Annenberg Institute
BROWN UNIVERSITY

EdWorkingPaper No. 25-1314

Behind the Scenes: Faculty-Staff Collaboration in a Student Success Effort

Ellen Bryer
Brown University

Catherine Mata
Brown University

Katharine Meyer
Brookings Institution

Lindsay Page
Brown University

Interventions to improve postsecondary student success often involve supports that are external to the college classroom, although there is growing evidence that faculty involvement in interventions can improve student outcomes. This paper explores the challenges that arise when faculty and staff collaborate to improve student success as well as the organizational changes that support the implementation of a low-touch, technology-based intervention. Drawing on interviews with the implementing team, we find that faculty and staff negotiate their different understandings of the intervention's goals, develop new channels of communication, and create new roles to facilitate their collaboration. The findings speak to the context-specific changes that underpin implementation and may explain the difficulty in scaling low-touch interventions to other contexts.

VERSION: October 2025

Suggested citation: Bryer, Ellen, Catherine Mata, Katharine Meyer, and Lindsay Page. (2025). Behind the Scenes: Faculty-Staff Collaboration in a Student Success Effort. (EdWorkingPaper: 25-1314). Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University: https://doi.org/10.26300/c3e8-nx92

Behind the Scenes: Faculty-Staff Collaboration in a Student Success Effort

Ellen Bryer[1]
Brown University

Catherine Mata
Brown University

Lindsay Page
Brown University

Katharine Meyer
Brookings Institution

This version: October 14, 2025

Abstract

Interventions to improve postsecondary student success often involve supports that are external to the college classroom, although there is growing evidence that faculty involvement in interventions can improve student outcomes. This paper explores the challenges that arise when faculty and staff collaborate to improve student success as well as the organizational changes that support the implementation of a low-touch, technology-based intervention. Drawing on interviews with the implementing team, we find that faculty and staff negotiate their different understandings of the intervention's goals, develop new channels of communication, and create new roles to facilitate their collaboration. The findings speak to the context-specific changes that underpin implementation and may explain the difficulty in scaling low-touch interventions to other contexts.

Keywords: Higher Education; Collaboration; Organization Theory/Change; Student knowledge

[1] Bryer: ellen_bryer@brown.edu; Mata: catherine_mata@brown.edu; Meyer: kmeyer@brookings.edu; Page: lindsay_page@brown.edu. This research was supported through a grant from the Ascendium Education Group. We gratefully acknowledge Georgia State University (GSU), the National Institute for Student Success, and the focal department at GSU for their support and engagement with this study. We thank conference participants at the 2025 Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness conference for their feedback. Institutional support was provided by the Annenberg Institute at Brown University and Brookings Institution. All errors are our own.

Behind the Scenes: Faculty-Staff Collaboration in a Student Success Effort

While a growing share of high school graduates attend college, fewer than two-thirds of students who began a bachelor's degree at a four-year institution in 2014 earned a degree within six years (Irwin et al., 2024). With increasing attention on graduation rates, colleges and universities have developed their administrative capacity to track and improve student outcomes (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2018; Kelchen, 2024; Kurlaender et al., 2015). Interventions to promote students' success in college vary widely in intensity, duration, and target outcomes, ranging from comprehensive, multi-factor programs to lighter-touch nudging interventions (Dynarski et al., 2022; Meyer, Nurshatayeva, et al., 2025; Reber, 2024).

Postsecondary interventions that aim to improve persistence and graduation often involve supports that are external to the college classroom, such as financial aid or supplemental advising, even when the stated goal is to improve student performance in and completion of academic coursework (Bailey et al., 2015; Bettinger & Baker, 2014; Weiss et al., 2019). While faculty members and college classrooms are implicated in studies of developmental education (Sepanik & Barman, 2024; Weiss & Headlam, 2019) and online learning (Kofoed et al., 2024), interventions to address college persistence and completion rarely include faculty as key actors or collaborators (Reber, 2024). In comparison to the K-12 level, policy interventions at the postsecondary level do not typically include a focus on the work of teaching and learning (Bailey et al., 2015).

Recent studies of student success interventions in which faculty are directly involved have shown promise for improving student performance and persistence (Carrell & Kurlaender, 2023; Park & Xu, 2024; Smith et al., 2018). These studies illustrate the potential for students to benefit from interventions that involve faculty behavior or classroom practices and point to

questions about how faculty collaborate with university staff focused on student success (hereafter "student success staff") and potential barriers to scaling these interventions.

