COURSE WITHDRAWAL AS AN EARLY WARNING SIGNAL

What Tri-C's new survey suggests about student pressure, course experience, and the timing of support

From the Office of Institutional Progress and Effectiveness
Cuyahoga Community College

Introduction

Course withdrawal is often recorded near the end of a student's effort to continue, but the conditions that make withdrawal likely usually begin much earlier. A student may misunderstand expectations in the first week, miss an early assignment, wait too long for feedback, fall behind during a health or work disruption, or continue attending while quietly losing confidence. By the time withdrawal appears in the official record, some of the most important opportunities to help the student may already have passed.

That is the central issue raised by Tri-C's new Student Course Withdrawal Survey. The survey does not simply tell us why students withdraw. It raises a more urgent institutional question: when does Tri-C first know that a student's momentum is weakening, and is that knowledge early enough to change the outcome?

A ranked list of withdrawal reasons is useful, but it can also be misleading if read too narrowly. Mental and physical health concerns, work demands, family responsibilities, financial pressure, transportation challenges, learning fit, unclear expectations, and format mismatch all appear in the survey. These reasons matter. But the larger pattern is not captured by treating them as separate explanations competing for first place.

The more important question is how these pressures interact in students' actual experience. Health and work challenges may begin outside the classroom, but they can become harder to manage when students are also uncertain about expectations, unclear about their standing, waiting for feedback, or unable to see a realistic path back into the course. Under those conditions, withdrawal may become less a sudden decision than the point at which continuing no longer feels academically or personally workable.

The survey should therefore be read as an early warning signal about student momentum, course experience, and institutional timing. It suggests that many students are trying to persist under tight margins of time, health, money, work, and family responsibility. In that context, timely feedback, clear expectations, and feasible recovery options become especially important. They do not remove the pressures students carry, but they can influence whether early difficulty remains manageable or turns into withdrawal.

Scope and approach

This analysis draws on two versions of Tri-C's Student Course Withdrawal Survey. The newer instrument has roughly 300 responses so far and should be treated as an early but useful signal about emerging patterns. It should not be read as a final diagnosis or a definitive ranking of causes. The older instrument, with more than 10,000 responses, offers a broader and more stable view of withdrawal patterns over time, but it provides less detail about what sits beneath categories such as academic difficulty, dissatisfaction with instruction, or personal reasons.

The survey was redesigned because earlier results suggested several recurring issues that were difficult to separate with the older instrument. These included misalignment between students and course content, misalignment between students and course format, and delays in feedback. The newer survey makes those issues more visible by separating learning fit, format fit, expectation clarity, and related features of the course experience.

Both surveys were sent to students who withdrew from one or more courses, including students who withdrew completely for the semester. The surveys excluded students who dropped courses during the add/drop period. This analysis also draws on open-ended comments, which help clarify how broad categories such as health strain, learning fit, work conflict, and course clarity appear in students' actual descriptions of their experience.

A recent national analysis from Trellis Strategies provides useful context, but it should be used carefully. Trellis' "Some College, No Credential" survey examined former undergraduates who left college before earning a credential. Tri-C's survey examines students who withdrew from one or more courses. These are related issues, but they are not the same measure and should not be treated as if they produce identical evidence.

The value of the Trellis findings is contextual. They suggest that many students nationally leave college while managing financial strain, family responsibilities, work demands, cost concerns, and weak institutional connection. That national pattern does not prove the Tri-C interpretation, but it helps place the local survey results within a broader student success problem. Students often leave not because one factor alone made college impossible, but because several pressures made continuation feel less realistic under the conditions they were experiencing.

What students selected and what the pattern suggests

The new survey results are useful precisely because they make several forms of difficulty visible at the same time. Some are pressures students carry into the course. Others are conditions students encounter within the course. Still others concern the timing of information, feedback, and support.

Mental and physical health concerns were the most frequently selected reason in the new survey. Student comments describe being overwhelmed, managing chronic or acute health problems, and trying to continue while carrying levels of strain that left little room for recovery. This finding is important and should be taken seriously. It also should not be interpreted to mean that withdrawal is mainly outside the College's influence. Health strain becomes harder to manage when a student is also unclear about course expectations, uncertain about standing, behind on assignments, or unable to see a realistic path back into the course.

Learning fit and course experience also appear prominently. Just over 30 percent of respondents reported that the course content or instructional approach did not fit their learning needs. The comments suggest that many students were not simply saying the course was hard. They were describing difficulty understanding how to succeed in that particular course environment. Some described unclear priorities, slow or opaque grading, limited instructional connection, or the feeling that they were largely teaching themselves without enough timely guidance.

