

On Need-Blind Admissions Policy: Role and Implications

The 1991-92 Report of the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

July 30, 1992

The full committee met on four occasions during a year when the fate and role of the committee were the subject of considerable discussion by the University Council. However, there was a strong consensus among committee members that the committee should actively investigate a topic of importance and general interest. The topic chosen was "Need-Blind Admissions Policy; Role and Implications," and it was determined to use this study to demonstrate that the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid can, and should, provide meaningful input and advice to the University Council. While we have used the term "need-blind admissions" throughout, we recognize that the need-blind admissions policy *per se* is only one of a complex set of issues related to the management of available resources in order to recruit and retain a talented and diverse undergraduate student body.

After considerable discussion, the committee identified five topics for investigation that influence, or are influenced by, the Need-Blind Admissions Policy of the University. Small subcommittees were appointed to investigate and report on these topics:

I. Impact of Reduced Budget on Need-Blind Admissions (A Study Employing Financial Modeling)

Chair: Warren Seider
Members: Rajeev Narang
William M. Schilling, *ex officio*
Robert Summers
Peter Wilding

II. Demographic Impact of a Need-Conscious Admissions Policy

Chair: Robert F. Giegengack
Member: Gia Daniller

III. Recommendations on Methods of Increasing Endowment Designated for Need-Blind Admissions

Chair: Phoebe Leboy
Members: Olga Hasty
Margie Toy

IV. Communication and Impact of Need-Blind Admissions Policy

Chair: William Westerman

V. Impact of Need-Blind Policy on International Student Recruitment

Chair: Gia Daniller

In addition to these activities the committee has received regular reports from Dean Stetson and Mr. Schilling on the status and progress of activities related to admissions and financial aid. Their input and counsel was invaluable in the preparation of the reports of the subcommittees.

At an early stage it became apparent that the subcommittees were investigating areas relating to financial aid and support that are subject to gross misinterpretation if not communicated effectively. The committee has prepared the following report with the realization that the contents must be interpreted with care and not subjected to use out of context. The report condenses the findings and recommendations of the Committee and subcommittees.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The current need-blind admissions policy is essential to recruiting and maintaining a diverse and talented student body.
2. The University administration is urged to explore other means of addressing projected budgetary shortfalls before taking what appears to be the irreversible step of altering our present need-blind admissions policy.
3. The University should aim for a long-term goal of generating \$150 million of endowment for undergraduate financial aid within the next five years.
4. The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid should meet annually with the Vice President for Development to discuss endowment goals and the progress being made to achieve them.
5. The University should better publicize its need-blind admissions policy, and produce materials for potential applicants in which the efforts of the University to counterbalance federal student aid cuts are also publicized.
6. The University should increase its efforts to secure endowments specifically directed at increasing the financial aid resources available for foreign students. International alumni and foreign firms operating within the United States should be specifically targeted.

I. Report on the Impact of Reduced Budget on Need-blind Admissions (A Study Employing Financial Modeling)

A computer model has been an important tool used by the Financial Aid Office to study the impact of changes in the key variables (e.g., number of aided students, cost of attendance, parental contribution, . . .) on the financial aid budget. Although the model is used commonly to examine potential scenarios in future years, the table that follows [next page] is for the 1990-91 academic year. This output provides average and total values for each of the five cohorts of supported students. For example, in the first cohort (first year students), 885 students received aid, the average and total costs of attendance were \$22,193/student and \$19,640,463 and the average and total parental contributions were \$5,361/student and \$4,744,485. Similar figures are provided for the student contribution (typically from savings and summer jobs), outside grants (from Federal and State sources and foundations), and from student self help (mostly from work-study positions). The entries for NEED 3 are the average and total grants provided to the students. For all five cohorts, involving 3562 students, these summed to \$31,751,964.

These funds were obtained from \$2,539,101 of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), \$250,000 of other grants, \$1,727,000 of endowment income, and \$304,000 of "unmet needs" (outside grants for which students did not apply or loans and jobs which they declined). This left a net need of \$26,931,863, which the University took from its unrestricted aid budget. Note, that \$28,475,000 were budgeted for unrestricted aid, but \$2,086,057 was used to match work-study grants and Perkins loans and to cover tutoring grants, aid for summer school, etc. Hence, \$26,388,943 were available to cover the net need.

