Force Conference (Notes by Dr. Randa Rejmer-Eskridge)

- 19 programs by fall 2014
- Potentially going to 23 LLP
- Fall 2012
  - retention 90% compared to 80% non-LLP
  - GPA 3.28 vs. 2.83 non-LLP
- Proposals: resources needed, plan moving forward
- Infrastructure:
  - North zone of campus 1100 more beds for fall 2016-6000 total new beds
  - more LLP focused
  - 990 LLP beds in 2013
  - 2108 fall 2014
  - fall 2017, 4200 beds
  - returning students: 1800 beds for fall 2014 for continuing students
    - 1400 have signed up for next fall
  - Zone concept: 740 in Champions (Business Enterprise, Engineering, Ed-Life, CI-connect, INet) I, 430 Champions II (A&S Wired)
    - Study North will go in, coffee shop
    - Haggin Hall (Healthcare)
    - Central Honors (Honors and Global Scholars)
    - Woodland Glen I (Leadership and Service and ROTC)
    - Woodland Glen III, IV, V fall 2015 (Stem Cats CI Connect, INet, Lex Engaged)
- LLPs started in 1989
- Funding:
  - food services
  - transportation
  - social space- flexible opening to the outside, more home like
• Leslie Woltenberg: Informing Our Campus: Learning Community Literature Review
  ▪ Shapiro & Levine, 1999: Purpose
    ▪ to create more supportive (academically and socially) as well as seamless learning environments that encourage students to make connections between subject areas, between in- and out-of-classroom learning experiences, and between each other and faculty members.
  ▪ Dewey, Meiklejohn- structured models
  ▪ Tinto, 2003: graduation rates, greater academic success, connection with peers
  ▪ reforming undergraduate education, Barbara Smith
  ▪ creating the sense of belonging (Kuh et al., 1991)
  ▪ Key outcomes:
    ▪ retention, higher GPAs
    ▪ formation of supportive community of peers
    ▪ engaging course structures and learning experiences
    ▪ greater involvement in the life of the university, engagement outside of the classroom
    ▪ advanced moral reasoning and gains in critical thinking
    ▪ Perry
  ▪ Michigan State: degree granting residential programs
  ▪ Maryland College Park Scholars
  ▪ Syracuse: dual director structure, Tinto is there
  ▪ Bowling Green State University: Chapman Hallmark
  ▪ Emory University: sophomore year experience
  ▪ "Relationship and Capital in LLCs: A Social Network Analysis
    ▪ How does one's role within a residential community of peers

• Justin Blevins: LL at UK: A Historic Review of the Program (in charge of assessment of LLPs)
  ▪ tutoring in the halls
  ▪ service learning opportunities: reflection, discourse, engagement/immersion
• integration of curriculum in fun playful ways
  ▪ film series similar to what the Health Colleges’ Student Services Office is doing with Unnatural colleges
• marketing
• personalization of space, group identity and traditions (need a white coat piece to LLP at end of year)
• funding is important for programming
• National Survey of LLPs- look at learning outcomes
• Need a focus group each semester
• LLP Best Practices Model
  ▪ infrastructure: clear goals and objectives, academic departments, residence life, adequate resources
  ▪ academic environment

• Joe Fields-Elswich, College of Communication and Information: Looking Forward
  ▪ Successful LLPs
    ▪ director commitment
    ▪ faculty involvement
    ▪ collaboration
    ▪ administrative support
    ▪ proram quality
    ▪ funding
  ▪ create an archive of programs and opportunities afforded to our students
  ▪ plug students in to campus and across campus
• Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Ph.D. Future Directions for LLPs
  ▪ pyramid discussion (see below)
  ▪ academic and residence life work in tandem
    ▪ most effective organization: what is a realistic faculty involvement?
    ▪ parallel partnership: must have trust
  ▪ academic courses need to be offered for credit
• faculty advising: traditional in nature that can morph into a mentoring relationship
• academically and socially supportive
• classroom space is less important than the credit
• faculty offices are important in the residence halls
• not vital to have a faculty living in—older students yes, important, but not for first years
• need flexible living space that can accommodate many different types of program
• sophomores in the hall for first year students to ask questions of + mentors
• co-curricular activities: most powerful
  ▪ study groups
  ▪ k-12 outreach
  ▪ visiting work settings
  ▪ career workshops
• make sure co-curricular are well inline with the academic
• limited offerings are better, but they must be well integrated with one another. Activities done visiting sites are tied to classroom settings
• mortar= assessment of each block
• staffing= grad student in residence? good idea? Junior and seniors are used. Could be a good idea. Peer affect would extend to graduate students.
• what constitutes a successful program?
  ▪ intellectual pursuits
  ▪ overall satisfaction
  ▪ sense of belonging
• International LLPs?
  ▪ STEM programs
  ▪ Honors programs
  ▪ rely on faculty- present in life of residence halls
• Support of first generation?
  ▪ bringing people in to talk about industries
peer effect is the most important part of the university experience

assessment commonalities?
- have to have classes and must be for credit
- all parts are well integrated with one another

Funding?
- boutique and small funded by academic unit
  - best self-reported learning outcomes
- student affairs and housing
  - best with peer cohesion
- hybrid funding of academic and student affairs
  - $10,000-$100,000
- student fee- only if modest, but they see more resources
  - in house advising
  - in house tutoring

classes?
- take for major or impacts GPA
- classes in hall might not be as rigorous or important

different size of programs?
- 50 students small
- hybrid- 300 students is the outer edge
- larger ones need to have tracks with only 80-120

most effective selection of staff:
- all parties need to be involved in selection of staff
- RAs should be participants from the program- STEM programs
  - support for courses
  - additional level of training for the program is necessary

RAs and peer mentors
- roles must be well articulated if you use both

LLPs movement:
- large communities but don't live in the hall.

