

Meeting 1: Share Whitepaper: September 11th, 12:00 - 1:00 PM

Participants:

Total Questions Asked: 45, 11/45 answered

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

Themes:

Data/Research used to support initial whitepaper

Data supporting transformation

How NACADA work fits in

Universities doing this already

Organizational changes

Hiring and qualifications of all academic coaching levels

Parameters for Placement

Timeline

Now till May implementation (7-8 months)

Professional development

Technology

Professional Development

What does it look like?

When does it start?

Fitting in core curriculum at same time

Technology

Procurement timeline

Process for choosing the solution

Training

Questions:

1. 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 instruct students. What is the role of faculty in this?
Faculty Advising remains the same, layers on top of or alongside undergraduate academic coaching similar to its current arrangement. Faculty's main role is in the classroom and building those classroom relationships, engaging every student everyday with sound equitable academic practices.
2. What are the best practices associated with Advising and Graduation Success Coaching?

Please refer to the Whitepaper

3. What are the implications for data informed decision making?
Requires accountability, when used alone it doesn't include intuition and experience.
Timing and framing
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.
Faculty advising is a level on top of our basic level of care provided by Unified Coaching Model. Communication will need to be addressed as each department/college determines their structure.
5. Can you share the data being referred to?
See white paper appendixes and EY Report
6. Can you provide Universities you have modeled it after?
Kent State, University of Central Florida, Georgia State, Pace University, University of Texas, San Antonio. EY report outlines a few. See Whitepaper.
7. What tension points do you anticipate and what are plans to address them? Have you done a pre-mortem exercise organizationally?
Assistance with change management has been discussed with our partners at AASCU. There are talks to leverage their experience in higher education change management realm.
8. What was purpose of moving several Grad coaches to Senior grad coaches a couple months ago, how does this fit in the model you are moving to?
These were grant funded promotions that were prudent at the time.
9. Why has none of the work to date been collaborative within our community?
Consultation should happen at front end not at implementation. Much of this work was accomplished with NACADA.
As stated by the Provost, these meetings are the collaborative approach. The series of meetings will take feedback and inform the final draft. The NACADA report was reviewed this model's approach enhances many of the facets reported.

10. Last year there was a series of professional development sessions that was run by one of the NACADA committees. This was a great opportunity for advisors and grad coaches to meet one another and learn about services on campus. With the upcoming changes, should we offer a similar series for advisors and coaches to learn about advising within different colleges and coaching techniques?

Yes! More to come as we work with HR, AASCU, and CCA.

11. Regarding the timeline: What will be happening between the six month period of October through April to prepare the Academic Advising Teams for May's implementation of the model?

Working with HR

Planning and timing for designing professional academic coaches

More to come as we work with HR, AASCU, and CCA.

12. How can advisors best prepare for this transition now, knowing that the Spring is going to be extremely busy with learning the Core Curriculum and assisting students with registration?

Keep an open mind, uniform change, attend and participate in community meeting, learn new information.

We are working with AASCU and CCA to determine best moves forward.

Continue to engage and keep sharing feedback as we are looking forward to moving ahead given current expertise.

13. Is it the expectation that coaches be cross trained to advise for all majors within tier unit or should they be trained to advise for all majors within the university.

Coaches will be trained to advise for majors within their units.

14. Will you include Assistant Deans in the training?

College Dean's determine the participation and relationship with AVP of Student Belonging and Success. See whitepaper, organization structure.

15. How will you right-size caseloads for staff members who include advising with other duties?

We are currently working with HR to design job descriptions and best manner forward to accommodate the New Unified Visioning.

16. Can you explain how this model is going to effect how courses are scheduled?

New technology will enable better use of up-to-date scheduling techniques, efficient communication avenues, and will align with current student support practices. Student historical data will be captured so that advisors are given the whole student picture. Making the scheduling experience better for students and staff.

17. CSU Course Schedules are pre-set every year and. How can students determine their flexible schedule when the internal structure is not set-up like a for profit school schedule?

We are not changing scheduling.

