

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - Campus Conversation on Undergraduate Education Planning

Overall Objectives

1. Provide forum for Neal (EVP&P) to share vision about Undergraduate Education at UNLV
2. Discuss how the Undergraduate Integrated Learning Vision (UiNLV) addresses all aspects of students' preparation for their future: in the workforce, in their future education; as citizens; as lifelong learners
3. Share work done to date by various stakeholder groups in undergraduate education and student learning.
4. Explain how strategic decisions already made contribute to enhanced student retention and performance (e.g., learning communities; first year experience; mandatory advising; mid-semester grades; other diagnostic methods to provide students with feedback)
5. Receive feedback from participants about what we want our students to know and be able to do, as articulated through the work of the general education process on specific learning outcomes
6. Engage in conversations about how we might apply specific strategies to achieve student success, and share practices about what we are doing at UNLV
7. Expose ways that many stakeholders contribute to the culminating experience of student learning. Facilitate conversations about shared responsibility for student development.

The working group recommends separating the conversation into two parts:

Part One would focus on **what** the UNLV goals for student learning are, as articulated in the Focus: 50-100, in the Gen Ed work to date, in the AAC&U reports; and through the conceptualization of the Academic Success Center. In order to avoid "silos," the focus for all stakeholders/presenters should be on attaining the Focus 50-100 Strategic Plan objectives and outcomes, such as student performance, retention, and success after they leave us (academically and career). The focus should be on what we want them to know and do - specific learning outcomes and foundation skills.

Part Two would focus on receiving feedback from campus stakeholders on the **what** – as identified through the work of general education. It also focuses on strategies for **how** to create learning environments to support student success (e.g., strategies articulated and under development such as learning communities and 1st year experience)

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - Campus Conversation on Undergraduate Education Planning

Objectives Part 1

The working group recommends that the event for Part 1 focus on objectives 1-4, above.

Audience Part 1

The working group recommends that Part 1 is open to the entire campus. We further recommend that those specifically invited to Part 2 be targeted for Part 1 as well, and encouraged to attend as part of a two part event for them.

Proposed Agenda – Part 1 (2 hours total)

1. Identify moderator to welcome and introduce topic
2. EVP&P Smatresk sets the scene, the direction (Focus priorities for ed, ed theme, pres retreat, AAC&U teams, UiNLV) Neal also to address the perspective of curricular, co-curricular, and research (undergraduate research and research-based learning) (30 minutes)
3. Major initiative stakeholder 15 minutes each to highlight their work
 - Dave James (gen ed)
 - Ann McDonough (Academic Success Center)
 - Who else?
4. Panel Q & A with Neal, Dave, Anne, and Chris (identify someone to pose questions and facilitate responses)

With prepared questions posed to each person and answered in round robin fashion --addressing how each one sees their work supporting or focusing on each of the following:

- Enhanced Retention
 - Improved Performance
 - Postgraduate success
5. Audience questions
 6. Notecards with comments/question for attendees

Objectives Part 2

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - Campus Conversation on Undergraduate Education Planning

The working group recommends that the event for Part 2 focus on objectives 5-7, above.

Audience Part 2

The group recommends that the audience focus on faculty and academic administrators, including deans, associate deans, and department chairs. It should also include representatives from other stakeholder groups who contribute to student learning. Attendees should be nominated and invited to attend. Lists from the gen ed retreat should be reviewed. All participants should be encouraged to attend both events.

Participants should include:

- some full time and other instructors (adjuncts, and GAs) who teach general education courses
- faculty who have been experimenting with first-year courses and learning communities
- department and/or college curriculum committee members
- members of faculty Senate committees such as Curriculum and General Education;
- members of the advisory committees on Assessment and General Education;
- members of Advisory...(some advisors?)
- representatives from libraries instruction program
- student life
- staff from Academic Success Center
- students (grad, GPSA and undergrad, CSUN)

Proposed Agenda – Part 2 (3.5 hours total)

1. Facilitator welcome and introduce who is there, why, and format of the day
2. Activity on general education outcomes. Participants reminded of the focus on WHAT we want students to know and do – and the work of the gen ed committee highlighted at part 1. Now we want to hear from them. Design activity to receive feedback needed by committee on the specific outcomes. (45 minutes)
3. Expert (to be identified) who can acknowledge that our challenges are universal and who can introduce strategies that others are applying to achieve desired outcomes (e.g., examples specifically from learning communities models, range of first year experience issues, integration of research-based learning experiences, structure and delivery of learning support) (30 minutes)
4. Panel for peer-to-peer sharing and spotlight on UNLV efforts (no more than 3 people – 15 minutes each – highlighting an application of learning communities, first year experience, and perhaps research-based learning... (45 minutes)

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - Campus Conversation on Undergraduate Education Planning

Consider another way to share/deliver this information if too much time here – through “homework” for participants (e.g., collect and share profiles of projects – write as case studies – put info online..)

5. Table work (participants are assigned to tables – mix of groups, departments)

(need to work on this activity – questions – but focus in part on – “what this means for me, my department – but also need to get input on the specific strategies...”)