LLPs self-selection does provide for some of the foundation of success
- active engagement
- peer engagement
  - Juniors and Seniors program should be developed separately from the first years and sophomores
    - will see faculty differently
    - career oriented
  - 3rd and 4th help 1st and 2nd years
    - 1st and 2nd years reach out to K-12
- Student Panel
  - Jake Ingram- Engineering
  - Joe Pat- Global Village chemical
  - Keenland
  - First generation
  - Loretta Stafford- first gen
  - Moreen OWel- Honors
  - Toya- Honors LLP
  - How did you hear about the programs?
    - word of mouth
    - market better
    - preview night, mail, every tour, older students, student testimonials
  - social media
    - facebook polling
    - twitter
    - email
  - extra curriculars
    - math tutors
    - programs
    - coffee chats
    - feedback is important
  - Peer mentors:
    - another source of help
- motivator
- advisor
- need to clearly define

- program expectations:
  - differences across the board in how things are run
  - need to know more peer mentors and spread them out
  - focus on students as peer mentors, having a intimate relationship
  - bring people together more
  - classes in hall brings people together
  - need to clearly define the peer mentor

- Experiences:
  - family experience
  - carving pumpkins
  - bridge gap
  - exposure to different backgrounds and identities
  - make it a multi-year experience
    - need to have something to come back to
  - access to LLPs in future years even if you are not living in
    - retain connections through classes and events
    - alumni experience

- Organic Experiences:
  - intramural teams
  - visits to local parks

- Other LLPs at other institutions
  - language LLPs

- courses:
  - need an academic course that is attached
    - UK 101, MA 137- recitation section

- Cohort sections:
  - optional ability to cohort yourself

- ways to evaluate the LLP:
- social capital
- how many people are interested in coming back to serve as a peer mentor or RA
- ideal peer mentor: talk to about issues
- sense of belonging measure
- talking about personal issues
- cultural competency
- set core goals for LLP and then individualize the rest
  - Funding:
    - pay a fee to be a part of LLP
    - don't want to pay- could be daunting to students
    - maybe can't afford it
    - may need to consider some subsidies

- Stakeholders and Participants: who needs to be involved in the design and execution of plan for LLP
  - student vote for potential programs
  - residence life
  - community
  - the study
  - resources that are specific to the focus of the LLP
  - assessment coordinator
  - facilitate the academic structure of courses
  - marketing planner
  - admissions
  - students
  - coordinators
  - faculty by in
  - clinicians
  - EdR
  - financial leadership
  - Upper leadership
• PR

• Learning Outcomes
  ◦ retention
  ◦ GPA
  ◦ moral and critical thinking
  ◦ leadership
  ◦ assess connectedness to community (peer and faculty)
  ◦ cultural competency
  ◦ institutional vs. individual/community
  ◦ having too many outcomes- narrow to 3 or 4
  ◦ learning outcomes related to identity- connect to the University
  ◦ social

• Common Metrics:
  ◦ SAP tracking measures- identifiers in the system
  ◦ focus groups
  ◦ look at what already exists nationally and personalize it for us
  ◦ declaration of major/change of major/time to graduation
  ◦ longitudinal examination of data
  ◦ targets for group (GPA may be lower for some groups)
  ◦ common elements and differences

• Who is responsible for making a community successful?
  ◦ takes both student affairs and academics
  ◦ team approach
  ◦ one person from both teams that coordinates
  ◦ peer mentors: training and job description
  ◦ programming calendar for planning that matches the curriculum- be intentional
  ◦ regular meetings
  ◦ strong voice in who is hired on the academic side with student affairs

• Reflections:
  ◦ continue feedback loop
engage people on the ground in the process
open and honest conversation
collaboration
day-to-day operations need to begin
  - market
mix different communities from time to time
Appendix G: Stakeholders and Participants

Stakeholders and Participants: Who needs to be involved in the design and execution of a plan for an LLP?

Scott Kelly          College of Business  Assoc Dean
Laura Hornback      Student in Wired
Rose Boulay          College of Education student
Leslie Woltenberg   Consultant
Karen Slaymaker      UKIC
Marcia Shrout        Res Life
Randa Reamer         Health Sciences Assoc. Dean
Nina Marijanovic     Res Life, Academic Initiatives
Jessica Pennington,  A&S Wired staff
Jim Wims             Res

Georgia State: proposals due in October; students vote; all communities are approved for one year only; the use Facebook to reach all students; LLC’s are floors only

Should sample peer mentors as vested stakeholders (not just general student body)

Must have “buy in” from Student Affairs (Res life); we need their expertise not just in planning, but in the execution because they are the “eyes and ears” of the community

Must have involvement from the Schools/Colleges and stand alone units such as the International Center

Some LLP’s should engage community partners

Should engage Assessment partners (but not just Res Life staff); the problem is that those people are few and far between

The process of developing new courses and linked courses is cumbersome at UK, which is an obstacle
Someone needs to support the faculty in their interdisciplinary pursuits

How do we coordinate the effort to market LLP’s?

Students need to engaged in LLP design

Students must be able to prioritize their facilities…. “What would make it for you?”