Faculty involvement in student success interventions and in collaboration with student success staff is underexplored in the higher education policy literature. We aim to address this gap in the literature by examining the collaboration between faculty and staff that was required to implement an experimental study of a text-message communication intervention in an academic course. We ask:

1. What challenges arise when faculty and staff collaborate on a technology-based academic intervention aiming to improve student success?
2. What organizational processes, roles, and routines support the implementation of this type of course-based intervention?

The paper draws on interviews with the faculty and staff involved in efforts to embed artificial intelligence (AI) enabled chatbot communication into a gateway STEM course in a large, diverse, public university. We find that, far from implementing a pre-set intervention, faculty and staff continuously negotiate their different understandings of the goals of the intervention, develop new channels of communication, and create new roles to facilitate their collaboration. The early implementation of even this relatively "low-touch" and technology-based intervention requires adjustments to organizational processes in and around the classroom.

The findings of this paper contribute to the literature on the implementation of postsecondary student success interventions. First, the findings illustrate the challenges and opportunities of postsecondary interventions that include faculty collaboration, an important gap in postsecondary student success interventions. Second, the findings about the extent of

organizational shifts required to implement this collaborative intervention in one context offer insight into the process of scaling such interventions to other contexts.

Organizational Dimensions of Student Success

Organizational framework

Organizational sociologists consider institutions of higher education complex "organized anarchies" (Cohen et al., 1972). Within universities, administrative and instructional units and resource streams are loosely coupled or loosely connected to one other (Weick, 1976) and the relationship between different domains are fluid and evolving. For example, degree pathways in large open-access institutions have emerged iteratively to maximize student enrollment at a low-cost (Bailey et al., 2015). Additionally, there is a longstanding tradition of faculty autonomy in postsecondary research and teaching (Hofstadter, 2017). Thus, in a typical university, decisions about course content and course pathways are loosely coupled with administrative or advising domains of the university.

Within this organizational context, the movement to improve student success is an effort to consider efficiency of student pathways through institutions (Bailey et al., 2015; Scott-Clayton, 2011). In other words, universities and the people who comprise them consider how to more tightly couple activity across distant domains through policy and organizational change. Targeted changes to policies and programs have long been a feature of K-12 education but are relatively new in higher education (Bryk et al., 2010; Doyle & Kirst, 2015; Rigby et al., 2016). Contemporary broad-access colleges and universities receive considerable pressure to improve students' stagnant rates of degree completion and time to degree, processes that involve faculty-governed domains: the classroom, curriculum, and degree pathways (Bailey et al., 2015; Doyle

& Kirst, 2015; Irwin et al., 2024). Increasingly, administrative units, such as student affairs or institutional research, focus on assessing and improving institution-wide patterns of student performance and student outcomes.

Student success interventions

A range of interventions support students in navigating siloed aspects of the university (Reber, 2024). To succeed in college, students must navigate academic expectations and complex administrative processes such as FAFSA completion and course registration (Dynarski et al., 2022; Page et al., 2025). Comprehensive interventions, or interventions that offer multiple components (e.g., advising, transportation assistance, "last-dollar" financial aid, tutoring) increase student completion by integrating support across the full college experience. Behavioral interventions have been shown to increase college access (Castleman & Page, 2015), enrollment (Page & Gehlbach, 2017), and academic success (Meyer et al., 2025) especially when they target discrete, required, and time-sensitive processes (Page et al., 2025).

Whereas comprehensive interventions such as CUNY ASAP make multiple organizational changes that significantly alter the college experience of the treated students compared to the status quo (Scrivener et al., 2015), the implementation of behavioral interventions is typically understood as less intensive. Research has shown that successful nudging interventions are more effective when delivered locally by trusted sources (Avery et al., 2021; Bird et al., 2021; Page et al., 2025). Thus, technology-based interventions may be difficult to scale to new contexts (Avery et al., 2021). These findings suggest that implementing both comprehensive and low-touch interventions involves changes to organizational routines and relationships. However, questions remain about the extent to which organizational changes are required to implement these comparatively "low-touch" interventions.

Faculty involvement in success interventions

While faculty and higher education classrooms are involved in research on developmental education, learning communities, and online learning, interventions that change student-faculty interactions, instructional practices, and curriculum are less common in the education policy literature (Bailey et al., 2015; Reber, 2024). However, recent studies indicate the promise of interventions that change faculty behavior or classroom practices. Carrell and Kurlaender (2023) found that randomly assigning students to receive personalized, strategically-timed emails from faculty about their performance earned higher grades and perceived the professor and course more positively. Park and Xu (2024) found suggestive evidence that students achieved higher course grades when their faculty members had received training in active learning techniques.