Future Scenarios

Given the computer model, which the subcommittee judged to be quite adequate, two potential scenarios were considered. The first is to maintain the status quo, with the Need-Blind Admissions (NBA) policy in place. The model would continue to be used for fine tuning; that is, to study the impact of small adjustments in the number of aided students, the cost of attendance, parental and student contributions, outside grants, self help, and

restricted and unrestricted funds available. For different values of these parameters, the degrees of freedom are adjusted to eliminate the deficit.

The second scenario assumes that the available unrestricted funds will fall x% short of meeting the increased needs projected by the model over the next four years. Values of x = 4 and 10 are considered, although it should be emphasized that these are hypothetical, only if budgetary pressures necessitate, and are currently not planned. They are used for purposes of illustrating possible consequences of a budget shortfall. Within the second scenario, three possibilities are considered:

a. Replace the shortfall with restricted funds. At 4%, based upon the 1990-91 budget, the shortfall of \$1.14MM would be cut, to be replaced by the 5% yield from \$23MM of new endowment funds. A shortfall of 10%, \$2.85MM, would be replaced, requiring \$57MM in new endowment funds. See Section III of this report where targets for endowment are addressed.

b. Reduce the average grant per student. At 4%, the average grant would be reduced from approximately \$7400 to \$7100. At 10%, it would be reduced to \$6700. These monies might be replaced by increased student loans and/or self help.

c. Reduce number of grant-aided students. This would mean partially dropping the NBA policy or admitting some students without providing grant aid. At a 4% shortfall, to reduce the unrestricted grant monies by approximately \$1.14MM, 155 fewer students would receive grant aid (that is, 39 students/class). A 10% shortfall, which would constitute a serious inroad, would reduce the unrestricted grant monies by about \$2.85MM, with 387 fewer students receiving grant aid (that is, 97 students per class).

Current Data, FY 1990-91

First Year	Average \$	# Aided	TOTAL \$
Cost of Attendance	\$22,192.61	885	19,640,463.00
Parent Contribution	\$5,361.00		4,744,485.00
Student Contribution	\$1,707.00		1,510,695.00
NEED 1	\$15,124.61		13,385,283.00
Outside Grants	\$1,418.00		1,254,930.00
NEED 2	\$13,706.61		12,130,353.00
AVG SELF HELP	\$4,337.00	885	3,838,245.00
NEED 3	\$9,369.61		8,292,108.00
Second Year	Average \$	# Aided	TOTAL \$
Cost of Attendance	\$22,610.55	849	19,196,357.00
Parent Contribution	\$5,338.00		4,531,962.00
Student Contribution	\$1,914.00		1,624,986.00
NEED 1	\$15,358.55		13,039,409.00
Outside Grants	\$1,347.00		1,143,603.00
NEED 2	\$14,011.55		11,895,806.00
AVG SELF HELP	\$5,100.00	849	4,329,900.00
NEED 3	\$8,911.55		7,565,906.00
Third Year	Average \$	# Aided	TOTAL \$
Cost of Attendance	\$22,302.00	824	18,376,848.00
Parent Contribution	\$4,926.00		4,059,024.00
Student Contribution	\$1,883.00		1,551,592.00
NEED 1	\$15,493.00		12,766,232.00
Outside Grants	\$1,322.00		1,089,328.00
NEED 2	\$14,171.00		11,676,904.00
AVG SELF HELP	\$5,426.00	824	4,471,024.00
NEED 3	\$8,745.00		7,205,880.00
Fourth Year	Average \$	# Aided	TOTAL \$
Cost of Attendance	\$22,031.19	907	19,982,289.00
Parent Contribution	\$4,820.00		4,371,740.00
Student Contribution	\$1,917.00		1,738,719.00
NEED 1	\$15,294.19		13,871,830.00
Outside Grants	\$1,149.00		1,042,143.00
NEED 2	\$14,145.19		12,829,687.00
AVG SELF HELP	\$5,444.00	907	4,937,708.00
NEED 3	\$8,701.19		7,891,979.00
Fifth Year	Average \$	# Aided	TOTAL \$
Cost of Attendance	\$18,467.12	97	1,791,311.00
Parent Contribution	\$3,215.00		311,855.00
Student Contribution	\$1,554.00		150,738.00
NEED 1	\$13,698.12		1,328,718.00
Outside Grants	\$830.00		80,510.00
NEED 2	\$12,868.12		1,248,208.00
AVG SELF HELP	\$4,661.00	97	452,117.00
NEED 3	\$8,207.12		796,091.00
TOTAL NEED 3			31,751,964.00
TOTAL SEOG FUNDING			2,539,101.00
OTHER GRANTS			250,000.00
TOTAL ENDOWMENT			1,727,000.00
UNMET NEED			304,000.00
NET NEED			26,931,863.00
TOTAL UNRESTRICTED AID BUDGET			28,475,000.00
UNRESTRICTED AID BUDGET OTHER			2,086,057.00
UNRESTRICTED AID BUDGET LESS OTHER			26,388,943.00
DIFFERENCE			(542,920.00)

