

Johann Ari Larusson · Brandon White
Editors

Learning Analytics

From Research to Practice

 Springer

Learning Analytics

Johann Ari Larusson • Brandon White
Editors

Learning Analytics

From Research to Practice

 Springer

Editors

Johann Ari Larusson
Center for Digital Data, Analytics
and Adaptive Learning at Pearson
Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Brandon White
Department of English
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California, USA

ISBN 978-1-4614-3304-0

ISBN 978-1-4614-3305-7 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-3305-7

Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014940734

© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

To our families

Acknowledgements

As editors with interests in pedagogy, community, and collaboration, it is only fitting that we begin by expressing our gratitude to our authors, each of whom has made the production of this volume such a valuable learning experience in its own right. Thanks to their efforts, we are confident that this book will make a forceful first contribution to the field of learning analytics. In particular, we would also like to thank Ryan Baker and Stephanie Teasley for their separate early insights into the project's potential merits, scope, and organization. We have kept these suggestions in mind since the first, and they have been instrumental in shaping the volume that we hold today.

We would moreover like to thank the organizers and members of the Society for Learning Analytics Research (SOLAR) for their foundational efforts in providing a formal and quickly evolving home for the study of learning analytics. It was through the collective achievements and enthusiasms of the participants at the 2011 conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge (before SOLAR even had that name) that the prospect of such a collection first came together.

This book could not have been assembled without the efforts of the many people on Springer's editorial and production staff, specifically Melissa James and Miriam Kamil. We would moreover like to thank those who helped us with our own side of the editorial and production process, Mike Vetter and Diego Villamil.

Finally, we want to extend our utmost gratitude to our colleagues at Brandeis University, Pearson, and the University of California, Berkeley for their support and guidance throughout this process. Your every effort has helped to reinforce what a learning community, at its best, might be.

Johann Ari Larusson
Brandon White

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
	Johann Ari Larusson and Brandon White	
Part I Preparing for Learning Analytics		
2	Designing Learning Analytics Experiences	15
	Abelardo Pardo	
3	Harnessing the Currents of the Digital Ocean	39
	John T. Behrens and Kristen E. DiCerbo	
4	Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics	61
	Ryan Shaun Baker and Paul Salvador Inventado	
Part II Learning Analytics for Learning Communities		
5	Analytics Through an Institutional Lens: Definition, Theory, Design, and Impact	79
	Matthew D. Pistilli, James E. Willis III, and John P. Campbell	
6	A Learning Management System-Based Early Warning System for Academic Advising in Undergraduate Engineering.....	103
	Andrew E. Krumm, R. Joseph Waddington, Stephanie D. Teasley, and Steven Lonn	
Part III Learning Analytics for Teachers and Learners		
7	The Data-Assisted Approach to Building Intelligent Technology-Enhanced Learning Environments	123
	Christopher Brooks, Jim Greer, and Carl Gutwin	

8 Identifying Points for Pedagogical Intervention Based on Student Writing: Two Case Studies for the “Point of Originality”	157
Brandon White and Johann Ari Larusson	
Index	191

Contributors

Ryan Shaun Baker is Associate Professor of Cognitive Studies in Education in the Department of Human Development at Teachers College Columbia University and Assistant Professor of Social Science and Policy Studies at Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

John T. Behrens is Vice President of Learning Analytics for the Pearson School Group and Vice President of the Center for Digital Data, Analytics and Adaptive Learning at Pearson. He is also an Adjunct Assistant Research Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Notre Dame.

Christopher Brooks is a Research Fellow at the School of Information, University of Michigan.

John P. Campbell is Associate Provost and Chief Information Officer at West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Kristen E. DiCerbo is a Principal Research Scientist in the Center for Digital Data, Analytics and Adaptive Learning at Pearson and a Distinguished Learning Game Researcher at GLASSLAB.

Jim Greer is a Professor of Computer Science and Director of the University Learning Centre at the University of Saskatchewan.

Carl Gutwin is a Professor of Computer Science at the University of Saskatchewan, with a research focus on Human Computer Interaction (HCI) and Computer Supported Collaborative Work (CSCW).

