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Wait List Monitoring & Dashboard
Course Waitlists

• Full waitlists
  • Required lower-division General Education courses
  • Low-volume, high-demand upper-division courses
  • Popular courses and/or instructors

• Institutional Concerns
  • Student progress to graduation
  • Modality planning
  • Faculty workload
  • Transparency
Process

• Student tries to register for closed class, and adds self to waitlist
  • Students can see position on waitlist
  • Academic leaders can find waitlists students in Banner/ARGOS
• If seat opens up, student gets 48 hours to enroll
• If no seat opens up, student ... waits
• One week before classes begin, lists are purged
  • Waitlists turned off
  • Deans and Heads get data on purged students
  • Welcome to the Thunderdome
First Change – Regular Monitoring

• Collect summary data from ARGOS
• Compare with historically challenging areas
• Send to Deans and Heads
  • About every couple of weeks

• Some improvement – but not enough
Second Change – Structural Changes

• Revised rules around waitlists
  • 1000-2000 level courses
    • First-in, first-out
  • 3000-4000 level courses
    • Graduation Candidates first
    • Seniors
    • Everyone else

• Again – more progress
Third Change – Data Delivery

• Monday morning delivery of CSV
  • To Deans and others
  • Every CRN in academic unit with at least 1 active waitlisted student
  • Important data points like capacity, modality, instructor, Gen Ed

• Maybe ... less progress?
**Results**

12-month moving sum of occupied waitlist seats

First change is across calendar 2020.

Second change is Spring 2022.

Third change is Fall 2022.
Results

Number of waitlist spots claimed by month which were left over at purge.

The need for some monitoring is clear in July and August 2020.

Continued monitoring may have made a difference in Fall 2021.

Continued monitoring plus data delivery in Fall 2022, and results deteriorated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourth Change – Spring 2023

Created dashboard based on department and advisor feedback

Waitlisted students who are majors in the college.

Waitlisted students in classes controlled by college.
Unresolved Issues

- Two problems with course modality
  1. Students may enroll/waitlist both online and on-ground sections of the same class. False indicator of demand.
  2. Student preference for online continues to confound scheduling. Some courses fill and waitlists fill while alternative modality sits unused.

- A particularly painful example of the second issue: A course in RCOB had 100+ seats available across on-ground sections while the single online section of 39 seats had all 39 waitlist spots claimed.
Early Alert Campaign
Progress Report Campaigns (Early Alerts)

• UTC shift towards a professional advising model

• Strong mid-term grade submission rates

• Student and advisor feedback
The Road to Early Alerts

EAB Navigate Platform

Small pilots in FA19 & FA20
- Small population
- Select FYE, math, and English classes
- Technical and training pilot
FA21 Progress Report Launch

- Targeted high freshmen enrollment & high DFW rate classes
- 73% response rate from faculty
- 697 students flagged as at-risk
- Learning curve continued
FA21 Progress Report Results

• Some decrease in D’s and F’s
• 27% at-risk students withdrew from the class
• Overall results suggested room to improve
FA22 Progress Report Campaign Changes

• Adjusted faculty reporting window
• Launched peer coaching
• Technical changes for easier tracking
• Expanded course coverage
FA22 Progress Report – Early Insights

• 79% response rate from faculty (+6% from FA21) with 639 students flagged at-risk
• 386 advising appointments*
• 3,000 text messages & emails*
• 110 academic support sessions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alert Reason(s)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged/Lack of participation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late/missing assignments</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low test/quiz scores</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring/SI recommended</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on campaign population and Navigate activity from mid-September to mid-October
Progress Reports – What’s Next?

Near Term
• Intervention outcomes
• Who are we missing?
• Qualitative data
• Finding a balance

Future goals for 2023+
• Leverage other data sources
• Department engagement on course selection
• Predictive analytics
Survey Overview

Intent: understand selection factors, participation in activities (academic & social), knowledge of resources, and reasons for stop out.

Instrument: Built from prior UTC Retention Survey (2008, 2012), literature review, other institution examples
Population & Response

Target population:
- a. students who left UTC since 2012,
- b. without earning a degree, and
- c. did not complete a degree at any other institution.

Survey sent to over 8,000 prior students; 543 bounced back

- 301 surveys opened and 292 completed!!!!!!
  ✓ Incentive for completion: drawing for a $50 gift card (3)
Respondents

• Student characteristics while at UTC:
  ✓ Female (47%)
  ✓ White (55%)
  ✓ Between 25-40 years old (43%)*
  ✓ Juniors (42%)
  ✓ Identified first-generation (41%)

• Enrollment characteristics while at UTC:
  ✓ Attended full time (69%)
  ✓ Received financial aid (62%)
  ✓ Last year of attendance; 2020 (20%), 2019 (14%), 2021 (11%), 2012 (7%)
Top Five Reasons for Leaving UTC

1. Financial issues (21%)
2. Depression (15%)
3. Academic difficulty/navigating major path (14%)
4. Desire to change school based on career interests/ available degree majors (11%)
5. Life event or personal emergency (10%)

❖ Less than 1% left because of academic probation

❖ Write in responses: Faculty (4%), Pandemic (2%), Campus Safety (2%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial issues</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic difficulty</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired to go to different school because of career interests/available majors</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life event or personal emergency</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with course availability</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic responsibilities</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of connection to advisor and/or mentors</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Issues</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about career aspirations</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended to leave prior to degree completion</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to finish a degree</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from area</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed/wanted to be closer to home</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic concerns</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to leave due to probation</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship stress</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s background differs from that of most students</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes Impacting Retention

- Advising: lack of knowledgeable advisors, need for early intervention, and transfer pipeline challenges.
- Course Access: too many full courses, need for evening/weekend sections & increased frequency of offerings.
- Faculty: monitor online courses, poor teaching skills
- Financial: need faster refunds, more scholarships
- Post-Traditional Student Support: have non-traditional programs; support
Recommendations

• Advising: Implement early warning system *prior* to midterm grades.

• Course Access: Audit course schedule to determine need. Expand available online/hybrid degree programs.

• Faculty: expand faculty development training (online pedagogy).

• Financial: review timeline of students' refund, expand student education of timeline, and increase local financial support.

• Post-Traditional Student Support: provide a comprehensive support center available after 5pm. Expand degree opportunities.
Action Items

Direct from Survey Results
• Re-enrollment campaign of students
• Student Success and Retention Committee focus on post-traditional students
• Course schedule audit
• Hybrid course definition workgroup
• Partner with WCTL to assist with evaluation of services (faculty development)

Indirect
• Policy review
• Inventory of department/unit retention plans
• Focus groups with current students
• Survey of current students
Next Steps

- Conduct SWOT analysis specific to post-traditional population
- Focus groups with transfer student population
- Continued retention analysis
- Feasibility studies for degree programs
Continue the Discussion...