Playbook for Student Success
10 Insights and Imperatives for the Next Phase of Completion Investment
Why Don’t Students Complete?

Root Cause of Attrition Remains Frustratingly Elusive

In my interviews with students, I have found that the biggest reasons for a delay in graduation are that students switch majors, fail out of courses, cannot get required courses, do not qualify for their intended majors; they have to work to pay for their living expenses, do not think there are any jobs for them after graduation, pursue double majors, do not receive adequate advising, have medical problems and personal issues.

Faculty Member,
Large Public Research University

Thousands of pages of task force recommendations

Hundreds of new student success administrators

Hours spent in campus meetings and town halls

Countless presentations on improving completion
Stakes are Higher than Ever
Economic and Political Pressures to Retain and Graduate Students

High Economic Cost of Attrition
Estimated 13% of total E&R spending at publics (9% at privates) associated with attrition; average cost of $12,800 in “lost” credits to attrition add to cost of a degree

Enrollment Headwinds
Rate of undergraduate enrollment growth slowing dramatically across the next decade; over 20% of institutions reported enrollment shortfalls of 10% or more in 2012

State Performance-based Funding
Rapid adoption of performance-based funding formulas for state allocation; 33 states (and counting), up from just 4 in 2010

Highly Visible Federal Ratings
Proposed rating system to be released this summer; federal completion metrics positioned as way for families to compare “value” of institutions

Source: Delta Cost Project, Measuring (and Managing) the Invisible Costs of Postsecondary Attrition (2012); EAB interviews and analysis.
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First Phase of Institutional Effort

Approaching the Limit of Initial Investments
Continued Progress on Completion May Require a Different Approach

Impact of Early Retention Initiatives

- Deploy an early alert system to flag academic risk
- Complete a “bottleneck course” audit to redesign academic schedule
- Integrate career and academic advising
- Pilot upper division degree completion program
- Enhance professional development for advisors; better use of data

Six-year graduation rates

Are we approaching the limit to how many students can be retained?

12%

Average growth in public student services spending per student FTE AY 2000-2010

1) Represents an average of public research, master's, and baccalaureate institutions.

Retained, But For How Long?

Losing Ground After Year One
Sophomore and Upper Division Attrition Increasing

Attrition Across the Student Lifecycle
Public University Graduating Classes, 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Year</th>
<th>First-year attrition</th>
<th>Upper-class attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-One State Flagship Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-fifths of attrition occurring after first year

Source: EAB Student Success Collaborative analysis.
Beyond Retention to Graduation

Increasing Completion While Sustaining Improvements in the First Year

Student Outcomes By Year

California State System – 2003 Cohort through 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cohort</td>
<td>38,562</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>31,274</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>27,456</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td>18,086</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Year</td>
<td>7,404</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year</td>
<td>-1,157</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Year</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Year</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Year</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Year</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND
- Net Attrition
- Continuing
- Graduation Rate

How do we continue to increase FY retention?
Why do students leave after the first year?
How do we reduce time to degree?

Source: California State University Analytic Studies, “Graduation Rates by Campus, Ethnicity, and Gender,” (2014).
What We Now Know About Student Success

Investment in Data, Analytics, and Research Accelerating Progress

Gaining Insight into Student Patterns of Behavior

A+

- What grades in prerequisites are correlated to success in the major?
- When do most students who graduate declare their last major?
- Which populations on campus are leaving during the sophomore year?

80%

Of CIOs and VPs of Student Success expect increased investment in analytics in the next two years

Entering a New Phase in Student Success

Yesterday’s Approach

Target resource intensive support services and staff to highest risk students

Focus efforts and programs on first year students to boost retention

Monitor academic progress to identify students at risk of probation

Today’s Approach

Recognize “murky” middle students as attrition risks with opportunity for improvement

Address sophomore and upper division attrition and emphasize persistence to graduation

Apply a holistic risk model with academic and non-academic factors to identify students at risk of withdrawal
The Student Success Playbook
Ten Insights and Imperatives for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

5 Insights for Re-Framing the Institutional Conversation
What do we need to change?
- Data disciplines
- Staffing models
- Academic policies
- Technology

5 Imperatives for Building the Student-Centered Enterprise
Expediting Task Force Execution
The Student Success Playbook

Five Insights for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

1. Disproportionate share of resources allocated to the academically underprepared despite the fact that most students leave in good academic standing.