18. During the previous forum, it was explained that there will be an opportunity for any qualified personnel to apply for the Senior Academic Coach position, but the remaining advisors and grad coaches will be placed into either assistant or associate academic coach positions at your discretion. Is this going to be determined by concrete qualifications, like degree and years of service or is it going to be determined by soft skills? If it is not based off of concrete qualifications any qualified advisor or grad coach should have the opportunity to apply for their preferred job, especially if there is a difference in pay.

HR to determine the qualifiers likely degree and years of services.

19. What are the minimum and preferred qualifications for the different levels of academic coaches?

We are currently working with HR to design job descriptions and best manner forward to accommodate the New Unified Visioning.

20. Who will be meeting with the incoming Fall Cohort 2025 freshman and transfers when they need scheduling starting in May when the model begins to be implemented?

Advisors will maintain current caseloads through the end of spring and will be assigned new students.

21. Who will be training the academic coaches about the numerous intricacies of each major, i.e., prerequisites, course sequences, accelerated masters and co-ops degree paths, etc., in order to advise, coach and mentor?

We are working with AASCU and CCA to determine best moves forward. Also, constructing a plan for continuous improvement and build our own Professional Learning Community consisting of professionals who assist with many of these needs.

22. When will the decision of the new advising software happen so that it will be deployed in time for advisors to be trained to ensure the success of monitoring student persistence and academic progress under the new Unified Academic Coaching Model?

Before November: Identify vendor and complete contract negotiations. Begin implementation in November.

23. What are plans, investments, ideas, and/or steps that the Division of Student Belonging and Success will engage in to boost the purpose, morale, and retention of

the current employees i.e., Advisors and Graduation Success Coaches, Faculty Senate, Academic Steering, Dean's Council, and Cabinet Member, who are key to the model's success and implementation?

Our focus is to provide a best in class experience for students to better addressing the outcomes for students. That is our collective focus.

Comments to Note:

Grad rates and retention rates are not only an academic advising problem, but some policies also need addressed, lack of customer service in other departments is an issue for students.

Concerns about timing with new General Education Curriculum implementation during same time frame.

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

Participants: 74

Questions: 23

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?

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?

Metrics:

Academic Achievement

Attainment of Learning Objectives

Acquisition of Skills and Competencies

Student Satisfaction

Persistence

Retention

Career Success

Student Wellness and Belonging

What advisors will be responsible for those metrics?

All Academic Coaches

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

Evaluations of the model, student retention and persistence, student satisfaction and belonging are being developed.

Accountability standards to be determined.

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 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'm wondering what issues this restructuring is it designed to solve the way it's 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.**

The structure supports the University goals of unification, standardizing and

centralizing. Continued collaboration is encouraged, opportunities will be part of the PLC planning and expected!

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 **what is the, the rationale or the, 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 this different, um, these different labels to different advisers, or say, coaches.**

Criteria is being determined by HR. Our system allows for growth of Academic Coaches as requested in NACADA report.

4) Jonathan Buckland

O page 13 of your 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 by that. 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 amount of advisers that you list is almost double the amount that actually is currently here at C-S-U.

Attrition we can anticipate are VSIP Numbers. As whitepaper states: # of FTE's TDB.

5) Mark Wirtz

My question is, um what's going to be the pay grade for each of these teared coach positions right now? Graduation success coach coaches are at a pay grade six and advisers are at a pay grade five. And so will all advisers be moving to a pay grade six of all these new job titles?

This is being worked out by HR.

6) Courtney Glover

So my question is that in the white paper, it references that there is 95 academic advisors and related professionals. Um, I guess our question is, who are those related professionals? Does that include campus form one, the career coaches? And what exactly is their role in this future model in determining case load numbers? Um, it's hard to imagine that there's 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 reference. And so just wondering how those roles play into the new model, if those offices are somehow gonna be combined with this, or how that all works, and, um, I guess, how, how you plan for them to work together in the future. And then, is this 95 taking into consideration everyone who is taking the visa that we already know is leaving separate from the attrition rates that are expected?

Others: Special Populations: Sullivan Deckard, Honors, Athletics, TRIO, GSCU, Pathways to practice, CCP, First Year Advising. The 95 does not include VSIP professionals. See whitepaper organizational structure.

7) Sarah Rutherford

I'm faculty in the Department of Art and Design.

