11-30-2016

Creating Communities of Engaged Learners: An Analysis of a First-Year Inquiry Seminar

Michael J. Stebleton
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, steb0004@umn.edu

Rashne Jehangir
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, jehan001@umn.edu

Creating Communities of Engaged Learners: An Analysis of a First-Year Inquiry Seminar

Abstract

This *Practices from the Field* article describes the rationale and operationalization of an interdisciplinary team-taught first-year inquiry seminar and learning community program at a large predominantly White research institution. The authors both serve as faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development and teach in the program. This initiative is unique in that we employ a micro-learning community model with students and faculty teaching teams within a single course.

Using the frameworks of high-impact and effective educational practices (Kuh, 2008), the authors describe the seminar and the selected practices that are intentionally integrated into the curriculum (e.g., common book, writing intensive, experiences with diversity, and others). We discuss specific pedagogical practices and course activities, including use of iPad in design of small group projects. Another feature of this curriculum is its focus on engaging all students, including a growing number of first-generation and immigrant students, comprising approximately 40% of the entering class.

Additionally, we include assessment data based on student survey responses focused on key practices. Discussion and implications conclude the article where we provide recommendations for higher education professionals and student affairs practitioners who are involved in learning community initiatives.

Overview of Purpose and Objectives

Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) defined *student engagement* in higher education contexts as a contract that involves two elements: "what the student does and what the institution does" (p. 413). In recent years, educators at both two- and four-year institutions have implemented a wide range of initiatives in order to intentionally engage undergraduate students, both academically and socially, primarily during the critical first year (Jackson, Stebleton, & Laanan, 2013; Koch, Griffin, & Barefoot, 2014; Love, 2012). The effectiveness of first-year experience initiatives in higher education—including first-year seminars and learning communities—is well-documented in the scholarly literature (Clark & Cundiff, 2011; Conte, 2015; Fink & Inkelas, 2015; Jehangir, 2010; Jessup-Anger, 2015; Matthews, Smith, & MacGregor, 2012; Stebleton & Nownes, 2011; Tampke & Durodoye, 2013).

The purpose of this *Practices from the Field* article is to describe and analyze a first-year inquiry (FYI) seminar and learning community program at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. The program is a "micro-learning community" model with student cohorts and faculty-led teaching teams within a single course. In other words, both the students and faculty members are involved in learning communities. Our program is currently housed in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), and we (the authors) are both faculty members in the college. Like many first-year initiatives, this program deliberately integrates high-impact practices and educationally effective teaching and learning practices (Kuh, 2008; Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013). Our first-year experience (FYE) model encompasses two semesters for all incoming students. In the spring semester, we offer traditional linked learning community courses. The Fall first-year inquiry 4-credit course is unique, and it differs from the Washington Center definition of learning communities because we do not employ a structure of linked courses in the curriculum for incoming students[1]. However, our work grows directly out of the Washington Center's mission and represents an iteration of the Washington Center's definition that fits with the CEHD curriculum and institutional mission (E. Lardner, personal communication, May 31, 2016).

For the micro-learning community, our goal is to create a community of scholars with a strong commitment to multicultural curriculum and pedagogy that supports holistic student development (Schoem, 2005). This article is divided into three main sections: (a) descriptions of the target student population and specific curricular first-year initiatives, including pedagogical approaches; (b) an analysis of student outcomes based on selected educational practices; and (c) implications and directions for future practice for comparable first-year programs. Two features that contribute to the uniqueness of our first-year program are: the focus on a project-based learning assignment that involves the use of the iPad through a college-wide borrowing program; and attention to curriculum and pedagogy that fosters the social and academic engagement of all students—including

---

[1]Learning Community Designs. http://evergreen.edu/washingtoncenter/new-era-lcs/designs.html

historically underserved students that comprise over 40 percent of the incoming student body in CEHD. A significant number of admitted students are the first in their family to go to college (i.e., first-generation status) and many of them come from immigrant and refugee communities. Specific examples of assignments used by faculty members will be shared, and the focus will be on student learning and engagement as a result of participation in the community.

