League of Innovation
Learning College Inventory – EMCC Level of Improvement
Summary

"The Learning College concept captures a college's commitment and journey to realign institutional priorities, policies, programs, practices, and personnel to focus on learning as the primary business of the college."
League for Innovation Site: (http://www.league.org/league/projects/lcp/ind)ex.htm)

Background:

Spring 2007 marked the beginning of Estrella Mountain Community College's (EMCC) ongoing transition in becoming a *Learning College*. Emphasis on changing the campus culture by placing *learning* at the core of all programs, procedures and processes has us examine our institutional efforts by asking; "how an activity, effort and/or process impacts learning and how do we know?" A chronological account of events, efforts, processes, and results outline the college's independent, interconnected and ongoing effort on the *Learning College Journey*. Overall progress has advanced in both awareness and performance of key implementation items between the initial *Learning College Inventory* survey in 2008 and results from the most recent administration in 2011.

- Spring 2007 – The development of Title V Grant involved campus-wide discussions on learning theory and design, learning strategies, learning college models, and strengthening a learning-centered institution in improving at-risk student preparedness.
- Fall 2007 – The College's annual "Day of Learning" was launched, providing all employees an opportunity to share, foster, and renew personal and professional relationships with *learning* as the core objective. Following a brief all-employee breakfast and meeting, "Day of Learning" sessions are held throughout the day. Presentations, workshops, and forums developed and facilitated by EMCC faculty and staff provide the framework for engaging activities.
- Spring 2008 – EMCC sponsored League of Innovation *Learning College* representative, Dr. Cynthia Wilson, to facilitate several campus discussions among employees on what it means to be a Learning College. Over a three-day period, Dr. Wilson engaged 17 across-college focus groups representing various employee groups. All employees were invited to complete the League's *Learning College Inventory*. Findings from the inventory were summarized into a report serving as an accompanying planning guide for continued *Learning College* initiatives.
- Spring 2008 – EMCC formed the "President's Community Advisory Council" with West Valley community members. The intent of the council is to gain insight and counsel regarding trends, educational opportunities, strategic directions, and collaborative program efforts. The first formal meeting addressed EMCC's goal in becoming a *Learning College*. The College continually informs the Council on institutional directions, priorities, and learning-centered progress through bi-annual meetings and annual published report.
- Summer 2008 – Faculty representatives from all divisions, along with several administrative leaders, formed a *Learning College* committee to address EMCC's student retention. Team members attended the League for Innovation College Summit in Overland Park, Kansas. Members produced a shared

"White Paper" focusing research on: *1) Academic Early Alert, 2) Addressing Incoming Students, 3) Campus-wide Student Engagement, 4) Developmental Education, and 5) Pedagogy.* Elements from the shared research were considered and implemented through a number of college programs.

- o *Academic Early Alert: Starfish EARLY ALERT Software System*
- o *Incoming Students: iStart Smart (Student Success Pilot Program)*
- o *Student Engagement: Student Governance System, EMCC 101*
- o *Developmental Education: Professional Learning Community, ALEKS*
- o *Pedagogy: Development of Modular and Mini Prep Courses*

- Summer 2008 – College awarded Title V *Strengthening Hispanic Institutions* Grant. The $2.8 million, five-year award supports the following grant activities: *1) Infrastructure support to improve learning preparation and learner success, 2) Increase campus-wide student engagement, 3) Transform and cultivate campus climate/ culture and improve student learning through all college constituencies, and 4) Strategically align and grow college endowment support for student goal attainment.*
- Fall 2008 – A campus-wide dialogue occurred with a *Learning College* Consultant concerning implementation of "guaranteed class schedule" options. Resulting conversations created two spring 2010 "guaranteed" schedule pilots: *1) Three sessions of five 5-week classes for 15 weeks, and 2) Two sessions of seven 8-week classes for 16 weeks.*
- Fall 2008 – Evaluation and modification of College planning process begins with a coordinated task force including employee group presidents, and senior administration. The group researched both strategic planning and the *Learning College* initiative. Recommendations include modification and realignment of the College's six strategic directions with the five foundations of the *Learning College*.
- Spring 2009 – Continued assessment of College planning process involves extending planning and improvement through every level of the organization. Campus feedback supports implementing changes. New College priorities established for 2009-2012 planning cycle. Resulting efforts strengthen data use in planning process, increase campus-wide involvement, improve student learning outcomes through campus-wide effort, create consistency across program areas, and improve flexibility in accounting unique program components. A newly created program review "template" aligns with Higher Learning Commission criteria while also incorporating *Learning College* philosophy. Program review process pilots four academic, three student service, nine occupational, and eight Southwest Skill Center programs.
- Spring 2009 – College begins preparation for 2012 accreditation visit by examining the *College Vision, Mission, and Core Values* statements. A comprehensive alignment among College, Maricopa Community College District, and the *Learning College* objectives becomes the goal. An employee driven Organizational Strategic Direction Team encourages across-campus workshop participation in aligning new Vision, Mission, and Core Values.
- Summer 2009 – College sends team of 32 faculty and staff to League for Innovation *Learning College* Summit. Collaborative committee work produces working definition of a Learning College as applied to EMCC.
- Fall 2009 through fall 2010 – College prepares for 2012 accreditation with emphasis on Learning College principles. More than 25 program reviews are completed with an increased emphasis on learning. The new Vision, Mission and Core Values statements are presented and approved by Maricopa Community College Governing Board. Expanded employee development and recognition programs include