2. Greatest opportunity to increase graduation rate is targeting support to students from 2.0 to 3.0 – a “murky middle” often overlooked.

3. Most institutions over rely on GPA which masks critical differences in credit momentum and progression (Not All 2.7s are Equal).

4. High flyers have a smoother path through the first two years; risk is at entry to the upper division when confronting barriers to major choice.

5. Student major-changing follows surprising but predictable patterns; unrealized opportunity for better capacity planning and advisor allocation.
The Student Success Playbook

Five Imperatives for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

6. Build a risk model incorporating academic and non-academic factors; continuously update with new behavioral data, and re-examine at critical milestones when re-categorization is most likely to occur.

7. Prioritize frequency and focus of advising based on predicted risk profile.

8. Assign advisor caseloads based on major-switching patterns to allow for personalization and continuity throughout student academic careers.

9. Craft registration and withdrawal policies to reward long-term commitment and disincent unprincipled deviation from plan.

10. Automate transactional processes to promote self-service and reserve staff for higher value activities.
Not Every Problem Caught by an Early Alert

Academic Indicators Can Miss Certain At-Risk Populations

**Campus Early Warning System**

**Common Flags**
- Poor attendance
- Lack of participation
- Missing assignments
- Low midterm grade
- Poor study habits
- Low cumulative grade

**New Additions**
- Lack of writing proficiency
- Lack academic readiness
- Disruptive behavior
- Complaints from peers
- Attending wrong section
- Unresponsive to attempts to contact
- Sudden change in mood
- Illness or poor hygiene
- Repeated requests for extensions

**Often Overlooked**
- Non-academic reason for poor grade or attendance
- Top academic performers thinking about transfer
- Academically okay but concerned about fitting in
Insight #1: Not Just Academically Underprepared

Most Students Leave in Good Standing
Loss of Promising Undergraduates Bespeaks More than Academic Risk

Academic Standing and Timing of Attrition of Non-Transfers

- 48% Left Early in Good Standing
- 33% Left Late in Good Standing
- 14% Left Early in Poor Standing
- 5% Left Late in Poor Standing

Fewer Lost in the Upper Division But At Higher Economic, Opportunity Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of Attrition</th>
<th>Percent of All Attrition</th>
<th>Dollars in Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Year or Less</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Years</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>$29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Years</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>$47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Analysis excludes students who transfer.

Source: Delta Cost Project, "Measuring (and Managing) the Invisible Costs of Postsecondary Attrition" (2012).
Exacerbated by Today’s Financial Reality

Expected Family Contribution Burden Shouldered by Students

Students Funding Larger Share…

Percentage of Public Higher Ed Revenues from Net Tuition, 1988-2013

…as Parents Pay Less than They Used To

Average Percentage Share of Tuition Costs

Parent Income and Savings

Student Borrowing

Student Income and Savings

Parent Borrowing

Cost is More Than Just Tuition

The non-tuition share of total in-state cost of attendance includes textbooks, supplies, room and board.

61%
Insight #2: Opportunity for Improvement Greatest Among “Murky Middle”

Greatest Opportunity for Intervention
Least Likely to Seek Support or Receive Proactive Intervention

Graduation Rate by First Year GPA
Sample of 66 EAB Student Success Collaborative Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year GPA</th>
<th>1st Decile</th>
<th>2nd to 5th Deciles</th>
<th>Top Half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2.0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Small academic improvements correlate with meaningful graduation gains</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>“The Murky Middle”</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24% difference in graduation rate</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EAB Student Success Collaborative analysis.
When a 2.7 is Not a 2.7

Same GPA Can Mask Meaningful Differences in Credit Velocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Pattern</th>
<th>Credit Completion</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A’s in distribution requirements; DFWs in major prerequisites</td>
<td>At Elevated Risk; Schedule Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Consistent record of B- in all courses</td>
<td>Monitor for Changes but Likely to Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond GPA
Credit Earning Behavior Compelling Measure of Progress

