

Meeting 2: Feedback Session: September 19th, 4:00 - 5:00 PM

Participants: 74

Questions: 22

1. Vania Alvarez-Minah

Can we please see what data in addition to DFW rates were used in guiding the model? Will you share with us how and what data was used in designing the Unified Academic Coaching Model? What metrics and benchmarks will be used to assess student success? What advisors will be responsible for those metrics? In what ways will advisors be held accountable for student success?

*We currently have a 70% retention rate, a 50.1% six-year graduation rate meaning only half our students finish in 6 years. In addition, subsequent graphs added to Whitepaper (Appendix pages 20-24) and EY Full Report illustrate additional data. Typical metrics associated with student success will be considered in addition to measures that are specific to CSUs student population. This data can be analyzed at the individual, group and systems level. Metrics include but are not limited to
Academic Achievement*

2. Kaleen

Hi, I am Keleen. I am an adviser in the College of Business. One of the biggest changes that I have

Living Learning Communities
Career Development and Exploration

7. Sarah Rutherford

As faculty in the Department of Art and Design. I am the undergraduate director of the design program, so I'm the faculty adviser for design students. And we have an integrated model, a good relationship with our advisers in arts and science, even with first year advising, with transfer center. And we have pretty intrusive advising with our students. The model, as described, where faculty advising fits in, is that it would be a layer on top of everything. And I wanted to note, because the faculty only appear a couple times in the white paper, there is a big opportunity to include faculty advisers, those of us that are doing it; we often have close relationships with many students. And experience working with other advising professionals. I would recommend involving faculty advisers in the Vanguard Alliance. Because we see also how sometimes advising issues trickle down into student confusion, or how they interpret who is their adviser and who is in their network and who isn't. I do see some potential advantages in that. A student will be associated with one person, and that might be easier for them to keep track of. But I would say, you know, wherever there are possibilities to include faculty advisers as a part of this, rather than just a layer on top, I would look at that. One other comment related to what Kaleen had mentioned, about the concerns of the reporting structure being changed. I would echo that too, that having our advising, working through our associate deans of students, has helped me

Continual communication between academic coaches, senior academic coaches, AVP of Student Belonging & Success, and Assistant Deans.

9. Joshua Linerode

All right. So, for the record, I would like to say that the professional advisers on campus, we are not opposed to change. However, it is kind of hard to get behind the proposed change when one was not fully a part of the discussion when it comes to creating the plan. So, because I know, at the last town hall, it was Susan, who was a wonderful host, because I cannot think of the MC kept on saying, we, we want to be a part of these conversations. We want to be a part of these conversations. But the fact that the white paper was created, built, and put together without talking to the people that it is going to end up affecting for a lack of better terms, feels like a slap in the face. I know I'm upset about it, so I'll speak on behalf of myself when it comes to that. But I also know a lot of my colleagues are really upset that we were not brought into these types of conversations. I would also like it to be pointed out that the advising community on campus was already working on creating unifying processes through our various narcotic committees. I would like to know why all of the work that those NACADA committees have done, were not referenced, used, consulted, or even really asked for, to the best of my knowledge, when it comes to creating the white paper. Because, again, we were already working on determining unifying processes. And then next thing we know, oh, by the way, we're gonna completely overall, everything. And here's a new plan. I would also like it to be pointed out that the advising community on campus was already working on creating unifying processes through our various NACADA committees. I would like to know why all of the work that those NACADA committees have done, we're not referenced, used, consulted, or even really asked for, to the best of my knowledge, when it comes to creating the white paper. Because, again, we were already working on determining unifying processes. And then next thing we know, oh, by the way, we're gonna completely overall, everything. And here's a new plan.

The Unified Model builds on some NACADA work and enhances the approach to a Unified Model.