restructuring that identifies full-time employee leadership. While implementing "mandatory" orientation, testing, and placement for new EMCC students, the College also aligns resources to strategies having the greatest impact on learning.

- Summer 2010 – College sends team of 35 faculty and staff to League for Innovation *Learning College* Summit.
- Fall 2010 – During the Fall Leadership Council Retreat, all college leadership participated in a retreat session that examined where the institution was on its Learning College journey. Utilizing an evaluative tool *Leadership, Transformation, and Lessons Learned: Self Reflective Worksheet,* College leaders targeted top priorities to help keep the college moving forward.
- Fall 2010 - *Defining Us: Learning First Tour.* The Tour provides a forum for all Estrella Mountain employees to come together and discuss how they individually contribute to student learning.
- Fall 2010 – The College implements a learning college website.
- Fall 2011 – After several courageous conversations and an examination of the best practices at learning-centered colleges, the college eliminates late registration and implements the following schedule model for fall 2011.
  - o Start time of 7 a.m. is instituted for all classes
  - o Five-day traditional schedule until 12 p.m. Every class that ended prior to 12 p.m. is to be maintained as the traditional schedule (Monday/Wednesday/Friday, Tuesday/Thursday)
  - o Classes starting after 12 p.m. are converted to four-day schedule (Monday/ Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday)
  - o Science, Nursing and Labs remain unchanged
    - • Hybrid and five/eight-week guaranteed classes remain unchanged
- Spring 2011 - Learning College Yearbook that was created as a result of the *Defining Us: Learning First Tour*. The yearbook outlines for employees the Institutional Mission, Vision, Core Values and Strategic Directions, while documenting the story of our Learning College journey. The yearbook also captures highlights from tour discussions that explored how Estrella Mountain employees incorporate Learning College Principles in their daily activities and responsibilities.
- Spring 2011 – EMCC administers a second *League of Innovation Learning College Inventory* to all employee groups. The initial general *Learning College Inventory* (assessment survey) was distribution by Dr. Cynthia Wilson during her sponsored spring 2008 visit.

Learning College Inventory – EMCC Level of Improvement

The *Learning College* Inventory is designed to help an institution assess its status as a *Learning College*, i.e., a college that places learning first and provides learning opportunities any way, any place, and any time. It is also designed to be a tool for monitoring and directing a college's progress toward becoming more learning centered. This inventory comprises five critical areas in which institutions committed to becoming *Learning Colleges* are focusing their attention and resources: **Organizational Culture, Employee Recruitment and Development, Technology, Student Learning, and Learning Outcomes**. This summary report reflects the key characteristics and principles of a Learning College as applied to these five focus areas.

Overall progress and significant levels of improvement between spring 2008 and spring 2011 are presented to help indicate Estrella Mountain's levels of improvement. **General summary responses are represented within the 16 sections of the *Learning College* Inventory.** These observations are not exhaustive, and further examination of each item is recommended. Exploration of perceptions indicated in the results may benefit by comparing with actual practice at the College.

Findings:

The 2011 *Learning College Inventory* included 132 respondents. Distribution among employment category indicates: Faculty teaching and non-teaching (n=60),; Staff, including maintenance operations facilities, safety and security, administrative assistant professional staff, and similar positions (n=40),; Administrative, including executive leadership, dean, director, manager, and similar positions (n=32).

For each statement in the *Learning College Inventory*, respondents are asked to indicate the **level of implementation** their college has achieved regarding the item described by using the following scale:

    0 = I don't know: I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college.
    1 = None: Our college has not yet addressed this item.
    2 = Discussion: Our college is in a discussion stage but has taken no further action on this item.
    3 = Planning: Our college is in planning stage with this item.
    4 = Partial Implementation: Our college has taken some specific action on this item and has additional action to take.
    5 = Full Implementation: Our college has fully implemented this item.