Impact on Admissions

The modelling subcommittee raises several questions concerning the impact of the second scenario, especially possibility c, on the student mix and the University community in general. These are being considered in detail by the subcommittee on the student mix, and consequently, are not repeated here. It is noted, however, that the subcommittee expects that any departure from the NBA policy would be received very negatively by the University community.

II. Subcommittee on the Demographic Impact of a Need-Conscious Admissions Policy

The subcommittee has studied an exercise undertaken by Christoph Guttentag, Director of Planning in the Admissions Office, to assess the impact on undergraduate demographic diversity of the hypothetical adoption of an admissions policy that would be partially need-conscious. The exercise addressed a rank-ordered list of applicants to the four undergraduate schools in the 1989-1990 admissions cycle, and specifically identified

- 1) the population, admitted under a need-blind policy, that would have been denied admission under a policy that was partially need conscious, and
- 2) the population denied admission in 1989-1990 that would have been admitted to replace population 1.

Comparison of the two populations so identified yielded the following conclusions:

1. Adoption of even a partially need-conscious admissions policy will reverse in one stroke the 15-year campaign undertaken by the admissions office to diversify the undergraduate student population at the University of Pennsylvania, unless such a policy is micro-managed to avert its predictable adverse impact on that diversity.

2. The substituted cohort (population 2) is drawn largely from a small number of our largest feeder schools. One effect of a need-conscious admissions policy on college counselors in those schools would be to lower their perceptions of Penn's selectivity.

3. The cohort rejected (population 1) comes primarily from the less typical schools on the eastern seaboard.

4. The combination of effects 2 and 3 would lead to a loss of diversity in demographic categories that are less obvious than those constituencies identified by the admissions office as recruitment priorities.

5. A single standard for identifying aided students to be denied admission would affect each school differently. Consequently, a need-conscious admission policy would have to be formulated for each school based on each school's enrollment target and applicant pool.

6. The impact on public perception of adoption of a need-conscious admissions policy, however small the program may be at the outset, would in all probability damage our reputation far out of proportion to the size of the population admitted under need-conscious conditions. The impression, already widely held, that Penn caters to a moneyed elite would be confirmed in the minds of many.

7. The substituted students (population 2) would probably figure out who they were. Would they then think of themselves as second-class citizens, or as a moneyed elite? Would they feel entitled to better "service" from the institution?

8. As the existence of a need-conscious admissions policy became public knowledge, applicants would begin to attempt to manipulate the system to their advantage. Some would apply without requesting aid, hoping to gain admission as part of population 2. They would then expend limited family resources for the first year, and submit credible financial-aid applications in subsequent years. Others admitted from population 2 would experience real financial reverses after admission, and request financial aid in subsequent years. Would the students from population 2 be so identified for their entire undergraduate careers?

We recognize the limitations of the single exercise we have studied. We understand that the admissions office will repeat the exercise for other admissions cycles, and will incorporate in the exercise a range of assumptions with respect to yield from population 2. We await the results of those additional illustrations. We also acknowledge that we have probably only begun to identify predictable and potential adverse consequences of adoption of even a partially need-conscious admissions policy.

However, based on our current analysis, the members of the subcommittee feel that the limited financial benefit that would accrue from adoption of a need-conscious admissions policy would not compensate the institution for the subtle, but broad and lasting, adverse impact of such a policy on the demographic diversity and egalitarian spirit that today characterize the

undergraduate student body at the University of Pennsylvania. We urge the University administration to explore other means of addressing projected budgetary shortfalls before taking what appears to be the irreversible step of altering our present need-blind admissions policy.