Work, time, and schedule pressure also appear frequently. Roughly one quarter of respondents cited job or work schedule conflicts. Other students noted that course meeting times or course schedules did not fit well with their other responsibilities. For many Tri-C students, time is not an abstract resource. It is divided among work, caregiving, transportation, health needs, and multiple courses. When time becomes unstable, withdrawing from a course can become the only available way to preserve employment, family obligations, or progress in another class.

Course clarity, format fit, and navigability also matter. About one in five students reported that course expectations were unclear or confusing, and a similar share reported that the course format was not a good fit. In the comments, students described disorganized course shells, outdated syllabi, shifting or unclear due dates, and cases where the actual experience of the course did not match what they expected from the listed format. These conditions can matter greatly for students who do not have extra time to search for instructions, interpret conflicting messages, or wait several weeks before learning whether their approach is working.

Family responsibilities, childcare, transportation, technology access, materials, tutoring access, and financial strain appeared less often than the leading categories, but they remain important. Their significance is not only in how often they are selected individually. Their significance is also in how they can intensify other problems. A modest technology problem, a missed tutoring opportunity, a transportation disruption, or a childcare gap can become decisive when a student is already behind, uncertain, sick, working long hours, or unsure how to recover academically.

The main point is not that all withdrawal decisions are the same. They are not. The point is that the most common reasons do not sit neatly on opposite sides of a line between “student life” and “College responsibility.” The findings suggest that student constraints and institutional conditions interact. Health, work, and family pressure may begin outside the classroom, but course clarity, format fit, feedback timing, and recovery options can influence whether those pressures become academically unrecoverable.

What the new survey clarifies

The older survey showed broad and durable patterns. Academic difficulty, personal or family reasons, dissatisfaction with instruction, and work-related conflicts were among the major categories. Those findings remain important, especially because they were drawn from a much larger response base. But the older survey was less able to show what students meant when they selected a category such as academic difficulty or dissatisfaction.

The new survey adds interpretive value by separating several issues that were previously harder to see. It suggests that learning fit, course clarity, format alignment, and feedback timing are not peripheral concerns. They appear close to the center of how many students describe the experience that led them to withdraw.

This does not mean that the new survey overturns the older one. It gives the College a clearer lens. The older survey showed that academic difficulty, personal circumstances, work conflicts, and dissatisfaction mattered. The new survey begins to clarify the mechanisms inside those categories. It helps move the question from “Did the student struggle academically?” to “What made the struggle difficult to recognize, interpret, or recover from in time?”

That shift is important because the second question is more actionable. A student may experience academic difficulty for many reasons. Some reasons are tied to preparation, time, health, or competing responsibilities. Others are tied to course expectations, course structure, assignment sequencing, feedback timing, format fit, or the availability of a feasible recovery path. The new survey does not answer all of those questions, but it points the College toward them more directly.

Withdrawal as a timing problem

This timing problem becomes clearer when the survey findings are read alongside students’ comments. Many withdrawal decisions appear to emerge after earlier moments of confusion, delay, mismatch, or disruption have already narrowed the student’s options.

This is why withdrawal should be understood as an early warning signal, even when it appears late in the course record. It tells the College that momentum weakened somewhere before the withdrawal itself. The important question is whether Tri-C can identify that weakening momentum earlier and closer to where it first appears.

In many cases, early difficulty is visible before it becomes a formal withdrawal risk. It may appear in a weak first assignment, a missed low-stakes quiz, a student who attends but does not participate, a student who stops opening course materials, a pattern of late submissions, or a confused message asking what is due. It may also appear in a student who is still trying, but whose work shows partial understanding that has not yet been corrected.

These early signs do not always require a large intervention. Sometimes the most important response is simple clarification. A student may need to know which assignments matter most, what a successful submission looks like, whether they are actually behind, what can still be made up, where to get help on a specific skill, or how to prioritize the next week of work. The difference between staying and withdrawing may depend less on a major support program than on whether the student receives a timely and specific signal before confusion turns into discouragement.

This point should be made with respect for faculty. Faculty are often the people closest to the first evidence of student difficulty. They see early work, partial understanding, missed assignments, weak attendance patterns, and students who seem present but uncertain. The challenge is not that faculty lack concern. The challenge is that the College’s formal systems may not always help convert those early course-level signals into timely, feasible, and coordinated responses.

That distinction matters. A call for earlier feedback loops should not be heard as a claim that faculty are failing students. It should be understood as a design question for the whole institution. How can the College help students know earlier where they stand? How can faculty be supported in identifying and responding to early signs of confusion without creating unrealistic workload? How can advising, tutoring, technology, communication, and course design reinforce one another before the student concludes that withdrawal is the only realistic option?