I'm the undergraduate director of the design program, so I'm the faculty adviser for design students. And we have a pretty integrated model um a good relationship with our advisers in arts and science ever relationships with first, year advising, with transfer center. And we, we have pretty intrusive advising with our students. UM And the, the model, as described, where faculty advising fits in, was that would be kind of a layer on top of everything. And I wanted to note, cause the faculty only appear the word fact, the only appears a couple times in the white paper, there's a really big opportunity to include faculty advisers, those of us that are doing it we often have um pretty, close relationships with a lot of students um we have. You know experience working with other advising professionals. So, um, first, I would, I would recommend involving faculty advisers in the Bank Guard Alliance. because we see also how sometimes advising issues trickle down into student confusion, or how they interpret who's their adviser and who's in their network and who it isn't. So I do see some potential advantages in that. UM, you know, 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. And then, um, one other comment related to what killing 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, UM has helped me in so many times where I have a student issue, UM, and they're able to step in, or they, they really have the pulse on what's happening UM with, you know. Curriculum advising our students. And so that's one part I might suggest to just potentially rethink how that might be approached.

Thank you for your comments. Noted.

8) Lauren Mannella

I'm an adviser in the Honors College, and I'm wondering how communication will improve with this new model, especially for program advisers such as Honors Trio and athletics, and also who will be responsible for giving advisers information.

TBD, however, aligns with goals of unification, standardizing and centralizing all academic coaching.

9) Joshua Linerode

Alright. So, for the record, I would like to say that the professional advisers on campus, we are not opposed to change. However, it's kind of hard to get behind the proposed change

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 affecting 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. **So 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. 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 affecting 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.

The unified model builds on some NACADA work and enhances the approach to a unified model.

10) Jonathan Buckland

Another question I had is I-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 UM, 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, um, as 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. It technically is supposed to unless there's actually data that would prove this is exactly what's happened, which we have not seen.

Once a student has chosen the path, then the goal is to have one advisor till the finish. The model does not align with forcing a student making changes to a major to stay with the same person.

11) Chris Greggila

First, Jonathan actually kind of stole my question to some degree, but I-I wanna expand on it a little bit um given the, recent news of the um eleven hold on let me get. The terminology integrated programs the ba PROGRAMS that were recently approved by the Ohio Department of Higher Education. **How is that gonna shape how a seal will be paired with a coach? Given that not all, but some of those are not in the same traditional colleges that, um, they, they're just not in the same college.** So they have 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. So, um, that would be kind of my question related to what I asked before, also with the transitional coaches as well.

12) Nathan Eldridge

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? And so that's basically it.

We can take a look at that!

13) Mark Wirtz

So, working within the proposed model of housing, current advisers Monday have coaches keeping them within their college units. **So 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 visa or advisers, leaving C-S-U going on to you know elsewhere um that 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.** Um at the end you know, at the end of September, the the student to advise ratio is going to be around 800 to one. And so it's going to be very hard for us to be student centered and to have time to develop and create nurture student belonging when we're going to be so limited like that.

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?

Caseloads will remain through the Spring Semester, then new student will be assigned.

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

NACDA 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?

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.**

16) Bradyn Shively

Thank you. Um, I had a couple different questions. Um, the first one that I had is regarding, um, I, I'm just curious if you tell us more about the rationale behind focusing on advising specifically. UM, the report seems to suggest that there are a lot of the ideas that quote, solving advising would, um, address a lot of the issue, the universities, issues with pretension and and students graduating and then those sorts of things. But as I think anyone assume 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. And I was just curious why advising was decided on as the focal point of that.**

And beyond that, what how this plan would solve some of those other issues that that can cost students no longer remain at the university? UM, here's my first question, and then my second question is, I was just, UM, wondering if you would also be able to **tell us more about, UM, the rationale behind removing the assistant deans from the advising process.** Um, 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-A tremendous wealth of knowledge both of how an individual college operates but also just how the university itself functions um that THEY are deeply instantly connected with the y network that a big university like cleveland state Has um And I'm. Just curious if you could explain more about kind of 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?