III. Recommendations on Methods of Increasing Endowment Designated for Need-Blind Admissions

The University's contribution to undergraduate financial aid is comprised of income from the restricted endowment for financial aid plus sufficient unrestricted funds from the annual operating budget to meet the requirements of our need-blind admissions policy. Currently, the University of Pennsylvania provides 94% of its institutional undergraduate financial aid from unrestricted funds, with only 6% coming from restricted endowment funds. As noted by the Provost's Working Group on Undergraduate Education in the report *Planning for the Twenty-First Century (Almanac Supplement, December 5, 1989)*, this low level of financial aid endowment is in marked contrast to the situation at most of our peer institutions. In 1990-91, only 6% of institutional aid was derived from endowment marked for undergraduate financial aid while the proportion of other institutions in the Ivy group ranged from 22 to 93%. Thus, Penn has the highest percentage of institutional grants for undergraduate aid funded from unrestricted sources of all Ivy League universities, and nearly the highest of the universities in the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE). It is clear that, as noted in the 1989 report, Penn's financial aid budget is severely underendowed. We have therefore reviewed the activities of the Development office that are targeted toward generating increased revenue for undergraduate aid from endowment funds.

The Campaign for Penn has set a goal of raising \$50 million for undergraduate financial aid. As of February 1992 the Campaign had received pledges totalling \$34.8, with \$20.4 million in hand. \$4.3 million of these funds may be used for either graduate or undergraduate aid; the remainder is restricted to undergraduate aid. While the subcommittee was pleased with the high priority that the Development Office has assigned to fund raising for this goal, we offer several recommendations:

- 1) In addition to its goal for the Campaign for Penn, the University should aim for a longer-term goal of generating \$150 million of endowment for undergraduate financial aid within the next five years.
- 2) The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid should meet annually with the Vice President for Development to discuss this goal and the progress being made to achieve it.

The best protection for Penn's need-blind admissions policy would be sufficient assets in Penn's endowment to completely fund our annual institutional costs for financial aid without drawing on unrestricted funds. Analysis of our current institutional expenditures for undergraduate financial aid indicates that this would require a restricted endowment of approximately \$600 million, which would ensure a diverse student body of high academic quality.

IV. Communication and Impact of Need-Blind Admissions Policy

The subcommittee focused on the communication of the University's need-blind admissions policy in the context of the perceptions held by prospective students, and parents, on the structure and amount of available financial aid.

Though it is virtually impossible to measure accurately the perceptions held by families in different income groups regarding federal budget cuts and the availability of financial aid, figures provided by the American Council on Education demonstrated significant decreases (in constant dollars) over the twelve year period, 1980-1992, with a concomitant shift toward loan programs (and the prospect of a larger debt after graduation). In addition, while the overall amount for Pell Grants increased by 31% in constant dollars, the maximum award per student fell by 22% and could not keep pace with increases in tuition at Penn.

As both federal and state grants have been cut over those twelve years (by 8%—but by much more in constant dollars), tuition and other expenses have increased by over 150%. To keep pace, both the University itself and students and their families have been pressed to make larger contributions to the students' education.

With the limited data available to us, we cannot measure accurately at this point the impact of federal budget cuts or increased university costs. Preliminary data from the financial aid office suggests that the distribution of income among families of aided students was evenly distributed across

income levels in 1979. By 1987, however, the distribution of income levels had become skewed toward higher income families. This trend reflects decreasing diversity of family income level among aided students at Penn, and should be investigated further and more thoroughly, especially for the years 1987-1992.

There are a number of different variables which may have contributed to this:

- 1) students not applying to Penn because they believe aid is unavailable or inadequate
- 2) an underpublicized need-blind admissions policy
- 3) a higher correlation between income level and better college preparation
- 4) the decision by students and their families that the aid package offered does not meet their needs
- 5) a trend from single wage-earner to two wage-earner families in the matriculating pool
- 6) stronger recruitment by the University on the national level among upper-income applicant pools and feeder schools
- 7) a change in admissions policy concerning the desired economic make-up of each entering class.

We are quick to point out that the trend is not reflected in decreasing minority matriculation. Furthermore, we cannot truly apportion the impact each factor has had, and such measurement may prove difficult to obtain. Because the data suggest shifts in income distribution during the past decade which may already be more significant than possible future scenarios outlined in this report, it is important to study this trend more carefully. This committee in the future should look at income levels of the applicant pool (and levels relative to the society in general), income levels of matriculating students relative to accepted students, and student yield levels relative to amount of self-help requirements. Studies should be carried out to gauge the effects from 1979 to 1992, covering the Carter, Reagan, and Bush administrations. Furthermore, as COFHE data suggests that trends in enrollment and income diversity may not have been replicated at all other COFHE institutions, it should be investigated to what extent Penn has been divergent (if indeed it has) from peer institutions in its ability to maintain income diversity and financial aid availability.

