

The Learning College Journey: Declaring Vs. Doing

Don Turk, Meeta Goel, Veneeya Kinion, Kendra Carpenter & Barbara Johnson

“If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more, you are a leader.” –John Quincy Adams

Abstract

In 2004, believing that Learning College principles went hand-in-hand with our Academic Quality Improvement Program accreditation and its focus on helping students learn the college leadership adopted a Learning College orientation. Despite this declaration, personalizing and applying Learning College principles has been challenging for us. Terry O’Banion’s Learning College model assumes educational experiences are designed for needs of learners, not institutions. A Learning College Council just formed and the leadership has made furthering Learning College a strategic goal. This study conducted focus groups with college employees and students using open-and close-ended items designed to provide data about our knowledge, attitudes, and behavior relative to our Learning College progress. The results generally indicated that although the college has made some progress, it is still far from the ideal. The data will serve as a baseline and help us gauge progress on our Learning College journey. The findings should interest college leadership, other stakeholders and also help drive initiatives addressed by the Learning Council.

We are currently facing significant societal changes locally, nationally and internationally. A level of globalization that has never before been seen. These changes are being driven by the challenges before us, namely advancing technologies, changing demographics, lack of a knowledgeable and socially responsible citizenry, increasing accountability and competition (for learning and funds). Higher education can no longer be primarily about individual benefits but more about the greater societal good. O’Banion (2007) states that higher education was historically designed to meet the needs of an agrarian (e.g. children who had to help with farm work) and an industrial economy (e.g. school structure that was modeled after factories). There is a need to shift from the agrarian and industrial influence to an informational-based economy. Otherwise, innovations in technology and business will slow down due to the lack of sufficient access to technology.

The gap between what people want from higher education and what it provides has been widening (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Never before has there been such a great need for higher education to address these challenges—a do or die imperative, so to speak. According to Garvin, Edmondson & Gino (2008), organizational learning depends on a supportive learning environment, concrete learning processes and a reinforcing leadership. They offer an instrument for assessing the depth of the learning that does occur. Never before has there been such a great body of knowledge available regarding how we learn. Knowledge that has not historically been strategically applied throughout higher education. Knowledge that could help institutions of higher education be held accountable and rise to meet the demand for a skilled and global citizenry.

Based on this need and the availability of learning-related knowledge, further help for higher education has arisen in the form of the Learning College movement. The following will present these three catalysts for change in greater depth—the key

challenges facing us; knowledge about how we learn and the Learning College movement, as well as a fourth meta-catalyst without which real change is impossible.

Catalyst #1 for Change: Key Challenges

Because of technology, an increasing percentage of the populace has access to information anywhere and anytime. This access to technology is revolutionizing how we communicate and the very fabric of daily life. The Millennial Generation is the first to grow up with mobile technology and expects access and usage of it. They learn differently and have less use for memorization and a greater affinity for interactive learning. Higher education is no longer constrained by space and time or a given geographical market. Colleges should no longer view their market as limited to a given geographical area, but only by those who do not have internet access. Programs and services can be accessible 24/7 via technology and learning can occur anywhere anytime. Training of all types is crucial-for IT people, employees in general, expanded online offerings for courses and services, etc. Colleges need to increase their partnerships with vendors and other institutions to provide a more competitive electronic environment e.g. high-speed internet, wireless, etc. (Morrison, 2003). Otherwise the digital, educational and economic divide between the haves and have not's will continue to grow. Also, innovations in technology and business will proceed at a slower rate.

The ethnic mix is expected to change drastically in favor of diversity and with the resulting multi-cultural global environment will come increasing demand for affordable and easily accessible education. Larger numbers of high schoolers will seek higher education and yet will tend to be under prepared for that education. This will warrant better partnerships with high schools, as well as early intervention at the college-level e.g. first year experience. The increasing aging population will retire and demand more continuing education. People are changing jobs more frequently during their lifetimes and community colleges can be proactive in anticipating these changes and in the provision of training and retraining that assists with such transitions (Morrison, 2003).

The emphasis on greater accountability from higher education institutions demands better data than more traditional indicators of success such as retention and graduation rates. It is much more important to produce evidence of learning that will lead to a more productive and fulfilled citizenry-one that will be able to not only contribute to knowledge, but also be able to comprehend, analyze and evaluate its meaning or think critically within the context of an increasingly complex world. Consequently, there is also greater emphasis involving students and faculty in research and more practical applications of knowledge where creativity and excellence are valued commodities. As Boggs (2001) suggests, such scholarship has historically been rejected as a mission of community colleges instead of being embraced and celebrated.

Colleges and universities are experiencing decreases in state and federal funding with increased competition and accountability for the funds received. This coupled with rising tuition is making college even less affordable for the masses (SCUP, 2007). Consequently, institutions are increasingly seeking local or private funds. They are rethinking their visions and missions in light of the competition for funds and students (both national & international) and trying to find their niche in today's market. Colleges are trying to improve at establishing priorities. They are finding ways to cut operating costs e.g. increasing class sizes, increasing use of adjunct faculty, freezing salaries, decreasing benefits, cutting courses and programs, decreasing facilities-related

spending, increasing online delivery options, partnering with other schools, sustainability efforts, etc. In addition to raising tuition and seeking private funding, they are finding more ways to make money on site via cafes, stores, child care centers, sustainability practices and programs (students support these and will help pay towards these through increased fees), business and industry partnerships, etc. (Rosenstone, 2004; Spanier, 2000).

Catalyst #2 for Change: Knowledge about Learning

Those few colleges and universities that have successfully embedded quality through all processes and focused on producing learning have been applying these learning principles, which have their roots in psychology, philosophy and sociology, for years. These principles involve viewing learning as an active construction of meaning from information and experience; developing strategies for goal achievement; metacognition; contextual (influenced by culture, technology and instructional methods), motivationally, emotionally, developmentally, socially and assessment-driven (American Psychological Association, 1997; Reynolds, 2006). Viewed thus, learning can not only be fun but stems from an internal locus of control rather than an external one, which is a shift in how educators have seen it. Stage, Muller, Kinzie & Simmons (1998) state that educational environments promoting social learning using elements such as peer teaching, group projects, practica, visual presentations, multiculturalism and use of the internet can empower all types of learners to help transform themselves and society. Such interactive methods are especially suited to how the Millennial Generation prefers to learn.

Until recently, this has been largely successfully practiced at the Master's and Doctorate level, where much of the learning is self-determined and self-assessed, as the student has every opportunity to become an expert life long learner. Unlike rote learning, knowledge of how to go about learning and assimilating it with existing knowledge is not forgotten. However, we need to be able apply much of what we know about learning much earlier than at this level e.g. K-12 and community college.

