THE HIDDEN COST OF MISREADING STUDENT INTENT

By: Gregory Stoup, VP Institutional Progress and Effectiveness
Cuyahoga Community College

Community colleges are built for breadth. That openness is the sector's defining strength, and it also creates a quiet operational challenge that colleges often handle with blunt categories. Colleges struggle to accurately identify why a student is enrolling, and then to build the right experience around that purpose. When a college misreads intent, the student experiences the system as confusion, delay, unnecessary cost, and a sense that effort is being spent in the wrong direction.

Student intent is a moving target; colleges measure it with blunt instruments

Student intent is rarely a single, stable target that a learner arrives with fully-formed and then carries unchanged from term to term. Many students arrive with aspirations that are real and motivating, yet still broad: a better job, a bachelor's degree, or a fresh start after a setback. Those aims do not translate cleanly into the categories colleges ask students to initially choose and they do not map neatly to a declared major, an application checkbox, or a program code in the student information system.

The system confuses early paperwork with settled purpose.

Other students arrive with sharply practical aims that sound smaller than they are: a short credential, a specific skill bundle, a license, a promotion, or a move from unstable work to steadier work. For these learners, the question is often not: "What do you want to study?" It is: "What do you need to change in your life, and how fast do you need that change to happen?" Their intent may be clear, yet it can still be misread if the college treats degrees as the default definition of purpose.

For many first-generation students, intent is also hard to express in institutional language. The student may not know the difference between transfer planning and degree planning, or between a program that leads to a job and a program that mainly keeps options open. Undecided or liberal arts can hide very different purposes, and those purposes often shift once the student experiences the first few weeks of college, meets an advisor, struggles in a gatekeeper course, or discovers that a desired field has prerequisites they did not anticipate.

Adult learners often bring clearer goals, yet their intent is shaped by constraints that younger students do not carry to the same degree: work schedules, childcare, transportation, and/or health. Time constraints and risk tolerance shape what success can realistically look like in a given season of life, and a student can be deeply serious and still choose a shorter route because it is the only route that fits.

Because intent is complex and often evolving, the proxy measures colleges rely on misclassify students at scale: major, degree-seeking status, and first term course selection. Those are thin signals and they can be misleading. A student may declare a major simply to complete

enrollment requirements. A student may choose courses based on what fits a work schedule rather than what fits a pathway. A student may signal degree seeking because it sounds like the right answer, even when they are actually testing whether college is worth the time.

Colleges route students using data that was never designed for routing.

The institutional consequences are predictable. Advising becomes generic because it is not anchored in a clear purpose. Pathways become mismatched because the college is routing students based on weak signals. Students who need speed get placed into sequences designed for exploration, while students who need exploration get pushed into premature commitment. Over time, the system starts producing outcomes that look like motivation problems, even when they are better understood as intent detection problems.

The student experience of misread intent

For recent high school graduates, the risk often shows up as false clarity. A student may intend to transfer or earn a bachelor's, yet lack the navigational knowledge to understand prerequisites, sequencing, and the compounding penalty of taking the wrong early courses. They often do not know which courses are truly foundational, which are merely convenient, and which quietly close doors later. A schedule that looks reasonable can become a trap. One wrong math placement can add terms. One elective that does not apply to a transfer pathway can consume scarce aid. One delayed gateway course can push everything else back.

If the college treats a declared major as settled intent, it can mistake compliance for commitment. The student might have picked something because the form required it, or because it sounded aligned with a vague aspiration, or because a friend suggested it. The institution then routes the student into a default sequence that assumes the student understands the stakes of early choices. Credits accumulate without building. The student feels busy, yet progress is unclear. When friction appears, it gets interpreted as personal weakness rather than as the predictable result of a pathway that was never truly aligned to the student's purpose. The pattern is familiar. Aspiration remains high. Momentum becomes fragile. Stopping out becomes a rational response to confusion and delay, not a lack of ability.