Five critical *Learning College Inventory* areas indicate Estrella Mountain's focused attention on resources supporting its commitment in becoming a *Learning College*. Indications of campus "Awareness" improvement showed gains in four of the five critical areas with "information technology" showing a slight decrease between 2008 and 2011. Most improvement changes also proved statistically significant. The "Level of Improvement" chart below shows awareness and improvement areas between 2008 and 2011.

Level of Improvement

League for Innovation Learning College Inventory EMCC Level of Improvement Spring 2008 to Spring 2011	Awareness Improvement	Implementation Improvement
Organizational Culture		
1. Planning	Yes*	Yes *
2. Focusing Resources	Yes *	Yes *
3. Creating a Culture of Focused on Learning	Yes	Yes*
Employee Recruitment and Development		
4. Selecting Employees		Yes *
5. Defining Employee Roles		Yes *
6. Developing Employees	Yes	Yes*
7. Holding Conversations About Learning		Yes*
Information Technology		
8. Planning for Information Technology		Yes *
9. Applying Information Technology	Decrease in Awareness*	Yes *
Student Learning		
10. Providing Many Options for Learning		Yes*
11. Creating More Powerful Learning Environments & Experiences		Yes *
12. Collaborating for Learning	Yes*	Yes*
13. Orienting Students to New Options and Responsibilities	Yes	Yes*
14. Ensuring Success of Underprepared Students	Yes	Yes*
Learning Outcomes		
15. Identifying and Agreeing on Learning Outcomes	Yes*	Yes*
16. Assessing and Documenting Learning Outcomes	Yes	Yes*

*Category includes one or more questions that were statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

A general summary of spring 2011 responses represented within the five critical areas and 16 sections of the *Learning College Inventory* is presented below. Overall comparative responses between 2008 and 2011 and accompanying levels of improvement are also displayed.

A. Organizational Culture - This section of the inventory deals with decision making, resource allocation, and activities designed to create a culture focused on learning.

1. **Planning.**

   Responses to items focused on the College's planning activities indicate notable levels of improvement. All three items in this section show positive response gains in Awareness and perceived levels of implementation. A high number and percent of respondents consider Estrella's *Learning College* planning in more advanced levels of implementation. Results also indicate statistically positive differences between 2008 and 2011. Table 1 displays individual section item mean Likert score difference for Planning.

Table 1 Planning: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Planning (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. An institutionwide action plan guides implementation of the college's learning-centered mission.	*1.21	4.12
b. All college stakeholder groups are involved in planning for and implementing learning-centered principles.	*1.03	3.98
c. College stakeholders consider these two questions when making decisions: Does this decision improve and expand learning? How do we know?	*1.11	3.93

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

2. **Focusing Resources.**

   Responses to items concerning the College's resources focused on learning indicate greater awareness of the implementation status. The seven items in this section show positive response gains in perceived college performance as a *Learning College*. A sizable number and percentage of respondents recognize that planning and implementation are under way. Five of the seven items listed in this section show statistically positive differences between 2008 and 2011. Table 2 displays individual section items mean Likert score difference for Focusing Resources.

Table 2 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Focusing Resources (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Budget processes and decisions are driven by a focus on learning (i.e., consideration of what will improve, expand, and document student learning).	*0.70	3.66
b. Resources are allocated to support initiatives to make the college more learning centered.	*0.78	3.87
c. Resources are allocated to ensure that college facilities complement the focus on learning.	*0.50	3.86
d. Community and corporate partnerships are used to help the college improve and expand student learning.	0.45	3.66
e. The college devotes significant resources to research to identify, assess, document, and apply information about the learning outcomes of its students.	*0.76	3.95
f. Members of all college employee groups serve as resources to increase and expand student learning.	*0.83	3.91
g. The college uses nontraditional workload models to improve and expand learning.	0.55	3.25

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

3. **Creating a Culture Focused on Learning.**
   Responses to the five items in this section reveal positive perceptions concerning the College's work creating a culture focused on learning. Positive progress is shown in overall Awareness for four of the five items. Awareness of College documents (e.g., mission/vision statements, catalog, programs and policy descriptions) - as well as regular campus evaluations contributing in creating a culture focused on learning was perceived as progressing. Although none of the five Awareness items proved statistically significant, all five Performance items indicate statistically significant differences between 2008 and 2011. Responses suggest Estrella Mountain is positively advancing efforts in creating a culture focused on learning. Table 3 displays individual section items mean Likert score difference in Creating a Culture Focused on Learning.