Barr & Tagg (1995) stated that experience, research and common sense have taught us that people learn at different rates and in different ways with different subjects, but our schools are still governed by time. It has been more about time spent learning rather than what or how much is learned. And although most educators recognize that students have different learning styles and that critical thinking should be embedded in all courses, there's little evidence to corroborate this and colleges tend to be more teacher-centered than learner-centered. Faculty and staff need training in identifying and addressing different learning styles, using technology effectively and assessing learning. In February, 2008 when Sandy Shugart, Valencia Community College's President, spoke at our college, he emphasized that anyone can learn anything, so students (employees too) really shouldn't be feeling that certain things are too difficult for them to learn e.g. Math.

Even though many community colleges have tended to be student-centered and try to provide life long learning opportunities, they haven't been as successful in producing evidence of that lifelong learning. The onus is now on two-year schools to demonstrate that they can play a significant role in the production of a skilled and well-rounded workforce.

Catalyst #3 for Change: Learning College Movement

Since the 1990's, community colleges have been undergoing a major shift in what they perceive to be their reason for existence, i.e. a much greater focus on learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995; O'Banion, 1998). The movement has been gathering momentum ever since, with the emphasis being less on individuals and more on anticipating and meeting social and economic needs. Communities have generally expressed satisfaction with their local two-year schools and supported them. This has made for slower rate of change for schools truly interested in becoming learning colleges. Higher Education's traditional instructional paradigm of the sage on the stage transferring knowledge to students has not undergone significant change for centuries. Although lectures are suitable for some learning and learners, other options such as project-based learning or using the students' creation of websites to promote collaborative learning are more suitable in other contexts. Also, competency certifications in collaboration with business and industry may be more desirable than traditional degrees at other times. The old paradigm needs to be more than tweaked; it needs to be discarded and replaced with a more efficient structure (influenced by business models), where all actions emanate from a learning focus not only within the classroom, but outside it as well and produce real learning—namely, learning how to learn for life.

The Learning College model was developed by Terry O'Banion (1997), an expert on community college issues. According to O'Banion, “the learning college places learning first and provides educational experiences for learners anyway, anyplace, anytime”. The model assumes that educational experiences are designed for the convenience of learners rather than for institutions and their staff. The model's six underlying principles are reflective of this philosophy. These principles are at the heart of the learning college. They refer to processes and structures that focus on the student. Essentially, O'Banion postulated a starting point for community colleges that wish to become learning colleges.

Much as technology is available anytime and anywhere, community colleges need to create places for learning, all the time and everywhere (LeRoy, Hummel, Brajevich & Smart, 2001). All employees have a role to play in creating a learning-centered culture and the impact on students and even employees is assessed by their growth as learners. Under this philosophy, the traditional classroom and teacher-student relationship is turned upside down, with greater attention to promoting retention and learner success. The focus is on the development of learning experiences around what the learner needs to know to be successful in the job market or for life in general.

Catalyst #4 for Change: A Required Mind Shift

Typically organizations of higher learning proceed with addressing one or more of the first three catalysts. They typically do this in a top-down fashion and not always strategically. One would speculate that if armed with these three catalysts, commitment to becoming a learning-centered organization would not be so difficult, however it is much easier said than done. Constrained by their archaic structures, institutions of higher education have generally been resistant to change and too slow to effect collaborative change. All employees need to be encouraged to help define how the college will address challenges using a learning-centered approach.

This Learning College journey and mind shift does take time and can't be accomplished in a top down fashion. Professional development needs to engage everyone. There

needs to be a collective commitment to the production of learning. Data should drive decision-making that focuses on improving learning. Classrooms not only should have connectivity, but also be conducive to a variety of small and large group interaction. Colleges need to be better prepared to respond quickly to today's and tomorrow's learners (Spanier, 2000).

O'Banion's (1997) four limitations of higher education as being time-bound, place-bound, bureaucracy-bound and role-bound constrict the creation of a learning-centered environment. This change is about risk-taking. Massive Institutional transformation is needed so that institutions are relevant, competitive, accessible and accountable providers of learning. All aspects of the college-strategic planning, budgeting, facilities, curricula, policy development, application of technology and support services should focus on effecting learning and the letting go of old mindsets e.g. less emphasis on credit hours, semester systems, in-seat time, etc. Based on cognitive psychology, changes in thinking precede behavioral changes. Thus, this mind shift is the fourth catalyst required for the real and lasting change that is needed.

Some Examples of Institutional Transformation

With all the tools at our fingertips, we need to embrace and facilitate this transformation. Institutions have the opportunity to truly become the leaders for learning. Since the 1990's, numerous community colleges have taken steps towards this goal. In 2000, the League for Innovation helped further the transformation of community colleges from teaching to learning institutions by selecting 12 innovative colleges as Vanguard Learning Colleges to serve as models for other schools in the areas of organizational culture, staff recruitment, technology, learning outcomes and under prepared students. Some of their experiences with Learning College implementation, as well as those of other colleges follow.

According to O'Banion (2007), these colleges have been struggling with new ways of thinking and how to change the traditional architecture of education. He offers five examples of how this change can occur. Firstly, O'Banion suggests we need to eliminate traditional departmental structures in favor of more collaborative and inter-disciplinary ones such as Cascadia Community College's. The college has been organizing its faculty and staff around four main learning outcomes. Secondly, traditional faculty loads are inefficient because they focus on faculty time rather than what and how students need to learn and impact innovations e.g. independent study, service learning, etc. The bias inherent in our historical grading system is the third necessary change because the focus needs to be on learning outcomes. A League for Innovation project involves working with 16 community colleges to embed learning outcomes within their structure. Accrediting bodies are also insisting on this, so institutions will have to comply with putting learning at their core. Fourthly, late registration is a practice that is out of synch with learning principles, as it is more about increasing enrollment and diminishes the importance of learning on those first days of class. Finally, being bound by hours spent learning instead of what is learned and how it is learned is ineffective. O'Banion suggests that we could use technology and entrance and exit competencies to become freer of such time constraints.