Overall, the University presents its need-blind admission policy clearly in admission and financial aid materials. (Also, promotion of the policy appears to be achieved in a satisfactory manner through oral presentations made during the college recruitment process). The message that "Penn is affordable" appears to be a refrain that is as important to the admissions staff as it is to prospective students. Written materials could promote the policy more visibly, by, for example, emphasizing the policy in the admissions application booklet before the reader reaches the admissions and financial aid forms. Students and families may also wonder about sentences such as, "Penn meets full financial need, as determined by the Office of Student Financial Services," but again, there is no way to accurately measure the perception of such a statement. It might be desirable for the written materials to feature information on need-blind admissions more prominently and clearly, but for various budgetary reasons this may not be feasible at the current time.

Recommendations on Communication

We recommend that the University better publicize its need-blind admissions policy, and produce materials for potential applicants in which the efforts of the University to counterbalance federal student aid cuts are also publicized. Recruitment efforts nationally should include and be sensitive to a more even distribution of income. But we recognize that the University would in all likelihood not be able to meet the demand if this attempt were successful. At current costs, it is probably impossible for the student body to return even to its 1979 level of financial aid distribution without either a) a serious increase in the restricted endowment for financial aid or b) a serious redistribution of the University's overall budget, with more money appropriated for undergraduate student financial aid. The restoration of federal aid for students—both graduate and undergraduate—would be a desirable solution and a cause for which the University's lobbyists could well work in Washington.

It also appears clear that a need-blind admissions policy does not necessarily guarantee economic diversity on campus. As the distribution of financial aid among different income levels appears to have shifted during the 1980s, it would be important to see if this trend has continued to 1992, and to understand if and how this change took place, and how it can be reversed.

(continued next page)

V. Impact of Need-Blind Policy on International Student Recruitment

Currently, seven percent of undergraduates are international students, defined as those students whose legal residence is outside of the United States.* The number of foreign students has increased more than 50 percent since five years ago when international students constituted four percent of undergraduates. During the 1991-92 school year, foreign students constituted 11 percent of the freshman class. Within the next few years, international students will comprise at least 10 percent of Penn's undergraduate student body.

For the purpose of consideration for financial aid, certain distinctions within the category of "international students" exist. Canadian and Mexican citizens, as well as U.S. citizens living abroad, are admitted Need-Blind and considered along with the domestic applicant pool. All other non-U.S. citizens who are not permanent U.S. residents applying for financial assistance are not admitted Need-Blind.** These students are informed that the standards for admittance are substantially more rigorous for foreign financial aid applicants, and candidates who can pay their expenses are therefore urged not to apply for University-sponsored financial assistance. The foreign students who do not apply for aid are considered along with the domestic applicant pool and are not subject to stricter standards of admission. A foreign student (excluding Canadians and Mexicans) who chooses to apply for financial aid will not be admitted if the University can not fully meet the student's financial need, even if the student would otherwise qualify for admittance to the University.

The subcommittee notes that a large difference in admit rates exists between international students applying for financial aid and those who do not. In 1991, 35.5% of all international student applicants were admitted to Penn, whereas only 9.4% of the foreign financial aid applicants who were considered for admission on a Need-Conscious basis were admitted. According to the admissions office, the foreign aid applicants who are not accepted comprise the most qualified pool of non-admitted students and are, on average, extremely qualified candidates for admission. The lack of funds available for foreign students directly results in a population of extremely qualified applicants that are effectively denied any chance of attending the University.

* Foreign citizens who are bona fide permanent residents of the United States are not considered international students. Whereas for statistical purposes, U.S. citizens permanently living abroad are technically considered international students.

** The University also has one special aid award reserved for a Black South African student.

† It is estimated that the average University grant awarded to a foreign student (available figures include Canadian students who are admitted need blind; excluding them would make the amount greater) for the class of '95 was \$12,619. If forty such students entered the University during a given academic year, the total amount of required funding would be approximately \$505,000. If forty students are in every class, the figure needed each year (assuming determined need does not increase) is roughly 2 million dollars. The working capital of endowment is about 5%, which would require an endowment of 40 million dollars in order to fund 40 foreign students a year for four years. Recognizing that this is a huge sum of money, it is probably unrealistic to expect such an endowment in the foreseeable future. Nonetheless, the subcommittee feels that actions should be taken to move as quickly as possible in this direction. If the University is to succeed in its extensive efforts of globalization currently underway, a sustained commitment to diverse international undergraduate student representation is both appropriate and essential.

