



2.

Hi, I am . 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.

The







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



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





the appropriate title under the new tear structure would be? How would they improve the

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. We are very experienced advising personnel across the university with a lot of student experience. That's just my encouragement. I know some of the things that are being done are really good. I know some of the things that are being done are really good. I know some of the things that are being done are really good.

this off. Not to mention we have to have training on it all and always. And you're

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 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 major as 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 difference. 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.

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, current advising resources are across four entities, academic programs, academic



# Three Year Retention Rates

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%



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%