Paul Salvador Inventado is Assistant Professor in the Center for Empathic Human-Computer Interactions, College of Computer Studies, De La Salle University, Philippines and a Ph.D. student in Architecture for Intelligence in The Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research, Osaka University, Japan.

Andrew E. Krumm is an Education Researcher at SRI International, Center for Technology in Learning.

Johann Ari Larusson is a Senior Research Scientist for the Center for Digital Data, Analytics and Adaptive Learning at Pearson, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

Steven Lonn is Assistant Director of USE Lab and Library Learning Analytics Specialist at the University of Michigan.

Abelardo Pardo is Lecturer in the School of Electrical and Information Engineering, University of Sydney, Australia.

Matthew D. Pistilli is a Research Scientist for Teaching and Learning Technologies for the Instruction Design Center within Information Technology at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Stephanie D. Teasley is Research Professor in the School of Information and USE Lab Director at the University of Michigan.

R. Joseph Waddington is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the University of Notre Dame, Institute for Educational Initiatives.

Brandon White is a doctoral candidate in English at the University of California, Berkeley.

James E. Willis III is an Educational Assessment Specialist for the Instructional Design Center within Information Technology at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Johann Ari Larusson and Brandon White

Supporting teaching and learning with technology is becoming as commonplace as chalk in today's educational institutions. However, simply making technology available or requiring students to use it does not necessarily guarantee success. How does one effectively explore online learning communities so as to get an accurate description of the complex interactions taking place? What methods for analysis are available? What does a method of analysis even look like? What is the unit of analysis? How can an institution effectively organize its data? How does the information collected enrich students' learning experiences? How can we positively impact the teachers' pedagogical practices? How does one even design for successful implementations of educational technology that report back data rich enough to affect subsequent implementations? These questions are the ones required to better inform an educational agenda not only for "teaching with technology," but simply for teaching in the first place.

These processes, whatever their form, are inherently complex. The teaching and learning themselves might be taking place in a classroom, but are all nevertheless unfolding in an intangible time and space—inside a "black box," so to speak—producing enormous volumes of data where the vision of what data to collect, how to collect it, and how to explore it is not necessarily clear. In recent years, learning analytics (LA) has emerged as a field that seeks to provide answers to questions such as the ones highlighted above. Learning analytics can be summarized as the collection, analysis, and application of data accumulated to assess the behavior of educational communities. Whether it be through the use of statistical techniques and predictive

J.A. Larusson (✉)

Center for Digital Data, Analytics and Adaptive Learning at Pearson,
Boston, Massachusetts, USA
e-mail: johann.larusson@pearson.com

B. White

Department of English, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA
e-mail: brandonw@berkeley.edu

modeling, interactive visualizations, or taxonomies and frameworks, the ultimate goal is to optimize both student and faculty performance, to refine pedagogical strategies, to streamline institutional costs, to determine students' engagement with the course material, to highlight potentially struggling students (and to alter pedagogy accordingly) to fine-tune grading systems using real-time analysis, and to allow instructors to judge their own educational efficacy. In every case, learning analytics gives all stakeholders insight into what is taking place from Day 1 to Day X of a given class irrespective of the type of activity taking place. In short, learning analytics is broadly defined as the effort to improve teaching and learning through the targeted analysis of student demographic and performance data (Elias 2011; Fritz 2010). The contents of the "black box," in other words, become that much more visible, with their various markers sampled, collected, evaluated, and replayed in a legible form.

Learning analytics encompasses a range of cutting-edge educational technologies, methods, models, techniques, algorithms, and best practices that provide all members of an institution's community with a window into what actually takes place over the trajectory of a student's learning. Involvement in LA technologies and pedagogies allows educators and scholars to engage in a contemporary and innovative approach to an educational issue that is already an integral part of higher education.

In many ways, the field of learning analytics should be considered new. The field itself has come into being largely thanks to the proliferation of digital data produced by educational institutions' increasing tendency to produce, submit, and assess academic work in electronic form (Greer and Heaney 2004; Hirst 2011). While the first formal conference on LA, held in 2011, is evidence of its growing relevance in educational circles on an international scale, the fact that such a conference had not existed previously is sign enough of LA's relative infancy.

