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The Reimagining College Access Initiative

- **June 2017**: 1st Convening, Tested & Validated the Vision
- **2017-2018**: Task Forces
  - Recognition
  - Technology
  - Leading Places
- **May 2018**: 2nd Convening, Feedback on the Task Forces’ Recommendations
- **2018-19**: Work Strands
  - Criteria
  - Transfer of student info
  - Pilots
- **May 2019**: 3rd Convening, Workshopping the Work Strands
- **2019-2020**: Pilot RCA
  - K-12 & IHE learning community to increase quality, equity, and access
Partners with more than 800 Colleges and Universities

Works with IHEs in 49 states, DC, and multiple countries

Collaboration with SlideRoom to support submission of student work
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Innovative schools have found that performance assessments strengthen teaching and learning.

Many colleges want to use to illuminate what students know and are able to do, particularly where tests are no longer used.

Finding the bridge is key.

The Promise of Performance Assessments: Innovations in High School Learning and College Admission

Roneeta Guha, Tony Wagner, Linda Darling-Hammond, Terri Taylor, and Diane Curtis
What are performance assessments?

Opportunities for students to demonstrate what they know and are able to do through actual *doing*....

With iterative feedback and opportunities to revise.

- Open-ended problems
- Evidence-based analysis
- Research investigations
- Exhibitions of learning
- Defense of ideas
What can students demonstrate on performance assessments?

Performance assessments can provide more valid measures of the higher-order thinking skills needed for postsecondary success.

- Disciplinary Inquiry
- Critical Thinking
- Creative Problem-Solving
- Self-management
- Communication
- Collaboration
Performance Assessments Can....

• Develop deeper understanding and cognitive skills
  • Analysis & synthesis of information
  • Evaluation and use of evidence
  • Communication through writing, speaking, quantitative and graphic representations

• Develop social-emotional abilities
  • Planning, organization
  • Self-management
  • Resourcefulness & perseverance
  • Collaboration
  • Problem solving
  • Taking and using feedback
  • Growth mindset
NY Performance Standards Consortium

• Since early 1990s, schools have graduated students by portfolio with performance tasks in ELA, math, science, history + (often) world language, arts, internships

• Revision to standards that express the criteria for inquiry in the discipline

• Presentation and defense of ideas to a jury of scholars & peers

• Strong outcomes in high school & college
## Performance-Based Assessment Tasks (PBATs)

### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Selects appropriate and efficient strategies to solve non-routine problems. Provides in-depth analysis of strategies.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate and efficient strategies to solve non-routine problems. Provides some analysis of strategies.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate, but inefficient, strategies to solve non-routine problems, and executes conceptually sound mathematical procedures with minor computational errors.</td>
<td>Selects an inappropriate strategy or Makes major conceptual errors or procedural errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning &amp; Proof</td>
<td>Executes conceptually sound mathematical procedures accurately. Makes valid conceptual/theoretical argument(s) and mathematically justifies it logically and thoroughly.</td>
<td>Executes conceptually sound mathematical procedures with minor computational errors. Makes valid conceptual/theoretical argument(s) and mathematically justifies it logically.</td>
<td>Makes argument(s) and justifies most mathematical statements accurately.</td>
<td>Makes arguments but does not justify mathematical statements accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the relationships between mathematical concepts, procedures, and/or strategies.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of the relationships between mathematical concepts, procedures, and/or strategies.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited understanding of the relationships between mathematical concepts, procedures, and/or strategies.</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate understanding of the relationships between mathematical concepts, procedures, and/or strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Creates an accurate and sophisticated mathematical representation(s), inherent to the task, to solve problems or portray solutions.</td>
<td>Creates an accurate mathematical representation(s), inherent to the task, to solve problems or portray solutions.</td>
<td>Creates an accurate mathematical representation(s), inherent to the task, to solve problems or portray solutions, but may be imprecise or contain minor errors.</td>
<td>Does not create an accurate mathematical representation, inherent to the task, to solve problems or portray solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance-Based Assessment Tasks (PBATs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New York Performance Standards Consortium</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circle one:**  
- Teacher  
- External Evaluator  

