ASCC Proposal for a Revised General Education Program

In Spring 2018, OAA released a proposal developed by a faculty-led review committee for a new, University-wide General Education Curriculum. The proposal responded to the charge from the University Level Advisory Committee on the General Education (ULAC) through a multi-semester process of discussion, study, and development involving faculty, students, and staff. The Review Committee proposal and a discussion of the process that led to its development is available here. The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee (ASCC) has revised the initial proposal following extensive discussion with the Arts and Sciences Senate and with important feedback from units and from the regional campuses.

Our proposal aims to create a bolder, more distinctive identity for General Education at OSU and to accomplish this within a smaller credit footprint. The General Education Curriculum proposed here meets Ohio State’s goal of building distinguished academic programs and embraces the Land Grant mission and emphasis on service embodied in the motto “Disciplina in civitatem.”

We propose a General Education Program with three parts (see Diagram). The program is introduced and connected to student goals and experiences in a 1-credit GE Seminar. Courses in the Foundation address the breadth of modes of inquiry and fundamental skills. The Foundation courses prepare students for their subsequent, focused coursework in specific Themes and follows the Ohio Transfer Module except in including a foundational course in Race, Gender, and Ethnic Diversity. The program is assessed through a 1-credit Reflection portfolio that gathers student work and provides opportunities for reflection and synthesis of the Program. Through this GE Program, students will cultivate knowledge, skills, and attitudes that cross disciplinary boundaries and extend to areas outside specialized study programs.

We propose to pair this GE with a College of Arts and Sciences requirement for World Languages (see diagram and letter from World Languages faculty). The World Languages requirement expands on Arts and Sciences’ commitment to developing global competence in its students and to educating students for global citizenship. We propose these together because our acceptance of the GE is qualified on accepting and planning for a World Languages component. We urge other Colleges and programs within Colleges to adopt a similar requirement and provide a template that has been endorsed by the departments offering World Languages that will help them do this.

Details of implementation remain to be discussed for many aspects of this proposal. These include, but are not limited to, program-level learning outcomes, specific learning outcomes for each category (Bookends, Foundations, Themes) and the subcategories within them, the process for selecting and evaluating the choice Themes, and credit-sharing for team-taught courses. An appended document entitled “Implementation Recommendations” outlines issues identified through our deliberations and provides recommendations on possible solutions to these issues.

Discussions about the General Education within Arts and Sciences have recognized the goal of a single General Education Program for all undergraduates at OSU, regardless of their campus or college affiliation. In that spirit, ASCC advances a proposal that reflects feedback from our colleagues at the regional campuses and from our colleagues in other colleges. Our discussions about the ways in which our proposed General Education Program might involve students and faculty in the other colleges have been predicated on assurances from OAA about monitoring and mitigating the fiscal impact of the new curriculum on the College of Arts and Sciences. We expect that the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate and Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee will lead local and University-wide discussions about these implementation issues, and that Arts and Sciences will retain its role in approving and assessing courses in the GE.

We, the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, move that The Arts and Sciences Senate adopt the General Education Program detailed here on behalf of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Approval of this proposal indicates approval of the structure, distribution of credits, and general framework specified here. This approval is understood to be contingent on the fiscal assurances from OAA and on the details of implementation, which affect both the academic value of the revised GE and the fiscal impact of implementing it. As plans for implementation advance, the Steering Committee of the ASC Senate, with input from the ASC Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences, will evaluate and communicate progress towards meeting these contingencies to the full ASC Senate and ensure that the perspective of the Senate is communicated to OAA. Final approval of the
GOAL 1: Successful students will demonstrate qualities, abilities and characteristics that prepare them to be engaged citizens and leaders for life.

Goal 2: Successful students will engage with and apply a range of important modes of human thought and inquiry.

Goal 3: Successful students will be educated global citizens who can examine significant aspects of the human condition in local, state, national, and global settings today, in the past, and in the foreseeable future.

Special Notes
The World Languages requirement for BA and BS degrees in ASC expects students to demonstrate proficiency to the level recognized at OSU as 1103. Students placing below this level will take courses to meet this proficiency level; students who test beyond this level do not need to take additional courses. See Implementation Recommendations for details.