Valencia's President, Sandy Shugart spoke to our Learning Council and Learning for Leaders groups recently about the college's commitment to learning. He stressed that what works for them came out of years of engagement and courageous conversations,

so simple copying does not work. According to Dr. Shugart, people know you care about learning through your values, your realignment of resources and the types of risks you take. The focus is on results related to fully understanding the student experience and creating the best learning environment for everyone especially during the student's first 15 credit hours. This is accomplished through a "culture of inquiry" and constant assessment of learning, so it can be further improved. In addition to traditional methods of assessment such as retention and success, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, focus groups and other local surveys to facilitate decision-making are used. Several governing councils are utilized (e.g. budget and planning) versus one leadership council with a loaded agenda for all decision-making. He endorsed innovations such as short classes with flexible start times and hybrid courses. He appeared to have little tolerance for late registration and lack of rigor. Dr. Shugart addressed the importance of student and teacher responsibility, as well as everyone really caring about students and learning. This means providing full student services at all times, including good advising and the development of education plans for students.

Valencia strategically addressed learning by design and moved away from how student learning has traditionally been defined: taking a course, earning a degree and being in college. Likewise, in an essay by Bishop, Klinger & Nellis available on the college web site, employee learning could have been defined as working in college. The focus became what was learned and evidence of that learning. This involved definition of outcomes and standards, employment of learner-centered strategies, assessment and sharing of results to help promote accountability.

McPhail (2004), as the Chancellor of The Community College of Baltimore County, stated that only when every college employee (from the custodian to the President) embraces learning-centeredness, can it really come to life. The leadership needs to provide guidance in the form of a clear vision of learning-centeredness; however change will come both from the top down and the bottom up. McPhail further suggests that this vision can be thought of as the foundation of the structure necessary for change, a strategic plan as the framework and employees as the bricks that will complete the structure. He recommends a representative "think tank" with employees, trustees and students to lead the institution through its transformation. Also essential are collaborative and technology-based approaches that create many options for learning; a strong faculty-based committee focused on learning outcomes assessment and the linking of in the classroom and out of the classroom learning through collaboration amongst student development and academic personnel. This type of synergy is transformational.

Paradise Valley Community College began its journey to become a Learning College in 1997. Coming from a systems thinking approach, in 2001, the college realigned its organization to promote collaboration amongst units and increase organizational, as well as student learning with a deep commitment to learning at the core of its being (Bendotti, Dale & Shadburne, 2005). The focus became educating the whole student and producing learning both in and outside the classroom. Similarly, the emphasis was on the organizational learning where conversations about learning, innovation, collaboration and new thoughts on organizational effectiveness were encouraged. This collaboration across units was used to implement and improve key areas: First Year Experience, Learning Communities, Service Learning, Distance Learning (and its support), the SUCCEED Program, expanded high school bridge programs, instructional technology/media, Co-Curricular Student Clubs, outcomes assessment, leadership training and athletics.

In summary, this group of leading colleges has found the Learning College journey to be long, fraught with challenges and have realized that there remains a long way to travel as yet and one may never quite “get there”. The key to progress seems to lie in involving everyone, realigning resources to target learning, having anyone and everyone be able to learn, assessing learning and using that evidence of learning to further improve it.

Our College’s Learning College Journey

Our community college, Colorado Mountain College (CMC) had been an Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) school for several years when, after seeing examples of Learning Colleges, our leadership became convinced that Learning College tenets went hand-in-hand with doing AQIP. Largely ignoring the importance of stakeholder perceptions and their engagement with the process, we adopted a Learning College orientation in 2004 and “declared” ourselves a Learning College. Since then, numerous conversations have taken place regarding what a Learning College is and based on other schools’ experiences and how the journey for becoming a Learning College is long. But we embarked on that journey without a map. What exactly does it mean to declare ourselves a Learning College? Our internal and external stakeholders have been questioning “Isn’t learning what we have always done at colleges?” The Learning College philosophy laid out by O’Banion (1997) explicates a more elaborate approach to learning—one that is not so time, efficiency, place or role bound.

Personalizing Learning College principles has proved very challenging for us. Four years later, we’re still attempting to pinpoint our progress on this journey, with the majority of employees and other stakeholders still unsure of what it all means and, more importantly, their role in it all. Learning College tenets have not been consistently tied to the employee goal setting and evaluation process.

Last summer’s strategic planning session led to the advancement of Learning College becoming a College Wide goal for 2007-10, so it could be targeted directly and visibly until it becomes a more automatic part of how we do business. College Wide advancement of employee professional development is another goal and likely inextricably linked to our progressing as a Learning College. A Learning Council (much like the “think tank” recommended by McPhail, 2004) was formed to help address the more strategic implementation of Learning College, but student representation is still lacking. Thus, there appears to be much enthusiasm for directing resources towards furthering Learning College. As an AQIP school, the infrastructure for measuring effectiveness is largely in place; however our Learning College progress has really not been evaluated and since no group has really been addressing this, our efforts have been diffused. We really can’t provide good answers to O’Banion’s central questions: Are our actions promoting improved and expanded learning and how do we know that we are?

The Learning Council has recently tweaked our mission some more to better reflect our purpose within the Learning College context and the types of actions that are required to achieve that purpose. We have documented examples of behavior reflecting Learning College principles, mainly through an AQIP survey administered last year asking employees to provide examples of what they are doing to help students learn. In addition to holding college wide learning conversations, we administered an informal Learning College Inventory to the College leadership at our 2006 summer planning retreat. At that time, the collective opinion based on the conversations and the leadership was that although we have made some progress toward the ideal, we are far from realizing it and

we must continue to help all stakeholders better understand and use Learning College principles.

Albeit inconsistently, we have also tried to ask the two Learning College questions about whether we're learning at meetings (e.g. Board). Many of our faculty and staff have visited two exemplary colleges (Morraine Valley & Valencia Community College). We have also changed our language to better reflect learning (e.g. vision, mission, titles such as Chief Learning Officer); increased collaboration amongst Academic Services and Student Services to better address learning both inside and outside the classroom; focused on developing learning outcomes for courses as one of our AQIP projects; begun to improve how we implement First Year Experience and Early Alert type initiatives, distance learning and its support for learners; are in the process of an instructional restructure; implemented a leadership training program; increased cross-functional and cross-site collaboration; improved the representativeness of committees and have been working on improving our data collection and usage (e.g. CCSSE, Collegiate Learning Assessment, National Community College Benchmarks, Community & Graduate Surveys). Our heart appears to be in the right place with everything we do have in place, but we need to be more strategic with how we go about it.

In deference to the last four years of conversations and use of Learning College language, the need for engaging everyone and the role of thought in determining behavioral change, perhaps that time was needed to truly begin the necessary mind shift. The college now appears ready for greater involvement and collaborative action. The Learning Council feels it now needs to begin moving away from a focus on Learning College language to action.

