

Learning-to-Learn Camps: Their History and Development

Daniel K. Apple¹, Wade Ellis, Jr.², and Denna Hintze²

Abstract

For most Process Educators, there is an “always already” quality to the concept of learning to learn; it is an idea we tend to take for granted as we realize its potential in our classrooms by incorporating things like learning skills into our teaching. We understand that learning itself consists of myriad skills that can be improved, leading to improved learning for our students. Pacific Crest’s work with learning to learn, especially as it led to the creation of the Learning-to-Learn Camps, is offered here from a historical perspective. This record also serves as a testament to one of the core concepts of Process Education: that every learner can learn to learn better, regardless of current level of achievement; one’s potential is not limited by current ability.

Introduction

Pacific Crest’s interest in the concept of *learning how to learn* began nearly 30 years ago with the introduction of a software package, POINT FIVE (later renamed PC:SOLVE), to the college market. Dan Apple, the president and founder of Pacific Crest, recalls,

We persuaded colleges to purchase a site license for this problem-solving language by having 20 to 40 students team up and complete a series of learning challenges with examples from across the curriculum. During these demonstrations, faculty saw how their students could improve not just the amount of knowledge they constructed but their actual learning performance. The students did this by improving skills in the areas of information processing, thinking, problem solving, communication, teamwork, self-management, leadership, and managing their emotions.

These demonstrations were repeated hundreds of times and it became apparent that student learning behaviors, skills, and deficits were quite similar, across disciplines and even ages, for college-aged students.

In 1989, Pacific Crest carried out a very enlightening set of demonstrations at 22 different colleges that included a highly selective college, a women’s college, a business school, an engineering school, several research universities, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive state colleges. At each of these demonstrations, students were placed in four teams based upon how many years of college they had completed; the teams were formed into groups of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The teams were then tasked with a learning performance challenge.

Dan shares the usual outcome of these demonstrations:

By the end of the 60-to-90-minute demonstration of each team’s learning performance, the audience, which consisted of faculty members and administrators, had become very agitated as they realized that the learning performances of the seniors were no stronger than those of the freshmen. Though the seniors might have had more facts at their disposal and *knew* more, they had no greater facility in learning than did the freshmen. It was evident that if learning were to be improved, someone needed to teach students to learn *how to learn*.

Focus on Learning to Learn

By 1990, Pacific Crest was very interested in helping students learn how to learn and in helping faculty teach learning how to learn. Three major tacks were taken to realize these goals: helping to articulate and define Process Education as an educational philosophy, creating a curriculum supporting learning to learn, and finding a way to model the process of learning to learn with students in a way that would allow faculty to participate and learn how to teach learning skills.

Process Education

In 1990, Pacific Crest teamed up with IBM and SUNY Training Center to sponsor Problem-Solving across the Curriculum, a national conference that continued for seven years. During these conferences, the investigation into learning to learn continued with presentations and workshops focused on the concept. In the very first keynote session, the conference attendees performed an analysis of time spent on “doing,” “learning,” and “learning to learn.” This

¹ Pacific Crest

¹ Educational Consultant

analysis helped produce a consensus at the conference that very little time (less than two percent) was spent on learning how to learn. Over the years during which this conference was held, the community members expressed a desire for a label for this learning-to-learn approach and the educational philosophy it implied (Apple, personal recollection, 2014). In 1994, Apple and Lawrence delivered a paper titled, *Education as a Process*, at the International Conference on Teaching and Learning at University of Maryland University College. Thus was Process Education born as a philosophy of education (Apple & Lawrence, 1994).

