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Abstract

View from the front gate: A comparative study of NYC Schools from a college admissions perspective

by

Sharon J. Hardy

Advisor: Dr. Nicholas Michelli

This study evaluated patterns of college applications from NYC Schools to CUNY. Specifically, a cohort of former large high schools that were reorganized into small schools of choice (SSCs) under the City’s Children First education plan were studied. Coupled with the assessments of college admissions directors, the study concluded that despite an increase in applications, the outcomes of student academic quality and college preparation from a college admissions perspective were mixed.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction

Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s education agenda was outlined in his *Children First* Initiative. Introduced at a press conference in 2002, a key component of *Children First* was the creation of smaller, specialized high schools to replace the large “diploma factories”, as Mayor Bloomberg described the City’s failing schools. The argument presented to parents and the public by the Mayor and then NYC Schools Chancellor Joel Klein, was that the new smaller specialty-themed high schools would provide students with a better education experience and prepare students for careers and college. Schools selected for closure and reorganization were typically located in the City’s poorest neighborhoods and served New York’s most vulnerable and underserved populations of African-American and Hispanic students.

NYC Schools share a distinct relationship with the City University of New York (CUNY), the city’s public higher education system. CUNY enrolls 35,000 freshman students each year. More than 75% of CUNY’s freshmen are graduates of NYC Schools. Since Mayor Bloomberg first took office the graduation rates of NYC Schools has increased and during the same period, CUNY experienced an increase in freshman applications from NYC Schools. Enrollment tables retrieved from CUNY’s Institutional Research website are included in the appendix to provide an overview of trends in enrollment of first-time freshmen from Fall 2002 to Fall 2012; a profile of undergraduates for Fall 2012; enrollment of first-time freshmen by gender and college for Fall 2012; and a system retention rate report on graduation rates of first-time freshmen by cohort from Fall 2002 to Fall 2012 are included as well.¹

A college admissions director plays an important role in planning and implementing a college’s recruitment and enrollment strategies for students. College recruitment plans entail developing close relationships between college admissions offices and high schools. In many ways college admissions directors serve as ‘gatekeepers’ to college access. Their roles as recruiters and evaluators of applicants offer a unique perspective on a high school’s reputation and overall performance, offering a unique professional assessment that is often limited or completely overlooked in the public education conversation on high school performance, college preparation, and college readiness. A freshman applicant’s admission file typically is comprised of an application, essay, high school transcript, standardized test scores, and possibly two recommendation letters, commonly provided by the high school guidance counselor and/or teachers.

**Purpose of study**

I believe that an evaluation of college applications from a high school can offer valuable information on the college preparation and college readiness of its students as a whole. Coupled with the assessments of college admissions directors, information from such a study can inform policies that guide college readiness, college preparation, and college admission practices, as well as support partnership between secondary and postsecondary schools (K-16/20 education).

Criteria used by admission staff at CUNY to evaluate a freshman student’s admissibility are the Undergraduate Application for Admission, High School Transcript, and Standardized Test Scores. Writing samples and recommendation letters are only required of students applying to highly selective programs, such as Macaulay Honors College and Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education at City College. Students applying for general admission to the University are evaluated on high school coursework and GPA and SAT scores, although SAT scores are not required for admission to CUNY’s community colleges.
CUNY recommends the following college preparatory curriculum for high school students:

- “Four years of English (composition and literature)
- Three years of Math (algebra, geometry and trigonometry. A fourth year of math is preferred.
- Three years of Social Sciences (history, anthropology, economics, geography, government, political science, psychology or sociology). A fourth year is preferred.
- Two years of a lab Science (biology, chemistry, physics or earth science). A third year is preferred.
- Two years of a single Foreign Language
- One year of Visual or Performing Arts.”

In addition to following a college preparatory curriculum, high school students are required to meet a minimum level of proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics. CUNY uses standardized tests such as the SAT and New York State Regents subject area exams to evaluate students’ proficiency and admissibility to a college. For example, the math proficiency level varies with four-year colleges requiring higher scores than community colleges. Table 1.1 shows the minimum SAT Math, NYS Regents Exam and CUNY Math 1 and Math 2 Tests scores requirement established by CUNY for a student to be considered math proficient. While individual scores will naturally contain a wide range, based on student preparation and ability, one might assume that college bound students from NYC Schools would generally possess CUNY’s recommended college preparatory curriculum as a minimum in their high school coursework.

---

2 Source is CUNY’s UG admissions page: http://cuny.edu/admissions/undergraduate/9th-10th-11th-graders.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>SAT Math</th>
<th>NYS Regents</th>
<th>CUNY Math 1</th>
<th>CUNY Math 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Baccalaureate, School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York College</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers College</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC College of Technology</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough of Manhattan Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>480</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostos Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsborough Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensborough Community College</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, CUNY’s Skills and Assessment Tests (SKAT) are used by the University to evaluate basic proficiency levels of new students. Students may meet proficiency requirements in Writing, Reading and Mathematics based upon performance on the SKAT tests. CUNY colleges may also request SKAT testing to determine if a student meets admission requirements for college level coursework.

New York City’s *Children First* Initiative descends from the federal government’s education agenda outlined in *No Child Left Behind*, led by President George W. Bush’s administration. Geared toward teacher and school accountability and high-stakes testing to evaluate student learning, with language that mirrored the alarming message of *A Nation at Risk*, *Children First* was introduced by New York City’s school administration as a “bold, common-sense plan” and that the goal was one of “student success” (New York City Department of Education, 2002). For New York City’s public schools, *Children First* provided a strategic plan to transform the City’s schools and students. The plan’s goal was to create stronger schools with better prepared students through the reorganization of high schools and strategies to increase high school graduation rates.
One approach in addressing graduation rates was credit recovery coursework. Credit recovery is an initiative not exclusive to New York City schools, but a recognized strategy to assist at-risk students in graduating from high school. However, the practice of credit recovery is questionable in terms of student learning. An article by The New York Daily News reported that during the 2011-2012 school year, “one out of every 10 high school credits at a selection of nine public high schools were earned through credit recovery” (Burke, Chapman, & Monahan, 2013). How colleges evaluate credit recovery courses during the admission process can be informative to collaboration between NYC Schools and CUNY.

Students’ high school coursework serves as their academic credentials when applying to colleges. The rigor of high school coursework is evaluated by colleges when considering which students in their applicant pool to extend offers of admission. Therefore, high school curriculum and course rigor is important for opportunities in college choice and access.

Background to the issues
During a press conference in March 2009 New York City’s public education leadership, CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, NYC Schools Chancellor Klein and Mayor Bloomberg, announced the City graduated more college-ready students and that more high school graduates chose to enroll at CUNY. Mayor Bloomberg proclaimed, “More students enrolling from our public schools into CUNY colleges is proof that our education reforms are working and that we are preparing our students better for higher education opportunities.”

Findings from previous studies examining the outcomes of Children First found that high school graduation rates increased, however during the time of the study it was unclear to what extent Children First directly influenced higher graduation rates (Fruchter & McAlister, 2008).

---

4source http://www1.cuny.edu/mu/forum/2009/03/23
In addition, the influence of *Children First* on higher test scores or the remnants of prior reforms are indistinguishable (Kemple, 2010). In terms of school closings as a strategy coupled with NYC Schools’ management style, the needs and input of those stakeholders at the base, specifically students and teachers, imposed many challenges for underserved communities (Pappas, 2013).

This study aimed to explore if NYC Schools under the *Children First* initiative led by Mayor Bloomberg’s administration expanded college access and enrollment for NYC public school students from the viewpoint of those at the colleges’ front gate, the college admissions directors. The study sought to identify characteristics of admission patterns and profiles of freshman applicants to CUNY by high school and to examine the impact of two components of *Children First*: the closing and reorganization of failing schools and credit recovery for high school students.

**Key terms**
College enrollment (application and admission), college preparation, college readiness, *Children First* outcomes, college admission directors, academic profiling, credit recovery, small schools of choice high schools and K-16/20 partnership

**Research question**
How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ *Children First* Initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?
Research design

The research project’s setting was a public university system comprised of 24 colleges, of which 19 of the colleges enroll undergraduate students. This project focused on the academic credentials of the freshman applicants. The student sample size was determined based upon the selection of high schools reviewed in the study and the number of applicants to CUNY from that high school in the years selected for analysis, Fall 2002 and Fall 2012. The research project sought to identify any gaps between high school preparation and college expectations of readiness as defined by CUNY’s proficiency standards and observations of the University’s directors of college admissions.

This study enlisted a mixed methods approach applied in two stages of data collection. One stage employed quantitative analysis of predetermined variables from freshman applications to CUNY from a specific list of NYC Schools that were identified by school officials as failing schools and replaced with co-located smaller high schools.

NYC Schools selection process

The first criteria for schools selected was to have students that applied for freshman admission to CUNY. Schools that send large numbers of qualified or admissible students are considered by college admission professionals as “feeder schools”. The smaller specialized schools that replaced the former high schools were used for the comparison data. High school and applicant data was retrieved from two primary databases, CUNY’s institutional research database (IRDB) and the University’s College Admissions System (CAS). Data from the Fall 2002 application for college admission cycle was used as a base year prior to Children First in comparison to application data from the Fall 2012 admission cycle to analyze the performance of applicants to CUNY of students who experienced nearly their entire elementary and secondary
school experiences under the *Children First* Initiative. Therefore, the applications years selected are a snapshot that can provide a pre- and post-implementation analysis of Mayor Bloomberg’s era as the self-proclaimed “education mayor”.

Data was analyzed through characteristic percentages of selected variables to construct academic and population profiles of applicants by high school and their performance as first-year students at CUNY.

*Study limitations*

There are several areas that data presented limitations in the study. Data gathered from the application for admissions presented one considerable challenge in that not all questions are required that a college applicant to answer. Optional questions may limit the number of responses in certain data variables. For example, SAT scores are only required for students applying to attend a senior college at CUNY. Therefore, community college applicants may not have SAT test scores for inclusion in the SAT variable analysis. In addition, the student body from a high school for the purpose of the study was limited to those applying to CUNY and relied on CUNY data.

*Summary*

This chapter presented an introduction to the researcher’s interest in examining the impact of NYC Schools’ reorganization of high schools on freshman applicants to CUNY. The study was designed to explore observations from a college admissions perspective, which adds a unique outlook to policy and planning on college preparation and college readiness.

Chapter Two provides an overview of the literature from a broad range of issues that set the stage for contemporary public education practices, as well as offering insights to the policy
initiatives and political agendas that infiltrated education discourse. Chapter Three is a detailed description of the study’s application of mixed methodology and Chapter Four chronicles observations and analysis from collected data. Chapter Five is the researcher’s conclusion and offers a set of recommendations.
Chapter Two – Literature Review

Introduction

Drawn from the literature is the groundbreaking impact *A Nation at Risk* has had in setting the stage for a new kind of education agenda that continues to influence public education more than 30 years after the report’s release. *A Nation at Risk* opened the door wider for the federal government’s entrée to public education, a responsibility previously left to State’s and local jurisdictions. What is not evident from the literature is an understanding of the impact reforms of the past generation have had in improving public education for urban communities and in providing the key to the American dream by addressing plaguing issues such as poverty and opportunity gaps. How are we really doing in educating students? The literature presents a conflicting portrait of the state of public education and the outcomes of reforms that closed schools and implemented high-stakes testing. It appears from the literature that performance outcomes are dependent upon who is included in the data and who is prepared for testing.

Setting the context for public education in the 21st century

American statesman Benjamin Franklin declared the only things guaranteed in life were taxes and death. However, to Americans a third guarantee would emerge, that of public education, which would provide the key to obtaining and living the American dream. The promise of public education in a democratic society is that the voices of multiple stakeholders participate, although the decibels of those voices vary from time to time. Historian David Tyack explained, “Americans have followed a common pattern in devising educational prescriptions for social ills” (Tyack, 1991, p. 1).

Public education provided the platform to inform and to immerse a deluge of immigrants into the American way of life. Education afforded access to women and to minorities, although
at times in limited roles, it was only through education that America sought to overcome its self-inflicted injustices. Tyack and Cuban (1995) explained, “Americans’ sense of education as a public good has traditionally included more than merely economic advantage, individual or national” (p. 141), but is part of our core values as a nation, which is why the topic of education is passionately debated and evaluated continuously. Tyack described the American process of education reform as an ongoing “tinkering” with the system. Tyack stated, “Tinkering is one way of preserving what is valuable and reworking what is not” (Tyack & Cuban, 1995, p. 5).

Theodore Sizer presented the humanistic side of education in *Horace’s Compromise;* where learning is seen as a both a relational and individual experience. Sizer wrote, “Learning is a human activity, and depends absolutely (if not annoyingly) on human idiosyncrasy” (Sizer, 1992, p. 205). Yet, with the relational and social aspects of education, the formative learning experience has also served as the cornerstone for American ingenuity and economic might. Today, education in America is no longer about solely achieving the American dream, but the arguments for tinkering with education policy and practice include dominating any competition from global powers that have emerged. The role of American high schools has evolved beyond preserving democracy through an educated citizenry to graduating a skilled workforce to producing human capital to engage in the competitive global market.

James & Tyack explained, “Enormous changes have taken place over the past century in the American political economy, in the scope and social purpose of the high school, in the clientele it has served, in its finance and governance, in the complexity of its bureaucratic structure, and in its link with the later careers of high school graduates” (James & Tyack, 1983, p. 400). It is with those social, economic and cultural changes that we look to education to sort out what is good. Sizer stated, “American high schools and the opportunities within the schools’
grasp often do not lend themselves easily to quantification…Inspiration, hunger: these are the qualities that drive good schools” (Sizer, 1992, p. 221).

Urban education in particular has never strayed far from the center of public contention on how schools live up to the promise of providing the key to the American dream. At one time public education was about uniformity, then access, next moving on to an era that focused on equity. Today, the conversation has turned to excellence, which from the literature is illustrated as a means to sustaining the United States’ economic superiority. In discussing school quality, Eric Hanushek wrote, “An economy’s ability to grow over time – its ability to innovate and to raise both productivity and real incomes – is at least in part a function of the quality of its education system” (Hanushek, 2003, p. 143).

Political and social contexts of education reform
A key argument drawn from the literature is the political agenda of the power elite that deliberately employs education to replicate social and cultural norms with opportunity and economic impacts. In her book, Shock Doctrine, Naomi Klein explained how a “crisis hypothesis” (Klein, 2007) is used to shape public opinion that we need to act and to influence policymakers. Education as an institution serves as a distraction from the root of a number of our social ills which ultimately emerge from the issue of poverty, place, and opportunity (Anyon, 1997), (Swanstrom et al 2002). There is a considerable amount of documentation on the impact of poverty and school performance. Poverty is the root of poor learning and failing schools. Paul Hill wrote, “The problems of big-city school systems need solutions that improve human resources, strengthen and sometimes recreate institutions, and channel political energies away from adult financial interests and toward student learning” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. 127).
John Raisian explained the condition of public education as such, “The Sputnik-inspired commitment to improving the education system had clearly lost priority – as had student achievement” (Raisian, 2003, p. 4). It was such a state that set the national mindset and enabled the report, *A Nation at Risk*, to continue to influence public education more than 30 years after its publication. *A Nation at Risk*’s language grounded public education discourse in assessment and high-stakes testing to evaluate learning progress. Curriculum and accountability became topics of contention as well.

**Research rationale: my perspective**

Despite lofty named policy initiatives that are touted as ambitious reforms (*No Child Left Behind, America 2000, and Race to the Top*); the core of public education has essentially been left unchanged since the expansion to mass education more than a century ago. If our education system is to rise to the needs and demands of the 21st Century, then it is imperative for us as a nation to be reflective of our public education system and to understand how it serves all. The role of high schools has expanded to meet the public’s expectation of preparing students for higher education. Colleges and universities are more than producers of knowledge, but are now trainers for the job market. The rapid growth of innovation and technology not only impacts our economy, but our daily life opportunities, in which education is a foundation for prosperity and access in society. My belief is that in order for education to truly address our societal needs and opportunity gaps, our public secondary and postsecondary schools need intentional and comprehensive partnerships. It is increasingly important to align the expectations of K-12 with those of higher education, thus the benefit of K-16/20 planning in education policy.

My professional life to this point solely existed in higher education administration, beginning as an admissions counselor in Philadelphia at my undergraduate alma mater after
completing my bachelor’s degree. It was not until several years later, then working in New York City, I received an opportunity to join the central administration at the City University of New York (CUNY) as the director of admission for an innovative undergraduate teacher education program, The Teacher Academy. Although I am a proud product of public education, it was public education in the suburbs, and I quickly realized during my recruitment visits to high schools throughout New York City’s five boroughs and reviews of admission applications to CUNY, there was clearly a difference in the public education experience and product.

A poignant and troubling revelation for me was the rather complex relationship between The City University of New York (CUNY) and the NYC Department of Education (NYC Schools). Despite the regular “tinkering” with on-going and new programs and initiatives (such as the now defunct Teacher’s Academy), at times the relationship ranged between degrees of collaboration to competition depending on the issue and conversation on hand at the conference room table. But, not exclusively to New York City, a larger conversation seemed to be missing between public secondary and postsecondary institutions, that of connecting college preparation and college readiness to meet expectations of colleges and the capacity of high schools. This was increasingly alarming to me as I observed daily in the New York City system, the inconsistencies in public education at the secondary level and its resulting consequences in the higher education opportunity afforded to applicants to CUNY.

Through this literature review I seek to highlight key areas that can provide insight to understanding and further exploring the challenges public education faces today, particularly in urban communities and their school systems. I will briefly examine at a high level, school reform and the political context that opened the door for government intervention and foray into setting the nation’s public education agenda of college and career readiness with the
groundbreaking reports, A Nation at Risk and A Test of Leadership. I use the groundwork of exploring education reform of the 1980s to understand the challenges faced by public education (secondary and postsecondary) in the 21st Century, particularly in New York City, the celebrated global capital of the world.

My intent is not to point fingers and to place blame, but rather to conduct a research project to inform and to encourage a conversation between education policy- and decision-makers in secondary, postsecondary and government to move beyond “tinkering” with education to considering bold reforms of significance and substance, which the literature strongly suggests intentional K-16/20 partnership is a good place to start.

Research question
How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ Children First Initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?

To support the exploration of the study’s research question, a set of guiding questions were employed to navigate data collection and in constructing a final interpretation of observations from quantitative and qualitative sources.

Guiding questions
1. What college admission tendencies can biographical-demographic and academic variables of application by NYC high school identify?
2. What are the distinctions observed in meeting CUNY’s college proficiency by high school?
3. What are the variations and patterns in applicants completing CUNY’s recommended college prep curriculum through credit recovery coursework?
4. What distinctions can be observed in students’ first-year college GPA and in retention to the sophomore year?
5. How do CUNY’s admissions directors interact with NYC Schools?
On public school reform: a brief history

There is an extensive collection of literature that documents the evolution of public education and offers insight to the social and economic contexts that fueled the unique American style of educating its diverse and rapidly growing population. Themes of education reform are attached to transformative eras in the evolution of the United States as a country. The turn of the 20th Century opened secondary education to the masses to support a nation that needed a workforce to move from an agrarian to an industrial economy. Subsequent eras led to themes of access, such as the Civil Rights of the 1960s and inequality of the 1970s. David Tyack and Larry Cuban explained, “School reform is a prime arena for debating the shape of the future of the society….however, discourse about the purpose of education has been impoverished by linking it insistently to the wealth of nations” (Tyack & Cuban, 1995, p. 136).

Several books and articles offered commentary on school reforms and understanding the environment that is necessary to foster the adaption and the institutionalization of school reform to find a place of normalcy in education practice. For example, David Tyack, offered a description of four characteristics that were needed for school reform agendas to become institutional:

1. “Lasting reforms were often structural add-ons that did not disturb the standard operating procedures of schools;
2. Innovations became frozen into state law or regulations;
3. Programs that lasted often produced constituencies interested in seeing them continue; and
4. Reforms proposed and implemented by school administrators and teachers themselves to make their work easier or more efficient or to improve their professional status generally seemed to stick better than innovations pushed by outsiders” (Tyack, 1991, p. 15).
The politics of urban and education reform

In the fictional literary series, *Horace’s Compromise*, author Theodore Sizer in a docudrama fashion characterized the plights faced daily in American high schools during the 1980s and 1990s. Sizer offered five imperatives for stronger schools:

1. “Give room to teachers and students to work and learn in their own, appropriate ways;
2. Insist that students clearly exhibit mastery of their school work;
3. Get the incentive right, for students and for teachers;
4. Focus the students’ work on the use of their minds; and
5. Keep the structure simple and flexible” (Sizer, 1992, p. 214).

In *Radical Possibilities* (Anyon, 2005), Jean Anyon offered a robust agenda for urban education reform. Her argument focused on the economic and political obstacles that she declared are imperative to tackle for the sake of addressing the United States’ increasing level of poverty, especially for urban minority populations. To support her position, Anyon wove together research from sociology, education, and economic areas to provide a historical perspective and applied past successful strategies to employ in our current education policies and practices. Ultimately, Anyon contended that we cannot deliver effective education reform, until we established structures for equality in economic access and reinvest in our impoverished inner-cities.

As mentioned previously, one cannot help but acknowledge the overpowering role politics has come to play in education and in setting the national agenda. In *Political Spectacle*, (Smith, 2004) Mary Lee Smith presented several theories. First, she argued that societal conditions have enabled a demoralizing politicization of public education through the form of theatrical spectacle. Government and media networks have aligned with the private sector in intertwining our Nation’s economic prowess with the outcomes of public education. Second, Smith argued that this politicization has detrimentally influenced education research, which is
used to construct policy, therefore setting a platform for national and local reform agendas such as *A Nation at Risk* and New York City’s *Children First*. The spectacle is created as characters and roles are cast and performed for the public arena through mass media and intended to influence public opinion. Smith presented *A Nation at Risk* as a pivotal instrument used by politicians in creating the perception that our schools were failing.

It is evident from the literature that education is closely intertwined with political and social movements. The agenda of those with political power is countered with the demand for reform from those who have the agency to speak for the voiceless and underserved. In terms of public urban education, common themes emerged on the need to prioritize education for civic and economic health. Paul Hill identified three priorities for urban public schools’ reforms to focus on; “incentives, investments, and autonomy” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. viii).

The role of socioeconomic status (SES) in education is well documented in the literature as well, particularly in outcomes for urban public education. This is a key item in education reform as part of understanding the political and social contexts that have consequences on education policies and practices, both intentional and unintentional. Hill wrote, “The hard fact is that many educators and policymakers simply do not expect inner-city students to be capable of learning very much. These young people are caught in a classic double bind: the problems of their communities affect both the quality of schools and young people’s ability to benefit from schooling. The larger economic system constrains the future of their communities and their communities’ capacity to support decent schools” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. 5).