Learning analytics ideally attempts to leverage data to provide insight into the activities taking place within the classroom. What metrics are derived can then be fed back into pedagogy or applied with consequences even well outside the classroom itself. Several higher education institutions in particular have begun applying learning analytics to evaluate crucial aspects of the learning process and pedagogical practice, alongside institutional aims like student retention and cost reduction (Siemens and Long 2011). Holistic descriptions of several of these practices can be found in (Siemens and Long 2011) and (Ferguson 2012). A recent U.S. Department of Education brief held that learning analytics prioritizes the "*human tailoring* of responses, such as through adapting instruction content, intervening with at-risk students, and providing feedback" (Bienkowski et al. 2012, p. 13). This approach "does not emphasize reducing learning into components but instead seeks to understand entire systems and to support human decision making" (ibid). Yet for all the budding interest in LA, its earliest implementations have evolved from older models and methods, from raw data mining (cf. Baker and Yacef 2009) and learning community studies (cf. Dawson 2010) to the broader field of academic analytics (Goldstein and Katz 2005; Campbell et al. 2006). As institutions and educators increasingly begin to install learning analytics systems, or learning analytics enabled systems, they often tend to employ frameworks inherited from several of these other fields. Even nominal attempts to directly improve learning and teaching practice tend to digest institutional systems data with limited understanding of how that data

could or should inform pedagogy. Although these other inquiries remain vital and valuable fields, the purpose of this volume is to help situate LA's unique priorities, unique intended benefits, and unique ranges of personnel capable of putting that technology into practice. Growing the field of learning analytics requires making sure that it remains distinct from what came before and that its purpose remains rigorously clear.

Up until recent years, research and practice in this area has been hampered by a lack of definition, with work in the field dispersed throughout a number of journals and conferences, making it more difficult for experts to share results, get a real sense of what is new and innovative, or to identify the best practices, strategies, or tools to use. The birth of learning analytics as a field of study in its own right, through a now annual conference, the recently established Society for Learning Analytics Research, and with workshops and symposiums being organized around the world, has now made it possible to consolidate research once taking place along its periphery under one umbrella.

Learning analytics is uniquely positioned as a field with the potential to guide the efforts of any of a number of institutional actors or stakeholders, from students to instructors, IT professionals to educational administrators. While the inputs of learning analytics derive primarily from the classroom, any one of these stakeholders may well be charged with evaluating the results, putting changes into action, and weighing the impact that results. This book attempts to provide the first comprehensive reference book for LA, with the aim of helping scholars, researchers, developers, IT professionals, chief technology and information officers, university administrators, or anyone and everyone interested in advancing the field of learning analytics by showcasing the latest results, strategies, guidelines, methods, models, and tools. Collecting all of this information in one volume will allow scholars and researchers to take stock of ongoing efforts in the field, helping to illuminate what areas remain to be explored, and thus pushing the field yet further forward.

The purpose of this volume is, simply put, to provide an entry point into the field for any one of these actors depending upon their unique institutional interests. As a field with a broad appeal, simply navigating the extant literature of learning analytics, let alone attempting to put any of those principles into practice, can prove daunting. The chapters that follow each attempt to consolidate much of the available literature while putting forth best practice guidelines or model case studies that might prove of interest to particular types of readers. As such, this book is organized not around common problems or the mounting complexity of its efforts, but rather around the kinds of communities that each chapter attempts to address. It is the hope of the editors that this approach will allow different kinds of readers an opportunity to easily identify those chapters most likely to offer immediate insights. In the remainder of this introduction, each chapter's possible contributions to the field are thus suggested alongside discussion of its possible appeal to different classes of readers. Rather than simply summarizing what follows, the reader can think of this chapter as a map to the different ways in which the book itself might be read.

These myriad types of engagement are what the complexity of the field of learning analytics requires. What is learning analytics? The answer is not simply our own, as editors, but the one that the book itself, through each of our various

contributors, comes to suggest. These inquiries *themselves are* learning analytics. By probing the field's theoretical investments and by classifying its possible components, by exploring its history relative to educational data mining (EDM) and by helping to place it within a broader institutional context, by applying case studies to educators and students and academic advisors alike, these chapters take stock of all the many stakeholders that learning analytics might attempt to benefit, and thus most comprehensively demonstrate its power and its promise.