Learning-to-Learn Curricula

In 1990, Pacific Crest began to publish student curricula that incorporated learning to learn in active learning materials. The first publication, *Problem Solving*, was a small activities booklet designed to help students improve their problem-solving performance. In 1992, Pacific Crest collaborated with 20 different educators to create and then publish its first formal learning-to-learn resource called *Learning through Problem Solving* (Apple, Beyerlein, & Schlesinger, 2002). The Learning Process Methodology (LPM) made its first appearance here, together with activities focused on problem solving, self-assessment, and critical thinking (Pacific Crest, 2014a). The goal was for learners to use the book to help them improve their performance in learning and problem solving by improving a set of learning skills. This book led to two additional products, *Foundations of Problem Solving* (Myrvaagnes, 1996) and *Foundations of Learning* (Baehr & Krumsieg, 1996).

As time went by, the learning-to-learn curricula were improved and diversified. Notable innovations include,

- Advancement in *Foundations of Learning* (Redfield & Lawrence, 2009) and *Learning to Learn: Becoming a Self-Grower* (Apple, Morgan, & Hintze, 2013), leading to curriculum delivered in different formats
- *Creating a Student Success Toolbox* reflective journal to grow learning performance (Carroll, Beyerlein, Ford, & Apple, 1996)
- Producing first-year Process Education curriculum for disciplinary courses (Hanson, 1996)

Faculty Development and Focus

In their work with educators and students, employees at Pacific Crest were often privy to conversations among frustrated faculty and staff. Dan recounts,

It was typical to hear faculty talking about “these students” not belonging at “our college.” What they meant were students who weren’t prepared and weren’t yet at the level the faculty expected them to be...but it seemed to me, as I watched our interventions with students and how quickly they could learn to learn, that “these students,” about whom the faculty lamented, were really just students whom the faculty didn’t know how to make successful...the faculty didn’t know how to effectively empower them. It is striking that these conversations were indistinguishable across colleges and disciplines.

At the same time, it became apparent that the 2-to-3-hour student-focused learning-to-learn experiences Pacific Crest was offering not only caught the attention of faculty; these sessions also seemed to excite and inspire them to begin to change their mindsets and seek to improve their teaching practices with respect to creating success with students. In its involvement with the members and leaders of the National Association of Developmental Educators (NADE), Pacific Crest discovered that, more than anything else, educators needed support (coaching and mentoring), resources (curriculum and tools), and processes (professional development) to help them empower students. Since many of the developmental education courses had completion rates of less than 50 percent, Pacific Crest placed more focus on these courses and the faculty who taught them. But this was no less true for other courses; faculty could help to bridge the gap between failure and success for many of their students if they had the appropriate training and tools to help them help their students learn how to learn.

As with the curricula, what Pacific Crest offered to faculty in the form of professional development classes continued to evolve and improve, eventually leading to a catalog that offered more than 22 different professional development institutes and workshops.

The First Camp

The impetus for the first Learning-to-Learn Camp (LLC) came from an opportunity in Scranton, Pennsylvania in 1994, for Pacific Crest to work with approximately 20 foster children in the local Catholic diocese who were temporarily without foster parents. Dan Apple was given a week (9 a.m. to 4 p.m., daily) to work with them on a series of different activities in a computer room at Lackawanna College. The goal was to ascertain whether engaging learning-to-learn experiences designed to improve a child’s self-image and confidence would have a

significant impact on teenage wards of the state. This was an eye-opening experience for Dan, the children involved, the diocese, and the president of Lackawanna College. As a result, both Dan and the president of the college were motivated to put in place a “Learning-to-Learn Camp” the next summer with the help of a small grant from the North Star Project in Philadelphia.

The first week-long camp was held in the summer of 1995 at Keystone College outside of Scranton because Lackawanna College had no housing. The participants consisted of 24 students, all 13 to 15 years of age, living in housing projects. 12 were from Philadelphia, and 12 were from Scranton; it was a group of 18 girls and 6 boys. During the five days of the camp, the staff of 10 faculty members learned a great deal about the participants. Of the 24 children, there had been

- 4 recent deaths of immediate family members
- 6 recent hospitalizations of an immediate family member
- 18 cases of prior sexual abuse

Dan shares,

The more we learned, the more we were motivated to make this experience as transformational as possible...so many of these kids were caught in a cycle of violence and abuse and it needed to stop. They needed to be empowered to stop it. We had seen first-hand that learning to learn isn't confined to the academic classroom...that if self-image and self-efficacy aren't addressed in underperforming students, the changes are just superficial and temporary.

