

## **Funding first-year courses in Residential Learning Communities (RLCs)**

\* **NOTE:** Two exceptions:

- a) courses taught in the Honors College
- b) courses taught as part of learning communities that for the most part aim to enroll students from just a single college (e.g. Dean's Signature programs in CAS)

### ***Guiding Principles***

1. In the interest of equity, roughly the same amount of money will be made available to the RLCs on a per student basis. The precise formula needs to be worked out. The distribution of money could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student. To achieve this equity, there must be some method of pooling the money that is generated via algorithm 1.
2. In the interest of equity, we must ensure that no degree-granting college (Responsibility Centers in IBB-speak; hereafter RCs) gets a disproportionate share of available revenue. An RLC that enrolls more students would necessarily still draw in more total \$\$\$. But even in this case, the revenue generated following algorithm 1 should be used by a sponsoring college only to pay for the costs associated with sponsoring an RLC. In short, the revenue should not be drawn off by a RC in support of other college needs.
3. Besides equity in itself, the funding model aims to guarantee that every RLC effectively has a dedicated source of revenue. That said, any RLC that fails to attract students in sufficient numbers might be disbanded.
4. We aim to avoid a "one-size fits all" concept for the RLCs. We expect that students would choose to enroll based on personal interest.
5. We assume that certain activities or programs offered through the currently operational RLCs would be of benefit to all students (though precisely how to identify these is to be determined). The funding for these should fall under some "general programming" model (most likely run through Residential Life).
6. For the time being, RLCs are being imagined primarily in terms of their residential organization (students living in dorm-based communities). That means the curricular element is best understood as co-curricular (or perhaps more akin to PE courses).
7. To be discussed: making some of the revenue available to the undergraduate degree-granting colleges in support of other initiatives with similar recruiting and retention goals: e.g. academic-, career-, or peer-advising—perhaps through some UVM 001 model as suggested by the student member of the FPPC

... require ALL students to take a 1 credit course that combines elements of the advising center, career hub, internships coordinator, wellness environment/living well etc.

“College 101” if you will. That way it would be more equitable and the students who need these various services most would be “caught in the net cast wider” so to speak. Taking money from this venture (and perhaps dipping into other pots) would benefit not only students but also the efforts of faculty + staff. An incredible tool for the Provost’s favorite words “recruiting & retention” directed at all the things students need to be academically successful in their college career. The course I took at Elon [student started there and transferred to UVM] was somewhat like this, perhaps UVM could take the lead and combine elements of this with some of the wellness environment & career center stuff: <https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/koenigsberger-learning-center/elon-101/>