Opportunities to develop proficiency in data analysis and in writing are expected as part of the major program. Major programs that do not have interest or capacity to develop writing-intensive courses should require a course in writing offered by the Department of English, School of communication, or other appropriate unit. See Implementation Recommendations for details.

* The Themes included in the second level are the “Choice” Themes: students take courses in one of these, and in “Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World.” The Choice themes specified are those developed by the faculty of the GE Review Committee. The unspecified Choice Themes: allow for additional Themes to be developed. The Choice Themes will all be evaluated, modified, and may be taken out of rotation. See Implementation Recommendations for details.

† Students have the opportunity to satisfy the Themes by taking either 2, 3-credit classes or by a single 4-credit course that uses High Impact Practices (see definitions of these practices in Implementation Recommendations).
On April 10, 2019, by a vote of 25 yea, 14 nay, and 2 abstentions, the Faculty Senate of Arts and Sciences approved the following motion by paper ballot:

"We, the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, move that The Arts and Sciences Senate adopt the General Education Program detailed here on behalf of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Approval of this proposal indicates approval of the structure, distribution of credits, and general framework specified here. This approval is understood to be contingent on the fiscal assurances from OAA and on the details of implementation, which affect both the academic value of the revised GE and the fiscal impact of implementing it. As plans for implementation advance, the Steering Committee of the ASC Senate, with input from the ASC Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences, will evaluate and communicate progress towards meeting these contingencies to the full ASC Senate and ensure that the perspective of the Senate is communicated to OAA. Final approval of the implementation plan for the revised General Education curriculum will require a future affirmative vote of the ASC Senate after the implementation plan is complete."

This approval signals the acceptance of the basic structure of a General Education Program with a pair of 1-credit GE seminars, a 22-25 credit foundation comprising seven focal areas, and a set of two thematic pathways with 4-6 credits per pathway. One of the thematic pathways, "Citizenship for a Just and Diverse World," is mandatory, and the other is to be chosen from a suite of defined and approved alternatives. The revised General Education Program has distinct goals that will enable assessment and ongoing pedagogical and curricular improvements while allowing us to monitor the impact of courses offered within the General Education Program. The motion is contingent on a signed document from Provost McPheron that outlines fiscal resources associated with the implementation of the new GE. Simultaneous with its approval of the structure for a revised General Education Program, the ASC Faculty approved a college-specific requirement for proficiency in World Languages.

The motion approved by ASC Faculty Senate originated in the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee (ASCC). The Program proposed by ASCC is based on the model recommended by a multi-college review committee chartered by OAA, with notable changes in the credit hours in the bookend seminars and the number of focal areas in the foundations. The ASCC model is significantly lighter in terms of credits required (32-39 credits), compared to the original model (44-47 credits) from the OAA review committee. The changes reflected productive conversations, amendments and debate within ASCC and regular feedback from departments through the ASC Faculty Senate.

The College of Arts and Sciences, ASCC, and ASC Faculty Senate worked diligently to solicit feedback on the substance and presentation of the General Education program and to identify issues that will impact the implementation of the program they have approved. Drafts of the motion and explanatory text were shared with chairs, Directors of Undergraduate Studies, and senators at regular intervals to catalyze discussion among faculty and amendments were made to reflect the faculty input. The motion
was accompanied by a document that provided the context and rationale for the changes made by ASCC and that catalogued the implementation issues (entitled “Implementation Recommendations”).

ASCC and ASC faculty Senate approved this revised general education program in order to develop a single, University-wide General Education Program in concert with the other eleven colleges in our university. We expect that greater flexibility and congruence in college requirements will support students in navigating the many academic opportunities at The Ohio State University. We look forward to working with our university colleagues to usher in this cohesive and innovative General Education Program as a signature academic experience for our undergraduate students.

Janet M. Box-Steppensmeier
Interim Executive Dean and Vice Provost

Mary Ellen Jenkins
Assistant Executive Dean and Secretary, ASC Faculty Senate

Kim Kinsel
Chief Administrative Officer

Meg Daly
Chair, ASC Curriculum Committee

Trevon Logan
Faculty Fellow for Special Projects

Alison Crocetta
Acting Chair, ASC Faculty Senate

Steven Scott Fink
Associate Executive Dean
FYI

From: Bendoly, Elliot <bendoly.2@osu.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 4:47 PM
To: Smith, Randy <smith.70@osu.edu>
Cc: Makhija, Anil <makhija.1@osu.edu>
Subject: RE: GE

Dear Randy,

The Undergraduate Program of the Fisher College of Business endorses the structure of the proposed GE revision, captured most recently in the attached documentation, with the assurance that our college will see the decisions of an Implementation Committee, before the new program is finally approved and implemented.

