

Engaged Learning/Course Redesign Subgroup Meeting  
December 10, 2010  
1:30-3:00  
Regionalist Room, Kansas Union

**Subgroup members present:** John Augusto, Mary Banwart, Jennifer Church Duran, Sarah Crawford-Parker, Ann Cudd, Andrea Greenhoot, Susan Gronbeck-Tedesco, Rick Hale, Chris Haufler, Joe Heppert, and Fred Rodriguez

**Subgroup members absent:** Devon Cantwell, Sara Rosen, and Mike Vitevitch

**Agenda:**

1. EEE and Strategic Planning updates—Crawford-Parker
2. Overview of the 2010 NSSE report—Paul Klute, OIRP
3. Review of reading materials—What Works—Greenhoot
  - a. Literature review produced by the Retention and Graduate Task Force at KU
  - b. George Kuh’s “High Impact Educational Practices”
4. Review of engaged learning practices at AAU institutions—Greenhoot
  - a. What **common themes** emerge from your review of engaged learning practices at AAU institutions?
  - b. Which practices are **supported by evidence** (either according to the literature reviews mentioned above, or information provided by the institution itself)?
  - c. Which practices would **address our key objectives** (improving retention, graduation rates, and/or student engagement at all levels)?
  - d. Which practices would best **connect to KU’s existing strengths** and/or infrastructure?
  - e. Which practices appear to be the most **sustainable**?
  - f. Which practices are **intriguing or appealing** for other reasons?
5. Developing a short list of strategies for further investigation.

**Discussion questions:**

Outlined above in 4 a-f.

**Discussion outcomes:**

There’s a high degree of overlap between George Kuh’s work on high impact activities and the programs we found at other AAU institutions. Common themes that emerged from the literature review and research of AAU institutions include that most schools offer a variety of engaged learning activities for students. There are very few one-size-fits-all models. Most institutions are attempting to develop some form of first-year experience. There is an intentional focus on getting students connected in the first year. Most AAU institutions have a common reading program, although the structure of such programs varies. The positive impact of common intellectual experiences or grouped/linked courses was another theme that emerged from the research. Also,

most institutions have institutional structures—real or virtual— that support each of the engaged learning strategies we discussed. The subgroup identified a list of priority areas—undergraduate research, common intellectual experiences, course redesign programs, experiential learning and global awareness opportunities, institutional structures, freshman summer institutes, and first-year seminars—to research further over the winter break.

**Next steps:**

- Subgroup members will be assigned in teams of two to each priority area. Teams will conduct additional research over the winter break, paying particular attention to how certain programs would build on KU strengths and what empirical and institutional data support the efficacy and sustainability of certain activities.
- Next meeting **Tuesday, January 11<sup>th</sup>, 9 a.m.-noon**, location TBD.