The Impetus for the Current Research

Thus far, we seem to have made some progress, but we must continue to help all stakeholders understand their impact on learning. Becoming a learning college is a long and personalized journey for each college. This research examines the pitfalls and challenges involved in CMC's voyage towards a full embrace of learning college principles

The purpose of the current study was to provide empirical support for our Learning College progress and newly created Council by gathering data on where we are with employee knowledge, perceptions of behaviors and attitudes regarding Learning College and how we can proceed with improvements. We examined instruments available for assessing Learning College progress-primarily those available from League for Innovation (2000) and O'Banion (2003). The former is a Learning College Inventory that was developed to assess progress towards becoming more learning-centered and although it appears to be a statistically sound instrument and found useful by some colleges, it has generally been too cumbersome for widespread use. O'Banion's inventory was briefer and designed to gauge judgments of progress on the Learning College journey. Since O'Banion's work had been a focus of CMC for the past four years, we decided to use O'Banion's six Learning College principles to develop knowledge-related items; O'Banion's (2000) 14 challenges for colleges committed to becoming learning-centered to develop items related to perceptions of behavior and also a set of items regarding attitudes about becoming a Learning College. In addition, we developed four focus group questions reflecting these dimensions.

We felt the findings would interest college leadership and other stakeholders, as well as provide baseline data for issues which could be addressed for improvement by the Learning Council e.g. the increasing of understanding and involvement with respect to Learning College tenets. Although CMC employees are passionate about becoming a learning college, after three years, CMC has just begun to adapt learning-centered principles. We will need the help of all stakeholders as we continue on the road to truly becoming a learning college. The results from this study should promote the import of having direction and resources behind goals that are set and provide support for a more personalized and effective advancement of our Learning College journey.

Methodology

In light of where CMC appeared to be on its Learning College journey at this time, the current research can best be considered a 2 phase pilot. The study was approved by our IRB. Phase I involved the conduction of focus groups comprised of faculty, staff and students at each of our seven campuses and District Office during the last week of November and first week of December 2007. Our survey was designed to measure participants' knowledge of Learning College principles, their knowledge of CMC's institutional vision, their perceptions regarding CMC's progress towards becoming a Learning College and attitudes about CMC's intent to become a Learning College. Four focus group questions were also used to ascertain knowledge, attitudinal, and behavioral dimensions relevant for measuring CMC's progress towards becoming a Learning College. The questions guiding these focus group discussions reflected a force field analysis approach.

Data were collected during two-hour sessions. Seventy-three participants comprised of faculty, staff, administration and students (the majority of whom were selected by and from campuses) provided data in Phase I of this pilot study. Two of the presenters served as facilitators; the third as a recorder. An audio recorder was also used to record focus group responses. After arriving in the data collection context (typically a classroom or conference room), the participants were provided food and beverages while they completed a voluntary informed consent sheet (See Appendix A). An oral description of the consent form was provided which emphasized the anonymity and confidentiality of participant responses as well as the voluntary nature of the study.

After completing and submitting the consent form, participants provided written responses to a set of four open-ended questions for focus group discussion (See Appendix B). To increase the anonymity of the responses provided to these four questions, the participants were instructed to submit their responses face-down in a specified location and wait quietly until everyone had completed their four questions. Next, participants were provided a verbal description of four quantitative scales (see Appendix B) and given an opportunity to complete the survey. Upon completion of the survey, participants submitted their responses and were then provided the correct answers to items 1-16 on the survey. This component was designed to ensure that participants would have correct information regarding Learning College principles and CMC's institutional vision before engaging in the discussion. Participants' open-ended responses were returned to them and they were encouraged to participate in an audio-taped focus group discussion based on their responses.

A series of follow-up and probe questions were standardized for the four focus group items and were presented during strategic points therein by the moderator for the

discussion. Two researchers made notes regarding participant responses referencing features such as participants' tone, inflection, verbal emphases, and specific commentary provided during the discussion. Each focus group discussion lasted roughly 75 minutes. Following the discussion participants were debriefed and encouraged to avoid discussing the study with anyone until the data are presented in early March, 2008.

The exploratory results from this appear below including the themes from the written responses to the four open-ended questions, followed by the results for the quantitative survey items.

Based on results from Phase I, for Phase II of the pilot, only the quantitative items of the survey were utilized and adjusted so only the items related to knowledge of Learning College principles, perceptions of CMC's progress towards becoming a Learning College and attitudes about CMC becoming a Learning College were included. Because of the recent adjustments made to the vision and mission, the two items related to the vision were excluded. Then in February, 2008 an Informed Consent Form and link to the survey were administered via email to all employees college wide. A small incentive was offered for completing the survey. Forty employees responded to the survey. The analyses of the data from this administration are also presented below.

Results

Phase 1-a) Themes from Participants' Written Responses to Open-Ended Items:

Question #1: In your own words define what is meant by "Learning College?"

- Staff, faculty, administration & students all engaged and committed to continuous learning
- Focus is on student needs; student learning i.e. student-centered
- Diversity of learning styles considered and opportunities for all learners
- Don't really know
- Collaborative approach
- Student as having responsibility for learning too
- Evidence of learning is available

Question #2: Compared to what CMC is to you at present, what will CMC "look like when it has fully implemented the Learning College concept?"

- Success of students
- Engaged students
- Greater faculty collaboration, mentoring
- Policies & procedures reflective of Learning College
- Variety of learning opportunities for all types of learners
- More effective assessment of learning

Question #3: In your opinion, what would be some of the barriers that might prevent CMC from becoming a Learning College?

- Funding
- Resistance to change/fear of new approaches/buy-in
- Lack of a cohesive vision
- Lack of understanding about what Learning College is
- Lack of communication

Question #4: In your opinion, what elements of CMC will facilitate our becoming a Learning College?

- Professional Development for all
- Commitment to learning for all
- Improved communication
- Culture change
- Collaboration
- Strong leadership
- Small class sizes
- Excellent community

Audio tapes were made of the focus group discussions and are currently being transcribed. However, themes similar to those presented above emerged from the discussions as well. Employees were generally very engaged in the discussion and no major behavioral anomalies were noted, with the exception of a couple of participants who tried to refer to notes on Learning College while they were completing the survey. They were asked to put those notes away.

b) Quantitative Survey Items:

Questions 1-14: How knowledgeable are CMC employees regarding Learning College Principles?

