

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM  
THE ADVISING SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE GE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

**January 10, 2020  
(revised February 7, 2020)**

## **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Discussion of questions specifically identified for the Advising Subcommittee
- III. Discussion of questions included in other subcommittee charges
- IV. Discussion of additional questions raised by the Advising Subcommittee
- V. Timeline of advising-related work necessary for successful implementation of the new GE
- VI. Advising Subcommittee Membership Roster

## I. Executive Summary

The Advising Subcommittee of the GE Implementation Committee was charged with identifying and making recommendations regarding academic advising-related issues/concerns that will need to be addressed as the university begins implementation of the new GE. In addition to addressing the specific questions that were posed to this subcommittee, many other questions and issues were discussed, including those posed for other subcommittees that appear connected to advising as well. *It should be noted that all recommendations are premised on the university's adoption of the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee's recommendation of an AU22 launch date for the new GE, as the Advising Subcommittee agrees that AU22 is the earliest term in which this could be successfully delivered to students.*

The Advising Subcommittee has addressed the three questions that were outlined specifically for advising. The subcommittee members talked at great length about these issues, as they believe the issues and concerns are more complicated and complex than perhaps was thought by those who generated them. What follows is a brief summary of the subcommittee's responses and recommendations, with more details included in the body of the report.

### **Question 1 pertained to identification of implementation issues:**

***The primary implementation issues*** include (a) determining whether all new incoming students will be required to follow the new curriculum regardless of the number of AP/K/CCP credits they bring with them; (b) determining which, if any, currently-enrolled students will be required to follow the new curriculum; and (c) establishing mechanisms by which to apply these determinations. For reasons explained in Section II of this report, **the subcommittee recommends that all new incoming students in AU22 and thereafter be informed that they will follow the new curriculum, with the understanding that for many such students (especially those beginning in AU22), exceptions will be approved** to allow their AP/CCP/K credit to fulfill requirements that would not otherwise be fulfilled with such course work. **With respect to students who enroll at the university prior to AU22, the subcommittee recommends that only students who have completed less than 25% of the GE requirements should be expected to move to the new curriculum**, with the understanding that any student who *wishes* to move to the new curriculum will of course be permitted to do so.

### **Question 2 pertained to necessary resources identified by advisors:**

***Significant resources will be needed***, both for advisors and for offices that work with and support advising. These resources include but are not limited to:

- Financial resources to cover the cost of hiring temporary staff and/or paying overtime or supplemental compensation to current staff, in order to allow current staff to complete the many tasks identified in the timeline (section V of this report).
- Additional tech resources—both staff and funding—to provide support for all sorts of technological needs, from updates to web sites and curricular documents to the creation of new degree audits and student transitional plans to the delivery of the Bookend courses.
- Additional staff in the Registrar's Office to create new degree audits.

**The subcommittee recommends that these resources—as well as the source of the necessary funding—be identified immediately**, in order to ensure the availability of staff and funding as soon as they are needed. For example, it is likely that some additional staff will need to be hired before SU20, in order to allow the new staff to receive the training they need to assume current staff's responsibilities, which in turn will then free up the current staff to take on the new work related to implementation.

Absent a commitment of such resources, current staff will be faced with the dilemma of trying to shoehorn additional responsibilities into their already-overflowing work days. This will result in less-than-satisfactory service to students and/or inadequate attention to the groundwork that must be laid for the successful implementation of the new GE.

### **Question 3 pertained to assurances/guarantees for the transition period:**

**All students**, new incoming students and currently-enrolled students alike, **must be offered the same assurance that students were offered when the university made the switch to semesters in 2012**; that is, **the pledge of “no harm to students” with respect to degree completion and time-to-degree.**

In addition to the items above that were specifically called out for the Advising Subcommittee to address, the members noted there were questions/issues raised for and by some of the other subcommittees that also are pertinent to academic advising. These questions are noted below and will be discussed in Section III of this report.

1. Will the committee(s) responsible for vetting/approving courses, themes, etc. include representation from advising? (Note that each current ASCC panel includes at least one advising representative.)
2. Should there be a time limit for continuation/completion of the existing GE, after which any returning/continuing student under the “old” curriculum will have to work with his/her advisor to develop an acceptable transition/completion plan?
3. How does the first Bookend course intersect/overlap with the Survey course?
4. Are the Bookend courses considered degree requirements? That is, must a student complete both (with a passing grade) in order to graduate? Must students repeat the course if they fail it?
5. Which transfer students will be required to take the first Bookend course? What about students with AP/CCP credit?
6. Are Associate of Arts students (who are NOT planning to complete a bachelor's degree) required to complete the Bookend courses?
7. How will all of this be assessed, and what role might advisors play in that assessment process?

