## Admissions Assessments

## CASPER

An SJT that measures social intelligence and professionalism by probing for 10 aspects of this construct.


Let's Try It

## During the rating process

## Background and Theory

Four sections


Aspect
Indication of which aspects
to focus on

## ?

Guiding Questions

3-4 questions to help you think critically and fairly about responses

## Application

Paragraph including context and connection between scenario and aspect

## : 三

Points to

## Consider

## Casper is human rated

Raters are blinded to avoid biases

Diverse rater pool of more than 300 people


Each rater focuses on 1 scenario and rates anonymized responses using a 9-point Likert-type scale

Casper score is an average of 12 unique impressions

## Casper z-scores and percentiles

Mean of the group is set to zero (0)
Applicants above the mean have positive $z$-score


## Example

Scenario: Two friends are discussing their third friend, Anna, who they worry is in an unhealthy relationship.
Question 1: "Should you get involved in this situation with your friend Anna? Why or why not?"

| $z=-2.51$ <br> 1st Percentile | $z=-0.68$ <br> 25th Percentile | $z=0.03$ <br> 50th Percentile | $z=0.68$ <br> 75th Percentile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. Anna did not ask for help and they are both adults in the situation. | I think that I should talk to Anna about the concerns that we have been having. She is a close friend and maybe she wants help with the situation as well. | Yes, but not in an intervention type of fashion. I would first just try and set up a party, or big friend get together <br> to try and "get the gang back together" for a night. Even let her bring her boyfriend. I would try and let her see all the good times that she has been missing without confronting her about it directly, and really it would just be because everyone just wants to have fun together. But other than that there is not much we can do to change her mind, people in that situation are unwilling to take advice from anyone, and if you do that it usually ends up driving them away. So I would just try to support her and be there for her for when she needs help. | Yes because it seems like Anna is in a very controlling and unhealthy relationship. It is difficult for the person in the unhealthy relationship to see and understand that what the other person is doing to them is harmful and unfair because love blinds that reasoning. Having a third party come in to talk about the relationship may help Anna see that she isn't being treated with the respect that she deserves. |

$z=2.51$
99th Percentile

I think that Anna's friendship with the rest of the friends should be important enough for us to get involved and help her. She seems clearly not to be thriving, and it is speculated that Jason is not good for her. If the things like paying for him, not talking to other guy friends for him are true, then the relationship seems unhealthy and Anna's mental health may be at risk However it is important not to jump to conclusions because maybe the rumors aren't true and Anna was just in a bad mood on that day Either way, I would like to have a friendly, group discussion with Anna and maybe even Jison involved At the onversation I would make sure that no one the friend group makes on the we are in a safe environment

## General Best Practices

## A starting point for the method best for you.

## At initial screening



Allows you to use information about an applicant's personal and professional characteristics, as well as academic metrics, in initial screening

## Part of a formula or rubric



Allows you to use information from the full range of scores, rather than just the extreme ends of the scale

## In conjunction with interviews



Casper may measure some overlapping aspects, but it is designed as a pre-screening tool

## Casper and your selection process

Applications

## ใใి $\}$

Screened applications

Interviewees<br>Offers/Rank

 list

Spots/ Learners


Casper
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Standardized
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File review
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## Using Casper in your admissions process

Approach


Formulaic


Rubric


Qualitative

Description

Combine Casper and other metrics to create an overall score for each applicant, which can then be used to rank applicants.

Include Casper alongside other metrics in a scoring guide, with each level clearly described

Your reviewers use Casper and all other application materials to make a progress decision, without any mathematical formula.

Benefits

Data-driven; highly defensible and trackable

Interpretable groupings of performance; highly defensible and trackable

Highly flexible to your reviewers interpretation

Risks

Small (non-meaningful) differences may not relate to future performance. May be too granular. Highly dependent on formula weights

Highly dependent on rubric weights and definitions

Greater dependance on the program's applicant reviewers and risk of individual biases, defensible process needs clear documentation

## คo Formulaic

```
(99*1/3) + (57*1/3) + (78*1/3)
```

|  | Knowledge <br> Test-\%ile | GPA - \%ile | Casper - <br> \%ile | Total <br> score | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weight | $1 / 3$ | $1 / 3$ | $1 / 3$ |  |  |
| app1 | 99 | 57 | 78 | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | 1 |
| app2 | 42 | 24 | 41 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 4 |
| app3 | 40 | 43 | 37 | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 3 |
| app4 | 26 | 87 | 88 | 67 | 2 |

- Casper and other scores to create overall score for applicant
- Applicants can be ranked to prioritize for next phase


## Rubric

Similar to formula, with additional step of 'grouping' functionality equivalent scores
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Standardized Test - } \\
\text { Percentile }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { GPA- } \\
\text { Percentile }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Casper- } \\
\text { Percentile }\end{array}
$$ <br>

4 \& \geq 90^{th} \& \geq 90^{th}\end{array}\right]\)| $1 / 3$ |
| :---: |
| 3 |

Scores from 0-4 are given in each category then overall score is calculated based on the assigned weighting.

## (7) Rubric

$$
\left(4 / 4^{* 1 / 3}\right)+\left(2 / 4^{* 1} / 3\right)+\left(4 / 4^{* 1} / 3\right) * 100
$$

Knowledge Test
Weight
Score type

| app1 | 99 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 57 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| app2 | 42 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 24 | 0 |
| app3 | 40 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 43 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| app4 | 26 | 1 | 87 | 3 |

$1 / 3$

Rubric
Percentile
Rubric
Percentile

Casper
$1 / 3$

## Total score

Percentile

## Rubric

| 78 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 41 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 37 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 88 | 4 |

- Casper and other scores to create overall score for applicant
- Applicants can be ranked to prioritize for next phase
- Total score based on rubric defined by admissions committee
- Can include additional application material into rubric (LOR, CV, Service Hours...)