The quality of the physical space and the quality of the experience… there must be two pieces…

Athletics wants the best facilities to get the recruit, but they are also concerned about that student/athlete once on campus

In Business, an LLP was planned without faculty involvement

Culture shift needed in the Colleges to embrace LLP’s

RCM should have an incentive factor for College “buy in”

The University (P&T unit, college, and area committees) must value faculty involvement in LLP’s…it must count!

If more than one College is occupying a building, there must be better coordination (EdR must be involved)

One obstacle is that EdR does not have experience in building halls with specialized instructional spaces

University public relations must be well versed (informed) on student success tied to LLP’s….

Stakeholders/new hires need to be brought in early enough to plan
Notes: Session Three: Metrics

- How do we measure the outcomes of LLP’s?
- Recommendation to create a unique identifier within SAP to appropriately flag and track LLP students, enabling reporting on a variety of performance variable/reports.
  - How to correctly capture when participation in LLPs begins and ends? To know to what extent LLP participation may have had an impact on students’ experiences or performance.
  - Tracking at-risk subgroups, e.g. 1st Gen, college preparation variables, out-of-state, race/ethnicity, etc.
    * Must know which LLP, not just a participant in an LLP for the disaggregation of data and individual program review.
    * How might targets for particular groups or LLPs vary to better capture systemic issues of privilege inherent in college preparation and performance?
  - Collection of data for strategic and timely interventions: mid-term grades, advising and enrollment/priority registration, etc.
- Student emphasized:
  * A need for “relatedness”; sense of belonging; with whom you are connecting; or caring/supportive climate.
  * Sense of Community & belonging
What are some strategies for incentivizing survey participation?

* Group competitions, such as penny wars.
* Formatting assessment measures such as survey participation as part of community contract or expectations.

What can be done to encourage students to take greater responsibility for their learning?

Is it possible to track how many people later take up leadership positions on-campus after LLP participation?

Must capture interactions/meetings with faculty.

Must capture interactions/meetings with peers.

How many people drop out of LLPs and for what reason? Roommates? The requirements of the community?

How many LLP participants also study abroad or participate in undergraduate research?

Declaration of major or change of major?

Time to degree

Exposure to students who are different

Take Away:

1. SAP identifier
2. Look at what exists – EBI; NSSE; NSLLP
3. Use of Focus group to accent the surveys and data collected from SAP
4. Find ways to address the idiosyncrasies of individual communities and their programmatic outcomes and goals
Small Group Session: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for LLPs

The discussion in this groups was brisk and wide-ranging. The basic points made include:

- We need to clearly distinguish institutional goals (like retention) from student learning outcomes.

- Keep SLOs to a manageable number. Too many SLOs will make measurement and assessment difficult.

- Should have campus-wide goals that are applicable to all LLPs.

- Individual LLPs should develop their own specific SLOs that “nest” or relate directly to the more general campus-wide outcomes.

- We need to beware of having LLPs with SLOs that are too similar. This would make it difficult to explain the differences to prospective students (marketing problem) and begs the question of why we need separate LLPs with the same goals.

- The size of the LLP may impact SLOs. How do we insure consistency/measure outcomes if there are too many students?

- Assessment of SLOs should be one way to understand if an LLP is successful or is sustainable, worth the effort.

- Remember that LLPs have an “implicit” curriculum as well as an “explicit” curriculum.
  - “Explicit curriculum” is the learning that takes place in formal academic settings, UK Core classes, courses in majors, classes required/embedded or linked to the LLP
  - “Implicit” curriculum is linked to the “lessons” learned about building a sense of community, sense of safety, involvement, engagement.

- SLOs might be divided into three areas:
  - Academic, including moral or critical reasoning skills, skills derived from courses that are linked to the LLP. We should explore whether SLOs taken from UK Core Outcomes could serve as general campus SLOs for LLPs.
  - Social (including relationship-building and diversity)
  - Leadership and/or personal growth and development

UK Live and Learn Program Task Force

Agenda

January 31, 2014

1. Introduction (10 minutes)
2. Open Discussion (10 minutes)
3. Modifications and Approval for Report Outline (15 minutes)
4. Method and Steps for Moving Forward (15 minutes)
5. Assignments, Deadlines, Future Meetings (10 minutes)
6. Adjournment
Appendix J: Woltenberg LLP Outline

UK LLP Taskforce: supplemental notes for LLP Model

I. Goals are the institutional aims for the investment in LLPs, e.g. enhanced recruitment, improvement in academic achievement, higher retention and persistence.

   a. Purpose of an LLP: To create more supportive (academically and socially) as well as seamless learning environments that encourage students to make connections between subject areas, between in- and out-of-classroom learning experiences, and between each other and faculty members (Shapiro & Levine, 1999)

   b. (See LLP Conference Workgroup Prompt for outcomes & metrics for relationship to goals.)

II. Strategies are the guiding principles for achieving institutional goals, e.g. targeting resources on students at key transitions (as in the first year), specific at-risk groups (transfer, first generation) as well as a commitment to using informed, research-based methods.

   a. LLP Conference Workgroup Prompt: Stakeholders and Participants- Who needs to be involved in the design and execution of a plan for an LLP?

   b. LLP Conference workgroup topic: Who is responsible for making a community successful? What does it take to generate a true academic/student affairs partnership?