17) Joshua Linerode

So 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. Has been the whole thing with all of this. 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 decorate 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. What have you? This makes it sound like there are gonna be three different types of coaches on on this campus within this structure.

So the standard academic coach, and I know that there's probably a better terminology out there, but probably better. We're gonna 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 of am I with the transitional 01:00 a.m. 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) Sarah Rutherford

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

Um, I think there's A-A real opportunity here for the organizers and i you Know I, appreciate the chance to give feedback on this model um but i l'm l'm IN, design we're like critique, is our life but we're, 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, um, but critique is also just A-A-A lens on how someone outside of you is viewing the process right so um there may?

Be, some things to rethink and so **I-I hope, the organizing team um 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 UM in the student experience.**

So, UM, that's just my encouragement. I know this has gotta 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.

19) 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 gonna have one academic coach throughout their entire career, does that mean that advisers in those areas, like trio, UM athletics and honors, would then take over full program academic and making sure they're meeting their honors and C-L-A whatever it might be requirements and that there.

Would 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.

20) Susan Carver

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

UM, the fact that we need to have, um, what I thought was going to be stolic, or there was one other that we were reviewing and that you would speaking to wisdom and, um, imagine that reason was able to pull it off, get is the top of his list in his is. And T team were able to then be ready to implement. The other thing that we need to take into consideration is our Kevin Neal in the Registrar. That then needs to embrace not only the input of the current curriculum for students who are for 24 and prior, the new core curriculum, for our fault, 25 students and beyond. Oh, and the integrated degrees. So that's a whole other lift on top of wisdom and team who's also spread them because of people leaving and Beesips and idea Register. **So keeping a mind, a timeline of thinking of maybe may just might wanna 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 gonna 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 gonna 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's going to do that? And how?

21) Bradyn Shively

Hello. I'm back. UM. So I had A-A couple questions and then just sort of A-A general comment with I'll start with i just I-I really appreciated doctor rutherford's comment about just sort of how you know appreciating the opportunity and also just that you know understanding where the questions are coming from I-I don't everyone.

On the zoom i think would say, that that they, want whatever is best for students i think

we're all in agreement on that and we are, all in favor of whatever is best for those students. But we just all, I think, I-I think there's a lot of questions we all just wanna 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, um.

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

UM 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, 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.

UM that there will be trans issues that arise from such a transition, starting at the beginning of May, I fear. UM related to that. UM there's also, this is going right into the summer when orientations will be starting. UM, which is a whole university effort, particularly with advisers, where we all meet individually, with every single incoming student, across every individual major. UM There are gonna be a lot of transition things that we will have to be dealing with on top of doing that. UM. And then, of course, started the false and I started those other things. So I'm just curious if, um beyond with dealing with the fallout of visas 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.**

Oh, and another thing I just thought of my question, we will have a new genetic curriculum, which is out the universities control. This is mandate coming down from the state that will be going into effect in fall of 2025. Um, 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, um, some thought I-I think we just all appreciate more clarification on that um and the other question that i have is regarding current students who will be affected by this transition um it is 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 case, the size of cases are going to change, or advisers are not going to have the same majors they've 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 kind of seamless and cohesive UM experience in the advising realm. And so I'm just curious, one, **if there is a plan UM to accommodate the transition difficulties for current students. And if so, what, what is that plan? UM. But then, beyond that, kind of, like, you know, what essentially would would do, how, how will we support those students as as we're 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, 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 stuff like five times at this point. UM 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.

So my point of clarification with that one 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. So we were working on that. So if you would like that stuff, go free to ask we can get it to you.

23) Vania Alvarez-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 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.

Dean Question/Comment Submissions:

"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 specific 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 have to recommit to being student-centered (as the white paper states) by changing our advising model if we consider it one of our strengths now?"

1. How does supervision work if advisors are not moving to a new physical space?
2. The whitepaper says that you anticipate attrition by implementing unified advising. Why? Please clarify?
3. Explain the "academic coaching model." How does it differ from academic advising?
4. After the initial meetings in the fall, the timeline in the white paper is blank until notifying stakeholders in April and full implementation in May. How will we get there? Is there an actual implementation plan? When will training take place, job titles change, student caseloads move, new software be available, students be notified, etc.?"