Table 3 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Creating a Culture Focused on Learning (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. College leaders demonstrate their commitment to creating a learning-centered institution.	*0.64	4.08
b. Major college documents (e.g., mission and vision statements, college catalog, program descriptions, personnel policies, job descriptions) reflect learning-centered principles and practices.	*1.22	4.41
c. The college's academic policies (e.g., registration, placement, attendance, academic standing) reflect priorities placed on learning.	*0.83	3.93
d. The college community supports the major changes needed to make the college more learning centered.	*0.65	3.87
e. The college regularly evaluates its progress toward becoming more learning centered.	*0.93	3.95

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

B. Employee Recruitment and Development – This section of the Inventory considers the necessary contributions members of the community bring to the life of a *Learning College*. Success depends on all college stakeholders and substantive conversations regarding the focused meaning of utilizing institutional resources and activities for advancing and enacting learning.

4. **Selecting Employees.**
   The two response items in this section show mixed results regarding the perceived Awareness of implementation in employee selection. Little positive movement in employee overall awareness of implementation in the area of "job descriptions promoting student learning and success" and "selection committees trained in how to apply learning focus within hiring process." Respondent's level of Performance concerning implementation advancement also indicates mixed results for these two items. In this case, perceived College implementation advancement regarding "selection committees trained in how to apply learning focus within hiring process" showed a statistically significant change over 2008. Table 4 displays individual section items mean Likert score difference for Selecting Employees.

Table 4 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Selecting Employees (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Job descriptions reflect employee behaviors and outcomes that promote student learning and success.	0.48	3.40
b. Selection committees are trained in how to apply a focus on learning in the hiring process.	*0.65	3.13

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

5. **Defining Employee Rules.**
   The two response items in this section also show mixed results. Respondents perceived Awareness of implementation in defining employee roles selection has witnessed only slight improvement over 2008. Responses reflecting College Performance in this area does not show overall positive advancement in perceived implementation for these items. Although item "roles and responsibilities for all employee groups explicitly relate to improving student learning and creating more effective learning environments" did show a statistically significant respondent Performance perception change since the previous *Learning College Inventory* administration. Table 5 displays individual section items mean Likert score difference for Defining Employee Rules.

Table 5 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Defining Employee Rules (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Roles and responsibilities for all employee groups explicitly relate to improving student learning and creating more effective learning environments.	*0.62	3.27
b. College reward systems encourage employees to adopt these learning-centered roles.	0.40	2.42

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

6. **Developing Employees.**
   Two of the three response items indicate improvement in implementation Awareness status of College efforts in developing employees. The item acknowledging "employees participating in development activities promoting learning-centered principles" showed a measurable decrease in Awareness from 2008 to 2011. In terms of perceived progress in understanding the implementation status with Performance in developing employees, all three items indicated statistically significant changes. Table 6 shows item section mean Likert score differences (between 2008 and 2011) for the Developing Employees section.

Table 6 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Developing Employees (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Employee development programs are designed to prepare all employees to help the college become more learning centered.	*0.64	3.40
b. Each year, an increasing percentage of employees participate in employee development activities focused on promoting learning-centered principles.	*1.12	3.71
c. Employee evaluation processes and outcomes demonstrate a focus on learning-centered principles.	*0.69	3.13

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

7. **Holding Conversations about Learning.**
   Both items showed overall positive advances in respondents Awareness of Campus implementation status. Respondent's indicated positive changes in comprehending the implementation status of all items in this section. The results show notable changes (statistically significant differences) in respondent's understanding of what advances the College has made in this area over 2008. Table 7 displays Performance results on these items between 2008 and 2011.

Table 7 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Holding Conversations about Learning (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Collegewide conversations about learning (i.e., what it means to focus policies, programs, and practices on learning) are a routine practice.	*0.99	4.01
b. Outcomes from these conversations about learning are used to modify college policies, programs, and practices to improve and expand learning.	*1.08	3.75

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

C. Informational Technology – This section views Information Technology's role in enhancing learning for students and employees. An emphasis on technology for *Learning Colleges* is used as a means to provide learners more control over their own learning, making learning more effective and efficient.

8. **Planning for Information Technology.**
   Responses to items in this section, in general, indicate little movement in Awareness of implementation since 2008. Overall Awareness in the area of Planning for Informational Technology may have actually decreased for respondents since the 2008 *Learning College Inventory*. Overall respondent's perceived notion of Campus Performance in recognizing improved implementation for these items is negligible. However three comparative items indicate statistically significant mean Likert score differences between 2008 and 2011. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Planning for Informational Technology (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. The college has a long-term strategic information technology plan that addresses technology purchase, upgrade, user support, and employee training.	*0.48	4.17
b. The technology plan includes specific references to ways technology will be used to increase and expand learning for students.	*0.66	4.04
c. The college monitors the degree and quality of access to technology for all members of the college community.	*0.76	4.21
d. The college has a formal strategy to increase access to technology for all members of the college community.	0.42	4.01
e. The college routinely evaluates the effectiveness of technology applications in facilitating student learning or success.	0.43	3.91

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

9. **Applying Informational Technology.**
   A good majority of respondents did not indicate strong knowledge of Campus implementation on the fourteen items listed under this category. The item "Admissions" was one statistically significant

recognized item which resulted in increased Awareness of implementation progress between 2008 and 2011. Respondent perceived notion of the College making observable progress in implementing the items related to Performance did show some positive changes. However, overall results show the categorical area "Applying Informational Technology" needing additional attention. Table 9 displays item by item comparative results for respondent's perceived Performance mean Likert score changes between 2008 and 2011.