Credit Accumulation as Leading Indicator

**Six-Year Graduation Rates by Credit Earning Behavior, CSU**

- Earned 20+ SCH Year 1: 67.3%
- Earned < 20 SCH Year 1: 21.0%

**Six-Year Graduation Rates by Credit Completion Ratio, CSU**

- Completed 80% of credits attempted: 69.7%
- Earned < 80% of credits attempted: 29.1%

Making the Leap to the Upper Division

Progress Plateauing between 60 and 70 SCH
Strong Starters Departing in the 5th Term

Average Earned Credits at Attrition
Sample of 66 Student Success Collaborative Institutions

Attrition among high academic performers most common at entry point to upper division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year GPA</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.8</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EAB Student Success Collaborative analysis.
Insight #4: Higher Flyers at Greatest Risk In Upper Division

Major Hazards Approaching the 5th Term
Risk of Attrition Linked to the Challenges of Choice

Unable to Choose

Still Undeclared
I’ve changed my major multiple times and still don’t know what I like.

Institutional Barrier to First Choice

Denied Admission into Upper Division Major
I wasn’t admitted to the Film Studies program. What now?

Unwilling to Choose

Additional Major or Minor Late in Career
If I double major I can double my job prospects.

Academic Performance
Insight #5: Predictable Patterns to Major Switching Behavior

Four Types of Major on Campus

Tracking Student Flow In and Out of Programs

Donor Majors
Students flow out of these majors more often than they flow in

*Example: Computer Science*

Static Majors
Students who initially declare this major rarely switch; few students flow in

*Example: Nursing*

Acceptor Majors
Students flow into this major but few students flow out

*Example: Social Work*

Pivot Majors
Equal flow of students in and out of the major

*Example: English*

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Visualizing Student Flows Between Majors

Student Major-Switching Analysis
Groupings of Majors from the EAB Student Success Collaborative

N=2,693 majors at 50 institutions
Circle size indicates relative enrollment size

Rate of Student Flows In and Out of Major

Net Receivers of Students

Net Donors of Students

Percentage of Students in a Major Who Switched into the Major

Source: EAB Student Success Collaborative analysis.
Multiple Applications Across Campus

Accountability Metrics by Major
Retention and graduation targets; weighting importance of DFW rates, service course availability

Course Capacity Planning
Forecast demand for lower and upper division courses and sections by term and year

Coordinating Prerequisites
Maximize credit transfer and minimize time to degree implications of major switching

Guiding Advising Caseloads
Optimize advising assignments to student best fit major pathways
The Student Success Playbook

Five Insights for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

1. Disproportionate share of resources allocated to the academically underprepared despite the fact that most students leave in good academic standing.

2. Greatest opportunity to increase graduation rate is targeting support to students from 2.0 to 3.0 – a “murky middle” often overlooked.

3. Most institutions over rely on GPA which masks critical differences in credit momentum and progression *(Not All 2.7s are Equal)*.

4. High flyers have a smoother path through the first two years; risk is at entry to the upper division when confronting barriers to major choice.

5. Student major-changing follows surprising but predictable patterns; unrealized opportunity for better capacity planning and advisor allocation.
The Student Success Playbook

Five Imperatives for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

6. Build a risk model incorporating academic and non-academic factors; continuously update with new behavioral data, and re-examine at critical milestones when re-categorization most likely to occur.

7. Prioritize frequency and focus of advising based on predicted risk profile.

8. Assign advisor caseloads based on major-switching patterns to allow for continuity throughout student academic careers.

9. Craft registration and withdrawal policies to reward long-term commitment and disincent unprincipled deviation from plan.