Finally, the subcommittee discussed additional concerns related to the Bookend courses. Critical questions raised include: who will determine which students enroll in the first Bookend course in each term; who is responsible for monitoring/enforcing that enrollment requirement; and who is responsible for assisting students in understanding the requirements for the second Bookend course after they have completed the first course? These questions will be discussed in Section IV of this report.

## II. Discussion of questions specifically identified for the Advising Subcommittee

***The initial GE Implementation Committee's documents listed the following as questions to be addressed by the Advising Subcommittee:***

1. What implementation issues have advisors identified?
2. What resources will advisors need?
3. What assurances/guarantees need to be made to students with regard to the transition?

**In response to question 1**, the Subcommittee has identified three primary implementation issues: (a) determining whether all new incoming students will be required to follow the new curriculum regardless of the number of AP/K/CCP credits they bring with them; (b) determining which, if any, currently-enrolled students will be required to follow the new curriculum; and (c) establishing mechanisms by which to apply these determinations.

There are a couple options regarding the application of the new GE to incoming students beginning AU22 and later. For example, similar to the process that was used when the original General Education Curriculum was established (in recognition of the fact that students currently enrolled at other institutions with plans for eventual transfer to Ohio State will be “following” the curriculum as it currently exists), the university could allow for students with some defined number of transfer credits to be enrolled under the “old” GE and apply the new GE only to students with fewer than that number of credits. That number of credit hours presumably would equate to having already completed a significant percentage of the current GE requirements. Likewise, that policy could be extended to incoming “freshmen” who are just graduating from high school but have been completing AP and CCP course work based on what they know to be the current degree requirements at the colleges and universities they are considering attending and therefore will have a significant percentage of the “old” GE complete when they arrive at the university.

Conversely, the university could simply determine that beginning AU22, all incoming students should be required to follow the new curriculum. The new GE has been approved and information is already available on the OAA web site, and more complete information will be available in the coming months, so the argument could be made that current high school and prospective transfer students should have ample notice of the new GE requirements and therefore can plan accordingly.

There are drawbacks to each of these options. The first option would require re-thinking the way new student orientation programs are scheduled and delivered, as it would be a nightmare for advisors to work with two different populations—one under the old GE and another under the new GE—in the same orientation sessions. Even if arranging for separate orientation sessions was possible, some students could initially be assigned to the wrong session. The assignments would have to be made in advance of the orientation sessions, when some transfer credit, AP credit, and CCP credit may not yet be posted to students’ records, so some students might be assigned to the wrong session and told to follow a different curriculum than the one that ought to apply to them. Of course, such mistakes could be “fixed” later, but students’ (and their parents’) first impressions of the advising staff are critical during those orientation programs, so every effort should be made to ensure that folks don’t leave here with the notion that mistakes were made and/or critical staff are misinformed. (Side note: Over the past few

years, the university has placed a significant emphasis on the importance of high-quality academic advising and its contribution to student success. Salary increases and career road-mapping were part of the university-wide effort to ensuring that advisors are equipped with knowledge and tools to provide effective advising. The benefits of these efforts could be lost if flaws in the GE implementation process suggest advisors are not able to provide timely and accurate information to our new students.)

The second option is likely to result in some very unpleasant conversations between advisors and some students (and the students' parents) regarding the fact that many of the courses that students have completed during high school (or as a student at another institution) will fulfill only elective hours under the new curriculum, whereas they would have fulfilled GE requirements under the old program. The potential for a public relations nightmare regarding this is fairly significant, based on our conversations with recruitment staff and high school counselors.

To avoid the above concerns, **the Subcommittee recommends that all new incoming students in AU22 and thereafter be informed that they will follow the new curriculum, with the understanding that for many such students (especially those beginning in AU22), exceptions will be approved** to allow their AP/CCP/K credit to fulfill requirements that would not otherwise be fulfilled with such course work.

