History of ACADAOS

The Academic Advising Association of The Ohio State University

Academic advising at The Ohio State University has a long and interesting history.\textsuperscript{1} In 1873, the first Ohio State President Edward Orton is said to have met with first year students every week after Friday chapel to orient them to the college and answer their questions about the curricula. As was the custom during that time, academic advising was strictly the purview of faculty members. The broad scope of advising services offered to Ohio State students today, however, is the result of many historical, administrative and campus culture changes. An enormous increase in student enrollment, a curricula that has become unbelievably complex, and a recognition of the importance of advising in students' success and retention, are a few of the influences that have brought about changes in how academic advising is currently administered at Ohio State, who is responsible, and the various formats in which it is provided.

Although faculty advisors continue to be acknowledged as the primary source for providing departmental and academic major information to students, this history is about another important source for advising students: full-time professional advisors who work in conjunction with university and college administrators, faculty, student services professionals, and other university offices and services. It is important to recognize these professionals' contributions to student success and retention over the years. This history records the formation and growth of the organization that represents professional advisors on campus today, the Academic Advising Association of The Ohio State University (ACADAOS).

To appreciate the history of professional advisors on campus, it must be placed within the context of the history of advising at Ohio State. One of the first written references to academic advising at the university was a section in the College of Engineering bulletin in 1902 that referred students to the College Secretary for, "... consultation or information in regard to their status as members of the College of Engineering or for the filing of petitions, changes of course, changes of class cards, adjustment of schedules and similar needs." As noted in Gordon's history of academic advising at Ohio State, The College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science (now the College of Arts and Sciences) used the term "student advisers" in its 1906 bulletin. The college announced a "system of advisers, the chief objects of which are ... to assist the undergraduate in choosing studies that will result in a well-rounded course and will achieve most economically the purpose which the student has in view in his course" (pp. 22-23). This is important to note because in addition to faculty advising, this is the first time in print that non-faculty college office staffs were acknowledged as giving academic advice.

\textsuperscript{1} Gordon, V.N. (2004) The history of academic advising at The Ohio State University from 1873 to 2004. Unpublished manuscript.
One of the most important actions taken by the university in support of academic advising was implemented in 1928 when the Central Committee on the Freshman Problem recommended that a system of junior deans be established in each of the undergraduate colleges. The rationale for these junior divisions was that the “character of the student body in the first two years of the University is such as to call for rather distinctive treatment” and that these needs “are not being sufficiently provided for under present conditions.” This junior deans system for coordinating advising services in the college offices acknowledged the need to concentrate on students in their first two years. This system remained in place into the 1940s.

Although there were no university-wide job descriptions or titles for full-time advisers at this time, a variety of titles were being used by the colleges to denote staff whose primary duty was to advise students. The College of Education created the full-time position of “student adviser” in 1940 and the first department to hire a full time “student adviser” was Electrical Engineering. The Division of Art was the first to use the title “Coordinator of Advising.”

Some Colleges in the 1950s expanded their advising services. The College of Arts and Sciences detailed in its 1955 bulletin the role of “educational counseling services” for the campus in general and the College’s role in “educational advisement and counseling.” It indicated that faculty advisers advised upper class students but freshman-sophomore program planning was done primarily in the College Office, with “constant referrals made to resource persons on the faculty.” A system of designated coordinating faculty advisers in each department was responsible for answering general student questions and for the assignment of individual faculty advisors for baccalaureate students. By the late 1960s most Colleges used the title of “counselor” for their full-time academic advisers.

The “freshmen problem” and the issue of retaining students in their first two years was recognized as a concern again in the early 1960s. As a result of studies and heated discussions, University College was established “... to promote excellence in lower-division higher education.” Its mission was to provide advising to all university first year students and other special student groups (e.g., honors, minorities). The Council on Academic Affairs recommended that University College become a separate entity since its mission was, “... to serve as a foundation for all of the undergraduate colleges of the University.” The new College took on responsibility for the academic advising and orientation of all new freshmen, some sophomores, and some special groups of new students. It also assumed responsibility for teaching the freshmen survey course within which the degree units presented their curricular information and content. To address the large numbers of students who required academic advising and orientation, University College employed a system of full-time professional and graduate student advisors. A substantial training program was instigated by the college along with degree unit assistance to prepare the graduate student assistants that were hired as part-time advisors. This large group of new full-time and graduate student advisors drew increased attention to the importance of the advising function on campus.
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Founding of ACADAOS