10. Automate transactional processes to promote self-service and reserve staff for higher value activities.
A More Holistic Definition of Risk

The Old Thinking

Use available admissions data to identify most academically underprepared students prior to matriculation

The New Thinking

Develop holistic model to predict likelihood of withdrawal based upon historical analysis of academic and attrition risk
Holistic Assessment of FY Attrition Risk

Step 1: Identify Historical Patterns of Student Attrition

Isolating Characteristics Associated with Higher Risk of Withdrawal

Withdrawn in Good Standing
- Commuter status
- Students who are not from East of the Connecticut River (international, out of state, West of River)
- Federal Loans
- FAFSA choice

Predictive in Both Models
- High School GPA
- High School District
- Athlete
- African American
- Admissions Rating

Academic Risk Factors
- Males
- STEM Majors
Assessing Risk of Incoming Class

Step 2: Create an Initial Risk Profile Based on Pre-Enrollment Data

Targeted Advising Cohort Structure

- **Cohort 2** Tutoring (High Risk of Academic Probation, Low Withdrawal Risk)
- **Cohort 1** Intensive (High Risk of Academic Probation, High Withdrawal Risk)
- **Cohort 4** Monitor (Low Risk of Academic Probation, Low Withdrawal Risk)
- **Cohort 3** Engaged (Low Risk of Academic Probation, High Withdrawal Risk)

**Active Ingredients**

- Students assigned to cohorts based on attrition risk and forecasted academic performance. Initial placement can be adjusted based on student behavior.
- Interventions are targeted to students differently based upon their assignment. Professional advising staff prioritize interaction frequency based on a student’s assigned risk cohort.
- Caseload model facilitates tracking of student performance to advisors.
Student Risk Changes Over Time

The Old Thinking

Assigned risk level remains static after initial assessment at matriculation

The New Thinking

Student risk is dynamic and changes over time based upon behaviors
A Proxy for Grit

Step 3: Calibrate Risk Based on First Week “To Dos”

Welcome to ABC University!
Fall Freshmen To Do List

**Week One**

- Pay Registration Fees
- **Pick up ID Card**
- Purchase Books
- Schedule Meeting with Academic Advisor
- Verify Meal Plan
- Attend Mandatory Library Orientation
- Complete Online Alcohol Prevention Program
- Purchase Parking Permit

---

Week One Leading Indicators

*To Do List Serves as Proxy for Grit, Readiness*

1. **Collection of ID Card**
   Failure to pick up ID card during the first week of class may signify a lack of connection to the institution, inattention to detail, or disengagement.

2. **Scheduled Meeting with Academic Advisor**
   Proactive scheduling of an advising appointment is indicative of a student’s commitment to their academic success and planning.

3. **Attendance at Library Orientation**
   Failure to attend a mandatory on-campus event is an early sign that a student may not be taking his or her academic commitments seriously. Schedule these sessions through Banner to allow to simplify tracking and quickly identify “no shows”.

---

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
### Other Commonly Used Proxies for Grit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Commitment</th>
<th>Campus Engagement</th>
<th>Health and Well-Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-enrollment campus visit</td>
<td>Club and activity attendance</td>
<td>Dining hall card swipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting the campus website</td>
<td>Athletic event attendance</td>
<td>Visits to campus gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of housing deposit</td>
<td>On campus leadership role</td>
<td>Participation in intramurals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Monitoring of Student Behavior

Harnessing the Power of Technology to Intervene Just in time

LMS, Digital Courses
Student log-ins, completion of online assignments, discussion board posts, lecture capture interactions, downloading online course materials

Swipe Card Data
Tracking check-ins at advising, tutoring and writing centers, career services, financial aid, lectures, symposia, dining hall, parking garages, gym

Mobile Micro-Surveys
Apps and student portal micro-surveys prompt behaviors such as purchasing textbooks, registering for classes, or assessing stress

Source: EAB interviews
Right Student, Right Intervention, Right Time

The Old Thinking
“One size fits all” approach to advising first year students

The New Thinking
Predicted risk dictates individual student intervention frequency and type
Scaling Personalized Intervention

Step 4: Provide FY Advisors Intervention Strategy For Each Cohort

High Academic Probation Risk

Cohort 2

Tutoring

n=171
Academic risk; receive intensive tutoring

Cohort 2a

n=45

Low Withdrawal Risk

Students who did not participate in library orientation are reassigned to Cohort 2.

Cohort 4

Monitor

n=320
High likelihood of persistence; monitor engagement and first term performance

Cohort 3

Engaged

n=232
High flyer population; increase campus engagement but realize likelihood of transfer

High Withdrawal Risk

Cohort 1

Intensive

n=211
Academic and attrition risk; receive targeted tutoring, intrusive advising, and engagement services

Low Academic Probation Risk

Intervention focused on academic support, supplemental instruction, remediation.