However, these studies leave open questions about how faculty's participation in the intervention interacts with other aspects of their role: how they prepare for courses and, in some cases, collaborate with administrative units. Literature from student affairs indicates that some collaborations between faculty and staff can be challenged by the chasm between their responsibilities, status, and perception of each other's roles (Kezar, 2005; Whitt et al., 2008). Answering questions about the context-specific aspects of implementation will contribute to our understanding of the portability and scalability of student success interventions that are embedded in the classroom context. As colleges and universities have expanded their efforts to promote student success (Bailey et al., 2015; Scott-Clayton, 2011), it is important to consider how administrative units that focus on student success can collaborate with faculty and begin to leverage the classroom space to promote successful outcomes for students.

Data and Methods

Context

This study is situated at Georgia State University (GSU), a large public, research university in Atlanta, GA that enrolls roughly 45,000 undergraduate students. GSU serves a diverse student population; over half of students receive Pell grants and 66 percent of students identify as Black, Hispanic, or of two or more races. GSU has a pooled college completion rate nearly identical to the national four-year institution average, with about 57 percent of students earning a bachelor's degree within eight years of initial enrollment (College Scorecard, n.d.). This project is part of a research-practice partnership that aims to understand the effectiveness of incorporating proactive, non-generative AI-enabled text messaging ("the chatbot") into systems of outreach and support for the university's undergraduate population. Previous interventions successfully improved student outcomes in and outside of the classroom (Meyer, Page, et al., 2025; Page & Gehlbach, 2017). Within the university, the chatbot is housed in and overseen by an administrative unit focused on improving student success.

This interview study took place in the context of a semester-long pilot evaluation of the course-specific chatbot in a gateway STEM course for intended STEM majors. For confidentiality, we do not identify the exact course in this paper. The focal course is taught in-person every semester to roughly 1,000 students per semester. In the 2023-24 year, about one quarter (23%) of students in the course earned Ds, failed, or withdrew (DFW).

In the spring of 2024, students enrolled in two lecture sections of the target course were randomized to the conditions of control and treatment. Students in both conditions received regular course communication. In addition, students in the treatment group received timely outreach and support with specific course content and general academic competencies via text

messages. Figure 1 displays chatbot messages from a sample week. The chatbot text messages were written and sent by the student success staff and their TAs after consulting with faculty about course content and assignments. Oftentimes, the messages were targeted to students' performance on key assignments. The chatbot also included an interactive self-assessment function called "quiz me." Created in collaboration with faculty and staff, "quiz me" offered students access to timely non-graded quizzes via text message. Any questions students texted the chatbot were answered either immediately by the chatbot AI or as soon as possible by a course teaching assistant (TA). Students could pause or opt out of the messages at any time.

Data collection and analysis

This study draws on a unique set of interviews conducted with the faculty and staff (n = 9) who were involved in the early implementation of this intervention. The respondents include three faculty members, four full-time student success staff members, and two graduate teaching assistants.

Interviews took place in the summer of 2024, after the pilot semester and before the formal two-year RCT began in the fall of 2024. The interviews were conducted by a member of the research team who, at the time of the interviews, had met most of the respondents but was still relatively new to the team. This hybrid insider and outsider role is advantageous for interviewing, providing common ground for respondents to feel comfortable as well as a genuine reason for respondents to explain their experiences in detail (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009).

The interviews lasted between 30 and 100 minutes (50 minutes, on average) and focused on the design and implementation of the chatbot communication. All interviews covered respondents' involvement with and perception of the chatbot as well as their perception of collaboration amongst the chatbot team. In addition, faculty interviews included questions about

their teaching experience and perception of student needs, and staff interviews included questions about their other job duties and the administrative inputs that supported implementation.

The research team transcribed and thoroughly reviewed the transcripts before preparing them for coding with the RADaR (Rigorous and Accelerated Data Reduction) technique (Watkins, 2017). The RADaR technique is conducted in Microsoft Excel and is well suited to qualitative analyses that address a particular research question (Watkins, 2017). Following our broad research question about how faculty and staff collaborate in the context of an intervention to improve student academic success in higher education, we reduced the data to a subset of participants' responses that directly addressed some aspect of faculty-staff collaboration. During the reduction process, we wrote brief notes about each remaining response and settled on an initial set of codes (e.g., "collegial team", "TA as intermediary", "communicating about syllabus changes") to apply to the responses. In the next phase of analysis, we applied these codes and sorted the data using key attributes such as faculty or staff status. Finally, we reviewed the text in each code group in isolation and discussed patterns and contrasts.

Findings

This section discusses the challenges that arise in a collaboration between faculty and staff on a classroom-based academic intervention as well as the routine changes and new roles that facilitate collaboration.