Table 9 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Applying Informational Technology (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Admissions	0.09	3.88
b. Orientation	0.49	3.93
c. Assessment	0.45	4.01
d. Advisement	0.30	3.68
e. Registration	0.35	3.99
f. Enrollment management	0.36	3.84
g. Creation of learning environments and experiences	0.44	3.94
h. Development of individual student learning plans	0.54	3.39
i. Monitoring student progress	*0.56	3.73
j. Student interactions with faculty and other students	*0.49	3.83
k. Access to information resources	0.44	4.19
l. Documenting competencies and goals achieved	*0.55	3.68
m. Career planning and placement	*0.68	3.71
n. 24-hour help-desk support for students and employees	*0.70	3.59

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

D. Student Learning – This section sees a learning-centered college as one which promotes powerful learning environments and experiences; and collaborative learning opportunities. The Learning College expects students to take primary responsibility for their learning with support and resources to help them meet their learning goals.

10. **Providing Many Options for Learning.**
Overall responses to the five items indicate positive progress in Awareness of implementation status for these items. Respondents indicate a good level of comprehension concerning the efforts being made regarding levels of implementation. The results also show notable changes (statistically significant differences) in respondent's understanding of student learning support efforts and available learning options for most of the items. Table 10 displays registered Performance results on these items between 2008 and 2011.

Table 10 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Providing Many Options for Learning (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. The college routinely inventories the learning options available to students and employees.	*0.75	3.69
b. The college has a plan for increasing the learning options available for students and employees.	0.45	3.54
c. Anytime learning opportunities are available for all students.	*0.77	3.84
d. Anyplace learning opportunities are available for all students.	*0.88	3.82
e. Opportunities for experiential learning (e.g., service learning, internships, cooperatives) are available for all students.	*0.78	3.86

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

11. **Creating More Powerful Learning Environments and Experiences.**
Responses on three of the five items in this section indicate good progress in Awareness of implementation throughout campus. Awareness of implementation decreased slightly pertaining to "each student having an individualized learning plan to meet their learning goals" and "each student's learning style is assessed to better choose learning options." Respondent results indicate overall positive progress in recognizing the creation of more powerful learning environments as indicated through Performance comparisons between 2008 and 2011. The level of implementation viewed at the College has achieved positive progress regarding most items, with four out of five proving statistically significant changes over time. Table 11 displays item Performance results.

Table 11 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Creating More Powerful Learning Environments and Experiences (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. Each student has an individualized learning plan designed to meet his or her learning goals.	*0.77	2.88
b. Courses and learning experiences within the curriculum are designed to enable students to achieve expected learning outcomes for each program.	*0.64	3.90
c. Teaching styles and approaches for each faculty member are documented and shared with students to help with selection of learning options.	0.60	2.83
d. Each student's learning style is assessed to help choose optimal learning options.	*0.72	2.96
e. Student evaluations are used to improve learning environments and experiences.	*0.67	3.82

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

12. **Collaboration for Learning.**
Overall results from respondents on items in this section show notable positive change indicators in Awareness of implementation status for learning collaboration. All four items improved regarding Awareness. One item, "use of a collaborative process in planning and promoting student and organizational learning" showed a statistically significant change over 2008. Respondent understanding of implementation levels and College Performance in achieving positive change advanced for all items between 2008 and 2011. Table 12 displays item results.

Table 12 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Collaboration for Learning (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. The value of collaboration to promote learning is reflected in major college documents and activities (e.g., mission statement, program descriptions, course design, course scheduling, reward systems).	*0.90	4.14
b. The college uses collaborative processes to plan for and promote student and organizational learning.	*0.77	3.95
c. Collaborative learning experiences are available for students through a variety of options (e.g., learning communities, team learning, project-based learning, student mentoring, peer tutoring).	*0.92	4.22
d. Models of collaborative learning with proven success for improving and expanding student learning are identified for replication.	*0.61	3.64

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

13. **Orienting Students to New Options and Responsibilities.**
    All three items had respondents' indicating improvement in Awareness of Campus implementation efforts. Respondents also showed positive overall awareness in the Performance of the college on items expressed in this section. All three items showed statistically significant changes between responses from 2008 to 2011. Comparison results for item scores from 2008 and 2011 are shown in Table 13.