High-Impact Practices and Effective Educational Practices

Kuh (2008) discussed the value of high-impact practices for student engagement, especially in terms of their positive influence on first-generation students and other historically underserved populations. These high-impact opportunities include: first-year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative projects, service learning, global learning, and capstone projects, among others (Kuh, 2016). As Kuh noted, these experiences tend to positively impact most undergraduate students, but there is a disproportionately large benefit for historically underserved students. In other words, there is a compensatory effect (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Whereas outcomes on high-impact practices have been largely anecdotal, recent scholarly work by Kilgo, Sheets, and Pascarella (2015) offered longitudinal data on the positive impact of these activities on students' learning.

Much has been written about effective teaching and learning in higher education, including the impact of deep learning and other successful practices (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005). Additionally, recent work continues to explore the physical conditions or ecology that leads to optimal learning environments for diverse students, including first-year students (Strange & Banning, 2015; Stebleton, 2011). In this article, we opted to use to the work of Kuh and O'Donnell (2013) on educationally effective practices across a variety of high-impact activities to frame our analysis of the FYI program at our home institution. Educationally effective practices (both inside and outside the classroom) engage students intellectually in new and innovative ways, including:

- Experiences set at appropriately high levels;
- Significant investment of time and effort (by both students and faculty);
- Public demonstration of competence;
- Relevance through real-world application;
- Interactions with peers and faculty;
- Experiences with diversity;
- Structured opportunities for reflection and integration;
- Frequent and constructive feedback

In the remaining sections of this paper, we will describe our Fall semester FYI multidisciplinary team-taught course and articulate how we incorporated several of these high-impact activities and educationally effective practices into the curriculum. We will share student evaluations as well as implications based on these results.

Overview and Description of the Institution, College, and Students

The University of Minnesota-Twin Cities is a large four-year, public research institution offering over 140 majors across 17 degree-granting colleges and schools. As of Fall 2016, the university had a total enrollment of approximately 51,600 students; of that total 30,975 students were undergraduates. Among undergraduate students, 69.1% are White; 5.2% are African American; 1.3% are American Indian, 3.4% are Hispanic; 10.9% are Asian, .3% are Hawaiian, 9% are International, and .7% unknown. Approximately 48.3% of undergraduates are male and 51.6% are female. Approximately 90% are enrolled full-time; 8% of undergraduates are over the age of 25. About 88% of first-year students live in campus housing, approximately 25% are first-generation students, and 27% are Pell grant recipients. During Fall 2016, there were 487 first-year students in the College of Education and Human Development, representing approximately 9.5% of the institution's 5,111 undergraduate first-year students. The total number of all undergraduates in CEHD is 2,437 as of Fall 2016; approximately 31% are students of color.

Each fall semester all first-year entering CEHD students enroll in the FYI course. There are nine majors offered within the college. CEHD is a diverse college within a predominately white institution overall. Approximately 40% of the fall incoming students identify as students of color. Over 50% of the Class of 2020 are first-generation students and many identify as foreign-born or second-generation immigrant students; additionally, 32% are enrolled in the federally funded TRIO Student Support Services Program. The Twin Cities area has one of the largest East African immigrant populations outside of Africa as well as the largest Hmong population in the United States. Many students continue to arrive as refugees to Minnesota with their families, and CEHD attracts many of these recently arrived students. The entering ACT average for incoming CEHD students is 24. Largely because of first-year initiatives over the previous eight years, the overall first-year retention rate for CEHD was 95.6% in 2013—the second highest among the seven first-year student admitting colleges at the university. Given the growing diversity of CEHD and shifts in admissions policies, we knew that a coordinated first-year program was required to meet the needs of our students.

Providing a Historical Context: Rationale for Seminar

The design and rationale of this FYE program was driven by two issues: (a) a major university re-structuring of CEHD in 2005-2006 that brought an interdisciplinary group of faculty to the college; (b) and the admittance of first-year students to CEHD that had previously only admitted enrolled juniors, seniors, and graduate students. CEHD became a first-year admitting college with the most diverse incoming class of undergraduates at the university, and the merger also brought two undergraduate majors to CEHD. This re-structuring also prompted a revised and renewed mission with a focus on local, national,

and global engagement across the lifespan. These structural changes created a window of opportunity to design and implement a first-year program that would serve as a common intellectual experience for all incoming students entering the college. During the fall semester, we create and deliver the FYI course. In the spring term of the first-year, students are required to participate in a thematically linked learning community offering.