III. Outcomes are the learning-based competencies, skills, or knowledge-sets established for the LLPs. Some should be shared campus-wide, some specific to the individual community.

   a. LLP Conference Workgroup Prompt: Learning Outcomes for LLPs

IV. Metrics and Assessment form the “scorecard” by which programs will be periodically measured

   a. LLP Conference Workgroup Prompt: Common metrics- By what data and results should all LLPs be measured?

*** perhaps should consider developing LLP Task Force sub-committees to invest further in the topics of 1.) Goals & Strategies as well as 2.) Outcomes & Metrics (to flesh out more specifics and begin developing verbiage for each item)
Key items to consider at this stage...

- **MACRO**: administrative purview EDR partnership, process related to new LLP proposal, & regular assessment of existing programs; central office/staff (aid in vision casting, evaluation, & campus/partner management of this program expansion); next steps for articulating goals, outcomes, and metrics (develop a supporting committee to involve partnerships & administrative versus day-to-day perspective)

- **MICRO**: streamlining day-to-day functions; ensuring consistency, coordination, & collaboration among all LLPs; help with refining assessment instruments to ensure proper outcomes & metrics are articulated

**Workgroup Prompts from 2013 LLP Conference:**

I. Stakeholders and Participants: Who needs to be involved in the design and execution of a plan for an LLP?

II. Who is responsible for making a community successful? (SA: “too few faculty aren’t willing to help.” Faculty: “there’s little academic connection in SA programming.”) What does it take to generate a true academic/student affairs partnership?

III. Common metrics: By what data and results should all LLPs be measured?

IV. Learning Outcomes for LLPs

(Expanded notes from the UK LLP Conference on each of these prompts below… it should be noted that many of these points could be placed under more than one workgroup prompt.)

I. Stakeholders and Participants: Who needs to be involved in the design and execution of a plan for an LLP?

   a. **Quick reference to LLP literature/research:**

      i. LLPs are a versatile and effective approach in enhancing student learning and student success, promoting curricular coherence and faculty revitalization, and in some institutions, can become a key element in institutional transformation (*Smith et al., 2004*)

      ii. Learning communities provide a new way for students, staff, and faculty alike to engage in the life of the institutions. Such communities are reflective of a conceptual shift of moving from a teaching to a learning paradigm, emphasizing the value of the co-curricular, collaborative learning, and student development (*Smith et al., 2004*)

   b. **Themes from the conference:**
i. KEY PARTNERS: Student Affairs (Res life, Schools/Colleges, stand-alone units (i.e. International Center), student leaders (Resident Advisors & Peer Mentors), community partners, Assessment partners

ii. TIMING: Stakeholders/new hires need to be brought in early enough to plan

iii. ACADEMIC SIDE: The process of developing new courses and linked courses is cumbersome at UK, which is an obstacle. Someone needs to support the faculty in their interdisciplinary pursuits (Faculty Director?). Culture shift needed in the Colleges to embrace LLP’s: RCM should have an incentive factor for College “buy in”. The University (P&T unit, college, and area committees) must value faculty involvement in LLP’s… it must count!

iv. PHYSICAL SPACE: If more than one College is occupying a building, there must be better coordination (EdR must be involved). One obstacle is that EdR does not have experience in building halls with specialized instructional spaces

v. MARKETING: How do we coordinate the effort to market LLP’s (UK message and EdR)? Students need to engaged in LLP design: Students must be able to prioritize their facilities..... “What would make it for you?” University public relations must be well versed (informed) on student success tied to LLP’s....

c. Outstanding questions/issues:

i. What is the difference between “LLP Staff” and “LLP Faculty” (as referenced in the model) versus the campus partners (i.e. Meg in Honors, Tony in Engineering, Jason in Agriculture, etc.).

ii. Need to define who is the centralized/core LLP staff (vision-casting, administration/director, assessment/evaluation, management of day-to-day function with partners, etc.) -and- where this is positioned for our campus (org chart)

1. Are there positions that don’t exist yet... but should, in order to help ensure the successful roll-out of this expansion plan? (examples: Faculty Member? Program Director? Assessment Coordinator?)

iii. Identify ideal staffing models at other institutions... what works well, what is feasible for our campus, and how quickly do we put such a plan into action here.
II. Who is responsible for making a community successful? (SA: “too few faculty aren’t willing to help.” Faculty: “there’s little academic connection in SA programming.”)

What does it take to generate a true academic/student affairs partnership?

a. Quick reference to LLP literature/research:

Successful LLP Programs....

i. PARTNERSHIP MODEL: ...cite significant program expansion when a shift is made from program providing (program/task-focused) toward greater partnership engagement (student-centered) (Kramer, 2007); ... create seamless experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships between academic & student affairs to enhance student learning (The Student Learning Imperative, 1996); ... integrate partnerships, connections, resources, and learning opportunities to help prepare students for life beyond graduation (Lenning & Ebbers, 1999)

ii. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: ... model intellectual inquiry by offering an abundance of academic partnerships & programs (such as faculty colloquia, guest lectures, site visits, undergraduate research, etc.) (Kuh et al., 1991); ... increase students’ development, achievement, & persistence through encouraging the integration of social and academic lives within a university and its programs, & via quality interaction with peers, faculty members, & campus environment (Lenning & Ebbers, 1999); ... offer linked classes that improve student motivation, interaction, and achievement via the support of faculty members who report improved teaching methods, expanded perspectives on modern issues, and renewed enthusiasm for sharing the specialized knowledge of their field (Finley, 1995)

b. Themes from the conference:

i. An LLP needs strong coordination between student affairs and academics, but ultimately an LLP needs to have one person in charge. Someone who can connect well with both academics and student affairs, and not just a team of individuals without anyone taking the lead. It is a full-time job to coordinate/lead a successful LLP. Each LLP needs a full-time director.