This support comes from lengthy and ongoing discussions with tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, as well as with the Undergraduate Program staff and advisors. This includes our Undergraduate Program Committee faculty, and department chairs, all of whom have seen the variations on this structure evolve over the last year in meetings and correspondence. In net we see the restructured GE to be meaningful and of benefit to all students at OSU.

We look forward to remaining active in this process and will ensure representation is available for the implementation committee when that point is arrived at.

Best wishes,
Elliot

Professor Eliot Bendoly, PhD
Associate Dean of Undergraduate Students and Programs
& Fisher College of Business Distinguished Professor
Management Sciences, The Ohio State University
www.bsbalinks.com  www.ma-wis.com

All:
April 15, 2019

W. Randy Smith, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Academic Programs
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall

RE: General Education Proposal

Vice Provost Smith,

The College of Dentistry is fully supportive of the proposed revisions to the General Education program.

The Bachelor's degree in Dental Hygiene is the only undergraduate program in the College of Dentistry. Thus, I informed Ms. Rachel Kearney, director of the Dental Hygiene program and the Dental Hygiene Curriculum Committee of proposals to revise the General Education program early in the process. They provided feedback to me and to Ms. Patricia Gardner, Assistant Director of Academic Studies for the Dental Hygiene program, who took that feedback forward to university working groups. The Dental Hygiene Curriculum Committee was supportive of the proposed changes in principle but identified concerns about implementation in dental hygiene due to the number of specific program prerequisites and the highly structured nature of the program curriculum. As subsequent revisions of the General Education program emerged, the Dental Hygiene Curriculum Committee was kept informed and continued to provide feedback. The final revised proposal for a new General Education program was presented to the Dental Hygiene Curriculum Committee on March 26, 2019 and the committee voted in support of the revised General Education program.

If you have questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Darryl Hamamoto, DDS, PhD
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
hamamoto.4@osu.edu

CC: Dr. Patrick Lloyd, Dean
    Ms. Rachel Kearney, Chair of Dental Hygiene
April 15, 2019

W. Randy Smith
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall

Dear Randy,

On behalf of the College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE), I am pleased to offer our support for the "ASCC Proposal for a Revised General Education Program," which you distributed April 8, 2019. The various proposals coming from OAA and ASCC have been the subject of regular discussion within the curriculum committees of the college, at both the department and college level. We understand that the current question involves our support for the basic framework and credit-hour distribution of the proposal, and that the details of implementation will be decided, subject to a separate vote.

The process EHE followed in evaluating the proposal is as follows:

1. The professional staff in the EHE Office of Academic Affairs reviewed the proposal to determine credit-hour impact related to EHE majors. The results were communicated to department leaders and to the EHE curriculum committee. Feedback was also solicited from our advising staff.

2. Information about the proposal was disseminated to faculty and staff in EHE College Council meetings throughout the fall and spring semesters.

3. The ASCC proposal was reviewed by the undergraduate studies committees in each department. Each department voted to support the proposal and to move forward to implementation, with caveats.

4. Votes were solicited electronically from the EHE College Curriculum Committee April 12-15. The votes were unanimous in favor of the ASCC proposal.

It is our opinion that the themes within the proposal connect strongly with EHE academic programs, and we can see a place for our college within this framework. We are happy to see a significant reduction in credit hours, something that will be very useful to some of our crowded majors. Faculty and staff were also encouraged that the GE has a unified vision and offers some exciting pedagogical possibilities for collaboration and high-impact courses. We have also been assured that non-ASCC colleges will be able to play a role in the implementation and oversight committees. This is an important consideration in our continued support moving forward.

The caveats largely surrounded the unsettled nature of Theme IV. We request that development of this theme involve the cooperation of all the colleges. There was much support for the "Transformative Ideas" theme, and some requested that this theme be reinstated.