Description of the Seminar and Effective Practices Integrated

CEHD's first-year experience (FYE) program serves over 450 students each year. This case study addresses the format of the program since its inception in 2008 through 2015 with specific attention to the Fall semester curriculum. Although the FYE program offers year-long required curriculum for all CEHD first-year students, each fall semester, all students enroll in one of five cohort sections of a First Year Inquiry Course that is team-taught; this is one aspect of the "micro-learning community." The second component of the community is comprised of the faculty members who meet regularly to create and revise curriculum on a yearly basis. A guiding question that drives curriculum development for the FYE is: "How can one person make a difference?"

This case will focus on the centerpiece of this FYE, a 4-credit course titled, *First-Year Inquiry (FYI): Multidisciplinary Ways of Knowing*. Drawing from a multi-disciplinary approach, the FYI course is team-taught by faculty and instructional staff. Two course objectives guide the curriculum development: focus on appreciation of differences and the development of strong written and verbal communication skills. All FYI classes share the following common features: small class size (N= approximately 25-27 students); a common book; writing intensive focus; discussion-based classes; and a core iPad project. Each class is taught by two faculty members who co-designed the curriculum around the theme of making a difference. These faculty members work in dyads on curriculum development and team-teach in the classroom once a week. There are typically five iterations of the FYI class offered, each with teams of two faculty members coordinating curriculum and pedagogy. In addition, faculty for all five iterations come together to select a common book that drives curriculum across all FYI classes. As such, there are learning communities of faculty in dyads but also as a larger group.

All faculty members adopt and integrate curriculum and texts through the lenses of equity, diversity, and social justice. The class meets three times per week for 75 minutes. Twice a week, students meet in small discussion sections with one instructor. On Fridays, all of the students within a given section (typically 75-115 students) gather for a larger class meeting led by both instructors who co-facilitate the class. These Friday sessions also incorporate activities such as guest speakers, field trips, films, and faculty-student writing conferences. The course design focuses on several educationally effective practices. In the following sections, we will describe the program and curriculum in detail, and then highlight these practices for which we have measurable assessment data.

Seminar and Faculty Involvement

The communities are comprised of faculty members who represent different academic disciplines. Drawing upon their disciplinary expertise, the faculty members co-develop, implement, and lead the FYI course. Each seminar section has its own theme, and the faculty members structure the curriculum around the cohort theme. For example, one of the thematic sections taught by a mathematician and a social scientist is titled, *Hunger Games: Ethics and Unfairness in the Arena*. Using the book and film series as a framework, the instructors integrate social sciences and mathematical thinking to explore issues of injustice across a range of institutional systems (e.g., higher education, criminal justice and law enforcement, and housing, among others). A second section, *Stories as Game Changers: Understanding Critical Moments,* was designed by faculty in the humanities and social sciences, and uses readings in history, sociology, and literature to explore powerful events and experiences of people and communities to consider the reasons for storytelling. One way in in which this design might differ from other seminars is that it is content and discipline-based (Gore, Metz, Alexander, Hitch, & Landry, 2004). Intentionally embedded into the pedagogy is scaffolded attention to analysis in reading, discussion, and writing—as well as cultivating a classroom community (Lardner & Malnarich, 2008; Palmer, 2011).

Pedagogical Practices and Course Activities

The design of the FYI affords students discussion-based learning in small seminar-sized classrooms twice a week, while also providing experience in a larger group of 100 students on Fridays. Given that the FYI is a university-designated writing intensive course, all sections engage in both formal and informal writing with opportunities for revision and individual conferences with the faculty member. Some of the instructors have formal training in composition and literary studies; others have a common understanding of writing standards, including extensive experiences teaching writing intensive courses for the college across disciplines. The common book anchors each FYI section and creates a common intellectual experience for all first-year students; a key objective is to both challenge *and* support students, pushing them to critically think in new ways (Stebleton, 2016). Additionally, the curriculum includes a visit by the author of the text and a panel of local experts that engage students and faculty in application of the issues addressed in the book to our community. The common book selection has sought to engage students and faculty in the study of issues of equity and social justice locally and globally. Examples of some of the common books are: *An Ordinary Man* by Paul Rusesabagina, which takes up the genocide in Rwanda, and *The Latehomecomer* by Kao Kalia Yang, a memoir about the Hmong immigrant experience. Most recently, the fall of 2016 cohort read and analyzed *Just Mercy* by attorney Bryan Stevenson, a story that focuses on social injustices in the criminal justice system. Serving as an additional