According to the literature, the shortfall and failure of most education reforms are that the fundamentals of the school system are left intact with the assumption that the base of our school system is good. Paul Hill explained, “It is this assumption that accounts for the disappointing
results of two decades of efforts to improve American schools. The institutional reality is that within the system – and often outside it too, for those leaders coopted by the internal frame of reference – very few stakeholders are convinced of the need for profound alterations in the way the business of education is conducted. In this type of environment the reforms that are possible are modest and incremental, modifications at the margin offering little promise of substantial improvement” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. 13). What becomes clear after reviewing the pattern of education reform over the past century is what Paul Hill described as a “policy churn” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. 14), and too often conversations on reform are reserved for political and education insiders that rotate and function in independent as opposed to intersecting circles of stakeholders.

*The state of American high schools*

The literature suggests several factors that contributed to the current condition of high schools and the practices that reformers looked to impact. Diane Ravitch wrote, “Most of the post-1970 decline is from “pervasive changes,” changes in schools and society.” (Ravitch, 2003, p. 32). The “pervasive changes” referred to are expansive social movements such as desegregation and equity in schooling that placed responsibilities on school staff, for which many teachers and school administrators were unprepared to encounter. Theodore Sizer wrote, “High school is a kind of secular church, a place of national rituals that mark stages of a young citizen’s life…The value of its rites appears to depend on national consistency” (Sizer, 1992, p. 6). In addition, the constant variable that shaped school environment and student performance based upon Sizer’s observations was socioeconomic status.
Education reform and teachers

The teaching profession is both chastised and lauded across the literature. Theodore Sizer explained, “Managing a high school classroom is a complex business, requiring judgment about adolescents as well as a sense of order, a firm grasp of the subject under study, and a thorough understanding about the accepted folkways of the craft. Irrespective of their credentials, teachers without judgment stumble. It is the heart of teaching…And yet Americans underrate the craft of teaching. We treat it mechanistically” (Sizer, 1992, p. 3). In a critique that described education reforms as scientific management where systems are too often led by dispassionate professionals at the top of pyramidal tiers and classrooms, specifically teacher and students, are placed at the base. Sizer wrote, “Top-down bureaucracies depend on orderly predictability. What is desired at the peak must find its way to the base. Information is standardized in order to be comprehensible…inevitably; the result is a monolithic system” (Sizer, 1992, p. 206). However, despite a questionably limited educational structure for teachers with increased accountability, recent research suggested that high schools continue to produce high-quality graduates.

A National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) study of high school transcripts reported several key findings in the areas of students’ high school curriculum, tests scores, and racial/ethnicity. According to the study:

- “A greater percentage of 2009 graduates completed more challenging curriculum levels than 1990 or 2005 graduates;
- In 2009, graduates who completed a rigorous curriculum, an Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate mathematics, or higher level mathematics course in 9th grade had average NAEP mathematics scores at the Proficient level;
- The percentage of White and Asian/Pacific Islander graduates who completed a rigorous curriculum level increased more than the percentage of Black or Hispanic graduates” (Nord, et al., 2011).
Recent data issued by the College Board reported that the United States’ continued to gain ground in adding Advanced Placement exams to support a rigorous high school curriculum. In particular for New York State\(^5\), although identified as offering AP coursework and exams above the national average, the College Board suggested areas for improvement with strategies that included:

- “Ensure that public colleges and universities develop AP Exam credit and placement policies based on institutional goals, alignment with corresponding courses, and objective outcomes research;
- Provide targeted assistance and resources to schools serving traditionally underserved populations;
- Provide resources to schools and districts to support research-based programs that build content knowledge and skills – particularly in literacy and math – to prepare students for success in AP course work, and in college and careers” (The College Board, 2014).

*Setting the education agenda: a nation at risk*

*A Nation at Risk* was the report that culminated the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, commissioned under the Regan administration. The Commission’s report was rampant with language that incited fear and alarm to take action for what was proclaimed as a pandemic of failure in our schools that would lead the nation to an unsettling place of mediocrity. The report opened with five shocking words, “Our Nation is at risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Diane Ravitch wrote, “*A Nation at Risk* captured national attention, shaping the terms of the debate about schooling for a generation after its publication” (Ravitch, 2003, p. 25).

Research and commentary on the outcomes of *A Nation at Risk* span 30 years after the report’s publication. Richard Elmore wrote on *A Nation at Risk*’s impact that, “The course of educational reform has led, probably inadvertently, over the past twenty years toward the classroom – toward a more explicit connection between what policy says and what teachers and students are expected to do” (Elmore, 2003, p. 24). Thus, it is suggested that the reforms have triggered an integration of policy and practice, which can be positive. Elmore further explained, “With the adoption of the *No Child Left Behind Act* in 2002 – the centerpiece of federal education policy – the federal government is now in the position of being the chief enforcer of performance-based accountability at the state and local levels” (Elmore, 2003, p. 27).

*A Nation at Risk* opened the door for federal government intervention in public education and for changed governance models of public schools in urban communities. Caroline Hoxby wrote, “The same interest-group politics that made schools mediocre in the first place would control the implementation of *A Nation at Risk*’s recommendations” (Hoxby, 2003, p. 106). John Raisian explained that the Koret Commission on K-12 education found that “Standards-based reform has not achieved its full potential” (Raisian, 2003, p. 13) and recommended the strategies of, “clear goals, accurate measures, consequences, and replacing failing schools” (Raisian, 2003, p. 15) were needed for serious reform.

Much of the literature critiquing *A Nation at Risk* questioned considerable flaws in the data and the comparison of the performance of United States’ students to international performance scores of countries that do not administer mass-education to as diverse a population in the United States. Yet, the report secured enough space on the national radar to take its place as a political spectacle and reshape American belief in the less than adequate quality and performance of its public schools.
Susan Fuhrman wrote, “The reforms since *A Nation at Risk* have highlighted educational quality, not access to educational services” (Fuhrman, 2003, p. 16). Fuhrman explained, “The reforms have left us with significant inequities in our educational system. Poorer schools still generally spend less than wealthier counterparts; lower-performing students typically have less prepared and less qualified teachers than higher-achieving students; achievement gaps between minorities and whites and more and less advantaged students remain large” (Fuhrman, 2003, p. 21).

As with every policy there are winners and losers, Paul Hill explained, “*A Nation at Risk* prescribed remedies that made sense for students whose basic preparation for school was sound and for school systems that had the capacity to respond to pressure by offering more rigorous courses” (Hill, Kacey, & Celio, 2003, p. 112). In regards to educational outcomes, critics reported the data on minority students is not always clear, because student groups tend to be aggregated nationally. Paul Hill stated, “Students who are both minority and in big cities are the ones who have benefited least from *A Nation at Risk*” (Hill, Kacey, & Celio, 2003, p. 114). Furthermore, what would become a tremendous consequence to urban education reform, *A Nation at Risk* prepared the foundation for *No Child Left Behind*, which Paul Hill wrote, “implemented measures that tend to be punitive by closing schools that typically serve the urban poor who are often minorities” (Hill, Kacey, & Celio, 2003, p. 129).

Another important critique offered in the literature is the treatment of teachers in reforms post-*A Nation at Risk*. Chester Finn explained “the role of teachers is merely that of instrument in reforms as opposed to active agents as an ends in themselves” (Finn Jr., 2003, p. 233). John Goodlad in his work has critiqued a problem, particularly for urban schools, in the lack of coordination between schools and colleges in teacher preparation. This is an area that is ripe for
partnership that would offer renewal and innovation for the teaching profession and ultimately influence inequities that are the consequences of policy and practice in the public education experience.

Education reform and the governance of public school systems
The literature provides extensive insight on the government’s intervention into education post-\textit{A Nation at Risk}. Specifically for urban centers, the doors opened for state or mayoral control of the public school system. \textit{A Nation at Risk} brought home the idea in the American psyche that if schools were not held accountable; our children would not be prepared to meet their full educational and economic potential.

Michael Kirst and Katrina Bulkley outlined the conditions that advanced the mayoral control of schools movement as:

1. “Bureaucratic dysfunction;
2. corrupt school boards; and
3. decrease in federal funds for education” (Kirst & Bulkley, 2001, p. 6).

Kirst and Bulkley also suggested economic motivation for mayoral control served as a prescription for urban revitalization and development” (Kirst & Bulkley, 2001, p. 10). The modern urban mayor is more likely to privatize because Kirst & Bulkley explained, “in a tight budgetary climate more city jobs to pay off constituencies will not work…a marked contrast to the old style “civil rights” mayors of the 1970-1990 era” (Kirst & Bulkley, 2001, p. 15).

The literature offers a number of lessons on mayoral control for education stakeholders and policymakers. Two well documented models are those of Boston and Chicago school systems. Mayoral control in Chicago was launched by a Republican legislature and governor,
even though the City was led by Democrat Mayor Richard Daley. IN her review of Chicago schools Dorothy Shipps wrote, “Reformers and politicians who think that troubled city school systems need the political clout, accountability, and resources of city hall, and the managerial talents of business, often look to Chicago as an example” (Shipps, 2003, p. 16). Shipps identified four key components from the Chicago model of mayoral control:

1. “Improving student achievement and instruction is not intuitive; it requires high levels of professional educational expertise that can conflict with mayoral control;
2. Engagement of civic leaders;
3. Challenges of centralized authority and transparency to stakeholders; and

However, a key critique offered by Shipps is that instability and inconsistency impact outcomes. Shipps explained, “The unintended consequences of the test-driven accountability scheme also encourage reductions in the breadth and depth of the curriculum and greater focus on test preparation…Building teacher and principal capacity tends to take a backseat to accountability” (Shipps, 2003, p. 28). Described as a positive contribution, Shipps wrote, “When given accountability for the schools, the Chicago example shows that mayors can respond by acquiring more resources for schools…they can promise electoral support in exchange for extra funding from state and federal leaders” (Shipps, 2003, p. 30). Shipps further explained, “Chicago’s experience also clarifies that giving school leaders the fiscal flexibility to allocate funding where needed and the legal authority to set priorities free from layers of regulation may be as important as who is in charge” (Shipps, 2003, p. 31). Therefore, a strong and charismatic leader is important to lead a substantive reform agenda.

The Boston model’s success story, as described in the literature, was centered on the highly collaborative relationship of Mayor Tom Menino and Superintendent Tom Payzant who
worked together from 1995 to 2006. Frederick Hess wrote, “Boston consistently outperformed other Massachusetts districts with similar low-income populations in elementary, middle, and high school, in both reading and math…as well as boosted the number of advanced placement of mathematics and English exams taken by Hispanic and African American students” (Hess, 2008, p. 222). And while Hess explained that, “Much of what has been written on mayoral takeovers is ambiguous and inconclusive” (Hess, 2008, p. 223), he surmised that, “Overall the research offers promise for the accountability and access to resources afforded by mayoral control” (Hess, 2008, p. 228). Hess outlined concerns of stakeholders that are characteristics of mayoral control as:

1. “Loss of transparency;
2. marginalized populations/stakeholders;
3. appointed boards tend to “go native” while serving at mayor’s discretion; and
4. education may be vulnerable to mayor’s focus” (Hess, 2008, p. 236).

Futhemore, Theodore Sizer offered traits on the pyramidal style of governance that can be implicit with mayoral control as:

1. “Forces us in large measure to overlook special local conditions, particularly school-by-school differences;
2. Bureaucracy depends on the specific, the measurable;
3. Large administrative units depend on norms, the bases of predictability;
4. Centralized planning requires a high level of specificity; and
5. Hierarchical bureaucracy stifles initiative at its base; and given the idiosyncrasies of adolescents, the fragility of their motivation and the need for their teachers and principals to be strong, inspiring, and flexible people, this aspect of the system can be devastating” (Sizer, 1992, p. 207).

For an alternative view on an effective modeling of governance Frederick Hess prescribed these characteristics of good governance:

1. “clear division of roles and authority;
2. a coherent and organized strategy;
3. patience and focus; and
4. engagement of civic leaders and stakeholders” (Hess, 2008, p. 236).
In justifying the necessity for mayoral control, Paul Hill wrote, “An initiative that threatens no one will change little and cannot make a substantial difference in schools…A community that did not need to transform its schools would not be contemplating mayoral takeover or other major reform initiatives” (Hill, Campbell, & Harvey, 2000, p. 106).

*Education reform: agenda for NYC schools*

Setting the stage in New York City was an extensive history of political agendas and controversies under the guise of public education. Prior to mayoral control, NYC Schools were governed by an assortment of community school districts and boards at the local level. Norm Fruchter wrote, “What resulted was a political dynamic that linked and polarized the citywide school board and the local community boards…The Central Board was particularly vulnerable to political conflict and instability” (Fruchter, 2008, p. 87). Fruchter explained the organization of the decentralized era of school governance into three periods, roughly lasting a decade each:

1. “Jurisdictional struggles;
2. Passive central board and emergence of strong instructional practice in certain districts; and

During the 1990s and under the governorship of Mario Cuomo, New York State embraced the idea of national standards for curriculum and achievement. New York State’s Regents increased the minimum required units for graduation and institutionalized subject-area examinations known as the Regents Examinations. Fruchter explained, “The Regents then phased in a set of requirements that would culminate in all students having to pass five Regents examinations – in English, Math, Science, American History, and Global Studies – to graduate” (Fruchter, 2008, p. 91).
NYC Schools’ chancellors and the City’s mayor have a long history that includes collaborative and tenuous relationships. Prior to the era of mayoral control, New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and NYC Schools’ Chancellor Rudy Crew had a rather contentious relationship. Both wanted to transform NYC Schools, but the Chancellor promoted change through autonomy and empowerment and in opposition to the Mayor’s preferred method of private school vouchers. Following Chancellor Crew’s tenure during the late 1990s, Harold Levy served as NYC Schools Chancellor for two years beginning in 2000. Chancellor Levy was focused on transformation of schools as well, however his efforts concentrated on preparing stronger classroom teachers. Chancellor Levy was also the first without a background in education to lead NYC Schools and set a precedent for integrating corporate and education management style in the administration of the City’s public schools.

In 2002 Joel Klein was appointed NYC Schools Chancellor by Mayor Bloomberg and the most dramatic transformation of NYC Schools began. One of their first acts was to relocate the New York City Department of Education (DOE) from Brooklyn to Manhattan. The DOE’s new home was at the Tweed Courthouse, which is ironic that an institution characterized by years of corruption would find its new home in a building named after the infamous political boss, William Tweed, of New York City’s Tammany Hall days. But, most important, the DOE’s stately home was literally at the back door to the Mayor’s quarters at City Hall and under mayoral control.

Upon his first swearing in as New York City’s 108th Mayor in 2002, Michael Bloomberg declared his legacy would be that of “the education mayor.” During his first inauguration speech Bloomberg stated, “We will improve our public schools. Parents know that their children are safe and receiving an education that prepares them for the future is what they demand. We will test
our educators. We will test our students. But the real test is that of political resolve, the test of ourselves. The need is real. The time is now. And without authority, there is no accountability. The public, through the mayor, must control the school system. To do this, I will build a partnership with the governor, our state legislators, the city council, the borough presidents, the teacher's union and parents. Together, we will create a school system that works for all our children.”  

In his second mayoral term inaugural address, Bloomberg discussed the continuation of his education initiative and declared, “Our mission over the next four years will be to create from pre-school through high school a public education system second to none. We will strengthen the three pillars of our school reform: leadership, accountability and empowerment, putting resources and authority where they belong in the schools of our city. And because the eyes of the nation are on our efforts, our successes hold the promise of hope for schools across America. What a wonderful gift for New York to share with the rest of our country.”

On the Bloomberg & Klein style of management, Norm Fruchter wrote, “Mayor Bloomberg and Chancellor Klein imposed a highly corporate model of governance and management on the city school system...Previous experience, knowledge, and expertise were devalued as ineffective modes of operation that had contributed to academic failure” (Fruchter, 2008, p. 98). Fruchter explained, “Standardized test scores and high school graduation rates were the targeted measures of success for the Mayor’s and Chancellor’s education agenda (Fruchter, 2008, p. 101).

---


NYC’s *Children First* initiative

The *Children First* initiative was New York City’s response to the federal government’s agenda of *No Child Left Behind*. With language that mirrored that of *A Nation at Risk*, the reform’s agenda was introduced in 2002 as a “bold, common-sense plan” and the goal was one of “student success” (New York City Department of Education, 2002). The components of *Children First* focused on standardizing curriculum, empowering school principals, closing failing schools and opening smaller schools.

To assess the outcomes of *Children First* Fruchter and McAlister studied the Fall 2003-Spring 2004 as the first year of measurable outcomes for *Children First*. Their study of the 2004 graduating class’, which was the first class to graduate under *Children First*, outcomes can also be attributed to reforms under the previous administration of Chancellor Crew concluded Fruchter & McAlister. Graduates in 2007 were the first to graduate undergoing four years of *Children First* (Fruchter & McAlister, 2008, p. 21).

Fruchter & McAlister’s research showed in a preliminary analysis of high school outcomes that the high school graduation rate increased from 50.8% in 2002 to 59.7% in 2006. The retention rate increased as fewer students dropped out of school (Fruchter & McAlister, 2008, p. 22). The researchers explained, “When all the factors are considered, it is difficult to distinguish *Children First*’s pattern of student achievement from the outcomes of the years preceding the mayor and the chancellor’s unprecedented restructuring effort...Thus it is hard to legitimate the mayor and the chancellor’s claims for the success of the *Children First* reforms” (Fruchter & McAlister, 2008, p. 25). There are also external factors to consider for outcomes during the implementation of *Children First*, such as the economic downturn after the
devastating September 11, 2001 attack at the World Trade Center and the economic recession in 2008, as well as NYC’s transient population groups, and standardized testing changes of content and scoring.

In 2007 Children First underwent a revamp or what some observers considered to be the second phase to further decentralization of the schools by empowering principals. One can argue that the revamp completed the next phase of recommendations from A Nation at Risk and advanced the influence of privatization of public schools through school closings and the expansion of charter schools.

What is missing from the literature and the discussion on reforms such as Children First is an understanding of the impact for college bound students that have been focused on testing and not developing holistic academic backgrounds and higher level skills that consist of critical and analytical thinking. Norm Fruchter wrote, “Starting new small high schools of choice quickly became a central focus of Children First… Little attention has been paid to the reduction in curriculum, particularly in science, social studies and the arts, that has resulted from the expansion of diagnostic testing and test preparation in elementary and middle schools…Little alteration has occurred in the traditional concentration of experienced teachers in advantaged schools” (Fruchter, 2008, p. 111).

Since 2010 MDRC, a nonprofit, nonpartisan education and social policy research center created by the Ford Foundation in 1974, has issued reports on NYC Schools’ reorganization efforts of its high schools in to small schools of choice (SSC). The MDRC concluded in one study that “Attending an SSC increased on-time high school graduation rates by more than 9.4 percentage points or what is roughly the equivalent in magnitude to 44% of the gap in graduation
rates between white students and students of color in NYC” (Unterman, 2014). In addition, an increase in college-bound students could be expected as students attending an SSC had a higher probability of graduating from high school in four years and enrolling in college within a year of high school graduation (Unterman, 2014).

The state of higher education and a call for high school graduates

Twenty-three years after the publication of A Nation at Risk, the report, A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education, commissioned by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings in President George W. Bush’s administration, would begin to change the public discourse on higher education. The report’s language created a “crisis hypothesis” with stunning words such as: “envy, superiority, collective prosperity, disturbing and declined” (U.S. Department of Education, 2006), to describe higher education in the United States. The commission’s report stated, “Access to American higher education is unduly limited by the complex interplay of inadequate preparation, lack of information about college opportunities, and persistent financial barriers…Substandard high school preparation is compounded by poor alignment between high schools and colleges” (U.S. Department of Education, 2006, p. 1). The report called for States’ graduation standards to align with college expectations and needs of employers.

In their article, The Undereducated American, (Carnevale & Rose, 2010) argued that the United States’ supply of college graduates was not on par to meet the needs of our economy. While college enrollments have continued to grow since the implementation of the GI Bill, the number of college graduates has remained level in recent years. This unsatisfactory production of college graduates has created an economic chasm between those who hold college degrees and those without a college degree, according to Carnevale & Rose. The authors proposed the
addition of 20 million college graduates by 2025 are required to meet the needs of our weakened 
economy and to address inequality in wage distribution.

In contrast, (Wolff, 2006) argued in Does Education Really Help? Skill, Work, and 
Inequality, that simply producing more college graduates neither addressed the issue of 
economic inequality nor guaranteed economic growth and productivity. Wolff concluded from 
his data analysis that increased skill did not lead to increased wages; attained education level is 
not linked with productivity; the decline in the dispersion of education attainment and the more 
moderate declines in the variance of worker skills did not culminate in a reduced level of 
earnings inequality; and technology’s expansion has not lead to increased earnings (Wolff, 
2006). These conflicting positions presented in the literature present a dilemma when the 
national focus is moved to excellence in education with the goal of college and career readiness.

One problem, in particular for public education, is what appears to be a complex 
relationship that has transpired into one of disconnection between secondary schools regarding 
academic preparation and colleges’ expectations of college readiness. The percentage of first-
time freshmen requiring remedial or developmental intervention has skyrocketed and added a 
tremendous expense for public colleges. John Raisian stated, “Remediation remains the fastest-
growing activity on many college campuses” (Raisian, 2003, p. 7).

Policy Matters, published by the American Association of State Colleges and 
Universities, identified institutional performance and college readiness as two of the top ten 
higher education state policy issues for 2013. The newsletter stated, “Emblematic of this focus 
[on college readiness] are the more than a dozen national college completion initiatives, all of 
which are strengthening the partnership between states and stakeholders from across the P-20 
education spectrum” (Policy Matters, 2013). A strong driver for accountability at the college
level is that despite mass education and a plethora of colleges offering today’s students both physical and virtual campuses, the United States has lost ground in college degree attainment when compared to our global competitors. Data from the College Board reported that the United States had lost its dominance as the world leader of college graduates. In 2011 the United States ranked 12th among 36 developed nations.8

Another problem for higher education is its financial challenges at a time of decreasing state budget support. The steady increase of college costs over the years is increasingly under the microscope of state and federal policy and law makers, especially when colleges are reporting a rising need to offer developmental courses to bridge the academic transition from high school to college. Developmental programs create an array of costs from personnel, curriculum, and facilities to student support services. According to trends in college pricing, the average price for in-state tuition and fees is $7,750 to $9,804 for undergraduates at public colleges and $26,798 to $37,171 at private institutions (The College Board, 2013). Multiple the yearly costs of tuition and fees by the average of the six years it takes for a student to complete a bachelor’s degree and a student is potentially paying $46,500 to more than $58,800 for a public education. CUNY’s sister public institution’s, the State University of New York (SUNY), annual rate for tuition ranges between $4,076 for community colleges and $6,170 for senior colleges.9 CUNY’s annual tuition is $6,330 for its senior colleges and $4,800 for its community colleges.10

---

9 SUNY Tuition and Fees web site: https://www.suny.edu/smarttrack/tuition-and-fees/
10 CUNY Tuition and Fees web site: http://www.cuny.edu/admissions/tuition-fees.html
NYC Schools and CUNY

In 1999, CUNY’s Board of Trustees voted to eliminate remediation from the University’s four-year colleges, meaning that to receive an offer of admission a student must demonstrate the ability to perform college level work. The raised bar on admissions standards to CUNY’s four-year colleges has dramatically changed students entering CUNY’s colleges, particularly students who would have previously been admitted to a four-year college, but are now shifted to a community college because of remedial needs. Enrollment of first-time freshmen at CUNY’s four-year colleges was 17,182 students in Fall 2012 compared to 15,210 students in Fall 2002.\(^1\)

CUNY’s admissions requirements were adjusted to account for the increased academic selectivity of the University’s senior colleges. Students are now required to achieve a minimum 480 SAT verbal score and 500 SAT math minimum score for admission to a senior college at CUNY. In addition, students can gain admission through scoring a minimum of 75 or 80 on the Regents exams. Since the change in admission eligibility requirements, CUNY implemented multiple remediation programs offering developmental coursework that students could complete as a condition of admission to the University.