Table 13 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Orienting Students to New Options and Responsibilities (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. All students are given training to help them take primary responsibility for their learning and navigate the variety of available learning options.	*1.13	3.59
b. The college has identified standards and expectations for the student's role in his or her own learning process (e.g., making decisions, exploring options, signing agreements, undergoing assessments).	*0.88	3.53
c. Expectations regarding students' responsibilities in the learning process are documented and communicated in all courses.	*0.88	3.87

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

14. **Ensuring Success of Underprepared Students.**
    Respondent Awareness of implementation progress was positive for four out of the five items. Awareness of College implementation efforts regarding item "Assessment, advising, placement, and orientation programs for underprepared students reflect strategies proven to enhance retention and success for this population" scored a bit lower. However, respondents were positively aware of the College's implementation Performance on all of the items in this section. The mean Likert score change per item from 2008 to 2011 also showed statistical significance.   Table 14 displays Performance changes per item.

Table 14 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Ensuring Success of Underprepared Students (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. The college regularly assesses its programs for underprepared students to determine student success rates, program strengths, and program weaknesses.	*0.84	3.98
b. Employees with responsibility for underprepared students undergo specialized development programs aimed at increasing success rates for this population.	*1.08	3.60
c. Assessment, advising, placement, and orientation programs for underprepared students reflect strategies proven to enhance retention and success for this population.	*0.89	3.80
d. Faculty use strategies proven to improve retention and success of underprepared students.	*0.71	3.78

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

E. Learning Outcomes – This section considers learning outcomes as core competencies (e.g., communication, numeracy, literacy, collaboration) a learner should acquire and demonstrate regardless of the degree or certificate program completed.

15. **Identifying and Agreeing on Learning Outcomes.**
Responses to items focused on the College's learning outcomes indicate notable levels of improvement. All five items in this section show positive response gains in Awareness and perceived levels of implementation. Four out of five show statistically significant differences between 2008 and 2011. A high number and percent of respondents consider Estrella's *Learning College* efforts in identifying and agreeing on learning outcomes in more advanced levels of implementation. Table 15 displays individual section items mean Likert score differences.

Table 15 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Identifying and Agreeing on Learning Outcomes (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. College employees agree on the value of identifying student learning outcomes.	*0.68	3.98
b. A college-wide process for identifying and agreeing on student learning outcomes is used.	0.47	3.45
c. Faculty members in each program and department are engaged in identifying and agreeing on learning outcomes.	*0.56	3.74
d. The institution provides resources (training, reference materials, time, consultants) to assist employees in identifying and assessing learning outcomes.	*0.54	3.72
e. The college has defined a set of learning outcomes that students in each program must achieve.	*0.54	3.81

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

16. **Assessing and Documenting Learning Outcomes.**

Responses to items in this section show generally high Awareness of College implementation efforts. Respondents also showed positive overall awareness in the Performance of the college on items expressed in this section. All six items showed statistically significant changes between responses from 2008 to 2011. Comparison results for item scores from 2008 and 2011 are shown in Table 16.

Table 16 Focusing Resources: Individual Mean Likert Scores

Assessing and Agreeing on Learning Outcomes (Performance)	mean Likert score difference 2008-2011	2011 mean Likert score
a. College employees agree on the value of assessing and documenting student learning outcomes.	*0.79	3.99
b. A collegewide process for assessing and documenting learning outcomes is used.	*0.77	3.87
c. Assessment is used to identify the gaps between learners' knowledge and skills and their learning goals.	*0.86	3.83
d. Successful models for assessing student learning outcomes are identified for others to follow.	*0.75	3.70
e. College employees use innovative approaches for measuring learning outcomes not easily measured by traditional tests.	*0.79	3.83
f. The college successfully documents student learning in ways other than grades and credit.	*0.79	3.57

*Statistically different (p<.05) between first and second inventory administration.

APPENDIX

Respondent results to the "Awareness" question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college." is provided for the five critical areas and 16 sections of the *Learning College Inventory*. Overall comparative responses between 2008 and 2011 and accompanying levels of improvement are also displayed. *Note: A *decrease* in the percent response indicates *a greater* "Awareness" of the item's implementation status.

