



Undergraduate Student Government

General Assembly Resolution R. 26-01

Authors: Representative Andrew Thompson, President Brian Ward

Co-Sponsor: Vice President Prince Ghosh

Presented: October 11th, 2016

Passed: October 11th, 2016

A Call for Accountability in the Admissions Policy and Increased Financial Transparency

Whereas, The University has expressed serious interest in increasing the diversity, particularly socioeconomic diversity, of the student body, and to do so has decided to meet the full need of all students who matriculate to the University;

Whereas, The University has stated that in order to follow through with this policy of meeting the full need of all applicants, it must either raise an additional \$15 to \$20 million per year in financial aid or become “Need Aware” for a small part of the domestic, non-waitlist applicants, taking into account the financial circumstances of applicants when making an admissions decision;

Whereas, Thus far, the University has often characterized socioeconomic diversity by the number of Pell Grant recipients;

Whereas, An increase in the number of Pell Grant recipients would likely require a reduction in students whose family income is slightly greater than Pell Grant eligibility but still quite low, given the majority of money from the Pell Grant program goes to students whose families make less \$20,000 a year;

Whereas, Students whose family income is too high for them to receive a Pell Grant contribute to the socioeconomic diversity of the institution;

Whereas, The University has not made any concrete, public commitments to release statistics other than Pell Grant eligibility, such as the income brackets of admitted and matriculated students, which would be critical for understanding socioeconomic diversity beyond just Pell Grant recipients;



Undergraduate Student Government

Whereas, The University has not made a concrete, public commitment to reverse the new admissions policy if there is not a substantial increase in diversity, and has not publicly stated any diversity goals by which this policy change could be considered a success;

Whereas, In Resolution R25-06 the USG requested that prior to implementation of any policies that could noticeably impact undergraduate students, the appropriate non-student entities shall diligently and earnestly consider all recommendations put forth by all undergraduate students and student groups, including the Undergraduate Student Government

Whereas, A lack of financial transparency makes it unclear as to just how challenging it would be to reapportion the \$15 to \$20 million such that the University could remain need blind;

Whereas, This resolution, in large part, seeks to solidify a variety of commitments made in conversations between administrators and Executive Committee members of the Undergraduate Student Government and the Undergraduate Diversity Collaborative;

Whereas, Peer institutions have compiled and released statistics outlining the overall socioeconomic diversity of their universities (see Appendix A);

Be it resolved by the Undergraduate Student Government, acting in full session:

- I. That the University ought to make, in writing, a public commitment to release expanded statistics regarding:
 - a. The incomes of families of recent past classes, beyond just the number of Pell Grant recipients (see Appendix A).
 - b. The incomes of families of future students, beyond just the number of Pell Grant recipients (see Appendix A).
- II. That the University ought to make, in writing, a public commitment to:
 - a. Assess the results of the new admissions policy following the matriculation of the Class of 2022, present a status update to the Undergraduate Student Government, and report the findings to the Case Western Reserve University community.
 - b. Allow the Undergraduate Student Government to appoint no fewer than two students to any committee assembled to discuss the outcomes of changes to the admissions policy.
 - c. Revise the admissions policy if socioeconomic and racial diversity does not improve.
- III. That the University ought to make, in writing, a public commitment to increase financial transparency by releasing more detail into the breakdown of expenses, specifically in



Undergraduate Student Government

categories of high expenditure without direct student benefit, such that it is clear that moving \$15 to \$20 million to financial aid would be unfeasible (see Appendix B).