At a press conference in March 2009 New York City’s public education leadership, CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, NYC Schools Chancellor Klein and Mayor Bloomberg, announced the City graduated more college-ready students and that more high school graduates chose to enroll at CUNY. Mayor Bloomberg proclaimed, “More students enrolling from our public schools into CUNY colleges is proof that our education reforms are working and that we are preparing our students better for higher education opportunities.”\(^2\) However, CUNY’s former Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost, Alexandra Logue, presented a


\(^2\) source http://www1.cuny.edu/mu/forum/2009/03/23
troublesome trend in students at CUNY to the City Council. The former Vice Chancellor testified at a City Council hearing on higher education in 2011 that, “At our community colleges 79% of new freshmen enter CUNY needing remediation (74% for graduates of Department of Education [NYC Schools] high schools). As a result of these high percentages, CUNY spends some $30 million per year on remediation.”

During a more recent press conference in December 2013, Mayor Bloomberg proudly exclaimed a high school graduation rate of 66% for 2013, considerably higher than a 60.9% rate in 2011 and 60.4% in 2012. New York State’s high school graduation rate overall is 74%. While the number of high school graduates has increased under Mayor Bloomberg’s tenure, what is not quite clear is the relevancy of a student earning a high school diploma as a guarantee of college and career readiness and that all students are thriving from Children First’s aggressive reforms.

New York City boasts the largest public urban education system in the nation. New York City’s public schools enroll 1.1 million students in grades K – 12. The City’s higher education institution, The City University of New York (CUNY), enrolls 269,000 degree-seeking students and additional 270,000 non-degree students in its 24 colleges located throughout New York City’s five boroughs. New York City’s public schools essentially serve as the feeder schools into the City’s public college system. At CUNY, the majority of the freshman applicant pool is from NYC Schools.

---

13 Transcript of VC Logues’ testimony to NYC Council Committee on Higher Education. Available at: http://www1.cuny.edu/mu/academic-news/files/2011/11/Testimony_AWL_10_24_111.pdf
15 Reported at a Meeting of the NYS Board of Regents in February 2013
16 http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/default.htm
17 Enrollment figure source is CUNY About Us web page at: http://www.cuny.edu/about.html
Total enrollment of first-time freshmen at CUNY in Fall 2002 was 26,274 students (senior college enrollment was 15,210 and community college enrollment was 11,514). In comparison, total enrollment for first-time freshmen at CUNY in Fall 2012 was 35,616 students (senior college enrollment was 17,182 and community college enrollment was 18,434 students).  

*Insights on higher education remediation and high school preparation*

In their study that examined college remediation, Attewell & Lavin (2006) concluded with a recommendation on the importance of secondary school preparation as a precursor to college success and degree attainment. The researchers explained that, “Poor high school preparation, rather than taking remedial coursework is what reduces students’ chances of graduating from college” (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006, p. 889). Therefore, the relationship between high school curriculum and performance is a direct correlation to predicting a student’s college performance. Colleges have intervened with developmental education to lessen the performance gap, however the extent to which a student remains in remedial coursework, detrimentally impacts a student’s likelihood to persist and to graduate. The inconsistent level of college readiness in new freshmen can account for the downward trend in degree attainment.

Data from an Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPED) report at first glance appeared promising. The report found that, “The percentage of first-year undergraduate students in associate’s and bachelor’s degree programs who reported enrolling in remedial courses was lower in 2003–04 than in 1999–2000 (24 vs. 32 percent for associate’s degrees and 18 vs. 24

---

18 Source: CUNY Data Book at [http://www.cuny.edu/irdatabook/rpts2_AY_current/ADMS_0019_FTFR_DEGPR_FTPT_HIST.rpt.pdf](http://www.cuny.edu/irdatabook/rpts2_AY_current/ADMS_0019_FTFR_DEGPR_FTPT_HIST.rpt.pdf) accessed on 4/1/15
percent for bachelor’s degrees)”¹⁹. Data from *Education Pays 2013* showed that black and Hispanic females gained significantly in degree attainment from 1982 to 2012, at the rates of 7 percent to 17 percent respectively. In contrast, an area of great concern is the increased gap between white and black males in degree attainment. According to the report, 94% of white males in 2012 graduated high school and completed some college or earned a bachelor’s degree, compared to 87% of black males.

In their article, “Separate and Unequal”, Carnevale and Strohl showed how uneven and stratified higher education had become arguing that, “White students are concentrated in the nation’s most well-funded, selective four-year colleges and African-American and Hispanic students are more concentrated in the 3200 plus least funded, open-access two- and four-year colleges” (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013, p. 7). The admission selectivity of colleges and distribution of student populations demonstrates as Carnevale and Strohl explained, “Minority students are more unprepared for college than whites and are more likely to be directed into crowded and underfunded education settings” (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013, p. 8).

To understand how this distribution across higher education occurred, one is directed to examining discrepancies in the overall secondary school preparation of students at a time when “no child was to be left behind”. In the article “Challenges Facing Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century,” Ami Zusman used Jonathan Kozol’s term of “savage inequalities” to characterize the differences between wealthy and poor school districts. Zusman wrote, “Unless higher education institutions work with low-wealth schools and communities to advocate for increased resources and to improve their students’ college readiness, U.S. society will lose the talents of a growing segment of the population” (Zusman, 2005). Zusman predicted that,

---

“Colleges will need to develop ways to respond effectively to low-income, first-generation African American and Latino students who do make it to college but who tend to drop out at higher rates than do middle-class white students” (Zusman, 2005). Zusman argued that while more students are enrolling in college, the obstacle of overcoming inadequate academic preparation and the increased burden of college costs impede access to higher education for poor and underserved students, who are overwhelmingly of African American or Hispanic backgrounds. This has greater societal implications when considering the nation’s overall well-being and prosperity. “Reducing access to higher education raises concerns about meeting society’s economic and civic needs at a time of increasing technological, economic, social, and political complexity and interdependence” wrote Zusman (2005).

While researchers such as Zusman (2005) argued for colleges to take action, the issue of college readiness cannot be addressed successfully if academic expectations between high schools and colleges are not aligned through conversation and coordination. In Academically Adrift Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa reasoned, “Many students come to college not only poorly prepared by prior schooling for highly demanding academic tasks, but more troubling, they enter college with attitudes, norms, values, and behaviors that are often at odds with academic achievement” (Arum & Roksa, 2011, p. 3). Arum & Roksa wrote, “Our study provides evidence supporting the proposition that students who come into college with higher levels of academic preparation {AP courses + SAT/ACT preparation} are better positioned to learn more while in college” (Arum & Roksa, 2011, p. 126).

David Conley created a conceptual framework entailing four dimensions for defining college readiness: “key cognitive strategies, key content knowledge, academic behaviors, and college knowledge” (Conley, 2010, p. 18). Through his research studying high schools that
consistently send large portions of their graduates to college at high levels of readiness, Conley identified seven principles as best practices for high schools:

1. “Create and maintain a college-going culture in the school;
2. Create a core academic program that is aligned with and leads to college readiness by the end of the 12th grade;
3. Teach key self-management skills and expect students to use them;
4. Make college real by preparing students for the complexity of applying to college and making the transition successfully;
5. Create assignments and grading policies in high school that more closely approximate college expectations;
6. Make the senior year meaningful and challenging; and
7. Build partnerships with and connections to postsecondary programs and institutions” (Conley, 2010, p. 19).

In a study of urban high schools, Roderick studied three measures of college readiness: testing, minimum college admission criteria, and high school GPA. They concluded with four policy recommendations based upon two main strategies for improving college readiness: raised standards and integrated data systems (Roderick, Nagaoka, & Coca, 2009).

Prescribed strategies for college readiness are:

1. “Develop valid indicators of college readiness and build accountability;
2. help high school educators meet the instructional challenge;
3. bridge the information and social capital gap; and

After studying high school graduation and college-readiness rates in a ten year longitudinal project, Jay Greene and Marcus Winters used the minimum admission criteria for non-selective four year colleges, which consisted of a high school diploma, a minimum level of course requirements completed in high school, and to have basic reading skill. The researchers issued a report of findings that included:
• “The national high school graduation rate for all public school students remained flat over the last decade, ranging between 71% and 72%;
• Wide disparity in the graduation rates of white and minority students; and
• A large difference among racial and ethnic groups in the percentage of students who leave high school eligible for college admission” (Greene & Winters, 2005).

There is an extensive amount of literature on the discrepancy in college preparation and of college readiness performance and ultimately degree attainment for minority students. While more students have graduated from high school, minority students are at risk of not being college ready. Adriana Villavicenio wrote, “Among students scheduled to graduate in 2010, only 9% of Black males and approximately 11% of Latino males graduated “college ready” (Villavicencio, Bhattacharya, & Guidry, 2013). From their research, Villavicencio made the following recommendations for improving the college readiness rates of students:

1. “Focus explicitly on college readiness;
2. invest resources in the 9th grade;
3. increase opportunities for rigorous coursework;
4. cultivate student leadership/voice;
5. form strategic partnerships; and
6. train school staff in culturally responsive education” (Villavicencio, Bhattacharya, & Guidry, 2013).

David Conley explained, “The differences between high school and college first become apparent to students in entry-level college courses…this is where many students find out how ill-prepared they are, not just in their content knowledge but also in the ways that they learn, study, manage their time, and organize and apply what they are taught” (Conley, 2010)…“Remaking high school to align better with college success standards will not be easy…the evolving needs of students compel us to make changes in the relationship between high schools and colleges” (Conley, 2007, p. 29).
From the higher education perspective, David Spence expounded, “Higher education needs to band together to send readiness information to all high schools…this single message about specific standards will enable all high schools and their teachers to focus on and give priority to college readiness with the necessary strength” (Spence, 2009).

In a report on the performance of New York City high schools, James Kemple made the following recommendations for NYC policymakers to address preparing students for college:

- “Identify and support students who are struggling to meet the minimum requirements for a Regents diploma;
- Align performance standards, curricula, and instruction with skill that are needed to be successful in college and in a career; and
- Develop multiple, high-quality pathways toward success for students who may not opt for a four-year college degree” (Kemple, 2013).

**Credit recovery and high school preparation for college**

Credit recovery is an initiative not exclusive to New York City schools, but a recognized strategy to assist at-risk students in graduating from high school. Credit recovery coursework provides a platform for high school students to master learning outcomes and to make up credit after they have failed a course (Fleischer, 2012). A review of the literature revealed an abundance of articles on the influential impact the administration of on-line course recovery programs have had in increasing high school graduation. In a case study that interviewed student participants from an urban charter school in the southwestern United States, themes identified included re-engagement of students in the school environment and the creation of a community of positive role models (Parks, 2011). Parks concluded that the positive social and environmental implications of credit recovery programs for at-risk students can increase high school graduation rates.
However, the practice of credit recovery may be questionable in terms of student learning and academic preparation. An article by *The New York Daily News* reported that during the 2011-2012 school year, “one out of every 10 high school credits at a selection of nine public high schools in New York City were earned through credit recovery” (Burke, Chapman, & Monahan, 2013). In addition, New York City’s auditor general reported that course identification is a challenge when reviewing a students’ academic record because of inconsistent course coding, therefore it is not always clear if a course is for credit recovery (Fleisher, 2012). This suggests the possibility of negative implications for a correct assessment of a student’s high school transcript and interpretation of their coursework and standardized test scores. How colleges evaluate credit recovery courses during the college admission process can be informative to collaboration between NYC Schools and CUNY.

*Collaborative partnerships and p-16/20 education: models for public education*

An area of intervention and that offers promising and exciting outcomes from the literature is that of P-16/20 collaborations. A collaborative relationship between secondary and postsecondary institutions can strengthen capacity to support substantive reforms. Pedro Noguera remarked, “Unless reformers work with educators to adopt changes, and unless those who work in the school feel ownership of and responsibility for their work, even the best ideas are sabotaged or become unworkable” (Noguera, 2002, p. 61).

From the literature the areas of collaboration between high schools and colleges are extensive, ranging from teacher preparation to aligned curriculums and standards. Jennifer Dounay explained, “A curriculum embedded with college readiness indicators may consist of courses that are aligned with college admissions requirements, which are generally more
challenging than the state or district mandated high school graduation requirements” (Dounay, 2006).

Another recommendation is the benefit of coordinated data systems to inform education practice and student learning. Joseph Creech outlined the benefits of integrated data as:

- “Provide reports from colleges to high schools on the performance of high school graduates in remedial and entry-level courses; and
- Use information from college-to-school reporting systems to bring college and school faculties together to work on specific ways they can help students prepare and succeed” (Creech, 1997).

Research studies have shown that mathematics tends to serve as gatekeeper of academic tracks and at the college level mathematics requires the highest rate of remediation. In their remediation study, Attewell analyzed data from the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) that showed 40% of students took at least one remedial course (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006, p. 897) in college. Their research study found that public colleges were more likely to require remedial courses than private colleges for students with similar academic performance levels (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006, p. 914) and more specifically they found that the, “Gap in graduation rates corresponds with high school preparation and not college developmental work (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006, p. 915). Even more alarming, their research found little consistency in how students are assigned to remedial coursework but found the measure by which colleges’ evaluate students to be rather arbitrary. This is a clear example of an area of disconnected expectations and opportunity for further research. While high schools prepare students for anticipated college study, colleges act in seclusion and selectively change the academic measures of proficiency and college readiness, leaving secondary schools to guide students without clear expectations or achievement goals (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006).
This finding is significant because it supports the importance of aligning high school preparation with colleges’ expectation of academic readiness. Several P-16/20 initiatives on the national level, as explained in Policy Matters 2013, are positive approaches to addressing the disconnection between secondary and postsecondary education. One is the implementation of the Common Core State Standards and the reformation of remedial education from four-year to two-year colleges. Another example is California’s early assessment program which is designed to function as an early intervention mechanism and collaboration between the State’s high schools and colleges (Baily, 2011, p. 18). Under the early assessment program students take a test that is intended to show their strengths and weaknesses in key subjects such as mathematics and English. Tests results are used by students, parents and teachers to address individual students’ needs to improve their level of college readiness to attend a California public two-year or four-year college. The collaboration is intended to save students time in managing their academic careers as well as saving financially for both students and institutions. This supports the literature on the benefits of using data integration between high schools and colleges.

Partnerships and education pipelines

While initiatives, such as the Common Core Standards, that align academic expectations between high schools and colleges, there remains the need for further dialogue and collaboration across the P-16/20 education levels. The talent cultivated in each student matters, as the article Tools and Insights stated, “Skilled people, not computers or raw silicon, are the fundamental source of the innovation that drives the economy” (Alliance for Regional Stewardship, 2006, p. 11). There is an imperative need for an education pipeline to meet the talent demand of the innovative knowledge economy and global competition.
NYC Schools and CUNY formed Graduate NYC in 2008 to promote college readiness and increase the number of New York City public school students that go on to higher education and degree attainment. The program website stated the partnerships goals as:

- “Increase the percentage of high school graduates meeting college readiness standards from 38% of 2010 graduates to 67% of 2020 graduates.
- Increase the percentage of high school graduates enrolling immediately in college by 21% by 2020.

Associate Degree:

- In 3-Years: From 10% of students entering in 2006 to 25% of students entering in 2017.
- In 4-Years: From 15% of students entering in 2005 to 40% of students entering in 2016.

Baccalaureate Degree:

- In 6-Years: From 47% of students entering in 2003 to 61% of students entering in 2014.”

Although the Graduate NYC program is one of the many positive partnership programs shared between NYC Schools and CUNY, the numbers in remediation at CUNY provide insight to much needed conversation on aligning expectations on college readiness. If our public education system is guided by policies that encourage schools to put “Children First” and to encourage our students to “race to the top” so that “no child is left behind”, then we need to include all of our children in our conversation on college readiness goals. One can’t help but question what will become of the anticipated 33% of students who will not meet college readiness standards according to Graduate NYC’s 2020 goal number.

---

20 Graduate NYC web site at http://gradnyc.com/about-us/about-graduate-nyc/
Administering and managing college admission: the professionals

The director of college admission on a college campus holds the unique role of “gatekeeper” (Steinberg, 2003) (Hilton, 1997). As the credit unit and standardized test scores became the evaluation and categorization tools of choice in higher education, the college admissions chief administrator played a key role in the organization and standardization of a rapidly growing higher education system in the 1960s across the United States (Miyahara, 1995).

In his study to construct a profile of admission directors at four-year colleges, (Hilton, 1997) interviewed admission directors and identified several characteristics for the role, a few of the most prevalently described were:

1. Know your institution’s mission and understand institutional politics;
2. Advocate for students;
3. Establish an office with an honest work ethic;
4. Empower staff; and
5. Know how to market your institution’s mission (Hilton, 1997).

Existing literature on college admissions is concentrated towards the most elite colleges and universities. Studies pertaining to college admissions directors are prevalent from the perspective of highly selectively colleges and professional, such as law, nursing or medical, schools. Yet, the profession of college admissions is comprised of individuals at more than 4,000 colleges and universities across the United States, who often serve as the primary contact between high schools and colleges. Therefore, one can argue that college admissions directors and their staff offer a unique perspective on high school graduates and their college preparation and readiness levels. In an annual national survey of college admissions directors conducted by Inside Higher Education, several survey highlights included:

- One third or 34% of admissions directors believe that admitted minority applicants have lower grades and test scores;
• Half of the directors felt that minorities along with veterans should be given special consideration in admissions;

• 32% of admissions directors at public colleges felt minority admitted applicants to their institution had lower grades and test scores compared to other applicants;

• 65% of public colleges reported a pathways program as a key part of their applicant recruitment strategy.

The addition of research from the lens of the “everyday” college, which comprises the majority of higher education and not the Ivy League and highly selective colleges, will benefit the catalog of public education research as well as inform policy and practice.

In a study that examined what factors influence if an urban high school student will apply to and enroll in a four-year college, researchers concluded that a high school plays an integral role in preparing students to be college applicants and in selecting what colleges to apply to (Roderick, Coca, & Nagaoka, 2011). Furthermore, for urban high schools whose school practices included having school staff that engage with students in the college search and application process, as well as providing support in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) a significant portion of their graduates enrolled in four-year colleges (Roderick, Coca, & Nagaoka, 2011). A best practice for high school in preparing students for college is to create an environment that sets and supports expectations of college degree attainment for students’ and their families (Roderick, Coca, & Nagaoka, 2011).

In examining the high school to college link Martinez & Klopott conducted a literature review for thematic predictors of college-going behavior and how these behaviors are incorporated within school reform initiatives. Four primary themes identified for successful college enrollment of low-income and minority high school students were:
1. “Access to a rigorous academic common core curriculum;
2. Prevalence of personalized learning environments;
3. Balance of academic and social support; and
4. Alignment of curriculum between various levels” (Martinez & Klopott, 2003).

Furthermore, Martinez & Klopott observed that the extent to which high school graduates are more academically prepared based on a core curriculum and one-size-fits-all standardized testing was not a guarantee for college preparation and readiness (2003). One thing that is clear from the literature is that there is significant need for understanding academic expectations in levels of proficiency between secondary and postsecondary education. One study prescribed that students need to be supported in their development of college-knowledge prior to the college application and enrollment process (Barnes, Slate, & Rojas-LeBouef, 2010).

Where my study intends to add to the literature is to gather observations from the perspective of CUNY’s admissions directors that can add a missing value to planning and collaboration between the City’s public high schools and university. In a previous study of applicants to CUNY with similar academic credentials, but one group enrolled at a senior college and the second group enrolled at a community college, students that attended the two-year school earned fewer credits and were less likely to persist to earning a bachelor’s degree (Alba & Lavin, 1981). While CUNY continued to raise the bar on admission to its senior colleges in the University’s post-open admissions era, Alba & Lavin explained nearly 30 years earlier that “placing a student in a senior college could perhaps be described as giving a student an extra edge; placing in a community college as posing an extra hurdle” (Alba & Lavin, 1981).
Conclusion

Although this review of the literature is rather ambitious in that it touches on a wide-range of topics, I believe each component discussed offers insight to understanding the complexities, policies, practices and challenges currently facing public education in urban communities. As the literature explained, public education is the cornerstone in supporting American society, with strong influence from political agendas. Reformers have engaged in “tinkering” with education to meet the Nation’s evolving economic needs and mass-social movements.

For New York City’s more than one million students in its K-12 schools and nearly 500,000 in its higher education system, the literature provides models of effective practices and warnings by which to measure the successes and failures of the City’s approach to mayoral control and subsequent implementation of reforms at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. What is needed more for further study and where I hope to contribute to the literature with this study is to examine the consequences of NYC School’s Children First strategies to increase high school graduation rates on CUNY. I turned to the literature on K-16/20 partnership models, because I believe A Nation at Risk and A Test of Leadership serve as tea leaves in anticipating the political agenda driving education reform and forecasting the impact on urban communities. For public school systems, such as NYC Schools and CUNY, K-16/20 collaborations that take on curriculum alignment to teacher preparation are the best ways to confront the national dialogue on accountably and measureable outcomes. James & Tyack wrote, “Although the impulse to solve major social problems through the secondary school [public education] may be naïve, desirable social consequences may nonetheless flow from it” (James & Tyack, 1983, p. 406).
Summary

This chapter situates the study within relevant writings and previous research. In particular, facets shaping our public education dialogue and agenda are reviewed. Topics include secondary and postsecondary reforms, New York City’s mayoral control of public schools and its *Children First* initiative, evaluation of college preparation and readiness, and the role of the college admissions director are explored. The literature review begins with the conditions that enabled the groundbreaking and controversial *A Nation at Risk* continue to serve as the cornerstone for public education policy more than 30 years after its publication. Chapter Three explains the applied research methodology and Chapter Four chronicles the data analysis. Chapter Five concludes with the researcher’s findings, discussion and finally with recommendations.
Chapter Three – Research Methodology

Introduction
The purpose of this research study was to observe the patterns of admission, enrollment, and retention of freshman applicants to CUNY from NYC’s public high schools. The study compares a selection of the large high schools that were closed under NYC Schools’ Children First Initiative to the applicants from the smaller specialized high schools that replaced them.