As a result of the experience and what they observed, a majority of the camp facilitators and coaches became strong participants and leaders in the Process Education movement.

The Evolution of the Camps

Table 1 lists the top 11 landmarks in advancing the Learning-to-Learn Camps over the last 19 years.

In 1996, St. Augustine's University, with a pilot of 130 volunteer incoming students, led to the implementation of the Learning Communities Program and Pacific Crest's largest Learning-to-Learn Camp to date (it included all

Table 1 Landmarks in the History of the Learning-to-Learn Camp

Landmark	Year(s)	Camp Location
Curriculum based on <i>Foundations of Learning</i> 1 st edition	1996	St. Augustine's University
Integration of the LLC as the foundation of a year-long student success program for incoming first-year students (Kuskokwim website, 2014)	1996–1999	St. Augustine's University Univ. Alaska – CRA
Incorporation of the <i>Learning Assessment Journal</i> (for metacognitive/learning awareness and promoting the practice of self-assessment)	2000	Sinclair Community College
Integration of a formal professional development process for faculty (the LLC as a hands-on laboratory for faculty to practice, train, and mentor)	2000	Madison Area Technical College (MATC)
Train-the-Trainer-Model (as a process for creating future facilitators)	2001	MATC
Incorporation of the <i>Life Vision Portfolio</i> (to help participants begin developing a supporting and sustaining life vision)	2001	MATC
Focus on self-growth as part of the LLC curricula (setting goals, self-assessment and a self-growth paper)	2004	University of the District of Columbia
Content-focused LLC (Calculus LLC; eventually also Algebra and Smart Grid LLCs)	2009	Buffalo State University
Recovery model LLC (nursing students who had failed out of the nursing program)	2009	Hinds Community College
Addressing the needs of high-performing (honor) students (focused on the research process and scholarly writing)	2010	Grand Valley State University
Varied the length of camp to meet host requirements (affirming that a proportional percentage of outcomes could be achieved in 1, 2, or 3 days)	2010–2014	Cerritos College, Lamar University, Nassau Community College

450 incoming students). The learning communities in this camp took the *Foundations of Learning* course in the fall. This resulted in a first-year retention improvement of 9 percentage points.

This approach was eminently transferable; Kuskokwim Campus of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks and College of Rural Alaska took the same approach in 1999 with their Native American rural population and experienced even greater success with what they termed their Emerging Scholars Program (still functioning and successful as of 2014).

Pacific Crest saw the impact the LLC had on faculty and added a formal professional development focus at Madison Area Technical College's (MATC) second camp, using a Train-the-Trainer model, which became a key component of MATC's professional development program.

During the next few years a formal reflective and self-assessment process and the *Life Vision Portfolio* were added, and the Process Education model of a self-grower and the use of a self-growth paper were incorporated.

Pacific Crest continued to innovate with the Learning-to-Learn Camps, adding a specific disciplinary content focus for the first time in 2009. This was an LLC focused on calculus; later camps focused on algebra, and Smart Grid. In total, Pacific Crest has held 15 different STEM-oriented camps.

Pacific Crest also worked with varied groups of participants including middle schoolers, high schoolers, traditional entering 18-year-old freshmen, and non-traditional college students (with a median age of 45 years). Learning-to-Learn Camps were conducted at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), with Native American students, honor students, Job Corps participants, engineering students, and inner-city students in Washington, D.C. and New York City. Learning-to-Learn Camps have been held in 14 different states.

Some of the camps were used as an admissions requirement, some as a required part of the recovery process for students to regain admission into a program, some as part of an equalizing process, and still others as a college readiness experience.