Goals of the intervention

All of the faculty and staff involved care deeply about student success and view the chatbot as a worthwhile pursuit to support student needs. As one staff member said, "There's this

partnership that's happening between faculty and an administrative unit that is powerful." A faculty member described enjoying learning more about what student success staff do: "there are some really caring people out there with a lot of energy to try to make life better for students." Within an interested department, individual faculty agree to participate in the study and to have their students randomly assigned to receive the chatbot. A staff person pointed out that the departments and faculty members who are involved in implementing and evaluating the chatbot are highly selected: "You don't approach the idea without being excited about it.… It's been such a very selective process." Even in a collegial partnership focused on improving students' outcomes, faculty and staff have inherently different roles within complex higher education institutions.

Faculty and staff bring different understandings of the root of students' academic challenges and thus, different understandings of the goals and purpose of the chatbot intervention. Faculty are attuned to the underlying math and science skill gaps that they perceive as hindering students' success in the target course. One faculty member described math skills as a major barrier to students' success:

> And the biggest obstacle is the students' background, probably it is still lasting impact of Covid because this generation…was probably in middle school… or high school during the pandemic, and it was primarily online and it's noticeable. So, the lack of math skills. Just the mental math skills is primarily the obstacle…It's not just the ability to subtract or add, it's some ability to apply critical thinking.

What faculty view as fundamental math or critical thinking skills cannot be easily provided in their course or in the chatbot intervention.

As faculty are uniquely attuned to students' math and science preparation for the course, they envision an intervention that could improve these skills. For example, one faculty member wished that the chatbot could address students' questions about the subject matter itself, (e.g., "Help me understand the difference between speed and acceleration.", "How would I know how many significant figures to use?"): "I'd like to see real academics. I'd like to see it start to answer real [subject matter] questions. But that's going to have to be another different grant." Another faculty member also hoped for a future iteration of the chatbot that would focus on subject matter knowledge:

> Probably some online study things. Those are probably what I'm looking for actually…It really can be based on the students' levels and how to make them more successful, like passing the class or getting like more interested in this class and engage them more.

This faculty member envisioned resources that were more intensive than the existing messaging and interactive self-tests, but understood true subject-matter knowledge as out of scope for the current chatbot. However, faculty members shared a perspective that this kind of a resource would be necessary to truly improve students' academic outcomes in the focal course.

By contrast, staff are concerned with students' other skill gaps, such as organization, time management, or awareness of support resources. Student success staff aim to facilitate the best academic outcomes for students with the skills they bring to the target course. Staff and faculty both hope that the chatbot will improve students' grades in the focal course. However, student success staff view improving grades as a way to holistically support students in their journey toward completing college: "If we are improving grades…, and if that now makes students more eligible for scholarships and things like that, if it encourages them to stick out school one more semester, it's worth it."

Student success staff also worry about the potential of gateway courses to "weed out" interested students. In the focal course, there are certain exams which only 60 percent of students pass. Where faculty again emphasize students' lack of math and science preparation as a fundamental issue, student success staff view this as a systemic challenge that indicates a need for changes in the course: "So you're telling me that 60% of the class just failed or missed this exam completely?" Another staff member said, "Is it, you know, a 'weed out' course, are we trying to do that? Because if we're not trying to do that, then something else needs to be fixed." Early implementation of an academic chatbot involves alignment on the scope of what the chatbot can do as well as open communication about course content and major assignments.

Changing syllabi

To keep the chatbot tightly connected to each instructor's course, the implementing faculty members and student success staff held weekly meetings to review any changes and differences in the syllabi.[1] Faculty are accustomed to independently making such changes to the pacing of the material or spacing of assignments throughout the semester. However, syllabus changes affect the timing of reminder messages and self-assessment (i.e., "quiz me") prompts. One faculty member speaks to the need for regular adjustments to the syllabus:

> [For] some asynchronized classes, we only do minor changes every semester…But I think this course really depends on the students. So that's why the chatbot… every semester then it has to be changed somehow.

In the faculty's view, the course "depends on the students," necessitating changes from semester to semester and even within a given semester. A faculty member explained, "every week now we need to meet and tell [success staff] like, okay, where we are now and what kind of content we

covered. So, then they will put the correct information…and also like the correct quiz questions to send out [via the chatbot]."