For the study, the researcher analyzed quantitative admissions data from a selection of first-time freshman applicants to the University for Fall 2002 and for Fall 2012. In addition, qualitative data was gathered through interviews with CUNY’s admission staff to capture the college admissions professionals’ perspective on application and enrollment patterns.

This chapter will provide an explanation of the methodology selected to conduct the study, as well as explain the application specifics and reasoning for each component of the study’s design.

Research question and rationale
Research question: How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ Children First Initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?

To support the exploration of the study’s research question, a set of guiding questions were employed to navigate data collection and in constructing a final interpretation. The following table lists guiding questions with the researcher’s rationale for applying to answer the project’s research question.
### Table 3-0-1 Guiding Questions of Inquiry and Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What college admission tendencies can biographical-demographic and academic variables of applications by a NYC high school identify?</td>
<td>Construct a general biographical and demographic student profile for each high school’s applicants to define population applying to CUNY and students enrollment patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the distinctions observed in meeting CUNY’s college proficiency by high school?</td>
<td>An evaluation of college proficiency level will serve as an indicator of college readiness, as well as provide insight on admission eligibility and enrollment at a CUNY college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the variations and patterns in applicants completing CUNY’s recommended college prep curriculum through credit recovery coursework?</td>
<td>Explore the prevalence of credit recovery coursework in key subject areas such as mathematics and English and how such coursework is evaluated by college admission staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What distinctions can be observed in students’ first-year college GPA and in retention to the sophomore year?</td>
<td>An assessment of students’ first-year college GPA and retention can provide information on college-level performance and academic preparation of students by high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do CUNY’s admissions directors interact with NYC Schools?</td>
<td>Interviews with CUNY’s admissions directors provide insight on their observations and recruitment experiences with NYC Schools pre and post implementation of Children First.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address the study’s line of inquiry, a mixed methods approach was designed and conducted. The draw to conducting a mixed methods study was many fold, however the combination of flexibility and depth were most appealing for addressing the primary research question. A mixed methods study is defined as “the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 17). (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 165). Mixed methodology presents several advantages when designing a research study. Researchers, Onwuegbuzie and Leech explained that a mixed methods approach affords the researcher more flexibility and a more holistic review of the
study’s data (2004, p. 770). Furthermore, in particular to the education field, a specific benefit of a mixed methods approach is that it “enhances the interpretation of significant findings in educational evaluations” (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2004, p. 771).

A qualitative or naturalistic line of inquiry further complements research in the education field, where in general, academic conversations tend to focus on quantitative measurements such as test scores. Frances Stage, a researcher in the field of higher education wrote that, “Naturalistic research is capable of producing findings that will enhance our understanding of processes underlying cause-and-effect relationships established through quantitative research” (Stage, 1992, p. 19). Therefore, a mixed methodology can equip policy and decision makers with a deeper understanding of the issues or identify focused areas of intervention and inform professional practice. Qualitative and quantitative data are interwoven in a complementary fashion and surface additional facets or perspectives to understanding the story that research reveals, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Stage explained, “The findings of naturalistic approaches can both assist in the development of the conceptual frameworks from which quantitative models are drawn and illuminate our understanding of the processes that underlie associations in these models” (Stage, 1992, p. 25). Additionally, a point that cannot be underscored enough for education researchers is the depth of diversity related issues that are imperative to understanding the extensive range of social and cultural backgrounds of what is no longer a predominately monolithic population that comprises our school classrooms and college lecture halls. Stage wrote, “The cultural and subcultural diversity of students calls for the use of methods that allow the researcher to be sensitive to diverse frames of reference” (Stage, 1992, p. 25). For this study, which explored the link between policy and practice across an urban
education system from a higher education perspective, a mixed methods approach seemed most appropriate.

The basic design of this study followed a methodological triangulation (Morse, 1991) and a convergence procedural model (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 167), in which qualitative and quantitative methods are used equally and in parallel to address the same research question. Qualitative and quantitative data for this study were collected independently and simultaneously. Results were integrated at the point of data interpretation as demonstrated in the following figure:

![Qualitative data collection and analysis ➔ INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS ← Quantitative data collection and analysis](image)

The study’s design employed a concurrent triangulation model, where the simultaneous collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data were integrated at the point of interpretation to answer the research question (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 179). The use of concurrent triangulation as explained by Creswell, “may note the convergence of the findings as a way to strengthen the knowledge claims of the study or must explain any lack of convergence that may result...and is advantageous because it can result in a well-validated and substantiated findings” (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 183).

The study’s qualitative questioning followed a comparative question design (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006) that gathered the observations of participants when comparing two sets of freshman applicants from the selected group of high schools evaluated in the study.
Research site and participants

The research study’s setting is The City University of New York (CUNY), an urban public university system comprised of 24 colleges, of which 19 (12 Senior and 7 Community) of the colleges enroll undergraduate students. Three of the University’s senior colleges are comprehensive colleges and offer both associates and bachelor’s degrees. Approximately 75% of CUNY’s freshmen class each year yields from NYC Schools, as demonstrated in Table 3.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-0-2 FALL 2002 AND FALL 2012 APPLICATIONS TO CUNY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman apps from NYC Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman enrolled from NYC Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY Office of Institutional Research

This research project focused on the academic credentials and admission and enrollment patterns of the freshman applicants from a select group of NYC Schools. Specifically, the high schools studied were those that were deemed failing schools during the administration of Mayor Michael Bloomberg and NYC Schools’ Chancellor Joel Klein. The pair carried out their education agenda through their education policy initiative, *Children First*. The primary goals of *Children First* were to increase high school retention and graduation rates and to create a school system that was transparent, empowered, and accountable.

The student sample size was determined based upon the high schools selected and the number of students that applied to CUNY from the high schools in the years selected for
analysis. The project used applicant data from Fall 2002 and Fall 2012, which reflect the pre and post era of the administrations of Mayor Bloomberg and Chancellor Klein.

**Instruments and data sources**
The research project also sought to identify any gaps between high school preparation and college expectations of readiness as defined by CUNY’s proficiency standards and explained by CUNY’s admission professionals. The University’s standards are:

**Reading and Writing**
- SAT Critical Reading score of 480 or higher
- ACT English score of 20 or higher
- N.Y. State English Regents score of 75 or higher

**Mathematics**
- SAT Math score of 500 or higher
- ACT Math score of 21 or higher
- N.Y. State Regents:
  - Score of 80 or higher in either Integrated Algebra, Geometry or Algebra 2/Trigonometry AND successful completion of the Algebra 2/Trigonometry or higher-level course.
  - Score of 75 or higher in one of the following:
    3. Math A or Math B
    4. Sequential II or Sequential III

Table 3.3 provides an overview of the data sources used for this study and the rationale for selection as a primary source.

---

21 [http://www.cuny.edu/academics/testing/cuny-assessment-tests/admissions-requirements.html](http://www.cuny.edu/academics/testing/cuny-assessment-tests/admissions-requirements.html)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Institutional Research Database (IRDB)</td>
<td>Provided access to all student enrollment data collected by the University</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY College Admissions System (CAS)</td>
<td>Provided access to all student application data collected by the University</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Admissions Staff</td>
<td>Provided access to subject matter experts in the field of college admissions</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUNY Institutional Research Database (IRDB)** – CUNY’s IRDB is an extensive warehouse containing more than 25 years of institutional data that is collected and maintained by the University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). The IRDB provides frozen snapshots of enrollment, graduation, student characteristics, cohort tracking, applications, and financial aid data with up to ten years of data per student.

**College Admissions System (CAS)** – CUNY’s CAS system holds all freshmen application data collected from the University’s on-line application for undergraduate admission, including high school transcript and standardized tests scores. The data is collected and maintained by the University’s centralized administrative office for undergraduate application processing, the University Application Processing Center (UAPC).

**CUNY Admissions Staff** – Each CUNY college maintains an admissions office staffed with professional administrators that are charged with student recruitment, evaluation and processing of applicants and student enrollment.
Procedures for data collection

This study’s mixed methods approach gathered data from two independent sources of data collection. The quantitative portion of the study gathered data from two University databases, the IRDB and CAS files. A list of predetermined variables from the freshman application to CUNY was used to evaluate academic credentials and enrollment patterns of applicants by high school.

NYC Schools selection process - High schools from each of the five boroughs were considered for the study. Schools were selected by identifying high schools in each borough that were open during the 2001-2002 academic year and had seniors apply to CUNY for the Fall 2002 freshman class. The comparison list of schools was created by cross checking CUNY’s Fall 2012 high school applicant list of freshmen and mapping any new schools that did not appear on the Fall 2002 list to the corresponding larger high school that was closed. The list of high schools was also verified by checking NYC Schools’ on-line high school directory to confirm school closure and establishment of a series of newer specialty high schools.  

CUNY Admissions Staff selection process - Each CUNY College maintains an admissions office that is led by a Director of Admission. Admission directors were invited through flyer distribution and email communication to participate in a voluntary and anonymous interview.

Procedures for data analysis

Data was analyzed in what Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2004) describe as a parallel mixed analysis, for which they outlined three procedural conditions:

1. Each sets of data are analyzed separately
2. Neither analysis builds on the other during the analysis stage
3. Findings are combined once both sets of analysis are completed.

Quantitative design:

A selection of variables from CUNY’s Application for Undergraduate Admission, high school transcript, and standardized tests for college admission were reviewed, (a sample of CUNY’s application for admission is provided in the appendix). A summary spreadsheet was used to record and organize data selections for analysis. The table below provides a listing of the study’s selected variables gathered from the IRDB and CAS database systems. The variables were analyzed using SPSS and Excel to construct descriptive statistics. Summary tabulations of mean GPA and standardized test scores were used to form a descriptive analysis of the students’ academic and biographical-demographic profiles by high school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Field:</th>
<th>Application question number:</th>
<th>Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expected date of entrance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Application term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zip code</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geographic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of time in NYC</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intended Major</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>Student aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choices of college – can list up to 6</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>Student aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. High School Name ETS Code</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>KEY: Selection group for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Citizenship</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ethnicity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Country of Origin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parental origin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Native language</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Application to SEEK or CD</td>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Student population profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SAT math and verbal scores</td>
<td>CAS admissions system/high school transcript</td>
<td>Student academic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Met CUNY proficiency</td>
<td>CAS admissions system or CUNY IR</td>
<td>Student academic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Admission Decision(s)</td>
<td>CAS admissions system or CUNY IR</td>
<td>Student academic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. CUNY college enrollment</td>
<td>CUNY IR</td>
<td>Student academic profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*23 CUNY’s SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) and CD (College Discovery) are the two City University higher education opportunity programs designed to assist high-potential, low-income students who otherwise might not be able to pursue a college degree because they are not academically well prepared for college-level work” [http://www.cuny.edu/academics/programs/notable/seekcd.html](http://www.cuny.edu/academics/programs/notable/seekcd.html) A student chooses to apply to SEEK/CD as part of the application for admission to CUNY. The SEEK/CD portion of the application is optional.*
Additional variables from the IRDB/CAS databases with the rationale included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/Fields</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. High school senior year math units completed</td>
<td>Identify use of credit recovery in college preparation coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Freshman Year GPA</td>
<td>Measure first year academic performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Enrolled Fall 2003 and Fall 2013</td>
<td>Evaluate first year retention/attrition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher’s intent was to identify themes that emerged from the quantitative analysis of freshman students’ admission application materials and organize into topics that would be used to conduct interviews with CUNY’s directors of college admission. The purpose of qualitative analysis was to further explore the themes that were identified from the researcher’s probe of admissions data and to test the validity of significant quantitative relationships that emerged. However, since data interpretation would not be integrated until the discussion of findings, the researcher elected to follow a convergence model and proceeded with parallel quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.

### Table 3-0-5 Number of NYC Schools and Students Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of NYC Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants to CUNY</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number admitted to CUNY</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior college as highest choice</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college as highest choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative design

The qualitative portion of the study entailed interviewing CUNY’s directors of college admission. Interviews were semi-structured with specific questions that allowed for open-ended responses. Interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis. Interviews were transcribed using a professional transcription service, Rev.com. Analysis was conducted by reviewing interview transcripts using Dedoose software to code and to identify recurring themes discussed by the admission directors during their individual interviews. In addition, representation from CUNY’s three college categories: senior, comprehensive, and community, were recruited to provide a breath of perspectives from the University’s admission directors. The identity of interview participants were coded to protect anonymity and to preserve a level of comfort that would permit participants to speak without fear of retribution from their colleges’ executives for comments made during the interview. The researcher wanted to be sensitive to interview participants discussing institutional admission standards and interpretations of NYC Schools’ as well as CUNY’s academic policies and practices.

### Table 3-0-6 Number of Interview Participants in the Study by Senior and Community College Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Admissions staff participants</th>
<th>Senior and Comprehensive College</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview protocol

1. The researcher attended a meeting of the college admission directors with is held monthly at the University’s central office. The researcher announced the study and distributed a flyer that invited voluntary participation.

2. A personal email was sent by the researcher to each admission director followed the flyer distribution and invited his/her participation in an interview.
3. Interviews were scheduled by phone or in person based upon the respondents’ preference and schedule. For interviews conducted in person, the researcher went to the interviewee’s office. One participant preferred to come to the researcher’s office.

4. The interviewer presented interviewees with the list of high schools being used in the study and explained the study’s purpose.

5. The interviewer explained IRB protocol and presented form for signature. For interviews conducted by phone steps four and five were completed by email.
### Interview questions and rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many years have you worked in college admissions?</td>
<td>Gather information on level of college admissions experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you worked at CUNY?</td>
<td>Gather information on level of public education experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is your familiarity with the elements of NYC Schools’ <em>Children First</em> Initiative introduced in 2002 under Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Chancellor Joel Klein, specifically relating to strategies used to increase the number of high school graduates such as the closing and reorganization of high schools and the use of credit recovery?</td>
<td>Gather information on awareness of NYC Schools’ policy initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. From the list of schools presented in this study, which schools are you most familiar with?</td>
<td>Gather information on the administrator’s perceptions and observations of NYC Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What characteristics have you observed in your prospective student and applicant pools from NYC Schools between 2002 and 2012? How do these characteristics compare to non-NYC public high schools from where you receive applications?</td>
<td>Gather information on the administrator's observations and comparisons of NYC Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do you determine the quality of college preparation by high school? What assessment(s) do you use to determine readiness for a high school senior?</td>
<td>Gather information on college’s selectivity measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In terms of high school units how do you view credit recovery coursework? Do you use a</td>
<td>Gather information on college’s selectivity measures in the consideration of credit recovery courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different assessment for non-NYC schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did your college increase its admission standard for freshmen between 2002 and 2012? As a result, did you make any changes to your high school outreach because of higher admission standards at your college?</td>
<td>Gather information on college’s selectivity measures when considering admissions standards and high school outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. For NYC Schools students admitted to your college as freshmen, what patterns have you observed in first-year retention? How does this compare to non-NYC Schools?</td>
<td>Gather information on administrator’s perceptions and observations in student enrollment patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to mention?</td>
<td>Discover issues not initially identified by the researcher that admissions staff deemed noteworthy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding protocol

The following list of key words was used to code and organize interviewees’ responses for analysis.

1. *Children First*  
   a. Closing and opening of high schools  
   b. Credit recovery

2. NYC Schools  
   a. Familiarity of schools

3. Student characteristics  
   a. Prospects  
   b. Applicants  
   c. Freshmen

4. Academic preparation  
   a. Assessment measures of quality

5. College admission standards

6. Freshmen attrition/first-year student retention

7. Other/Outliers

*Addressing trustworthiness and credibility*

To address data trustworthiness and credibility the researcher applied a mixed methods design as a form of triangulation or what has been labeled as convergent methodology (Campbell, 1959) or convergent validation (Jick, 1979). Stage explained, “Advocates of this [mixed methods] approach share the conception that all methods should be viewed as complementary rather than competing, and that triangulation will enhance or shed light on results” (Stage, 1992, p. 124). Stage further explained, “Triangulation can also be a strategy for enriching conclusions by contributing new, explanatory findings” (Stage, 1992, p. 127).
Therefore, as applied in this study, triangulation was used to organize the researcher’s documented observations across data sources in an effort to construct an explanation and understanding of greater depth. Political scientist researcher, Stephen Van Evera stated that, “All evidence is not equal because the predictions they test are not equally unique or certain” (Van Evera, 1997, p. 34). This is a true statement across all disciplines. When considering research design in education Stage explained, “Triangulation can capture a more complete, holistic, and contextual portrayal of the issue studied…it may be most useful in enriching our understanding by allowing for new or deeper dimensions to be visible” (Stage, 1992, p. 126).

*Limitations of the study*

There are several areas of limitations to the study. Data limitations include the selection of schools studied, which did not include high schools that were not closed as a comparison. NYC Schools that were not closed is a group that may be considered for future comparison studies, based upon this study’s key findings. Furthermore, for comparison studies, New York City’s population of private and parochial school students that apply to CUNY may be analyzed.

It is also important to note for the variables selected from the IRDB, the Office of Institutional Research as a practice imputes ethnicity when not provided by a student. In addition, total applications figures only include applications processed by UAPC and not applications processed directly at the colleges as direct admits. CUNY colleges may process several hundred direct admit applications for each applicant term, which entails receipt of application materials and evaluation by college staff for an immediate admission decision.

The primary investigator of this study is employed by CUNY and has worked as a college admissions counselor and director. The investigator’s professional role in the
University’s Enrollment Management Office affords security access to student database systems and institutional research reports. A vital part of Enrollment Management’s task is to employ student enrollment data to develop and implement strategies to recruit, enroll, retain and graduate students across the University. Although, CUNY Central collaborates regularly on projects with NYC Schools, the relationship is complex and often volleys between cooperation and competition. The researcher’s affiliation with CUNY may hold bias as a college administrator concerning expectations of college readiness and perception of high school preparation for students applying to a college.

The study design used mixed-methods analysis. A next step or subsequent research from the study’s initial discovery and conclusion may include further study that explores the researcher’s observations in greater depth. Future study can examine nuances that surface in this study’s qualitative and quantitative findings. Research involving interviews with CUNY students and staff, as well as NYC Schools’ staff and students, would enable expanded exploration from additional perspectives of various stakeholders of New York City’s public education system.

**Summary**

This chapter presents a detailed protocol for answering the primary research question of, “What patterns in admission, enrollment, and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY can be observed when comparing the large high schools that were closed under NYC Schools’ *Children First* Initiative to the applicants from the smaller specialized high schools that replaced them?” The researcher selected a mixed methodology design that employs quantitative admission and enrollment data of freshmen applicants to CUNY for Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 and qualitative data from CUNY’s directors of college admission. The practicality of a mixed methods design seemed most appropriate for this study that sought to explore the consequences of education
policy and its intersection points with education practice. Researchers Johnson and
Onwuegbuzie explained, “Mixed methods research offers great promise for researchers who
would like to see methodologies describe and develop techniques that are closer to what
researches actually use in practice” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 15). This study’s design
followed a convergence model that gathered and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data
independently and combined findings at the point of discussion and interpretation.
Chapter Four – Data Analysis and Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the study’s observations and key findings. The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of NYC Schools’ Children First initiative on CUNY from a college admission perspective. The study employed quantitative and qualitative data sources to answer the primary research question, “How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ Children First Initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?”

Organization of Data Analysis

Following the research project’s congruent mixed methodology format, qualitative and quantitative findings are presented in this chapter separately as discussed in Chapter Three. The qualitative portion of the study involved interviews with CUNY’s directors of college admission. A descriptive overview of interview participants is presented first, followed by a presentation of analyzed data in the order of the study’s set interview questions that were asked by the researcher during individual sessions with the study’s volunteer participants. Excerpts from transcripts are arranged under thematic headings that emerged from question responses and grouped by the researcher for discussion.

Interview participants

CUNY is comprised of 24 colleges in total, which includes 12 senior and comprehensive colleges and 7 community colleges. This particular study was interested in CUNY’s 19 colleges that enroll first-time freshmen. Volunteers were invited to participate by flyer and email communications. A total of 12 admissions professionals from CUNY participated in the study.
The following sets of tables provide a descriptive overview of interview participants. First, figure 4.1 shows the distribution of participants by college type. Six admissions or enrollment staff members from a CUNY senior college participated, two comprehensives colleges are represented in the participants, and four community colleges are represented in the study. To distinguish the classification of colleges it is important to note that, senior level colleges offer baccalaureate degrees, comprehensive colleges offer associates and bachelor’s degrees, and community colleges offer associate degrees.

FIGURE 4-1 INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS BY COLLEGE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Type</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College selectivity for the study is defined by a college’s admission review and selection criteria. CUNY’s senior colleges have minimum proficiency requirements that an applicant must meet to receive an offer of admission and are considered High in selectivity compared to comprehensive or community colleges. In addition, senior colleges may require an applicant to provide supplemental application materials for certain majors such as a portfolio or additional essay questions that are more extensive than the questions on the general application for admission, such as the application for admission to Macaulay Honors College. Moderate colleges are selective, but more flexible in their academic proficiency requirements for
admission. The third category, Low, are primarily the community colleges, which have minimal admission requirements other than the earning of a high school diploma or general education diploma (GED). As shown in figure 4.2 admissions staff members that participated in interviews represented three levels of college selectivity, with 50% of the interview participants from a senior college and the remaining 50% from a community college or comprehensive college, represented at 25% each of the non-senior college participants.

While gender was not an active consideration on my part when recruiting volunteers for the study, it was unintentional to achieve an even 50% gender representation of female and male interview participants, as shown in figure 4.3. Six females and six males participated in interviews.
The ethnicity of interview participants was based on my classification of participants. The ethnic distribution of CUNY’s admission staff is quite diverse across the University’s 24 colleges and reflected by the more than 40% representation of minorities that comprised the study’s interview participants. Figure 4.4 provides a breakdown of interview participants by ethnic group classification.

Another interesting observation of interview participants was the extensive number of years of experience possessed by the group not just as a whole, but also individually as professionals in higher education and in years at CUNY. Interview participants had a combined
sum of 319 years of professional experience in higher education and 285 years in admissions at CUNY. Individually, CUNY experience ranged from three to 40 years of working in college admissions. The overall average for participants working in admissions at CUNY was close to 24 years, as demonstrated in Figures 4.5 and 4.6.
Interview outcomes

A set of open-ended questions, discussed in Chapter Three’s methodology section, were asked during my interviews of CUNY’s college admissions directors. Descriptive details pertaining to years of professional experience in higher education and length of time working in admissions at CUNY were addressed in the preceding tables and descriptions.

