Participants:

Questions asked first Zoom Session: 34
        Questions answered first Zoom Session: 11
Questions emailed by Zoom Participants: 9
Dean's questions after initial meetings: 3

Data supporting transformation
How NACADA work fits in
Universities doing this already

Hiring and qualifications of all academic coaching levels
Parameters for Placement

Now till May implementation (7-8 months)
Professional development
Technology

What does it look like?
When does it start?
Fitting in core curriculum at same time

Procurement timeline
Process for choosing the solution
Training

Questions:

1. The document I reviewed titled "Unifed Coaching Model" clearly identifes problems with current advising at CSU, provides many goals and justifcations for decisions, and gives many organizational charts. What I am not seeing is any defned role for the faculty who instruct students. What is the role of faculty in this?

3. What are the implications for data informed decision making?

4. Will coaches be advising students on their major coursework? My understanding was that in the new unified model, there would be no formal faculty major advisors. If a department chooses to provide faculty major advising, what is the plan to unify/clarify who does what? Specifically, if a given department wishes to advise their students on their majors, how will it be communicated to students who they see for what, and how will you avoid confusion if two people are advising on the same content? This is already a point of confusion in our current model – I think it is important to communicate how/if this will change in the new model.

5.

1) Vania Alverez-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 Unifed Academic Coaching Model?

        See whitepaper and EY Findings.

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?

What advisors will be responsible for those metrics?

In what ways will advisors be held accountable for student success?

2) Kaleen

Hi, I'm Keleen. I'm an adviser in the furniture business. One of the biggest changes that I've seen in the proposed document is to the organization in the reporting chain. We are strengthened by reporting to our assistant deans who have extensive knowledge of and connections to our colleges, allows us to to quickly address student issues related to curriculum and to bring important issues related to curricula and class of erings quickly to the attention of appropriate faculty. It seems like severing this direct connection between academic and student af airs is a step backwards.

3) Caleb Steindam

So the, the new system, according to the white paper, seems to impose a tier system of advisers so some advisers would be labeled as assistants while others would be labeled as associate to other seniors um I'd like TO ask

4) Jonathan Buckland

O page 13 of your white paper, you specif cally mentioned that you anticipate attritio

when one were 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 can't think of the MC what, period word that makes sense here, kept on saying, we, we wanna be a part of these conversations. We wanna be a part of these conversations. But the fact that the white paper was created and built and put together without talking to the people that it's going to end up af ecting for a lack of better terms, kind of feels like a slap in the face. Um. So, and I know I'm upset about it, and I know speak, 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.

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. So, because I know, at the last town hall, it was Susan, who was a wonderful host, because I can't think of the MC what, period word that makes sense here, kept on saying, we, we wanna be a part of these conversations. We wanna be a part of these conversations. But the fact that the white paper was created and built and put together without talking to the people that it's going to end up af ecting for a lack of better terms, kind of feels like a slap in the face. So, and I know I'm upset about it, and I know and 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. So I would like to know why all of the work that those narcotic 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.

And so we are in need of advisers, UM, stationed here to fully learn the majors. They would be assigned, UM, to be here house with us, so that training and collaboration happens within the college, and this would be true of other colleges. So I'm using Arts and science as an example as an example. But this would apply everywhere. And so what are your plans to rectify this immediate need?

14) Joshua Linerode

Okay, so, because I don't see any other hands up after me, I have a list. So I would like to get a couple clarifications on things. So 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, um of it all is that on page twelve and 13, so on page twelve go 2.2. And then on page 13, under recommended action items, it talks about the Academic Success Coaches, or whatever the title it fully is, cause I don't have it memorized, UM. Talks about how we would be developing, we develop a flexible, individualized education plan, I-E-P template as a proactive approach to personalized intervention for students at risk of college dropout as we all know Yes we can create plans but of course we can't force, students to do anything.

So, um, I would like to get some clarification of what you if you mean, like the traditional IEP plan that is usually used in K through twelve, versus, like, determining a graduation plan of, hey, here's what you need to be able to graduate.

Let's kind of plan this stuff out, that type of thing. And if you mean more along the traditional IEP, let's using K through twelve, um, how is that gonna be different, um, than what ODS currently does? Because there's also some legal things that falls, that falls under all of that as well.

And then my last one, I promise, well, at least for right now, is the fact they NACDA, at which the National Academic Advising Association, UM, through the multiple times that I've read the white paper, is really only ever mentioned once, maybe twice, and that is to talk about case loads. About how case loads should be 200 to 300 students per one advisor.