Based upon unique situations and requirements, Learning-to-Learn Camps, typically 5-day experiences, have been conducted in 1-, 2-, 3-, and 4-day formats. There was even a 6-week, half-days program for job readiness development for 90 students in Washington, D.C.

Current innovations include:

- Conversion of the LLC into a 1-credit course appropriate for all incoming college students (using

Learning to Learn: Becoming a Self-Grower as the course text)

- Conversion of the LLC into a course for all 9th graders at a high school
- Development of an online certificate for Teaching Learning to Learn to fully support faculty teaching a learning-to-learn course or coaching at an LLC

While the innovations represented by the landmarks in Table 1 were in direct response to specific challenges and contexts of student populations, the majority of LLC innovations can be captured by a summary list of contexts across which variation can occur in the LLC:

1. **Age of Learner** (middle school, high school, traditional-age college, non-traditional age college)
2. **Ethnic and Economic Background of Participants** [Native American, urban African American, diverse first-generation international, Hispanic, southern rural African American, southern rural white, upper middle class (all races)]
3. **Purpose** (recovery from failure, emerging scholars, entrance requirement, Scholar's Institute for honor students, bridge program)
4. **Motivation** (self-selective, requirement for attending college/program, readmission, special additive, paid training, course credit)
5. **Location/Institution** (rural, inner city, universities, colleges, community colleges, or high schools)
6. **Content** (research practice, college readiness, calculus, algebra, Smart Grid, nursing, engineering, job skills)
7. **Staffing** (ratio variation from 2 staff/1 student to 20 staff/1 student; paid to volunteer, one-time to multiple camps for training-the-trainer experience)

Current Design

By 2005, Pacific Crest had developed a formal course design document that defined the overall outcomes, including behavioral changes and learning outcomes that the camp sought to affect, and the means by which the camp accomplished these. The end design was essentially an application of the performance principles of Process Education (Beyerlein, Schlesinger, & Apple, 2007) and implemented a majority of the scholarship represented by the *Faculty Guidebook* (Beyerlein, Holmes, & Apple, 2007). The design includes the anticipated learner transformations, clear expectations for the students, and the requirements for success. The targeted transformations, each of which is addressed by one or more learning activities (Table 2), include:

1. Increased learning to the degree that individuals meet learning challenges in half the time of previous attempts
2. Significant increase in self-efficacy and self-esteem
3. The ability to appreciate and use methodologies
4. Observable desire for self-growth realized through the practice of self-assessment
5. A powerful life vision and development of a life plan to realize that vision
6. Willingness to take risks and appreciate failure as a productive pathway to success
7. Increase in self-regulation, self-motivation, and ownership of learning
8. Learning to perform effectively and successfully while being evaluated
9. Increased teamwork skills and experience as an effective member of a learning community
10. Significant gains in metacognition/self-awareness

These transformations are effected by means of the typical LLC agenda (see Table 2). In these camps, students participate in 30 learning activities and 6 contests, and they

write 40 pages of reflective and self-assessment content, 60 pages of critical thinking responses, 25 pages of a Life Vision, and a 4-page self-growth paper. They have 350 pages of reading to accomplish with the expectation that they will complete reading logs before each class. They participate in an active teamwork learning experience during each activity, compete as part of a team, and experience bonding with a team and a larger community (Armstrong, Anderson, & Nancarrow, 2007).

The majority of participants quickly find themselves outside their comfort zones with numerous failures and empowering successes resulting from these failures. Students are mentored by faculty within their learning teams and learning communities, and through consistent discoveries start realizing that there is virtually no limit to who they can become and what they can achieve. They take control of their learning and life to achieve their life vision. These experiences are not only carefully designed; their impact and results are documented by the camp participants themselves (Pacific Crest, 2014b; 2014c).