In an effort to provide an environment of safety and trust for frank conversations, interview participants were assured anonymity in their participation and responses. Interview participants were coded by a numerical system known only to the researcher. Participants’ responses are labeled by college type (senior, comprehensive or community) and corresponding participant’s identification number.

NYC Schools’ Children First initiative

After asking interview participants general background questions on their years of experience and professional background, the next phase of questioning gaged participants’ level of awareness with NYC Schools’ Children First initiative. Each of the interview participants were familiar with NYC Schools’ reorganization of schools, however I noted that few participants knew NYC Schools’ education policy roadmap by its name, Children First. None of the interview participants discussed the initiative’s goals, as articulated by former NYC Schools Chancellor Joel Klein, to create a public school system of accountability, transparency, and empowerment. When admissions directors were asked to discuss their familiarity with Children First in terms of strategies to increase high school graduation rates, several directors spoke of school closings and the reorganization of large high schools into smaller specialized
high schools. Responses from admissions directors when asked about their awareness of

*Children First* included:

“I really don't know that I know that much about it at all unless we're talking about the move to close under performing schools and open them as smaller schools.” – Senior College Admissions Director (AD) 2

“I am familiar with that concept but I have to say right off, I don't remember what exactly that entailed.” – Senior College AD 9

“I don't recall that. I do recall the closing of the high schools and opening up of new schools.” – Community College AD 6

Markedly, when admissions directors were more elaborative beyond the recollection of large schools closing in their descriptions of *Children First*, admissions directors described their perceptions and expectations of the environment smaller schools offered to students. One admissions director recalled the *Children First* initiative in terms of smaller schools and delivery of student services and stated:

“I'm not so much familiar with the specific design elements. The part that I did follow was the breakdown of the large high schools into the smaller high schools, specifically because a lot of the schools that I worked with were small high schools that weren't necessarily broken down from large high schools, but a handful were. Then I worked with a number of the larger schools so it was interesting to see a kind of a comparison between the larger schools and the smaller schools that I was working with and the difference almost in services and familiarity of the counselors with their students.” – Community College AD 12

While none of the admissions directors referred directly to *A Nation at Risk* or to national initiatives such as *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top*, the message that as a whole our high schools were underperforming was heard and incorporated in to the dialogue of college admissions personnel, as one director explained:

“From what I recall there were issues with a number of schools in terms of performance and one of the solutions was to close those schools and reorganize them into smaller schools that can provide better coordinated services and have a number that the staff can better manage so that the
students can be retained, can progress, and be better prepared for college education.”
Comprehensive AD 4

Another admissions director from a comprehensive college at CUNY expressed concern with *Children First* and NYC Schools’ reorganization of high schools in terms of limitations within the curriculum design of the City’s growing collection of small specialized high schools. The admissions director explained:

“Well, what we saw was that they closed what we were considering our big feeder schools. Then they were breaking them up into these smaller magnet-types of schools. The problem was that when they broke up these schools, they didn't break up the curriculum as a full curriculum. They broke it up based on what these new schools were targeting. This became very problematic for a school like ours, where we want students to come to us with a very broad range of curriculum.”

Comprehensive AD 5

One of the senior college admissions directors, while much like peer admissions directors at CUNY was unfamiliar with the details of *Children First*, provided an explanation on awareness that associated the restructuring of high schools with New York City’s Mayor Bloomberg and not NYC Schools Chancellor Klein. The director explained:

“I don't know how familiar I am with that [*Children First*] particular thing. The restructuring, I think, has challenged all of us because it was the consolidation of some schools, the restructuring of how the education pieces worked in the school itself. I think the biggest challenge that I see now in comparison to what was started by Bloomberg ... I liked Bloomberg's model ... I think the model that we're going back to becomes a little bit more challenging. It's not doing what it's supposed to be doing and I think from what we've seen the results are not really producing what we wanted it to produce. You know we're not getting a stronger student.” – Senior College AD 11

While discussing their familiarity with the elements of NYC Schools’ *Children First* initiative admissions directors were not particularly critical of initiatives, however issues relating to the new smaller schools and observations on high school curriculum offerings were expressed as an area of concern by the admissions directors. Focused on the smaller high schools that were
opened within the larger closed high schools during our discussion, one admissions director discussed the smaller school design and community impact as such:

“I know that some of these larger high schools that were slated for closing and they broke them out into these smaller academy-like units usually within the same buildings. They were reconfigured in terms of curriculum, focus of curriculum, in some cases staffing, and in terms of how students were admitted to those schools. Where previously some of these schools I think were very much neighborhood schools, that tended to change when this came about.” – Senior College AD 3

Another senior college admission director identified the closing and reorganization of high schools as a school safety or environmental issue, explaining that:

“In my mind making them smaller might have made them in some ways safer, but it didn't change the fact that these students...To me they had almost no counselors. They didn't have more of the services that I thought they would be getting. When you say small, I think of private schools, I think of small classes with better teachers. I'm not sure that's what they got, but I think they did break them up.” – Senior College AD 2

High school curriculum was discussed by both the community and senior college admissions directors. Notably, the admissions directors were consistent in their belief that high schools continued to experience challenges in providing a curriculum that aligns with colleges’ expectations of levels of proficiency for college-level academics. One community college admissions director noted:

“Under the initiatives that were supposed to improve the education, they reviewed and revised curriculum. Obviously, we did not see the effects in the higher education level.” – Community College AD 1

The sentiment of an unaligned curriculum that does not meet the recommended expectations of academic units for a college preparatory high school curriculum was explained by one comprehensive college participant as such:

“What happened was, when these schools broke up, the kids don't know when they're in eighth grade where they're going to be four years later. They would say, "Oh, you know, I think I want to go into Community Leadership." They would go into the high school for Community
Leadership. What happened and what we see is that the portfolio of courses that are available to the students don't give them the opportunity to take things like physics, to take things like calculus. Now we're getting students coming to us as freshmen saying to us, "Well I want to be an electrical engineer." Well, but they've never seen physics in high school. They've never seen the pre-calculus.” Comprehensive College AD 5

Admissions directors expressed uncertainty of the benefits students received in what might be considered premature career placement of students into specialty themed high schools, where the students may not have the maturity or educational exposure to make an appropriate selection at this point in their educational careers. Questions raised by the admissions directors concerning the curriculum goals of the smaller specialized high schools opened under the *Children First* initiative focused on their not understanding the connection between the goal of a specialized high school and the production of a well-rounded high school graduate. From the college perspective, admissions officers are seeking to recruit well-rounded students to study at their colleges. CUNY’s undergraduate admissions website advises high school students with an interest in attending the University to pursue the following high school curriculum as a minimum standard:

- four years of English (composition and literature)
- three years of math (algebra, geometry, and trigonometry). A fourth year of math is preferred.
- three years of social studies (history, anthropology, economics, geography, government, political science, psychology, or sociology). A fourth year of social studies is preferred.
- two years of a lab science (biology, chemistry, physics, or earth science). A third year of lab science is preferred.
- two years of a single foreign language
- one year of visual or performing arts

Freshman applicants who have not followed a college preparatory curriculum are not excluded from applying to the University, however a student’s high school curriculum does influence the
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choice of CUNY colleges an applicant may have access to in terms of admissions eligibility and levels of academic proficiency.

**Familiarity and observations on NYC Schools**

Participants were asked to review a comparison list of schools from 2002 and 2012 (see appendix for list of schools), the admissions directors as a group consistently named the 2002 list of former large high schools as the group with which they were most familiar. In terms of the smaller high schools, comments from admission directors from all three college levels expressed their unfamiliarity with schools in statements such as the following:

“I don't see any increase from the breaking up of those schools not a student who's stronger.”
Senior College AD 2

“When it comes to the breakouts, the smaller groups, the familiarity decreases rapidly” – Senior College AD 3

One senior college director whose college houses a highly selective honors program did not view the newer schools from the 2012 list as a likely source for potential students and stated:

“For the most part our applicants do not come from these schools. We have some applications, but these are generally not the schools that our students apply from.” - Senior College AD 9

In contrast, when discussing the schools from the 2002 list the admissions directors were more detailed and confident in their statements of name recognition with high schools. More than name recognition, admission directors expressed a familiarity with schools on a personal level through relationships with high school staff and with student populations from each high school as a whole. Each admissions director seemed to associate a communal personality and an expectation of the student product or graduate from each high school that was understood by college admission staff. Comments by the admissions directors while reviewing the list of schools for the study included the following:
“Yes, familiar in terms of names, all of those comprehensive schools are the schools that honestly we recruited at quite a bit when I was working for a private school in the late '80s and early '90s...It's by name more than saying, "Wow, you know, I really know the students. I really am familiar the way that you are when you're in a private admissions setting and you need to read those applications and understand the students coming from them." – Community College AD 10

It's funny, I'm familiar probably more so with the original schools than what they've been broken up into. – Comprehensive College AD 4

At times while discussing high schools, I observed that admissions directors displayed a tendency to group and characterize NYC Schools by borough. Borough associations would then follow with individual school names, of which the following excerpt provides an example of this form of school categorization:

“The Bronx schools are really not big feeders for us. We don't really see anybody from the Bronx, none of these schools. But when we get into Manhattan we're really seeing almost everybody. The Brooklyn schools, of course, Franklin Lane, Wingate, Lafayette is a huge feeder for us. Prospect Heights is a huge feeder for us. South Shore, Tilden. These schools are all very, very big feeders for us. Now, from Tilden, It Takes a Village as one of our very big feeder high schools. We see a lot of kids coming from there. Robeson broke up and became P-Tech.” – Comprehensive AD 5

A significant pattern observed by the researcher was that when discussing the newer high schools, admissions directors tended to name the former larger high school that was reorganized into a series of smaller schools. The following description from an admissions counselor while reviewing the list of schools provided by the researcher, explained to me which schools they currently received applicants. The admissions director did not name the smaller high schools, but grouped high schools by building or former high school name. The admissions director stated:

“We do work with most of these schools. DeWitt Clinton, Truman, Herbert Lehman.” – Senior College AD 8
Another topic that admissions directors mentioned while reviewing the list of high schools, was a change in their relationships with high school guidance or college counselors. For example, two senior college admissions directors stated:

“We used to go to Leman [high school] a lot. There was a counselor at Leman that was older and was one of the old cohorts of guidance counselors who knew how to work with students to get them into schools, and appropriate schools. And she retired.” – Senior College AD 11

“I'm pretty familiar with the larger schools because the bulk of my career was spent dealing with those schools and the college advising staff, counseling staff in those schools and talking to students and recruiting from those schools and doing admissions work for them.” – Senior College AD 3

When recalling the former high schools, despite the high schools’ size, the college admissions directors expressed a deeper or more collaborative professional connection to the schools’ guidance counselor staff than compared to the reorganized smaller high schools. The working relationship between guidance counselors and college admissions directors was one in which both groups worked closely and served jointly as resources in matching students to the college that best fit students’ education aspirations and academic needs.

**Characteristics observed in prospect and applicant pools**

When asked to discuss their observations of their prospective and applicant student pools between 2002 and 2012, admissions directors focused on academics, specifically in relation to academic preparation and proficiency levels. Admissions directors from all three college levels, community, comprehensive and senior, expressed reservations that NYC Schools had succeeded in producing better prepared high school graduates, despite an increase in high school graduation rates over the past decade and under the *Children First* initiatives. Directors remarked on observing an increase in remedial needs of students in statements such as the following:
“The New York City students seemed a little under-prepared academically. What I see at the community college level and also at the senior college, we saw this as well that students had tremendous amounts of remediation needs. Obviously it's a little bit larger at the community college, but even at the senior college we saw the need for remediation.” – Community College AD 10

“I don't see that the students are necessarily being better prepared. I think that that's been a real problem for us and for the students in the schools. I think it's true in the City overall, but when we look at performance, particularly with SAT's at schools throughout the City, the Bronx students are among the lowest scoring students. That has definitely been a challenge for us.” – Senior College AD 8

“There only may be a handful of the schools on the list [list of high schools provided by the researcher] that we would identify as providing us with high performing students. So there still seems to be an issue in terms of academic performance at many of these schools…many of them are still at risk of low performing in terms of academics. A handful are schools that we would identify as producing students that are eligible for a baccalaureate program or for some of our honors programs.” – Comprehensive AD 4

**Observations on test scores and high school GPA**

Observations in standardized tests scores, particularly SAT scores and Regents subject area exams were noted by the admissions directors as an area of discrepancy in comparison to students’ high school grade point averages. One senior college admissions director explained:

“My main observation has been the discrepancy between [students] high school average and the standardized exams, Regents exam scores. They're just so way off base. I often see a student with 90 averages in English and high 60s in the ELE [English Language Exam], or the reverse with Mathematics. These students with these inflated scores have a tough time passing our CUNY placement exams. It makes me wonder how legitimate their grading policies are at these particular schools.” – Senior college AD 7

Another senior college admissions director lamented, while reviewing the list of NYC Schools featured for this study, that many of the high schools’ graduates would not find their way into the College’s prospective or applicant student pools. The admissions director described
a practice of self-selection or rather deselection on the part of high school staff in encouraging
their students to apply for admission to the College. The director explained:

“A lot of schools have realized that we place a lot of emphasis on the SAT scores, and I would
say as a general rule, and I hate to say this, that a lot of these schools would have students that
have lower SAT scores. They would probably decide they would not be admitted so that they
don't even try, which is kind of sad.” - Senior College AD 9

The admissions directors identified further discrepancies between students’ high school
performance and the percentage of students who meet CUNY’s skills assessment exemption
requirements; therefore the student is required to take the CUNY Skills Assessment Test. One
senior college admissions director explained when referring to the list of NYC Schools in the
study that:

“CUNY Skills Assessment Test, which as you know, means they have a 480 on the critical
reading of the SAT or 75 in English Regents, and even a 500 on the math section of the SAT or
an 80 on one of the Regents and three units of math successfully completed. The percentage of
students, who come from these schools for the most part, is in the single digits who meet those
qualifications. That gives you an idea of what level these students are coming in with. For a
school like ours where for the bulk of our freshman class or a good percentage of our freshman
class, we're looking for math and science preparation because they're going into STEM
programs. That presents a really difficult challenge for us.” Senior College AD 3

Another area of concern expressed by the admission directors was the overall
performance of students on Regents subject area exams, which are required for earning the
preferred Regents or Advanced Regents high school diploma. New York City in accordance
with the State, awards three types of high schools diplomas, a local diploma, a Regents diploma,
or an Advanced Regents diploma. The local high school diploma is restricted to students who
are approved by the high school as meeting a set of conditions that enables students to graduate
with lower exam scores. Table 4.1 provides subject and exam score requirements for the Regents
and Advanced Regents diplomas. From the college admissions perspective, Regents scores
present yet another academic hurdle for students in underperforming high schools as one admissions director explained:

“I think the Regent scores have dropped considerably. The Regent scores are terrible. Is it because the Regents is becoming more difficult? Is it because the students really don't care about what they're doing in anything other than English and Math because they know, really, those are the only ones that they need for exemption purposes? We're seeing kids coming who are telling us they want to be nursing students and have a 46 on the chemistry Regents or a 58 on the math Regents.” – Comprehensive AD 5
### Table 4-1: NYS/NYC High School Diploma Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents Diploma</th>
<th>Advanced Regents Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examination Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your child must achieve a score of 65 or higher on</td>
<td>Your child must meet Regents diploma exam requirements, AND score 65 or higher on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these five Regents exams:</td>
<td>following exams:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>1. Mathematics (all three of these: Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II/Trigonometry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mathematics (any one of these: Algebra I,</td>
<td>2. Science (Living Environment and one of these: Chemistry, Earth Science, or Physics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry, or Algebra II/Trigonometry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Global History and Geography</td>
<td>3. Languages Other Than English (LOTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. U.S. History and Government</td>
<td>Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Science (any one of these: Living Environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, Earth Science, or Physics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Minimum Credit Requirements</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies: Global History (4), U.S. History (2),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Government (1), Economics (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Including at least two credits of</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced math (e.g., Geometry or Algebra II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, including labs: Life Science (2), Physical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (2), Life Science or Physical Science (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Other than English (LOTE)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education (every year, distributed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific ways)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art, Music, Dance, and/or Theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CREDITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The math ability challenge

CUNY has a minimum criteria in mathematics for freshman applicants. For exemption from skills testing a student must meet the following requirements for math proficiency:

- SAT Math score of 500 or higher
- ACT Math score of 21 or higher
- N.Y. State Regents:
  - Score of 80 or higher in either Integrated Algebra, Geometry or Algebra 2/Trigonometry AND successful completion of the Algebra 2/Trigonometry or higher-level course.
  - Score of 75 or higher in one of the following:
    - Math A or Math B
    - Sequential II or Sequential III

An offer of admission to one of the University’s senior-level colleges is excluded to students who meet proficiency requirements, since remediation was removed from the purview of the University’s senior colleges by CUNY’s Board of Trustees in 1999. However, math proficiency was a recurring factor commented on by the admissions directors as one of the most challenging requirements for NYC Schools’ students in offering admission to their college’s pool of prospective students. One admissions director explained:

“The students are either not taking the Regents seriously, or the Regents exam is too difficult, or they're not being prepared. I really think, for the most part, a lot of them are not prepared because we take a large conditional population because we're two-tiered. The thing for us is, we do see a lot of them passing the English. So they'll come with the English at the 75, 77, 78. We're not seeing the 90 average student here. It's just not the profile of our students. But math for us is our, really, the bane of our existence here.” – Comprehensive AD 5

The admissions director further explained that the college had responded to the growing population of students who were not meeting the college’s math proficiency requirement by
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creating a course that is not a remedial math course, but a course that provides new college students with a mathematical foundation; a foundation that lacked from a student’s secondary education. The admissions director reported that each semester the college’s administration closely monitored the enrollment of this math course because the need often required the addition of course sections to meet course enrollment demand.

For a college with extensive science-based and mathematics-based programs, the math proficiency issue presents a particular challenge in recruiting students from NYC Schools. One senior college admissions director noted:

“[One of our programs here], for example, wants students to walk in the door being ready to do calculus. I venture to say that a relatively small percentage of the graduates of New York City Public Schools are ready to do calculus.” – Senior College AD 3

**College Now and special programs**

One of NYC Schools and CUNY’s largest collaborations is the College Now program. College Now is administered by CUNY and available to every public NYC high school. The program provides the opportunity for NYC Schools’ students to take CUNY courses offered through a partnership with their high school and a CUNY college. Courses may be taken for college credit or applied to the high school curriculum as elective credits.

During a discussion of the differences between NYC Schools and non-NYC Schools in the college applicant pool, one admissions director explained the potential and missed opportunity of using College Now to supplement the high school curriculum, especially for the smaller high schools where course offerings are limited and the curriculum is more concentrated. When asked by the researcher if there was a difference between the applicants from NYC Schools and other area schools, one admissions director without hesitation responded:
“Day and night. The kids who are coming to us from, especially, we get a lot of kids coming out of a lot of the local Catholic high schools, from LaSalle, from Bishop Ford, from all of them. They are taking more sequenced types of classes. You're looking at the transcript and they have the four years of English, and they've got the three years of math, and they've got the three years of the foreign language and the three years of the sciences. Their curriculum is, I think, more formalized, that they have to take things. The wiggle room for them is not there. That becomes advantageous for us. A lot of them are also coming with a lot of, not AP work, but some college level work they're coming with. They're seeing already possibly a low level math that they've done through the high school, but at the college level.” Comprehensive AD 5

In terms of schools and students taking advantage of CUNY’s College Now, the same admissions director went on to explain:

“A lot of these high school kids at these schools are not doing College Now. As much as College Now is very big in the University, they're taking courses like Soc [Sociology] and Psych [Psychology]. They're not getting the Englishes and the Maths and the lab sciences that they would need to get them prepared for a college like ours.” – Comprehensive AD 5

Where one college admissions director viewed College Now as a potential area for supplementing high school curriculum and supporting college preparation, another college discussed an initiative led by its local College Now office to collaborate with the College’s partnering College Now high schools. The admissions director explained:

“One thing that our College Now people here have done, in conjunction with a previous associate dean and now I'm not sure who he's working with, but they have started offering classes to students, prep classes for the SATs…having schools help hand-pick students for these classes to try to help them with their scores. They've definitely scored much higher after they've had this type of preparation.” – Senior College AD 8

The admissions directors were generally positive in their remarks concerning College Now. The Directors viewed the College Now program as an encouraging opportunity to augment high school curriculum offerings.
Regents and curriculum

Admissions directors were asked to explain the methods they used to evaluate the quality of college preparation by a high school and to further explain the measurements they used to determine if a student was academically prepared for college. Similar to their observations in their college’s prospective and applicant student pools, the admissions directors remarked on their reliance on Regents scores and the importance of a student’s overall high school curriculum. One admissions director explained the academic preparation review process:

“You know it by their Regents scores. You know it by the fact that in some of those schools they will only get one unit of math. You're thinking, "I don't take one unit." I try not to take one unit even for OSS [an academic opportunity program at CUNY] because those students here have to get out in one semester and I can't judge that they even learn that work, so there's a feeling that I get from just looking at records and looking at schools…They've done a harder program, but maybe they have a 78. I can put that kid in OSS if they are also slightly weak in the math because many of our programs don't take ... You don't need pre-calculus or calculus unless they said they wanted to be a doctor or they wanted to be in business, that's not the problem, but there are students who I know for what they were given, they have done everything that was asked. Then there’s schools that you know that those courses are not the same courses.” – Senior College AD 2

CUNY’s Skills and Assessment Tests provide a tool to evaluate academic preparation as one community college admissions director explained that for the community college:

“The CUNY reading and writing and mathematics test, exemption from it, either through SAT scores or regions, is a pretty good way to judge” – Community College AD 1

The evaluation process involves more extensive selection criteria at the senior college level and is therefore more selective in the process, as a senior college admissions director outlined how the senior college evaluates academic preparation through the following manner:

“We use the standard, CUNY CAA, the five subject areas. So we actually look at that. We want a student based on our criteria that we give UAPC for the selection of our DOE students. That we want a student who has done at least three years of a language. We do ask for more than two years of math. So what does that mean? That means we get some with two and a half but that's okay. We ask for four years of English, social science, we ask for some kind of fine arts
component. We're asking for a well-rounded student. Science, we want at least two years of science. We really push to get three. And that's even becoming more of a challenge now because it's not part of that at this point. So that becomes a challenge to us too. So we use the same criteria but I think our challenge is that not everybody is following those same criteria.” – Senior College AD 11

High school grades and performance on standardized tests are another method that admissions directors employ to evaluate an applicant’s academic preparation. One community college admissions director explained that trends in students’ performance are observable by high school. The community college admissions director explained:

“The one thing I will say is that you almost tend to see a pattern sometimes of schools where you know that grades in the 90s aren't necessarily grades in the 90s because they don't really align to, say, Regents’ scores or SAT scores that you see coming from the same school. Some of the schools where you'll consistently see high GPAs of 90, 95 but the Regents scores are much, much lower and SAT scores of the students that have taken the SATs are in the 400 range of verbal. I'd say as you work more and more with applicants from specific high schools you see that. You tend to see patterns.” Community College AD 12

High school curriculum and the importance of the breadth and depth of coursework was an important attribute to the admissions directors in evaluating college preparation. Traditionally, the goal of a college admissions director is to recruit talented students to attend the college. Students were offered college admission under the premise that under the tutelage of college faculty students would develop into educated adults. While the occasional tutor may be used by a student to supplement course instruction, there was not an extensive remediation programming to supplement secondary schools’ academic preparation. Students who followed a college-prep curriculum and even with the most modest performance could be considered “college material”. One senior college admissions director explained:

“We really are looking to try to give a chance to students who may not look as great on paper, but we see that they have taken solid courses. “ – Senior College AD 2
Methods of evaluating high school performance trends

However, the challenge in the admissions process at CUNY is the ability to seek out that well-rounded student beyond the high school GPA and test scores. By pure volume in application numbers, CUNY colleges rely primarily on evaluating applicants by a numerical evaluation. One community college admissions directors explained:

“For the four year senior college, and the CUNY system, as you're well aware, it's a little bit more numbers driven and a little less the art of admissions… We didn't question the school, is this 85 as meaningful from Christopher Columbus as it is from Bronx Science? We just basically look at the grades, look at the SATs. If it fits the profile for what we're looking for, we accept. At the community college level, it's all the way on the other side of the spectrum. It's open access. You can come in. It's just a matter of where's your starting point.” – Community College AD 10

For CUNY’s senior colleges the numbers game is used to evaluate trends by high school as a senior college admissions director described:

“The first thing we look at is enrollment data. Number of applicants, number of applicants who met the minimum admission requirements, those who are in test compliance and ultimately those that enrolled. I'm looking at prior year’s data, so it's not necessarily for the incoming class, but for the class before them, or the couple of years before them. Aside from that, we look at specific academic data. Their SATs, their Regents, their college academic average. There's a slew of things that we look at before we determine if we should even be recruiting in these types of schools.” – Senior College AD 7

Reporting and data collection to identify student performance trends are used actively by admissions and enrollment staff members for recruitment and enrollment planning. A senior college admissions director explained:

“We have a report that gives us information about how many students applied from each of the schools for the last three years. How many of them have been accepted and how many of them have enrolled, so that very important for us. If we don't have a lot of information then we may also look at greatschools.org or we sometimes look at the US New & World Report just to get some kind of sense of the school. Obviously we are looking for students who are high achievers and we look at the pattern of students who have applied to our college in the past and been accepted.” – Senior College AD 9
The selective colleges and programs include the use of high school rankings to inform strategic recruitment and enrollment planning. There may be implications for the everyday high schools that are not marquee attractions for a school district or receive public accolades that cement a high school’s reputation to attract college recruiters. Negative assumptions may be attributed by college admissions staff to the high schools that are not listed amongst prestigious rankings. Yet, rankings are used by colleges and by students themselves when selecting colleges, despite rankings arbitrary nature of selection and methodology that is often murky at best. One admissions director noted regarding the college’s selectivity measures for high schools’ academic preparation:

“I've looked at success ... performance rather of students over time, so I can't say that I've done this in any big, huge, comprehensive way, but I have looked at many of our targeted schools. I will take a freshman class that comes from a school that we're really interested in. For example, in the George Washington complex… The Gregorio Luperón School where we do get a certain number of students. I look at their performance all the time and found that they did really well when they got here, despite all of them being immigrants pretty much 100% and having language difficulties.” – Senior College AD 3

This remark is interesting because it refers to a math and sciences based high school that was created within the former George Washington High School. The student body is diverse and primarily English Language Learners and a high school of choice for college recruitment.

Aside from mainstream ranking lists, the use of individual school profiles provides an additional source for colleges to evaluation of a high school’s academic preparation. One comprehensive college admissions director explained:

“Quantitatively we will see some of the numbers and profiles from the schools when we're doing our analysis for our data in terms of the students that are coming here. We try to get information in terms of report cards to those schools and see how they compare. Look at the performance in terms of high school averages, SATs, and that sort of thing, and also performance on the assessment tests. Qualitatively just with our interaction with the students and the types of
questions that are in preparation for just our campus visits, we can kind of get a feel for where the students are academically.” – Comprehensive AD 4

CUNY Placement Exams

Student aspiration and academic reality often first coincide at the point of college admission. A high school student may believe that his/her high school academics meet the expected academic foundation colleges seek. One comprehensive college admissions director explained:

“Because we are two tiered, if the student applies and they have the equivalent of a high school diploma and they put down an associate degree, they're eligible to come. So we admit them and then once they pass through, it really now becomes the issue of what happens at the test, at the placement level, and then what happens in advisement, and now we squash their dreams. The student who did not do the chemistry Regents, the student who did not do well on the math placement exam and is sitting in two semesters of remedial math, these students really realistically, unless they become very, very exceptional students, will never see these high-demand programs. Now these kids have eaten up aid for so many semesters and really, where do they go after that? It's really very sad. It's a very sad situation. My feeling is, it's all because the high schools are really, really not preparing these kids.” – Comprehensive AD 5

This academic awakening or realization of under preparedness presents numerous issues for affected students. Emotional and motivational issues on behalf of the student, as well as issues of academic access that result from gaps in opportunity for underserved high school students. In addition, there are financial aid implications for college students who enroll in remedial course work. Students who are receiving Federal or New York State financial aid are essentially on the clock once they enroll in a degree program at a college, meaning there are time constraints for degree completion and standards for satisfactory academic progress in order to maintain financial aid eligibility.
Forms of intervention

Several college admissions directors discussed initiatives their colleges had undertaken to address observed inconsistencies in college preparation by high schools. Programs described by the admissions counselors included working with prospective students, as well as applicants and admitted students. One community college admissions counselor spoke of the community college’s creation of a test prep program in response to feedback from high schools. High school staff and parents expressed to the community college that their students who applied as freshmen were not prepared for the CUNY Skills and Assessment Tests. The admissions director explained:

“Most community colleges, and we're included, students do have some skill proficiency issues and CUNY Start [a CUNY created and administered remedial program]. We started inviting students to come in for testing workshops prior to their test appointment. That has made a significant change and we're noticing some complaints by high school advisors, parents, and students, that students were being admitted to the college and going into the skills test cold.” – Community College AD 6

The purpose of CUNY’s Skills and Assessment Tests are to evaluate student proficiency levels. The tests may be used for admission consideration by a college or may be used by a college as a placement mechanism to enroll as student in the appropriate course level. It is common practice for colleges to require placement exams for newly enrolled students, however the caveat for CUNY’s community colleges is the high-stakes nature of the tests in the sense of determining if a student is placed in an academic development or remedial program or permitted to progress into college-level and academic program course requirements.

CUNY colleges have educational opportunity programs that are intended to provide academic access to students who demonstrate strong academic potential and are economically disadvantaged. The Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK) and College
Discovery (CD) programs are housed at CUNY’s senior and community colleges respectively. Both programs provide academic support and student services to assist students from their freshman year through college graduation. One senior college director reflected on an increase in students who are caught in the middle by being academically disadvantaged and in an economic double-bind, not poor enough or not wealthy enough to have access to or to benefit from other educational resources and support-oriented opportunities. An admissions director noted:

“Then I see as the biggest problem that you need a program that's like SEEK. A lot of those kids are not poor, so they couldn't be SEEK. They're middle-income students, so they couldn't get into a SEEK program. They're forced to go to a two-year school which isn’t horrible, but you lose a lot of them because they don't believe they belong there.” – Senior College AD 2

One admissions director observed that the issue of college preparation was a larger systemic issue that expanded beyond high school, but to the elementary school level. The admissions director explained:

“From my perspective, as an educator and a person that has worked in various areas, we tend to look in sort of a limited ... When we look at our higher ed, community college, senior college, we don't look back at the high school. I put it to you that we have to look even further. Really to be quite honest with you, we need to begin at the public school system, at the very beginning, to see how the pathways are either being created or not created. Most of the data that I know, still has a lot of our children being lost at 8th grade.” – Community College AD 1

**Guidance/college advisor collaboration**

The relationship between the high school guidance counselor and college admissions officer serves as a vital link connecting high schools and colleges. Guidance counselors support high school students in navigating the college search and application process. High school staff rely on relationships with college recruitment and admissions colleagues to serve as key
resources in accessing the higher education community. A community college admissions
director commented:

“The college advisor often, when you're a selective college, is as much about selling their high
school and the quality of that education to the college rep as the college rep is trying to be
persuasive about the benefits of their students attending.” Community College AD 10

During conversations with the college admissions directors, few of the admissions
directors mentioned high school guidance or college advisors by name; however when a high
school counselor’s name was mentioned by an admissions director the counselor tended to be
from one of the former large high schools and not from one of the reorganized smaller schools.
One admission director reflected on a collaborative relationship experienced for many years
between the college and a large public NYC high school, however the counselor had retired and
the link and depth of collaboration between the college and high school was weakened and
eventually lost or less engaged.

The high school guidance counselors and college admissions officers’ connection is
further exemplified from a discussion with a senior college admissions director who explained
how the high school counselor served as a conduit to a high school’s college-bound students. The
admissions director stated:

“If a school just out of the blue contacts us and invites us we still do take a look and see how
strong the students have been who have applied to our college in the past. Sometimes we also
reach out to the counselors and just indicate that we are specifically looking for high achieving
students and would this be a good venue for us.” – Senior College AD 9

The credit recovery strategy

Credit recovery was relatively unknown by name as a strategy to increase high school
graduation rates when the topic was introduced for conversation to the admissions directors by
the researcher. Comments from the admissions directors ranged from vague familiarity of the concept of credit recovery as a practice on the part of NYC Schools to complete unawareness of the practice. Several admissions directors discussed their reliance on reviewing high school units as part of their college’s admission evaluation. There was a distinct difference in how and when the admissions directors reviewed an applicant’s transcript. Community colleges were less reliant on an applicant’s high school transcript and academic units as two community college admissions directors explained:

“We're a community college so there is no need for us to look at academic units because a student, for the most part, just needs to have a DOE high school diploma. The breakdown of the units is not something that we look at.” – Community College AD 6

“Normally we wouldn't see it [high school coursework]. The only time that we're really diving in to transcripts would be for transfer students.” – Community College AD 10

In contrast, the senior colleges’ admissions directors offered a more varied explanation on their review of an applicant’s high school transcript and evaluation of academic units and coursework. For example, one admissions director, while addressing observations of NYC Schools and credit recovery coursework noted:

“I know you're starting with 2002, but going back even further than that, you did often see high school transcripts coming through with courses that were questionable as far as whether or not they really had enough academic heft to be considered college preparatory or should really be even considered more than an elective at the high school level. They were coming through as having met certain key requirements out of the high schools. I think I've seen a lot less of that type of thing going on more recently.” – Senior College AD 3

In further discussions of credit recovery course work admissions directors commented on high school courses with questionable academic rigor can impact an applicant’s consideration for admission to their college. A different senior college admissions director commented:

“The schools make some adjustments to help move students along through graduation. An example that I recall was the business math course. If students struggle with their algebra class in high school, they were given some type of a business course that would substitute for the math
requirement. When they came to the college, they were in for a rude awakening because they've actually never taken real, solid mathematics.” – Senior College AD 7

CUNY Colleges have the unique benefit of a centralized processing center for admissions, the University Application Processing Center (UAPC). This is unique because unlike The State University of New York (SUNY) which has an application processing center, the difference is that CUNY’s UAPC conducts the admissions evaluation on behalf of the colleges. SUNY’s application center is limited in that it only collects applications for admissions and sends the application files to each college to process and review for admission. At CUNY, for each enrollment cycle the undergraduate colleges provide UAPC with their admissions criteria for students they want to admit and provide a range for students that they will consider for admission upon a closer review by the college’s director of admission. The first and largest cut of applicants for freshman admission to CUNY colleges occurs through UAPC. Students who fall into the review category are sent to the college’s director of admission, which is when an applicant’s credentials receive a more holistic evaluation, but the admissions director still relies on the academic evaluation and information provided by UAPC. UAPC reviews applicants’ academic courses and determines acceptable units to calculate students College Admission Average (CAA). In addition, UAPC collects and posts all standardized tests scores to the admissions system for college admissions staff. An admissions director may or may not review an applicant’s transcript; therefore credit recovery coursework is unknown to the college admissions directors or their staff when conducting application reviews. One senior college admissions director explained the process as such:

“To be quite honest with you, I very rarely look at the transcript. I very much look at our computer system to see the units that CUNY has given them ... I’m more interested in how many Regents did they take, how many units overall did they take, were they really just floating, or were they trying hard courses, and maybe that student has to struggle, but he's doing that kind of
work. If he's not used to doing that kind of work, he's not going to come here and do it.” – Senior College AD 2

**Multiple Regents exams and college readiness**

However, reviewing the transcript is no guarantee of identifying credit recovery course work. UAPC does not award credit for credit recovery course work or calculate the units as part of an applicant’s academic evaluation or CAA. Where credit recovery was most associated as an issue by college admissions directors is in the practice of high school students sitting for multiple Regents subject exams until a passing score is achieved. Admissions directors from a comprehensive and a senior college explained:

“I think the one thing we are challenged with is the one negative and this goes across the board to all of the DOE schools, more so than the privates and most of the publics on the island. The DOE schools will allow the student to sit, especially for an English Regents, four times, five times. That shouldn't be the case. If the student passes with a 65 they've passed, they have satisfied the requirement. That is where the DOE has taken the guidelines of the University and have actually used it against us because that student truly is not prepared.” Senior College AD 11

“We see that [credit recovery] a lot with the kid who didn't graduate in June, they do this during the summer, and they graduate and they've taken now the Regents four times. Then they finally eke out the 65 so they can be awarded the diploma.” – Comprehensive College AD 5

The practice of enabling students to sit for multiple Regents potentially creates a false academic reality for students who are underperforming or failing in an academic area. A student believes the s/he has met the academic requirement by simply achieving a passing grade on the Regents exam, however if the exam score is lower than CUNY’s requirement the student is placed in remedial coursework or required to take CUNY Skills Assessment Test to evaluate proficiency and at CUNY’s more selective colleges and programs determine admissibility to the college. There appears to be a disconnection between Regents exam scoring and CUNY’s expectations on proficiency for college level academic coursework. Math ability was provided
by the college admissions directors as an example of deficiency for NYC Schools’ students while discussing credit recovery. The admissions directors expressed concern on the impact of students’ inadequate math preparation. An admissions director remarked:

“That's the problem [math ability], and it becomes a very frustrating thing for them. Now, "Okay, yeah, I got a 65, and I graduated." Then when they take the placement test, they score so low that we have to refer them out to go to some other program to remediate because they're at such a low level they're not even at the eighth grade math level.” - Comprehensive College AD 5

On the other hand, one senior college admissions director noted that achieving a high score on a standardized test, such as the SAT, is not a guarantee for admission and may in fact work against the student if his/her high school coursework and grades do not present an upward or steady trend of improvement and achievement. The senior college admissions director explained:

“When I see a really bright student with high SATs that I know that it's going to be taken at some schools, that student probably is not going to do the work because he's not used to it. I tend to look for how many units of academic subjects.” – Senior College AD 2

**College admission standards**

Ten of the twelve participants in the study reported that their college had raised its admission standards over the past ten years. The senior college admissions directors commented on their observations of a more competitive admission profile and one college admissions director noted an increase in student retention and graduation rates. The admissions directors discussed a variety of strategies that were implemented to enroll a freshman class with a higher academic profile. Methods included increasing the minimum SAT score requirement and/or increasing the CAA minimum, and in some cases requirements were adjusted by academic program. One admissions director from a comprehensive college explained:
“We were open at the associate's level and we would take anybody. We went to a 70 average for all the associate's programs. Of course they don't need to be certified [proficient]. And then for the bachelor's programs, we had been at a 75 and we went to a 77. They have to be fully CUNY certified. For what we call our high-demand majors, we had moved from a 75 to an 80. Many of the majors, many of the bachelor's majors are now requesting more units.” – Comprehensive College AD 5

The community college admissions directors were less likely to report raised admission standards at their colleges. The nature of community colleges serving as open access institutions would account for the low selectivity of admission standards. However, a trend that the community colleges directors reported was that freshmen were applying to their college much earlier in the admission cycle than in years past. This pattern in earlier enrollment of freshmen at community colleges was influenced by the raised admissions standards at CUNY’s selective senior colleges, which shifted a population of students to CUNY’s community colleges because the applicants no longer met admissions requirements at CUNY’s senior colleges. In addition, CUNY’s Board of Trustees removed remediation coursework from its senior colleges in 1999 and concentrated developmental coursework at the University’s community colleges. The University’s Manual of General Policy states:

Policy 1.07 Admission to Baccalaureate Degree Programs
No student who has not passed all three Freshman Skills Assessment Tests, and any other admissions criteria that may exist, shall be allowed to enroll and/or transfer into that college's baccalaureate degree programs. Students seeking admission to The City University of New York senior college baccalaureate degree programs who are in need of remediation shall be able to obtain such remediation services at a the University community college, at a senior college only during its summer sessions, or elsewhere as may be made available. This resolution does not apply to English as a Second Language (ESL) students who received a secondary education abroad and who otherwise are not in need of remediation. (BTM,1999,01-25,009,__)²⁷

Interestingly, even within CUNY’s most selective academic programs a population shift occurred, as one senior college admissions director noted that although the college did not dictate a minimum or particular high school average or GPA requirement for admission, a highly competitive academic profile grew from the program’s limited number of freshmen seats and growth in popularity with NYC Schools most academically competitive high school students.

The admissions director explained:

“In general, what we say is if you have a 90 average or better and if you have a 1200 or better on the SAT that's a good place to be but there's no specific requirement, but I can tell you the student that has an 89 average and 1100 on the SAT has a very small chance of being accepted, but we don't have any specific requirements… the decisions are not just based on average and SAT anyway but if we had a superstar who had an 85 average and had 1300 on the SAT our retention studies indicate that the GPA is a better predictor than the SATs.” – Senior College AD

High school outreach

An observed outcome of higher admission standards reported by the admission directors was a change in their colleges’ recruitment outreach to NYC Schools. A change in high school outreach and recruitment strategy was less evident at the community college level, where one community college director noted the advantage of having a large public system of feeder high schools. The admissions director noted:

“Because the pool of applications is so large at CUNY, we just shifted who we took rather than trying to strategically recruit differently.” – Community College AD

The senior college admission directors expressed greater concerns of college readiness from NYC Schools’ students, especially in underserved schools and neighborhoods. Senior college admission directors voiced a desire and commitment to serve NYC Schools and the
City’s students, but felt pressured by college and University administration to maintain a competitive admissions profile. One senior college admissions director explained:

“I think the ultimate goal is to recruit from a better prepared population. In the past, the bulk of our students were from the Bronx and Manhattan, but we found that these students were simply not meeting the minimum criteria.” – Senior College AD 7

The quest for academically prepared students for some senior college admissions directors has extended their recruitment efforts and high school outreach beyond the City’s five boroughs. Admissions directors discussed increased recruitment initiatives in Westchester and Nassau counties as well as in northern New Jersey. Admissions directors described several factors that influenced their decision to actively engage with a high school as a source for prospective applicants to their college. In particular, trends in student application and enrollment data were an important tool, as one senior college admissions director explained:

“We have looked as I said at the pattern in the last three years, how many applications and how many accepts and how many enrolled students and if those numbers are very very low then we generally will not visit.” – Senior College AD 9

Another senior college admissions director discussed an alternative approach to high school outreach that limits the number of high school visits and college fairs attended by the college in favor of hosting campus visits to the college. The admissions director described an extensive campus tour program that regularly hosted two or three group tours daily and said:

“Instead of going to every college fair, we will accommodate almost any high school who wants to come here for a visit. We have found that people have to come and be on the campus to see themselves here, and to understand what it's like.” – Senior College AD 2

To further elaborate what can be considered a high school pre-selection process for high school outreach, one senior college admissions director explained:
“We have to really target the schools where we know students will be eligible. We've changed both the schools we visit as well as our high school tour program. I think we're more selective about what schools come on campus.” – Senior College AD 8

Several of the senior college admissions directors remarked that limited staffing resources further influenced the extent of their interaction with a high school. A senior college admissions director explained:

“We've also been very careful about which high schools we target since we are a public institution and our resources are limited…We obviously want to get as much bang for our buck as we can, so we're recruiting heavily from schools where we see students have a good chance of being admitted and being successful at our college and because we're a commuter college, it's reasonable for them to commute to us, where we've seen successes with them in the past and where we want to make inroads and encourage more students to apply. Those are the schools that we sort of have been focusing on.” – Senior College AD 3

Communication with high schools and messaging to their students was also discussed by the admissions directors. One community college admissions director remarked on the college’s use of a high school counselor newsletter distributed monthly to communicate newsworthy events at the college. Another admissions director, from a comprehensive college, explained the college worked actively through its high school visits to inform high school guidance counselors on the college’s admission requirements, and notably to address the troublesome trend in declining math proficiency levels. The admissions director stated:

“We try to communicate to the schools what we recommend in terms of preparation for a baccalaureate program with emphasis on at least preparation from the proficiency areas. One example is trying to encourage these schools to encourage the students and convince the parents that mathematics in the fourth year would be helpful because a lot of that in terms of students not being proficient is tied to math. So, that's where they would communicate not only our standards we're a little bit different in that we have the 2-year and 4-year programs.” – Comprehensive College AD 4
Patterns in first year retention

Questions on first-year retention revealed that this was an area that in general admissions directors were not directly involved in and could not readily comment on trends at their college. Although the admissions directors reported data was available for their college, retention figures were not numbers that the admissions directors quoted or recalled at will during our conversations. Thus, the observation was that for the college admissions office the focus was on student recruitment, admission and enrollment. Admissions directors were not directly involved in or accountable for conducting a follow through of student academic progress after an admitted student enrolled at the college.

Each interview concluded with asking participants if they’d like to address any topic that had not been mentioned or further discuss any topic that related to our discussion that they would like to highlight. Additional items raised by the admissions directors included one senior college admissions director who was concerned that the college’s competitive academic profile challenged the college’s efforts to enroll a diverse freshman class. The admissions director was troubled that the college’s high SAT scores of successful applicants excluded students of color, who the admissions director explained were known not to perform as well on the SAT when compared to Caucasian and Asian students.

Concerns on test scores were not excluded to the SAT. One community college admissions director and one senior college admissions director remarked on the General Education Diploma (GED). The community college admissions director felt that NYC Schools retained more students, but was concerned that students were directed into IEP diploma programs that were not accepted by CUNY, thus excluding or setting up a hurdle in gaining
access to higher education opportunities for students enrolled in Individualized Education Program (IEP) at NYC Schools.