And then the A-I-A-S-C-U-C-C-A and N-I-S-S those are mentioned more than NACADA um and it talks about using those three other programming to help. Determine our professional development and how we're setting up the this coaching model and how advising works here at CSU, when really they don't have any professional background in academic advising. So why are we not using the professional recommendations that we got from the

currently here, there will be anything change, um, not just on our end, but on their end. So I'm just curious how they'll be supported. And thank you.

22) Joshua Linerode

I'm back. Um, okay, so, because I wanna be able to say that I mentioned it and not have regrets later. Um, the last thing that I have highlighted, and I double checked my stuf like f ve times at this point. UM is primarily a point of clarif cation. On page seven. Under the current and proposed practice, csu's current advising resources are across four entities, academic programs, academic colleges, student belonging in success and athletics. See appendix Figure one. These decentralized entities each have a unique leadership structure, their organization and our operation include disjointed professional development opportunities, accountability, lines, approaches, and even technology, which allows for the proliferation or duplication of methods, models, technologies, and practices.
So my point of clarif cation with that one is those issues were originally being recognized under the Advising Community stuf that we were working on. And that was the entire point of the Advising Community meetings that we were having on a semi regular basis, as well as the NACADA committee meetings. So we were working on that. So if you would like that stuf , go free to ask we can get it to you.

23) Vania Alverez-Minah

Just a good question. I thought about asking it before, and for sake of making sure that this is one of the many questions that you have written down, I like to know with regard to students success were similar students compared with each other, such as not comparing honor students to students who enrolled with lower scores. UM. And then also, what about reaching out to students who left to f nd out why did they leave? That's something that's commonly done in money companies to just evaluate how to make improvements and why customers might leave.

"Considerable time and effort has been spent developing this approach, and this is to be applauded. The document I reviewed titled ""Unified Coaching Model"" clearly identifies problems with current advising at CSU, provides many goals and justifications for decisions, and gives many organizational charts. What I am not seeing is any defined role for the faculty who actually instruct students. What is the role of faculty in this? "

"Why are we spending so much on ""coaches"" and not hiring professionals who instruct students in the classroom?
"
"What does this actually mean: (This looks like AI language)
""Integrated support for multiple academic and social support units on campus to identify and address the needs of CSU's diverse student body; provide strategic direction to the campus in implementing an inclusive, equitable and engaged model of student success that includes the academic and co-curricular experience of students and an integrated student success model; and provide the campus with data-informed strategies and metrics that are monitored and evaluated to ensure efficient and effective programs and services that address the needs of students.""
Could you explain this without the jargon?"

How and when were academic advisors, and directors of advising, consulted to consider potential policy changes, technology uses, etc?

What reason is there to believe that TRIO's success can be replicated across the university? Does TRIO not have a lower student to advisor ratio than the general student body? Do TRIO students not receive a level of support that cannot be replicated across the general student body?

In what way will academic coaches be 'coached' to use information about courses with high DFW rates?

"The website refers to ""the data"" in this sentence: ""CSU data shows that if approached holistically with sound academic coaching, these student groups may have a better foundation and path toward graduation. What data is this referring to and why isn't it linked to the answer?"

"""establishes a vanguard alliance and an academic advising leadership team who will provide policy recommendations and practical modifications, it creates a unified advising identity, commits to meet advising needs better, and invests in those who engage in advising.""

What is ""a vanguard alliance""???"

Did an AI bot put this report together? The answers to the questions posted on the website are not specif c but very general.

New job descriptions? Where are these posted on the website?

why hasn't the Steele and Zarges external review been provided to complement the white paper by Banks and Sridhar?

"Would you say we do not have a "student-centered" "student-centric" campus now? Being student-centered was listed as a strength of CSU's new strategic plan. So why do we

when students show up with urgent needs). I also do not understand how staf ing ef iciency is achieved or how the locations will operate safely and ef ectively, as I don't think it is in the plans to have administrative or front desk assistance at each of the numerous existing locations. Finally, I'd tie this to the upcoming need to identify space for current RT occupants – don't we serve all university facilities needs better when we think holistically? In A&S, for instance, why leave BH 221 will a large conference room and executive of ice, large front desk area, and 7 individual of ices if it will be empty but for 3 of those of ices? What would entering such a space signal to our students in terms of optics and the degree to which we value academic advising/coaching and have invested in it as a resource? Doesn't it make more sense to have fewer locations for students to f nd, and therefore better use of " freed up" space for other university needs?