

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

Participants: 74

Questions: 22

1. [REDACTED]

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

Student Satisfaction

Persistence

Retention

Student Wellness

Student Belonging

We are all collectively responsible for enhancing student success, retention, and recruitment. Per the organizational charts provided in the white paper, the VPs for Academic Affairs, Enrollment and Student Belonging and Success will work together to enhance our retention, graduation, and enrollment efforts. The AVPs will work in conjunction with Assistant Dean's as determined by their College Dean. In addition, the AVP will work closely with assistant deans, vanguard alliance and the academic success coaching leadership team to provide guidance and support for all academic coaches.

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

Standards of care will be developed in conjunction with academic coaching professionals as part of our professional learning efforts.

2. [REDACTED]

Hi, I am [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] One of the biggest changes that I have 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 quickly address student issues related to curriculum and to bring important issues related to curricula and class offerings quickly to the attention of appropriate faculty. It seems like severing this direct connection between academic and student affairs is a step backwards. **So, I am wondering what issues this restructuring is designed to solve the way it is presented now. And if any thought has been given to how this disconnection from our colleges could play out in this new model and the drawbacks that it could have for our students and our advisers and trying to address issues in a timely way.**

There remains a strong relation between associate deans and advisors in the academic colleges. Physical location will remain the same. The senior Academic Coach is the lead role for academic coaching model and will function much like the Assistant Dean role. Senior academic coaches will work with AVP of Student Belonging & Success, who will work in partnership with the Assistant Deans as determined by the College Dean.

3. [REDACTED]

The new system, according to the white paper, seems to impose a tiered system of advisers so some advisers would be labeled as assistants while others would be labeled as associate to other seniors. I'd like to ask **what is the rationale or the purpose of having some of us below or above others of our colleagues who presumably would be doing similar work? And what would be the other criteria or the selection process for assigning these different labels to different coaches?**

The Unified Model includes a leveling approach as a tool to address equity in pay, as suggested in NACADA report, pg. 16, first full bullet. We are working with HR to identify criteria that will inform the placement, pay, and hiring processes.

4. [REDACTED]

On page 13 of the white paper, you specifically mentioned that you anticipate attrition within the implementation of this model with very little and no detail as to what you mean. Do you mean by attrition that you will be laying people off? Do you mean that you expect people to quit? What is your anticipation of attrition, especially since the number of advisers that you list is almost double the number that is currently here at CSU.

Attrition we can anticipate are VSIP Numbers.

5. [REDACTED]

What is going to be the pay grade for each of these tiered coach positions right now? Graduation success coaches are at a pay grade six and advisers are at a pay grade five. Will all advisers be moving to a pay grade six of all these new job titles?

This is being worked out by HR.

6. [REDACTED]

My question is that in the white paper, it references that there are 95 academic advisors and related professionals. Our question is, who are those related professionals? Does that include campus 411, the career coaches? And what exactly is their role in this future model in determining case load numbers? It's hard to imagine that there are actually 95 advisors that would be working in this new model. And right now, many caseloads are well above the 300 to one ratio that is being referenced. And so just wondering how those roles play in the new model, if those offices are somehow going to be combined or how that all works. How do you plan for them to work together in the future? Is this 95 taking into consideration everyone who is taking the VISIP that we already know is leaving separate from the attrition rates that are expected?

The Unified Model is an integrated approach to advising and coaching. See [whitepaper](#) for organizational structure.

95 advising and related professionals Include (as derived from EY Report)

Athletics – Advising

Campus 411

College of Arts and Sciences

College of Business

College of Public affairs and Education

College of Engineering

College of Health

Honors college

College of Law: Advising/Career/Bar prep supports

First year advising office

Pathways to Practice

Graduation Success Coaches

TRIO/SSS

Care Management

*Living Learning Communities
Career Development and Exploration*

7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I am the [REDACTED]. 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 so many times where I have a student issue. And they are able to step in. They really have the pulse on what is happening with the curriculum and advising our students. And so that's one part I might suggest to just potentially rethink how that might be approached.

The faculty advising role is determined by the college/discipline and will continue to remain that way. The Unified Model provides one point of contact for faculty. Standards of care and committee composition will be developed with academic coaching professionals as part of our professional learning efforts.

8. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and I am wondering how communication will improve with this new model, especially for program advisers such as Honors Trio and athletics, and who will be responsible for giving advisers information.

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

9. [REDACTED]

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 [REDACTED], 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. [REDACTED]

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 same person.

11. [REDACTED]

First, [REDACTED] actually kind of stole my question to some degree, but I want to expand on it a little bit given the recent news of the eleven integrated programs that were recently approved by the Ohio Department of Higher Education. **How is that going shape how a student will be paired with a coach? Given that not all, but some of those are not in the same traditional colleges. They are just not in the same college.** Will multiple coaches with the advisors, then be trained to be able to assist a student from different majors, because we do know that students change their majors frequently. That would be kind of my question related to what I asked before, also with the transitional coaches as well.

Every program has a home college, and all coaches will be provided professional learning on all programs.