Two additional issues that were raised by each college level of admissions directors was the challenge of coordinating college recruitment activities within a school building that housed multiple independent high schools. One comprehensive college admissions director explained:

“One thing that does come to mind, again the reorganization was to try to better serve the students. I know, again from a recruitment perspective, in some cases it works when the schools within the original schools work well together in terms of perhaps college counseling, when they collaborate an organization of fairs or tours and that sort of thing. So, there is an increased burden for the college to work and communicate with the schools because you have cases where it's one school that has become three, six, maybe even seven schools. So, how we serve those schools might be undermined in some ways based upon this reorganization. So, that's been a challenge along the years. Some do it better than others, but from a recruitment perspective that can be an issue…We try to communicate with the schools as best as possible. When appropriate we can provide some feedback, but in the end we'll kind of figure out the schools that we work best with.” Comprehensive College AD 4

A senior college admissions director described a sense of disconnection between the numbers of students a school building may serve in relation to the number of students a college recruiter might be exposed to during a visit. The admissions director explained:

“I often go to college fairs or personal visits at these schools. I see them as physically huge high schools, close to 1000 students within the building. They only bring 20 or 30 students to the activities. Where are the other students? "Well, these schools coordinate their own events. They'll do a fair next week." Why don't you combine efforts? "Well, it's my responsibility to ensure that my students move forward to this point." They have their own responsibilities.” – Senior College AD 7

As my conversation concluded with a few of the admissions directors, they took the opportunity to express their reservations and doubts that NYC Schools’ initiatives under its Children First plan had produced better students, but rather a complex variety of mixed and lackluster results. One community college admissions director noted:
“I think it was a shell game. I really don't think that a lot of things really changed fundamentally... I think we were fed a lot of things to satisfy our need to know or to feel as if we were in control, but I think the system remained the same. It just took on a different face. The reason I'm saying that is because the product speaks for the system, and the product didn't get better, if anything it got worse at certain points. We still have as the Daily News is now reporting, we have a terrible, terrible situation in the Bronx, which is one of the most economically depressed areas, and yet the school system is failing the community. The students can't read and write and do math. The world has not changed; those are the basics that you need.”
– Community College AD 1

The reservations of *Children First* initiatives and NYC Schools’ assertions of graduating stronger students were most notably expressed by a senior college admissions director who concluded our conversation by stating:

I just think that we need to look at the whole problem and they’re picking at pieces of it. Somebody said to me that New York is so political that we can never fix any problem because there's always a political answer to it. It's not rocket science. My mother was better educated than I was and I was better educated, I'm talking about high school, than my daughter was. God knows what these kids are.”
– Senior College AD 2

**Quantitative Analysis**

An evaluation of college applicants by high school was conducted to identify characteristics in applicants to CUNY. The quantitative evaluation used values gathered from CUNY’s application for undergraduate admission, high school transcript, and standardized test scores of freshman applicants. The selection process was guided by the researcher assembling the common data points (CAA and SAT scores) a college admissions director would use to construct an academic profile of applicants by high school. An item to note is that unlike traditional college admission offices, CUNY’s undergraduate applications for admission are managed by CUNY’s University Application Processing Center (UAPC) and admission is primarily conducted by a centralized and automated process. Therefore, CUNY directors of
admissions work more directly with admitted freshman applicants and indirectly in the initial evaluation of application materials.

The study’s list of variables (discussed in Chapter Three) was provided to the University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), who in return provided a research file specifically void of student identifying information to preserve anonymity. The Fall 2002 file contained 52,229 students and the Fall 2012 file contained 73,066 students. These numbers represent freshman applicants for the fall semester, regardless of high school type. Table 4.2 exhibits the number of freshman applications received for Fall 2002 by high school type. Approximately 60% or 29,349 applicants were from NYC Schools. Less than 12% or 6,182 applicants were from New York City private and parochial schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-2 Fall 2002 Applicants by High School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Foreign Starting Fall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid NYC Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid NYC Private or Parochial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid NYS but Not NYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Out of NYS, or Foreign Pre Fall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender distribution of all freshman applicants for Fall 2002 was majority female, with 58% or 29,106 applications and 42% or 20,745 applications from males, as shown in figure 4.7.
Table 4.3 shows the imputed ethnicity of enrolled freshmen for Fall 2002. The freshman class enrolled 26,722 students across the University. Approximately 30% of freshmen in 2002 were identified as Black or Hispanic. White students were about 14% of the class and Asian students were identified as 7.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native Alaskan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7932</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7571</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7262</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26722</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>25507</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52229</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows the number of students who enrolled in Fall 2003 after the freshman year. Compared to the Fall 2002 freshman class 22,663 students enrolled after their freshman year in
Fall 2003, meaning that 4,059 or 15% of students did not enroll after their first year at CUNY. The average first-year GPA of students who did enroll in Fall 2003 was 2.59.

**Table 4-4 Fall 2003 Registration Show File of Fall 2002 Freshmen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>29566</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrol</td>
<td>22663</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52229</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NYC Schools – Fall 2002 applicants’ profile**

An overview of freshman applicants form NYC Schools for Fall 2002 showed the following descriptive profiles of ethnicity and gender. Slightly more than 30% of NYC Schools applicants were identified as Black or Hispanic, similar to the percentage of Black and Hispanic students in the overall applicant pool for Fall 2002. Asian students were 8.6% and White students were 11.2% of the pool.

**Table 4-5 Applicants from NYC Schools by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native Alaskan</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4448</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4564</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14856</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14493</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>29349</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More females than males applied from NYC Schools as shown in the Figure 4.8

Approximately 59% or 29,106 females applied in 2002 and 20,745 males applied for freshman admission.
Academic profile

The average CAA for applicants from NYC Schools was 77. The CAA averages for English and Mathematics were 78 and 73 respectively. The average SAT total score was an 899 and the average SAT verbal and SAT math scores were 433 and 465 respectively. Test scores were based on 20,443 test takers from NYC Schools.

From the Fall 2002 file, 14,856 students from NYC Schools enrolled at CUNY (shown in Table 4.6. When analyzed by the researcher against the Fall 2003 enrollment file, the class retained 13,528 students for a retention rate of 91% and is shown in Table 4.7. The average first year GPA of freshmen from NYC Schools was 2.51, which was only slightly lower than the 2.59 GPA of all first-year students for the University.
To ensure accuracy of system-retention rate calculations, OIRA de-duplicated the files prior to merging into the supplied Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 files for the researcher’s study. When merging the Fall 2003 and Fall 2013 data, OIRA removed any student not included in the Fall 2002 or Fall 2012 merged CAS-SHOW file and matched against students enrolled for the Fall 2003 or Fall 2013 semesters. OIRA noted that the file scrubbing process may slightly lower institutional retention rates, however CUNY’s institutional retention rate would not be effected, since a student may have enrolled at another college within CUNY for his/her second year. Students who did not have academic information in the CAS file were direct admits, therefore the applications were processed locally at a CUNY college admissions office. Direct admit application materials are sent to UAPC by the admitting college. Therefore, because of processing time between the colleges sending application materials to UAPC for posting to the CAS system some variable information was potentially blank for some students.
Selection of NYC Schools for data analysis

While creating the list of schools to evaluate for the study, I noticed a concentration of high school reorganization in two New York City boroughs, the Bronx and Brooklyn. In particular, the poorer neighborhoods of both boroughs housed a majority of the high schools that were identified as failing and slated by NYC Schools’ administration for closure. As I reviewed the data I opted to randomly select a sampling of schools from four boroughs, Bronx, Manhattan, Queens, and Brooklyn, for a closer analysis. Staten Island did not have any schools identified as closed and reorganized into smaller schools. Furthermore, although no student identifying information is presented, the researcher elected to code school names upon publication of results to further ensure anonymity of students.

The following table (4.8) shows the former larger high schools selected for analysis as part of the study and the corresponding small schools that were used as the comparison group for 2012. The listing includes the number of applicants to CUNY from each high school for Fall 2002 and Fall 2012. A total of 486 students applied from the list of Fall 2002 high schools studied and 572 from the Fall 2012 comparison group of high schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Name - Coded</th>
<th>Number of Freshman Applicants to CUNY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Bronx02-A</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AB</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-AF</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Bronx02-B</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-BA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-BB</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Bronx02-C</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-CA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-CB</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-CC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx12-CD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Brooklyn02-A</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-AA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-AB</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-AC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Brooklyn02-B</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-BA</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-BB</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-BC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-BD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Brooklyn02-C</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-CA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-CB</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn12-CC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - Man02-A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-AA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-AB</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Man12-AC</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002 - Man02-B</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-BA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-BB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-BC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-BD</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man12-BE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002 - Queens02-A</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-AA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-AB</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-AC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002 - Queens02-B</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 High Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-BA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-BB</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-BC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens12-BD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart in figure 4.9 provides a visual representation of Fall 2002 applicants by high school.

**Figure 4-9: Fall 2002 Applicants by High School**

Of the ten schools analyzed for Fall 2002, Bronx02-C High School had the largest number of students applying to CUNY with 86 students applying for admission to a CUNY college. Man02-A had the least with three freshman applicants to CUNY. The following set of figures provide an overview of the academic profile by presenting the academic average of students that applied to CUNY by high school.

The College Admission Average (CAA) is calculated by CUNY’s UAPC. The CAA is a weighted average of high school course work completed in the areas of English, foreign language, mathematics, science, social studies, and the arts. For the ten Fall 2002 high schools studied, the overall average CAA of the high schools’ 486 students was a 67.4 CAA.
Academic profile

The CAA ranged from 73 to 58 and the two high schools at the lowest end of the range were both Brooklyn high schools and two Bronx high schools were at the higher end of the CAA distribution range of the ten schools with 73 and 72 CAA averages. The schools are also shown here by average CAA for English and mathematics. Figure 4.11 shows that the average CAA for English ranged from 46 to 78 and figure 4.12 shows the CAA for Math ranged from 44 to 73 across the group of high schools.
In terms of SAT scores, community colleges do not require standardized college admission exams such as the SAT for admission, therefore not all applicants had SAT scores as part of their application materials. The researcher observed that none of the three applicants
from Man02-A High School had taken the SAT. For those applicants with test scores the average math and verbal scores are shown in figure 4.13 by high school.

**Figure 4-13: Fall 2002 NYC Schools Applicants by Average SAT**

In looking at gender representation of the 486 students, 290 females and 196 males were represented by the applicants analyzed. Figure 4.14 shows the gender distribution by high school.

**Figure 4-14: Fall 2002 NYC Schools Applicants by Gender**
Figure 4.15 provides an overview of senior and community college as highest level of college eligibility for the group of freshman applicants studied. The distribution was relatively even with a total of 244 students admitted to a senior college at CUNY and the remaining 242 students were admitted to one of CUNY’s community colleges.

Of the 486 students that applied to CUNY, 268 students enrolled as freshmen in Fall 2002. Figure 4.16 shows the number of students that enrolled in CUNY by high school.
From the 268 students that enrolled as freshmen, 214 students enrolled in Fall 2003 for their sophomore year at CUNY, representing a 90% retention rate. Figure 4.17 shows the number of CUNY sophomore students for Fall 2003 by high school. Students from four high schools showed a 100% reenrollment rate of their students after their first year of college.
For further comparison, figure 4.18 shows the number of students enrolled as freshmen and sophomores at CUNY by high school, including the four high schools with a 100% reenrollment rate of their freshmen at CUNY.

**Figure 4-18: Fall 2002 and Fall 2003 Enrollment Comparison by High School**

Figure 4.19 shows the first-year college GPA for students who remained enrolled at CUNY beginning Fall 2003. The average first-year GPA was a 2.37 which was lower in comparison to the first-year GPA of all students, from the same Fall 2002 admission cohort, of 2.59.
Fall 2012 applicants

CUNY received 73,066 freshman applications for Fall 2012. More than 63% or 46,539 students were from NYC Schools. This number represented an increase of 17,190 students from NYC Schools compared to the 29,349 applications received in Fall 2002.

### Table 4-0-1: Fall 2012 CUNY Applicants by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>68,917</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73,066</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Starting</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Board of</td>
<td>46,539</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Private or</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS but Not NYC</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of NYS, or</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Pre Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68,917</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the number of females that applied in Fall 2012 increased to 37,516 compared to 29,106 in Fall 2002. The number of males increased from 20,745 in Fall 2002 to 31,521 for Fall 2012 as shown in figure 4.20 below.

**Figure 4-20: Fall 2012 CUNY Applicants by Gender**

The ethnic distribution of the applicant pool showed that 23.4% of applicants were Hispanic and 20% were Black. Whites represented 16.2% of the applicant pool as shown in Table 4.10. These numbers represent an increase in Black and Hispanic applicants compared to Fall 2002.

**Table 4-0-2: Fall 2012 CUNY Applicants by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native Alaskan</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11234</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14627</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17082</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11866</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/2 or More</td>
<td>8093</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5853</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69039</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>4027</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73066</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of freshman records in the file showed an enrollment number of 35,605 students for Fall 2012. The second year or Fall 2013 number of students who enrolled was 30,494 students. Therefore, more than 5,000 students or 14% did not enroll after their first year at CUNY. The average first-year GPA for second year students who did enroll was 2.65.

The ethnicity of NYC Schools students for Fall 2012 was 24% Black and 28% Hispanic or 52% when combined. The number of Asian students increased from 7.5% in Fall 2002 to 17.9% in Fall 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-0-3: FALL 2012 NYC SCHOOLS APPLICANTS BY ETHNICITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/2 or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of freshmen from NYC Schools in Fall 2012 was 23,190 and 20,285 were enrolled in Fall 2013 after their first year at CUNY for an overall 87% retention rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-0-4: FALL 2013 ENROLLMENT FOR NYC SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-0-5 F13SHOW FOR NYC SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average GPA for NYC Schools students after the first year was 2.59, equivalent to Fall 2002.

**Fall 2012 Bronx High Schools and number of applicants to CUNY**

The three former high schools in the Bronx were reorganized into 13 small schools by Fall 2012. A total of 246 students applied to CUNY from the group of small schools compared to 196 applicants from the three former large Bronx high schools combined in Fall 2002. Figures 4.21 through 4.23 provide an overview of students by their average CAA and CAA in Math and English by high school. Bronx02-B High School had twice as many students apply to CUNY than the other twelve Bronx high schools.

**Figure 4-21: Fall 2012 Applicants by Bronx High School**
The overall CAA range was 60 to 80 for the Bronx high schools. The CAA in English ranged from 44 to 80. One school showed a score of 14 but no explanation was provided with the data file for the low average. The average CAAs for Math were lower than the English and overall averages. None of the 13 schools showed a CAA higher than 79.
The SAT verbal and math scores were an average 464 verbal and 487 math based on 47,611 test scores. For NYC Schools there were 32,957 testers in the file provided by OIRA with an average 442 verbal and 472 math. Figure 4.25 shows the average SAT verbal and SAT math scores by high school.
A total of 125 females and 121 males applied from the Bronx high schools. Figure 4.26 shows the gender breakdown by high school. A total of 88 students were offered admission to a senior college at CUNY and 154 were admitted to a community college. Figure 4.27 shows the highest level of college eligibility by Bronx high school. Fewer students were offered admission to a senior college when compared to the Fall 2002 Bronx high schools, when 99 students from the former Bronx high schools were admitted to a senior college and 102 students were admitted to a community college at CUNY.
Figure 4.28 shows the enrollment of freshmen after the first year by high school. Only two high schools had 100% of their students enrolled after the first year at CUNY. Students could transfer to a college outside of the CUNY system or have chosen not to attend any college for a number of reasons based on personal, financial or other reasons that are not captured by the data used for this study. Two high schools showed an attrition rate of 50% (Bronx12-AA and Bronx12-CD) where half of their students reenrolled in CUNY after their freshman year. The first-year GPAs ranged from 1.92 to 3.04 by high school.
**Figure 4-28: Fall 2012 Bronx High Schools by Second Year Enrollment**

**Figure 4-29: Fall 2012 Bronx High School Students by First Year College GPA**
Fall 2012 Brooklyn high schools

Three of the Fall 2002 Brooklyn high schools became ten high schools by 2012. A total of 144 students were identified as applicants to CUNY for Fall 2012 compared to 156 students in Fall 2002. Figure 4.30 shows applicants by high school.

![Figure 4-30: Fall 2013 Brooklyn High Schools by Applicants](image)

Academic profile

The overall CAA ranged from 50 to 85 by high school. English ranged from 63 to 87, and same as the Bronx high schools, the math CAA range was lower with a 47 to 74 range. Like the Bronx high schools, none of the Brooklyn high schools had a CAA above the 70s as shown in figure 4.31. Figures 4.31 through 4.33 depict CAA scores by high school.
**Figure 4-31: Fall 2012 Brooklyn High Schools - CAA**

**Figure 4-32: Fall 2012 Brooklyn High Schools – CAA English**
Overall SAT verbal and math total combined scores were an average of 774 for the ten Brooklyn schools. In comparison, the average combined SAT score for the three former Brooklyn high schools in 2002 was 745. Figure 4.34 shows SAT verbal and math scores by high school.
A total of 80 females and 64 males were represented by the Brooklyn high schools. The total for Fall 2002 from the three Brooklyn schools was 59 males and 97 females. Figure 4.35 shows the gender breakdown of applicants by high school for Fall 2012.

**Figure 4-35: Fall 2012 Brooklyn High Schools by Gender**

From the 2012 Brooklyn schools, 72 students were admitted to a senior college and 76 to a community college. In Fall 2002 from the group of Brooklyn schools, 60 students were admitted to a senior college and 83 to a community college. Similar to the Bronx schools in the Fall 2002 group, fewer Brooklyn students were admitted to senior colleges from the schools studied compared to their predecessor high schools in Fall 2002.
Figure 4.37 first and second year enrollment. Students from three high schools showed 100% enrollment of students for Fall 2013.

The average first year GPA was 2.14 for the ten Brooklyn high schools reviewed; compared to 2.32 for the three former Brooklyn high schools in 2002.
Fall 2012 – Manhattan high schools

The two Fall 2002 Manhattan high schools became eight schools by Fall 2012. A total of 114 students applied to CUNY in Fall 2012 compared to 44 students from the two Fall 2002 Manhattan schools. Figure 4.39 shows the number of applicants by high school.

**Figure 4-38: Fall 2012 Brooklyn Schools by First Year College GPA**

**Figure 4-39: Fall 2012 Manhattan Schools Applicants**
Academic profile

The CAA for the Manhattan schools was higher than the Brooklyn and Bronx schools in the group of schools studied. The CAA range for the Manhattan schools was 67 to 81. Figures 4.40 through 4.42 show the CAAs by high school and subject area. The English CAA ranged from 69 to 82 and the math CAA was lower with a range of 62 to 86. One school showed in the research file with a 26 CAA for math, but no explanation was provided or observed for the low score.

**FIGURE 4-40: FALL 2012 MANHATTAN SCHOOLS - CAA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAN12AA</th>
<th>MAN12AB</th>
<th>MAN12AC</th>
<th>MAN12BA</th>
<th>MAN12BB</th>
<th>MAN12BC</th>
<th>MAN12BD</th>
<th>MAN12BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average SAT verbal and math scores for the Manhattan schools was an 809 combined score which was 43 points higher when compared to the 2002 Manhattan schools. Figure 4.43 shows the average SAT verbal and math scores by high school.
A total number of 46 females and 48 males applied in 2012 compared to 23 females and 21 males in 2002. Figure 4.44 FIG shows the breakdown of male and female applicants by Manhattan high school.

**Figure 4-44: Fall 2012 Manhattan Schools by Gender**

**Figure 4-43: Fall 2012 Manhattan Schools by SAT Scores**
Reviewing first year to second year enrollment showed that 100% of students from three of the Manhattan schools were enrolled after the first year. In 2002 from the two Manhattan schools, 100% and 88% of students enrolled for the second year. Notably the school in 2002 with 100% retention rate had two students enrolled, compared to the second high school which had 24 freshmen enrolled at CUNY in Fall 2002. The average first-year GPA was 2.69 in 2002.
compared to an average of 2.24 for the Fall 2012 high schools. Figure 4.47 shows the average first-year GPA by high school.

**Figure 4-47: Fall 2012 First Year College GPA for Manhattan Schools**

![Bar chart showing GPA by high school.](image)

**Fall 2012 Queens high schools**

Two Fall 2002 Queens high schools became seven high schools by 2012. The schools are shown in figure 4.48 by applicant numbers to CUNY. A total of 85 applicants applied to CUNY from the three former high schools in 2002 compared to a total of 68 applicants from the seven high schools in Fall 2012. Figure 4.48 shows the number of Fall 2012 applicants by high school.
Academic profile

Of the boroughs and schools reviewed in this study, the Queens schools had the highest overall CAA with a range of 68 to 83. The range for English was 69 to 83. The range for math was lower than the overall CAA and the CAA in English, consistent with the schools from the other boroughs. The CAA math ranged from 65 to 77.
Figure 4-50: Fall 2012 Queens High Schools – CAA English

Figure 4-51: Fall 2012 Queens High Schools – CAA Math
A total of 32 males and 53 females applied from the Queens schools in 2002, compared to 35 males and 33 females in 2012. Figure 4.53 shows the gender breakdown by high school.

In Fall 2012, 24 students were admitted to a senior college and 44 to a community college as their highest level of college eligibility. In comparison, 24 students from the two 2002
Queens high schools were admitted to a senior college and 44 to a community college. Figure 4.54 shows students’ college allocation levels by high school.

**Figure 4-54: Fall 2012 Queens Schools by College Allocation**

Figures 4.55 and 4.56 show a comparison of enrollment from freshman to sophomore years and the average first-year GPA by high school. Four of the seven Queens schools had a 100% retention rate to the second year, compared to retention rates that ranged from 79% to 89% from the two former Queens high schools in Fall 2002. The average first-year GPA ranged from 2.0 to 3.25 across the 2012 Queens schools, compared to an average of 2.14 and 2.64 for the 2002 Queens schools.
**Figure 4-55: Fall 2012 Queens Schools First Year Retention**

![Bar chart showing first year retention for different schools.]

**Figure 4-56: Fall 2012 Queens Schools First Year College GPA**

![Bar chart showing first year college GPA for different schools.]
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Analysis of data

The researcher’s observations from the study’s qualitative and quantitative data sources converge for interpretation in answering the study’s question discussed in Chapter Three, “How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ Children First Initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?”

Review of the quantitative data revealed that more students from NYC Schools applied to CUNY in Fall 2012 compared to Fall 2002. Overall, the University experienced a 59% increase in applicants from NYC Schools. The population of minority students from NYC Schools applying to CUNY grew between the Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 applicant pools as well. In Fall 2002, 36% of the applicants from NYC Schools were identified as Black or Hispanic, compared to 52% in Fall 2012.