ii. Academic colleges need to help select and hire peer mentors and not a sole decision by residence life. Also, peer mentors need training, not only in regards to the academic disciplines represented in LLP but also
about issues that might come up from a Resident Director’s perspective (i.e. substance abuse, etc.).

iii. Peer mentors and LLP directors should plan one social event and one service activity per semester.

iv. A Beginning of the Year LLP calendar is needed with all major activities listed.

v. Communication is key to success.

c. **Outstanding questions/issues:** *(the “Who’s in charge” question...)*

i. If each LLP had a full-time director... who manages this campus-wide group of individuals to ensure cohesion, consistency, and coordinate activities such as evaluation, collaborative programs, etc?

ii. What are the measures to evaluate a given LLP, related staff, programming, etc? Who manages this assessment plan?

iii. Who sets the requirements for LLP programming, events, etc?

iv. Who coordinates within-LLP events? Should there be a campus-wide LLP calendar (all LLP events, activities, etc. appear there)? (speaks to that “centralized” office/staff question...)

**III. Common metrics: By what data and results should all LLPs be measured?**

a. **Quick reference to LLP literature/research:**

i. Students involved with learning communities are more likely to persist through graduation, attain greater academic success, connect with peers and develop social networks, communicate with faculty and staff, and overall claim to have more successfully made the transition from secondary education to post-secondary *(Tinto, 2003)*

ii. The five core practices of successful communities are: community, diversity, reflection and assessment, integration, and active learning *(Smith et al., 2004)*

iii. four factors identified by researchers as important to student learning/success are interwoven among the variety of learning community structures: 1.) Students learn concepts better when topics overlap in classes; 2.) Students learn information better when it is reviewed/studied with peers; 3.) Students learn better when they are actively involved in the learning process; and 4.) Students are more likely to
persist through graduation if personal connections are made with students and faculty (Jaffee, 2004, pp. B16)

b. **Themes from the conference:**

i. Need to develop a SAP identifier (a “tag” on LLP students, specific for each community, so we can run reports and filter on them within the system)

1. Similar tags have been developed to identify Honors Students, UK Core categories for courses, etc. Who develops this technology & who manages the “tagging” of those students?

ii. Look at existing measurement opportunities/instruments – EBI; NSSE; NSLLP

iii. Use of Focus group to accent the surveys and data collected from SAP

iv. Find ways to address the idiosyncrasies of individual communities and their programmatic outcomes and goals

c. **Outstanding questions/issues:**

i. Identify best ways to measure: peer relationships; sense of community & belonging; with whom you are connecting; or caring/supportive climate; stakeholder interactions/effectiveness (faculty, staff, peer mentor, etc.); LLP attrition, time to degree, # LLP members who study abroad or engage in undergrad research

ii. Consider formatting assessment measures such as survey participation as part of community contract or expectations.

iii. Establish partnership with existing campus experts in evaluation to develop metrics that are measurable, useful, and effective (for program review, publication, etc.)

IV. **Learning Outcomes for LLPs**

a. **Quick reference to LLP literature/research:**

i. Broad, recurring themes in LLP research and literature: Supportive peer groups, sharing learning & involvement, and academic success & persistence

ii. Key Outcomes of LLP Participation:

1. Retention gains & higher GPAs
2. Formation of a supportive community of peers

3. More engaging course structures & learning experiences (out of class experiences, field trips, team projects, etc.)

4. Greater student involvement in the life of the university of increased engagement outside of the classroom (service projects, undergraduate research, etc.)

5. Advanced moral reasoning & gains in critical thinking

iii. The most critical issue regarding campus environments, student involvement, & retention is creating a sense of belonging among students (Kuh et al., 1991)

b. Themes from the conference:

i. GOALS VS. SLO’S: We need to clearly distinguish institutional goals (like retention) from student learning outcomes. Keep SLOs to a manageable number. Too many SLOs will make measurement and assessment difficult.

ii. BROAD VS. SPECIFIC GOALS/OUTCOMES: Should have campus-wide goals that are applicable to all LLPs. Individual LLPs should develop their own specific SLOs that “nest” or relate directly to the more general campus-wide outcomes. (Assessment of SLOs should be one way to understand if an LLP is successful or is sustainable, worth the effort.)

iii. SLO CATEGORIES: (1) Academic, including moral or critical reasoning skills, skills derived from courses that are linked to the LLP. We should explore whether SLOs taken from UK Core Outcomes could serve as general campus SLOs for LLPs.; (2) Social (including relationship-building and diversity); (3) Leadership and/or personal growth and development

iv. DIFFERENCES AMONG LLP’S: We need to beware of having LLPs with SLOs that are too similar. This would make it difficult to explain the differences to perspective students (marketing problem) and begs the question of why we need separate LLPs with the same goals. The size of the LLP may impact SLOs. How do we insure consistency/measure outcomes if there are too many students?

v. Remember that LLPs have an “implicit” curriculum as well as an “explicit” curriculum. (“Explicit curriculum” is the learning that takes place in formal academic settings, UK Core classes, courses in majors, classes required/embedded or linked to the LLP. “Implicit” curriculum is
linked to the “lessons” learned about building a sense of community, sense of safety, involvement, engagement.)

c. Outstanding questions/issues:

i. An additional committee should be identified to help articulate Program-wide Learning Outcomes in addition to “guidelines” for LLP-specific outcomes. This may include various campus partners with variety of experience/history with UK LLP. This will also help flesh out distinction between LLP learning outcomes versus scorecard measures.

ii. Must think beyond FYE (Freshmen Year Experience) and be intentional in our measurement design to think forward to sophomore year, transfer populations, upperclassmen, etc.