1.1 Preparing for Learning Analytics

The first section of the book, “Preparing for Learning Analytics,” looks to clarify the stakes of learning analytics by supplying suggestions for the field's domain, potential, and possible points of emphasis. In each of the three chapters, these suggestions take the form of guidelines for what the development of a learning analytics application might require. Whereas later chapters begin with established technologies or established pilot programs at host universities, these chapters take none of that for granted, investigating instead the very foundations of learning analytics practice.

An initial entry point for nearly any reader can be found in Chap. 2, Abelardo Pardo's “Designing Learning Analytics Experiences.” Pardo synthesizes the results and proposals of dozens of research findings to suggest five phases of design and execution through which an LA intervention might pass. These phases form a flexible framework that might be applied to any LA endeavor, providing readers with a sense of the kinds of decisions, dependencies, and trade-offs that are encountered in taking an analysis tool from conceptualization to subsequent enhancement.

The first stage, “capture,” corresponds to the earliest collection of student data. The second stage, “report,” delivers that data to a specifically defined set of stakeholders. The third stage, “prediction,” deploys any of a number of techniques to provide non-intuitive answers to frequently encountered educational questions, such as the likelihood of an individual student failing a course or failing to graduate altogether. The “act” stage that follows offers the possibility of issuing automated solutions or implementing manual ones that have the potential, ideally, to reverse the most dire consequences of the earlier prediction. In the final stage, “refinement,” the efficacy of the resulting actions is assessed anew so that the long-term viability of the analysis can itself be modified as need be.

Each stage in this process is presented not just as a single phase, with a pre-defined beginning and end, but as intimately bound up with choices that might have been made in earlier stages. Taking for instance only the “report” phase, Pardo singles out LA systems aimed at different classes of stakeholders. A process designed to deliver data directly to instructors requires a different set of investments than one generating metrics for IT professionals. Rather, therefore, than prescribing specific guidelines for what every stage ought to entail, Pardo instead offers a series of

questions at each stage that might inform how an LA implementation might be successfully designed and executed.

In a way, Pardo's chapter can be considered as a heuristic for much of the work of this volume as a whole. All of the subsequent chapters offer some specific engagement with one or more of the steps that Pardo outlines, and each is inevitably a product of choices that must have been made in any particular stage. Certain chapters, like that of Ryan Baker and Paul Inventado (see Chap. 4), are concerned principally with a specific phase: in this case, the kinds of calculations that are typically embraced during the "prediction" stage by learning analytics and EDM communities, respectively. Two case study chapters, as offered by Andrew Krumm et al. (see Chap. 6) and Brandon White and Johann Ari Larusson (see Chap. 8) provide considerations of two separate phases of analysis, carried out over a number of years. It might be suggested that these chapters have specific implications for what Pardo calls "refinement." Every attempted "prediction," however, is inevitably dependent on the stages that must have come before, every "refinement" only as good as the various acts that have been executed along the way.

Readers of this volume might thus do well to begin with Chap. 2, and to think of its many insights when taking up any of the chapters that follow. Such schematization of the assumptions underlying any particular technology will only lead to better questions, more pointed questions, and thus more opportunities for further refinement. Getting more LA systems to this final stage can be considered one of this volume's explicit goals. As Pardo mentions, because of LA's only relatively recent adoption and expansion, few LA systems have graduated to the "refinement" stage of analysis. There simply is not much longitudinal data on how a system might go through several iterations. It is our hope as editors that the next generation of LA research will see yet further instances of Pardo's framework being brought full circle.