In the late 1970s and early 1980s an informal group of full-time advisors across campus raised questions about the lack of career advancement and what they considered unequal and inadequate title and salary levels. A comparison of titles and salaries among academic advisors/counselors across Ohio State colleges found great discrepancies. Although no action was taken at the time, the issues affecting academic advisors’ professional status continued to be discussed. Many of the founding ACADAOS members were also on the University’s Career Services Committee (UCSC) that was composed of representatives from each college’s career planning and placement staffs. In the late 1980s this nucleus of advisors decided that a separate organization to represent advisors across campus needed to be organized to identify concerns, seek solutions, and promote professional development. The group began meeting informally for lunch on a regular basis and used the name Ohio State Academic Advising Association (OSACADA), combining the acronyms for Ohio State and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). Since there was no official tie to the national association at that time, some wanted a different name. (It wasn’t until later that NACADA established affiliated associations and Ohio State joined as an Allied Organization in 1993.) It was decided to hold a contest for a new name with the prize of a free lunch. The name selected by the members from the submissions was the Academic Advising Association at The Ohio State University (ACADAOS). ACADAOS became a formal university association in 1995 when the Office of the University Provost officially recognized it.

Governance Established

Realizing a need to formalize the governance structure of the association, the early leaders of ACADAOS looked to other organized grassroots advising associations, especially around the Big Ten institutions. The organization at Purdue University (PACADA) was the model deemed as the most appropriate. PACADA had been in existence for about 4 years and seemed to be thriving with their governance. Much of the verbiage in the ACADAOS constitution was formatted and modeled after this group. An interim constitution was drafted in July 1991 and revisions were made the following year when it was adopted in April.3 Continued discussions ensued to include terms of services for officers and transitional continuity of leadership. Subsequent amendments and revisions were made in 1993 and 1997. (The original ACADAOS Constitution is included in the Appendices; the current ACADAOS constitution is available online.)4

Mission and Purpose. The original mission of ACADAOS was to create a forum for accomplishing the purposes stated in the Constitution along with ethical guidelines and standards of practice.
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3 ACADAOS General Meeting Notes, April 1992
ACADAOS Mission

- Treat all students with dignity;
- Perceive students as individuals who are at different levels of ability and development;
- Assist students in the development of educational plans compatible with their career and life goals;
- Assist students to identify and assess alternatives and consequences of their decisions;
- Refer students to appropriate offices when it is in the student’s best interests to do so;
- Provide information that is as accurate as possible.

ACADAOS Purpose

- Provide opportunities for sharing information relevant to advising;
- Support for professional growth for those engaged in academic advising;
- Promote research related to academic advising;
- Enhance academic advising services at The Ohio State University
- Advocate professional ethics and standards of academic advising.

Officers and Committees Structure. The Executive Committee was designed to consist of the President, Vice President, Immediate Past President, Secretary, Treasurer and all current Committee Chairs. The Vice President and Past President positions were added two years after the Constitution was adopted. An Archivist was added to the Executive Committee in 2000. The original committees designated were: Professional Development, Nominations, Program, Research and Ethics. The Executive Committee had the authority to designate other committees as need and time dictated. By 1994, the following committees were in place: Advising Staff Awards, Career Development, Program, Campus Affairs and Communications, Membership and Nominations, and Professional Development. Several task forces were named in 1996 (e.g., Adult Learner, International) that fulfilled a recognized purpose at the time.

ACADAOS Activities

Established communication channels

ACADAOS initiated and engaged in many different activities to fulfill its mission during its first decade as a burgeoning organization. A possible explanation for the early success of ACADAOS was its ability to aggregate advisors from across campus with its two quarterly general meetings. During the pre-Internet age, ACADAOS provided a new communication channel for OSU administrative and student services offices to share information directly to front-line advisors. This new means of distributing information was immediately embraced by many of these administrative offices. During its first years of existence, many campus
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5 ACADAOS Executive Meeting Notes, January 2000.
shareholders spoke at ACADAOS’ meetings. Among the OSU offices that sought to capitalize on the opportunity to speak to a cross-section of OSU advisors with updates were the Orientation Office and the Young Scholars Program. The Provost’s Office presented the new general education curriculum (GEC) and the Office of Academic Misconduct discussed students’ rights and responsibilities. Updates from the Registrar’s Office proved so valuable to advisors they were quickly adopted as a regular part of each meeting. This pattern of requests from OSU offices spurred the ACADAOS Program Committee to adopt the format of starting the general meeting with a business meeting, followed by an invited OSU Office or program presentation, and a Registrar’s report. Success of these early meetings clearly influenced the formation of ACADAOS’ mission and purpose as well as its first Constitution.