Learning College Inventory Spring 2008 vs Spring 2011	Awareness		
Learning College Awareness Question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college."	**2008**	**2011**	**2008-2011 Diff**
A. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE			
1. Planning			
a. An institution wide action plan guides implementation of the college's learning-centered mission.	21.9%	11.1%	10.8%
b. All college stakeholder groups are involved in planning for and implementing learning-centered principles.	28.9%	16.4%	12.5%
c. College stakeholders consider these two questions when making decisions: Does this decision improve and expand learning? How do we know?	29.9%	19.4%	10.5%
2. Focusing Resources			
a. Budget processes and decisions are driven by a focus on learning (i.e., consideration of what will improve, expand, and document student learning).	25.5%	23.2%	2.3%
b. Resources are allocated to support initiatives to make the college more learning centered.	19.3%	17.9%	1.4%
c. Resources are allocated to ensure that college facilities complement the focus on learning.	15.3%	17.3%	-2.0%
d. Community and corporate partnerships are used to help the college improve and expand student learning.	25.5%	23.4%	2.1%
e. The college devotes significant resources to research to identify, assess, document, and apply information about the learning outcomes of its students.	19.0%	16.5%	2.4%
f. Members of all college employee groups serve as resources to increase and expand student learning.	21.2%	11.1%	10.1%
g. The college uses nontraditional workload models to improve and expand learning.	34.1%	30.2%	3.9%
3. Creating a Culture Focused on Learning			
a. College leaders demonstrate their commitment to creating a learning-centered institution.	7.3%	6.3%	1.0%
b. Major college documents (e.g., mission and vision statements, college catalog, program descriptions, personnel policies, job descriptions) reflect learning-centered principles and practices.	10.9%	5.5%	5.4%
c. The college's academic policies (e.g., registration, placement, attendance, academic standing) reflect priorities placed on learning.	11.7%	7.9%	3.8%
d. The college community supports the major changes needed to make the college more learning centered.	13.1%	13.6%	-0.5%
e. The college regularly evaluates its progress toward becoming more learning centered.	16.1%	9.6%	6.5%

Learning College Inventory 2008 vs 2011	Awareness		
Learning College Awareness Question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college."	**2008**	**2011**	**2008-2011 Diff**
B. EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT			
4. Selecting Employees			
a. Job descriptions reflect employee behaviors and outcomes that promote student learning and success.	19.1%	19.4%	-0.2%
b. Selection committees are trained in how to apply a focus on learning in the hiring process.	30.7%	24.4%	6.2%
5. Defining Employee Roles			
a. Roles and responsibilities for all employee groups explicitly relate to improving student learning and creating more effective learning environments.	15.3%	15.5%	-0.2%
b. College reward systems encourage employees to adopt these learning-centered roles.	24.8%	20.0%	4.8%
6. Developing Employees			
a. Employee development programs are designed to prepare all employees to help the college become more learning centered.	16.1%	12.2%	3.9%
b. Each year, an increasing percentage of employees participate in employee development activities focused on promoting learning-centered principles.	27.7%	35.2%	-7.4%
c. Employee evaluation processes and outcomes demonstrate a focus on learning-centered principles.	22.2%	16.8%	5.4%
7. Holding Conversations About Learning			
a. College wide conversations about learning (i.e., what it means to focus policies, programs, and practices on learning) are a routine practice.	12.6%	12.4%	0.2%
b. Outcomes from these conversations about learning are used to modify college policies, programs, and practices to improve and expand learning.	20.4%	16.5%	3.9%
C. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY			
8. Planning for Information Technology			
a. The college has a long-term strategic information technology plan that addresses technology purchase, upgrade, user support, and employee training.	19.0%	20.5%	-1.5%
b. The technology plan includes specific references to ways technology will be used to increase and expand learning for students.	26.3%	29.1%	-2.9%
c. The college monitors the degree and quality of access to technology for all members of the college community.	20.4%	24.0%	-3.6%
d. The college has a formal strategy to increase access to technology for all members of the college community.	27.9%	28.3%	-0.4%
e. The college routinely evaluates the effectiveness of technology applications in facilitating student learning or success.	27.7%	32.0%	-4.3%

