MASTER INDEX

Jewish Enrollment Research — Combined Workbook

File	Original Sheet Name	Source File	Jump To
CDS — CDS & IPEDS Analysis			
CDS	READ ME FIRST	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_READ ME FIRST
CDS	Enrollment Raw	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Enrollment Raw
CDS	White Share Decline	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_White Share Decline
CDS	Pell & Int'l Growth	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Pell & Int'l Growth
CDS	Pattern Analysis	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Pattern Analysis
CDS	Data Quality	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Data Quality
CDS	Columbia Detail	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Columbia Detail
CDS	Summary Dashboard	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_Summary Dashboard
CDS	IPEDS Financial Aid	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_IPEDS Financial Aid
CDS	IPEDS Intl-Adjusted Aid	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_IPEDS Intl-Adjusted Aid
CDS	IPEDS International Enrollment	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_IPEDS International Enrollm
CDS	IPEDS Geography (State Detail)	CDS_IPEDS_March_12_final_corrected	→ CDS_IPEDS Geography (State Det
C92 — Crimson 1992			
C92	Fig5 Verification	Crimson_1992	→ C92_Fig5 Verification
C92	1992 Full Workthrough	Crimson_1992	→ C92_1992 Full Workthrough
C92	Sensitivity Analysis	Crimson_1992	→ C92_Sensitivity Analysis
C92	Citations	Crimson_1992	→ C92_Citations
C92	Methodology Notes	Crimson_1992	→ C92_Methodology Notes
STK — Stacking Analysis			
STK	READ ME FIRST	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_READ ME FIRST
STK	0. Methodology & Sources	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_0. Methodology & Sources
STK	1. Master Inputs	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_1. Master Inputs
STK	2. Harvard 3-Series	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_2. Harvard 3-Series
STK	3. White Decomposition	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_3. White Decomposition
STK	4. Jewish Decline Analysis	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_4. Jewish Decline Analysis
STK	5. Source Quality Matrix	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_5. Source Quality Matrix
STK	6. Implications Summary	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_6. Implications Summary
STK	7. Stacking Composite (v7)	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_7. Stacking Composite (v7)
STK	8. Princeton Deep-Dive	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_8. Princeton Deep-Dive
STK	9. Nine-School Diversification	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_9. Nine-School Diversificat
STK	10. Excluded Variables	Stacking_Analysis_March_12_final_CORRECT	→ STK_10. Excluded Variables
CSB — Crimson Selection Bias Analysis			
CSB	Overview	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Overview
CSB	Harvard Trend	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Harvard Trend
CSB	Ivy League Comparison	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Ivy League Comparison
CSB	Bias Caveat Framework	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Bias Caveat Framework
CSB	Chart Data	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Chart Data
CSB	Statistical Validation	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Statistical Validation
CSB	Race Bias Analysis	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Race Bias Analysis
CSB	Geo Bias Analysis	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Geo Bias Analysis
CSB	Jewish Bias Adjustment	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Jewish Bias Adjustment
CSB	Audit Log	Crimson_Selection_Bias_Analysis_March_7	→ CSB_Audit Log
H99 — Hillel 1999 Print Edition			
H99	1999 Hillel Print Data	Hillel_1999_Print_Edition	→ H99_1999 Hillel Print Data
H99	Source & Methodology	Hillel_1999_Print_Edition	→ H99_Source & Methodology
H99	Suggested Document Changes	Hillel_1999_Print_Edition	→ H99_Suggested Document Change
HCG — Hillel College Guide (Audited)			
HCG	Audit & Corrections	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Audit & Corrections
HCG	Summary	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Summary
HCG	Harvard	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Harvard
HCG	Yale	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Yale
HCG	Princeton	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Princeton
HCG	Penn	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Penn
HCG	Columbia	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Columbia
HCG	Cornell	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Cornell
HCG	Brown	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Brown
HCG	Dartmouth	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Dartmouth
HCG	Stanford	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Stanford
HCG	Transitions	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Transitions
HCG	Methodology	hillel_college_guide_data_audited_March_6	→ HCG_Methodology
JER — Jewish Enrollment Data Repository			
JER	Data Repository	jewish_enrollment_data_repository_March_7	→ JER_Data Repository
JER	Legend & Notes	jewish_enrollment_data_repository_March_7	→ JER_Legend & Notes
PJE — Princeton Jewish Enrollment			
PJE	DP Senior Surveys	Princeton_Jewish_Enrollment_Final	→ PJE_DP Senior Surveys
PJE	All Sources	Princeton_Jewish_Enrollment_Final	→ PJE_All Sources
HCF — Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey			
HCF	Data Completeness	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Data Completeness
HCF	Ethnicity	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Ethnicity
HCF	Recruited Athlete	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Recruited Athlete
HCF	Family Income	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Family Income
HCF	Secondary School	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Secondary School
HCF	Legacy	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Legacy
HCF	First Generation	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_First Generation
HCF	Key Trends Summary	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Key Trends Summary
HCF	Financial Aid	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Financial Aid
HCF	Athlete Income	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Athlete Income
HCF	Legacy by Community	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Legacy by Community
HCF	Legacy by Income	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Legacy by Income
HCF	Legacy by Secondary School	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Legacy by Secondary School
HCF	Places of Origin - Region	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Places of Origin - Region
HCF	Admissions - Top Choice	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Admissions - Top Choice
HCF	Admissions - Early Action	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Admissions - Early Action
HCF	Racial Identity in Essays	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Racial Identity in Essays
HCF	Religion	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Religion
HCF	Religiosity	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Religiosity
HCF	Athlete Ethnicity	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Athlete Ethnicity
HCF	Politics by Religion	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_Politics by Religion
HCF	First Gen Ethnicity	harvard_crimson_freshman_survey_Feb_23_9F	→ HCF_First Gen Ethnicity
YAL — Yale Chaplain Religious Diversity			
YAL	All Categories	yale_chaplain_religious_diversity	→ YAL_All Categories
YAL	Jewish — Longitudinal	yale_chaplain_religious_diversity	→ YAL_Jewish — Longitudinal
YAL	Methodology Notes	yale_chaplain_religious_diversity	→ YAL_Methodology Notes

CDS & IPEDS Analysis

CDS / IPEDS ENROLLMENT DATA — READ ME FIRST

Last audited: March 12, 2026 | Prepared by: HJAA / Adrian Ashkenazy | AI-assisted audit: Claude (Anthropic)

1. WHAT THIS FILE IS

This file contains undergraduate enrollment counts by race/ethnicity for nine elite universities, drawn from Common Data Set (CDS) Section B2 and IPEDS. It is the PRIMARY DATA SOURCE for the HJAA report 'A Narrowing Gate: Jewish Enrollment at Harvard and Its Peers, 2004–2025.' It feeds the Pattern Analysis sheet and cross-checks against the companion Stacking Analysis file. It does NOT directly feed the appendix tables in the Word document — those use a separate dataset (see Section 3).

2. SHEET GUIDE

Enrollment Raw	Master count table. Baseline vs 2024-25 for all 9 schools. ALL percentage columns are formulas — never hardcode.
White Share Decline	Computed White% deltas. Feeds Pattern Analysis Finding 1.
Pell & Int'l Growth	IPEDS-sourced Pell and international enrollment trends. Independent of CDS B2 corrections.
Pattern Analysis	Four findings summarizing cross-institutional patterns. Text updated March 12, 2026.
Data Quality	Flags, source confidence ratings, known data gaps.
Columbia Detail	Columbia uses IPEDS degree-seeking UG (CC+SEAS+GS), NOT CDS B2. See Section 5.
Summary Dashboard	High-level summary for non-technical readers.
IPEDS Financial Aid	Pell grant recipient rates. Source: IPEDS SFA survey. Independent of CDS B2.
IPEDS Intl-Adjusted Aid	Financial aid adjusted for international student exclusions.
IPEDS International Enrollment	International student counts. Source: IPEDS EF first-time UG. FULLY INDEPENDENT of CDS B2 — corrections to CDS B2 counts do NOT cascade here.
IPEDS Geography	State-of-origin enrollment data.

3. CRITICAL: TWO-DATASET ARCHITECTURE — WHY DELTAS DIFFER FROM THE APPENDIX TABLES

There are TWO separate datasets in this project. They produce INTENTIONALLY DIFFERENT deltas. DO NOT attempt to reconcile them by changing either file.

DATASET A (this file — Enrollment Raw sheet):
- Column used: CDS B2 RIGHTMOST column = Total Undergraduates (degree + non-degree seeking)
- Baseline years: Harvard/Yale/Brown/Cornell/Dartmouth = 2014-15 | Penn = 2015-16 | Stanford = 2014-15 | Princeton = 2014-15 | Columbia = IPEDS Fall 2013
- Used for: Pattern Analysis, Stacking Analysis cross-checks, White% decline calculations

DATASET B (Appendix tables C.2, C.4–C.13 in Appendices Word document):
- Column used: CDS B2 MIDDLE column = Degree-Seeking Undergraduates only
- Baseline years: Harvard/Yale/Brown/Cornell/Stanford/Columbia = 2013-14 | Penn = 2015-16 | Dartmouth = 2014-15
- Used for: All appendix school-by-school tables

RESULT: Deltas will differ by 0.3–0.9 percentage points between the two datasets. This is expected, correct, and disclosed in a footnote on Appendix C.2.

4. BASELINE YEARS AND DATA ROWS (Enrollment Raw sheet)

School	Baseline Year	Row (base)	Row (2024-25)	Source	Notes
Harvard	2014-15	6	7	CDS B2 total UG — Harvard OIR	
Yale	2014-15	13	14	CDS B2 total UG — Yale OIR	
Princeton	2014-15	18	19	CDS B2 total UG — Princeton IR	Row 17 = 2001-02 (Chaplain-matched historical baseline, not used for main deltas)
Penn	2015-16	22	23	CDS B2 total UG — Penn IR	One year later than most peers — Penn joined the CDS later
Columbia	Fall 2013	26	27	IPEDS EF degree-seeking UG	Does NOT use CDS B2. See Columbia Detail sheet.
Dartmouth	2014-15	30	31	CDS B2 total UG — Dartmouth IR	
Brown	2014-15	34	35	CDS B2 total UG — Brown OIR	
Cornell	2014-15	38	39	CDS B2 total UG — Cornell IR	
Stanford	2014-15	42	43	CDS B2 total UG — Stanford IR	Appendix C.13 uses 2013-14 separately. This file uses 2014-15. Asian=1,332 for both years.

5. COLUMN DEFINITIONS (Enrollment Raw sheet)

Col B	Year label
Col C	Total UG (degree-seeking + non-degree-seeking) — CDS B2 rightmost column
Col D	White count
Col E	White % — FORMULA =D/C. Never hardcode.
Col F	Asian count
Col G	Asian % — FORMULA =F/C. Never hardcode.
Col H	Hispanic count
Col I	Hispanic % — FORMULA
Col J	Black count
Col K	Black % — FORMULA
Col L	International / Non-Resident Alien (NRA) count
Col M	International % — FORMULA
Col N	Two or more races count
Col O	Two+ % — FORMULA
Col P	Unknown / unreported count
Col Q	Unknown % — FORMULA

6. CORRECTION LOG — March 12, 2026 (21 cells corrected)

All baseline minority counts verified against primary source CDS B2 PDFs downloaded from each university's IR office. White counts, Total UG counts, and International counts were confirmed correct — zero changes. The following counts were corrected:

School	Category	Old Value	New Value	Source confirmed
Harvard	Asian	~1,200s	1,246	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Harvard OIR
Harvard	Hispanic	~600s	657	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Harvard OIR
Harvard	Black	~430s	463	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Harvard OIR
Yale	Hispanic	~540s	602	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Yale OIR
Yale	Black	~340s	371	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Yale OIR
Yale	Two+	~300s	326	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Yale OIR
Yale	Unknown	~110s	89	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Yale OIR
Princeton	Asian	~1,050s	1,097	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Princeton IR
Princeton	Hispanic	~400s	440	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Princeton IR
Princeton	Black	~380s	406	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Princeton IR
Penn	Asian	1,913	1,959	CDS 2015-16 B2 PDF — Penn IR
Penn	Hispanic	1,008	998	CDS 2015-16 B2 PDF — Penn IR
Penn	Black	693	688	CDS 2015-16 B2 PDF — Penn IR
Penn	Two+	373	405	CDS 2015-16 B2 PDF — Penn IR
Penn	Unknown	288	281	CDS 2015-16 B2 PDF — Penn IR
Brown	Asian	~800s	840	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Brown OIR
Brown	Hispanic	~690s	724	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Brown OIR
Brown	Black	~400s	422	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Brown OIR
Cornell	Asian	~2,340	2,470	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Cornell IR
Cornell	Hispanic	~1,600s	1,669	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Cornell IR
Cornell	Black	~840s	859	CDS 2014-15 B2 PDF — Cornell IR

7. CONFIRMED UNCHANGED — DO NOT ALTER

The following were explicitly audited and confirmed correct — zero changes made or needed:
- All White counts (every school, every year)
- All Total UG counts (Col C, every school, every year)
- All International / NRA counts (Col L, every school, every year)
- IPEDS International Enrollment sheet — fully independent of CDS B2; not affected by any CDS corrections
- IPEDS Pell / Financial Aid sheets — fully independent of CDS B2
- Columbia data — sourced from IPEDS EF, not CDS B2; not affected by CDS corrections
- Stanford Asian count (1,332) — confirmed correct for both 2013-14 and 2014-15

8. INTERNATIONAL DATA — FULLY INDEPENDENT OF CDS B2

International enrollment figures used in the narrative (+4.3pp Harvard, +6.4pp Dartmouth, +6.5pp Stanford) come from the IPEDS International Enrollment sheet, which uses IPEDS EF first-time UG survey data. These are completely separate from CDS B2. The CDS B2 corrections in Section 6 above do NOT affect any international figures anywhere in the report. Source attribution: 'IPEDS international enrollment survey, first-time undergraduates.'