**Circle one:**  
- Written  
- Oral Defense  

**Overall Holistic Evaluation**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualize</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Background research has been thoroughly conducted using at least two original sources.  
- Sources are all appropriately cited.  
- The significance of the problem is clearly stated  
- The hypotheses/theses are grounded in the background research. | Background research has been thoroughly conducted.  
- Sources are appropriately cited.  
- The significance of the problem is stated  
- The hypotheses/theses are relevant to the background research. | Background research is included in the introduction.  
- Sources are cited.  
- The significance of the problem is stated  
- The hypotheses/theses are clearly stated. | Background research is not included in the introduction.  
- Sources are not cited.  
- The significance of the problem is not stated  
- The hypotheses/theses are not stated. |

| **Critique Experimental Design** |             |      |           |                |
| Identifies, describes and controls relevant variables.  
- Thoughtfully evaluates the procedure, data sampling method*, and/or set up  
- Clearly describes bias in the design | Identifies, describes and controls most relevant variables.  
- Evaluates the procedure, data sampling method*, and/or set up  
- Clearly describes bias in the design | Identifies, describes and controls some relevant variables.  
- Evaluates the procedure, data sampling method*, and/or set up  
- Attempts to describe bias in the design | Does not identify, describe or control any variables.  
- Does not evaluate the procedure or sampling method and/or set up  
- Does not attempt to describe bias in the design |

| **Collect, Curate*, Organize, and Present Data** |             |      |           |                |
| Collects or curates* data in a reliable and valid manner.  
- Presents relevant data that is consistent with the problem.  
- Generates appropriate tables, charts and graphs with data and makes appropriate calculations.  
- Conducts thorough mathematical analysis of the data. | Collects or curates* data in a reliable and valid manner.  
- Presents relevant data that is consistent with the problem.  
- Generates appropriate tables, charts and graphs with data and makes appropriate calculations.  
- Conducts mathematical analysis of the data. | Collects or curates* data in a reliable and valid manner.  
- Presents data that is consistent with the problem.  
- Generates tables, charts and graphs with data.  
- Conducts analysis of the data. | Collects or curates* data in a non-reliable and/or invalid manner.  
- Does not present data or presents data that is not relevant to the problem.  
- Does not generate tables, charts and graphs.  
- Does not analyze the data. |

| **Analyze and Interpret Results** |             |      |           |                |
| Draws thoughtful conclusions that are supported by the data.  
- Relates conclusions to original question.  
- Thoroughly describes sources of error and their effects on the data or identifies limitations of data & conclusion*. | Draws conclusions that are supported by the data.  
- Relates conclusions to original question.  
- Describes several sources of error and their effects on the data or the limitations of data & conclusion*. | Draws conclusions that are partially supported by the data.  
- Attempts to relate conclusions to original question.  
- Describes sources of error and attempts to describe their effects on the data or the limitations of the data & conclusion*. | Draws no conclusions or draws conclusions that are not supported by the data.  
- Does not attempt to relate conclusions to original question.  
- Does not describe sources of error or does not attempt to describe their effects on the data or limitations of data*. |

| **Revise Original Design** |             |      |           |                |
| Proposes effective and relevant revisions for the experimental plan (and investigative plan*) to lessen the effects of bias and sources of error.  
- Poses thoughtful and relevant questions for future research. | Proposes relevant revisions for the experimental plan (and investigative plan*) to lessen the effects of bias and sources of error.  
- Poses relevant questions for future research. | Proposes revisions for the experimental plan (and investigative plan*) to lessen the effects of bias and sources of error.  
- Poses questions for future research. | Does not propose revisions for the experimental plan (and investigative plan*).  
- Does not pose questions for future research. |

| **Defense (for oral component only)** |             |      |           |                |
| Thoroughly answers questions relevant to the experiment and related topics. | Adequately answers questions relevant to the experiment and related topics. | Adequately answers questions relevant to the experiment. | Does not adequately answer questions relevant to the experiment. |

* When working with “big data.”
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City University of New York: An Overview

- 25 Colleges
- 275k Degree Seeking Students
- 86,577 Freshman Applicants
- 354,074 Applications

“CUNY propels almost six times as many low-income students into the middle class and beyond as all eight Ivy League campuses, plus Duke, M.I.T., Stanford and Chicago, combined.”