"How do you define ""faculty governance,"" and when were any faculty consulted? If you said they have, could you name who you contacted? When will faculty be ""allowed"" to provide feedback?"

The majority of the degrees in each college have specific pre-reqs and course sequencing that need to be closely monitored so there is course availability and that advisors are aware of changes. And there are always changes.

"

"Will 3344-60-02 Hiring policies of CSU be followed, or will people just be FOB or FOP(Friends of Banks and/or Petty)?"

3344-60-02 Hiring policies: As a state supported public institution of higher education, Cleveland state university is required to be in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. The university recruits, selects and hires the most qualified individuals for open positions. Recruitment, selection and hiring activities are guided by a commitment to diversity and the strategic priorities of the university. Cleveland state university is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer. It is the policy of Cleveland state university to

provide equal opportunity to all qualified applicants and employees without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or expression, national origin, age, protected veteran and/or military status, disability genetic information, marital status or parental status. All individuals who believe that they are qualified are encouraged to apply for all open positions. Hiring of non-U.S. residents is subject to specific federal regulations and statutes. Recruitment, selection and hiring for bargaining unit positions are subject to collective bargaining agreements. "

The report "A Unified Academic Coaching Model" indicates on page 10 that "the University-wide student-to-advising and related roles ratio is 200:1" but that number includes professionals who do not advise students. As noted on page 18 in figure 2, the 95 university-wide staff include Campus All-in-One Specialists, CARE Managers, Career Specialists, Law advisors, and advisors dedicated to graduate advising. And these numbers are based on 2022 data which is outdated due to attrition since 2022 and VSIP. Can you provide us with updated and accurate data?

"Policies on hiring:(3344-60-02 Hiring)

Definitions (1) "Open positions." All faculty and staff positions considered newly created, vacant or have the potential to become either, because of new institutional initiatives, reorganization/restructure, retirement, termination or strategic opportunity. (2) resignation, "Search." The process of posting, recruiting, selecting and hiring for open positions. (3) (4) "Full search committee." Those individuals empowered by the hiring manager to screen applicants, and refer candidates to the hiring manager and or department for selection. "Applicant." Any individual who completes the application process for a specific position and who meets the minimum qualifications for that position. "

What feedback and data support the idea that the current advising model does not work? OR did you make up that data, too?

"Who decides which employees transition to the academic coach role?

Tachelle Banks, Vice President, Division of Student Belonging and Success and Nigamanth Sridhar, Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs will make all the hiring decisions?? Really? Wow!

"There are two components of this plan that I suggest need reconsideration: location of advisors and the career ladder/job titles.

With regard to location, I don't know how a few advisors here and there in a myriad of locations across campus (sometimes without any logical connection to the academic programs housed in that location) provides maximum visibility and accessibility to students. The strength of the unification model, to me, is in streamlining the navigation process and this includes both the structure and the physical geography. In addition, Senior Coaches management of work teams and true cross-team collaboration is likely best achieved when they work in proximity to one another (and can step in for one another

when students show up with urgent needs). I also do not understand how staffing efficiency is achieved or how the locations will operate safely and effectively, 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 office, large front desk area, and 7 individual offices if it will be empty but for 3 of those offices? 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 find, and therefore better use of "freed up" space for other university needs?

With regard to the ladder/titles, why not use the work that was already painstakingly undertaken by SEIU and HR through the NACADA subcommittee? This received board support from the advising community and had already navigated the political channels. This system would retain a Senior Coach, but then have an Academic Coach II and an Academic Coach I, with already delineated requirements and job expectations. I see the mirroring of faculty tenure track titles in the proposal, but an Assistant or Associate Coach does not read the same to staff, nor do I believe it will read the same to students. It implies "junior to" or "less than" a coach. Coach should be the minimum, and a Senior Coach makes sense as the lead, but I caution that an Assistant Academic Coach sounds like a peer student or paraprofessional role. I'm particularly worried about how you would recruit strong talent into these roles should they become vacant or should we expand, because this is not what a student services professional would be looking for or expecting. Please see free to contact me if you'd like to explore either of these suggestions further.

Thanks,
Kristy Tokarczyk

"