12. [REDACTED]

I have a couple of comments or questions about the figures in the white paper. With figure for the retention rate is listed as coaching having better attention to the third semester. **I was just wondering if that could be expanded to also include information after they start seeing a full major adviser.** This is in no way disparaging first year advising, they do a great job, but just **looking at expanding beyond that third semester.** Additionally, in the figures below that, where it talks about certain student populations. I know, speaking as an adviser, we do spend extra time with students who need We take every student individually. And yes, there are certain student populations that require additional help,

and we are doing that. So I just want some added context in those figures, as far as what is possibly not being done that you think we need to do better?

*We can look at that! *Data added to end of document.*

Retention Rates Included:

Third Year ALL

Third Year by College all Programs

Fifth Year ALL

Fifth Year by College all Programs

Graduation Rates Included:

4 year ALL

4 year by College all Programs

5 year ALL

5 year by College all Programs

6 year ALL

6 year by College all Programs

13. [REDACTED]

So, working within the proposed model of housing, current advisers Monday have coaches keeping them within their college units. **Working within that, what are your plans to rectify an immediate need? And that need is that we have experienced significant attrition over the past couple of months through VSIP or advisers leaving CSU going elsewhere. Many of our units are experiencing adviser shortages and raising the student to adviser ratios well beyond 300 to one um and at the end of September arts and sciences e.g.** At the end of September the student to advisor ratio is going to be around 800 to one. It's going to be hard for us to be student centered and to have time to develop, create, and nurture student belonging when we are going to be so limited like that. We are in need of advisers stationed here to fully learn the majors. They would be assigned to be here with us, so that training and collaboration happens within the college, and this would be true of other colleges. I'm using Arts and Sciences as an example as an example. But this would apply everywhere. What are your plans to rectify this immediate need?

This situation is happening in Arts and Sciences and the Dean of is addressing this need with the Division of Student Belonging and Success.

14. [REDACTED]

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 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, because I don't have it memorized. Talks about how we would be developing, we develop a flexible, individualized education plan, IEP 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.

I would like to get some clarification of what you if you mean, like the traditional IEP plan that is usually used in K-12, versus, 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, like using K-12, um, how is that going to be different, from what ODS currently does? Because there are also some legal things that fall under all of that as well.

And then my last one, I promise, well, at least for right now, is the fact they NACADA, at which the National Academic Advising Association, 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 caseloads. About how caseloads should be 200 to 300 students per one advisor. And then the AASCU and NISS those are mentioned more than NACADA and it talks about using those three other programming to help determine our professional development and how we are setting up this coaching model and how advising works here at CSU, when really they do not have any professional background in academic advising. So why are we not using the professional recommendations that we got from the NACADA report to determine how we set up advising here at CSU and the professional development opportunities that advisers need. So why are we going to outside places and not our professional development body?

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

15. [REDACTED]

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. [REDACTED]

Thank you. I had a couple different questions. The first one is regarding, if you tell us more about the rationale behind focusing on advising specifically. The report seems to suggest that there are a lot of ideas that quote, solving advising would address a lot of the issue, the universities, issues with retention and students graduating and then those sorts of things. But as I think anyone would be able to tell you, **there are a myriad of factors that go into how and why students don't continue at a university, least of all, including the cost of the university, the availability of financial aid to them, their experience in their courses. All kinds of life issues that happen that university has zero control over. Why advising was decided on as the focal point of that.**

And beyond that, how would this plan solve some of those other issues that can cause students to no longer remain at the university? Here's my first question, and then my second question is, if you would also be able to **tell us more about the rationale behind removing the assistant deans from the advising process.** I think I can speak for most when I say that I would not be able to do my job as an adviser without my assistant dean. That that they are a tremendous wealth of knowledge both of how an individual college operates but also just how the university itself functions. They are deeply instantly connected with the network that a big university like CSU has. I am curious if you could explain more about how removing them from that process. Would one, be beneficial in your eyes? And then two, what, how would the knowledge of the managers, or whatever

the appropriate title under the new tear 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. [REDACTED]

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 halfway down the page CSU, we will have academic coaches who will target to specialized areas.

Number one, transition academic coaches will support our CSU students in transition or change, including students changing majors, transfer students, international students, and undecided student populations.

Number two, special populations. Academic coaches will support our CSU students from Sullivan Deckard, Athletics, Honors, and CSU LLC students based off of that alone, because it does not mention the traditional student population or students that come in and actually decide to stay with their major the entire time. This makes it sound like there are going to be three different types of coaches on this campus within this structure.

The standard academic coach, and I know that there's probably better terminology out there. We're going to use standard, a transition academic coach, and then the special population academic coach. So again, this entire thing has been talking about we wanna remove barriers for students, but isn't having three different types of coaches, and possibly every area, that's creating more barriers for students, more obstacles for students.

It's also a lot more confusing if am I with the transitional and I with the special populations one, or am I with the standard one? It's that needs some clarification or something. I'll probably be back after I look at my highlights. Again.

18. [REDACTED]

I want to thank all my colleagues and collaborators in advising across the university for all the thoughtful and attention and comments that you have been putting into this.