In addition to these general meetings, ACADAOS members also engaged in less formal gatherings. “Brown Bag” lunches were held in the Pomerene Hall Refectory starting in 1992 and after work social gatherings were arranged at local restaurants. These efforts helped build group camaraderie and identity. ACADAOS also created a logo for the organization and started selling merchandise to its members with the logo on items such as sweatshirts, tee-shirts and bags.

**Outreach to State and Regional Advising Organizations**

The opportunity for ACADAOS members to become involved with other campus advisors spurred their desire to seek relationships with other professional groups, locally, regionally, and nationally. Some members of ACADAOS were actively involved at the national level with the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and contact was initiated in 1993 for ACADAOS to become an Allied Member of NACADA. ACADAOS became one of the first academic advising organizations to develop this relationship with the national advising organization. The next year contact was made with advisors at Purdue University (PACADA) about holding a meeting for Big Ten Advisors. The first Big Ten advising meeting occurred in 1994 at Purdue University with Penn State and Ohio State hosting the next two years. Unfortunately these meetings were seen in conflict by a few Ohio State advising administrators with the annual meeting of the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (CIC) that was composed of only advising administrators. The Ohio State member of the CIC, Thomas Minnick conceded a compromise by allowing ACADAOS member, George Steele to accompany him to the CIC Big Ten meeting in Wisconsin.\(^6\) This action by a small group of advising administrators at the time caused the grass roots Big Ten advisors meetings to cease for a few years.

ACADAOS members were involved also with the creation of a state level advising organization for Ohio. Members of ACADAOS played a significant role in organizing the Ohio Academic Advising Association (OHAA). OHAA held its first conference in 1996 and ACADAOS members were encouraged to attend and participate in its summer conference. The creation of OHAA helped form the thinking of NACADA Region V leaders as to what other states and provinces could be organized. Professional bonds derived from these early efforts for

\(^6\) ACADAOS Executive Meeting Notes, April 1997.
collaboration among intra-institutional advising associations paid dividends. Due to a change in its organizational structure, NACADA Regions were able to acquire their own budgets in 2001. George Steele’s leadership of Region V from 2001 to 2003 led to the creation of the Region’s operating principles, the establishment of grants to assist states, provinces, and institutions to develop advising associations, and scholarships for the professional development of individual advisors. These efforts by Region V leadership during these years became the standard for the remaining nine NACADA Regions. Much of the success achieved by Region V was due to the collegial relationships developed by ACADAOS members’ lasting professional and personal relationships with other advisors throughout the Big Ten, Ohio, and the Region. These efforts are still visible in NACADA today since Region V has more Allied Advising Organization members than any of the other nine NACADA Regions.\(^7\)

Another example of the leadership and outreach by ACADAOS members that had an impact beyond the campus was hosting a NACADA Region V Conference. ACADAOS formed a committee in 1995 to explore the possibility of holding the NACADA Region V Conference in Columbus in 2000. A committee was formed of ACADAOS members, Peg Steele, Caroline Redding, and Carolyn Jensen, and Bryan Seager from Columbus State Community College. Support for the conference was obtained from Vice-Provost Arnold and the ACADAOS proposal was accepted by the NACADA Executive Office. The conference was held in the Hyatt Hotel on Capital Square with 320 people attending. The conference theme was “Charting the Course for a New Century,” with futurist Dr. Steve Millet of the Battelle Institute providing the keynote address.\(^8\)

**Professional Development**

**Workshops:** While ACADAOS used the general bi-quarterly meetings for acquiring and sharing knowledge among campus shareholders, it found its own members a valuable resource for other types of programs. The idea of offering additional workshops for campus advisors originated in the belief that some topics needed extended time to address adequately. ACADAOS members who presented regularly at the NACADA national and regional conferences led many of the workshops and presentations in the early 1990s on topics such as **Advising Undecided Students, Advising Research and Retention**. These workshops and sessions on timely topics continued through the remainder of the decade. The University College Annual Advising Conference that began in the 1980s was another vehicle for sharing knowledge among colleagues. ACADAOS played a key role in promoting the conference among its membership and encouraged them to present topical sessions. When the future status of University College’s demise became known, the conference ceased in 1999.
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\(^7\) NACADA Allied Members, https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Member-Services/Allied-Membership/Allied-Members.aspx.