Though the current lack of resources may prohibit this fact from changing in the short run, the subcommittee urges that attention be paid to increasing the financial resources available for foreign students in the long term. Specifically, the development office should increase its attempts to secure endowments dedicated to this end.† International alumni, foreign firms operating within the United States, particularly within the Philadelphia region, and American multinational corporations, should be specifically targeted. The subcommittee feels that increasing the number of highly qualified foreign students who would be unable to attend the University without financial assistance is a priority of its own and therefore deserves unique attention and separate funding.

There is currently a perception that while Penn has international student representation from an impressive list of countries around the world, it is only the wealthy elite of these countries that attend the University. Considering the fact that out of the 257 undergraduate international student matriculants in 1991, only 26 (46 if Canadian and Mexican students who qualify under the need-blind admissions policy are counted) received foreign financial aid, there is definitely a basis for this perception. If Penn students and the University community as a whole are to truly benefit from increased contact with people of diverse backgrounds and nationalities, then students from all socioeconomic levels should be encouraged and able to attend the University of Pennsylvania. Though a greater number of admitted foreign aid applicants does not necessarily translate into an increase in ethnic diversity, as foreign aid applicants tend to be unevenly distributed from certain areas and nations, the increase in economic diversity among the international student population as well as the benefit of high caliber students would be significant.

Chair's Comments

I wish to thank all the members of the committee, together with Dean Willis Stetson, Mr. William Schilling and Mrs. Constance Goodman for their energetic involvement in committee activities throughout the year. It is sincerely hoped that the work of this committee will serve the Council in a positive manner and that appropriate feedback will be forthcoming to allow even more fruitful endeavors by the committee next year.

The work of the subcommittees has been greatly aided by numerous staff of the University that have provided valuable input to the attached reports.

— Peter Wilding, Professor of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine

Members of the Committee:

<i>Chair:</i>	Peter Wilding (Pathology & Laboratory Med./Med)
<i>Co-Chair:</i>	William Westerman (GAS)
<i>Faculty:</i>	Robert F. Giegengack (Geology/SAS) Olga Hasty (Slavic Languages/SAS) Phoebe S. Leboy (Biochemistry/Dent) Warren D. Seider (Chemical Engineering) Robert D. Summers (SAS)
<i>Dean's Representatives:</i>	Kathleen McCauley (Nursing) Carrie Spann (Wharton Undergraduate Division) David P. Pope (Mechanical Engineering)
<i>Administration:</i>	Constance C. Goodman (Secretary to the Committee)
<i>Students:</i>	Keith J. Munera (C '93) Gia Daniller (Wh '93) Margie H. Toy (Wh '94) Rajeev Narang (Wh '93)
<i>Ex Officio:</i>	Frank E. Claus (Associate Vice President/Finance) George Koval (VPUL Representative) William M. Schilling (Director, Student Financial Aid) Willis J. Stetson, Jr. (Dean of Admissions)

Overall International Student Applicants

Year	Apps %	Incr/Decr	Admits	Admit Rate	Matrics	Yield
1991	1251	-0.40%	445	35.50%	257	57.70%
1990	1256	12.80%	424	33.80%	212	50.00%
1989	1113	5.79%	365	32.70%	180	49.30%
1988	1052	3.40%	282	27.00%	140	49.60%
1987	1017	-0.60%	277	27.00%	135	49.00%
1986	1023	-34.20%	304	30.00%	156	51.00%
1985	762	41.60%	235	31.00%	130	55.00%
1984	538	-0.50%	198	37.00%	102	52.00%
1983	541	1.80%	159	29.00%	91	57.00%
1982	531	=21.7%	110	21.00%	41	37.00%

Foreign Financial Aid Applicants

Year	Apps	Admits	Admit Rate	Matrics	Yield
1991	508 (579)*	48 (83)*	9.4% (14.3%)*	26 (46)*	54.2% (55.4%)
1990	529 (582)*	47 (87)*	8.8% (14.9%)*	20 (49)*	42.5% (56.3%)
1989	459 (509)*	52 (81)*	11.3% (15.9%)*	21 (36)*	40.3% (44.4%)
1988	417 (461)*	35 (52)*	8.0% (11.2%)*	19 (27)*	54.0% (51.9%)
1987	421 (479)*	34 (65)*	8.0% (13.5%)*	16 (29)*	47.0% (44.6%)
1986	444	32	7.2%	16	50.0%
1985	331	40	12.0%	20	50.0%
1984	127	21	16.5%	9	42.9%
1983	127	15	11.6%	7	46.6%
1982	—	9	—	3	33.3%
1981	—	6	—	2	33.3%

* Includes Mexican, Canadian and Black South African candidates.