

About Us

Team Members: Eric Miller & Nathan Yee

Team Name: ???

Project: Opinionated college rankings to help top students find the best schools for them, while pushing the higher education industry towards best practices

Journey so far:

- ❖ Talked to Emily Roper-Doten
 - Highly selective, cares about nontraditional metrics
- ❖ Got connected with admission officers at MIT, WPI, and UVA
- ❖ Started work on a “proposal document” to share with people
- ❖ Talked with Jeannine from the University of Virginia (UVA)
 - Large state school, publically funded
- ❖ Talked with Chris from MIT
 - Highly selective, massive brand recognition in marketing and pop culture

College endorsed rankings is very politically challenging

10/1 of Learning

Eric & Nathan

step 1: hypothesis

We believed that

Institutional pressures within schools have a large impact on what the admissions offices spend their time doing. Other institutional pressures also attempt to limit our solution space to ideas that politically acceptable.

step 2: observation

We observed

Large “titan” schools, such as MIT, would be extremely hesitant to endorse a list of rankings for other schools: seeming condescending isn’t good, faculty and administration went to those other schools (and vice versa), and some admissions people don’t actually know that much about other school.

step 3: learnings and insights

From that we learned that

- Getting credibility through college endorsement only works if the ranking methodology is transparent and actually comes off as not condescending.
- Framing is important, “Schools most like Olin”, is better than “Top 10 engineering schools, Olin_{TM}”.

step 4: decisions and actions

Therefore, we will

Rankings are the wrong framing.
i.e. “MIT Database of other schools”
i.e. “MIT Unordered List of schools like us”



Top universities care about rejected applicants

10/01/18

Person Responsible

step 1: hypothesis

We believed that

Universities don't see or treat rejected applicants as part of the community, mostly because they are perceived to have "failed" because they aren't good enough to get in. This is a mental blind spot that prevents them from seeing certain opportunities.

step 2: observation

We observed

Olin: "Just this year, we started sending a survey to our rejected applicants."

MIT: "I have been talking with my dean about this problem for years. We spend years, either through admissions materials or just through popular culture, getting people interested in MIT. And then 93% of them get met with this brick wall that says 'Sorry, we don't want you'"

step 3: learnings and insights

From that we learned that

Top schools *do* contain people that recognize this problem and care, but mostly they haven't figured out what to do about it. MIT's best idea was to send them links to edX and maybe invite them to STEM clubs with MIT alums and interested community members in cities around the world.

step 4: decisions and actions

Therefore, we will

Think more about the "community building" aspects of how interactions with applicants can build a long-standing connection that is valuable.