OSU Advisor Web site: The University College team of George Steele, Gary Kennedy, Melinda McDonald and Wendell Gardner proposed to ACADAOS leadership the creation of the first integrated Internet advising Web site for advisors at OSU in 1996. The Web site was based on the model they developed for undecided students at OSU and for which they were nationally recognized by NACADA with the Outstanding Advising Award in 1997.9 The proposal for the OSU Advisor Web site provided the horizontal integration of OSU resources and information that was typically contained in the vertical institutional silos of colleges and departmental Web sites. The issue of improving the referral process grew out of concern expressed in the Noel-Levitz and CUES reports from the previous year. Communication with Vice-Provost Arnold conveyed that ACADAOS was prepared to create a “common” training Web site for all OSU advisors and requested funds for a half-time graduate student to assist with the technology that would be needed. In an email to Dr. Arnold, ACADAOS President C. Yeack, outlined the purpose of the Web site as:

- A single campus resource for all advisors to bridge the gaps found in a de-centralized advising system;
- Providing suggestions for advising special populations of students;
- Providing advising information that can help all advisors;
- Streamlining the referral process; and
- Linking campus and external resources to specific advising issues.

ACADAOS stressed that the Web site was not to duplicate existing efforts and materials found in colleges and departments, but to supplement them. A proposed outline for the Web site was conveyed in the email along with two requests. The first request was for the 50% GAA and the second request was for the formation of an oversight committee composed of faculty and professional advisors to provide materials for the Web site. The request to the office of Academic Affairs for funding a graduate student administrative assistant to provide technical support led to help for only one quarter so most of the work on the site was accomplished by the advisors in University College. The OSU Advisor was launched in summer of 1997 but perhaps due to the newness of the Web, continued support for input from faculty and professional advisors did not continue. It has served, however, as the ACADAOS Web site since its inception with various iterations and site names.

Advising Awareness Week and the Advising Fair

Most of ACADAOS’ activities during its first decade addressed issues related to advising as a profession and policies related to the practice of academic advising on campus. One of its major projects was Advising Awareness Week, initiated in May of 1997. Advising Awareness Week was an effort to publicize the role of academic advising to the larger campus community. To achieve this goal, the ACADAOS Executive Committee sought to combine a number of one-week activities related to academic advising. To broadcast the week’s program the ACADAOS Executive Board promoted stories that were covered by The Lantern. Activities included Take-
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9 ACADAOS Executive Board Meeting Notes, October 1997.
Your-Advisor-to-Lunch day and the Outstanding Advisors Award Luncheon. The major event of the week was an Advising Fair. The three goals of the Advising Fair component were: 1) to increase awareness of advising at Ohio State; 2) to increase student awareness of advisors as accessible; and 3) to create an informal environment in which advisors could share information. The budget for the Advising Fair became a major concern, however. Donations were collected from several advising offices the first year to erect tents on the Oval. To assess these issues and others related to the Advising Fair, participating advisors were asked to complete an evaluation after the first year. Overall the feedback from advisors was positive but the Chair of the event, Carolyn Jensen, suggested to improve the quality of the event in the following years there needed to be greater participation by advisors on campus; an increase and better quality publicity; establishment of more secure sources of financial support; and the continued improvement of support by the Undergraduate Student Government.¹⁰ As ACADAOS prepared for the Advising Fair in 1999, it was decided to join hands with the Career Services Committee to host it. The 1999 evaluation reported that if the Advising Fair were to continue it needed better marketing, more energetic people, and something that no one could control, better weather.

Establishing an Advising Career Path

As indicated earlier, some of the earliest conversations that captured the attention of ACADAOS members focused on human resources issues relating to job titles, salary, and student advising loads. In April of 1993, the ACADAOS Research Committee shared with the membership its inquiry into academic advising as a profession with salary comparisons among institutions located in Franklin County. This led to a charge to the research committee to explore variations in the positions of academic advising at Ohio State. A survey was sent to ACADAOS members in April 1994 seeking information about their years of total service at OSU, their years as an academic advisor, their official university title, their highest educational level obtained, percentage of time working directly with students, and the number of students assigned to their advising load.¹¹ Many variations in title, salary and student workload were revealed.

Career Path Systems

Members of the research committee met with Larry Lewellen, Director of Human Resources and staff member, Kevin Donahue in July 1994 to discuss advising job titles and career pathing. Four main points were agreed upon that would guide efforts to establish a career path for academic advisors at OSU within the next five years.

1. Both employer and employees must participate in any remaking of a job classification system or the rewriting of job titles. The Human Resources staff offered assistance in establishing a Task Force composed of employers (assistant & associate deans) and members of ACADAOS to start a review process of the current job classification system.

¹¹ ACADAOS, General Meeting Notes, Research Committee, April 1994.
2. Any new system had to be flexible in its design so as to meet the needs of employers. The classification review could take anywhere from one to two years to complete and implementation of a new classification system up to 5 years.

3. The department of Human Resources assisted in collecting salary data from other Big Ten institutions. Both internal and external salary comparisons were compiled and titles were contrasted to similar ones in other universities' registrars and admissions offices.

4. Human Resources department agreed to update the ACADAOS database by using the job titles of employees at OSU who performed academic advising.