Chapter 3, "Harnessing the Currents of the Digital Ocean" by John T. Behrens and Kristen E. DiCerbo, extends the discussion of the previous chapter to address the abundance of electronic information that now characterizes many educational efforts. Behrens and DiCerbo contrast this "digital ocean" with what they call the "digital desert," the pre-digital environment of the late twentieth century where data was rare, expensive to obtain, and as such was only amenable to limited, if any, analytic applications. While the potential consequences of such a shift can be seen as an impetus for the instantiation of learning analytics as a field in the first place, Behrens and DiCerbo suggest that the prevalence of digital data requires perhaps a more fundamental reshaping that the field might yet need to undergo. In their account, the simple technological limitations of the "digital desert" were themselves responsible for the kinds of activities, like multiple choice quizzes, that were developed for analysis. These activities tended—and still often tend—to be presented in a fixed form, with static questions matched to fixed answers to measure the correct response. As we stand on the shore of the "digital ocean," however, these same standards for collection, evaluation, and dissemination needn't remain a constraint.

Behrens and DiCerbo argue that the potential of learning analytics lies in its ability to reconceptualize the educational space, allowing us to think of user activity as

an ever-modulating stream of inputs from which certain attributes can be observed over time rather than requiring any moment-by-moment measure of correctness. The consequences for this shift in worldview would thus alter not only the ways in which data is collected, but also the very way in which it is understood. If the current understanding of summative evaluations (like final exams) interspersed with formative exercises (like homework, quizzes, midterms, or papers) can be likened to an autopsy conducted following a series of routine checkups, a naturalistically embedded assessment by way of learning analytics might instead be compared to a heart monitor that regularly and automatically generates feedback on the conditions at hand. Rather than seeing the analytic interface as something that delivers content to students, this understanding would instead see learning analytics as something allowing students themselves to create, explore, and reinforce the conditions of their own learning. As in Chap. 2, this discussion would situate learning analytics as an embedded system of continued research and refinement.

This chapter takes as its explicit endeavor an attempt to help readers rethink some of the underlying assumptions regarding how data and data analysis might be structured in a computationally complex space. Readers looking to expand their sense of what learning analytics might attempt would benefit from using this chapter as a primer on the possibilities while also helping to root the field's ambit in a broader history of educational theory. The chapter itself concludes with a wealth of suggestions for future research, not strictly in the *applications* of learning analytics, but on the types of thinking and training that learning analytics might require of the researchers themselves. These suggestions are invaluable as a basis from which to evaluate the core assumptions of learning analytics, and in so doing further suggest the kinds of practices, principles, and applications that await on the horizon.

Despite the only recent consolidation of learning analytics as a specific field of inquiry, LA approaches and LA methods have not developed in a vacuum. Chapter 4, Ryan Baker and Paul Inventado's "Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics," examines learning analytics relative to the abutting discipline of EDM. Baker and Inventado provide a historical contextualization for EDM's growth, both as a research community and as a specific field of scientific inquiry.

Their particular focus, however, lies in the identification of several key methods that EDM has traditionally deployed that are perhaps more foreign to LA research, although they needn't necessarily be. These methods fall into the broad categories of "prediction models," "structure discovery," "relationship mining," and "discovery with models." For each category, Baker and Inventado not only identify relevant applications of the method, but discuss how each method has historically been a part of EDM research, and to what extent it remains so to this day.

By exploring each category more closely, Baker and Inventado are able to provide broad contextualizations of what EDM-type analysis might attempt. Their chapter could, in this way, be considered as a complement to Abelardo Pardo's chapter on learning analytics design (see Chap. 2). Yet the two projects—and, consequently, two learning communities—needn't be entirely at cross-purposes. The diachronic exploration of EDM's evolution that Baker and Inventado present is useful on the one hand for illuminating the areas where learning analytics researchers

have pursued EDMs through different means. It is useful in turn, on the other hand, for suggesting areas of inquiry that LA has heretofore left mostly untapped.

Readers looking to answer a specific subset of research questions might do well to consult this chapter as a kind of guide to what other strategies might continue to augment LA research. Taking a cue from John T. Behrens, one of the other authors in this volume (see Chap. 3), Baker and Inventado note that learning analytics and EDM essentially have their names reversed: that while learning analytics tends to focus on educational outcomes, EDM is more often than not concerned with the immediate products of learning. What this chapter potentially suggests is that a long-term implementation of LA and EDM methods in concert would ultimately wind up informing one another intimately, with improved learning coming to ensure continually optimal educational outcomes. At the point in the near future when both fields have readily demonstrated enough success that they can be readily installed, run, and refined—at the point, in other words, where research becomes practice—the difference between the two becomes virtually indistinguishable.