common intellectual experience, all students and faculty visit the Minneapolis Museum of Arts (MIA) for tours where they view and analyze art pieces that tie to main themes from the common book (Hailey, 2014; Yenawine & Miller, 2014). In recent years, the MIA has adopted the designated common book as part of a shared common experience, bridging the gap between university and the larger metropolitan community.

Most classes are situated in active learning classrooms which facilitate a collaborative environment and assignments that focus on multi-disciplinary inquiry in small teams around controversial issues of social justice, equity, and action. The writing intensive nature of the course as well as focus on collaborative projects with diverse peers around issues of equity are intentional mediums to practice and engage in educationally effective practices. Some of these group assignments have included action research projects, oral history interviews, as well as digital stories and short documentary films created on the iPad. The CEHD iPad initiative described below gives context to intentional use of this technology in pedagogy.

iPad Project: A Unique Feature

The iPad initiative is a cornerstone of CEHD's FYE program, and the corresponding classroom activities involve much effort on behalf of faculty members and other support structures, such as the instructional design team. The iPad initiative started in Fall 2010 with monies provided from an outside donor. The Dean of the college decided to pilot the iPad program in an effort to infuse digital technology into the FYE program. Moreover, this feature contributed to the objectives of promoting a "common intellectual experience" – another key high-impact practice. All students received an iPad during welcome week and faculty members implemented its use into the existing curriculum. In subsequent years, an iPad digital project was required for all sections. The primary goal was for students to use the iPad to enhance their learning around the construction of a class project, for example—a digital story or narrative that related to some course concept or theme. Projects focused on either individually-led initiatives or small group collaborations. For example, in one FYI section, the students worked in collaborative teams to create documentary short films about an untold story in our community using only the iPad (Jehangir & Madyun, 2016). In another section, the iPad was used in a neighborhood analysis project where student teams visited designated neighborhoods in the Twin Cities over the length of the semester and explored an issue or current need, such as food insecurity, poverty, access to health care, gentrification, and crime.

Assessment: Feedback from Students

Utilizing several surveys of the FYI program, we aimed to assess students' experiences around high-impact practices (collaborative projects, common intellectual experiences, among others), and we focused assessments around the iPad initiative. We did not have access to a comparison group, as all CEHD students were required to enroll in the FYI. The results indicated that the majority of students responded favorably to the survey items that corresponded to these practices. Students were last surveyed in Fall 2014 (n = 385) after the completion of the FYI course. Approximately 88% of students indicated that after completing the FYI course, "I feel I have improved my skill level and ability to figure out how to work with a group to complete an important assignment." Over 90% of students indicated that they improved on the ability "to negotiate differences to succeed as a group." Approximately 92% of students indicated that they improved their skill level and ability to "connect course content to real world situations." Since our FYI is a writing intensive course, students receive frequent and constructive feedback on projects. Over 92% of students responded that they enhanced their ability "to engage in a writing process to improve or revise a writing assignment." Similarly, approximately 95% of students indicated that they enhanced their ability "to figure out what steps to take to complete writing assignments."

The iPad collaborative project requires students to work as a group to create a final project that focuses on a critical issue related to a central theme (e.g., *American dream*, social justice). Demonstrating digital literacy skills is only one objective of the project. More importantly, students need to work collectively around concepts that are grounded in real-world applications. Because the iPad initiative is centrally integrated into the FYI, we also conducted surveys to assess and evaluate the benefits of this program.

The most recent iPad survey was conducted during 2013-2014 using the Fall 2013 cohort (n=434). The results indicate that students used the iPads for a variety of purposes and tended to benefit from their use. For example, 74% of students responded positively to the question that read: "if you used video and audio recording on your iPad for any course assignments, do you feel it allowed you to communicate your ideas more effectively?" This was an encouraging finding given that most instructors required a project using the iPad and related technology (e.g., iMovie, Voice recorder).