Early Alert is necessary, but not sufficient

Early Alert systems are one of the most visible ways colleges try to respond to students before problems become final. They are well-intentioned. They give faculty a way to express concern. They give advisors and support staff a way to prioritize outreach. They help the institution see patterns of risk that might otherwise remain scattered across individual courses.

The issue is not whether Early Alert is useful. The issue is whether it is early enough, close enough to the course experience, and connected to options that can still change the student's path.

Preliminary evidence at Tri-C suggests that many alerts are activated several weeks into the term, often around the fourth to seventh week in 14- or 16-week courses. In some cases, that timing may still be helpful. In other cases, the opportunity for meaningful course correction may already have narrowed. A student may have missed multiple assignments, received limited feedback, lost confidence, or become unable to complete enough work to recover the grade.

This is especially important for students managing health, work, family, and financial pressures. A student with abundant time may be able to recover from several weeks of confusion. A student working long hours, caring for family, managing illness, or moving between transportation and technology constraints may not have that margin. For these students, delay is not a minor inconvenience. It can determine whether catching up is still possible.

The Trellis findings are useful here as a caution, not as direct evidence about Tri-C withdrawal behavior. Trellis found that many former students left without speaking with faculty or staff before leaving. That finding should not be used to claim that Tri-C students behave in exactly the same way. It does, however, reinforce a practical concern: institutions should be careful about relying too heavily on students to initiate help-seeking once difficulty begins. Many students who are falling behind do not announce that they are falling behind. Some continue quietly until the course feels unrecoverable.

Early Alert should therefore be understood as one part of a broader feedback design. It can help, but it cannot carry the full burden of early intervention if the alert comes after the course-level signs have already been visible for several weeks. The more important institutional challenge is to create shorter feedback loops within the course experience itself and connect those signals to support while students still have realistic options.

What earlier feedback loops would mean in practice

Earlier feedback loops do not require every course to look the same. They do not require faculty to abandon professional judgment or reduce academic standards. They do require students to receive earlier and clearer information about whether they understand expectations, whether their work is on track, and what they can still do if they begin to fall behind.

In practice, this could include early low-stakes assignments that reveal misunderstanding before major grades are at risk. It could include a required first-week or second-week check for understanding that helps students confirm where materials are located, how assignments should be submitted, how grading works, and what steady progress looks like. It could include faster feedback on the first meaningful assignment, especially in courses where later work depends heavily on early concepts.

It could also include clearer recovery paths after the first signs of difficulty. Students often need more than a general reminder to seek help. They may need a specific next step. For example, a student who misses the first assignment might receive a message that explains what can still be submitted, what cannot, which upcoming assignment matters most, and which tutoring or faculty office-hour option is most relevant. A student who performs poorly on an early assessment might need to know whether the issue is content knowledge, study strategy, writing expectations, time management, or misunderstanding the instructions.

Earlier feedback loops could also help with format mismatch. If a student enrolls in a hybrid or online course and discovers that the format does not match their learning needs, that mismatch needs to become visible early. Waiting until midterm may leave few good options. Earlier signals could help identify whether the student needs a different section, stronger orientation to the course format, more structured contact, or a better explanation of how learning will occur in that environment.

The goal is not to create a surveillance system around students. The goal is to make academic standing and next steps more visible while they still matter. Students should not have to infer from silence that they are doing fine, only to discover later that they misunderstood expectations or lost too much ground. Nor should faculty be left to manage every early signal alone. A well-designed feedback loop would support faculty judgment, clarify student action, and connect advising, tutoring, and course-level support in a timely way.

This is the most actionable implication of the survey. Students will continue to face health challenges, work conflicts, family demands, financial pressure, and transportation problems. Tri-C cannot remove all of those pressures. But the College can reduce the likelihood that students encounter those pressures while also lacking clear expectations, timely feedback, and a realistic path to recover from early difficulty.

Implications for institutional attention

The findings point to several areas for institutional attention. They do not evaluate any specific program, policy, or office directly. They do suggest where the College should look more closely if it wants to reduce preventable withdrawal and strengthen student momentum.

First, withdrawal prevention should not be located only in student services. Student services are essential, but many withdrawal risks first appear inside the course experience. They appear in early assignments, grading rhythms, communication patterns, format fit, and students' understanding of what successful progress requires. A student can be referred to support and still remain unable to recover if the course itself provides no clear way to regain footing.

Second, the College should treat course clarity as a student success condition. Clarity does not mean lowering expectations. It means making expectations legible to students who are managing limited time and competing responsibilities. Clear syllabi, consistent course shells, visible due dates, timely grading, and direct explanations of what matters most can make a significant difference for students who cannot afford several weeks of uncertainty.