Summary Logistics

Since 1995, Pacific Crest has held Learning-to-Learn Camps with a total of 3,000 students, achieving an overall

Table 2 Typical Agenda for a Learning-to-Learn Camp

Day	Activity	Theme
1	Building Learning Communities (FOL 1.1)	communities/teamwork
	Orientation/Expectations	self-efficacy
	Becoming a Self-Grower (FOL 7.1)	self-efficacy
	Mathematics Skills (recurring)	learning to learn
	Analyzing the Course Syllabus (FOL 1.2)	self-efficacy
	Pictionary® (recurring)	communities/teamwork
	Exploring Team Roles (FOL 12.1)	communities/teamwork
	Using a Reading Log (FOL 3.1)	learning to learn
	Analyzing the Learning Process Methodology (FOL 4.1)	learning to learn
	<i>Student Success Toolbox</i>	self-assessment/self-growth
	Learning Community Time (recurring)	communities/teamwork
Student Council (Faculty Assessment) (recurring)	self-assessment/self-growth	
2	<i>Student Handbook</i> (FOL 6.2)	communities/teamwork
	Exploring the Assessment Methodology (FOL 13.1)	self-assessment/self-growth
	Applying the Learning Process Methodology (FOL 4.2)	learning to learn
	Charades (recurring)	communities
	Practicing the Reading Methodology (FOL 3.2)	metacognition/methodologies
	Analyzing the Problem-Solving Methodology (FOL 5.1)	metacognition/methodologies

Table 2 Typical Agenda for a Learning-to-Learn Camp (continued)

Day	Activity	Theme
2 con't	Time Management (FOL 9.1)	self-efficacy
	SII and Self-Assessment	self-assessment/self-growth
3	Developing an Educational Plan (FOL 6.3)	self-efficacy
	Planning for Success	self-assessment/self-growth
	Personal Development Methodology (FOL 7.2)	metacognition/methodologies
	Creating a Life Vision Portfolio (FOL 2.1)	self-efficacy
	Applying the Writing Methodology (FOL 11.1)	metacognition/methodologies
	Information Processing Methodology (FOL 8.1)	exploring methodologies
	Self-Assessment of Progress	self-assessment/self-growth
4	Assessing and Revising (FOL 11.2)	self-assessment/self-growth
	Academic Honesty (FOL 10.1)	self-efficacy
	Team Design Competition/Team Roles (FOL 12.3)	communities/teamwork
	Metacognition (L2L SG: Experience 11)	learning to learn
	Reading for Learning (L2LSG: Experience 10)	learning to learn
	Applying the Problem-Solving Methodology (FOL 5.2)	metacognition/methodologies
	Self-Growth Paper (FOL 14.1)	self-efficacy
5	Contests: Math, Writing, Problem Solving, Speech	self-efficacy, self-assessment/growth
	Talent Show	communities/teamwork
	Awards Ceremony	communities/teamwork

FOL = *Foundations of Learning* 4th edition L2LSG = *Learning to Learn: Becoming a Self-Grower* 1st edition

Note: Residential camps have three more activities on each of the first four days

Table 3 Key Outcomes Achieved by Learning-to-Learn Camps

Institution	Challenge	Result
St. Augustine's University	Increase 1 st year retention	9% increase in 1 st -year retention over 3 years
University of Alaska Fairbanks, College of Rural AK	Increase 1 st year retention	1 st -year success increase (15% to 73%)
Grand Valley State University	Strengthen scholarly performance	5 placed in top 12 at graduation (of 200)
Hinds Community College	Produce success in students who had previously failed the program	67% now practicing nurses (following year: 69% practicing nurses)
Hinds Community College	Underprepared STEM majors (ACT 15 –19) transferring to 4-year colleges in 2 years	50% transferred to 4-year STEM programs within 2 years
Grand Valley State University	Increase 1 st year retention of Freshmen Academy Students	1 st -year retention: 88% (among those who completed camp) 70% (among those who didn't complete camp) 82% (among the general student population)
Stony Brook University	Entrance requirement	100% of participants passed and entered Stony Brook University
Lincoln University	Entrance requirement	95% passed (52)

pass rate of 95% of participants. While individual results are available in the Comprehensive List of Camps (Table 4), key outcomes are offered in Table 3.