Progress over the next several years encompassed a variety of activities. In 1995 a draft for an academic career path was proposed again by ACADAOS for comment.\(^\text{12}\) The career path in this proposal identified three levels of academic advisor: Associate Academic Advisor, Assistant Academic Advisor, and Senior Academic Advisor. General pay ranges were suggested for each level along with a description of job knowledge, responsibility, performance review, and steps for promotion. The proposal sought a Professional Promotion Review Board, comprised of three administrators, one faculty member, and three advisors to review applicant’s materials for consideration of promotion from one level to the next. A series of workshops throughout the year were held by ACADAOS for its members and Human Resource representatives to become informed about the proposal and feedback was solicited. In general, responses were positive except for concern about the use of a Professional Promotion Review Board.\(^\text{13}\)

During this time ACADAOS' efforts paralleled a larger university Human Resources endeavor called Broadbanding. Broadbanding synthesized many diverse job titles in one particular field of employment. Although the first focus of Broadbanding was directed at IT and technology classifications, ACADAOS took the initiative to set the stage for academic advisors to be second in line for establishing a career path by Human Resources. This was done by proposing a Broadbanding model for academic advising and asking for member feedback. Vice-President Linda Tom and Human Resources Director Larry Lewellen discussed the proposal with ACADAOS members at a general meeting in December 1995 but no immediate action was taken.\(^\text{14}\)

Campus-wide workshops, discussions, and employer surveys were continued for two years by both Human Resources and ACADAOS. Human Resources proposed a new model in February 1996 that simplified titles to two levels of the advisor/counselor job family: advisor/counselor and advisor/counselor leader, but again no further action was taken by the administration.\(^\text{15}\) In February 1997, Human Resources published a report comparing the salaries
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\(^\text{13}\) ACADAOS General Meeting Notes, May 1994.
\(^\text{14}\) ACADAOS General Meeting Notes, December 1995.
\(^\text{15}\) Office of Human Resources, Documents, February 1996.
for academic advisors at Ohio State to the rest of the Big Ten and discovered that for the nine public institutions participating in the study, for two levels, academic advisor and academic advisor staff assistant, OSU professionals were paid 83% and 93% of the average respectfully.

Due to a change in university presidents in 1998 and other campus changes, the impetus for advisor Broadbanding came to a standstill. During the general meeting in April of 1998, an anticlimactic announcement was made to ACADAOS members that Human Resources had suspended Broadbanding efforts for academic advising. After five years of attempting to install a career path for academic advisors at The Ohio State University, no concrete results were seen. ACADAOS members who were active in promoting the Broadbanding effort at Ohio State experienced a bittersweet moment while attending the NACADA Annual Conference in 1998, where a presentation by advisors from the University of Minnesota described the implementation of a three-tiered career path for their academic advisors with a 360-degree review process that solicited yearly peer and student reviews.16

**Impact of Major Institutional Reports and Policies**

During the first decade of ACADAOS there were arguably four major policy reports that affected academic advising. In addition to the report on Broadbanding in 1995 and the related employer salary surveys conducted by Human Resources between 1995-1999, there was the 1995 Noel-Levitz Report on enrollment that addressed recruitment and retention efforts at OSU, the Committee for Undergraduate Experience (CUES) in 1995, and the Round Table report in 1998.

**Noel-Levitz Report**

The Noel-Levitz Report in 1995 was the result of the University Administration inviting consultants to campus to prepare a report on OSU future recruitment and retention policies.17 The authors of the report met with faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The report outlined the strengths and challenges OSU faced in regards to recruitment and retention. Among some of the challenges highlighted in the report that pertained to academic advising were: admission to some programs being restricted because of space/resources limitations; student’s perception’s that there was a lack of concern about them as individuals; students felt they got the “run around” as they were shifted from office-to-office for services and resources; and that attention to students was not a part of the faculty tenure reward structure. The report suggested that OSU adopt policies that built upon its strengths and address its challenges by: 1) raising the level of student satisfaction by improving the training of front line personnel; 2) reducing first year attrition by 5% in three years or less; 3) increasing the average ACT scores by .5 units each year through the year 2000; and 4) increasing the non-Ohio new first quarter first year student fees from 10% to 19% by the year 2000. Some of the other recommendations in the report that would later influence conversation about advising on

campus included the need to get students involved in coursework related to their major as soon as possible (although the report cautioned against direct enrollment) and to move orientation to spring term for selected students. The authors also emphasized the importance of UVC 100 (freshman orientation course in University College) as an element in any successful retention program and urged campus decision-makers not to change the current content of the course that met “the affective needs of incoming freshmen” with a “more academic subject matter orientation.”

Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (CUES)

The Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (CUES) began its work in 1994 looking at the totality of the undergraduate experience at OSU. Associate Dean of the College of the Arts, Dr. Karen Bell, who was the Chair of CUES, invited ACADAOS members to participate in the report. Dr. Bell shared with ACADAOS a section of the report on advising from the CUES sub-committee on advising, in January 1995.\(^{18}\) ACADAOS members’ reaction to the report was that they felt comfortable with the existing means of providing advising on campus with those items that worked well: freshman orientation, UVC as an entry point for students, the UVC 100 course, well trained advising staffs, and a desire to improve services. Items that did not work well and needed to be addressed were orientation for all types of transfer students, upgrading technology, issues related to oversubscribed majors, and the issue of closed courses. Suggestions by the focus group to help remedy advising issues included: revamping transfer credit; rethinking the mindset at OSU about non-traditional students; developing more proactive advising practices; and giving advisors better access to other campus offices such as Financial Aid and Admissions. Also suggested were better integration of academic and career advising; the creation of a career path for OSU advisors; and more resources and support for advising.

As the year 1995 progressed, ACADAOS leadership decided that it would write a response to both the Noel-Levitz and CUES Reports.\(^{19}\) The report was completed in September 1995 and was sent to Vice-Provost Arnold. In writing their response to these two reports ACADAOS addressed the following areas of concern:

(1) The special needs of freshmen;
(2) Direct enrollment;
(3) Transition into the University;
(4) Lack of space in selected programs;
(5) "Student run around" and training issues for staff;
(6) Reducing the runaround and valuing the individual;
(7) Career services hub;
(8) Structure of advising and technological needs;
(9) Curriculum issues; and


\(^{19}\) ACADAOS Administration, Reaction to Final Report on CUES and Noel-Levitz, 1995.
(10) Quality of instruction.

Each of these topics received individual attention in the report with a list of specific observations and suggestions and a summarizing statement. The report suggested more funds be allocated to areas of need such as entry-level math courses, study skill courses, and transfer orientation. They expressed concerns about duplication of efforts in regards to the CUES report suggestion of creating a university wide career hub. It was felt that services outlined for the career hub replicated existing services found in career service units, some degree units, and the Alternative’s Program in University College. The authors also expressed concern about the idea of moving autumn’s first-year orientation to May, as suggested in the Noel-Levitz’s report. They offered warnings concerning the suggested policy of pursuing direct enrollment based on the exploration needs of typical first-year traditional students and major-changers. In general the authors of the ACADAOS response to the CUES and Noel-Levitz’s report was one of support.

The Round Table on Advising

The Round Table on Advising was a group appointed by the Provost to “think hard about what we want to accomplish with academic and career advising.” The Round Table group was to consider goals for advising and how OSU was organized to achieve them. ACADAOS’ reply to the Round Table’s report addressed four topics for comment: organizational structures, communication, improvement in quality, and links to careers.\(^\text{20}\) The ACADAOS reply about organizational structures reiterated concern about direct enrollment of first year students to degree units. To better serve the adult population, it was suggested that a distance learning section of UVC 100 could be developed and offered to adult and transfer students. ACADAOS supported the creation of a council that would address advising issues on campus as a means of improving communication and sought representation on it.

The ACADAOS reply to quality improvement drew attention to the use of its OSU Advisor Web site as a means of sharing advising information across five OSU campuses for all types of advisors and administrators. ACADAOS clarified the impression put forth in the Round Table report about the quality of graduate-student advisors since the Round Table members recommended the University move from part-time to full-time advisors. At the time this was interpreted by many on campus as a means of questioning the quality of advising in University College where a large portion of the advising staff was comprised of graduate-student advisors. The ACADAOS reply pointed out that graduate-student advisors also were hired in many offices across campus and the issue should be focused more on training advisors rather than their type of employment. Perhaps a bit of bias from both the Roundtable writers and ACADAOS existed in regards to interpreting the report since many full-time advisors on campus at that time began their careers as graduate-student advisors and the authors of the Round Table Report viewed advising as more of an extension of the faculty role. The ACADAOS reply focused on a greater integration of academic and career advising and supported efforts to collect data on students’ career paths after graduation.