The 73 participants were next asked to judge the accuracy or inaccuracy of 14 statements regarding Learning College principles. These statements were written so that they were either accurate or inaccurate. An item was judged as “correct” if participants designated a true statement regarding Learning College principles as “accurate” and an untrue statement regarding Learning College principles as “inaccurate.” The response list for the 14 items appears below:

- Q1- At Learning Colleges everyone has all the right answers all the time.** (70% n = 51 Correct)
- Q2- Learning Colleges create substantive change in individual learners.** (37% n = 27 Correct)
- Q3- In a Learning College the students are more knowledgeable than instructors about the topic being studied.** (34% n = 25 Correct)
- Q4- Learning Colleges engage learners as full partners in the learning process.** (74% n = 54 Correct)
- Q5- Learning Colleges create and offer as many options for learning as possible.** (64% n = 47 Correct)
- Q6- When making decisions in a Learning College, student, faculty, and staff expertise are more important than research data.** (11% n = 8 Correct)
- Q7- Learning Colleges operate under the assumption that individuals learn best on their own.** (41% n = 30 correct)
- Q8- It is presumed in a Learning College that learners learn best when their educational options are limited.** (77% n = 56 correct)
- Q9- Learning Colleges assist learners to participate in collaborative learning activities.** (55% n = 40 correct)
- Q10- Learning Colleges define the roles of instructors by the needs of the students.** (23% n = 17 correct)
- Q11- Learning Colleges can be successful without documenting learning for their learners.** (45% n = 33 correct)
- Q12- Learning Colleges assume that learners learn best when the instructor leads the**

- learning experience.** (18% n = 13 correct)
- Q13- **Learning Colleges define the roles of students by the needs of the instructors.**
(64% n = 47 correct)
- Q14- **Learning Colleges succeed only when learning can be documented for its learners.**
(19% n = 14 correct)

Participants in this phase had the least knowledge regarding the instructors being guided by the needs of students and the role of data and documentation in becoming Learning College. Based on the percentages correct answers for most items, overall, the extent of their knowledge regarding Learning College principles was far from ideal. This is especially surprising since it has been assumed that the six Learning College principles and O'banion's writings have been shared college wide since 2004.

Questions 15-16: Knowledge of CMC's Institutional Vision

Participants were then asked to identify CMC's institutional vision from a set of seven vision options. Forty five percent of the respondents (n = 33) knew what the CMC vision is and 32% (n=23) selected the tagline for the vision ("Learning for Life"). When asked to identify the correct statement from a list, 17 respondents (23%) knew that CMC changed its institutional vision five months ago. Nearly 50% of participants still thought the last vision change occurred in 2004. This was understandable, since the vision had been modified recently. Because we have yet to fully get the vision and mission out there in many forms, these two items were omitted from Phase II.

Questions 17-30: Perceptions of Progress Towards Becoming a Learning College

Where are we at in terms of our progress towards full implementation of Learning College principles at CMC? Questions 17-30 asked respondents to rate CMC's progress towards becoming a Learning College on scales of 1-5 with 1 = "mere discussion" and 5 = "fully practicing." The mean for the 14 items was 3.45 (SD = .24). The reliability for items was relatively high (Cronbach Alpha = .89). As indicated in the knowledge portion of the survey too, the respondents seemed to be least sure about CMC's progress with assessment of learning outcomes. For the response options frequencies for each item in this section of the survey see Appendix C.

Questions 31-40: What is CMC's Attitude Regarding the Learning College?

Next, participants were asked 10 Likert questions designed to gauge their attitudes regarding CMC and the institution's intent to become a Learning College. The participants expressed their agreement or disagreement with 10 statements. For simplifying the interpretability of the analyses, negatively valenced items were recoded so that on the scale of 1-5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), higher numbers indicated more positive feelings. To increase the scale's reliability, one item was deleted from the scale (question # 33, "CMC is already a Learning College."). The Reliability for the nine-item attitude scale was quite high (Cronbach Alpha = .88). The mean for the scale was 4.37 (SD = .64).

Phase II- *Questions 1-14: How knowledgeable are CMC employees regarding Learning College Principles?*

In order to get at respondent knowledge of Learning College principles, they were asked to judge the accuracy or inaccuracy of 14 statements regarding Learning College principles. These statements were written so that they were either accurate or inaccurate. An item was judged as “correct” if participants designated a true statement regarding Learning College principles as “accurate” and an untrue statement regarding Learning College principles as “inaccurate.” The response list of how the 40 participants responded for the 14 items appears below:

- Q1- **At Learning Colleges everyone has all the right answers all the time.** (75% n = 30 Correct)
- Q2- **Learning Colleges create substantive change in individual learners.** (38% n = 15 Correct)
- Q3- **In a Learning College the students are more knowledgeable than instructors about the topic being studied.** (45% n = 18 Correct)
- Q4- **Learning Colleges engage learners as full partners in the learning process.** (70% n = 28 Correct)
- Q5- **Learning Colleges create and offer as many options for learning as possible.** (74% n = 29 Correct)
- Q6- **When making decisions in a Learning College, student, faculty, and staff expertise are more important than research data.** (23% n = 9 Correct)
- Q7- **Learning Colleges operate under the assumption that individuals learn best on their own.** (48% n = 19 correct)
- Q8- **It is presumed in a Learning College that learners learn best when their educational options are limited.** (83% n = 33 correct)
- Q9- **Learning Colleges assist learners to participate in collaborative learning activities.** (73% n = 29 correct)
- Q10- **Learning Colleges define the roles of instructors by the needs of the students.** (23% n = 9 correct)
- Q11- **Learning Colleges can be successful without documenting learning for their learners.** (49% n = 19 correct)
- Q12- **Learning Colleges assume that learners learn best when the instructor leads the learning experience.** (46% n = 18 correct)
- Q13- **Learning Colleges define the roles of students by the needs of the instructors.** (73% n = 29 correct)
- Q14- **Learning Colleges succeed only when learning can be documented for its learners.** (28% n = 11 correct)

Despite the small sample, the pattern of responses was similar to that obtained in Phase I. However, because more of the respondents were from District Office which has greater access to college wide initiatives and leads them, these respondents generally appeared to be somewhat more knowledgeable about Learning College principles. Respondents in both phases had the least knowledge regarding the instructors being guided by the needs of students and the role of data and documentation in becoming Learning College.

Perceptions of Progress Towards Becoming a Learning College

Where are we at in terms of our progress towards full implementation of Learning College principles at CMC? Respondents were asked to rate CMC’s progress towards becoming a Learning College on scales of 1-5 with 1 = “mere discussion” and 5 = “fully practicing.” The mean for the 14 items was 3.41 (SD = 1.44). Although the mean was similar to Phase I, there was greater variability, perhaps because employees and students from the campuses comprised the majority of participants of Phase I and more

District Office personnel responded in Phase II. District Office employees have tended to have a more favorable perspective of college wide initiatives on other previous surveys. The reliability for items was relatively high (Cronbach Alpha = .83). As with Phase I and the knowledge portion of the survey, the respondents seemed to be least sure about CMC's progress with assessment of learning outcomes. For the response options frequencies for each item in this section of the survey see Appendix D.