## Qualitative

| Knowledge <br> Test - <br> Percentile | GPA - <br> Percentile | Casper - <br> Percentile | Total <br> score | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |
| 99 | 57 | 78 |  | Proceed |
| 42 | 24 | 41 |  | Reject |
| 40 | 43 | 37 | N/A | Reject |
| 26 | 87 | 88 |  | Proceed |

- More commonly used qualitatively conjunction with other application material:
- Personal statement, LOR, CV, Service Hours...
- Particularly dependent on committee and reviewer priorities/biases

SUMMATIVE SJT
How can the Casper score be used?


Formulaic


Rubric


Qualitative

## Why we do not recommend cut-scores

undue emphasis on 'dividing lines'

Mid-range scores relate to more diverse classes while keeping high success rates

Selecting students based on small differences in scores is not supported

They hinder diversity

~40\% of black applicants not even seen with 500 Cut-score, vs < 10\% of white applicants

## What to expect from using cut scores

Given demographic differences in terms of cognitive admission metrics (GPA, MCAT, etc.), cut-off scores may disproportionately impact underrepresented minorities.

While Casper subgroup differences tend to be smaller than those for MCAT and GPA, setting cut-off scores for all admission metrics (GPA, MCAT, Casper) might negatively impact underprivileged applicants.

| Subgroup Comparison | Casper US <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 0 2 2}$ | US MED MCAT <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 0 2 2}$ | US MED GPA <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 0 2 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian to <br> Black or African American | 0.66 (moderate) | 1.17 (large) | 0.77 (moderate) |
| White to |  |  |  |
| Black or African American | 0.71 (moderate) | 1.09 (large) | 0.89 (large) |
| White to |  |  |  |
| Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin | 0.42 (small) | 0.81 (large) | 0.57 (moderate) |

## Formulae and Rubrics - as efficient, more inclusive, and better indicators of future performance

Ranking applicants across multiple dimensions

- Correlates better with future performance ${ }^{1}$
- A fast way to prioritize review
- Highlights ‘edge cases'
- Those who just missed the cut-off for any one metric... but could be promising overall
- Lets you recognize history and evaluate experience and barriers


## Edge Case - Example

|  | Knowledge <br> Test - \%ile | GPA - \%ile | Casper - <br> $\%$ ile | Total <br> score | Rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weight | $1 / 3$ | $1 / 3$ | $1 / 3$ |  |  |
| app1 | 99 | 57 | 78 | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | 1 |
| app2 | 42 | 24 | 41 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 4 |
| app3 | 40 | 43 | 37 | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 3 |
| app4 | 26 | 87 | 88 | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | 2 |

Cut-score $=30$
Applicant 4 would not be reviewed at all

Ranking applicants across dimensions
Highlights promise despite low Knowledge test score

## Why z-scores

Raw scores are converted into z-scores


## Needed for formulaic method

Use common scale when combining multiple measures

## Casper z-scores and percentiles

Alongside z-scores, we also provide percentile ranks for each applicant.
In order to relativize scores only with respect to Casper test takers from the same applicant pool, Z-scores and percentiles are calculated for each test instance cohort.

An applicant's percentile rank = the percentage of applicants from the same test sitting who received a raw mean scenario score lower than that applicant.
(e.g. 75 percentile $=75 \%$ of applicants taking the same test scored lower)

Casper striving to ensure difficulty across test instances is similar.

We can help the program calculate their own percentiles to compare applicants relative to other applicants to their own program.

## Casper z-scores and percentiles

Statistics based on 1127 test instances across the most recent 5 application cycles.

A person with a z-score of -1.73 will typically be in the 0-10 percentile range.

| Percentile Range | Number of <br> Applicants | Average <br> Z-Score | Median <br> Z-Score | SD |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0-10 percentile | 31142 | -1.84 | -1.73 | 0.42 |
| 10-25 percentile | 48422 | -0.98 | -0.97 | 0.19 |
| 25-50 percentile | 79994 | -0.32 | -0.31 | 0.2 |
| 50-75 percentile | 79903 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.2 |
| 75-90 percentile | 47692 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.16 |
| $90-100$ percentile | 33326 | 1.65 | 1.58 | 0.33 |

Due to the large sample sizes, we can be $99 \%$ confident that the average $z$-score is the true mean of each percentile range.

## Casper z-scores and percentiles



## What will the results look like?

| 10,757 Applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Search applicants |  | Q |  |  |  |  | Export $\vee$ |
| $\downarrow$ Last Name | AAMC | $\downarrow$ Birthdate | $\downarrow$ Email | $\downarrow$ CASPer Z Score | $\downarrow$ Percentile Rank | $\downarrow$ Red Flag Scenario | $\downarrow \text { Red }$ Comm |
| Hand | 1837294 | 1995-12-28 | applicant@example .com | -1.48 | 0.07 |  |  |
| Kuhn | 1837294 | 1997-04-23 | applicant@example .com | -1.06 | 0.14 |  |  |
| Harris | 1837294 | 1996-11-15 | applicant@example .com | -1.48 | 0.07 |  |  |
| Dickens | 1837294 | 1988-01-06 | applicant@example .com | 0.5 | 0.68 |  |  |
| Denesik | 1837294 | 1995-05-09 | applicant@example .com | -2.94 | 0 |  |  |

## Casper Quartile Report

(7) Starting the 2021-22 cycle, applicants will receive Casper quartiles 1 month after their test

Quartiles tell applicants how they scored relative to their peers. For example, applicants who scored in the fourth quartile scored higher than applicants in the first, second and third quartiles, meaning they scored higher than at least $75 \%$ of all applicants.