NOTE: The authors are aware of five colleges that are currently running their own versions of the Learning-to-Learn Camps, while other colleges have integrated the experience into their first-year programming.

Future Work

While this paper serves as a record of how the Learning-to-Learn Camps came to be and have been conducted

by Pacific Crest since 1995, there is a great deal of work still to be done, especially in the area of tracking and quantifying the longer-term results of increased learning to learn through the camp experience. We have included what results we have been able to establish and verify, but the bulk of the feedback we receive tends to be in the form of personal testimony and the gratitude of parents and students. As affirming and rewarding as the sentiments they share may be, they stand only as testament to changes in and for an individual. Tracking long-term impacts for groups of camp participants is one of our current challenges, the results of which we hope to share in future.

References

- Armstrong, R. C., Anderson, K., & Nancarrow, C. (2007). Learning-to-learn camps. In S. W. Beyerlein, C. Holmes, & D. K. Apple, (Eds.), *Faculty guidebook: A comprehensive tool for improving faculty performance* (4th ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Apple, D., & Lawrence, B. (1994). Education as a process. Proceedings of the 1994 ICTCM Conference. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Apple, D., Morgan, J., & Hintze, D. (2013). *Learning to learn: Becoming a self-grower*. Hampton, NH: Pacific Crest.
- Apple, D. K., Beyerlein, S., & Schlesinger, M. (1992). *Learning through problem solving*. Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Baehr, M., & Krumsieg, K. (1996). *Foundations of learning* (1st ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Beyerlein, S. W., Holmes, C. & Apple, D. K. (Eds.). (2007). *Faculty guidebook: A comprehensive tool for improving faculty performance* (4th ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Beyerlein, S. W., Schlesinger, M., & Apple, D. K. (2007). Introduction to process education. In S. W. Beyerlein, C. Holmes, & D. K. Apple (Eds.), *Faculty guidebook: A comprehensive tool for improving faculty performance* (4th ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Carroll, S., Beyerlein, S., Ford, M., & Apple, D. (1996). *The Learning Assessment Journal as a tool for structured reflection in Process Education*. Presented at the 26th Annual Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE). November 6, 1996. Salt Lake City, UT: IEEE
- Hanson, D. M. (1996). *Foundations of chemistry: Applying POGIL principles*. Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Marcoulides, G. A., & Marcoulides, L. (1987, August). A review of point five: An analysis and modeling system. *ACM SIGSMALL/PC Notes*, 13(3), 24-27. New York: ACM doi: 10.1145/36324.36328
- Mettauer, J. (2002). *Life vision portfolio*. Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Myrvaagnes, E., (with Brooks, P., Carroll, S., Smith, P., & Wolf, P.). (1999). *Foundations of problem solving*. Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest
- Pacific Crest. (2014a). About us. Retrieved from http://pcrest.com/PC/AboutUs/about_pop.htm
- Pacific Crest. (2014b). *Course design for the learning-to-learn camp*. Retrieved from http://www.learningtolearncamp.com/LLC_course_design_2015.pdf
- Pacific Crest. (2014c). *Learning-to-Learn Camp: In their words*. Retrieved from <http://www.pcrest3.com/lc/words2014.htm>
- Redfield, K., & Lawrence, B. H. (2009). *Foundations of learning* (4th ed.) Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.

Table 4 Comprehensive List of Pacific Crest-Facilitated Learning-to-Learn Camps

* The standard Learning-to-Learn Camp is five days in length, though an additional half-day is usual for a residential camp. In a residential camp, the participants are housed in a dormitory and camp activities typically continue as late as 9 p.m. In a commuter camp, participants simply attend the camp during the day (returning home each evening) and activities are generally finished by 5 p.m.