What is CMC's Attitude Regarding the Learning College?

Participants were again asked 10 Likert questions designed to gauge their attitudes regarding CMC and the institution's intent to become a Learning College. The participants expressed their agreement or disagreement with 10 statements. For simplifying the interpretability of the analyses, negatively valenced items were recoded so that on the scale of 1-5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), higher numbers indicated more positive feelings. The Reliability for the ten-item attitude scale was high (Cronbach Alpha = .92). The mean for the scale was 4.10 (SD = .83). The pattern of responses was similar to that obtained in Phase I; perhaps it was a little more favorable because of more District Office respondents.

Conclusions

The results of this pilot study indicate that CMC is on a steep slope of the Learning curve relative to Learning College principles and our institutional vision. According to participant responses, our progress towards full implementation of Learning College principles at CMC is mentionable, but still far from ideal, with responses to Learning College related behaviors generally falling at the midpoint between mere discussion to being fully practiced. Although we have been working on improving our data collection and usage (e.g. CCSSE, Collegiate Learning Assessment, National Community College Benchmarks, Community & Graduate Surveys), there appears to be the most uncertainty regarding CMC's progress with assessment of learning outcomes. Despite lacking sufficient knowledge of Learning College principles, based on how engaged participants were in the discussions, CMC appears willing to support the institutional direction relative to full implementation of the Learning College concept. It was also apparent that we need to get the revised vision, mission and training about Learning College "out there".

The data will be used to refine the measurement instrument utilized herein and will be re-administered college wide. Based on input from the Learning Council and the group's initiatives survey items will be added and the instrument will be administered to a larger, more representative and random sample, so that exploratory factor analytic techniques can be applied. Largely due to the small sample size, that was not feasible here. Some employees have expressed that if we want more people to participate, it helps to have an extrinsic reward for completing this type of survey because we expect them to do a number of surveys each year. This is difficult due to budgetary concerns. The data will help chart our progress on our journey and ensure that we are still headed in the right direction by serving as a gauge of our progress for our knowledge, attitudes, and behavior relative to Learning College concepts.

As Sandy Shugart said we shouldn't just copy/paste what another college has had success with, however, their successes can guide us. So, it's important to create that atmosphere of inquiry he referred to and a culture of evidence will emerge. The excuse

frequently used is that sites serve different communities, which is true to some extent. And as Sandy also said we should be able to create differing conditions for learning if needed, but data from this pilot study suggest that when it comes to principles of college wide relevance such as learning-centeredness, more commonalities exist district wide as to what is desired than differences.

Numerous ideas for realizing Learning College principles were presented here and some of them are no brainers for any place of learning, but much like how individuals learn by constructing meaning, organizations need to create meaning for themselves. Our mind shift needs to be meaningful & unique to CMC. The data from this pilot study reflect that CMC is still working on shifting its mind set. Without this fourth catalyst, successfully addressing the challenges before us, application of learning theory and becoming a learning college is not possible. Thus far, our attempts at these first three catalysts have been half-baked too. We are just now beginning to more consistently implement powerful learning strategies such as First Year Experience, Learning Communities, Service Learning, Hybrid Courses and other student success initiatives like Early Alert. As suggested by Barr & Tagg, colleges (CMC included) don't always make efficient use of resources and could benefit from such tactics as outcomes-based funding and the retention of faculty based on students' learning outcomes. We have sense of what a Learning College could look like here from the focus group themes which are also supported by the literature ("Collaborative, everyone learns, has resources, training available, good communication, evidence of learning, etc."), but CMC will have to continue to go through its own growth pains on its personal journey. We are beginning to develop a map now and it will need to be a fluid one.

Student, faculty, staff and administrators could be thought of as a winning sports team, working collaboratively, skillfully & efficiently across disciplines and areas. CMC's focus on continuously learning how to produce more learning in everyone is in harmony with AQIP's focus on helping students learn. But it is important to remember that the mind shift and embedding of such quality does take time. There has been a general feeling at college wide gatherings that CMC is poised to go from "good to great" or from adolescence to adulthood. Hopefully, a new president will strategically, with the help of the Learning Council, help lead us in this direction as we continue on our learning college journey.

References

- American Psychological Association (APA). (1997 Revision). *Learner-centered Psychological principles: A framework for school redesign and reform*. Washington, DC: APA Presidential Task Force on Psychology and Education.
- Barr, R.B. & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 13-25.
- Bendotti, B., Dale, P. & Shadburne, M. (2005). *Lessons learned-Three years after a learning-centered organizational realignment*. Innovations 2005 Presentation, March 6th, 2005.
- Bishop, P. Klinger, C. & Nellis, P. *Strategic learning goal 4: Learning by design*. Retrieved January 1, 2008 from:
<http://www.valencia.cc.fl.us/lci/essayys/Goal4Essay.htm>
- Boggs, G.R. (2001). The meaning of scholarship in community colleges. *Community College Journal*, 12(1), 23-26.
- Gavin, D.A., Edmondson, A.C. & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(3), 109-116.
- League for Innovation in the Community College. (2000). *Learning College Inventory*.
- LeRoy, G., Hummel, T., Brajevich, L. & Smart, , G. (2001). Creating a place for learning: Everywhere, all the time. *Community College Journal*, 12(1), 8-11.
- McPhail, I.P. (2004). *Transformation of a college: From teaching to learning*. American Council for Education. Retrieved January 14, 2008 from:
<http://findarticles.com>.
- Morrison, J. (2003). U.S. Higher Education in transition. *On the Horizon*, 11(1), 6-10.
- O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- O'Banion, T. (2000). An inventory for learning-centered colleges. *Community College Journal*, August/September, 14-20.
- O'Banion, T. (2003). *A pit-stop on the journey to become a learning college: How far have we traveled?* Created for Use at Seminar V of the Learning College Project, Orlando, FL.
- O'Banion, T. (2007). Creating a new architecture for the learning college. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 31, 713-724.
- Reynolds, J. (2006). Learning-centered learning: A mindset shift for educators. *Inquiry*, 11(1), 55-64.