Inkelas Model:

![Inkelas Model Diagram]

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS as referenced at the UK LLP Conference:

- Our Identity in the LLP world: articulate signature UK LLP goals/objectives, learning outcomes, and program hallmarks
• What should the “signature experience” be for UK students participating in LLPs? To what extent are students’ motivation, buy-in, and purpose for being involved in the community taken into consideration for the formation of new communities and the assessment of current communities? (Part of this is already achieved in the application process of new LLPs)

• **Support:** financial, integrated courses, staffing (centralized & specific to each LLP), student leadership roles, etc.

• Consideration for individual community distinction (common goals & learning outcomes, but allowing margin for customized metrics to help identify/measure attributes that are specific/unique to a given LLP)

• Small versus large community concepts: how are they proposed, structured, managed daily, assessed

• **Outreach opportunities:** research, professional experience, alumni, community members

• **Explore Program Expansion:** HS dual enrollment, camps/workshops, leadership experiences, certificate programs

• **Branding/Marketing:** how we are seen by others...our target demographic, broader LLP peers, scholarly work (research, publications); what role does EDR play into the UK LLP marketing plan

• Enhance and grow current **assessment strategies** to better meet the needs of a growing and evolving program, including consideration for both UK’s assessment needs and individual communities’ assessment needs

• **Academic-student affairs partnership:** How can we increase faculty awareness of LLPs, increase faculty buy-in, and assist in their understanding of co-curricular techniques or pedagogies for the residence halls? What strategies can be employed to increase collaborations between academic and student affairs for each community? What should strategic and balanced growth of the program look like?

• What has emerged in the literature as **best practice** (especially in terms of student success) and should be included as fundamental elements of UK’s program? How can we **increase both external and internal collaboration** for the sharing of best practices and ideas?
Impressions of the model:

- Need to operationalize the definitions of LLP partners, staff, faculty (this can be referenced in the Leadership & Support Structure section for Provost Report)
- LLP Advisory group: responsible for reviewing existing LLP and proposals for new community concepts. Would also serve as the repository for LLP happenings on campus. This group shouldn’t serve as an additional layer within the undergraduate/graduate council; but rather, can serve as a support as needed
- Group consensus seems to agree that the model is more conceptual rather than structural. Additional remarks included that we should identify key aspects such as suggestions for who comprises the advisory council, approving body (for new LLPs), etc.
- A suggestion was shared to develop an introductory narrative to help explain the model (gives context and needed detail to better understand the model)
- A request was made for the group to see a copy of the future-dated LLPs (those already approved for 2014 and beyond) from Dan O’Hair

Goals & Assessment:

- Consider making the UK LLP conference an annual event to measure our progress, measurement with benchmarks, etc.
- Deans are interested to know LLP overall goals, learning outcomes, assessment methods, internal benchmarking, etc.
- Make the clear tie between LLP goals and the institution’s goals
- How to define/measure the overall quality of the program (speaks to the “growth with quality” goal)
- General goals: time to degree, retention, higher GPAs

Size/Composition:

- Conversation surrounding the question of: “Are we 80%/20/100% LLP campus?” We need to articulate an informed decision on the percentage of LLP versus non-LLP beds and how quickly we get to that point.
• The percentage question above relates to the questions/concerns regarding the centralized structure to support the program. ResLife currently has 3 full time professionals devoted to centrally staff the LLP structure. How to grow from where we currently are… and what does the centralized support structure look like to help meet our growth goals (a greater volume of applicants to be reviewed, programming coordination, communication with LLP partners, etc.)

• What is the growth plan? Grow more progressively –or- a mass start of new and expanded communities? Where did the estimations of growth for 2015, 2016, etc. come from? We will need to think through how we manage our resources and support structure according to our identified growth approximations

• How do we address the issue of LLPs that exceed Inkelas’ suggested largest size 80 students or less? How do we address the concept of communities of hundreds of students? Need to develop some best practice models/suggestions (informed by the literature, best practice, and our own campus experience) to help shape new LLP proposals for success

Finances:
• Questions arose from the group regarding the financial situation of this program? This is a key question that impacts how the “centralized” staff functions, what it can do, etc.

• There is a broad spectrum financially of LLPs… (this can be referenced in the executive summary or part of recommendations)… some LLPs, by nature, are going to simply be more costly (i.e. some engineering course simply cost more than other courses based on technology needs, etc.)

Next steps: Volunteers to help write components of the report and share at next meeting…
• Academic Standards: Ben Withers, Randa Remer, Adrian McMahon
• Leadership & Support Structure: Marcia Shrout, Stacey Greenwell
• Assessment & Measures of Success: Tony Ralph, Leslie Woltenberg
• Summary & Recommendations: Dan O’Hair, Ike Adams
Appendix L: First-Year Mentor Responsibilities

Overview of First-Year Mentor Responsibilities 2014

**Job Description:** First-Year Mentors are expected to work 6 hours each week for the first ten weeks of the semester. Approximately 2 hours are spent in the BCC 100 classroom, contributing to the class as arranged with the course instructor. The other hours are spent working with first-year students as a group or individually outside of class and completing other tasks assigned by the instructor. Mentors should plan to meet regularly with their instructors at least 20 minutes each week. Mentors are also expected to attend bi-weekly mentor reports and attend bi-weekly mentor meetings. During the last 4 weeks of the semester, mentors are paid for 4 hours of work. This time should be spent reaching out to and interacting with students, especially those students who may be having difficulties.