\(^\text{20}\) ACADAOS, Documents, Position Papers, Round Table Response, November 1998.
ACADAOS Response: White Papers

After writing the ACADAOS Response to the Round Table Recommendations, the Executive Committee decided that ACADAOS would produce a number of short “white-papers” on relevant campus advising topics. The first topic addressed the use of interactive Web Video in advising. The paper suggested a trial effort be made to assess its effectiveness for inter-office communication and use with students. The paper admitted that effective use of interactive Web Video with students might be 3-5 years into the future, but hoped some limited lessons could be learned. Other papers published in 2000 addressed the topics of the four-year graduation plan, restructuring the University Survey Course, and the implementation and adoption of technology for academic advising. The ACADAOS paper addressing the adoption of a four-year graduation plan suggested 1) making special accommodations to the special needs of exploring students; 2) concern that an over-emphasis on the prescribed four-year time to graduation would discourage students from participating in learning experiences such as co-ops, internships and volunteering; 3) and finally that students be made aware of the difference between direct enrollment and direct admission and its impact on a timed graduation plan if students did not gain entry to their desired major or if they decide to change their major.

ACADAOS’ response in the white paper Restructuring University Survey entered the conversations that swirled around campus regarding changing the curriculum of the University Survey 100 course. The ACADAOS response suggested expanding sections of the course for specific populations of students, such as transfer and honor students. University College had adopted these approaches decades before with their sections of University Survey, but the ACADAOS recommendation sought to expand this effort to degree granting colleges that were expected to start working with new first-year students through direct enrollment. Several curricular changes were suggested, such as dropping some of the contemporary issues lectures like racial and gender equality and focusing instead on student success issues such as educational and career planning. ACADAOS also suggested making the Survey 100 course offerings more uniform across campus. At the time some colleges offered a three-week version, while others offered a full 10-week quarter version. ACADAOS members hoped their recommendations would lead to a restructured course that would provide an in-depth focus on topics that would help all new students navigate through the institution and achieve academic success. The ACADAOS white paper on technology in advising emphasized the participation of advisors in the decision-making process especially when the adoption of technology and the development of training was concerned.

21 ACADOS Executive Meeting Notes, April 1999.
It is difficult to assess the impact of ACADAOS efforts to influence decision-making on the advising issues addressed in the White Papers but as ACADAOS came to the end of its first decade, it is important to note that the organization had developed the confidence to be a strong voice in academic advising issues at the university and to make that voice heard among administrators and other shareholders.

Relationship with Academic Affairs

The relationship ACADAOS developed with Academic Affairs during the first decade was evolutionary in its nature. As conveyed earlier, ACADAOS began as a self-organized association on campus, not one appointed by the administration. Early conversations between Academic Affairs and ACADAOS seemed to blossom early due to the communications channels the organization provided to a wide array of advising offices on campus. As discussed in other sections of this history, campus-wide human resources policy efforts such as Broadbanding provided both ACADAOS and Academic Affairs a vehicle for cooperation. It may not be coincidental that the first time an OSU Provost Session spoke to ACADAOS was in October 1994 when where he underscored the importance of good advising and student retention.

When In the following year the issue of retention became a more central concern on campus through both the Noel-Levitz and CUES Reports, these reports reinforced the importance of the dialogue between both organizations. Vice-Provost Robert Arnold met with ACADAOS members at the May 1995 meeting to listen to advisors’ concerns about retention efforts and the use of technology in advising. It was also during this meeting that the Provost officially recognized ACADAOS as a legitimate OSU organization.

Although Academic Affairs funded specific ACADAOS projects when requested, the need for a reliable ACADAOS source of income was a constant problem. ACADAOS began as a self-funded organization through the collection of membership dues from advisors. It was rare for the ACADAOS budget to contain more than a thousand dollars with such a limited source of revenue from project request system. The desire for ACADAOS to fund projects such as maintaining the OSU Advisor Web site; sending ACADAOS representatives to the CIC meetings; providing a stipend for Advising Award Winners; and holding the Advising Fair always encountered financial constraints. As discussed earlier, the difficulty with the project-based approach was that sometimes there were difficulties in negotiating the purpose and delivery of the project as well as transferring funds in a timely, seamless way.