9. KEY FIGURES QUICK REFERENCE (post-correction)

School	Baseline Yr	Base Asian%	2024-25 Asian%	Δ Asian pp	White Δ pp
Harvard	2014-15	18.8%	23.6%	+4.8	-13.9
Yale	2014-15	16.5%	21.9%	+5.4	-15.9
Princeton	2014-15	20.9%	23.5%	+2.6	-12.3
Penn	2015-16	20.1%	29.6%	+9.5	-18.0
Columbia	Fall 2013	16.8%	18.7%	+1.9	-10.0
Dartmouth	2014-15	14.1%	13.1%	-1.0	-3.9
Brown	2014-15	12.8%	22.9%	+10.0	-10.0
Cornell	2014-15	17.2%	26.8%	+9.6	-10.9
Stanford	2014-15	19.0%	28.7%	+9.7	-14.5

Pearson r (Asian Δ vs Jewish enrollment % change, n=9, raw counts): r = +0.274, p = 0.48. Direction POSITIVE — opposite of displacement hypothesis. Not statistically significant. See companion Stacking Analysis file Sheet 10 for full methodology.

10. WARNINGS — READ BEFORE EDITING

⚠ **NEVER hardcode percentage cells. All % cells are formulas (count ÷ Total UG). Hardcoding breaks the audit trail.**

⚠ **NEVER change Total UG or White counts — these were confirmed correct from primary sources.**

⚠ **NEVER try to reconcile this file's deltas with the appendix tables. They use different columns and different baseline years. Both are correct.**

⚠ **The Stacking Analysis file (companion) uses its own White% baselines from 2013-14 degree-seeking data. Those are NOT in this file.**

⚠ **Columbia uses IPEDS EF data, not CDS B2. Do not substitute CDS figures for Columbia.**

⚠ **IPEDS International Enrollment sheet is a separate data pipeline. Changes here do not affect it.**

⚠ **If adding new year data, add a new row — never overwrite baseline rows.**

ELITE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY: ~2013 Baseline vs 2024 (9 Schools)

Eight schools use CDS Section B2. Columbia uses IPEDS degree-seeking UG (CC+SEAS+GS). Stanford v13: corrected 2024-25 to degree-seeking UG (was total UG including coterms).

BASELINE YEARS: Harvard 2014-15 total UG (CDS B2 rightmost col) | Yale 2014-15 total UG | Brown 2014-15 total UG | Cornell 2014-15 total UG | Stanford 2014-15 total UG | Penn 2015-16 total UG | Princeton 2001-02 total UG | Dartmouth 2014-15 total UG

AUDIT TRAIL (March 2026): All baseline minority counts (Asian, Hispanic, Black, Two+, Unknown) verified against primary source CDS B2 PDFs. 21 cells corrected March 12, 2026: Harvard Asian/Hisp/

School	Year	Total UG	White	White %	Asian	Asian %	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Black	Black %	Int'l (NRA)	Int'l (NRA) %	Two+	Two+ %	Unknown	Unknown %	Pell %	
Harvard	2014-15	6,636	2,905	*43.8%*	1,246	*18.8%*	657	*9.9%*	463	*7.0%*	755	*11.4%*	403	*6.1%*	216	*3.3%*	*16.5%*	
	2024-25	6,979	2,088	*29.9%*	1,647	*23.6%*	806	*11.5%*	628	*9.0%*	1,048	*15.0%*	542	*7.8%*	185	*2.7%*	*20.0%*	
Δ Harvard				**-13.9%**		**+4.8%**		**+1.6%**		**+2.0%**		**+3.6%**		**+1.7%**		**-0.6%**	**+3.5%**	
Harvard	2015-16	6638	2818	42.5%													★ *MATCHED BASELINE for*	
Δ Harvard (2015-16→2024-25)				-12.53%														
Yale	2014-15	5,477	2,578	*47.1%*	906	*16.5%*	602	*11.0%*	371	*6.8%*	570	*10.4%*	326	*6.0%*	89	*1.6%*	*11.6%*	
	2024-25	6,758	2,110	*31.2%*	1,483	*21.9%*	1,121	*16.6%*	628	*9.3%*	754	*11.2%*	479	*7.1%*	145	*2.1%*	*25.0%*	
Δ Yale				**-15.8%**		**+5.4%**		**+5.6%**		**+2.5%**		**+0.7%**		**+1.1%**		+0.5%	**+13.4%**	
Princeton	*2001-02*	*4613*	*3054*	*0.6620420*							*318*	*0.0689356*						*CDS 2001-*
Princeton	2014-15	5,258	2,417	*46.0%*	1,097	*20.9%*	440	*8.4%*	406	*7.7%*	579	*11.0%*	218	*4.1%*	98	*1.9%*	*18.0%*	
	2024-25	5,709	1,921	*33.6%*	1,339	*23.5%*	574	*10.1%*	499	*8.7%*	721	*12.6%*	411	*7.2%*	232	*4.1%*	*22.0%*	
Δ Princeton				**-12.3%**		**+2.6%**		**+1.7%**		**+1.0%**		**+1.6%**		**+3.1%**		**+2.2%**	**+4.0%**	
Penn	2015-16	9,726	4,255	*43.7%*	1,959	*20.1%*	998	*10.3%*	688	*7.1%*	1,127	*11.6%*	405	*4.2%*	281	*2.9%*	*12.9%*	
	2024-25	10,013	2,583	*25.8%*	2,964	*29.6%*	1,163	*11.6%*	876	*8.7%*	1,327	*13.3%*	537	*5.4%*	546	*5.5%*	*21.0%*	
Δ Penn				**-18.0%**		**+9.5%**		**+1.4%**		**+1.7%**		**+1.7%**		**+1.2%**		**+2.6%**	**+8.1%**	
Columbia	2014	8,100	3,138	*38.7%*	1,362	*16.8%*	1,082	*13.4%*	597	*7.4%*	1,127	*13.9%*	358	*4.4%*	300	*3.7%*	*21.0%*	
Columbia	2024	8,973	2,575	*28.7%*	1,679	*18.7%*	1,381	*15.4%*	674	*7.5%*	1,770	*19.7%*	561	*6.3%*	293	*3.3%*	*23.0%*	
Δ Columbia				**-10.0%**		**1.9%**		**2.0%**		0.1%		**5.8%**		**1.8%**		**-0.4%**	**8.1%**	
Dartmouth	2014-15	4,184	2,010	*48.0%*	588	*14.1%*	341	*8.2%*	284	*6.8%*	343	*8.2%*	209	*5.0%*	313	*7.5%*	*13.0%*	
	2024-25	4,474	1,973	*44.1%*	586	*13.1%*	442	*9.9%*	279	*6.2%*	667	*14.9%*	342	*7.6%*	134	*3.0%*	*19.0%*	
Δ Dartmouth				**-3.9%**		**-1.0%**		**+1.7%**		**-0.6%**		**+6.7%**		**+2.6%**		**-4.5%**	**+6.0%**	
Brown	2014-15	6,548	2,808	*42.9%*	840	*12.8%*	724	*11.1%*	422	*6.4%*	794	*12.1%*	332	*5.1%*	595	*9.1%*	*18.9%*	
	2024-25	7,226	2,379	*32.9%*	1,653	*22.9%*	876	*12.1%*	591	*8.2%*	917	*12.7%*	574	*7.9%*	213	*2.9%*	*13.6%*	
Δ Brown				**-10.0%**		**+10.0%**		**+1.1%**		**+1.7%**		**+0.6%**		**+2.9%**		**-6.1%**	**-5.3%**	
Cornell	2014-15	14,366	6,042	*42.1%*	2,470	*17.2%*	1,669	*11.6%*	859	*6.0%*	1,379	*9.6%*	618	*4.3%*	1,415	*9.8%*	*15.0%*	
	2024-25	15,792	4,915	*31.1%*	4,239	*26.8%*	2,066	*13.1%*	1,068	*6.8%*	1,498	*9.5%*	937	*5.9%*	1,016	*6.4%*	*18.0%*	
Δ Cornell				**-10.9%**		**+9.6%**		**+1.5%**		**+0.8%**		**-0.1%**		**+1.6%**		**-3.4%**	**+3.0%**	
Stanford	2014-15	7,018	2,633	*37.5%*	1,332	*19.0%*	1,178	*16.8%*	440	*6.3%*	575	*8.2%*	753	*10.7%*	39	*0.6%*	*16.0%*	
	2024-25	7554	1737	0.2299444(	2170	0.2872650	1289	0.1706380	560	0.0741329(	965	0.1277468	724	0.0958432(	35	0.0046333(	0.19	
Δ Stanford				-14.52%		9.75%		0.28%		1.14%		4.58%		-1.15%		-0.09%	3.00%	

SOURCES:

Harvard: CDS 2013-14 & 2024-25 B2. Pell: 16.5% (CDS cohort) -> ~20%.

Yale: CDS 2013-14 & 2024-25 B2. Pell: ~11.6% -> ~25%.

Princeton: CDS 2001-02 (CIRP-matched: Total 4613, White 3054, NRA 318) & CDS 2024-25. J/G = 0.107x (CIRP->DP matched). Pell: ~18%->~22%.

Penn: CDS 2015-16 (corrected from 2014-15: Total 9726, White 4255, NRA 1127) & 2024-25. Pell: 12.9%->~21%. J/G = 0.68x.

Columbia: IPEDS EF2013A_RV (Fall 2013) & EF2024A (Fall 2024), DEGREE-SEEKING UG only. Total: 7,970 → 8,973 (IPEDS confirmed 2-18-2026). Pell: 21% (SFA1314) → 23% (SFA2324). 2013 degree-seeking = all-students (GS included). 2024 degree-seeking differs from all-students or

Dartmouth: CDS 2014-15 & 2024-25 B2. Pell: ~13% -> ~19%. 'Unknown' fell 7.5%->3.0%.

Brown: CDS 2013-14 & 2024-25 B2. Pell: 18.9% -> 13.6% (DECLINED). 'Unknown' fell 9.6%->2.9%.

Cornell: CDS 2013-14 & 2024-25 v6 B2, DEGREE-SEEKING UG only. Total: 14,309 → 15,792. Pell: 15.0% → ~17-20%. 2024 corrected from total UG (16,128) to degree-seeking (15,792) per B2 form fields.

Stanford: CDS 2014-15 & 2024-25 B2. Appendix C.13 uses 2013-14 degree-seeking baseline separately to match Hillel source year (March 2014 guide). 2013-14: Total 6,980 | White 2,584 (37.02%) | Asian 1,332 | Hispanic 1,178 | Black 440 | NRA 565 (8.09%) | Two+ 753 | Unknown 39. Source: Stanford CI

Stanford: CDS 2014-15 & 2024-25 B2. Appendix C.13 uses 2013-14 degree-seeking baseline separately to match Hillel source year (March 2014 guide). 2013-14: Total 6,980 | White 2,584 (37.02%) | Asian 1,332 | Hispanic 1,178 | Black 440 | NRA 565 (8.09%) | Two+ 753 | Unknown 39. Source: Stanford CI

2013-14 WHITE % BASELINES — YALE, CORNELL, BROWN (stacking model source addendum — added March 2026)

The companion Stacking Analysis file uses AY 2013-14 White% baselines for Yale, Cornell, and Brown (one

School	CDS Year	White % (raw)	White % (domestic-adj)	Notes / Source
Yale	2013-14	0.4734	~52.5% (e	Raw White% from Yale CDS
Cornell	2013-14	0.4268	~46.5% (e	Raw White% from Cornell
Brown	2013-14	0.4327	~48.8% (e	Raw White% from Brown

RECONCILIATION NOTE: The stacking file's documented 0.3–2.4pp gap between these

WHITE SHARE DECLINE: ~2013 Baseline to 2024 (9 Schools, sorted by magnitude)

Eight schools use CDS B2. Columbia uses IPEDS (CC+SEAS+GS). Jewish estimates from Hillel/surveys.

School	Source	Baseline	White % Base	White % 2024	D pp	Rel. Decline	Jewish Base	Jewish Now	
Penn	CDS B2	2015-16	43.7%	25.8%	**-18.0%**	**-41.0%**	ndeis CMJS	% (Hillel 2025)	
Yale	CDS B2	2013-14	47.1%	31.2%	**-15.8%**	**-33.7%**	~23%	~10-12%	
Harvard	CDS B2	2013-14	43.8%	29.9%	**-13.9%**	**-31.7%**	~25%	~7%	
Harvard (J/G matched)	CDS B2	2015-16	42.5%	29.9%	-12.53%	-29.525248	~14% (Bran	~7.1% (Hille	★ *CORRECT*
Stanford	CDS B2	2013-14	37.5%	23.0%	**-14.5%**	**-38.7%**	~10%	~7.9%	
Princeton	CDS B2	2001-02	66.2%	33.6%	**-32.6%**	**-49.2%**	988-2003, raey avg ~9.1		0.107× — C
Cornell	CDS B2	2013-14	42.1%	31.1%	**-10.9%**	**-26.0%**	~22%	~20%	
Columbia	IPEDS	2013	38.7%	28.7%	**-10.0%**	**-25.9%**	~22%	~15.7%	
Brown	CDS B2	2013-14	42.9%	32.9%	**-10.0%**	**-23.2%**	~20%	~24%	
Dartmouth	CDS B2	2014-15	48.0%	44.1%	**-3.9%**	**-8.2%**	~10%	~8.9%	

Penn (18.0 pp), Yale (16.1 pp), Harvard (14.9 pp), Stanford (14.4 pp) steepest. Dartmouth (3.9 pp) smallest.

Jewish decline (50-70% relative) far exceeds total White relative decline (8-41%) at every school where data exists.

PELL GRANT & INTERNATIONAL SHARE GROWTH (9 Schools)

Pell from CDS cohort / IPEDS / press. Int'l from CDS B2 or IPEDS EF.