In comparing the group of 2002 high school applicants to the 2012 high school applicants there were indications of modest increases in applicants to CUNY by high school. In Fall 2002, 196 males applied from the group of ten high schools studied compared to 268 male students from the 2012 group of applicants from small schools. The number of applications from females increased from 268 in 2002 to 304 female students in 2012.

However, for CUNY’s college admission directors although the increase in applications for admission was welcomed, the admissions directors at CUNY’s senior colleges expressed concern in a reduction of minority students who met their colleges’ increased academic standards. Consequences include recruiting more aggressively outside of NYC Schools for more
academically competitive students, as admissions directors discussed expanding their recruitment strategies to high schools in neighboring counties and states.

In comparing the small high schools to the larger high schools they replaced, fewer students from the small high schools were admitted to a senior college. In Fall 2002 a total of 238 students were allocated to a senior college compared to 244 students in Fall 2002. From the group of applicants studied there was a 28% increase in students allocated to a community college between the Fall 2002 (242 students) and Fall 2012 (334 students) compared cohorts. The researcher also reviewed the number of students who were identified as passing all CUNY Skills Tests or meeting exemption requirements by high school from the data file provided by OIRA. As an aggregate number more students from the small 2012 schools met CUNY proficiency requirements in all subject areas with 86 students compared to 57 students that met the same criteria in Fall 2002 from the high school applicants reviewed.

Math proficiency was identified by the college admissions directors as a particular area of concern for NYC Schools’ students. Admissions directors from community and comprehensive colleges explained the creation of student developmental and academic bridge programs, such as CUNY Start, were interventions on part of the University to support students’ academic needs, where NYC Schools had not prepared students. Admission directors advocated for a more traditional and rigorous liberal arts curriculum for high school students. In addition, admission directors viewed the Common Core Standards favorably as a strategy to implement consistency across NYC Schools. Admissions directors spoke of leveraging CUNY’s College Now program to supplement academic programming in high schools to support students’ proficiency levels. The admissions directors tended to group and generalize high schools by borough and classified schools in the Bronx as underperforming and underserving students.
Notably, admissions directors were not critical of high school teachers, but criticized the NYC Department of Education’s administrative leadership for its disruptive implementation of *Children First’s* strategies. Specifically, admissions directors were judicious of the coordination and communication between co-located schools in regards to college recruitment of students.

High school curriculum was discussed in detail by the admissions directors and in their review of freshman applications in search of a well-rounded student with demonstrated academic ability. A particular theme that emerged from discussions with CUNY’s admissions directors was their observations of inconsistencies between high school grades and standardized test scores and the added caveat of students’ inability to meet CUNY’s proficiency requirements. The admissions directors expressed more confidence in discussing the curriculum of students from the 2002 group of schools. Admissions directors questioned the academic rigor offered by the small themed high schools from the 2012 group of schools. Overall, the data revealed that student retention after freshman year at CUNY was higher for the Fall 2002 high schools. Table 5.1 presents a comparison of retention rates between the Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 schools studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Fall 2002 Average college 1st year retention rate</th>
<th>Fall 2012 Average college 1st year retention rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit recovery was a concept that the admissions directors only peripherally encountered because high school transcript information is evaluated and entered into CAS by
UAPC staff. UAPC reviews applicants’ transcripts and assigns subject units and conducts the initial review for proficiency by completion of high school course work and grades or standardized tests scores. The admissions directors reported limited review of transcripts of high school applicants than compared to college transfer applicants. Admissions directors rely on the academic evaluations conducted by UAPC. UAPC does not accept credit recovery coursework to meet academic unit requirements.

While discussing credit recovery, the admissions directors identified the practice of students taking Regents exams until a score was earned that would meet CUNY admission requirements. Admissions directors felt strongly that this practice created a false academic reality for students in terms of college readiness.

Observations from admissions directors, despite their indirect role in retention efforts at their college, were consistent. Admissions directors were more involved with student recruitment activities and were not readily able to discuss retention statistics or academic performance of the first-year performance of students. Several admissions directors spoke of special programming efforts, such as learning communities and orientation activities, which were developed by their colleges academic and student affairs units. Services were designed to support students in their transition to college life and academic expectations.

Summary
This chapter outlined the researcher’s observations from interviews conducted with twelve CUNY admissions directors and a review of data from CUNY’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Variables collected from application files from a selected cohort of students from NYC Schools in Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 were analyzed. For the study ten large
high schools that were closed and reorganized into a collection of 38 small schools by Fall 2012 were reviewed.

Chapter Five – Conclusion and Implications

Summary of the Study

This study explored the outcomes of NYC Schools’ policies implemented under the public school system’s expansive reorganization plan known as Children First. Created under former Mayor Bloomberg’s and Chancellor Klein’s administration, a goal of the plan was to increase high school graduation rates through the closing of large high schools labeled as failing by the City’s government and school leaders. Large high schools were restructured into small themed schools, also called small schools of choice (SSCs). Specifically, this study reviewed from a college admissions perspective, “How do patterns of enrollment and retention of freshmen applicants to CUNY from the small schools of choice high schools created under NYC Schools’ Children First initiative compare to freshmen applicants from the larger high schools they replaced?”

The literature reviewed provided a broad overview of the political and social contexts that established the foundation for the federal government’s interjection into public education policy. Led by the groundbreaking reports, A Nation at Risk and A Test of Leadership, the literature situates the study within relevant writings and research that traverse topics from school reforms, mayoral control, and college preparation and readiness through the collaboration of K-16/20 public systems.

The study examined a population of college applicants to CUNY from Fall 2002 and Fall 2012, which served as bookend years to New York City’s first decade of mayoral control and controversial Children First era. While the City’s secondary and postsecondary leadership
publicly lauded higher high school graduation rates and increased numbers of NYC Schools students attending CUNY, the University’s admissions directors and a review of applicants academic profiles offer an untapped perspective in understanding the impact of education policy and practice across a public education system.

**Key findings**
- CUNY’s admissions directors possess an impressive number of stable years in their professional positions, offering a valuable resource in informing education policy. The average number of years of service at CUNY in admissions was 24 years.

- Despite their professional expertise in college preparation and college readiness, college admissions directors were informed indirectly on matters concerning NYC Schools’ major reform initiative *[Children First]* to increase college applicants. The role of admissions directors in the City’s arena of public education policy is one of spectator between NYC Schools and CUNY administrations.

- Admissions directors associated more with NYC Schools’ former large high schools than with the smaller schools that were co-located within the previous high schools. Admissions directors expressed a need for better coordination in terms of working with high school staff to recruit their students for college. Admissions directors reported challenges in high school outreach because of their own limited budgets and staffing in cultivating meaningful relationships with NYC Schools. High school outreach is a more selective process where admissions directors feel the need to build or to shape their future students beginning with the high schools they choose to work with and recruit students.
from. A high school’s reputation for producing quality students for selective colleges is primarily formed by how their students perform academically as college freshmen.

- High school curriculum, particularly in the development of solid mathematics skills is a key predictor of college readiness and an integral component in a college preparatory course of study (Fruchter, 2008) (Dounay, 2006) (Conley, 2010) and (Chellman, Crook, & Schwartz, 2011). College admission staff were perplexed by the connection between a small school’s name and the high schools’ academic mission. High school curriculum is a pertinent factor because of high schools role in preparing students for college access and choices (Roderick, Coca, & Nagaoka, 2011).

- Credit recovery coursework is a disadvantage to a college applicant in the admission evaluation process. Students have the potential for a negative impact by the creation of a false reality of academic preparation and proficiency that is not reconciled until college enrollment and placement testing.

**Implications**

Admissions directors can provide valuable insight on the intersection of college readiness and college admission. Their observations of high schools can inform principals and school leaders in curriculum development and in improving college knowledge for students. In addition, the perspective of admissions directors can inform planning that links K-16/20 academic partnerships. Programs such as CUNY’s College Now, which is available to all NYC Schools, can augment high school course offerings to improve student proficiency, especially in mathematics skills.
With increased competition for limited federal, state and local funding for education, it becomes imperative for public systems such as NYC Schools and CUNY to unite in working more efficiently to serve the City’s population through education. Successful high schools must coordinate their students’ academic preparation with the expectations of colleges (Wise, 2008).

The analyzed data did not present a compelling account of improved academic achievement for NYC Schools. The observance of undramatic changes in better prepared students in comparing the Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 applicants in this study, imply that considerable work is still to be done to achieve education equality and opportunity in New York City’s public schools. Previous research forewarned the changing demographic compilation of CUNY’s colleges, noting increased enrollment (Croke, 2011) and expansion of remedial programming (Lavin, 2000) at CUNY’s community colleges.

Future Research
This study is limited in that it reviewed cohorts of students that applied to CUNY. A more expanded study that documented and explored the postsecondary outcomes of NYC Schools’ students would be beneficial for education policy planning, such as NYC Schools’ Where are They Now reports. This study can serve as an introduction for topics that further explore the impacts of education policy and practice across a public education system. Specific areas of exploration include:

- Following students by high school cohorts through college graduation
- Mapping small schools of choice (SSCs) to students’ college major and academic program. For example, “What postsecondary careers do students from SSCs pursue?”
• CUNY’s mission is based in providing access and opportunity to New York City’s students. Further study in high school preparation and outcomes for the City’s most underserved populations can support the City’s education system in achieving its mission.

Where this study contributes to the literature is its observations on the added benefits college admissions directors can offer to the conversation on college readiness and preparation, as well as informing collaboration between secondary and postsecondary schools. Admissions directors work with a variety of schools and are able to identify best practices of successful schools in producing quality high school graduates and well-prepared college students.

Summary

This study examined the similarities and differences of NYC Schools’ applicants to CUNY in Fall 2002 and Fall 2012. The purpose of the study was to apply a college admissions perspective to identify and to understand outcomes of NYC Schools smaller high schools compared to the larger high schools they replaced as part of the City’s Children First initiative. A college admissions perspective offers new insights on the results of education policy and can inform collaboration between secondary and postsecondary institutions.

The lesson for NYC Schools is that it is not the size of the school, but what happens inside the building that makes a difference in serving students. Overall, the study indicated mixed results for NYC Schools in producing better prepared students for CUNY. Admissions directors from CUNY’s colleges reported that despite increased numbers of applicants from NYC Schools, when comparing the former large and new smaller high schools, the gains in academic quality of students were minimal. Notably, admissions directors described an
academic unreality for students who do not realize the extent of their unpreparedness until the college application and evaluation process.

Overall, observations in comparing the Fall 2002 and Fall 2012 group of high schools revealed that despite an increase in the number of high school graduates, significant academic gains had not occurred and that the education experience for students in the reorganized smaller high schools received an education that was more status quo than avant garde.
Appendix
List of closed and reorganized NYC Schools

BROOKLYN

Fall 2002

Small Schools – Fall 2012

Franklin K. Lane
Multicultural HS
Academy of Innovative Technology
Brooklyn Lab
Cypress Hills Collegiate
Urban Assembly School for Collaborative Healthcare

George Wood Wingate
School for Human Rights
School for Democracy & Leadership
HS for Public Service: Heroes of Tomorrow
Brooklyn Institute for Liberal Arts

Harry Van Arsdale
Brooklyn Prep
Williamsburg HS for Architecture & Design
Williamsburg Prep

Lafayette HS
International HS @ Lafayette HS for Sports Management
Kingsborough Early College
Life Academy HS for Film & Music
Expeditionary Learning School for Community Leaders

Paul Robeson
P-Tech: Pathways in Technology
Academy for Health Careers

Prospect Heights
International HS @ Prospect Heights
HS for Global Citizenship
Brooklyn Academy for Science & Environment
Brooklyn School for Music & Theatre

Samuel J. Tilden
It Takes a Village Academy
Kurt Hahn Expeditionary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Programs/Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Shore HS                  | Brooklyn Generation School  
                              | Brooklyn Theatre Arts HS  
                              | Victory Collegiate  
                              | Academy for Conservation & the Environment |
| Thomas Jefferson HS             | FDNY HS for Fire & Life Safety  
                              | HS for Civil Rights  
                              | Performing Arts & Technology  
                              | World Academy for Total Community Health |
| **BRONX**                       |                   |
| Christopher Columbus            | Collegiate Institute for Math and Science  
                              | Astor Collegiate  
                              | Bronxdale  
                              | HS for Language & Innovation  
                              | Pelham Prep |
| DeWitt Clinton                  | Bronx Collaborative  
                              | World View Metropolitan  
                              | Explorations Academy  
                              | Bronx Latin  
                              | E. Bronx Academy for the Future  
                              | Peace and Diversity  
                              | DeWitt Clinton |
| Harry S. Truman                 | Bronx Health Sciences  
                              | Harry S. Truman |
| Herbert H. Lehman               | Renaissance HS for Musical Theater & Technology  
                              | Pelham Lab  
                              | Schuylerville Prep  
                              | Bronx River  
                              | Herbert H. Lehman  
                              | Westchester Square Academy |
| Jane Addams                     | School for Tourism & Hospitality  
                              | Mott Haven Village Prep  
                              | University Heights Secondary |
Theodore Roosevelt
West Bronx Academy for the Future
Knowledge and Power Prep
Belmont Prep
Fordham HS for the Arts
Fordham Leadership Academy
Bronx HS for Law and Community Service

Walton HS
Kingsbridge International
International School for Liberal Arts
HS for Teaching and Professions
Celia Cruz Bronx HS of Music
Discovery HS

William H. Taft
Bronx Collegiate Academy
Dream Yard Prep
New Directions Secondary
Bronx HS of Business
Bronx HS for Medical Science
Claremont International

MANHATTAN

Bayard Rustin
Manhattan Business Academy
Quest to Learn
Hudson HS of Learning Technologies
Humanities Prep

Graphics
Urban Assembly School for Emergency Management
Business of Sports
Urban Assembly School for Technology

George Washington
College Academy
HS for Media & Communication
HS for Health Careers & Sciences

Julia Richman
Vanguard HS
Manhattan International HS
Talent Unlimited
Louis D. Brandeis  Urban Assembly School for Green Careers
Global Learning Collaborative
Frank McCourt HS

MLK Jr HS  HS for Arts, Imagination & Inquiry
Urban Assembly School for Media Studies
HS for Law, Advocacy & Community Service
HS for Arts & Technology Manhattan Hunter Science
Special Music School

Murray Bergtraum  Stephen T. Mather Building Arts & Craftsmanship HS
Manhattan Early College School for Advertising
Urban Assembly Maker Academy
Murray Bergtraum HS for Business Careers

Norman Thomas  Manhattan Academy for Arts and Language
Murray Hill Academy
Unity Center for Urban Technology

Park West  Food & Finance HS
HS of Hospitality Management
Urban Assembly School of Design & Construction
Facing History School
Manhattan Bridges HS

Seward Park  Essex Street Academy
Urban Assembly Academy of Government & Law
Lower Manhattan Arts Academy
New Design
HS for Dual Language & Asian Studies

Washington Irving  Gramercy Arts
HS for Language & Diplomacy
International HS at Union Square
Union Square Academy for Health Sciences
Academy for Software Engineering
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>International HS for Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtown HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst</td>
<td>Civic Leadership Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pan American Int'l HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flushing</td>
<td>Veritas Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens HS for Language Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flushing HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Rockaway</td>
<td>Frederick Douglass Academy VI HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens HS for Information Research and Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Medical Tech: A College Board School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Channel</td>
<td>Channel View School for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockaway Park HS for Environmental Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockaway Collegiate HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Metropolitan Expeditionary Learning School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens Metropolitan HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Queens Collegiate: A College Board School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillside Arts &amp; Letters Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School for Community Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica Gateway to the Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Gardens</td>
<td>Queens Prep Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excelsior Prep HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington Carver HS for the Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory Academy for Writers: A College Board School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Academy for the Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High School/Secondary School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of High School or GED Center</th>
<th>Date of actual or anticipated H.S. graduation receipt or GED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Address:</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12. While a high school student, did you take any college courses? | Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Did you attend CUNY's COLLEGE NOW Program? | Yes [ ] No [ ]
- College Name

#### 13. Have you ever received financial aid? | Yes [ ] No [ ]
- If yes, at:

#### 14. Are you a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces? | Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Are you a dependent of a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces? | Yes [ ] No [ ]

### Questions 15-18: Citizenship status and documents used to determine any other educational documents needed to evaluate your application and begin the visa process for temporary visa applicants. They are also used to determine eligibility for available financial aid programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a U.S. citizen?</th>
<th>Yes [ ] No [ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Citizenship</td>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Institutions Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year Age While Attending</th>
<th>Dates of Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Month/Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. What diploma or certificate did you receive when you completed secondary school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma or Certificate</th>
<th>Date Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 18:** Are you Hispanic/Latino?  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**Indicate your race by selecting one or more options:**  
- American Indian or Alaska Native  
- Asian  
- Black or African American  
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
- White

**Question 19:** From what country or part of the world did you or your family originally come?  
(Choose the box next to the name of the country or part of the world with which you most identify.)

- Afghanistan  
- Cuba  
- Greece  
- Ireland  
- Mexico  
- Panama  
- Bangladesh  
- Dominican Republic  
- Guyana  
- Israel  
- Nigeria (168)  
- The Philippines  
- Bhutan  
- El Salvador  
- Egypt  
- Italy  
- Peru  
- Trinidad  
- China  
- Ecuador  
- Haiti  
- India  
- Korea (102)  
- Puerto Rico  
- Vietnam

**Other - specify:**

**Question 20:** Where were you and each of your parents born?  
Check one in each column.

- Born in the United States, excluding Puerto Rico or U.S. Territories
- Born in Puerto Rico or U.S. Territories
- Born outside the United States

**Question 21:** Do you speak a language other than English at home?  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**If yes, with which language do you feel more comfortable?**

- [X] English  
- Language other than English  
- Equally comfortable with both

**Question 22:** Your native language

**Other languages spoken**

**Question 23:** Father's full name

**Last Name**

**First Name**

**Middle Initial**

**Question 24:** Father's residing in the United States?  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**Citizen of U.S.?**  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**Father's occupation**

**Question 25:** Father's residence

**City**

**State**

**Country**

**Question 26:** Mother's full name

**Last Name**

**First Name**

**Middle Initial**

**Question 27:** Mother residing in the United States?  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**Citizen of U.S.?**  
- Yes [x]  
- No

**Mother's occupation**

**Question 28:** Mother's residence

**City**

**State**

**Country**
### Trends in Enrollment of First-time Freshmen: Fall 1990 - Fall 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1990 Fall</th>
<th>1990 Fall</th>
<th>1992 Fall</th>
<th>1993 Fall</th>
<th>1994 Fall</th>
<th>1995 Fall</th>
<th>1996 Fall</th>
<th>1997 Fall</th>
<th>1998 Fall</th>
<th>1999 Fall</th>
<th>2000 Fall</th>
<th>2001 Fall</th>
<th>2002 Fall</th>
<th>2003 Fall</th>
<th>2004 Fall</th>
<th>2005 Fall</th>
<th>2006 Fall</th>
<th>2007 Fall</th>
<th>2008 Fall</th>
<th>2009 Fall</th>
<th>2010 Fall</th>
<th>2011 Fall</th>
<th>2012 Fall</th>
<th>2013 Fall</th>
<th>2014 Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCT</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>14,978</td>
<td>13,743</td>
<td>13,651</td>
<td>14,452</td>
<td>15,184</td>
<td>13,814</td>
<td>14,691</td>
<td>14,538</td>
<td>13,776</td>
<td>13,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMCC</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostos</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsborough</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensborough</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>12,028</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,018</td>
<td>11,833</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>10,787</td>
<td>11,041</td>
<td>10,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>27,002</td>
<td>25,574</td>
<td>28,220</td>
<td>27,887</td>
<td>28,220</td>
<td>25,647</td>
<td>28,513</td>
<td>25,326</td>
<td>24,817</td>
<td>24,042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table: ENRL_0013  4/20/2015  CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCCT</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>13,872</td>
<td>14,670</td>
<td>16,218</td>
<td>15,879</td>
<td>17,164</td>
<td>17,488</td>
<td>18,483</td>
<td>19,386</td>
<td>19,692</td>
<td>20,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMCC</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostos</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsborough</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensborough</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>11,698</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td>11,686</td>
<td>11,378</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>12,745</td>
<td>13,235</td>
<td>15,570</td>
<td>17,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>24,967</td>
<td>25,391</td>
<td>26,732</td>
<td>27,375</td>
<td>29,172</td>
<td>29,388</td>
<td>31,238</td>
<td>33,231</td>
<td>34,872</td>
<td>37,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trends in Enrollment of First-time Freshmen: Fall 1990 - Fall 2014

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 1990</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCCT</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>17,322</td>
<td>17,738</td>
<td>17,182</td>
<td>17,689</td>
<td>18,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMCC</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>7,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostos</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsborough</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>2,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>3,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensborough</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>3,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>17,877</td>
<td>18,384</td>
<td>18,454</td>
<td>17,742</td>
<td>18,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>34,829</td>
<td>37,129</td>
<td>35,616</td>
<td>35,622</td>
<td>37,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCC</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Senior Colleges</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>16,604</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMCC</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostos</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsborough</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community College</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quesnaborough</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Colleges</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>15,871</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>15,358</td>
<td>17,210</td>
<td>32,568</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Senior Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undergraduate Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>141,237</td>
<td>96,500</td>
<td>237,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Mean</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Years and Older</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Part Time</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside of U.S. Mainland</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Countries of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancestries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Language Other than English</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Spoken</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients²</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Less than $20,000²</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation in College³</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married³</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Children³</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work For Pay more than 20 hours per week³</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total First-time Freshman Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>17,182</td>
<td>18,434</td>
<td>35,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Public High School</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC Private Parochial HS</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS HS, outside NYC</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US HS, outside NYS</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Recipient</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current High School Graduate</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Of those born outside the U.S. mainland.
2 Based on degree-seeking students who are citizens or permanent residents of the U.S. (other students are ineligible for Pell Grants regardless of family income).
3 Source: 2012 Student Experience Survey of CUNY Undergraduates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cohort (N)</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>2 Years</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
<th>4 Years</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>6 Years</th>
<th>8 Years</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Still Enrolled</td>
<td>% Awarded Associate Degree</td>
<td>% Awarded Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td>% Baccalaureate or Associate Degree</td>
<td>% Still Enrolled</td>
<td>% Awarded Associate Degree</td>
<td>% Awarded Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td>% Baccalaureate or Associate Degree</td>
<td>% Still Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>10,573</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>10,669</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>11,164</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>12,041</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>12,497</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>11,755</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>11,796</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>11,641</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*System retention rates are calculated as the percentage of those who are still enrolled at any CUNY college in the subsequent fall term(s) and have not yet earned a degree. System graduation rates are calculated as the percentage earning a degree at any CUNY college any time prior to the start of the subsequent fall term(s). Students earning a degree, even if lower than that originally pursued, are counted for that degree and not as still enrolled, even if they are still enrolled in the subsequent fall term. Students who have earned both an associate and a baccalaureate degree within a given time period are counted for the baccalaureate degree only.*
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