While a majority of students (55%) stated that their use of the iPad impacted their active participation in class, only 30% indicated that the use of the iPad helped to develop connections with their instructors. In some cases, the iPads in the classroom may have impeded greater interaction with instructors and peers (e.g., 46% of students indicated that iPad use "did NOT impact my engagement in my classes"). Overall, students seemed to indicate that the iPad contributed to their learning. For example, approximately 65% stated that the use of the iPad gave them more ways to demonstrate what they learned, and 67% reported that they believed that an iPad was important to their learning.

Issues of accessibility to technology are vital to the success of this program. Access to the iPad seemed to impact TRIO students (more likely first-generation, low-income) more favorably than non-TRIO students. For example, 61% of TRIO students responded favorably to the question regarding "how did use of the iPad impact your active participation in class" (vs. 46% non-TRIO students). In sum, the overall benefits of the iPad program to both students (across diverse backgrounds) and faculty members have been positive and encouraging—and we intend to continue the iPad initiative in our teaching.

Discussion and Implications

The feedback from students provides positive support for the program moving forward. The cornerstones of the program—frequent faculty-student interaction, writing intensive, collaborative projects, and experiences with diversity—will continue to guide the initiative. The iPad component, bolstered by positive student evaluations, will be sustained for the foreseeable future as many students and faculty members gain digital literacy skills through a collaborative learning project. Although there tends to be strong commitment in this faculty learning community, the collective energy that is exhausted in new curriculum development each year is of critical concern to faculty sustainability.

Because of staffing changes and recent restructuring, the college will be faced with the challenge of recruiting new faculty members into the program. We are also currently exploring a two-year cycle for the common book which will allow for a more sustainable curriculum. Recently, we decided to use *Just Mercy* for two years, which includes a visit by author Bryan Stevenson in year two (Fall 2017). Given the demands of the course (e.g., writing intensive, heavy grading component, individual student conferences), the FYI is viewed as a major time commitment. Our goal is to encourage collective ownership of the program, replacing the general attitude that our work belongs to a select group of faculty members. The ongoing success of this initiative will largely depend on institutional support that attends to our work as an incentive-oriented faculty development opportunity.

Although this case study analysis represents only one institution, there are some general implications and recommendations for higher education professionals involved in the implementation of learning communities and first-year seminars. First, garner support from all levels of administration, including key stakeholders such as Deans and program directors. Again, successful FYE programs tend to include full commitment from participants.

Second, identify several key goals related to high-impact and educationally effective practices, and strive to structure and deliver a curriculum to meet those objectives. Avoid an unorganized, scatter approach to planning, hoping that any number of initiatives might directly impact students. Not all programs will include all practices; instead, identify the most important ones and strive to meet those goals.

Third, aim to create and deliver curriculum towards the needs of historically underserved student populations (including first-generation students), acknowledging that high-impact practices (e.g., writing intensive, use of a common book, diverse curriculum) will likely impact students from these populations most significantly (Jehangir, Stebleton, & Deenanath, 2015). In CEHD, this effort was supported by regular collaboration with the TRIO Student Support Services Program and their advisors as well as the integration of educationally effective practices.

Finally, acknowledge that ongoing change and transition is inevitable. Successful and sustainable programs will weather institutional changes (e.g., funding cuts, department closures, and changes in leadership roles) and persist— ideally evolving and improving in quality throughout the process. As higher education professionals and student affairs practitioners, it is vital to invest in this process of continual improvement.

Conclusion

Ultimately, fostering the engagement of our students during this critical first year is paramount. If *student engagement* truly involves a mutual contract between the academic institution and the student, then we as educators need to do our share of the diligent work required. Moreover, we contend that the onus lies on faculty members, first-year program directors, and other institutional leaders to create and deliver strong teaching and learning experiences during the critical first year. For higher educational professionals across all levels, we need to engage in innovative initiatives, including new learning community configurations such as the micro-learning community described, that will support and foster student development. In turn, this commitment and collaboration will inevitably lead to engaged communities of students who persist successfully towards graduation and beyond.