I think there's a real opportunity here for the organizers. And I appreciate the chance to give feedback on this model. I'm in design we are like critique, is our life but we are, constantly giving each other critique and I know it can be sometimes really hard to hear critique on

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. [REDACTED]

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 advisers in those areas, like TRIO, athletics, and honors, would then take over full program academic and making sure they're meeting their honors and CLA requirements? Would there no longer be that collaboration between those two types of advisers to make sure students are being successful across the board in the things that they're doing?

We encourage continued collaboration and have plans for that in our continuous improvement planning.

19. [REDACTED]

I'd like to just provide some suggestions in such that, maybe if you shared that there would be some more information about technology RFP.

The fact that we need to have, what I thought was going to be Stelic or there was one other that we were reviewing and that you would be speaking to [REDACTED] and I imagine that it is reasonable to pull it off, get is the top of his list. And IT team is able to then be ready to implement. The other thing that we need to take into consideration is [REDACTED] the Registrar. That then needs to embrace not only the input of the current curriculum for students who are FA24 and prior, the new core curriculum, our FA25 students and beyond. Oh, and the integrated degrees. So that's a whole other lift on top of [REDACTED] and team who's also spread them because of people leaving and VSIP. **So keeping a mind, a timeline of thinking of maybe may just might want to take into consideration that there is a huge lift that our dear register and colleagues needs to embrace in order to pull**

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. [REDACTED]

I had a couple questions and then just sort of a general comment with I'll start with I really appreciated [REDACTED] 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 know, meet with every single student or work with them going into the summer, because we all have so many students, and there is not a feasible enough amount of time to meet with our entire caseload prior to the end of the spring semester, beyond the fact that just not all students are on top of things and are able to actually register on time. There will be transition issues that arise from such a transition, starting at the beginning of May, I fear. There is also, this is going right into the summer when orientations will be starting. Which is a whole university effort, particularly with advisers, where we all meet individually, with every single incoming student, across every individual major. There are going to be a lot of transition things that we will have to be dealing with on top of doing that. Beyond dealing with the fallout of VISPs and just general regular departures from the university, **if there was any consideration giving to, again, working with this timeline in a little bit of later fashion.**

And another thing I just thought of my question, we will have a new genetic curriculum, which is out the university's control. This is mandate coming down from the state that will be going into effect in fall of 2025. There is just a lot being crammed into this amount of time, and **I worry that the systems of the university will not be able to support all of**

that. And I just wonder, again, if there is more rationale can fight about the timeline, or again, if there is any consideration to phasing this in or working with this with all the other things going on, I know there will be no idea way to do this, but, I think we just all appreciate more clarification on that and the other question that I have is regarding current students who will be affected by this transition. I Would imagine the case that once this goes into effect, students will not have the adviser that used to have, there will be some who will probably stay with the same adviser. But if the size of cases are going to change, or advisers are not going to have the same majors they have always had, then students will have a different adviser. I would imagine that that, for one would be confusing and disorienting for the students on top of potentially runs counter to the impetus behind the plan of ensuring students have a more seamless and cohesive experience in the advising realm. I'm just curious, one, **if there is a plan to accommodate the transition difficulties for current students. And if so, what, what is that plan? But then, beyond that, what essentially would we do, how will we support those students as we are kind of going through the transition?** Because I imagine for students who were not at CSU before this plan existed, they would never know any different. But for those who are currently here, there will be anything change, not just on our end, but on their end. How they will be supported. And thank you.

We anticipate the implementation of the Unified Model to occur toward the end of Spring 2025 semester. In many cases, students will remain with their current advising professional (to be academic coach). In some cases, there may be some shifts. In those instances, we will communicate with students, making them aware of potential changes. We will also proceed with student communication about the unified model.

21. [REDACTED]

I want to be able to say that I mentioned it and not have regrets later. The last thing that I have highlighted, and I double checked my stuff like five times at this point. Is primarily a point of clarification. 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.

My point of clarification with that is those issues were originally being recognized under the Advising Community stuff 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. 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. [REDACTED]

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. And then also, what about reaching out to students who left to find 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.

Evaluations and surveys are being drafted to measure various data points during and after a student's journey here at CSU.

***Retention Rates:**

| 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| ALL Colleges/ Programs | 59.5% | 57.2% | 57.5% | 60.7% | 63.1% | 56.1% | 56.8% |
| Arts and Sciences | 60.4% | 60.2% | 62.5% | 59.7% | 60.9% | 59.3% | 60.8% |
| Business | 57.9% | 58.9% | 54.1% | 63.2% | 63.5% | 54.2% | 53.8% |
| Education and Public Affairs | 58.1% | 54.3% | 54.1% | 58.4% | 60.1% | 49.4% | 52.4% |
| Engineering | 68.6% | 61.8% | 63.4% | 63.4% | 71.6% | 62.0% | 65.6% |
| Health | 61.4% | 60.1% | 59.5% | 68.8% | 69.7% | 64.2% | 59.7% |
| Undergrad Studies | 50.4% | 45.3% | 43.2% | 48.1% | 50.4% | 43.7% | 40.6% |

Graduation Rates

| Four Year Graduation Rates | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 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% |