Being a first-year mentor requires a serious commitment of both time and energy. Applicants should consider their fall coursework, other leadership positions, and work assignments before applying. Resident Assistants, student teachers and KCAB officers should not be First-Year Mentors.

**I. MENTORS MUST ATTEND ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 8-9</td>
<td>Spring Mentor Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16-19</td>
<td>Fall Mentor Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>Berry Bellhop--assist new students moving in to dorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21-23</td>
<td>Viking Venture, <em>(Each First Year Seminar Class will receive a different schedule.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>11:00 First-Year Mentor meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6</td>
<td><strong>First-Year Service Day</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>*7:00 “Can I Kiss You?” with Mike Domitrz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>11:00 First-Year Mentor meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>7:30 Conson Wilson Lecture: Summer Book Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>11:00 First-Year Mentor meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>11:00 First-Year Mentor meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 4 11:00  Martha Awards

ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Administrative:

• **Turn in a bi-weekly activity report online.** You’ll receive a reminder each week.

• **Post your work hours every pay period.** You’ll be paid a stipend equivalent to 6 hours of work. Please just post 1 hour per week.

• **Meet with your instructor for about 20 minutes a week outside of class** to compare observations about how the class is going, share concerns, and plan class activities and lessons. Depending on the wishes and/or needs of your instructor, you should plan to take an active role in planning the class. Your instructor will probably be glad to have your input.

• **Attend every class meeting** and speak up throughout the course whenever you can add an experienced student’s unique perspective to the discussion. Your instructor may also want to turn certain discussions over to you to lead.

• **Check in with any student who is not in class** to be sure he or she is ok and to catch the student up on assignments. This is especially critical during Viking Venture, when students are apt to make mistakes with the schedule.

• **Create an e-mail distribution list for your class** so that you can send reminders or announcements to the group.

• **Help facilitate BOLD beginnings.**

• **Additional duties:** Your instructor may ask you to take over some of administrative duties such as taking role, grading quizzes, and checking assignments.

• **Report to your ME leader or KP with any questions.**

General:

• **Interact with your students outside of class.** You should plan to spend approximately 3 hours each week interacting with students outside of the classroom. In addition to group activities such as hikes to the reservoir or dinner at Schroeder’s, look for ways to interact with individuals and or small groups of students. In the past, mentors have called on students in their dorm rooms, invited one or two students to lunch each week, taken students with them on a Wal-Mart run, etc. Your students can give you suggestions for group activities.
• **Be available to help in the FYE Office as needed.** From time to time we will need help with projects, surveys, etc. Please try to be as helpful as your schedule will permit.

**Viking Venture:**

• **Attend and participate in activities for your class as scheduled.** Your participation will ensure your students’ participation.

• **Arrange transportation to your instructor’s home for the summer book discussion.** Take a few minutes at the end of the Viking Venture class to set up carpools and distribute directions.

• **Participate in the summer book discussion.** Be sure that you have read the summer reading book and speak up during the discussion. Try to think of questions to move the discussion along.

**First-Year Service Day:**

• **Arrange transportation, pick up t-shirts for your class, and take cookout reservations prior to First-Year Service Day.**

• **Contact the agency or supervisor of your project prior to First-Year Service Day to confirm arrangements and directions to the site.**

• **Turn in to the FYE Office a waiver form for each student participating in First-Year Service Day.**

• **Serve as foreman of your work crew.**

Mentors must be in good academic and social standing. As student leaders, they are expected to comply with all rules of the Viking Code.
Appendix M: Benchmark Research Charts
Appendix N: LLP Task List by Month

Living Learning Program Task List by Month

Historically, these are the tasks and events that took with regard to daily oversight and coordination of the Living Learning Program:

May
- Holding LLP closing lunch and planning meeting for partners
- Preparing LLP application for upcoming year (approval of community descriptions and essay questions for each community)
- Planning for LLP induction ceremony in August
- Communicating with students about early move-in
- Holding LLP Retreat with partners – evaluating past year and planning for next year

June/July
- Communicating with all accepted LLP students about move-in dates and fees, induction ceremony, joining the community-specific Facebook group, reading the CRE text, etc.
- Communicating with Peer Mentors about move-in date and fees, training schedule, etc.
- Planning and preparing for LLP move-in (ex. working with Parking, UKPD, and Auxiliary Services regarding logistics, assembling volunteers to assist students, etc.)
- Planning LLP training for partners, Peer Mentors and Residence Life staff
- Coordinating meals for all Peer Mentors returning for training
- Updating LLP Residence Life staff and partner manuals
- Working with graphic designers to prepare recruitment materials
- Ordering LLP t-shirts
- Planning for LLP induction ceremony
- Presenting and staffing tables at Summer Advising Conference
- Preparing materials for Preview Nights
- Updating information and materials for the website

August
- Training all LLP Residence Life staff
- Training all LLP partner staff
- Holding planning luncheon for Residence Life staff and LLP partners
- Scheduling monthly one-on-one meetings with each community
- Preparing staffing schedule for recruitment events
- Coordinating access to classrooms for LLP partners and students
- Facilitating the LLP induction ceremony
- Posting housing and LLP application which goes live in late August