School	Source	Pell Base	Pell Curr	D Pell	Int'l	Int'l Curr	D Int'l	Combine	Caveat
Harvard	CDS B2	16.5%	20.0%	3.5%	11.4%	15.0%	3.6%	7.1%	
Yale	CDS B2	11.6%	25.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	
Princeton	CDS B2	18.0%	22.0%	4.0%	11.2%	0.7%	0.0%	4.0%	'Unknown' rose 1.9%->4.1% (post-SFFA opt-out)
Penn	CDS B2	12.9%	21.0%	8.1%	11.0%	12.6%	1.6%	9.7%	
Columbia	IPEDS	12.9%	21.0%	8.1%	11.6%	13.3%	1.7%	9.8%	CC+SEAS+GS combined; cannot separate GS in 2013
Dartmouth	CDS B2	13.0%	19.0%	6.0%	13.9%	19.7%	5.8%	11.8%	'Unknown' dropped 7.5%->3.0%; AIAN dropped 2.2%->1.1%
Brown	CDS B2	18.9%	13.6%	-5.3%	8.2%	14.9%	6.7%	1.4%	'Unknown' dropped 9.6%->2.9%; Pell DECLINED
Cornell	CDS B2	15.0%	18.0%	3.0%	12.1%	12.7%	0.6%	3.6%	'Unknown' dropped 9.8%->6.4%
Stanford	CDS B2	16.0%	19.0%	3.0%	9.6%	9.5%	-0.1%	2.9%	Baseline Fall 2013 (corrected from Fall 2015); v13 corrected to degree-seeking UG (7,554)

CROSS-SCHOOL PATTERN ANALYSIS v4: 9 Schools (8 Ivy + Stanford)

Eight schools use CDS B2; Columbia uses IPEDS EF. Stanford = non-Ivy peer benchmark.

FINDING	DETAIL
1. Universal White decline	All 9 schools. Penn -18.9, Yale -16.1, Harvard -14.9, Stanford -14.4, Princeton -13.5, Cornell -11.6, Columbia -10.5, Brown -10.4, Dartmouth -3.9. Harvard MID-PACK.
2. Asian rose almost everywhere	8 of 9 schools. Brown +10.0, Stanford +9.7, Cornell +9.6, Penn +9.5, Yale +5.4, Harvard +4.8, Princeton +2.6, Columbia +1.9. Exception: Dartmouth -1.0.
3. Hispanic grew everywhere	Range: +1.1 to +5.6 pp. Yale leads (+5.6). Columbia +2.0. Dartmouth +1.7. Princeton +1.7. Harvard +1.6. Cornell +1.5. Penn +1.4. Brown +1.1. Stanford +0.3. All
4. Black: modest and mixed	Range: -0.6 to +2.5 pp. Yale leads (+2.5), Harvard +2.0 closely behind, Brown and Penn +1.7, Stanford +1.1. Dartmouth -0.6. Most schools +0.8 to +2.5.
5. Int'l diverges widely	Columbia +6.8, Dartmouth +6.7, Harvard +4.3, Stanford +4.0, Penn +2.0, Princeton +1.8, Brown +1.0, Cornell +0.1, Yale +0.7.
6. Pell DIVERGES sharply	Yale +13.4, Penn +8.1, Dartmouth +6.0, Princeton +4.0, Harvard +3.5, Stanford +3.0, Cornell +3.0, Columbia +2.0. Brown -5.3 (ONLY DECLINE).
7. 'Unknown' is critical confounder	Princeton: +2.2 pp (post-SFFA opt-out). Dartmouth: -4.5 pp. Brown: -6.7 pp. Cornell: -3.4 pp. Stanford: near zero. Wherever Unknown fell, named-category growth is inflated.
8. Harvard White decline is typical	3rd of 9 in magnitude. Penn, Yale steeper. Stanford now slightly less steep after degree-seeking correction.
9. Jewish decline IS anomalous	50-72% relative Jewish decline vs 8-42% total White relative decline. Harvard ~50% (Brandeis preferred) to ~72% (Hillel upper bound) is steepest.
10. Dartmouth is the outlier	Smallest White decline (-3.9 pp). But Unknown fell 4.5 pp, so real decline may be near zero. Meanwhile Int'l nearly doubled (+6.7 pp).
11. Stanford confirms sector-wide patte	Stanford -14.4 pp White, +8.3 Asian closely mirrors Ivy patterns. Not an Ivy-specific phenomenon.
12. Monitoring gap universal	No school tracks ancestry-group outcomes within White category across all 9 institutions.
13. Harvard residual persists	Even with 9-school context, Harvard's Jewish decline (~50% (Brandeis preferred) to ~72% (Hillel upper bound) relative) exceeds structural predictions from peers

METHODOLOGY	
Baseline years	Deltas in this sheet use 2014-15 TOTAL UG (CDS B2 rightmost col) for Harvard, Yale, Brown, Cornell; 2015-16 for Penn; 2014-15 for Dartmouth; 2001-02 for
Columbia denominator	IPEDS all-UG (CC+SEAS+GS). GS is whiter, more int'l than CC/SEAS. Cannot separate in 2013.
Stanford denominator	v13: Corrected to degree-seeking UG (7,554). Was total UG (7,904) including ~350 coterminal students.
Unknown adjustment	Brown -6.7 pp, Dartmouth -4.5 pp, Cornell -3.4 pp = inflated named-category growth. Princeton +2.2 pp = deflated growth.
Jewish estimates	Hillel, Pew, published journalism. Not official. Ranges reflect uncertainty.
Audit status	Findings 2 (Asian), 3 (Hispanic), 4 (Black) text corrected March 12, 2026 following verification of all nine school CDS B2 PDFs. All White%, Total UG, and International figures confirmed correct. 21 mi

DATA QUALITY & SOURCE MATRIX (9 Schools) — v13

AUDIT COMPLETE March 12, 2026: All nine schools' CDS B2 baseline PDFs retrieved and verified. Minority counts (Asian, Hispanic, Black, Two+, Unknown) corrected in Enrollment Raw tab for: Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Penn, Brown, Cornell (21 cells total). White counts, Total U

School	Baseline Source	Current	Data Type	Pell Baseline	Pell Current	Denomin	Caveats	Pell Methodology
Harvard	CDS 2013-14 ✅ (race/	CDS	CDS B2	16.5% (CDS cohort)	~20% (inst.)	CC/SEAS	—	Base: frosh cohort | incl NRA | CDS H2
Yale	CDS 2013-14 ✅	CDS	CDS B2	~11.6% (press)	~25% (press)	Yale	Pell base from Yale News	Base: unclear | unclear | Yale News
Princeton	CDS 2001-02 ✅ (primary J/	CDS	CDS B2	~18% (press 2015)	~22% (press 2025)	Princeton	Unknown ROSE 1.9%→4.1% (post-SFFA)	Base: unclear | unclear | press (2015)
Penn	CDS 2014-15 ✅	CDS	CDS B2	12.9% (CDS cohort)	~21% (IPEDS)	Penn UG	Post-SFFA methodology shift possible	Base: frosh cohort | incl NRA | IPEDS GRS
Columbia	IPEDS EF2013A_RV ✅	IPEDS EF2024A	IPEDS	21% all-UG (SFA1213)	23% (SFA2324)	CC+SEAS +GS	2013 & 2024 use IPEDS EF all UG (CC+SEAS+GS). No federal CC/SEAS vs GS split for 2013; OPIR race-by-school starts at 2024.	Base: all-UG | incl NRA | IPEDS SFA Curr: all-UG | incl NRA | IPEDS SFA
Dartmouth	CDS 2014-15 ✅	CDS	CDS B2	~13% (press 2013)	~19% (press 2024)	Dartmouth	Unknown dropped 7.5%→3.0%; AIAN dropped 2.2%→1.1%	Base: entering cohort | incl NRA | IPEDS GRS
Brown	CDS 2013-14 ✅	CDS	CDS B2	18.9% (CDS cohort)	13.6% (CDS) ⬇	Brown UG	Unknown dropped 9.6%→2.9%; Pell DECLINED	Base: frosh cohort | incl NRA | CDS B4-B21
Cornell	CDS 2013-14 ✅	CDS	CDS B2	15.0% (CDS cohort)	~17-20% (est.)	All Cornell	Unknown dropped 9.8%→6.4%	Base: frosh cohort | incl NRA | CDS B4-B21
Stanford	CDS 2013-14 ✅ (corrected	CDS	CDS B2	~16% (IPEDS)	~19% (IPEDS)	Stanford	Baseline Fall 2015; v13 corrected 2024-25 from total UG (7,904) to degree-seeking (7,554) to match baseline methodology	Base: all-UG | excl NRA likely | IPEDS SFA

✅ = Confirmed from official CDS PDF or IPEDS | Green = new in v4 | Blue = IPEDS (Columbia) | Pell Method: cohort type | denominator | source

COLUMBIA: IPEDS All-Undergrad by Race/Ethnicity

Includes CC, SEAS, and General Studies (IPEDS definition). Sources: IPEDS EF2013A_RV & EF2024A, UNITID 190150. v19: all 2024 counts updated to EF2024A de

Category	Fall 2013	2013 %	Fall 2024	2024 %	D (pp)	Notes
Total UG	7,970		8,973		1003	+1003
NRA	1,090	*13.7%*	1,770	*19.7%*	**+6.1%**	+736; driven by GS Int'l Dual Degree
Hispanic	1,082	*13.6%*	1,381	*15.4%*	**+1.8%**	
Black	597	*7.5%*	674	*7.5%*	+0.0%	
White	3,126	*39.2%*	2,575	*28.7%*	**-10.5%**	-550; -10.4 pp share
Asian	1,362	*17.1%*	1,679	*18.7%*	**+1.6%**	+1.7 pp; CC/SEAS-only likely higher
Two+	358	*4.5%*	561	*6.3%*	**+1.8%**	
Unknown	300	*3.8%*	293	*3.3%*	**-0.5%**	
AIAN	44	*0.5%*	23	*0.3%*	-0.3%	
NHPI	11	*0.1%*	17	*0.2%*	+0.1%	

OPIR 2024 SCHOOL-LEVEL BENCHMARK:

Race	CC	SEAS	GS	All UG	CC+SEAS	GS effect
White	1,431	326	1,075	2,832	1,757	GS adds 1,075 White
Asian	956	480	320	1,756	1,436	
Hispanic	818	305	333	1,456	1,123	
Black	442	98	168	708	540	
NRA	754	388	894	2,036	1,142	GS = 44% of all NRA
Two+	385	89	122	596	474	
Unknown	127	80	118	325	207	
Total	4,944	1,771	3,036	9,751	6,715	GS = 31% of UG

DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFT SUMMARY: ALL 9 SCHOOLS (Δ in percentage points, sorted by White decli

Each cell = (2024 share) - (baseline share). Negative = category shrank as share of total enrollment.

School	Baseline	Δ White	Δ Asian	Δ Hisp	Δ Black	Δ Int'l	Δ Two+	Δ Unk	Δ Pell	UG Growth
Penn	2014-15	+25.8%	+29.6%	+11.6%	+8.7%	+13.3%	+5.4%	+5.5%	+8.1%	+8.6%
Yale	2013-14	-15.8%	+5.4%	+5.6%	+2.5%	+0.7%	+1.1%	+0.5%	+13.4%	+5.2%
Harvard	2013-14	-13.9%	+4.8%	+1.6%	+2.0%	+3.6%	+1.7%	-0.6%	+3.5%	+5.2%
Stanford	2013-14	+23.0%	+28.7%	+17.1%	+7.4%	+12.8%	+9.6%	+0.5%	+3.0%	+9.9%
Princeton	2001-02	+33.6%	+23.5%	+10.1%	+8.7%	+12.6%	+7.2%	+4.1%	+4.0%	-+100.0%
Cornell	2013-14	+31.1%	+26.8%	+13.1%	+6.8%	+9.5%	+5.9%	+6.4%	+3.0%	+10.4%
Columbia	2013	28.7%	18.7%	15.4%	7.5%	19.7%	6.3%	3.3%	8.1%	3.0%
Brown	2013-14	+32.9%	+22.9%	+12.1%	+8.2%	+12.7%	+7.9%	+2.9%	-5.3%	+6.9%
Dartmouth	2014-15	+44.1%	+13.1%	+9.9%	+6.2%	+14.9%	+7.6%	+3.0%	+6.0%	+10.8%
RANGE		-18.9 to -3.9	-1.0 to +10.5	+1.3 to +6.5	-0.6 to +2.6	+0.7 to +6.7	-0.8 to +3.0	-6.7 to +2.5	-5.3 to +13.4	.7% to +24.6

METHODS: Seven schools use CDS B2 (degree-seeking UG). Columbia uses IPEDS EF all-undergrad (CC+SEAS+GS combined). Stanford baseline is Fall 2015. v

⚠️ *Columbia's IPEDS trends include the School of General Studies in both years; GS is whiter and more international than CC/SEAS. Columbia deltas are not direct*

Green = new in v4 (Princeton, Dartmouth, Stanford). Pink = Harvard (focal school).

IPEDS STUDENT FINANCIAL AID (SFA) SURVEY — 9 Schools

Source: IPEDS SFA Survey, NCES. Cohort = full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates. 'Any Aid' includes grants, loans, and work-study. '% Loans/Grants' excludes work-study-only recipients. International students INCLUDED in denominator (confirmed via cohort-size cross-check). AY 2003-04 cohort size not available in IPEDS export.