ACADOAS’ primary contact in Academic Affairs changed in 1997 when Dr. Martha Garland became Associate Provost. ACADAOS approached her with a budget model similar to one that the University Career Services Committee had with Student Affairs. Arduous conversations continued for two years. This step was not taken without internal debate within ACADAOS members about how it might impact its independence. An example of this concern was the issue of direct enrollment as Provost Ed Ray officially announced the intent of OSU to directly enroll 80% of all new first quarter first-year students in 1999. Some ACADAOS members wished to express concern with this policy and did so through a White Paper.
As several ACADAOS presidents held discussions with Dr. Garland, the issue of independence within ACADAOS was slowly judged by its members to be less critical than a firm financial foundation for the organization. In 1999, it was announced that Academic Affairs would support ACADAOS with a $5,000.00 a year budget. The arrangement stated that ACADAOS would have to submit a request each year and itemize how the money would be allocated. The first budget reflected ACADAOS priorities at that time by allocating funds as follows: $1,500 for the Outstanding Advisor Award; $800 for the Advising Fair; $1,500 for the NACADA 2000 regional conference, and $1,200 for professional development.\textsuperscript{25}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The growth of ACADAOS in its first decade demonstrated how a group of dedicated advising professionals could create a self-organized advising association that advanced academic advising at The Ohio State University for students, the institution, and their own professional development. They accomplished this by creating networks throughout the institution to the academic offices and student services in which their students were involved. The impact of core members of the group also influenced academic advising beyond the campus by creating and participating within other state, regional and national academic advising associations. As academic advising became more of a nationally recognized critical service to students in higher education, ACADAOS members were in the forefront of its development. When dramatic organizational changes in advising were taking place in the latter years of its first decade, ACADAOS as a group always questioned policies that its members thought were not always in the best interests of students and offered positive solutions. The impact of their efforts to improve the status and advancement of advising as a profession at Ohio State University and nationally is still felt today.

*This history was written by George Steele, Margaret Steele and Virginia Gordon, 2016

\textsuperscript{25} ACADAOS Executive Meeting, November 1999.
Appendices

Awards

ACADAOS first considered the creation of a committee to oversee the awarding of Advising Staff Awards in 1994. Conversations about the award continued in both the Executive Committee and in the general meetings. Considerations included whether non-ACADAOS members could be nominated, how many awards should be given each year, if a special award for faculty advising should be created, or whether the recipient of the ACADAOS Academic Advising Award should automatically be nominated for a NACADA Outstanding Advisor Award. The first ACADAOS Outstanding Advisor Award was given in 1996.

In addition to receiving the ACADAOS Outstanding Advisor Award, many members of the ACADAOS community received recognition by the institution through the Ohio State University Outstanding Staff Award and through awards bestowed nationally by NACADA. ACADAOS members receiving these awards during its first decade are:

**ACADAOS Outstanding Advisor Awards**
- 1996 Peg Steele, Fisher College of Business; Mark Giese, University College
- 1997 Tom Davenport, Arts & Sciences; Caroline Redding, Mechanical Engineering
- 1998 Judith Bernstein and Judith Monson, Department of Mathematics
- 1999 Carolyn Jensen, University College; Wayne De Young, Political Science
- 2000 Jogy Das and Peggy Strow, University College
- 2001 Beth Dowling, Marion Campus; Melinda McDonald, Fisher College of Business

**OSU Outstanding Staff Awards, Awarded to Academic Advisors, 1991-2000**
- 1991, Mary Bailey, Chemistry
- 1993, Virginia N. Gordon, University College
- 1995, Carolyn Jensen, University College
- 1997, George Steele, University College

Source: [https://www.osu.edu/facultystaff-web/university_awards/staff_previous.html](https://www.osu.edu/facultystaff-web/university_awards/staff_previous.html)

**NACADA 1992-2016**
- 1992 Outstanding Advisor Award – Merit, George Steele
- 1997 Outstanding Advisor Award, Melinda McDonald
- 1997 Outstanding Advising Program, Advising Undecided and Major Changing Students for the 21st Century. Undecided and Alternatives Advising, University College
- 1998 NACADA Conference Keynote Address, Virginia N. Gordon
- 2003 Service to NACADA Award, Virginia N. Gordon
- 2003 Outstanding Advisor Award – Primary Advising Role, Margaret “Peg” Steele
- 2004 Outstanding Advising Program – Merit Undergraduate Student Services
• 2008 Service to NACADA Award – George Steele
• 2011 NACADA Virginia N. Gordon Award for Excellence in the Field of Advising – George Steele

Source: http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Programs/Awards/Association-Awards.aspx

Other: 2016 College of Education and Human Ecology Distinguished Alumni Award – Virginia N. Gordon

Presidents of ACADAOS, First Decade
• 1991-92 Mary Ellen Jenkins
• 1992-93 Mary Ellen Jenkins
• 1993-94 Caroline Redding
• 1994-95 Carolyn Jensen
• 1995-96 Cheryl Yeack
• 1996-97 Peg Steele
• 1997-98 Peg Steele
• 1998-99 Peg Steele
• 1999-00 Jennifer Grube Vestal/George Steele
• 2000-01 Barbara Gladman

Documents for Archives:
ACADAOS, General Meeting Notes
ACADAOS, General Meeting Notes, April 24, 1997, New constitution amendment
Roundtable, CUES, and Noel-Levitz’s Reports

This copy is a draft. Citations will be modified when the process for storing relevant documents is established with the OSU Achieves and the current ACADAOS leadership.