References

Clark, M. H. & Cundiff, N. L. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of a college freshman seminar using propensity score adjustments. *Research in Higher Education*. 52(6), 616-639doi: 10.1007/s11161-010-9208-x.

Conte, S. (2015). Learning community literature: Annotated bibliography. *New Directions for Student Services, 149*, 91-100. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/ss.20120.

Fink, J. E., & Inkelas, K. K. (2015). A history of learning communities within American higher education. *New Directions for Student Services, 149*, 5-15. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/ss.20113.

Gore, P., Metz, A., Alexander, C., Hitch, J., & Landry, J. (2004). Assessing the short-term career goals of first-year business students. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition, 16*(2), 67-84.

Hailey, D. (2014). Visual thinking, art, and university teaching across disciplines. *About Campus, 19*(4), 9-16. doi: 10.1002/abc.21163

Jackson, D. L., Stebleton, M.J., & Laanan, F.S. (2013). The experience of community college faculty involved in a learning community program. *Community College Review, 41*(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1177/0091552112473145

Jehangir, R. R. (2010). *Higher education and first-generation students: Cultivating community, voice, and place for the new majority*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jehangir, R. Madyun, N. (2016). In production: Using iPads to tell stories through documentary film. *International HETL Review*, *6*(4), Retrieved from: https://www.hetl.org/in-production-using-ipads-to-tell-stories-through-documentary-film/

Jehangir, R. R., Stebleton, M. J., & Deenanath, V. (2015). *An exploration of intersecting identities of first-generation, low-income college students* (Research Report No. 5). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Jessup-Anger, J. E. (2015). Theoretical foundations of learning communities. *New Directions for Student Services, 149*, 17-27. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/ss.20114.

Kilgo, C.A., Sheets, J. K. E., & Pascarella, E. T. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: Some longitudinal evidence. *Higher Education, 69*(4), 509-525.

Koch, S. S., Griffin, B. Q., & Barefoot, B. O. (2014). *National Survey of Student Success Initiatives at Two-Year Colleges*. Brevard, NC: John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kuh, G. D. (2016). Some thoughts about doing the right thing in uncertain times. *Journal of College and Character, 17*(4), 213-222. doi: 10.1080/2194587X.2016.1230761.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., & Whitt, E.J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., & O'Donnell, K. (2013). *Ensuring quality and taking high-impact practices to scale.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Lardner, E., & Malnarich, G. (2008). A new era in learning: Why the pedagogy of intentional integration matters. *Change, 40*(4), 30-37.

Love, A. G. (2012). The growth and current state of learning communities in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 132*, 5-18. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/tl.20032.

Matthews, R. S., Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. (2012). The evolution of learning communities: A retrospective. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning, 132*, 99-111. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/tl.20039.

Palmer, P.J. (2011). Higher education and habits of the heart: Restoring democracy's infrastructure. *Journal of College and Character, 12*(3), 1-6. doi: 10.2202/1940-1639.1823.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schoem, D. (2005). Modeling a diverse and democratic America: The Michigan community scholars program. *About Campus, 10*(5), 18-23. doi: 10.1002/abc.144.

Stebleton, M. J. (2011). Understanding immigrant college students: Applying a developmental ecology framework to the practice of academic advising. *NACADA Journal, 31*(1), 42-54.

Stebleton, M. J., & Nownes, N. (2011). Writing and the world of work: An integrative learning community model at a two-year institution. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 41*(2), 76-86.

Stebleton, M. J. (2016). Challenging students to become reasonable adventurers. *About Campus, 21*(4), 14-21. doi: 10.1002/abc.21246

Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2015). *Designing for learning: Creating campus environments for student success* (2ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tampke, D. R., Durodoye, R. (2013). Improving academic success for undecided students: A first-year seminar/learning community approach. *Learning Communities Research and Practice, 1*(2), Article 3. Available at: http://washingtoncenter.evergreen.edu/lcrpjournal/vol1/iss2/3

Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to

understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(4), 407-428.

Yenawine, P., & Miller, A. (2014). Visual thinking, images, and learning in college. *About Campus, 19*(4), 2-8. doi: 10.1002/abc.21162