Process

Previous Work
• General Education Committee formed IS and NFS subcommittees in Spring 2017
• Subcommittees interviewed various parties connected to courses (faculty, administration, and staff)
• Each subcommittee sent out a survey to faculty and staff soliciting feedback
• General Education Committee developed and assessed a variety of options

Process

Moving Forward
• Present committee’s proposals and recommendations at All Faculty Meeting and receive feedback
• Solicit further feedback
  • Friday, November 3, 1-2 pm (Lovejoy 3rd floor conference room)
  • Monday, November 6, 11 am-12 pm (MUC-International Room)
• Gen Ed Committee will create a final proposal and send it to Curriculum Council by end of 2017
• Curriculum Council will review and approve proposal in January and February 2018
• Faculty Senate first read in March 2018
• Faculty Senate second read in April 2018
• Fall 2018-Spring 2019 develop any new curriculum, approve any new course designations, and other required revisions
• Approved changes implemented starting in Fall 2019
## Considerations

- **Student Outcomes**
- **Constraints**
  - No increase in required credit hours
  - Budget neutral
- **Implementation**
  - Enrollment
  - Faculty load
  - Departmental/College/School burden

## Issues with Current NFS

- Difficult to do full content of course and the NFS content
- The content grade competes with the NFS goals
  - The faculty is evaluating them as a student in a content course while also trying to help them transition to the university environment
- Students don’t necessarily get the information they need when they need it
- Inconsistent implementation
- If students fail or drop the course, they also don’t complete the NFS component
- Registration concerns
  - Difficult to offer enough seats at times and in areas to meet student needs
  - Students take multiple NFS during their time at SIUE
### NFS Option #1
(Committee’s Recommendation)

- Change name to New Freshman Transition (NFT)
- 1 credit hour course
  - 1 hour for 15 weeks
- 20-25 students/section
- Faculty teach 3 sections of NFT per semester
- Syllabus that follows a progression to maximize benefit to students
- Could make it pass/no credit
- Could develop a transfer version

---

### NFS Option #1
- Pros
  - Recognized High Impact Practice
  - Dedicated class time to focus on NFS content
  - Likely to increase first semester enrollment in NFS
  - Frees students to enroll in content courses based on need and fit
  - Faculty can focus exclusively on helping students transition to SIUE
  - Requires fewer faculty to teach
    - Approximately 30 as opposed to approximately 45-50 currently required
  - Potentially spreads the NFT more broadly across the university
  - Can integrate many freshman activities into class
    - Example: Not Anymore training
  - Health Experience
NFS Option #1

- Cons
  - Requires dedicated faculty to teach new course
  - Have to create room in Gen Ed curriculum for a 1 credit hour course
  - May require more classroom space
  - Won’t link NFT content directly to study of course content

NFS Option #2

- Change name to New Freshman Transition (NFT)
- Keep NFT linked to a content course
- Move some NFT content to an online module so that it doesn’t take up as much class time.
  - Structured to get necessary information to students at the right time of semester
- Make the NFT content a certain percentage of the grade to make sure students are being assessed on it
NFS Option #2

• Pros
  • Creates a more consistent content than current model
  • Minimal new resources required
  • Works with current NFS requirements
  • Can integrate many freshman activities into class
    • Example: Not Anymore training
    • Health Experience

NFS Option #2

• Cons
  • Doesn’t solve the content/NFS conflict
  • Students don’t complete NFT if they fail or drop the course
  • Online is not the ideal way to deliver the NFT component
  • Doesn’t improve enrollment issues for students
  • Students can still enroll in multiple sections
Issues with Current IS program

• Doesn’t always function as envisaged
• Students often don’t see value of IS
• Expensive
• Difficult to schedule
• Often results in poor student evaluations
• Low evaluations can be a problem, especially for junior faculty
• Big teaching burden on CAS

IS Option #1
(Committee’s Recommendation)

• The hybrid model
  • Give breadth courses that have interdisciplinary content an IS attribute
    • One instructor with regular cap
    • Departments would apply to have course count as IS
  • Would also allow team taught courses (existing or new) that demonstrate effectiveness
  • In both cases, IS course counts as a breadth requirement
    • Student would be able to choose from two if it splits two different breadth areas
    • This is needed if we are going to add a 1 credit hour NFT
IS Option #1

- **Pros**
  - Reduces the faculty resources dedicated to IS courses
  - Combined with NFT Option #1, saves 2 credit hours in Gen Ed Curriculum
  - Expands opportunities for variety of disciplines to be recognized for interdisciplinary content
  - Highlights faculty who do interdisciplinary work
  - Allows departments to attract more students to courses that carry IS attribute

IS Option #1

- **Cons**
  - Loss of mandatory team teaching requirement
  - De-emphasizes the IS component by taking dedicated course away
IS Option #2

• Keep the existing courses and requirements but with a single instructor and smaller class size.
  • If allowed to meet breadth requirement, allows NFT to be 1 credit hour

IS Option #2

• Pros
  • Would make scheduling easier
  • Addresses student issues with team teaching
  • Requires less coordination between departments
  • Recognizes the IS capabilities of faculty
IS Option #2

- Cons
  - Still requires a dedicated course
  - Doesn’t deal with issue of faculty load
  - Eliminates team teaching requirement
  - Some courses won’t work as well with one faculty member