- Rosenstone, S.J. (2004). *Challenges facing higher education in America: Lessons and opportunities*. Paper presented at the University of Toronto Conference on Taking Public Universities Seriously, December 3rd, 2004.
- Shugart, S. (2008). *Learning College Presentation*, Guest Speaker, Colorado Mountain College, February 15th, 2008.
- Society of College and University Planning (SCUP, 2007). *Trends in higher education*, July 2007, 1-11.
- Spanier, G.B. (2000). *Five challenges facing higher education*. Executive Speeches, June 1st, 2000.
- Stage, F.K., Muller, P.A. Kinzie, J. & Simmons, A. (1998). *Creating learning-centered classrooms. What does learning theory have to say?* ERIC Digest., Washington, DC.

Appendix A

Colorado Mountain College

Research Study - Informed Consent Form

[Learning College Survey & Focus Group Study]

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to be in a research study designed to examine Colorado Mountain College faculty, staff, and administrators' views about Learning College principles and concepts. You were selected as a possible participant because you are employed by Colorado Mountain College and are qualified to provide your feedback and perspectives on a brief survey and to a list of selected focus group questions. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and the Department of Institutional Research at Colorado Mountain College.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this study is to examine Colorado Mountain College employees' perspectives on Learning College concepts and principles for the purposes of gauging and advancing Colorado Mountain College's progress as a Learning College.

PROCEDURES

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to participate in a brief survey that will be submitted anonymously. The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Following the survey you will be given a set of priming questions and asked to reflect upon your responses to those questions in a group discussion. The group discussion may last from 30-45 minutes. The entire group discussion will be audio taped.

RISKS/BENEFITS

This study has no known risks. Your survey responses will be anonymous and your audio taped conversation will be digitally and anonymously transcribed with qualitative data analysis software. The benefits of participation include lunch and a brief educational presentation regarding Learning College concepts. You will be informed about the results and applications of this study once all the data are compiled, analyzed, and written up for a report.

ANONYMITY/CONFIDENTIALITY

All survey data collected in this study are anonymous and therefore confidential. The audio taped discussion will not be anonymous but the contents will remain

confidential. In other words, the researchers will know your particular contributions to the discussion but all the records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in password secure databases and only the researchers will have access to the records.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY

Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with Colorado Mountain College in any form or fashion. Your participation is completely voluntary.

FUNDING SOURCES

This study is being funded by the Departments of Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research at Colorado Mountain College.

CONTACTS AND QUESTIONS

The researchers conducting this study are Don Turk, Ph. D. (Director of Institutional Research – x 8528), Meeta Goel, Ph. D. (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness – x 8534); Veneeya Kinion (Institutional Research Analyst – x 8526); Kendra Carpenter (Institutional Research Analyst – x8515) Barbara Johnson (Institutional Research Analyst Assistant – x8527). If you have any questions you may call any of the researchers and have your questions answered before you begin the survey and/or after you have completed the study.

For your records we recommend that you retain one copy of this form before you begin the survey. Please sign the top copy and turn it in to the researchers. Keep the second copy for yourself.

Name_____
Date_____

Signed_____

Appendix B

In your own words, define what is meant by “Learning College.”

Compared to what CMC is to you at present, what will CMC “look like” when it has fully implemented the Learning College concept?

In your opinion, what would be some of the barriers that might prevent CMC from becoming a Learning College?

In your opinion, what elements of CMC will facilitate our becoming a Learning College?

BEFORE COMPLETING THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ON THIS SURVEY, PLEASE TURN IN THIS PAGE TO THE RESEARCHERS.

On the items below please circle the number on the scale that indicates how accurately the statement reflects the principles of a “Learning College.”

1. At Learning Colleges everyone has all the right answers all the time.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

2. Learning Colleges create substantive change in individual learners.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

3. In a Learning College the students are more knowledgeable than instructors about the topic being studied.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

4. Learning Colleges engage learners as full partners in the learning process.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

5. Learning Colleges create and offer as many options for learning as possible.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

6. When making decisions in a Learning College, student, faculty, and staff expertise are more important than research data.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

7. Learning Colleges operate under the assumption that individuals learn best on their own.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

8. It is presumed in a Learning College that learners learn best when their educational options are limited.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

9. Learning Colleges assist learners to participate in collaborative learning activities.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

10. Learning Colleges define the roles of instructors by the needs of the students.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

11. Learning Colleges can be successful without documenting learning for their learners.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

12. Learning Colleges assume that learners learn best when the instructor leads the learning experience.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

13. Learning Colleges define the roles of students by the needs of the instructors.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

14. Learning Colleges succeed only when learning can be documented for its learners.

Completely Inaccurate					Completely Accurate
1	2	3	4	5	

15. From the list below, please circle the letter next to the statement (A-H) most accurately representing Colorado Mountain College's institutional Vision:

- A. Learning for Life
- B. An innovative leader among community colleges, Colorado Mountain College is creating a community of learners where everyone teaches and everyone learns.
- C. Colorado Mountain College will be a world class leader in lifelong learning
- D. Leading through Learning
- E. Colorado Mountain College will create a culture of leaders committed to providing an excellent educational experience for our communities
- F. Lifelong Learning
- G. Colorado Mountain College will be a national leader in learning amongst community colleges
- H. Lifelong Learning Through Leading

16. One statement from the list below is true. Please circle the letter next to the statement that is true:

- a. Colorado Mountain College has had the same institutional vision since its inception in 1967.
- b. Colorado Mountain College changed its institutional vision 20 years ago.
- c. Colorado Mountain College changed its institutional vision 10 years ago.
- d. Colorado Mountain College changed its institutional vision 3 years ago.
- e. Colorado Mountain College changed its institutional vision five months ago.

Institutions attempting to implement Learning College concepts usually vary in degrees of progress towards full implementation of concepts versus mere discussion or talk about changing. In the scale below we would like for you to read the statement and rate CMC's progress towards fully practicing that statement on the scale of "1 = Mere Discussion" and "5 = Fully Practicing." If you feel that you do not have sufficient knowledge about CMC or the Learning College concept to answer the item, please place a check mark in the box labeled "Not sure."