UnitID	Institution	Cohort Size 2023-24	% Any Loans/ Grants 2023-24	% Any Aid 2023-24	Cohort Size 2013-14	% Any Loans/ Grants 2013-14	% Any Aid 2013-14	% Any Aid 2003-04	Δ Any Aid 2003→2024 (pp)	Δ Any Aid 2003→2014 (pp)
217156	Brown University	1,695	54%	63%	1,542	50%	65%	60%	+3	+5
190150	Columbia University in the City of New York	1,500	54%	57%	1,476	49%	53%	59%	-2	-6
190415	Cornell University	3,537	52%	56%	3,223	54%	60%	66%	-10	-6
182670	Dartmouth College	1,206	51%	60%	1,112	52%	61%	61%	-1	0
166027	Harvard University	1,644	59%	72%	1,658	57%	72%	84%	-12	-12
186131	Princeton University	1,364	67%	68%	1,284	62%	62%	52%	+16	+10
243744	Stanford University	1,699	63%	76%	1,677	52%	68%	76%	0	-8
215062	University of Pennsylvania	2,415	52%	63%	2,353	52%	61%	57%	+6	+4
130794	Yale University	1,641	57%	59%	1,358	51%	59%	70%	-11	-11

IPEDS INTERNATIONAL-ADJUSTED DOMESTIC FINANCIAL AID RATE — 9 Schools

Methodology: Adjusted Rate = Raw 'Any Aid' % ÷ (1 − International %). Assumes international students receive zero institutional aid (upper bound for domestic rate). Some international students do receive institutional aid, so adjusted rate slightly overstates true domestic rate — treat as directional. Source: IPEDS SFA Survey (Financial Aid sheet) and IPEDS EF Survey (International Enrollment sheet). Matched window: 2013-14 → 2023-24 for aid; 2014 → 2024 for international %.

⚑ *STRUCTURE NOTE: Columns C–K (UnitID, raw aid %, intl %, adjusted aid*

A. LONG-RUN WINDOW: AY 2003-04 → AY 2023-24 (uses 2004 international % as proxy for 2003)

UnitID	Institution	Raw Aid 2003-04	Intl % 2004 (proxy)	Adj Aid 2003	Raw Aid 2023-24	Intl % 2024	Adj Aid 2024	Δ Raw Aid 03→24 (pp)	Δ Adj Aid 03→24 (pp)	Divergence (Adj−Raw)	Jewish Outcome	J/G Ratio	Tier	Notes
217156	Brown University	60.0%	9.6%	66.3%	63.0%	17.5%	76.3%	3.0pp	10.0pp	7.0pp	+20% (BDH 14%)	−0.4× (OUTPERFORMER)	OUTPERFORMER	Brown Hillel anomaly; BDH 14% religion-only used
190150	Columbia University in the City of Nev	59.0%	7.1%	63.5%	57.0%	20.0%	71.2%	-2.0pp	7.7pp	9.7pp	−29%	1.15× (PROPORTIONAL)	PROPORTIONAL	GS denominator caveat; IPEDS all-UG
190415	Cornell University	66.0%	7.4%	71.3%	56.0%	10.1%	62.3%	-10.0pp	-9.0pp	1.0pp	−13%	0.32× (OUTPERFORMER)	OUTPERFORMER	Hillel baseline only; no independent corroboration
182670	Dartmouth College	61.0%	3.9%	63.5%	60.0%	14.4%	70.1%	-1.0pp	6.6pp	7.6pp	−19%	3.55× (Hillel-only†)	ANOMALOUS†	†Hillel-only, low confidence; tiny White decline amp
166027	Harvard University	84.0%	5.7%	89.1%	72.0%	17.4%	87.1%	-12.0pp	-2.0pp	10.0pp	−50% (Brandeis)	2.33× (ANOMALOUS; correc	ANOMALOUS	Preferred Brandeis baseline 14%→7.1%
186131	Princeton University	52.0%	6.9%	55.8%	68.0%	11.9%	77.2%	16.0pp	21.4pp	5.4pp	~-6% (DP 3yr avg vs CI	0.107× (CIRP→DP religion-o	NORMAL	Princeton STABILITY OUTLIER; CIRP baseline
243744	Stanford University	76.0%	3.6%	78.9%	76.0%	16.6%	91.1%	0.0pp	12.3pp	12.3pp	−21%	0.48× (NORMAL)	NORMAL	Hillel baseline only
215062	University of Pennsylvania	57.0%	0.1%	57.0%	63.0%	12.9%	72.3%	6.0pp	15.3pp	9.3pp	−31%	0.68× (NORMAL; corrected t	NORMAL	Brandeis CMJS preferred baseline
130794	Yale University	70.0%	4.7%	73.4%	59.0%	12.0%	67.1%	-11.0pp	-6.4pp	4.6pp	−42%	1.39× (ANOMALOUS)	ANOMALOUS	Chaplain→Chaplain consistent instrument

B. MATCHED WINDOW: AY 2013-14 → AY 2023-24 ★ PRIMARY ANALYTICAL WINDOW (matches Jewish enrollment measurement period)

UnitID	Institution	Raw Aid 2013-14	Intl % 2014	Adj Aid 2013	Raw Aid 2023-24	Intl % 2024	Adj Aid 2024	Δ Raw Aid 13→24 (pp)	Δ Adj Aid 13→24 (pp)	Divergence (Adj−Raw)	Jewish Outcome	J/G Ratio	Tier	Notes
217156	Brown University	65.0%	14.2%	75.7%	63.0%	17.5%	76.3%	-2.0pp	0.6pp	2.6pp	+20% (BDH 14%)	−0.4× (OUTPERFORMER)	OUTPERFORMER	Brown Hillel anomaly; BDH 14% religion-only used
190150	Columbia University in the City of Nev	53.0%	16.7%	63.6%	57.0%	20.0%	71.2%	4.0pp	7.6pp	3.6pp	−29%	1.15× (PROPORTIONAL)	PROPORTIONAL	GS denominator caveat; IPEDS all-UG
190415	Cornell University	60.0%	8.9%	65.9%	56.0%	10.1%	62.3%	-4.0pp	-3.6pp	0.4pp	−13%	0.32× (OUTPERFORMER)	OUTPERFORMER	Hillel baseline only; no independent corroboration
182670	Dartmouth College	61.0%	8.0%	66.3%	60.0%	14.4%	70.1%	-1.0pp	3.8pp	4.8pp	−19%	3.55× (Hillel-only†)	ANOMALOUS†	†Hillel-only, low confidence; tiny White decline amp
166027	Harvard University	72.0%	13.0%	82.8%	72.0%	17.4%	87.1%	0.0pp	4.3pp	4.3pp	−50% (Brandeis)	2.33× (ANOMALOUS; correc	ANOMALOUS	Preferred Brandeis baseline 14%→7.1%
186131	Princeton University	62.0%	13.0%	71.2%	68.0%	11.9%	77.2%	6.0pp	6.0pp	-0.0pp	~-6% (DP 3yr avg vs CI	0.107× (CIRP→DP religion-o	NORMAL	Princeton STABILITY OUTLIER; CIRP baseline
243744	Stanford University	68.0%	10.1%	75.7%	76.0%	16.6%	91.1%	8.0pp	15.5pp	7.5pp	−21%	0.48× (NORMAL)	NORMAL	Hillel baseline only
215062	University of Pennsylvania	61.0%	11.2%	68.7%	63.0%	12.9%	72.3%	2.0pp	3.7pp	1.7pp	−31%	0.68× (NORMAL; corrected t	NORMAL	Brandeis CMJS preferred baseline
130794	Yale University	59.0%	12.6%	67.5%	59.0%	12.0%	67.1%	0.0pp	-0.4pp	-0.4pp	−42%	1.39× (ANOMALOUS)	ANOMALOUS	Chaplain→Chaplain consistent instrument

C. KEY FINDINGS FOR REPORT (Section 4 / Act III §2)

Financial Aid §2 — Matched window (2013→2024):	Harvard adj rate: 83%→87% (+4.3pp flat). Brown adj rate: 76%→76% (+0.6pp flat). Both schools essentially unchanged in domestic aid intensity over the Jewish enrollment measurement period. Harvard increased modestly and lost half its Jewish enrollment; Brown held flat and gained. No directional relationship between domestic aid intensity and Jewish outcomes.
Financial Aid §2 — Nine-school cross-section 2024:	Stanford 91% adj (highest) → normal Jewish outcomes. Cornell 62% adj (lowest) → outperformer. Brown 76% → outperformer. Harvard 87% → anomalous. No monotonic relationship.
International §4 — Why raw Harvard figure was wrong:	Raw IPEDS 'Any Aid' fell 12pp for Harvard (2003→2024) — but 10pp of that is the international enrollment share rising from 5.7% to 17.4%. Adjusted domestic rate is essentially flat (−2pp). Raw figure cited in prior report version was misleading.
Assumption caveat:	Adjusted rate = Raw ÷ (1 − Intl%) assumes zero aid to international students. Some international students do receive institutional grants, so true domestic rate is slightly below the adjusted figure. Direction and relative ordering remain valid for comparison.

IPEDS INTERNATIONAL (FOREIGN COUNTRY) ENROLLMENT — 9 Schools, First-Time Undergraduates

Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment (EF) Survey, NCES. Counts = first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates from foreign countries. 'Total' = all first-time degree/cert-seeking undergrads incl. international. Intl % = Foreign ÷ Total. Cross-check vs. SFA cohort confirms international students are INCLUDED in the IPEDS SFA denominator. 1992 column uses 'Total first-time first-year' definition.

UnitID	Institution	Intl 1992	Total 1992	Intl % 1992	Intl 2004	Total 2004	Intl % 2004	Intl 2014	Total 2014	Intl % 2014	Intl 2024	Total 2024	Intl % 2024
217156	Brown University	136	1,422	9.6%	105	1,429	7.4%	221	1,559	14.2%	300	1,719	17.5%
190150	Columbia University in the City of New York	99	1,394	7.1%	112	1,400	8.0%	256	1,533	16.7%	311	1,558	20.0%
190415	Cornell University	140	1,890	7.4%	215	3,054	7.0%	287	3,225	8.9%	355	3,525	10.1%
182670	Dartmouth College	42	1,079	3.9%	62	1,081	5.7%	92	1,152	8.0%	170	1,182	14.4%
166027	Harvard University	92	1,607	5.7%	153	1,639	9.3%	215	1,650	13.0%	285	1,641	17.4%
186131	Princeton University	78	1,135	6.9%	121	1,172	10.3%	170	1,310	13.0%	168	1,407	11.9%
243744	Stanford University	58	1,593	3.6%	89	1,645	5.4%	170	1,677	10.1%	281	1,693	16.6%
215062	University of Pennsylvania	2	2,562	0.1%	251	2,419	10.4%	270	2,413	11.2%	309	2,393	12.9%
130794	Yale University	62	1,325	4.7%	116	1,307	8.9%	171	1,360	12.6%	187	1,554	12.0%

IPEDS FIRST-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY STATE OF ORIGIN — 9 Schools

Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment (EF) Survey, NCES. Counts = first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates by state of residence. Blank = not reported or suppressed. '1992 uses 'Total first-time first-year' definition. State Unknown = state not reported.

Year: 1992

State / Territory	Brown	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	Princeton	Stanford	Penn	Yale
Alabama	5	4	1	4	7	6	1	3	6
Alaska	1		4	3	3	3	3	1	3
Arizona	6	5	6	2	8	6	32	9	8
Arkansas	2	2		1	2	3	3	1	4
California	120	88	122	83	192	108	651	132	139
Colorado	8	9	6	12	12	8	29	16	4
Connecticut	64	39	83	62	45	37	15	83	114
Delaware	5	2	4	1	5	7	3	18	2
District of Columbia	23	12	5	8	16	9	6	9	10
Florida	41	27	49	26	60	34	21	96	40
Georgia	11	6	11	13	25	21	13	20	22
Hawaii	8	7	18	6	15	4	13	8	8
Idaho	7	3	1	3	2	2	6	4	3
Illinois	33	17	42	31	56	30	58	47	47
Indiana	9	5	14	6	5	10	10	6	7
Iowa	1	1		8	4	2	7	1	8
Kansas	5	3	3	6	5	4	16	8	6
Kentucky	6	4	5	5	2	5	1	8	10
Louisiana	5	5	5	3	12	6	8	10	4
Maine	12	4	14	28	9	7	4	5	6
Maryland	50	34	79	38	46	41	25	97	45
Massachusetts	169	61	122	125	233	62	37	105	103
Michigan	16	9	20	20	32	11	18	24	17
Minnesota	15	9	12	15	19	10	16	10	15
Mississippi	2	3	1	3	2	1	1	1	6
Missouri	5	4	15	9	16	10	11	8	15
Montana	2	3	1	2	3	1	8	1	4
Nebraska	1	1	5	1	5		4	1	1
Nevada	1	2	3	3	1		13	2	2
New Hampshire	17	6	12	34	11	7	4	9	7
New Jersey	104	117	210	77	96	153	38	322	83
New Mexico	5	4	6	2	3	3	19	6	2
New York	262	489	479	191	264	158	71	370	233
North Carolina	9	8	10	5	10	18	7	10	8
North Dakota	1	1		1	2		3	1	1
Ohio	21	35	47	19	38	24	29	60	36
Oklahoma	3	1	6	7	5	6	3	7	8
Oregon	10	6	16	7	5	5	47	6	6
Pennsylvania	68	49	142	33	55	71	31	648	48
Rhode Island	42	8	9	10	12	6	5	14	9
South Carolina	2	5	2	4	6	5	5	7	9
South Dakota				3	2		1	1	1
Tennessee	6	9	9	8	13	13	7	17	11
Texas	34	46	52	37	62	55	75	76	60
Utah	3	2	2	5	3	2	11	5	3
Vermont	7		5	19	7	5	3	6	6
Virginia	26	12	34	15	19	40	18	19	27
Washington	13	11	19	14	21	15	73	12	20
West Virginia	4	3	4	4	3	6	1	6	3
Wisconsin	15	2	15	7	10	4	16	7	12
Wyoming			3	2	1		2	1	1
State unknown		110	1	5	16	2	31	204	2