For adult learners, misread intent tends to produce the opposite problem. Unnecessary length. Many adults are seeking shorter programs that connect quickly to wage increases, and they measure value in time to benefit as much as in credentials. Their constraints are not marginal. Work schedules, family duties, transportation, health, and the cost of lost hours all shape what is feasible. A pathway that requires multiple years, even if well designed, can be misaligned with the decision the adult learner is trying to make. They are often asking, "What can I complete soon enough to change my earnings and stability within the next year?"

The system can label as failure what the student experiences as success.

When the college defaults adults into degree architectures, advising scripts, and course sequences optimized for traditional completion, it can turn a targeted goal into an overbuilt plan. The adult learner gets enrolled in requirements that are not necessary for the outcome they want or gets placed into sequences that delay the point where learning becomes economically useful. Even strong advising can struggle if the only recognized definition of success is degree completion. Adults then do what rational adults do. They take the parts that matter, gain a skill, secure a better role, and stop. The non-

completer label can describe a student who achieved their purpose, while the institution reads the story as failure because it never captured the original purpose in the first place.

Performance funding turns misread intent into a measurement distortion

This challenge becomes sharper in performance-based funding environments because measurement is no longer simply a way to describe performance. It becomes a mechanism that allocates resources. When colleges cannot reliably distinguish degree-intending students from students pursuing targeted skill gains, large numbers of learners who never intended to complete a degree get swept into completion-based metrics as failed completers. The college is then judged, and often funded, as if those students set out to finish a credential and fell short, even when their original goal was a discrete skill gain, a short-term certificate, or a fast move into higher wages.

That does two kinds of damage at once. First, it penalizes institutions for serving the very students the economy increasingly sends to community colleges: adults who want shorter, job-connected learning that leads to wage growth. Second, it pushes strategy in the wrong direction. Leaders start to optimize for what is easiest to count rather than what is most important to build. Advising and program design can drift toward trying to convert everyone into a completer, even when a portion of students would be better served by shorter aligned pathways that are intentionally designed for rapid payoff.

The distortion compounds because it blurs two very different problems. It mixes true non-completion, where a student wanted a degree and got stuck, with purposeful non-completion, where a student achieved their aim and exited. When those are merged into one outcome bucket, colleges lose diagnostic clarity. They cannot easily see where friction is breaking degree pathways, and they cannot accurately demonstrate value for students whose success is measured in wages, mobility, and time to benefit.

In that context, a funding formula can amplify the cost of misclassification, turning an intake data weakness into a budget consequence. The institution loses money and also loses the ability to tell the truth about what is happening. A college can only improve what it can see, and performance funding makes the ability to see student intent and to separate intents cleanly in metrics, an issue of both educational integrity and institutional viability.

The demographic context makes intent alignment a core survival skill

Two pressures converge here. In many regions, the pool of recent high school graduates is shrinking, which means the traditional pipeline is less reliable as a stabilizing base for enrollment planning. At the same time, adult learners are becoming more explicit about what they will and will not buy with their time. They want shorter programs. They want credentials that translate quickly into wage increases. They want learning that fits around work and family without asking them to wager years of life on a distant payoff.

These forces change what competition looks like. Colleges are no longer competing only with nearby institutions. They are competing with employers who offer paid training, with short term providers that promise speed, and with the quiet, rational decision many adults make to “do nothing” because the system feels too long, too confusing, or too risky. When the high school graduate market tightens, a college cannot make up the difference simply by recruiting harder. It has to convert interest into progress, and it has to make value legible quickly.

This is where intent alignment becomes a survival skill rather than a refinement. If colleges treat intent as a secondary data point, they will experience demographic change as volatility. Enrollment will swing because the institution cannot reliably match people to what they came for. Outcomes will swing because students will be routed into structures that assume degree completion even when the student is seeking a targeted, time bound return. In that environment, many students will look like stop outs when they are actually mismatch exits, and many programs will look underperforming when they are simply serving students whose goals were never captured in the first place.

Intent confusion disguises system problems as student problems.

The strategic danger is that colleges will respond to this volatility with broad initiatives and generic fixes. More advising. More outreach. More nudges. More marketing. Those responses may be well intentioned, yet they do not solve the root problem if the institution still cannot reliably distinguish a transfer bound student from a skill upgrader, or a degree explorer from a wage seeker who needs a short program now. Without a clear read of intent, colleges end up improving services in the abstract while leaving the core routing problem intact.