1.2 Learning Analytics for Communities

The second section of this volume explores learning analytics that speak to the specific interests of learning communities beyond the immediate teacher–student relationship. These chapters ask what it means to conceive of learning analytics at a large scale, either by discussing the implications of learning analytics for institutions as a whole, or by empowering a different level of stakeholders to leverage analytic insights.

One of the common concerns of several of this volume’s authors lies in the granularity—or specificity—of the reporting data that an LA system might produce (see, for instance, Chap. 2). Data must be specific enough that its insights are made intelligible, but general enough that the end user isn’t overwhelmed by abundant detail. Many of the chapters in this volume, such as Chap. 8 or Chap. 6, describe technologies meant to be put in the hands of on-the-ground users, be they instructors or students advisors. In a more fully integrated LA landscape, however, one can easily imagine any number of classrooms interventions taking place side by side. As soon as decisions about LA use need to be made beyond the individual classroom, a different series of questions immediately need to be considered. Chapter 5, “Learning Analytics at an Institutional Level,” by Matthew D. Pistilli, James E. Willis, III, and John P. Campbell, describes the way in which an institutional actor, such as an administrator, a technology officer, or a system administrator, might go about the process of implementing and overseeing an LA architecture.

Building off of Tinto’s theory of student departure, Astin’s theory of student involvement, and Chickering and Gamson’s principles for good practice in undergraduate education, the authors suggest a framework for where an institutional attempt at LA might even be committed. The standard that the authors put forth is ultimately a measure of a student’s place in his or her educational environment.

Learning communities inevitably extend well outside the classroom, and even factors as casual as a student's frequency of contact with an instructor or involvement in the extracurricular games taking place nearby can stimulate a student's investment in his or her educational institution, increasing the likelihood that he or she will remain enrolled, excel in classes, and work towards a degree. Institutions themselves are thus ideally positioned to leverage observations of these interrelated interactions through analytics. Such a model of analytical practice takes stock of a diverse array of factors, gathered from a variety of different interactions, and uses the data from these interactions to suggest altered approaches that might improve a student's comfort, confidence, and capability in his or her educational setting.

Several consequences emerge from this analysis, the first of which is suggested even by the use cases sketched above. Pistilli et al. foremost suggest a renovation in the ways in which institutions even come to think of analytics in the first place, urging institutions to take stock of ambient data based on existing interactions between students, faculty, and supporting staff rather than going out and creating data sets from the ground up. The second suggestion informs the way in which such data might ultimately be used. Policies governing the privacy of information collected and disseminated in such a context are alone an important consideration for any such implementation, especially considering the varying standards for how confidential information might be handled at different universities even within the same country, city, or state. But what the authors ultimately put forward is a means for an institution to consider the interests of every other stakeholder concerned. It is not only, for instance, that faculty need to be sensitive to how they deploy analytics in their interactions with students, but that they also need to remain cognizant of the ways in which students could actually be *discouraged* by the result, leading to a negative feedback loop which is far from any LA implementation's intended purpose.

Readers of this volume with a particular interest in institutional efficacy would do well to consult this chapter early as a baseline look at what the commitments of an institution in an LA context are or could be. What this chapter suggests is that the most stable sense of analytics' place in an institution's daily life can only be understood holistically, as an aggregate consideration of the benefits accrued to every one of its individual actors.

Chapter 6, Andrew E. Krumm, R. Joseph Waddington, Stephanie D. Teasley, and Steven Lonn's "A Learning Management System-Based Early Warning System for Academic Advising in Undergraduate Engineering" reports on an ongoing case study working hand-in-hand with stakeholders to develop a system capable of informing academic advisors of students in need of additional support. It shouldn't escape notice that this study, while directly dependent on student data, is the only chapter of this volume that doesn't use the individual course instructor as the primary instigator of interventions. This configuration of stakeholders thus suggests one immediate application of the kind of discussion found in Chap. 5. The relevant stakeholders here, and the ones who the authors approached with considerations for the second phase of their study, are the academic advisors who more often than not function as gatekeepers between instructional and institutional requirements.