- IV. That the University ought to make, in writing, a public commitment to continue to release yearly estimates on the cost of meeting full need while also having a need blind admissions policy, and the University should release and regularly update a timetable for meeting this ultimate goal.
- V. That this resolution be sent, in its entirety, to:
 - a. Barbara Snyder, President of Case Western Reserve University
 - b. Case Western Reserve University Board of Trustees
 - c. Richard Bischoff, Vice President for Enrollment
 - d. William Baeslack III, Provost and Executive Vice President
 - e. Robert McCullough, Director of Undergraduate Admission
 - f. Jonathan Carlson, Vice President for Financial Planning
 - g. Marilyn Mobley, Vice President for Inclusion, Diversity, and Equal Opportunity
 - h. Naomi Sigg, Director, Office of Multicultural Affairs
 - i. Venus Puliafico, Director of University Financial Aid
 - j. Louis Stark, Vice President for Student Affairs



Undergraduate Student Government

Appendix A

The Undergraduate Student Government resolves that the administration ought to provide expanded statistics that paint a more robust picture of socioeconomic diversity at the University. Specifically, USG is seeking the *public release of the income brackets of students receiving need-based aid*. While the release of the income brackets of all students would be best, the release of income brackets of students receiving financial aid represents the vast majority of lower and middle class students, and changes to the number of students in these categories will reveal changes to socioeconomic diversity. Most importantly, *this statistic is identical to those released by peer institutions*, such as Vanderbilt University and New York University. Both of these universities are private institutions, leading research universities, and members of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

Vanderbilt University

The following statistic is available at:

[www.vanderbilt.edu/financialaid/
undergraduate/revealing-numbers.php](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/financialaid/undergraduate/revealing-numbers.php)

**Need-Based Awards to First-Year Vanderbilt Students
2014/15**

Income Range	Median Award	# of Awards	Award Range
\$0 - 39,999	\$61,658	69	\$36,548 - 65,083
\$40,000 - 59,999	\$59,132	90	\$9,263 - 66,138
\$60,000 - 79,999	\$55,711	99	\$27,234 - 63,274
\$80,000 - 99,999	\$53,189	97	\$17,824 - 62,535
\$100,000 - 119,999	\$47,460	88	\$14,736 - 59,070
\$120,000 - 139,999	\$40,906	82	\$14,600 - 55,642
\$140,000 - 159,999	\$38,983	69	\$5,955 - 52,098
\$160,000 - 179,999	\$34,113	42	\$3,729 - 51,466
\$180,000 - 199,999	\$33,903	24	\$7,300 - 46,404
\$200,000 +	\$18,458	65	\$2,824 - 44,367



Undergraduate Student Government

New York University

The following statistic is available at:

[www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/
ugAdmissions/documents/financial-facts11.pdf](http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/ugAdmissions/documents/financial-facts11.pdf)

Income Distribution for Families of Dependent Undergraduate Students Receiving Need-Based Aid, 2010-2011

Family income	Number of students
Less than \$20,000	1,421
\$20,000-\$40,000	1,597
\$40,000-\$60,000	1,232
\$60,000-\$80,000	1,102
\$80,000-\$100,000	1,050
\$100,000-\$150,000	2,028
More than \$150,000	1,892
Total	10,322



Undergraduate Student Government

Appendix B

The Undergraduate Student Government resolves that the administration ought to increase financial transparency. While the annual Budget Books provide some information about expense and revenue of the University, there remains much about the budget that is not clear to the student body. Two major areas had ought to be addressed:

1) Clearly defining key terms

In the Budget Book, the expenses of the University are broken into two categories, direct and indirect, and subcategories beneath them. While some categories are relatively clear in terms of the type of expenditures included, such as “Library,” others are not, such as “Fringe,” “Non-salary direct expenditures,” “Student Services,” and “University Services.”

2) Offering greater detail within expense areas

In the Budget Book, the subcategories into which expenses are broken lack detail and prevent students from understanding the final destination of money. Beyond just defining terms, it is critical that more specific breakdowns be offered. For example, while defining “Non-salary direct expenditures” is vital, it also important that students are provided with more detail subcategories to account for these funds. While much of this impetus is up to individual colleges and schools, it is critical that the University General budget be more detailed as well, providing an idea of how much money, for example is spent on salaries of university administration.