The regular meetings facilitate the implementation; without them, the chatbot would be untethered from the actual pacing of the course and would be unable to provide relevant and timely resources. For example, a message that prompts students to attend tutoring before their homework assignment needs to include the accurate deadline for the assignment even if the deadline has changed. At the same time, greater differentiation across sections of the same course means greater staff effort to customize the chatbot to each section. As one staff member describes:

> It really does make things difficult when there's different syllabi, i.e., you have to like make sure that this population is getting that message, this [other] population is getting that message, and then this one's getting that one…So I just feel like there's a lot of room for human error …They're almost like two different classes, when you have two different syllabi, like in terms of the workload.

Under norms of academic freedom, faculty have the freedom to adjust their syllabus as they see fit. Customization of the chatbot increases the burden on faculty to track and communicate their changes as well as the work for student success staff implementing a differentiated intervention in multiple sections. As a tailored, adaptable intervention, the chatbot will continue to require some additional resources, such as regular meetings with faculty, to integrate into future iterations of the course.

Forging routines

The planning and early implementation of the chatbot intervention involve changes to routines, roles, and processes in and around the classroom. Both faculty and staff described the growing

pains of forging new channels of communication, working relationships, and shared expectations across siloed parts of the university. As one faculty member explained,

> Basically, it's more preparation at the beginning, because we need to create the quiz me question pool…before the semester starts…. And then, this whole semester every week we met about one hour and then after the meetings we also work with the TA… to let her know our progress.

Even though meeting frequency will decrease in subsequent semesters, regular meetings among faculty, staff, and graduate TAs about syllabus changes and the chatbot content represent a significant shift in the usual order of business. Effective communication among a large group that does not normally work together is challenging. Several staff members expressed their hopes that one senior staff member could coordinate all chatbot communication between faculty and staff. One staff member explained, "We meet weekly for 30 minutes. That meeting often goes over ...I think a better balance would be: let folks like [the senior staff member] and the chatbot communications team figure out like what those communications need to be."

Another staff member agreed that although the senior staff person wound up leading the meetings, the collaboration would benefit from her being involved in all communication with the implementing faculty: "I would have all faculty communication either go through [the senior staff person] or have [her] be copied and have some clear, defined relationships." Regular meetings and clear lines of communication create a forum for ongoing dialogue about students' needs and improving the integration of the chatbot into the focal course. Although this is unfamiliar, faculty and staff were committed to creating and strengthening the channels of communication that worked best for them. However, their effort to do so underscores both the

lack of a natural or inherent structure that bridges these disparate parts of the university and the effort required to bridge them.

Creating a new role

Two graduate TAs supported the everyday implementation of the chatbot and facilitated students' interactions with the chatbot. One of the TAs supported other chatbots at the university, but this section primarily focuses on the role of the subject-specific TA who exclusively focused on this course chatbot. The TA position eased communication between faculty and staff. Both faculty and staff described the TA as a trusted intermediary, fluent in both the subject matter and the chatbot technology, who ensures that the chatbot stays tightly connected to the course. A staff member explained the value of having someone who is already familiar with the target course and faculty in this role:

> I think having that course level TA helps a ton…It really helps if that student has been a TA for that course before. Like if they have an existing relationship with the faculty, they're trusted. They understand how these assignments work, which one's hard, how students navigate them.

The graduate TA's experiences in the subject and at the university enable her to be a bridge between faculty and student success staff.

The TA facilitates the flow of information between faculty and staff. When asked to describe her role, the TA described how she takes the questions she receives from the faculty for the weekly, non-graded self-assessment (i.e., "quiz me") and then inputs or "scripts" them to be sent as text messages:

> I already have the questions from the quiz me from the professor. They are already approved and I just need to create a response for them in case they're incorrect…Like, I'm not giving them the direct answer. I just direct in the book which section they need to look at and put all the quizzes into the chatbot software.

Similarly, the TA also shares course information and performance with the student success team who then uses it to send targeted messages to students. As another TA described:

> [The course TA], she has access to their test scores and she will like, send that information to [the student success lead]…and they will generate specific messages like, 'Oh, it looks like you didn't do so well on this last exam. Here's some more study tools.'

In this example, the TA knows which information the student success staff need to target specific messages and can seamlessly facilitate that without involving the faculty directly. A staff member explained how the TA's translation of subject specific changes ensures that the chatbot can be closely tied to the course:

> [The TA] is the [subject matter] expert and the liaison with the faculty. Because even though we meet with the faculty, they talk to her a bit more often and [she's] going to know like, 'Oh, [niche topic] is not going to be covered on this test.'…So having a TA that the faculty trust has been important.

In the context of the chatbot implementation, graduate TAs play a role in decision-making and their authority and expertise are highly valued.