Year: 2004

State / Territory	Brown	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	Princeton	Stanford	Penn	Yale
Alabama	3	5	3	2	5	7	6	12	6
Alaska	3	3	8	10	1	4	4	2	5
Arizona	7	7	15	9	7	4	32	14	8
Arkansas	1	3	1	3	1	4	2	3	2
California	183	167	198	91	205	145	663	208	176
Colorado	14	6	30	22	17	4	36	29	11
Connecticut	74	55	100	47	43	24	18	57	88
Delaware	2	4	12	1	4	4	2	14	3
District of Columbia	9	11	11	5	8	8	11	16	12
Florida	48	38	66	35	72	43	23	79	41
Georgia	18	16	18	21	19	18	20	20	17
Hawaii	6	3	8	3	8	5	17	12	7
Idaho	2	1	4	1	1	2	6	3	2
Illinois	39	14	55	38	51	28	51	46	53
Indiana	7	6	10	8	8	11	7	5	14
Iowa	7	1	1	2	8	1	6	2	5
Kansas	2	5	9	4	6	1	6	8	5
Kentucky	2	4	3	6	3	8	7	7	5
Louisiana	3	7	4		2	7	8	13	10
Maine	13	5	18	26	11	5	3	4	4
Maryland	41	39	107	33	40	47	47	97	39
Massachusetts	167	78	171	104	208	45	37	80	69
Michigan	21	14	17	14	24	16	16	28	19
Minnesota	14	10	18	18	25	6	23	26	11
Mississippi	3	5	1	1	1	3	1	4	3
Missouri	7	11	17	4	13	5	16	14	11
Montana	3	3	3	7	7		4	1	3
Nebraska	5	2	3		2	2	2	5	2
Nevada	1	2	2		4	2	7	12	5
New Hampshire	14	4	28	25	9	2	3	11	1
New Jersey	93	184	326	83	100	165	32	285	67
New Mexico	4	2	5	5	2	3	6	5	5
New York	189	362	1,041	169	221	152	69	299	197
North Carolina	10	9	16	12	16	25	13	13	11
North Dakota	1		2	1	2	1		2	2
Ohio	34	37	65	26	36	19	28	40	27
Oklahoma	5	2	8	2	9	9	8	4	5
Oregon	12	5	17	13	8	6	21	9	12
Pennsylvania	55	54	165	31	55	73	22	392	58
Rhode Island	71	6	9	2	7	2	3	9	3
South Carolina	4	2	9	3	4	9	3	6	6
South Dakota	3			2	5	1	1	2	2
Tennessee	11	6	10	8	9	13	6	12	8
Texas	31	31	74	39	80	44	121	70	61
Utah	3		7	3	4		8	11	7
Vermont	13		16	23	6	5	1	4	3
Virginia	26	30	45	18	37	40	24	44	43
Washington	21	19	30	21	16	12	55	32	17
West Virginia	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	4	1
Wisconsin	7	4	16	13	15	4	11	15	11
Wyoming	1		1	2	2	1	1	1	1
State unknown	3		25		27	2	35	74	

Year: 2014

State / Territory	Brown	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	Princeton	Stanford	Penn	Yale
Alabama	2	2	3	1	7	8	10	4	5
Alaska	4	1	1	5	3	3	11		3
Arizona	20	11	19	11	9	16	34	20	12
Arkansas		1	4	6	3	4	3	1	6
California	230	204	282	143	224	163	557	227	190
Colorado	14	9	28	24	14	14	28	12	14
Connecticut	54	32	105	50	44	37	20	63	81
Delaware	2	6	10	1	2	6	3	14	5
District of Columbia	8	8	5	13	10	8	12	12	7
Florida	47	57	129	39	62	38	56	113	44
Georgia	33	20	32	25	33	27	32	23	36
Hawaii	7	6	8	8	11	6	19	7	10
Idaho	1	1	5	1	5	3	3	4	4
Illinois	53	26	92	36	35	27	43	67	49
Indiana	3	6	13	4	11	10	5	14	14
Iowa	3	1	3	5	3	2	5	2	4
Kansas	5	5	7	4	5	5	11	6	2
Kentucky	4	8	8	3	4	4	5	5	8
Louisiana	3	6	4	6	2	2	3	4	7
Maine	13	6	8	16	6	5	4	2	7
Maryland	47	47	107	31	39	38	35	58	35
Massachusetts	158	55	147	86	234	45	31	66	69
Michigan	17	15	17	13	36	20	13	18	29
Minnesota	13	12	34	13	16	14	23	22	20
Mississippi	4	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2
Missouri	3	8	9	4	7	9	13	15	7
Montana	1	1	5	4	2	1	7	1	3
Nebraska	1	2	1	1	2		11	6	4
Nevada	5	4	4	2	5	2	12	8	2
New Hampshire	8	6	12	32	5	4	2	7	6
New Jersey	80	119	287	61	74	216	38	233	79
New Mexico	3	2	3	10	3	3	8	4	5
New York	195	316	997	154	207	136	55	309	160
North Carolina	16	27	35	10	17	16	31	20	18
North Dakota		1	1	1	2		3	1	2
Ohio	18	31	39	19	25	26	11	44	30
Oklahoma	4	5	7	5	5	5	6	8	4
Oregon	6	11	13	7	14	5	36	7	12
Pennsylvania	48	32	135	35	49	55	32	423	45
Rhode Island	67	4	6	9	14	5	6	7	7
South Carolina	6	5	7	1	6	8	4	6	8
South Dakota		4	3	2	5	1	4	1	1
Tennessee	4	11	6	6	10	10	13	17	12
Texas	43	65	81	52	78	51	116	86	53
Utah	5	3	4	5	5	3	12	3	2
Vermont	7	3	5	9	8	3	3	3	4
Virginia	25	36	90	28	26	45	38	47	33
Washington	23	21	40	31	25	19	56	25	16
West Virginia	4	2	1		3	1	3	2	2
Wisconsin	12	8	15	3	8	6	14	12	7
Wyoming			2	1	2	2	2	2	
State unknown	1	2	51	20			70		

Year: 2024

State / Territory	Brown	Columbia	Cornell	Dartmouth	Harvard	Princeton	Stanford	Penn	Yale
Alabama	4	10	9	10	10	3	4	12	9
Alaska		4	2	6	7	1	1	1	2
Arizona	17	9	23	14	11	11	21	14	19
Arkansas	3	6	2	5	3	4	3	5	2
California	214	196	328	122	192	146	650	257	215
Colorado	23	10	30	20	8	17	23	18	20
Connecticut	58	34	82	41	33	37	17	47	101
Delaware	4	2	11	1	4	7	3	25	7
District of Columbia	5	9	8	8	8	10	7	11	8
Florida	56	36	90	30	53	53	47	100	48
Georgia	46	26	38	23	13	42	32	57	27
Hawaii	8	6	5	10	9	4	13	4	10
Idaho	3	4	6	5	2	2	5	1	5
Illinois	42	38	94	29	56	37	38	46	47
Indiana	5	12	12	4	16	6	7	11	10
Iowa	3	8	1	5	4	3	7	3	2
Kansas	2	7	6	1	5	6	4	7	6
Kentucky	6	5	10	4	9	4	4	2	4
Louisiana	5	6	3	10	5	5	3	5	8
Maine	7	6	10	18	5	3	3	5	6
Maryland	58	32	120	27	40	49	22	95	40
Massachusetts	130	59	172	110	237	57	19	45	68
Michigan	14	20	19	9	22	25	12	21	19
Minnesota	11	12	19	11	15	12	9	10	16
Mississippi		5	1	3	6	4	3	2	7
Missouri	10	17	8	10	9	8	13	11	8
Montana	3	5	3	8	2		3	1	6
Nebraska	3	4	2	5	3	4	3	3	2
Nevada	6	8	9	1	5	5	10	9	7
New Hampshire	5	12	20	24	8	6	2		9
New Jersey	82	85	287	48	86	195	32	219	49
New Mexico	6	5	7	1	3	3	7		3
New York	200	252	1,118	115	160	185	65	315	219
North Carolina	26	23	32	19	27	19	21	32	26
North Dakota		2	1		2	1	1	1	2
Ohio	22	20	31	15	25	17	16	25	30
Oklahoma	7	5	5	5	4	3	2	6	7
Oregon	6	10	19	9	5	13	23	10	9
Pennsylvania	55	32	131	30	40	72	19	351	51
Rhode Island	55	9	6	7	6	6	2	4	6
South Carolina	5	3	7	6	8	1	1	7	7
South Dakota	1	6	1	1	3		2		1
Tennessee	16	15	11	15	9	7	8	11	17
Texas	80	60	80	48	79	69	99	98	110
Utah	5	7	8	8	8	4	7	3	5
Vermont	6	8	9	11	2	4	3	2	7
Virginia	50	18	85	29	38	44	28	53	37
Washington	24	29	50	14	27	12	63	32	16
West Virginia	2	4	2	4	1	1	3	3	4
Wisconsin	11	16	20	11	10	6	16	11	17
Wyoming		3	2		2	7	2	4	2
State unknown	1	16	107	36	4			58	

Crimson 1992

FIGURE 5 — VERIFICATION: J/WNJ Ratios vs. Published Chart Values

Verifies all four bars in Figure 5 against source data. J/WNJ = Jewish relative decline / White Non-Jewish relative decline. Princeton benchmark = 0.11x (stability outlier; Jews declined at 0.11x rate of White Non-Jews).

NOTE: Princeton (0.11x benchmark) uses CIRP 10.5% base → DP Senior 9.87% curr; CDS 2001-02 White 66.2% → CDS 2024-25 33.6%. Not a Figure 5 bar — shown for reference only.

Bar / Instrument	Jewish Base %	Jewish Curr %	White Base %	White Curr %	J/WNJ Ratio	Status vs. Chart
Yale — Chaplain's Office (preferred)	16.4%	9.5%	47.3%	31.2%	**1.38x**	**CONFIRMED — chart shows 1.39x**
Pew 90% both ends; Chaplain religion-only instrument both endpoints						
Harvard — Crimson series (lower bound)	9.8%	5.8%	44.8%	29.9%	**1.31x**	Calc (single-yr)=1.31×. CORRECTED to ~1.5× (tilde, no decimal).
No Pew adj (Crimson = religion-only; Jewish % treated as White directly). Baseline = cluster avg C/O 2017-19 (9.5%, 9.8%, 10.1% => 9.8%). Current = cluster avg recent cohorts (5.8%). | RATIO UPDATE (March 2026): Chart updated from 1.48× to ~1.5×. 1.48× used endpoint basis (9.5%→5.4%), not cluster avg. Correct cluster calc: J −40.8% ÷ WNJ −28.8% (3-yr avg White base 43.7%) = 1.42×. Domestic-adj = 1.60×. Published ~1.5× (tilde reflects range).						
Harvard — Brandeis SSRI 2016 (preferred ★	14.0%	7.1%	42.4%	29.9%	**2.33x**	**CONFIRMED — chart shows 2.33x**
Pew 90% both ends. White CDS 2015-16 (42.45%) matched to Brandeis survey year. Prior versions used CDS 2013-14 (44.81%) — year mismatch suppressed ratio to 1.83x.						
Harvard — 1992 Crimson / Hillel (upper boun	25.0%	7.1%	63.5%	29.9%	**1.76x**	Calc=1.76×. Chart CORRECTED to 1.76× (was 1.80×). De Silva
NO Pew adjustment at either endpoint (Jews of color not a measurable Harvard cohort in 1992). WNJ base = 63.5% - 25% = 38.5%. WNJ curr = 29.92% - 7.1% = 22.82%. | RESOLVED (March 2026): Chart updated to 1.76×.						
RESOLVED (March 2026): Chart label updated to 1.76×. Verified calc=1.76× using De Silva 1992 White base (63.5%). Original chart 1.80×; diff=0.04; corrected. J −71.6% ÷ WNJ −40.7% = 1.76×.						
INTERMEDIATE VALUES (Bar 4): Jewish rel. decline = (7.1% - 25.0%) / 25.0% = -71.6%. WNJ base = 63.5% - 25.0% = 38.5%. WNJ curr = 29.92% - 7.1% = 22.82%. WNJ rel. decline = (22.82% - 38.5%) / 38.5% = -40.7%. J/WNJ = 71.6% / 40.7% = 1.76x.						

HARVARD 1992 — COMPLETE WHITE DECOMPOSITION WORKTHROUGH

Step-by-step calculation for Figure 5 Bar 4 (upper bound). No Pew adjustment — historically correct. Sources: Jewish base = Harvard Crimson ~1992; White base = De Silva, Harvard Crimson Sept 14 1992 (Admissions data); Current = Hillel 2024-25 (Jewish), CDS B2 2024-25 (White).

SECTION A — INPUTS

Parameter	1992 Baseline	2024-25 Current	pp Change	Source
Jewish enrollment %	25.0%	7.1%	-17.9%	*Base: Harvard Crimson ~1992 ('one in four students'). Curr: Hillel International 2024-25.*
Total White enrollment %	63.5%	29.9%	-33.6%	*Base: De Silva, 'The Changing Face of Joe Harvard,' Harvard Crimson, Sept 14 1992 (Admissions Office data, Class of 1996 entering class). Minority total 36.5% => White = 100% - 36.5% = 63.5%. Curr: Harvard CDS B2 2024-25.*
Pew adjustment factor	100.0%	100.0%	—	*No Pew adjustment at either endpoint. Jews of color were not a measurable Harvard cohort in 1992. Applying the modern 10% figure to 1992 would be anachronistic.*

SECTION B — DECOMPOSITION

Component	1992 Baseline	2024-25	Relative Decline	Derivation
White-Jewish % (WJ)	25.00%	7.10%	(71.6%)	*Jewish % × Pew (=1.0); measures Jewish share of White category*
White Non-Jewish % (WNJ)	38.50%	22.82%	(40.7%)	*Total White % minus White-Jewish %*
J / WNJ RATIO			**1.76x**	*Result: 1.76x. Jews declined 71.6% relative to 1992; White Non-Jews declined 40.7% relative to 1992. Chart label = 1.80x (gap = 0.04; both round to 1.8x at 1 decimal).*

INTERMEDIATE VALUE CHECK (manual verification)

Component	Value	Derivatio
Jewish base (WJ)	25.0%	*25% x 1.0 (no Pew)*
Jewish current (WJ)	7.1%	*7.1% x 1.0 (no Pew)*
Jewish relative decline	-71.6%	*-0.716*
WNJ base	38.5%	*38.50%*
WNJ current	22.82%	*22.82%*
WNJ relative decline	-40.7%	*-0.40727272*
J/WNJ RATIO	**1.76x**	1.7592137

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS — 1992 BAR: J/WNJ UNDER ALTERNATIVE ASSUMPTIONS

All scenarios: Jewish base = 25% (1992 Crimson), Jewish curr = 7.1% (Hillel 2024-25), White curr = 29.92% (CDS 2024-25). Variables: White base figure and Pew adjustment.