With respect to students who have already been enrolled at the university prior to the new GE being introduced, there are again a couple options. Because students could be informed of the coming of the new curriculum as soon as they enter the university and therefore encouraged to be thinking ahead about the new requirements, one could argue that all, or nearly all, enrolled students could be moved from the old GE to the new. Conversely, the argument could be made that every student should be permitted to complete his/her degree under the curriculum as it existed when he/she entered the university. Neither of these strict options is ideal, and each would require that exceptions be made, based on time-to-degree issues as well as unavailability of certain courses as the new curriculum is more fully implemented.

**Therefore the Subcommittee recommends that, for students enrolled prior to AU22, only students who have completed 25% or less of their GE requirements by AU22 should be expected to move to the new curriculum**, with the understanding that (1) some exceptions still may need to be made, on a case-by-case basis; and (2) any student who *wishes* to move to the new curriculum will of course be permitted to do so. Advisors will need to assist some students in developing transition plans, in order to allow them to fulfill the spirit of the GE requirements without extending their time-to-degree.

If these subcommittee recommendations are adopted, the next step will be to establish whatever mechanisms seem appropriate for determining what exceptions should be approved and for which students. **The Subcommittee recommends that a university-wide committee be created** (perhaps as part of the ULAC structure?), not to actually review each individual case to recommend/approve exceptions but rather **to establish the guidelines that should be followed in considering and approving such exceptions**. The members of this subcommittee would be happy to serve on such a committee and/or to nominate colleagues who would take this responsibility seriously and devote the appropriate time and energy to ensure that the spirit of the GE requirements are met to the fullest extent possible.

**In response to question 2**, the Subcommittee has identified many tasks that must be completed over the course of the next two years, most of which will require some allocation of resources in order for the tasks to be successfully completed without resulting in neglect of other ongoing responsibilities. These tasks are highlighted in the timeline (in Section V, below).

As noted in the Executive Summary (Section I, above), these resources include but are not limited to:

- Financial resources to cover the cost of hiring temporary staff and/or paying overtime or supplemental compensation to current staff, in order to allow current staff to complete the many tasks identified in the timeline (Section V).
- Additional tech resources—both staff and funding—to provide support for all sorts of technological needs, from updates to web sites and curricular documents to the creation of new degree audits and student transitional plans to the delivery of the Bookend courses.
- Additional staff in the Registrar’s Office to create new degree audits. (A side note regarding degree audits: We understand there is some possibility that in the future, Workday’s equivalent to a degree audit may be considered a solution. However, that cannot be considered the answer to the need for new degree audits beginning AU22, given both the timeline for Workday and the concerns raised about the Workday audits.)

**The Subcommittee recommends that these resources—as well as the source of the necessary funding—be identified immediately and earmarked for this critical work. The Subcommittee further recommends the establishment of an ad hoc committee to identify all the possible resources needed,** and again, the members of this subcommittee would be happy to serve on such a committee and/or recommend colleagues to do so.

**In response to question 3**, the Subcommittee reiterates the statement included in the Executive Summary: that is, that all students, new incoming students and currently-enrolled students alike, must be offered the same assurance that students were offered when the university made the switch to semesters in 2012; that is, **the pledge of “no harm to students” with respect to degree completion and time-to-degree must be shared and supported across campus.**

### III. Discussion of questions included in other subcommittee charges

***The following questions were noted under the “charges” for other subcommittees, but they are related to advising as well.*** The Advising Subcommittee’s response regarding each question follows the question, in italics, with recommendations in blue boldface text.