Discussion

Taking a perspective that considers the organizational context of higher education institutions, this article examines the process of involving faculty in student success

interventions. Involving faculty in interventions to improve student outcomes at the postsecondary level has shown promise (Carrell & Kurlaender, 2023; Park & Xu, 2024; Smith et al., 2018). However, in the siloed university context, faculty and staff do not typically work closely together. Drawing on the case of an intervention to embed non-generative AI-enabled text communication ("the chatbot") in a gateway STEM course to improve student outcomes, we asked two research questions here. First, what challenges arise when faculty and staff collaborate on a technology-based academic intervention to improve student success? Second, what organizational processes, roles, and routines support the implementation of this type of course-based intervention?

We find that, from their unique roles in the institution, faculty and staff bring different perspectives on student challenges to their collaboration on a student success intervention. In general, faculty are concerned about students' academic preparation for the target course and seek to foreground this in the chatbot intervention. In contrast, success staff are concerned about students' performance in the target course and how that relates to university-wide patterns in student outcomes generally. To facilitate their collaboration and implementation of the intervention, several key changes to roles and routines serve to bridge faculty and student success staff. These changes constitute a rearrangement of typical relationships in higher education. Faculty keep staff informed about changes to their syllabus in order to support the intervention. Regular meetings and newly forged channels of communication facilitate the collaboration and bridge disparate parts of the university. Finally, a TA, hired for this intervention, uses their subject- and course-specific knowledge as well as their knowledge of student success initiatives to serve as an essential intermediary between faculty and staff. The findings illustrate how, although it takes some time and effort to bridge the distinct faculty and

staff perspectives on student challenges, their perspectives are complementary in that they lead to a more complete picture of students' needs in and out of the classroom.

Findings from this study contribute to our understanding of what it takes to implement interventions that involve faculty or that are situated within the postsecondary classroom. The department and specific faculty involved in this intervention are eager collaborators, aware of the intervention's positive impacts in other departments (Meyer, Page, et al., 2025) and, along with the staff, speak positively about their collaboration.[2] And yet, our findings demonstrate the inherent challenges and changes to routine that are required when collaborating across loosely coupled university units (Kirst & Stevens, 2015; Syno et al., 2019). Additionally, the centrality of the TA role in facilitating the collaboration between faculty and staff is a significant rearrangement of typical higher education organizational structures. As trainees, graduate teaching assistants have comparatively low status in the university context (Pasquinelli, 2024). In the context of this intervention, faculty and staff described the TAs as highly skilled and as vital to the implementation. The findings of this study speak to the importance of the roles and relationships that underly implementation of even this light-touch, technology-based intervention at a single site. Our findings illustrate the importance of recruiting faculty members, staff, and TAs who can function as a team (Hill, 2014) and grapple with the changes and challenges that a new intervention requires.

While some dynamics of the collaboration between faculty and staff may be specific to this context, our findings contribute to a broader gap in the literature on the implementation of postsecondary student success interventions. Our findings illustrate how an intervention that a student experiences as low touch may nevertheless involve significant organizational and operational realignment at the outset as well as consistent input from faculty and staff over the

course of the intervention. Thus, the findings offer an additional explanation for why apparently portable interventions such as text-message campaigns may be particularly effective in some contexts as opposed to others (Avery et al., 2021; Bird et al., 2021). New routines and relationships that bridge across domains of the university or sectors of education take time to forge even when everyone is enthusiastic. At the same time, our findings also underscore the promise of new collaborations across disparate organizational units beyond the specific intervention. We can imagine how developing a common language and shared routines between faculty and student success staff could strengthen and inspire future collaborations, and enrich both groups' ability to serve students.

Colleges and universities are considering how to promote student success amid stagnant completion outcomes and a changing economy. This article adds important context to research on low-touch, technology-based interventions by illustrating the organizational realignments that support the early implementation of such interventions within the college classroom. Future efforts to develop and implement student success interventions in postsecondary classrooms or in partnership with faculty should carefully consider changes in relationships and routines that such interventions require of faculty and staff across the university.

Notes

1. While regular meetings would continue after the pilot semester, they decrease in frequency to biweekly, then to monthly, and possibly even less frequently after the evaluation period.
2. In addition to participating in the implementation, faculty in our context are also participating in a multi-year evaluation of the intervention. A willingness to participate in the research would not be needed when exclusively focusing on implementation.