September
- Ongoing meetings with each existing community to discuss LLP needs
- Meeting with newly approved communities to discuss implementation details
- Facilitating meetings with LLP partners as a group
- Recruiting students to apply for LLPs for the upcoming year (ex. participating in all admissions events, coordinate a community wide Hobson’s connect communication, etc.)
- Working with partners to coordinate LLP partner participation in After Office Hours
- Coordinating partner requests for academic alliance funds (ex. parking, dining, etc.)
October
- Meeting with each existing community to discuss LLP needs
- Meeting with newly approved communities and discuss implementation details
- Facilitating meetings with LLP partners as a group
- Recruiting students to apply for LLPs for the upcoming year (ex. participating in all admissions events, coordinate a community wide Hobson’s connect communication, etc.)
- Coordinating LLP After Office Hours event
- Beginning administrative tasks such as creating community pledge for all LLP’s, acceptance letters, connected course registration, etc.
- Beginning to communicate with partners and students about spring class enrollment

November
- Meeting with each existing community to discuss LLP needs
- Meeting with newly approved communities and discuss implementation details
- Facilitating meetings with LLP partners as a group
- Recruiting students to apply for LLPs for the upcoming year (ex. participating in all admissions events, coordinating a community-wide Hobson’s connect email communication, etc.)
- Working with partners to update or create job descriptions for Peer Mentor positions
- Working with partners to update or create pledge sheet agreements
- Working with the Housing Assignments Office to provide partners with LLP application #’s
- Beginning to provide partners with LLP application reports
- Launching yearly assessment of student and staff interaction (called “Resident Student and Staff Interaction and Engagement” survey, or “RSSIE”).

December
- Planning spring training for LLP partners and Peer Mentors
- Facilitating meetings with LLP partners as a group
- Recruiting students to apply for LLPs for the upcoming year (ex. participating in all admissions events, Governor’s Scholars Reunion, etc.)
- Coordinating email communication regarding the LLP with all students via Hobson’s Connect
- Recruiting for Peer Mentor position for all LLPs through interest sessions, email advertisements, personal recruitment efforts, etc.
- Beginning communication with partners about connected classroom space and needs in the fall
- Sending rosters of present LLP students to partners for evaluation and highlighting names of students that have withdrawn
- Sending applicant numbers to each community and sending 1st choice applications to partners
- Providing partners with final G.P.A. presentations of Peer Mentors for fall semester

January
- Conducting training for LLP partners and Peer Mentors through in-hall meetings and a training luncheon
- Facilitating meetings with LLP partners as a group
- Recruiting students to apply for LLPs for the upcoming year (ex. participating in all admissions events, coordinate a community wide Hobson’s connect communication, etc.)
- Finalizing connected LLP courses for the fall semester
- Updating acceptance links in SAP and student pledge sheets
- Assisting in coordination of LLP “welcome back” events for all existing communities
- Sending applicant numbers to each community and sending 1st choice applications to partners
- Beginning to send out early-admission acceptance letters to students
- Organizing the Peer Mentor interest session
- Connecting with Registrar’s office to notify of connected LLP courses
- Organizing Peer Mentor focus groups
- Beginning to plan for LLP Showcase in April
- LLP early move-in planning
- Collecting partner feedback on students who are underperforming or not meeting LLP expectations
- Providing partners with the Annual Report for completion by April 1st

February
- Coordinating a community-wide Hobson’s connect email
- Beginning to schedule focus groups for all LLP’s – 2 year cycle
- Creating LLP focus group questions
- Facilitating monthly LLP partner meetings
- Launching the Peer Mentor application process
- Providing partners with information on prospective RAs interested in working with an LLP
- Receiving and sending to partners Peer Mentor applicant reports and essays
- Making Peer Mentor interview selections and communicating names to Residence Life staff to set-up interviews
- Launching internal “Survey of Living Learning Environments” and sharing results with partners
- Sending a list of connected courses to Advisors prior to Merit Weekend
- Creating new marketing materials and presentations for Merit Weekend
- Targeting communication to non-committed students attending Merit Weekend
- Beginning selection of Hall Directors with involvement of LLP partners
- Sending 1st choice LLP applications for partner review
- Sending 2nd and 3rd choice applications to partners as appropriate
- Continuing to notify and send acceptances to students on behalf of communities

March
- Facilitating LLP focus group meetings for each community
- Creating LLP focus group reports and responses for each community
- Conducting Peer Mentor interviews and selection
- Attending Merit Weekend events
- Continuing to plan for LLP Showcase event
- Sending 1st choice LLP applications for partner review
- Sending 2nd and 3rd choice applications to partners as appropriate
- Communicating with wait-listed students interested in the LLP
- Finalizing publications and promotional materials for next academic year
- Doing a program/community review in anticipation of next year’s cohort
- Facilitating one-on-one meetings with each LLP partner
- Collecting names of waitlisted students and communicating with them
- Creating the LLP calendar for next academic year

April
- Collecting Annual Reports and following-up with partners to review results
- Finalizing planning for LLP Showcase, i.e. printing certificates, buying folders, ordering food, securing a speaker
- Planning Peer Mentor orientation
- Sending 1st choice LLP applications for partner review
• Sending 2nd and 3rd choice applications to partners when appropriate
• Facilitating one-on-one LLP partner meetings
• Continuing to receive names of waitlisted students
• Holding LLP Showcase event
• Compiling internal reports (ex. demographic information of interested students, other statistics)