Year	Month	Length	College / Host	State	Participants No.	Participants Description	Residential or Commuter	Camp Focus	Results / Outcomes	Innovations / Notes
1995	Aug	5	Lackawanna College	PA	24	Children from housing projects ages 13-15	R		96% passed	Use of a Reflection Journal
1996	Jul	5	William Penn University	IA	20	At-risk students	R			Use of an outside facilitator
	Aug	5.5	St. Augustine's University	NC	130	Volunteer 1 st -year students	R		First Fulbright scholar	Use of <i>Foundations of Learning</i> and the Learning Process Methodology
1997	Aug	5.5	St. Augustine's University	NC	450	All 1 st -year students	R		9% increase in 1 st -year retention over 3 years	Scaled up previous camp to incorporate entire 1 st -year class
1998	Jun	5	Bronx Community College	NY	45	Upward Bound ages 13-17	C	Mathematics	All participants passed	First worked with STEM UP Program (integration of STEM pathways into schools)
	Aug	5.5	St. Augustine's University	NC	450	All 1 st -year students	R		9% increase in 1 st -year retention	Foundations of Learning Community Program
1999	Aug	5	Madison Area Technical College (MATC)	WI	60	Current failed students	C			<i>Life Vision Portfolio</i> ; 1 st of 14 annual Learning-to-Learn Camps
	Aug	5	MATC	WI	60	At-risk incoming students	C			Added Faculty Academy in spring
2000	Aug	5	Sinclair Community College	OH	50	At-risk incoming students	C		88% 1 st -year retention (was 20%) 95% persisted to 2 nd year	"At-risk" students identified
	Sept	5	University of Alaska Fairbanks, Kuskokwim Campus, College of Rural Alaska	AK	22	All 1 st -year students	R		1 st -year success increase (15% to 73%)	Component of Emerging Scholars Program

Year	Month	Length	College / Host	State	Participants No.	Description	Residential or Commuter	Camp Focus	Results / Outcomes	Innovations / Notes
2001	Aug	5	MATC	WI	50	At-risk incoming students	C			Camp leadership transferred afterward (first college to assume facilitation; continued for 14 years)
	Aug	5	Sinclair Community College	OH	50	At-risk incoming students	C		88% 1 st -year retention (was 20%)	Mentored the facilitators to run the camp ("train the trainer")
2004	Jun	4	SUNY Old Westbury	NY	12	Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP) students	R		100% completion	Expedited 4-day model
	Jun	5	University of the District of Columbia (UDC)	DC	60	Bridge Program	C		Led to 6 additional camps	Model of bridge program structure leading with LLC before summer courses
2004	Aug	5	University of the District of Columbia/Edison	DC	50	TRIO & Charter School (High school) students	C	STEM preparation (chemistry)		Discipline-focused camp
2005	Jun	5	UDC	DC	80	TRIO Program	C			High school TRIO model
	Jun	5	UDC	DC	50	Bridge Program	C			The standard point system is produced (3,000 for completion to 6000 for superstar)
2006	Jul-Aug	6 wks, 1/2 days	UDC	DC	90	Job Skills Program Age 14	C	Job Skills	80% participated fully; >60% completion	Prolonged program with sustained growth
	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	25	Middle school math students	C	Mathematics	Led to a 5-year STEM UP grant for underprepared STEM students	Use of an outside facilitator
2007	Jun	5	UDC	DC	50	Bridge Program	C			
	Aug	5	Brevard Community College	FL	36	At-risk students	C		Majority completion	
2008	Jun	5	UDC	DC	50	Bridge Program	C			Use of an outside facilitator