References

Avery, C., Castleman, B. L., Hurwitz, M., Long, B. T., & Page, L. C. (2021). Digital messaging to improve college enrollment and success. *Economics of Education Review*, *84*, 102170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2021.102170

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*. Harvard University Press. https://research.ebsco.com/c/jfwlhf/ebook-viewer/pdf/nqguihifn5?location=https%25253A%25252F%25252Fresearch.ebsco.com%25252Fc%25252Fjfwlhf%25252Fsearch%25252Fdetails%25252Fnqguihifn5%25253Fdb%25253De000xna

Bettinger, E. P., & Baker, R. B. (2014). The Effects of Student Coaching: An Evaluation of a Randomized Experiment in Student Advising. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *36*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713500523

Bird, K. A., Castleman, B. L., Denning, J. T., Goodman, J., Lamberton, C., & Rosinger, K. O. (2021). Nudging at scale: Experimental evidence from FAFSA completion campaigns. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *183*, 105–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2020.12.022

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. The University of Chicago Press.

Carrell, S. E., & Kurlaender, M. (2023). My Professor Cares: Experimental Evidence on the Role of Faculty Engagement. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *15*(4), 113–141. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20210699

Castleman, B. L., & Page, L. C. (2015). Summer nudging: Can personalized text messages and peer mentor outreach increase college going among low-income high school graduates? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *115*, 144–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.12.008

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392088

College Scorecard. (n.d.). *Georgia State University Profile*. Retrieved July 7, 2025, from https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/school?139940-Georgia-State-University

Doyle, W. R., & Kirst, M. W. (2015). Explaining policy change in K–12 and higher Education. In M. W. Kirst & M. L. Stevens (Eds.), *Remaking college: The changing ecology of higher education* (pp. 190–209). Stanford Univ. Press.

Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *8*(1), 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105

Dynarski, S., Nurshatayeva, A., Page, L. C., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2022). Addressing Non-Financial Barriers to College Access and Success: Evidence and Policy Implications. *NBER Working Paper Series*.

Gansemer-Topf, A. M., Downey, J., Thompson, K., & Genschel, U. (2018). Did the Recession Impact Student Success? Relationships of Finances, Staffing and Institutional Type on Retention. *Research in Higher Education*, *59*(2), 174–197. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9462-2

Hill, L. (2014, June). Collective Genius. *Harvard Business Review*. https://research.ebsco.com/c/jfwlhf/viewer/html/igx7tpqaqr

Hofstadter, R. (2017). *Academic Freedom in the Age of the College*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351288927

Irwin, V., Wang, K., Jung, J., Kessler, E., Tezil, T., Alhassani, S., Filbey, A., Dilig, R., Mann, F. B., Barnett, M., Purcell, S., & Nachazel, T. (2024). *Report on the Condition of Education 2024* (No. NCES 2024-144). US Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2024/2024144.pdf

Kelchen, R. (2024). The Role of State Higher Education Policy in Student Success and Equity. *Journal of Postsecondary Student Success*, *3*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.33009/fsop_jpss135047

Kezar, A. (2005). Redesigning for Collaboration within Higher Education Institutions: An Exploration into the Developmental Process. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(7), 831–860. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-6227-5

Kirst, M. W., & Stevens, M. L. (Eds.). (2015). *Remaking college: The changing ecology of higher education*. Stanford University Press.

Kofoed, M. S., Gebhart, L., Gilmore, D., & Moschitto, R. (2024). Zooming to Class? Experimental Evidence on College Students' Online Learning during COVID-19. *American Economic Review: Insights*, *6*(3), 324–340. https://doi.org/10.1257/aeri.20230077

Kurlaender, M., Howell, J. S., & Jackson, J. (2015). Improving Collegiate Outcomes at Broad-Access Institutions. In M. W. Kirst & M. L. Stevens (Eds.), *Remaking college: The changing ecology of higher education* (pp. 237–260). Stanford Univ. Press.

Meyer, K., Nurshatayeva, A., Page, L., & Reber, S. (2025). *Support for College Access and Success*. AEFP Live Handbook. https://livehandbook.org/higher-education/college-access/college-access-and-success-programs/

Meyer, K., Page, L., Mata, C., Smith, E., Walsh, B. T., Fifield, L. C., Tyson, M., Eremionkhale, A., Evans, M., Frost, S., & Jung, E. E. (2025). Let's Chat: Chatbot Nudging for Improved Course Performance. *Annenberg EdWorkingPaper*. https://doi.org/10.26300/ES6B-SM82

Page, L. C., & Gehlbach, H. (2017). How an Artificially Intelligent Virtual Assistant Helps Students Navigate the Road to College. *AERA Open*, *3*(4), 233285841774922. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858417749220

Page, L. C., Meyer, K., Lee, J., & Gehlbach, H. (2025). Conditions Under Which College Students Can Be Responsive to Text-Based Nudging. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *0*(0), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2025.2481219

Park, E. S., & Xu, D. (2024). The Effect of Active Learning Professional Development Training on College Students' Academic Outcomes. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *17*(1), 43–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2022.2151954

Pasquinelli, N. (2024). Professor-in-Training: Status Control of the Teaching Assistant. *Work and Occupations*, *51*(1), 47–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/07308884231178551

Reber, S. (2024). *Supporting Students to and through College* (pp. 1–41). Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/supporting-students-to-and-through-college-what-does-the-evidence-say/

Rigby, J. G., Woulfin, S. L., & März, V. (2016). Understanding How Structure and Agency Influence Education Policy Implementation and Organizational Change. *American Journal of Education*, *122*(3), 295–302.