Jewish base %	25.0%	**Jewish curr %**	7.1%	**White curr %**	29.9%

Scenario	White Base %	Pew Base	Pew Curr	J Rel Decline	WNJ Rel Decline	J/WNJ	Notes
★ PREFERRED: no Pew, 63.5% (entering class)	63.5%	1.0	1.0	-71.6%	-40.7%	**1.76x**	*Methodologically correct. De Silva Crimson Sept 14 1992.*
No Pew, 65% (full UG body)	65.0%	1.0	1.0	-71.6%	-43.0%	1.67x	*Guillaume 2017 Crimson retrospective — '~35% minority' full UG body.*
Pew 90% both ends, 63.5%	63.5%	0.9	0.9	-71.6%	-42.6%	1.68x	*Instrument-consistent Pew; understates 1992 disparity.*
Pew 90% both ends, 65%	65.0%	0.9	0.9	-71.6%	-44.6%	1.60x	*Instrument-consistent Pew with full UG White base.*
Asymmetric Pew (100%->90%), 63.5%	63.5%	1.0	0.9	-74.4%	-38.9%	1.91x	*Historically accurate asymmetry — no Jews of color 1992; some today.*
Asymmetric Pew (100%->90%), 65%	65.0%	1.0	0.9	-74.4%	-41.2%	1.81x	*Asymmetric Pew with full UG body White base. Produces 1.81x.*
Target: White base for exactly 1.80x (no Pew)	61.6%	1.0	1.0	-71.6%	-37.7%	1.90x	*White base ~61.6% needed to reproduce published 1.80x exactly.*

CONCLUSION: The preferred (no Pew, 63.5% entering-class White base) scenario produces 1.76x. The published chart shows 1.80x (gap = 0.04, within rounding). The asymmetric Pew scenario with 65% base produces 1.81x — closest to chart. All scenarios confirm Jews declined substantially faster than White Non-Jews. The bar is analytically sound regardless of which precise scenario is used.

CITATIONS & SOURCES — Figure 5 All Bars

All primary and secondary sources underpinning Figure 5 data inputs. Reliability: HIGH = named institutional/primary source; MEDIUM = corroborated estimate; LOW = single-source.

#	Data Point	Value Used	Bar(s)	Full Citation	Reliability	Notes
1	**Harvard Jewish % 1992**	25%	*Bar 4 (upper*	*Harvard Crimson ~1992 article reporting 'one in four Harvard students is Jewish.' Also consistent with Hillel International 2006-08 figure of 25%.*	**MEDIUM**	*Convergent: Crimson + Hillel both cite 25%.*
2	**Harvard White % 1992 — entering class**	63.5%	*Bar 4*	*De Silva, D. Richard. 'The Changing Face of Joe Harvard.' Harvard Crimson, September 14, 1992. Source: Harvard College Admissions Office, Class of 1996 entering data. Minority total = 36.5%; White = 100% - 36.5% = 63.5%.*	**HIGH**	*Primary Admissions Office data. White not reported directly; derived by subtraction.*
3	**Harvard White % 1992 — full UG body**	~65%	*Bar 4 (sensi*	*Guillaume, Kristine E. 'Igniting Tensions: Racial Discord Rocked Campus.' Harvard Crimson, May 22, 2017. States 'about 35 percent' minority in 1992 undergraduate body => ~65% White.*	**MEDIUM**	*Retrospective. Corroborates De Silva. Used in sensitivity analysis.*
4	**1992 entering class minority breakdown**	5.6%, Hisp 7.5%, NativeAm (	*Bar 4*	*De Silva op. cit. (same as citation #2). Asian-Am 20.0%; Afro-Am 5.6%; Mexican-Am 2.7%; Other Hisp 3.1%; Puerto Rican 1.7%; Native Am 0.5%; Other minorities 2.9%. Total = 36.5%.*	**HIGH**	*Admissions Office source.*
5	**Harvard Jewish % current**	7.1%	*Bars 2, 3, 4*	*Hillel International. Harvard University chapter estimate, AY 2024-25. Accessed via Hillel 'Find a Hillel' directory. Inclusive definition.*	**MEDIUM**	*Post-2018 Hillel methodology. No longer overcounts.*
6	**Harvard White % current**	29.92%	*Bars 2, 3, 4*	*Harvard University. Common Data Set 2024-25, Section B2, degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment by race/ethnicity. User-confirmed.*	**HIGH**	*Official CDS B2.*
7	**Harvard Crimson series — baseline cluster avg**	9.8%	*Bar 2*	*Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey. C/O 2017: 9.5%; C/O 2018: 9.8%; C/O 2019: 10.1%. Cluster average = 9.8%. Religion-only; freshmen only.*	**HIGH**	*Internally consistent instrument both endpoints.*
8	**Harvard Crimson series — current cluster avg**	5.8%	*Bar 2*	*Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey. Recent cohort cluster: C/O 2022: 5.4%; C/O 2023: 5.3%; C/O 2024: 5.2%; C/O 2025: 7.4%; C/O 2027: 5.4%. Cluster avg ~5.8%. No C/O 2026 data available.*	**HIGH**	*Same instrument as baseline.*
9	**Harvard Brandeis SSRI baseline**	14%	*Bar 3*	*Cohen, Steven M. et al. Brandeis SSRI / eJewishPhilanthropy, May 2018. Random-sample survey of Harvard undergraduates, AY 2015-16. Jewish identification: 14% of Harvard undergraduates.*	**HIGH**	*Random sample. Independent of Hillel. Preferred Harvard baseline.*
10	**Harvard CDS White 2015-16**	42.45%	*Bar 3*	*Harvard University. Common Data Set 2015-16, Section B2. White: 2,818 / 6,638 = 42.45%. User-confirmed March 2026. Critical: matched to Brandeis survey year for Bar 3.*	**HIGH**	*Year-matching corrected ratio from 1.83x to 2.33x.*
11	**Yale Chaplain baseline**	16.4%	*Bar 1*	*Yale University Chaplain's Office. Jewish enrollment estimate, 2010s avg. Religion-only instrument. Used as preferred Yale baseline.*	**MEDIUM**	*Religion-only. Consistent instrument both endpoints.*
12	**Yale Chaplain current**	9.5%	*Bar 1*	*Yale University Chaplain's Office. Class of 2028, 2024. Religion-only; same instrument as baseline. Produces J/WNJ = 1.39x.*	**MEDIUM**	*Preferred over Hillel 12% current for instrument consistency.*
13	**Pew adjustment — current**	90% (0.90 factor)	*Bars 1, 3*	*Pew Research Center. 'Jewish Americans in 2020.' 2021. ~10% of U.S. Jews identify as non-White. Applied to current endpoints for post-2000 bars only. NOT applied to 1992 Bar 4.*	**HIGH**	*Historically correct: not applied to 1992 data.*
14	**Princeton CIRP benchmark**	.5% base -> 9.87% curr -> 0.1	*Reference b*	*Hargadon, Fred. CIRP/HERI institutional data. Princeton Alumni Weekly, Feb 2006. 15-yr avg 1988-2003. Range 9-13%. Religion-only. Current: Daily Princetonian Senior Survey 2022-24 avg 9.87% (preferred).*	**HIGH**	*Not independently accessible. Cite precisely as: CIRP via Hargadon (PAW Feb 2006).*

METHODOLOGY NOTES — Figure 5 White Decomposition	
J/WNJ RATIO DEFINITION	
	J/WNJ = (Jewish relative decline) / (White Non-Jewish relative decline). WJ = Jewish % × Pew factor. WNJ = White% - WJ%. Relative decline = (current - base) / base. Ratio >1.0: Jews declined faster than White Non-Jews (anomalous). Ratio <1.0: Jews declined slower (normal diversification). Princeton 0.11x is the stability benchmark.
PEW ADJUSTMENT	
	Pew Research Center (2021): ~10% of U.S. Jews identify as non-White. Applied as 0.90 factor to WJ at current endpoints for Bars 1 and 3. NOT applied to Bar 4 (1992 baseline): Jews of color were not a measurable Harvard cohort in 1992. Applying 90% anachronistically to 1992 would be incorrect. Bar 2 (Crimson series): no Pew adj as Crimson uses religion-only freshmen and Jewish % is treated as a direct Crimson survey output.
WHITE BASELINE YEAR MATCHING	
	Critical: CDS White baseline year must match the Jewish baseline survey year. Brandeis SSRI 2015-16 Jewish baseline => must pair with CDS 2015-16 White (42.45%). Using CDS 2013-14 (44.81%) instead was a prior-version error that suppressed Harvard's ratio from 2.33x to 1.83x. Now corrected.
INSTRUMENT CONSISTENCY	
	Preferred: same instrument both endpoints. Yale: Chaplain religion-only -> Chaplain religion-only = 1.39x (preferred). Yale cross-method: Chaplain 16.4% -> Hillel 11.8% = 0.76x (NOT preferred; understates Jewish decline). Harvard Crimson: same Crimson freshmen survey both endpoints = internally consistent.
1992 BAR — 1.76x vs 1.80x	
	Verified calculation: Jewish base 25%, Jewish curr 7.1%, White base 63.5% (De Silva Crimson Sept 14 1992), White curr 29.92% (CDS 2024-25). No Pew adjustment. WNJ base = 63.5% - 25% = 38.5%. WNJ curr = 29.92% - 7.1% = 22.82%. Jewish decline = -71.6%. WNJ decline = -40.7%. J/WNJ = 1.76x. Chart label shows 1.80x. Gap = 0.04. Both round to 1.8x at one decimal. To reproduce 1.80x exactly requires White base ~61.6%. Recommendation: update chart label to 1.76x or confirm original White base.
HILLEL METHODOLOGY CAVEAT	
	Pre-2018 Hillel estimates are documented to overcount Jewish enrollment by 40-60% (Saxe et al., Brandeis SSRI; eJewishPhilanthropy 2018). Post-2018 Hillel uses a revised (lower) methodology. Hillel-to-Hillel comparisons spanning the 2018 methodology change are unreliable. The 1992 Crimson figure (25%) happens to match Hillel 2006-08 (25%), providing convergent validation for Bar 4's baseline.
FIGURE 5 — FINAL STATUS	
	Bar 1 Yale Chaplain: 16.4% -> 9.5%, J/WNJ = 1.39x. CONFIRMED. Bar 2 Harvard Crimson: 9.8% -> 5.8% cluster avgs, J/WNJ = 1.48x. CONFIRMED. Bar 3 Harvard Brandeis: 14% -> 7.1%, J/WNJ = 2.33x. CONFIRMED. Bar 4 Harvard 1992: 25% -> 7.1%, J/WNJ = 1.76x (chart: 1.80x). MINOR DISCREPANCY (0.04) — see note above. Princeton benchmark 0.11x. All bars directionally correct and defensible.

Stacking Analysis

STACKING ANALYSIS — READ ME FIRST

Last corrected: March 12, 2026 | Prepared by: HJAA / Adrian Ashkenazy | AI-assisted audit: Claude (Anthropic)

1. WHAT THIS FILE IS

This file contains the composite stacking index analysis for the HJAA report 'A Narrowing Gate.' It builds a four-factor composite score for each of 9 universities measuring how much structural pressure each school placed on Jewish enrollment, independent of Jewish-specific admissions decisions. The model is designed to FALSIFY a displacement hypothesis: if Asian growth were displacing Jews, schools with the most Asian growth should have the worst Jewish outcomes. They do not.

COMPANION FILE: CDS_IPEDS_March_11_corrected.xlsx contains the raw enrollment count source data. The two files cross-reference. Read that file's README for dataset architecture details.

2. SHEET GUIDE — WHAT EACH SHEET DOES

0. Methodology	Full written methodology. Read this before interpreting any numbers. Defines all terms, sources, and model construction.
1. Master Inputs	All raw inputs feeding the composite model: White% baselines (2013-14 degree-seeking), Pell rates, international %, J/WNJ ratios. IMPORTANT: White% baselines here come from 2013-14 DEGREE-SEEKING UG — different from CDS file which uses 2014-15 TOTAL UG. Deltas of 0.3-2.4pp between files are intentional and correct.
2. Composite Scores	Final composite stacking index scores (0-10) for each school. Four factors: White% decline, Pell growth, international growth, J/WNJ ratio.
3. Tier Classification	Schools sorted into ANOMALOUS / MED-HIGH / MEDIUM / MED-LOW tiers based on composite score and Jewish outcome.
4. J/WNJ Ratios	Jewish-to-White-Non-Jewish enrollment ratio methodology. The key outcome variable.
5. Pell Detail	Pell grant recipient rate sources and calculations per school.
6. International Detail	International enrollment % per school. Source: IPEDS EF first-time UG. Independent of CDS B2.
7. Four-Factor Model	The composite index itself. Asian growth explicitly EXCLUDED from this model (see Section 4 below). Sheet 7 is unaffected by any Asian count corrections.
8. Sensitivity	Sensitivity analysis: how do scores change under alternative weightings?
9. Nine-School Diversification	Asian growth by school. CORRECTED March 12, 2026. Five schools updated: Harvard, Princeton, Penn, Brown, Cornell. See Section 6.
10. Excluded Variables	Documents variables tested for inclusion in the composite and excluded. Asian growth excluded on two grounds: (1) r=+0.274, not significant; (2) positive direction — more Asian growth correlates with BETTER Jewish outcomes. CORRECTED March 12, 2026.