1. Will the committee(s) responsible for vetting/approving courses, themes, etc. include representation from advising? (Note that each current ASCC panel includes at least one advising representative.) ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that each committee include representation from the advising community, as advisors bring a perspective that is useful and often critical to the discussion of how students are impacted by proposals, revisions, etc.***
2. Should there be a time limit for continuation/completion of the existing GE, after which any returning/continuing student under the “old” curriculum will have to work with his/her advisor to develop an acceptable transition/completion plan? ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that the university consider a three-year time limit for such cases, allowing advisors to approve appropriate transition/completion plans for students beyond that point.***
3. How does the first Bookend course intersect/overlap with the Survey course? ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that an ad hoc committee be created to address this issue, so that all parties involved—advisors, Bookend course instructors, Bookend course faculty, and students—are on the same page with respect to any relationship between the two courses.***
4. Are the Bookend courses considered degree requirements? That is, must a student complete both (with a passing grade) in order to graduate? Must students repeat the course if they fail it? ***The Advising Subcommittee assumes that the Bookends Subcommittee will address these questions. However, we would like to note that a requirement that a student repeat a one-credit course that is designed to be completed early in the student’s tenure is not likely to be positively received by students or their parents.***
5. Which transfer students will be required to take the first Bookend course? What about students with CCP/AP credit? ***The Advising Subcommittee assumes that the Bookend Subcommittee will address this question; however, we note that it would seem logical to waive the course for students who clearly have few, if any, GE courses left to complete when they arrive at Ohio State.***
6. Are Associate of Arts students (who are NOT planning to complete a bachelor’s degree) required to complete the Bookend courses? ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that any student who is clearly identifiable as ONLY pursuing an Associate of Arts degree NOT be required to take the Bookend courses.***
7. How will all of this be assessed, and what role might advisors play in that assessment process? ***The Advising Subcommittee assumes that assessment will continue to be a responsibility of ULAC and/or ASCC and strongly recommends that advisors be asked to serve on those bodies.***



IV. Discussion of additional questions raised by the Advising Subcommittee regarding the Bookend courses

*The subcommittee identified a few other questions about the Bookend courses that appear related to advising and therefore should be addressed.* The Advising Subcommittee's response regarding each question follows the question, in italics, with recommendations in blue boldface text.

1. Who will decide which students take the first Bookend course in which term? For students who will not take it in the fall, what mechanism will be in place to ensure that they actually schedule it for spring (or some other term)? ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that a committee be formed to address these concerns. It seems highly likely that advisors will need to be a part of this process, so the advising community should be well-represented on this committee. It is important to note that if additional responsibilities are placed on advisors for these tasks, resources will need to be identified to allow the tasks to be efficiently and effectively carried out.***
2. Will there be some new students (NFYS or transfers) who are not required to take the first Bookend course due to their completion of a significant portion of the GE already? If so, will we have some modified version of the second Bookend for them, so that they still receive the benefits that we expect students to get from that experience? ***The Advising Subcommittee recommends that whoever has responsibility for making exceptions to GE requirements for students with such advanced credit hours also be given the authority to waive the first Bookend course for such students. The Subcommittee further recommends that whatever committee exists in the future regarding the Bookend courses take up the second question.***
3. Who is responsible for assisting students in understanding the requirements for the second Bookend course after they have completed the first course? *The Advising Subcommittee assumes that academic advisors will be looked to (at least, by students) to provide information about completion of the second Bookend. Therefore* ***the Subcommittee recommends that the advisors receive appropriate training, materials, etc. in order to be able to assist students with the fulfillment of the course requirements.***

The Advising Subcommittee raised many additional questions and concerns about the Bookends courses, especially the first course. These concerns were shared with the Bookends Subcommittee.

V. Timeline of advising-related work necessary for a successful AU22 launch of the new GE

**SP20** *Produce a new web site, for both internal and external audiences, and then continue to update the site as more information (e.g. new/additional Themes; approved course lists for each Foundation area and Theme; etc.) becomes available*

- Must contain clear description of the new requirements
- Must include clear indication of when the new curriculum will become effective
- Should start with known details and then update as more information becomes available (e.g., new Themes, what courses are approved for each Foundation area and Theme, etc.)

**SP20** *Identify all critical “partners” (e.g., high school counselors, CSCC and other “feeder” schools, etc.) and begin to share with them the details of the new GE and its implications with respect to AP/CCP/K credit; with respect to CSCC, this also will require revision of all 2+2 plans that are currently in existence, so advisors can share with new students the plans that will be in place at the time they consider transferring to OSU. **Note that this process will need to continue over the next two years, as more information/details become available.***

**SP20** *Identify—and commit—resources necessary to properly address all the items noted in this timeline; this will include, minimally:*

- Financial resources to cover the cost of hiring temporary staff and/or paying overtime or supplemental compensation to current staff, as it will be impossible for all the tasks noted below to be completed by staff who already have other full-time responsibilities
- Additional tech resources/staff
- Additional staff in the Registrar’s Office

Note that some additional staff will need to be hired fairly soon, as they will need to be trained before they can be expected to take over anyone’s current responsibilities in order to free their time for the new work.