10. Jonathan Buckland

I believe that you have stated that the anticipated goal or the perceived goal that this unified model would actually accomplish is that someone would have an adviser or a

coach for their entire time here at CSU however you've also stated that our current advisers would remain coaching within their college and programs for the most part. My question is, how is this new model going to solve the fact that we already know that most students change majors constantly, and they're moving from one program to the next, and therefore it would not make any sense bas they're moving, that they would keep the same coach who may not even be an expert in that field anymore. And so therefore, this model really would not accomplish what you're saying it would. It technically is supposed to unless there's actually data that would prove this is exactly what's happened, which we have not seen.

Thank you for your comments. We will anticipate students changing majors once. Once a student has chosen the path, then the goal is to have one advisor until they finish. The model does not align with forcing a student making changes to a major to stay with the

Okay, so, because I don't see any other hands up after me, I have a list. I would like to get a couple of clarifications on things. The first part, on page two of the university organizational structure, it says, the AVP for Student Belonging and Success will work alongside associate and assistant deans in each college, as well as the AVP for enrollment and on course scheduling, curriculum changes and degree maps. That is a direct quote from the white paper. Then, on page nine, it talks about how can we simplify the requirements and sequencing, sequencing of courses for a major so that students can move between majors without significantly setting themselves behind? How can we encourage academic departments to continuously evaluate and innovate their degree structures to ensure that prerequisite structures do not become undue burdens on students? Again, that is also a direct quote from the white paper.

The second part, on page twelve go to

AASCU, CCA, and NISS, are the national leaders in student success models and working with a variety of universities.

15. Jonathan Buckland

Another question I have is the white paper focuses on what you're hoping to accomplish yet. This is a, in your own words, a transformational plan, which will forever alter the future of CSU moving forward. And while that may sound great as a legacy piece, my question would be, has there been a pre, mortem exercise organizationally, where you can identify where you expect to receive, push back, what your actual plans are to navigate through these dicey moments, um, in thoughtful ways, so that CSU as an organization will not be bottlenecked and completely crumble in advising and coaching moving forward. My concern is everything is about what you hope will happen, but there's very, been very little thoughtful exercise done as to how you plan to navigate or even anticipate the massive issues that will arise in any type of project of this nature that you will go through.

Thank you for your comments.

16. Bradyn Shively

the appropriate title under the new team structure would be? How would they improve the work done?

The Unified Model is an approach that integrates advising and coaching. See [whitepaper](#) for organizational structure. The senior Academic Coach is the lead role for academic coaching model and will function much like the Assistant Dean role.

17. Joshua Linerode

Page 15 under roles and Responsibilities. Well, before I talk about this, this specific one, the entire rationale behind this coaching model is we want to remove barriers for students.

However, on page 15, under Roles and Responsibilities, about the role of the Academic Coach, it says, "The Academic Coach will be responsible for providing academic support to students, including but not limited to: reviewing course materials, providing feedback on assignments, and assisting with time management." This role is currently filled by the Assistant Dean, and it is a full-time position. The Academic Coach role is currently a part-time position, and it is unclear how this role would be funded. The Assistant Dean role is currently a full-time position, and it is unclear how this role would be funded. The Academic Coach role is currently a part-time position, and it is unclear how this role would be funded.

something that you've worked really hard on, but critique is also just a lens on how someone outside of you is viewing the process. There may be some things to rethink and I hope, the organizing team looks at the questions as not just issues to address but opportunities to potentially rethink some parts of the model and the level of inclusion are very experienced advising personnel across the university have in the student experience. That's just my encouragement. I know this has got to be a lot to take in, but there is really a lot of good content here that I hope is considered in the design part of this.

Thank you for your comments, noted.

18. Courtney Glover

Traditionally, athletics advisers, trio advisers, honors advisers, have all worked together with academic advisers to help support students who fall into those categories. But with the different categories of the new academic coaches and the idea that they're going to have one academic coach throughout their entire career, does that mean that advisors in those areas, like TRIO, athletics,

this off. Not to mention we have to have training on it all and always. And you're thinking, this is going to be for 25, and we've got our freshmen and our transfer students coming in ready to want their schedules as May And so just what are we going to do in that transition, where we're thinking about technology and our registrar, and yet we've got to serve the needs of our incoming students. UM, and who is going to do that? And how?