Intervention focused on engagement in the department, co-curricular and extra-curricular learning.
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Source: EAB interviews
## Retention Increases Across Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2011 % Retained</th>
<th>2012 % Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1: Intensive</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 2: Tutoring</strong></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 3: Engaged</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 4: Monitor</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promoting Continuity in Academic Advising

The Old Thinking
Advisors assigned based upon institutional structures and departments; often requiring reassignments for major switching

The New Thinking
Student movement through the institution dictates advisor caseloads; optimizing consistency despite major switching
Mapping Student Pathways to Degree

How do students flow in and out of majors at the institution?

Map Historical Paths to Degree

- Analysis of first and last major for 5 years of student records reveals significant student migration across the institution

Categorize Majors by Student Flow Patterns

- Four types of major identified based on student flow patterns:
  - **Donor Majors**: Students exit these programs and few enter
  - **Acceptor**: Students enter these majors from other programs
  - **Pivot**: Students equally enter and exit these majors
  - **Static**: Very few students enter or exit

Assign Advisors to Major Clusters

- Advisors trained in set of thematically-related majors and a sub-set of common destination majors
- Goal: 80% of students remain with the same advisor despite major switching

Next Steps

Examine requirements for majors in clusters to promote coordinated prerequisites

Of students

- 65% graduate in 1 of 10 majors
- 75% switch majors at least once
Imperative #8: Assign Advisor Caseload Based on Major Switching Patterns

Personalization Despite Major Switching
UTSA Redeploys Academic Advising to Match Student Flow

Active Ingredients

- Students assigned to an advisor based on first major declared
- Advisor cross-trained in 10-14 programs of study based on student major switching patterns
- Goal is that >80% of students can maintain relationship with 1 advisor despite switching majors
- Advisors organized in clusters reporting to a central director who reports to the provost
- Special cluster for undeclared students to assist with exploration and placement

Life and Health Sciences Cluster

Primary Majors
- Chemistry
- Biochemistry
- Biology
- Health

Secondary Majors
- Marketing
- Communication
- Mathematics
- Public Health
- Kinesiology
- Psychology
- Management
- Interdisciplinary Studies

Active Ingredients

- Marketing
- Mathematics
- Secondary Majors
- Primary Majors
- Biochemistry
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Health
- Public Health
- Kinesiology
- Psychology
- Management
- Interdisciplinary Studies

82% Percent of students will remain with one advisor
12 Average number of majors an advisor is responsible for

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Migrating from Departments to Clusters

UTSA Implementation Timeline

- Advising Restructuring Plan announced
- Summer 2013
- Advisors submit top 3 cluster preferences
- Executing Director of Advising appointed
- Task forces oversee implementation
- Summer 2014
- Confirmed placement of advisors in new structure
- Deployed training sessions for all advisors
- Opened new advising office to students
- Confirmed placement of advisors in new structure
- Summer 2014

Implementation Advice

- Invite advising staff to participate on taskforces to provide input on future state operations and garner buy-in
- Allow advisors to state cluster preferences, but communicate placement will ultimately be dictated by student enrollments
- Confer management responsibilities to advising supervisor with central oversight
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Source: EAB interviews and analysis
# Sample Advising Clusters

## Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students with one advisor: 86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Majors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Majors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students with one advisor: 73%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Majors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EAB interviews
The Student Success Playbook

Five Imperatives for the Next Phase in Increasing Completion

5 Imperatives for Building the Student-Centered Enterprise

6. Build a risk model incorporating academic and non-academic factors; continuously update with new behavioral data, and re-examine at critical milestones when re-categorization most likely to occur.

7. Prioritize frequency and focus of advising based on predicted risk profile.

8. Assign advisor caseloads based on major-switching patterns to allow for continuity throughout student academic careers.

9. Craft registration and withdrawal policies to reward long-term commitment and disincent unprincipled deviation from plan.

10. Automate transactional processes to promote self-service and reserve staff for higher value activities.

Exediting Task Force Execution

Data Disciplines

Staffing Models

Academic Policies

Technology
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