17. CMC embraces an institutional vision and mission that reflects Learning College principles.

Mere Discussion					Fully Practicing	Not sure
1	2	3	4	5		<input type="radio"/>

18. CMC hires faculty and staff that embrace Learning College principles.

Mere Discussion					Fully Practicing	Not sure
1	2	3	4	5		<input type="radio"/>

19. Learning outcomes that are consistent with Learning College principles have been developed for all courses at CMC.

Mere Discussion					Fully Practicing	Not sure
1	2	3	4	5		<input type="radio"/>

20. CMC assesses learning outcomes in a way that is consistent with Learning College principles.

Mere Discussion					Fully Practicing	Not sure
1	2	3	4	5		<input type="radio"/>

In the following items indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number:

31. CMC should become a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

32. CMC does not need to be a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

33. CMC already is a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

34. Becoming a Learning College is not appropriate for CMC.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

35. Becoming a Learning College is the best thing that CMC could do for itself.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

36. I am strongly committed to assisting CMC in its progress towards becoming a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

37. I want no part in helping CMC become a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

38. If it were up to me, CMC would forget about becoming a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

39. CMC should not count on me helping it become a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

40. I couldn't care less if CMC ever becomes a Learning College.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

17. CMC embraces an institutional vision and mission that reflects Learning College principles.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	3	4.1	4.1	4.1
2	12	16.4	16.4	20.5
3	30	41.1	41.1	61.6
4	20	27.4	27.4	89.0
5 Fully Practicing	3	4.1	4.1	93.2
Not Sure	5	6.8	6.8	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

18. CMC hires faculty and staff that embrace Learning College principles.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	3	4.1	4.1	4.1
2	16	21.9	21.9	26.0
3	22	30.1	30.1	56.2
4	20	27.4	27.4	83.6
5 Fully Practicing	4	5.5	5.5	89.0
Not Sure	8	11.0	11.0	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

19. Learning outcomes that are consistent with Learning College principles have been developed for all courses at CMC.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	12	16.4	16.4	16.4
2	25	34.2	34.2	50.7
3	10	13.7	13.7	64.4
4	9	12.3	12.3	76.7
5 Fully Practicing	1	1.4	1.4	78.1
Not Sure	16	21.9	21.9	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

20. CMC assesses learning outcomes in a way that is consistent with Learning College principles.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	4	5.5	5.5	5.5
2	18	24.7	24.7	30.1
3	18	24.7	24.7	54.8
4	9	12.3	12.3	67.1
5 Fully Practicing	3	4.1	4.1	71.2
Not Sure	21	28.8	28.8	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

21. Job descriptions and mechanisms of evaluation for faculty and staff at CMC reflect Learning College principles.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	6	8.2	8.2	8.2
2	15	20.5	20.5	28.8
3	26	35.6	35.6	64.4
4	13	17.8	17.8	82.2
5 Fully Practicing	3	4.1	4.1	86.3
Not Sure	10	13.7	13.7	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

22. CMC provides a variety of learning options that are consistent with Learning College principles.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	2	2.7	2.7	2.7
2	10	13.7	13.7	16.4
3	25	34.2	34.2	50.7
4	27	37.0	37.0	87.7
5 Fully Practicing	4	5.5	5.5	93.2
Not Sure	5	6.8	6.8	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

23. CMC utilizes a collaborative approach in developing policies, procedures and programs consistent with Learning College principles.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Mere Discussion	7	9.6	9.7	9.7
	2	14	19.2	19.4	29.2
	3	19	26.0	26.4	55.6
	4	21	28.8	29.2	84.7
	5 Fully Practicing	5	6.8	6.9	91.7
	Not Sure	6	8.2	8.3	100.0
	Total	72	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.4		
Total		73	100.0		

24. CMC offers orientation opportunities for its students that reflect Learning College principles.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Mere Discussion	4	5.5	5.5	5.5
	2	14	19.2	19.2	24.7
	3	21	28.8	28.8	53.4
	4	14	19.2	19.2	72.6
	5 Fully Practicing	5	6.8	6.8	79.5
	Not Sure	15	20.5	20.5	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	100.0	

25. CMC's learning technologies effectively utilize Learning College principles

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	14	19.2	19.4	19.4
	3	24	32.9	33.3	52.8
	4	21	28.8	29.2	81.9
	5 Fully Practicing	4	5.5	5.6	87.5
	Not Sure	9	12.3	12.5	100.0
	Total	72	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.4		
Total		73	100.0		

26. CMC allocates its institutional resources in ways that promote progress towards becoming Learning College.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	3	4.1	4.1	4.1
2	14	19.2	19.2	23.3
3	23	31.5	31.5	54.8
4	19	26.0	26.0	80.8
5 Fully Practicing	4	5.5	5.5	86.3
Not Sure	10	13.7	13.7	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

27. The culture of CMC is conducive to progressing as a Learning College.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	3	4.1	4.1	4.1
2	9	12.3	12.3	16.4
3	13	17.8	17.8	34.2
4	36	49.3	49.3	83.6
5 Fully Practicing	8	11.0	11.0	94.5
Not Sure	4	5.5	5.5	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

28. CMC has communicated clearly to its employees the roles that each will have in becoming a Learning College.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	18	24.7	24.7	24.7
2	21	28.8	28.8	53.4
3	15	20.5	20.5	74.0
4	7	9.6	9.6	83.6
5 Fully Practicing	2	2.7	2.7	86.3
Not Sure	10	13.7	13.7	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

29. CMC talks openly and comfortably about its progress towards becoming a Learning College.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 Mere Discussion	7	9.6	9.6	9.6
2	5	6.8	6.8	16.4
3	22	30.1	30.1	46.6
4	23	31.5	31.5	78.1
5 Fully Practicing	11	15.1	15.1	93.2
Not Sure	5	6.8	6.8	100.0
Total	73	100.0	100.0	

30. CMC trains its employees to understand and implement Learning College principles.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Mere Discussion	15	20.5	20.5	20.5
	2	22	30.1	30.1	50.7
	3	15	20.5	20.5	71.2
	4	7	9.6	9.6	80.8
	5 Fully Practicing	4	5.5	5.5	86.3
	Not Sure	10	13.7	13.7	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	100.0	

Appendix D

Item #	1- mere discussion	2	3	4	5- fully practiced	6- not sure	Responses	Mean	SD
1	2	5	15	14	3	1	40	3.35	1.05
2	2	5	12	11	4	6	40	3.7	1.38
3	4	8	11	6	2	9	40	3.53	1.66
4	1	6	8	11	1	13	40	4.1	1.55
5	8	6	13	6	2	4	39	3	1.52
6	2	5	11	16	5	1	40	3.5	1.11
7	9	2	10	12	5	2	40	3.2	1.49
8	3	8	7	7	3	12	40	3.88	1.73
9	2	5	6	11	3	12	39	4.13	1.58
10	6	3	14	8	1	8	40	3.48	1.62
11	4	3	10	12	6	4	39	3.64	1.4
12	11	13	10	3	3	0	40	2.35	1.19
13	5	7	9	9	8	2	40	3.35	1.44
14	13	10	7	7	1	2	40	2.48	1.43