Year	Month	Length	College / Host	State	Participants No. Description	Residential or Commuter	Camp Focus	Results / Outcomes	Innovations / Notes
2009	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	42 Failed nursing students	C	Recovery Approach	43% superstars (18) 45% exceptional merit (19) 12% merit (5) 98% passed (41) 60% now practicing nurses	
	Jun	5	Smithfield Public School District	RI	38 9/10 th grade bubble students	C		8% superstars (3) 18% exceptional merit (7) 37% merit (14) 26% completion (10) 11% participant level (4) 90% passed	
	Jul	5	Illinois Institute of Technology	IL	31 STEM Bridge Program	R	Pre-engineering; Learning to Learn Science	61% superstars (19) 26% exceptional merit (8) 13% merit (4)	Discipline-focused camp
2010	Aug	5	University at Buffalo	NY	21 Calculus students	R	Calculus	57% superstars (12) 38% exceptional merit (8) 5% merit (1)	
	May	5	Hinds Community College	MS	60 Failed nursing students	C		45% now practicing nurses	Began to contextualize the camp for nursing
	Aug	5	Grand Valley State University (GVSU)	MI	60 Incoming honor students	R	Research preparation (Scholars Institute)		Focus on high-performing students
2011	May	5	Hinds Community College	MS	45 Failed nursing students	C		67% now practicing nurses (following year: 69% practicing nurses)	Camp leadership transferred afterward
	Jun	1	Cerritos College	CA	70 Teacher Training Program	C	Basics of learning to learn	Produced list of 100 Tips for Learning to Learn	
	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	30 STEM UP Program	R			Under-prepared STEM students
2012	Aug	5	GVSU	MI	60 Incoming honor students	R	Research preparation (Scholars Institute)	5 placed in top 12 at graduation (of 200 honor students)	Camp leadership transferred afterward
	Sept	2	Lamar University	TX	50 Calculus students	R	Calculus	Produced a list of 67 Techniques for Learning to Learn Calculus	Discipline-focused camp
	May	5	Hinds Community College	MS	27 Failed nursing students	R		26 re-enrolled as a result of camp success; 18 graduated (69%)	

Year	Month	Length	College / Host	State	Participants No.	Description	Residential or Commuter	Camp Focus	Results / Outcomes	Innovations / Notes
2012	Jun	5	Middle Georgia State College	GA	60	Developmental students	R		75% passed math 44% passed reading 80% passed English	Led to a change in summer development courses to meet college entrance requirements
	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	25	STEM UP Program	R	Chemistry and algebra	50% transferred to 4-year STEM programs within 2 years	Discipline-focused camp
	Aug	5	GVSU	MI	60	Second tail population (non-honor students)	R	Freshman Academy	All students got either an "A" or "B" in the course	
	Aug	5	Medaille College	NY	80	Tier 3 students	R			
	Jan	5	Job Corps	NY	35	Smart Grid Program	R	Smart Grid	Highest performance on Construction and Skilled Trades (CAST) test of any cohort (86% completed; had been 25%)	Discipline-focused camp
2013	May	5	Hinds Community College	MS	43	Failed nursing students	R		41 re-enrolled as a result; success (potential success rate: 63.4%)	
	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	20	STEM UP Program	R	Algebra	10% superstars (2) 40% exceptional merit (8)	Discipline-focused camp
	Jul-Aug	5	Stony Brook University	NY	65	Pre-engineering students	R	Smart Grid	All students passed and entered Stony Brook University	Discipline-focused camp
	Aug	5	GVSU	MI	50	Freshmen Academy (Academic Success Institute)	R		1 st year retention: 88% (completed camp) 70% (didn't complete camp) 82% (general student population)	Use the role of a second facilitator focused on professional development
	Aug	5	Hinds Community College	MS	51	Incoming 1 st year students	R			
2014	Jan	3	Nassau Community College	NY	50	Underprepared nursing students	C			Short program offered the essence of self-growth and learning to learn
	May	5	Hinds Community College	MS	35	Failed nursing students	C			Coaching the facilitators to upgrade the camp
	Jun	5	Hinds Community College	MS	14	STEM UP Program	R		86% superstars (12) 14% exceptional merit (2)	20 algebra activities and 10 learning-to-learn activities
	Jul	2	Lamar University	TX	12	Basketball team	R		Committed to 3.5 team GPA	