Third, institutional systems should be designed around the reality that many students will not ask for help early. This is not a character flaw. Students may be embarrassed, overwhelmed, unsure whether their problem is serious enough, uncertain whom to contact, or simply too busy trying to manage the next immediate obligation. If the College waits for students to self-identify as at risk, it will miss many students whose difficulty is already visible in their course behavior.

Fourth, Tri-C should examine whether students have feasible recovery options after early disruption. Encouragement matters, but encouragement without a realistic path can feel hollow. Students need to know what they can still do, what has already been lost, which next step matters most, and whether there is still a credible route to passing the course. That kind of practical clarity may be especially important for students trying to decide whether to withdraw in order to protect GPA, preserve financial aid, manage work, or reduce personal strain.

Finally, the findings should be connected to Tri-C's broader work on student momentum. Withdrawal is not only a course-level event. It can weaken a student's sense that college is working for them. A student may still believe in the value of a credential while becoming less certain that continuing at this institution is realistic under current conditions. That distinction matters. It means withdrawal prevention is also connection preservation.

Conclusion

The new Student Course Withdrawal Survey should be treated as an early signal, not as a final diagnosis. Its value is not that it produces a simple ranked list of reasons. Its value is that it helps Tri-C see where student pressure, course experience, and institutional timing may be interacting in ways that weaken momentum.

The ranked findings matter. Mental and physical health concerns, work conflicts, family responsibilities, learning fit, unclear expectations, and format mismatch all deserve attention. But the more useful institutional question is how those factors combine in students' actual experience and when the College becomes aware that continuing is becoming less realistic.

The clearest implication is the need for earlier and more course-proximal feedback loops. Students need earlier signals about whether they understand expectations, whether their work is on track, and what they can still do if they begin to fall behind. Faculty need support that respects their professional judgment and helps them act on early signs of difficulty without carrying the full burden alone. Advisors, tutors, technology systems, and communication practices need to connect more reliably to the points in the course where student momentum first begins to weaken.

None of this removes the seriousness of the pressures students face outside the classroom. Many students are carrying significant health, work, financial, and family responsibilities. The survey does not suggest that Tri-C can control all of those conditions. It does suggest that the College can examine whether its own academic and support systems make early difficulty easier to recognize, easier to interpret, and easier to recover from.

Course withdrawal should therefore be read as more than a student decision to leave a class. It should be read as an early warning signal about whether the College's systems are helping students sustain momentum under pressure. The opportunity is not only to understand why students withdraw. It is to identify earlier when momentum is weakening and to adjust the learning environment before withdrawal becomes the most reasonable choice available.

Sources

American Council on Education. (2024, February 26). Emotional stress top reason students may withdraw. *Community College Daily*. https://www.ccdaily.com/2024/02/emotional-stress-top-reason-students-may-withdraw/

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success*. Harvard University Press.

Bay, J. (2026, April 27). Why students stop out and what brings them back. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2026/04/27/why-students-stop-out-and-what-brings-them-back

EAB. (2025, April 15). Design an early alert system faculty will actually use. *EAB*. https://eab.com/insights/blogs/student-success/design-early-alert-system-faculty-will-use/

Independent Educational Consultants Association. (2023, October 22). Navigating leave of absence and withdraw policies in college: Why we need to know. *Independent Educational Consultants Association*. https://www.iecaonline.com/quick-links/insights/blog/navigating-leave-of-absence-and-withdraw-policies-in-college/

Inside Higher Ed. (2023, January 24). Study analyzes why college students in counseling withdraw. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/01/24/study-analyzes-why-college-students-counseling-withdraw

Jaggars, S. S. (2014). Choosing between online and face-to-face courses: Community college student voices. *American Journal of Distance Education, 28*(1), 27–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2014.867697

Jaggars, S. S., & Xu, D. (2016). How do online course design features influence student performance? *Computers & Education, 95*, 270–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.014

New America. (2022, October 17). Five recommendations for community colleges to equitably implement early alert systems. *New America*. https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/five-recommendations-for-community-colleges-to-equitably-implement-early-alert-systems/

Seim, A. A., et al. (2025). Predictors of higher education dropout intention in the post-pandemic context. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, Article 1508751. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1508751

Stoup, G. (2026). The timing problem at the heart of community college reform. Cuyahoga Community College. https://www.tri-c.edu/about/institutional-progress-and-effectiveness/documents/the-timing-problem-at-the-heart-of-community-college-reform.pdf

Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. University of Chicago Press.