Scott-Clayton, J. (2011). The Shapeless River: Does a Lack of Structure Inhibit Students' Progress at Community Colleges? *Community College Research Center*.

Scrivener, S., Weiss, M. J., Ratledge, A., Rudd, T., Sommo, C., & Fresques, H. (2015). *Doubling Graduation Rates: Three-Year Effects of CUNY's Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) for Developmental Education Students*.

Sepanik, S., & Barman, S. (2024). Long-Term Effects of the Dana Center Mathematics Pathways Model: Evidence from a Randomized Trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2024.2394537

Smith, B. O., White, D. R., Kuzyk, P. C., & Tierney, J. E. (2018). Improved grade outcomes with an e-mailed "grade nudge." *The Journal of Economic Education*, *49*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220485.2017.1397570

Syno, J. L. S., McBrayer, J. S., & Calhoun, D. W. (2019). Faculty and Staff Perceptions of Organizational Units and Collaboration Impact. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *37*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1353/csj.2019.0000

Watkins, D. C. (2017). Rapid and Rigorous Qualitative Data Analysis: The "RADaR" Technique for Applied Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917712131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917712131

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875

Weiss, M. J., & Headlam, C. (2019). A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Modularized, Computer-Assisted, Self-Paced Approach to Developmental Math. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *12*(3), 484–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2019.1631419

Weiss, M. J., Ratledge, A., Sommo, C., & Gupta, H. (2019). Supporting Community College Students from Start to Degree Completion: Long-Term Evidence from a Randomized Trial of CUNY's ASAP. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *11*(3), 253–297. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20170430

Whitt, E. J., Nesheim, B. E., Guentzel, M. J., Kellogg, A. H., McDonald, W. M., & Wells, C. A. (2008). "Principles of Good Practice" for Academic and Student Affairs Partnership Programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(3), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0007

Figure 1. Sample chatbot messages for one week in the focal course

Weekly Digest: Weekly overview message naming specific topics and subtopics and sharing upcoming deadlines.	**Targeted/ Interactive Support:** Interactive message to judge how prepared students feel prior to quiz.	**Quizme:** Test students understanding of key concepts presented this week
(Professor A) WEEKLY DIGEST 🤖 Hi <[firstname>! Your friend STEMbot is back 😀 This week we'll cover [specific subtopics] ⚛️ Those materials can be a little tough but don't worry, I'm here to help! Here's your schedule for this week: 1. HW2 (due by Monday 2/5) 2. Quiz 3 (in class Friday 2/9) *Pro Tip – Take some extra time this week to review the concepts and get ready for your quiz! I know you can do it! 💪 Don't forget you can always seek help. 👉 Office hours: ⏱️ Mon/Wed 12:30-1:30pm 📍 Room 101 👉 [Link to STEM Tutoring] **(Professor B)** WEEKLY DIGEST 🤖 Hi <[firstname>! Your friend STEMbot is back 😀 This week we'll cover [specific subtopics] ⚛️ Those materials can be a little tough but don't worry, I'm here to help! Here's your schedule for this week: 1. HW3 (due by Monday 2/5) 2. Quiz 3 (in class Friday 2/9) *Pro Tip – Take some extra time this week to review the concepts and get ready for your quiz! I know you can do it! 💪 Don't forget you can always seek help: 👉 Practice hours: ⏱️ Mon/Wed/Fri 11am-12pm 📍 Room 102 👉 [Link to STEM Tutoring]	Hi <firstname> Ready for your quiz today? Just curious – how prepared do you feel for the quiz today? 1. Yes, I studied pretty hard! 😃 2. Could go either way 😐 3. No, I'm worried 😟	Hi <firstname>👋 Time for the weekly check-in! ✔️Good thing too, because the concepts this week can be tough. Type 👉 #quizme to see what you know. 💡 You might need a calculator for this one! (As always, this isn't for a grade. It's just for you to see how you're getting the material.)

Note: Some details blinded or changed to protect confidentiality while preserving meaning.