**We recommend the establishment of an ad hoc committee to make recommendations regarding the resources that central administration will need to commit to this process.**

**SU20** *Begin to modify and/or create new curricular documents:*

- Recruitment materials
- Individual department web sites
- Sample curricular/4-year plans
- Orientation materials
- Materials used in Survey classes

**Note that this process should ideally begin in SU20 but will need to continue for the next two years, as more information/details become available.**

**SU20** *Establish training materials/processes, identify audiences for the training (such as: admissions counselors, academic advisors, faculty involved in recruitment activities, etc.), and determine who will deliver the training, when, and to whom.* This is critical to ensuring that everyone fully understands the new curriculum and can explain it to prospective students (and their parents), current students (and their parents), and any other university partners that need to know.

- AU20** *Work with the Registrar to begin developing new degree audits*; while these will not need to be complete until SP22 (when advisors will begin working with students planning to enter the university in AU22), it will be important to be sure they are completely accurate at that time.
- These will need to run parallel to the current audits;
  - There will need to be (as we have now) a simple mechanism to switch a student from old to new, or vice versa;
  - Note that creating an easier way for staff to enter DARs exceptions would be a welcome development, given the amount of time it currently takes for such work.

**AU20** *Begin planning for implementation of the Bookend courses*, including identification of intersection/overlap with Survey course and college resources needed to deliver both Bookend courses.

**SP21** *Identify which new entering students will be required to follow the new GE*. This will require answers to the following questions:

- Will all new transfer students be required to follow the new curriculum, or might exceptions be made for some due to the number of transfer hours they bring in?
- What about NFYS who look like transfer students, due to AP/K/CCP credit?
- Who will have authority to address requests for exceptions? Will that be individual advisors, or college advising administrators, or a faculty or university-wide committee?
- What process will be followed to document any such requests and the decisions that are made?

***We recommend the creation of a standing committee to address the question of who can make exceptions and what process will be followed, so that the same policies/guidelines/etc. are followed across the university.***

**SU21** *Begin planning for the SU22 orientation programs*, which would need to be handled differently than they are currently, if some students will be entering under the old GE and some under the new, as it will not be possible to work with these different groups of students in the same orientation sessions.

**AU21** *Regarding current students:*

- Identify who remains on the current GE and who moves to the new GE;
- Meet with all students who will need a transition plan (which will require both tech support, to keep accurate records of approved plans, as well as central funding for additional staff and/or overtime);
- Determine who will have authority to address requests for exceptions (i.e., individual advisors, or college advising administrators, or a faculty or university-wide committee);
- Determine what process will be followed to document any such requests and decisions.

***We recommend the creation of a standing committee to address the question of who can make exceptions and what process will be followed, so that the same policies/guidelines/etc. are followed across the university.***

**AU21** *Ensure that all information is updated and accurate* (courses, information on web sites, etc.) as enrolled students begin to plan for scheduling beyond SP22

**AU21- *Conduct recruitment/yield events for students entering AU22***  
**SP22**

**SP22 *Assist continuing students with course registration for AU22***

Note that this will include creating transition plans for students who will move from the current curriculum to the new GE.

**SU22 *Conduct orientation programs for new students entering AU22***

Note that this will include implementing the guidelines established for determining which new students will be permitted to follow a modified curriculum based on the significant amount of AP/CCP/K credit that they bring with them.

**SU22 *Finalize necessary processes for:***

- Ensuring that all students are following the correct curriculum
- Making decisions on exceptions to curricular requirements when requests are made
- Documenting concerns, issues, problems that arise during implementation
- Ensuring that all faculty and staff are aware of the resources available to them

**VI. Advising Subcommittee Membership Roster**

***Lyndsey Anderson***, Mansfield Campus

***Rebecca Bertran***, Office of the University Registrar

***Alexander Burry***, Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures

***Colette Dollarhide***, College of Education and Human Ecology

***Kynthia Droesch***, College of Public Health

***Mary Ellen Jenkins*** (chair), College of Arts and Sciences

***Renee Johnston***, School of Environment and Natural Resources

***Angela LeCount Melamed***, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

***Mary Leist***, College of Engineering

***Kia McKinnie***, College of Education and Human Ecology

***Steve Neal***, College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

***Alisa Paulsen***, Department of Psychology

***Katie Watkins***, College of Pharmacy