20. Bradyn Shively

I had a couple questions and then just sort of a general comment with I'll start with I really appreciated Dr. Rutherford's comment about appreciating the opportunity and also just that you know understanding where the questions are coming from. Everyone on the zoom I think would say, they want whatever is best for students. I think we are all in agreement on that and we are, all in favor of whatever is best for those students. But we just all, think there's a lot of questions we all just want to make sure we know what's going on but we do nonetheless I think, from speaking on behalf of 70 some people on a zoom, appreciate the opportunity, nevertheless.

But in regards to some questions, I had a broader one about the timeline some of this has been echoed by some other questions but I was just curious if there was any thought given to potentially delaying the release or the initiation of this unified academic coaching model.

May is a very busy time for advisers, that is with cleaning up, you know, tail end of things from the spring semester, the way that our registration process works.

We have to, you knowreg 1ay nBTGGf96)100504yTf1 0 0 16T34\$7pr20010h)11gr)11046)10(B)5ut BTGGf96

that. And I just wonder, again, if there is more rationale can fight about the timeline, or

NACADA committee meetings. We were working on that. If you would like that stuff, feel free to ask we can get it to you.

Thank you for your comments.

22. Vania Alvarez-Minah

Just a good question. I thought about asking it before, and for sake of making sure that this

Three Year Retention Rates								
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ALL Colleges/ Programs	70.9%	69.8%	71.5%	73.5%	76.6%	69.6%	68.7%	69.1%
Arts and Sciences	72.4%	71.6%	74.0%	73.7%	75.4%	70.7%	71.9%	71.5%
Business	68.6%	70.0%	70.7%	77.0%	75.3%	68.4%	66.1%	68.9%
Education and Public Affairs	65.4%	68.0%	66.3%	66.5%	72.0%	60.0%	66.3%	61.3%
Engineering	78.7%	77.0%	81.3%	75.9%	85.5%	79.2%	77.2%	78.4%
Health	74.4%	72.5%	70.5%	78.5%	80.6%	75.9%	68.9%	64.5%
Undergrad Studies	63.3%	58.2%	60.5%	65.0%	68.3%	59.2%	56.2%	59.7%

Five Year Retention Rates	
2015	2016

ALL Colleges/ Programs	32.8%	31.1%	33.5%	33.4%	34.6%
Arts and Sciences	34.5%	35.9%	40.0%	36.4%	36.8%
Business	38.0%	37.9%	34.1%	41.3%	38.7%
Education and Public Affairs	34.0%	27.4%	34.2%	37.0%	32.6%
Engineering	30.7%	25.9%	29.2%	24.1%	36.0%
Health	38.3%	37.3%	38.4%	44.7%	37.9%
Undergrad Studies	22.7%	19.3%	18.4%	17.7%	19.1%

Five Year Graduation Rates				
	2015	2016	2017	2018
ALL Colleges/ Programs	47.0%	45.0%	44.9%	46.1%
Arts and Sciences	49.5%	46.5%	47.7%	45.6%
Business	48.8%	52.2%	48.8%	52.4%
Education and Public Affairs	48.2%	41.6%	44.9%	46.2%
Engineering	51.7%	45.4%	44.6%	24.1%
Health	48.7%	51.6%	51.1%	56.3%
Undergrad Studies	35.8%	32.3%	27.8%	32.7%

Six Year Graduation Rates			
	2015	2016	2017
ALL Colleges/ Programs	50.8%	48.9%	48.9%

Arts and Sciences	53.1%	50.1%	51.6%
Business	51.7%	53.8%	51.2%
Education and Public Affairs	51.8%	44.2%	48.0%
Engineering	56.1%	50.8%	50.3%
Health	52.9%	56.6%	54.6%
Undergrad Studies	39.7%	36.7%	32.7%