Colleges that treat intent as an operational cornerstone can respond differently. They can design their front door around purpose, not around institutional convenience. They can offer clearer on ramps that separate short credentials, career change pathways, and degree transfer routes, while still allowing movement between them as goals evolve. They can build advising that starts with a simple question about what success needs to look like in the next six months, not only in the next six years. They can create measures of success that reflect the actual demand profile, including wage gains, skill attainment, and stackable progress, alongside degrees and transfer.

This approach does not abandon degree pathways. It protects them by reserving degree completion structures for students who genuinely want them and can realistically pursue them. It also dignifies the growing share of students whose goals are shorter and more time sensitive, and it makes those goals visible enough to support them well. In a tightening demographic environment, the colleges that thrive will be the ones that stop guessing what students intend and start designing around what they are truly trying to do.

What changes when intent becomes a design input?

Most colleges treat intent as a piece of intake paperwork —something to record, then set aside as the student moves into schedules, course plans, and advising conversations. In practice, that means intent is often treated as a label rather than a design signal. The system assumes it already knows what the student is trying to do, because a major was selected, a box was checked, or a program was attached to a record.

Intent is the first design decision

When intent becomes a true design input, the college stops treating that first label as the truth and starts treating it as an early hypothesis. It assumes that purpose can be unclear at entry, that it can change as students learn what college actually requires, and that constraints can reshape what is feasible even when aspirations remain high. It also recognizes that the cost of misreading intent is not abstract - it shows up as wasted credits, stalled momentum,

unnecessary time, and students who leave with the feeling that college did not fit their lives, even when a better fit was possible.

Instead of relying on broad institutional structures and hoping individual advisors can compensate, the institution should design its front end, its default pathways, and its success measures to reflect the reality that students come for different reasons. That creates a practical agenda, with specific moves that can be operationalized rather than merely endorsed.

Capture intent in plain language at entry, then re-confirm it early and often. A single intake question is not enough. Colleges need a structured intent check rhythm that recognizes goals evolve and that early experience shapes intent as much as intent shapes choices.

Build advising and default pathways around intent categories that reflect real student purposes. Transfer intent, degree intent, credential intent, skill upgrade, exploration, and personal enrichment: these can become operational groupings that drive first term course choices, milestone design, and support routing.

Measure intent fulfillment, not only completion. Using an intent outcome alignment frame that classifies outcomes as aligned, partially aligned, or misaligned, colleges can track whether students achieved what they came for. This does not weaken accountability. It makes it more accurate and more responsive to how students actually use the institution.

Protect funding metrics from intent misclassification. In performance-based systems, colleges should be able to separate degree intending cohorts from shorter purpose cohorts, and policymakers should be able to reward meaningful wage connected attainment alongside degrees and transfer. Without that separation, the system counts the wrong students as failures and creates incentives that work against labor market realities.

A clearer question for the next era

The sector often asks, “How do we raise completion?” A more foundational question, and one that fits the demographic and labor market moment asks whether colleges can reliably know what students are trying to do and build experiences that help them do it. When intent is captured well, pathways become coherent, advising becomes specific, short programs become legitimate rather than second class, and funding metrics move closer to truth.

When intent is captured poorly, students inherit the cost in time and confusion, and institutions inherit the cost in distorted performance, distorted funding, and strategies shaped around the wrong story of who their students are and why they came.

Sources

Adelman, C. (2006). *The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college.* U.S. Department of Education.

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

Complete College America. (2013). *The power of 15 credits: Enrollment intensity and student success.* Complete College America.

Karp, M. M. (2016). *A holistic conception of nonacademic support: Toward a differentiated and responsive support infrastructure.* Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Light, A., & Strayer, W. (2000). Determinants of college completion: School quality or student ability? *Journal of Human Resources, 35*(2), 299–332.

Scott-Clayton, J. (2018). The looming student loan default crisis is worse than we thought. *Brookings Institution.*