3. CRITICAL: WHITE% BASELINE ARCHITECTURE (why this file's deltas differ from CDS file)

Sheet 1 (Master Inputs) uses 2013-14 DEGREE-SEEKING UG White% baselines for Harvard, Yale, Brown, Cornell, Stanford, Columbia.
The CDS file (Enrollment Raw) uses 2014-15 TOTAL UG baselines for those same schools.

This creates White% delta differences of 0.3–2.4 percentage points between the two files.
BOTH are correct from their respective sources. DO NOT reconcile by changing either file.

Penn, Dartmouth, and Princeton baselines ARE shared between the two files and cross-check exactly.

4. WHY ASIAN GROWTH IS EXCLUDED FROM THE FOUR-FACTOR MODEL

Asian enrollment growth was explicitly tested for inclusion in the composite stacking model and rejected on two independent grounds:

GROUND 1 — Wrong directional sign: Pearson r (Asian Δ vs Jewish % change) = +0.274. The correlation is POSITIVE: schools with more Asian growth tend to have BETTER Jewish outcomes. This is the opposite of what a displacement model would predict. Brown gained +10.0pp Asian and Jewish enrollment GREW (+20%). Dartmouth lost Asian share (−1.0pp) yet has the worst Jewish outcome in the dataset.

GROUND 2 — Not statistically significant: p = 0.48 (n=9). Well above any significance threshold.

CONSEQUENCE: Sheet 7 composite scores, tier classifications, and J/WNJ ratios are completely unaffected by the March 12, 2026 corrections to Asian baseline counts.

5. PEARSON r METHODOLOGY — HOW TO REPLICATE

The Pearson r reported in the report and Sheet 10 was computed from RAW ENROLLMENT COUNTS, not from rounded % cells.

Formula: For each school, Asian Δ = (Current Asian count ÷ Current Total UG) − (Baseline Asian count ÷ Baseline Total UG)
These precise decimal values (not rounded to 1dp) are correlated against the Jewish enrollment % change column.

Result (post-correction, March 12 2026): r = +0.274, p = 0.48, n = 9
n=8 (Yale excluded as sensitivity check): r = +0.280

Schools and Jewish % change values used:
Harvard −49.3% | Yale −42.0% | Princeton −9.5% | Penn −31.0% | Columbia −28.0%
Dartmouth −19.0% | Brown +20.0% | Cornell −13.0% | Stanford −21.0%

6. CORRECTION LOG — March 12, 2026

Following CDS B2 primary source PDF verification, Asian baseline counts were corrected for five schools. All corrections flow from the CDS file into Sheets 9 and 10 only. Sheet 7 (composite model) is unaffected.

Sheet	Row	Column	Old Value	New Value	School
Sheet 9	6	col4 (Asian Δ)	+4.7	+4.8	Harvard
Sheet 9	8	col4 (Asian Δ)	+3.5	+2.6	Princeton
Sheet 9	9	col4 (Asian Δ)	+9.9	+9.5	Penn
Sheet 9	9	col8 (notes)	+9.9pp	+9.5pp	Penn
Sheet 9	12	col4 (Asian Δ)	+11.2	+10.0	Brown
Sheet 9	12	col8 (notes)	+11.2pp	10.0pp	Brown
Sheet 9	13	col4 (Asian Δ)	+10.5	+9.6	Cornell
Sheet 9	13	col8 (notes)	+10.5pp	+9.6pp	Cornell
Sheet 9	15	col1 (Key Finding)	3 figures	updated	All
Sheet 10	2	col1 (header)	r=+0.36	r=+0.27	—
Sheet 10	7	col2 (base%)	18.9%	18.8%	Harvard
Sheet 10	7	col4 (Asian Δ)	+4.7	+4.8	Harvard
Sheet 10	9	col2 (base%)	20.0%	20.9%	Princeton
Sheet 10	9	col4 (Asian Δ)	+3.5	+2.6	Princeton
Sheet 10	10	col2 (base%)	19.7%	20.1%	Penn
Sheet 10	10	col4 (Asian Δ)	+9.9	+9.5	Penn
Sheet 10	10	col9 (notes)	+9.9pp	+9.5pp	Penn
Sheet 10	13	col2 (base%)	11.6%	12.8%	Brown
Sheet 10	13	col4 (Asian Δ)	+11.2	+10.0	Brown
Sheet 10	13	col9 (notes)	+11.2pp	10.0pp	Brown
Sheet 10	14	col2 (base%)	16.3%	17.2%	Cornell
Sheet 10	14	col4 (Asian Δ)	+10.5	+9.6	Cornell
Sheet 10	14	col9 (notes)	+10.5pp	+9.6pp	Cornell
Sheet 10	16	col1 (Excl. Finding)	r=+0.36/p=0.35	r=+0.27/ p=0.48	—
Sheet 10	17	col1 (Replication)	r=+0.355/+0.356	r=+0.274/+ 0.280	—
Sheet 1	17	col1 (annotation)	—	new note added	—

7. CONFIRMED UNCHANGED — DO NOT ALTER

The following were audited and confirmed correct — zero changes:

- Sheet 7: All composite scores, tier classifications, J/WNJ ratios (Asian excluded from model)
- Sheets 0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8: No changes
- Yale Asian figures: Yale's 2014-15 Asian baseline (906/5,477 = 16.5%) was separately verified and confirmed correct
- Stanford figures: Stanford Asian=1,332 confirmed correct for both 2013-14 and 2014-15
- Columbia figures: Columbia sourced from IPEDS EF, not CDS B2 — unaffected
- Dartmouth figures: Dartmouth unaffected — Asian declined (−1.0pp), not a corrected school

8. CORRECTED FIGURES QUICK REFERENCE (Asian Δ, post-March 12 2026)

School	Base Asian%	2024 Asian%	Δ pp (corrected)	Tier	Jewish outcome
Harvard	18.8%	23.6%	+4.8	HIGH	ANOMALOUS (−49.3%)
Yale	16.5%	21.9%	+5.4	HIGH	ANOMALOUS (−42.0%)
Princeton	20.9%	23.5%	+2.6	MED-HIGH	NORMAL (−9.5%)
Penn	20.1%	29.6%	+9.5	MEDIUM	NORMAL (−31.0%)
Columbia	16.8%	18.7%	+1.9	LOW	ANOMALOUS (−28.0%)
Dartmouth	14.1%	13.1%	−1.0	LOW	ANOMALOUS (−19.0%)
Brown	12.8%	22.9%	+10.0	MEDIUM	OUTPERFORMER (+20.0%)
Cornell	17.2%	26.8%	+9.6	MED-LOW	OUTPERFORMER (−13.0%)
Stanford	19.0%	28.7%	+9.7	MED-HIGH	NORMAL (−21.0%)

Pearson r (Asian Δ vs Jewish % change, raw counts, n=9): r = +0.274, p = 0.48. NOT significant. POSITIVE direction. Asian growth excluded from composite model on both grounds.

9. WARNINGS

⚠ **Sheet 7 composite scores are the authoritative model output. Asian is NOT a factor. Do not add it.**
⚠ **The Pearson r must be recomputed from RAW COUNTS if any enrollment figures change — not from rounded % cells.**
⚠ **White% baselines in Sheet 1 come from 2013-14 DEGREE-SEEKING UG. They will NOT match the CDS file (2014-15 TOTAL UG). Both are correct.**
⚠ **Do not edit Sheets 0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 without a full methodology review.**
⚠ **If Jewish % change figures are updated (Hillel/Brandeis/chaplain data), ALL of Sheets 9, 10, and the Pearson r must be recomputed.**
⚠ **The J/WNJ ratio methodology is in Sheet 4. Do not substitute simple Jewish % for J/WNJ — they measure different things.**

STACKING PRESSURE INDEX — COMPLETE METHODOLOGY & SOURCE DOCUMENTATION

Harvard Jewish Alumni Alliance (HJAA) | Analysis finalized March 2026 | This sheet documents every methodological decision in the composite index. A reader with access to IPEDS and CDS public data should be able to reconstruct every cell in Sheet 7 from the instructions on this sheet alone.

SECTION 1 — WHAT THIS INDEX MEASURES AND WHY

Purpose
The Stacking Pressure Index measures the cumulative structural pressure on Jewish enrollment created by nine universities' admissions priorities. The core question: are the schools with the most structural pressure also the ones with the worst Jewish enrollment outcomes? If yes, structural stacking is a plausible explanation. If no — if schools with less pressure produce worse outcomes — stacking cannot explain the divergence and some other factor must be operating.

Falsification logic
The index is designed as a falsification tool, not a predictive one. If stacking were the complete explanation, composite score should rank-order J/WNJ ratios: higher structural pressure should predict worse (higher) J/WNJ. The decisive test is pairwise: Harvard (0.584) vs Brown (0.508) — Harvard has more pressure AND worse outcomes: consistent. Yale (0.344) vs Princeton (0.381) — Yale has LESS pressure than Princeton but a far worse J/WNJ: this is the Yale anomaly and it CANNOT be explained by stacking. Dartmouth (0.383) vs Princeton (0.381) — virtually identical scores, 3.44× gap in J/WNJ: Dartmouth is a separate unexplained anomaly.

What it does NOT measure
The index does not measure: legacy pipeline effects; holistic rating calibration; reader-level bias; yield-stage dynamics; campus climate effects; or any intentional factor. It measures only the mechanical, policy-level structural exposure from four quantifiable admissions priorities. Absence of a high stacking score does not exonerate a school. Presence of a high score does not condemn one. The index establishes what structural forces predict — the anomaly is what remains after that prediction is made.

SECTION 2 — WHY THE OECD/JRC HANDBOOK FRAMEWORK

Citation
OECD/JRC Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide. Joint Research Centre of the European Commission. OECD Publishing, 2008. ISBN 978-92-64-04345-9. This is the standard academic reference for composite index construction used by governments, academic institutions, and international organizations.

Why this framework
Three reasons: (1) Methodological independence — HJAA did not design the methodology; it adopted an established, published standard with known properties. This prevents post-hoc tuning to produce a desired result. (2) Transparency — the OECD/JRC framework requires explicit documentation of every step: dimension selection rationale, normalization method, aggregation rule, and sensitivity analysis. This sheet fulfills that requirement. (3) Robustness testing — the framework explicitly requires sensitivity analysis across weighting variants, which is done in Section E of Sheet 7. Rankings are stable across all tested variants for schools 1-5; the composite is not an artifact of weighting choice.

Normalization method
Min-max normalization (OECD/JRC §6.2). For each dimension, each school's value is rescaled to [0,1] where 0 = least structural pressure in the nine-school peer group and 1 = most. Formula: normalized = (x − min) / (max − min). Important: scores are peer-relative, not absolute. A score of 0.7 means 70% of the way between the least-exposed and most-exposed school on that dimension. It does not mean 70% of some external standard of "stacking pressure."

Level vs movement split
Each dimension is evaluated on two components: LEVEL (current endpoint value — what is the school's current exposure?) and MOVEMENT (relative change from baseline to current — how much did exposure grow?). These are normalized separately, then combined 50/50. Rationale: a school that started high and stayed high has high level but low movement; a school that started low and grew fast has high movement but moderate level. Both represent structural pressure but of different kinds. Equal weighting treats both as equally relevant. Sensitivity analysis tests 30/70 and 70/30 splits; see Sheet 7 Section E.

Dimension aggregation
Four dimensions, equal weight: each contributes 25% to the composite score. Composite = (D1 + D2 + D3 + D4) / 4, where each Di = 0.5 × normalized_level_i + 0.5 × normalized_movement_i. The equal-weight assumption is a standard default in the OECD/JRC framework when no empirical basis exists for differential weighting. No published research establishes that international enrollment growth is, say, twice as damaging to Jewish enrollment as geographic diversification. Equal weight is the defensible default.

SECTION 3 — WHY THESE FOUR DIMENSIONS

Selection criteria
A dimension was included if it met all three criteria: (1) Jewish applicants are disproportionately positioned on the unfavored side of that admissions priority; (2) publicly available, consistent, machine-readable data exists for all nine schools for the baseline and current year; (3) the mechanism has been tested individually in Section III of the report and found to be at least directionally plausible. Dimensions that met criteria 1 and 3 but lacked consistent cross-school data (e.g., legacy rate, holistic ratings, athletic recruitment share) were excluded from the composite and analyzed separately in Appendix F.

D1: International enrollment
INCLUDED. Rationale: international applicant pools are uniformly and substantially less Jewish than domestic pools. As international share of the entering class grows, the denominator available to Jewish students mechanically shrinks. Measure: first-time international undergraduate share = international first-time UG / total first-time UG (IPEDS EF survey). This is more precise than total enrollment stock because it captures the cohort-level pipeline effect without confounding with historical enrollment patterns.

D2: NE corridor concentration
INCLUDED. Rationale: approximately 43% of American Jews live in the Northeast corridor (NY, NJ, MA, CT). Geographic diversification away from this corridor disproportionately reduces the pipeline of Jewish applicants. Measure: NE corridor students (NY+NJ+MA+CT) as a share of DOMESTIC first-time UG. Domestic denominator is essential: using total first-time UG would conflate NE geographic diversification with international enrollment growth, two separate mechanisms operating on different applicant pools. The domestic adjustment isolates the geographic rebalancing effect within the domestic pool.

D3: White domestic share
INCLUDED. Rationale: approximately 90% of American Jews identify as White non-Hispanic in official census categories (Pew 2021). Declining White share of the domestic undergraduate population directly compresses the pool from which Jewish enrollment draws. This dimension captures the aggregate effect of racial and ethnic diversification goals on the demographic pool that Jewish students occupy. Measure: White students / (total UG − NRA), where NRA = non-resident alien. Domestic adjustment is required for the same reason as D2: NRA growth is a separate mechanism already captured in D1. Mixing them would double-count international growth.

D4: Financial aid coverage
INCLUDED. Rationale: Harvard's expanded financial aid initiative since 2004 prioritized lower-income and first-generation students. Jewish applicants are disproportionately higher-income and continuing-generation, placing them on the unfavored side of this priority shift. Expanding financial aid at the margin typically signals socioeconomic diversification goals that compress the higher-income applicant pool. Measure: % of undergraduates receiving any financial aid (IPEDS SFA survey), domestic-adjusted (aid recipients / domestic enrollment). NOTE: a higher aid rate indicates more socioeconomic targeting, which is the direction of INCREASED stacking pressure on Jewish applicants.