Learning College Inventory 2008 vs 2011	Awareness		
Learning College Awareness Question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college."	2008	2011	2008-2011 Diff
9. Applying Information Technology			
a. Admissions	23.4%	40.0%	-16.6%
b. Orientation	27.7%	37.7%	-10.0%
c. Assessment	20.0%	22.0%	-2.0%
d. Advisement	28.9%	36.4%	-7.5%
e. Registration	22.1%	30.5%	-8.4%
f. Enrollment management	25.2%	33.6%	-8.4%
g. Creation of learning environments and experiences	21.2%	17.1%	4.1%
h. Development of individualized student learning plans	34.3%	38.0%	-3.7%
i. Monitoring student progress	24.1%	20.3%	3.8%
j. Student interactions with faculty and other students	22.6%	20.9%	1.7%
k. Access to information resources	17.6%	16.3%	1.4%
l. Documenting competencies and goals achieved	28.9%	23.4%	5.5%
m. Career planning and placement	27.9%	31.0%	-3.1%
n. 24-hour help-desk support for students and employees	25.7%	28.7%	-2.9%
D. STUDENT LEARNING			
10. Providing Many Options for Learning			
a. The college routinely inventories the learning options available to students and employees.	30.1%	32.5%	-2.4%
b. The college has a plan for increasing the learning options available for students and employees.	27.9%	26.2%	1.8%
c. Anytime learning opportunities are available for all students.	23.5%	19.0%	4.5%
d. Anyplace learning opportunities are available for all students.	23.9%	20.5%	3.4%
e. Opportunities for experiential learning (e.g., service learning, internships, cooperatives) are available for all students.	21.3%	15.4%	5.9%
11. Creating More Powerful Learning Environments and Experiences			
a. Each student has an individualized learning plan designed to meet his or her learning goals.	35.8%	46.9%	-11.1%
b. Courses and learning experiences within the curriculum are designed to enable students to achieve expected learning outcomes for each program.	25.2%	22.2%	3.0%
c. Teaching styles and approaches for each faculty member are documented and shared with students to help with selection of learning options.	33.8%	31.8%	2.0%
d. Each student's learning style is assessed to help choose optimal learning options.	34.6%	36.5%	-1.9%
e. Student evaluations are used to improve learning environments and experiences.	29.1%	19.5%	9.6%

ESTRELLA MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Learning College Inventory 2008 vs 2011	Awareness		
Learning College Awareness Question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college."	2008	2011	2008-2011 Diff
12. Collaborating for Learning			
a. The value of collaboration to promote learning is reflected in major college documents and activities (e.g., mission statement, program descriptions, course design, course scheduling, reward systems).	14.8%	7.4%	7.4%
b. The college uses collaborative processes to plan for and promote student and organizational learning.	20.0%	9.8%	10.2%
c. Collaborative learning experiences are available for students through a variety of options (e.g., learning communities, team learning, project-based learning, student mentoring, peer tutoring).	18.5%	11.4%	7.2%
d. Models of collaborative learning with proven success for improving and expanding student learning are identified for replication.	27.4%	26.8%	0.6%
13. Orienting Students to New Options and Responsibilities			
a. All students are given training to help them take primary responsibility for their learning and navigate the variety of available learning options.	36.0%	30.6%	5.4%
b. The college has identified standards and expectations for the student's role in his or her own learning process (e.g., making decisions, exploring options, signing agreements, undergoing assessments).	28.9%	28.2%	0.7%
c. Expectations regarding students' responsibilities in the learning process are documented and communicated in all courses.	34.8%	25.4%	9.4%
14. Ensuring Success of Underprepared Students			
a. The college regularly assesses its programs for underprepared students to determine student success rates, program strengths, and program weaknesses.	31.1%	25.6%	5.5%
b. Employees with responsibility for underprepared students undergo specialized development programs aimed at increasing success rates for this population.	43.4%	32.3%	11.1%
c. Assessment, advising, placement, and orientation programs for underprepared students reflect strategies proven to enhance retention and success for this population.	34.1%	35.8%	-1.7%
d. Faculty use strategies proven to improve retention and success of underprepared students.	40.3%	29.8%	10.5%
E. LEARNING OUTCOMES			
15. Identifying and Agreeing on Learning Outcomes			
a. College employees agree on the value of identifying student learning outcomes.	23.0%	15.6%	7.4%
b. A college wide process for identifying and agreeing on student learning outcomes is used.	28.1%	17.6%	10.5%
c. Faculty members in each program and department are engaged in identifying and agreeing on learning outcomes.	36.3%	24.2%	12.1%
d. The institution provides resources (training, reference materials, time, consultants) to assist employees in identifying and assessing learning outcomes.	24.3%	13.7%	10.6%
e. The college has defined a set of learning outcomes that students in each program must achieve.	28.7%	16.8%	11.9%

Learning College Inventory 2008 vs 2011	Awareness		
Learning College Awareness Question: "I do not know the implementation status of this item at our college."	2008	2011	2008-2011 Diff
16. Assessing and Documenting Learning Outcomes			
a. College employees agree on the value of assessing and documenting student learning outcomes.	21.3%	15.3%	6.0%
b. A college wide process for assessing and documenting learning outcomes is used.	26.5%	18.9%	7.6%
c. Assessment is used to identify the gaps between learners' knowledge and skills and their learning goals.	26.5%	20.3%	6.1%
d. Successful models for assessing student learning outcomes are identified for others to follow.	30.9%	21.8%	9.1%
e. College employees use innovative approaches for measuring learning outcomes not easily measured by traditional tests.	29.1%	27.4%	1.7%
f. The college successfully documents student learning in ways other than grades and credit.	29.1%	28.5%	0.6%