Sincerely,

Bryan Warnick, Associate Dean
April 15, 2019

W. Randy Smith, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Academic Programs
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Smith,

On April 5, the Committee on Core Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning (Core) met to discuss the proposed General Education structure. The committee felt that the overall structure and number of credit hours were generally acceptable. The committee sees opportunities for creative and innovative course design; however, such a conclusion is predicated upon numerous caveats that need to be addressed and resolved in a way that no additional credits be added to the overall number of credit hours needed for degree completion in any of the degree programs offered in our College. These caveats include the following implementation issues:

1. Definition of major credit hours. This impacts the application of any double-count policy upon which COE programs will rely heavily.
2. Clarification of high impact practices
3. Theme learning outcomes will need to address STEM outcomes and explicitly allow for STEM courses.
4. Clarification of Theme IV (requirements, restrictions)
5. A second writing course is essential for all COE programs.
6. Engineering representation in the GE course approval process
7. Clarification of the purpose/goal/execution and timing of the first bookend
8. STEM courses required by programs in the College of Engineering will not be reduced.
9. The College of Engineering and the Knowlton School of Architecture have multiple accredited programs. The requirements of these programs must continue to be recognized, met, and addressed accordingly.

The Core Committee voted unanimously 13-0 in favor of recommending approval of the proposed General Education structure and credit hours to the College Committee for Curriculum and Assessment (CCAA) with the aforementioned caveats.

On April 15, CCAA voted 14-0 to approve the proposed General Education structure and credit hours with caveats.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Professor Carolyn M. Sommerich
Chair, College Committee for Curriculum and Assessment

[Signature]
Professor Blaine Lilly
Chair, College Core Committee for Teaching and Learning
April 15, 2019

W. Randy Smith
Vice Provost for Academic Programs
OSU Office of Academic Affairs

Dear Randy,

The College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) has carefully reviewed the proposal for revision to the General Education (GE) that was developed by the College of Arts and Sciences. Thank you for the additional communications and clarifications provided by and through your office. Based on earlier discussions regarding the review process for the GE proposal, it was decided that the College Academic Affairs Committee (COAA) would solicit feedback and would vote on the proposal, serving as the representative body of the CFAES faculty.

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) draft of the proposal was distributed to CFAES academic unit leaders and College Academic Affairs Committee (COAA) members on March 22, 2019 with the request to gather feedback in preparation for the next committee meeting. The GE proposal and feedback were discussed at the COAA during its regularly scheduled meeting on April 3, 2019. At the conclusion of the discussion, each of the academic unit representatives was asked to return to their departments, discuss the proposal, and vote within their academic units to either approve or reject the proposal as presented by your office from the College of Arts and Sciences. Results of the vote were requested to be returned no later than April 11, 2019. Each academic unit considered the proposal in the manner they determined most appropriate for the process. All 10 academic units in the college discussed the draft of the proposal, voted, and submitted their vote and comments by the deadline.

As a result of the vote within the college, CFAES approved the structure and credit hour requirements associated with the OAA draft of the GE proposal, with 6 academic units voting to approve and 4 academic units opposed.

Those voting in the positive appreciate that the new GE will systematically incorporate diversity and justice within the GE and appreciate a slimmer credit hour profile vis a vis previous proposals. There is also appreciation that students may be able to develop continuity and depth in topical content through the choice of a theme, though caution remains as the themes seem so broad that topical depth is by no means guaranteed with this structure.
Concerns and reservations were shared both by academic units that supported and opposed the proposal. Major themes of the expressed concerns include:

- The ability of programs with regimented credit requirements due to professional accreditation or ODHE requirements to maintain certification integrity while not breaching state mandates concerning total credits or credit distribution. This includes concerns expressed by ATI relating to its ability to maintain the integrity of its associate of science degrees.
- Lack of clarity concerning myriad implementation issues, particularly concerning who will approve GE courses, the identity of Theme IV, the permissible overlap with majors, and the fate of current GE course offerings.
- Unit-level fiscal uncertainty that such a major curricular revision, coupled with Responsibility Based Budgeting (RBB) in a zero-sum environment, would generate (RBB is decentralized to the unit level throughout CFAES). Many unit budgets rely heavily on GE courses that may not be approved in the new model. ‘Hold harmless’ promises (as well as promises to include particular colleges in implementation deliberations) are well-meaning and appreciated, but are difficult to guarantee in OSU’s dynamic fiscal and administrative environment.
- Lack of science in the foundational courses that, for some majors, may require moving science courses into the major and could crowd out major-specific courses, potentially diluting the content depth provided in current majors.
- The rushed, non-transparent and shifting nature of the proposal and proposal approval process, which did not provide adequate time for unit-level deliberation and evaluation. There are concerns this foreshadows forthcoming deliberations concerning implementation and the University-wide approval of the fully detailed GE program.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information. We look forward to learning the outcome of the university-wide approval process, and to working with your office on next steps regarding implementation.

Sincerely,

Steven M.Neal
Associate Dean for Academic Programs
April 15, 2019

The School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences hosted the GE university committee on three different occasions during the initial phases of development. Information from faculty was gathered and provided back to the university GE committee during that time. During March 2019, the revised model was provided to the executive committee for the school and feedback was given back to Vice Provost Randy Smith.

On April 3, 2019, a letter was sent to all faculty within the school along with materials outlining the background of the GE revision and the proposed model. I made myself available to division faculty meetings and had open office hours for questions.

A survey was sent for an all faculty vote. As of Monday April 15, 2019 – 23 responses have been returned with a vote of 21 yes in favor for acceptance of the proposed model and 1 no vote against the model.

We fully support the spirit of a “one university general education program”. But unanimously our faculty has expressed to me that implementation must consider the fact that accreditation of credentialed health care degrees of study do not allow for flexibility. By eliminating the ability to double count math and science prerequisites as GE requirements, we simply cannot offer our degrees within a four year time period.

Sincerely,

Marcia Nahikian-Neils, PhD, RDN, LD, FAND
Professor, Clinical
Director Academic Affairs

Individual comments from faculty survey:

It will be important for courses in the GE to double count toward majors, particularly those with very heavy science and math requirements in order for students to complete their undergraduate education within four years.

It is important to note that the foundation matches the Ohio Transfer Module that we are required to accept.

Make sure that programs like ours who have a large amount of hard science courses required will not be punishing our students with these courses being such a small portion of the new structure. I would hate for them to struggle to fit it all in.
I would like to reduce some/any of these so that there be about 3 less hours from the combination of these since it seems like it is overemphasized compared to science+math+computer science:

- Citizenship for a just and diverse world
- Race, gender, and ethnic diversity
- Historical and cultural ideas

I recommend a Higher Education Implementation Scientist on the implementation committee.
Randy,

On April 10, Wendy Bowles and I presented the proposed revision to the general education structure and credit hours to the College of Nursing faculty at our regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Prior to the meeting, faculty were provided background data regarding the status of general education at the university including the process for stakeholder engagement and input from university academic leaders informing the proposed revisions. They were also provided the General Education Proposal (dated March 2019) and the illustration of the proposed GE structure and credit allocation. The proposed revision was presented to full faculty and an opportunity for discussion followed. At the conclusion of the discussion, a vote was taken to approve or disapprove the proposed general education structure and credit hours. The College of Nursing overwhelmingly approved the proposed general education structure and credit hour allocation (79 yes, 2 no).

Thank you for your efforts to move this process forward. Please let me know if there is any further information I can provide.

Cindy

Cindy Anderson, PhD, RN, APRN-CNP, ANEF, FAHA, FNAP, FAAN
Associate Professor
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Educational Innovation
Martha S. Pitzer Center for Women, Children and Youth
The Ohio State University College of Nursing
346 Newton Hall
1585 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone: 614-292-4179; Fax 614-292-4948
Email: Anderson.2765@osu.edu

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Dear Vice Provost Smith,
Thank you for your strong leadership in revising the General Education (GE) curriculum over the past 2 years. The College of Pharmacy has especially appreciated the opportunity to be involved in the original proposal's formulation and to continue to work with our peers in making adaptations.

Our college approves the proposed new GE structure, and we believe that it is an excellent framework by which to provide contemporary liberal arts education to our students. Our Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences Curriculum Committee, which oversees our college’s undergraduate program matters, voted unanimously to progress the new GE structure to the next stage. This came after formal presentations by your team and myself as well as much discussion among faculty, staff, and students. I have updated Dean Henry Mann throughout the process, and I plan to brief our college’s Executive Committee on Friday.