– The New York Times
City University of New York: The Admission Experience

- One Application
- Application Components
- Central Review Process
- Campus Decisions
City University of New York: The Consortium Pilot

2015
Holistic Review
PBAT
Advocacy
Campus Decision
City University of New York:
Implementation and Expansion

- Technology
- Timeline
- Standardization
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May 27, 2020
A Pilot is borne

Research Questions:

• How do students educated in the Consortium, with performance assessments who attend CUNY, fare over time in terms of college persistence (measured as CUNY-wide retention), GPA and credits accumulated in general and disaggregated by race/ethnicity, when compared to CUNY students in general?

• How do students in the CUNY- Consortium pilot who score under 500 on the SATs fare over time in terms of college persistence (measured as CUNY-wide retention), GPA and credits accumulated in general and disaggregated by race/ethnicity, when compared to CUNY students in general, Consortium students accepted through traditional means and students from selective high schools?
Findings

• First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot had a higher rate of persistence after one year

• A higher percentage of First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot earned 80% or More of Attempted First-Semester Credits

• First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot had higher grade point average for one year

• First Year Full Time Black Male Students Pursuing a BA from in the CUNY Pilot and from the Consortium Schools had a higher rate of persistence after one year (pilot and non pilot)

• First Semester Full Time Black Male Students Pursuing a BA from in the CUNY Pilot and from the Consortium Schools had a 2.90 GPA (pilot and non pilot)
Percent of Pilot Applicants Admitted to CUNY Four-Year Colleges and the Percent of Admits who Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2015 cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2016 cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2017 cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2018 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted to 4-year college</td>
<td>28.8% (N = 52)</td>
<td>77.8% (N = 81)</td>
<td>95.5% (N = 111)</td>
<td>78.1% (N = 110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>60% (N = 15)</td>
<td>66.7% (N = 63)</td>
<td>51.9% (N = 106)</td>
<td>67.4% (N = 86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY Admissions Office
First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot had a higher rate of persistence after one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Retained (N)</th>
<th>Retained (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium (non-Pilot)</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public*</td>
<td>24,504</td>
<td>21,331</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A higher percentage of First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot earned 80% or More of Attempted First-Semester Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Earned 80% or More of Attempted Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium (non-Pilot)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public*</td>
<td>24,316</td>
<td>19,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provided raw data for this analysis.

Note 1: These results are based on the population of students who graduated high school in 2015 or later and entered one of CUNY’s senior colleges as first-time full-time freshmen pursuing a Baccalaureate Degree without delay (usually within 6 months of graduating HS) and include entering cohorts of Fall 2015, 2016, and 2017.

Note 2: Students who did not attempt credits are excluded from this analysis; thus, total numbers (N) in this table for some student groups might differ from those presented in other tables throughout this report.
First Year Full Time Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot had a higher grade point average for one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>GPA SD</th>
<th>Median GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium (non-Pilot)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public*</td>
<td>24,284</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td><strong>3.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Year Full Time Black Male Students Pursuing a BA from in the CUNY Pilot and CUNY Pilot and from the Consortium Schools had a higher rate of persistence after one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Retained (N)</th>
<th>Retained (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Semester Full Time Black Male Students Pursuing a BA in the CUNY Pilot and from the Consortium Schools had a 2.90 GPA (pilot and non pilot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>GPA SD</th>
<th>Median GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Early results reveal encouraging patterns in terms of equity, access, credit accumulation, GPA and persistence
• Early evidence on race/ethnicity equity promising, but at the moment we have limited ability to conduct disaggregated analyses with small sample size
• The CUNY-Consortium pilot offers preliminary and very encouraging empirical evidence that college admissions policies rooted in performance assessments can strengthen equitable college admissions, achievement, persistence and eventually, we predict, graduation rates.
• Both the statistical evidence and the interviews with administrators suggest that even large public universities are beginning to recognize the need, and develop the means, to open admissions processes to a more diverse student community, through a multi-metric framework.
A precarious moment for education and equity

As private universities move toward test optional admissions, is it not the responsibility of public and private universities to develop policies that widen access, strengthen equity and deepen the creative intellectual development of our students?

A natural experiment on equity, access and higher education achievement has been borne from a public health crisis. How can we best examine and study this?
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Thank you for joining!

Learn more
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