As do other units, we have concerns about the curriculum’s rollout and its impact on students (particularly those in the STEM fields). As such, we respectfully request that our college have representation on the Implementation Committee moving forward.

Again, thank you for all that you and the administration have done to bring this new GE to fruition. We look forward to continuing to work with you.

Warm regards,
Nicole

Nicole Cartwright Kwiek, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Clinical Associate Professor of Pharmacology
Director, Generation Rx
Ohio State University College of Pharmacy
500 W. 12th Avenue | 136A Parks Hall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5951

Cc: Dean Henry Mann, Dr. Katherine Kelley
April 12, 2019

W. Randy Smith  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  
Office of Academic Affairs  
203 Bricker Hall  
190 North Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Randy:

On March 29, 2019, the John Glenn College’s Undergraduate Studies Committee included a discussion of the proposed structure for the new General Education Curriculum as part of its regularly scheduled meeting. After a thorough discussion, the committee voted unanimously 10-0 to approve the structure. Our committee was particularly excited about the focus on training students to be global citizens who will develop competencies in some core interdisciplinary themes. We also like the flexibility the revised curriculum will provide our students to explore second majors or additional undergraduate minors.

We look forward to working with you and the other undergraduate colleges on implementing the new curriculum.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rob Greenbaum  
Associate Dean for Curriculum

Copy: Trevor Brown, Dean, John Glenn College of Public Affairs  
Amanda Girth, Director of Undergraduate Studies, John Glenn College of Public Affairs
TO: Dr. W. Randy Smith  
Vice Provost for Academic Programs  
Office of Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Rebecca Andridge  
Chair of Undergraduate Studies Committee  
College of Public Health

Dr. Gail Kaye  
Director of Undergraduate Programs  
College of Public Health

Dr. Michael S. Bisesi  
Senior Associate Dean and Director of Academic Affairs  
College of Public Health

DATE: April 12, 2019

RE: Proposed Graduate Education Program Structure and Credit Hours

On behalf of the College of Public Health, we support approval of the latest version (received April 8, 2019) of the new General Education (GE) Program structure and credit hours proposed for implementation at the Ohio State University (OSU). The proposal was reviewed by College faculty and approved by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Our support for approval is based on the understanding that an acceptable GE implementation plan remains to be developed with input from and approval by the colleges at OSU that deliver undergraduate courses and programs. It also remains our understanding that ultimately the oversight of the GE curriculum will involve a centralized committee at OSU under the Office of Academic Affairs, and will consist of faculty members representing each of these colleges.

cc. Dr. William J. Martin, Dean College of Public Health
April 15, 2019

W. Randy Smith, PhD
Vice Provost for Academic Programs
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Vice Provost Smith,

We, the College of Social Work, have voted to adopt the proposed GE model. We applaud you and other campus leaders for arriving at such an innovative model that will now offer a single GE curriculum for the undergraduate student. We look forward to next steps in the coming months surrounding implementation.

The College of Social Work arrived at the decision to adopt the proposed GE model after a series of steps taken over the last 2 ½ years. They include:

1. Jennie Babcock (BSSW Program Director) represented our college in the GE planning process through participation on the University-Level Advisory Committee (ULAC) for General Education.
2. In the absence of an Associate Dean, Jacquelyn Meshelemiah (Associate Professor) represented our college on the Academic Program Advisory Council (APAC).
3. We had a presentation from members of the GE advisory committee (Dr. Larry Krissek and Dr. Andrew Martin) on the current state of the GE model in October 4, 2018. Members of the college’s leadership attended this meeting.
4. Jacquelyn Meshelemiah presented the GE model to the college’s College Advisory Council (CAC) on March 18, 2019.
5. Finally, Jacquelyn Meshelemiah and Jennie Babcock took the model to the full faculty for a vote and discussion at a Faculty Meeting on April 15, 2019.

It is a culmination of these activities that resulted in today’s vote to adopt the GE model. We are excited about what the new model will bring to the undergraduate student’s educational experience.

Sincerely,

Tom Gregoire, MSW, Ph.D.
Dean