Excluded dimensions
Legacy preference: plausible mechanism and directionally tested in Appendix F, but cross-school legacy rate data is not publicly available in consistent form. Athletic recruitment: tested in Appendix F (falsified by Brown); no consistent cross-school data for recruited-athlete share exists in public sources. Holistic ratings calibration: the most analytically important untested mechanism, but entirely non-public. Its absence from the composite does not diminish its analytical importance — it means the stacking composite is a floor, not a ceiling, on structural exposure.

SECTION 4 — BASELINE YEAR SELECTION AND RATIONALE

Baseline: Fall 2014
All four dimensions use Fall 2014 (AY 2014-15) as the baseline, except financial aid which uses AY 2013-14 (the earliest year consistently available in IPEDS SFA). Current: Fall 2024 (AY 2024-25); financial aid AY 2023-24. This is a standardized 10-year window applied uniformly across all nine schools. The prior version of this analysis (v6) used mixed baselines (some schools 2013-14, others 2014-15). v7 corrects this: all schools use the same baseline year. Mixed baselines introduce spurious cross-school variation because each school's baseline shifts by a different amount depending on where it happened to be in that particular year — the correction is material for Stanford (NE corridor) and Cornell.

Why 2014 specifically
Four reasons: (1) It is the earliest year for which all nine schools have consistent, machine-readable IPEDS EF geographic distribution data (first-time UG by state, including NE corridor states). (2) It predates the post-2015 acceleration in enrollment shifts documented in the Crimson series, providing a clean pre-acceleration baseline. (3) It aligns with the Brandeis CMJS 2016 Jewish enrollment survey window, which is the preferred baseline for Jewish enrollment measurement at Harvard and Penn. (4) Columbia's CDS data is most reliable from Fall 2014 onward (General Studies denominator issues are better documented from this point).

Penn exception
Penn uses 2015-16 CDS enrollment data for the White share dimension (D3) to match the Brandeis CMJS survey year, which is the preferred baseline for Penn's J/WNJ ratio. The stacking analysis uses 2014-15 for Penn's D3 baseline for consistency with all other schools. The J/WNJ ratio calculation uses 2015-16 independently, as documented in Sheet 3 (White Decomposition).

SECTION 5 — DATA SOURCES: EXACT TABLES AND ACCESS INSTRUCTIONS

D1: International (IPEDS EF)
Source: IPEDS Enrollment by Student Level and Race/Ethnicity (EF survey). Navigate to: nces.ed.gov/ipeds → Use the Data → Survey Components → Fall Enrollment. Table: EF [year] D — Gender by attendance status and level of student by race/ethnicity and residency status. Select: Total first-time UG (men + women) and Non-resident alien first-time UG. Baseline year: Fall 2014. Current year: Fall 2024. International share = non-resident alien first-time UG / total first-time UG.

D2: NE corridor (IPEDS EF-S)
Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment — Students by Geography (EF-S survey). Navigate to: nces.ed.gov/ipeds → Fall Enrollment → Student Migration. Table: EF [year] D — First-time UG by state of residence. Sum NY + NJ + MA + CT for NE corridor count. Total domestic first-time UG = total first-time UG minus non-resident alien first-time UG (from EF D table above). NE corridor domestic share = (NY+NJ+MA+CT) / domestic first-time UG. Baseline: Fall 2014. Current: Fall 2024.

D3: White share (CDS Section B)
Source: Common Data Set, Section B — Enrollment and Persistence. Table B2: Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity. Use: total undergraduate enrollment (full-time + part-time men and women), White non-Hispanic row, and Nonresident Alien row. White domestic share = White / (Total − NRA). CDS is published annually by each institution. Retrieve at: [institution].edu/ir/cds or search "[school] common data set [year]". Baseline: Fall 2014-15. Current: Fall 2024-25. NOTE: Columbia includes General Studies undergraduates in its total. Use with caution; Columbia J/WNJ ratios are rated LOW confidence in the report.

D4: Financial aid (IPEDS SFA)
Source: IPEDS Student Financial Aid (SFA survey). Navigate to: nces.ed.gov/ipeds → Student Financial Aid. Variable: % of full-time first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates receiving any financial aid. Domestic adjustment: the IPEDS SFA denominator is full-time first-time domestic (NRA students are generally ineligible for federal aid and excluded from the SFA table). The IPEDS SFA table is already effectively domestic-adjusted. Baseline: AY 2013-14 (earliest consistent availability). Current: AY 2023-24.

SECTION 6 — VERIFIED RAW DATA (source for all Section A values in Sheet 7)

School	Intl Base (Fall 2014)	Intl Curr (Fall 2024)	NE Base(d) (Fall 2014)	NE Curr(d) (Fall 2024)	White Base(d) (Fall
Brown	221/1,559 = 14.2%	300/1,719 = 17.5%	487/ (1,559-221) = 36.4%	470/ (1,719-300) = 33.1%	2,808/ (6,548-794) = 48.8%
Columbia	256/1,533 = 16.7%	311/1,558 = 20.0%	522/ (1,533-256) = 40.9%	430/ (1,558-311) = 34.5%	3,138/ (8,100-1,127) = 45.0%
Cornell	287/3,225 = 8.9%	355/3,525 = 10.1%	1,536/ (3,225-287) = 52.3%	1,659/ (3,525-355) = 52.3%	6,042/ (14,366-1,379) =
Dartmouth	92/1,152 = 8.0%	170/1,182 = 14.4%	351/ (1,152-92) = 33.1%	314/ (1,182-170) = 31.0%	2,010/ (4,184-343) = 52.3%
Harvard	215/1,650 = 13.0%	285/1,641 = 17.4%	559/ (1,650-215) = 39.0%	516/ (1,641-285) = 38.1%	2,905/ (6,636-755) = 49.4%
Penn	270/2,413 = 11.2%	309/2,393 = 12.9%	671/ (2,413-270) = 31.3%	626/ (2,393-309) = 30.0%	4,355/ (9,746-1,103) = 50.4%
Princeton	170/1,310 = 13.0%	168/1,407 = 11.9%	434/ (1,310-170) = 38.1%	474/ (1,407-168) = 38.3%	2,417/ (5,258-579) = 51.7%
Stanford	170/1,677 = 10.1%	281/1,693 = 16.6%	144/ (1,677-170) = 9.6%	133/ (1,693-281) = 9.4%	2,633/ (7,018-575) = 40.9%
Yale	171/1,360 = 12.6%	187/1,554 = 12.0%	389/ (1,360-171) = 32.7%	437/ (1,554-187) = 32.0%	2,578/ (5,477-570) = 52.5%

School	White Curr(d) (Fall 2024-25)	Aid Base(d) (AY	Aid Curr(d) (AY	IPEDS Source EF Table	CDS Source Section B2
Brown	2,379/(7,226-917) = 37.7%	65%	63%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Columbia	2,575/(8,973-1,770) = 35.7%	53%	57%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Cornell	4,915/(15,792-1,498) = 34.4%	60%	56%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Dartmouth	1,973/(4,474-667) = 51.8%	61%	60%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Harvard	2,088/(6,979-1,048) = 35.2%	72%	72%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Penn	2,583/(10,013-1,327) = 29.7%	61%	63%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Princeton	1,921/(5,709-721) = 38.5%	62%	68%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Stanford	1,737/(7,554-965) = 26.4%	68%	76%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25
Yale	2,110/(6,758-754) = 35.1%	59%	59%	EF2014, EF2024	CDS 2014-15, 2024-25

SECTION 7 — NORMALIZATION: WORKED EXAMPLE (Harvard, D1 International)

Step 1: Compute level
Harvard current international share = 285/1,641 = 17.37%. Peer group range: min = Cornell 10.07%, max = Columbia 19.96%. Harvard normalized level = (17.37% − 10.07%) / (19.96% − 10.07%) = 7.30/9.89 = 0.738.

Step 2: Compute movement
Harvard relative change in intl share = (17.37% − 13.03%) / 13.03% = +33.3%. Peer group range: min = Princeton −8.0% (intl share declined), max = Dartmouth +80.1%. Harvard normalized movement = (33.3% − (−8.0%)) / (80.1% − (−8.0%)) = 41.3/88.1 = 0.469.

Step 3: Combine 50/50
Harvard D1 composite = 0.5 × 0.738 + 0.5 × 0.469 = 0.603. This means Harvard is 60.3% of the way between the least and most internationally exposed school in the peer group, equally weighting its current level and the direction/magnitude of change since 2014.

Step 4: Final composite
Harvard composite = (D1 + D2 + D3 + D4) / 4 = (0.603 + 0.421 + 0.673 + 0.638) / 4 = 0.584. This places Harvard third highest in the peer group after Stanford (0.682) and Columbia (0.625). See Sheet 7, Section D for all schools.

SECTION 8 — LIMITATIONS, CAVEATS, AND EXCLUSIONS FROM ANALYSIS

Peer-relative scores
All scores are relative to the nine-school peer group. Adding or removing a school changes all scores because it changes the min/max of each dimension. The scores and rankings reported here apply only to this specific nine-school comparison. They cannot be compared to any other composite index using different peer groups.

Dartmouth J/WNJ exclusion
Dartmouth's stacking composite (0.383) is valid and included in the analysis. Its J/WNJ ratio (3.55×) is excluded from substantive analytical conclusions. Reason: Dartmouth's White Non-Jewish enrollment declined only 5.4% over the analysis window. When the denominator (White Non-Jewish decline) approaches zero, the J/WNJ ratio becomes mathematically unstable — a small White Non-Jewish decline produces a very large ratio even with modest Jewish decline. The 3.55× figure is a mathematical artifact of a near-zero denominator, not evidence of anomalous admissions behavior. Dartmouth is grayed out in Figure 9 of the report with an explanatory footnote.

Columbia GS caveat
Columbia's composite score (0.625, ranked 2nd) should be read with caution. Columbia's Common Data Set enrollment figures include General Studies undergraduates, a non-traditional undergraduate division not present at other schools. This inflates Columbia's total enrollment denominator, which affects both the White domestic share (D3) and the NE corridor domestic share (D2) calculations. Columbia's stacking score is directionally valid but not strictly comparable to the other eight schools. Columbia's J/WNJ ratio is rated LOW confidence in the report for the same reason.

Stanford NE corridor
Stanford's very low NE corridor score (0.059) correctly reflects Stanford's geography. Stanford has never drawn substantially from the NE corridor: its domestic NE share was 9.6% in 2014 and 9.4% in 2024, essentially stable. The prior version of this analysis (v6) incorrectly used a raw denominator for the NE calculation, which inflated Stanford's NE score by conflating international growth with geographic rebalancing. The domestic-adjusted denominator is the correct measure. Stanford's high composite (0.682, ranked 1st) is driven primarily by its White domestic share decline (D3 = 0.931) and financial aid expansion (D4 = 1.000), not NE corridor dynamics.

Version history
v6 (prior): mixed baselines (some schools Fall 2013-14, others Fall 2014-15); NE corridor used raw rather than domestic-adjusted denominator. v7 (current): all four dimensions standardized to Fall 2014-15; domestic adjustment applied consistently to NE corridor denominator. Material score changes: Stanford 0.807→0.682 (NE correction); Cornell 0.202→0.322 (NE correction, Cornell has highest domestic NE concentration in peer group at ~52%). Top-three ranking (Stanford, Columbia, Harvard) is stable across versions.

SECTION 9 — REVIEWER &

9.1 TWO-FILE ARCHITECTURE
This workbook (Stacking Analysis) and its companion file (CDS_IPEDS) are designed as a matched pair. They share inputs but serve different purposes:

- CDS_IPEDS_[date].xlsx — Stores every race/ethnicity enrollment count sourced from CDS B2 or IPEDS. Baseline year shown is 2014-15 for Harvard, Yale, Brown, Cornell, Columbia; 2015-16 for Penn; 2001-02 for Princeton (J/WNJ only); 2013-14 for Stanford. This file does NOT store 2013-14 rows for Yale, Cornell, or Brown (they predate the machine-readable IPEDS window). A reconciliation addendum for those three schools was added to the Enrollment Raw sheet in March 2026.

- Stacking Analysis (this file) — Computes all four stacking dimensions and the composite index. Sheet 1 (Master Inputs) is the single source of truth for J/WNJ baselines. Sheet 7 (Stacking Composite) is the single source of truth for the composite scores. These two sheets use DIFFERENT White% figures for different purposes — see §9.3.

9.2 BASELINE YEAR RULES (critical for cross-file matching)
There are TWO distinct baseline years in use and they serve different purposes. Confusing them is the most common source of apparent discrepancies.

COMPOSITE INDEX BASELINE (Sheet 7, all four dimensions):
All nine schools use Fall 2014 (AY 2014-15) as the structural baseline. This is the earliest year with consistent IPEDS state-of-residence geography for all nine schools. Penn exception: 2015-16 CDS B2 used for White(d) to match Brandeis CMJS survey year. The CDS companion file stores these exact rows.

J/WNJ CALCULATION BASELINE (Sheet 3, White Decomposition):
Harvard: CDS 2015-16 (42.45%) — matched to Brandeis SSRI survey year.
Yale, Cornell, Brown: CDS 2013-14 — sourced from school CDS PDFs; NOT in companion file.
Yale 47.34%, Cornell 42.68%, Brown 43.27% — each is 0.3–0.6pp above the 2014-15 row in the companion file (normal year-on-year drift; documented in companion file row 2).
Princeton: CDS 2001-02 (66.20%) — matched to CIRP/Hargadon survey era.
All others: same as composite baseline year.

RULE: Never cross-compare a J/WNJ baseline White% from Sheet 3 with the companion file's earliest row without first checking which year each is from.

9.3 WHITE% — TWO DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS IN THE SAME WORKBOOK ⚑
THIS IS THE MOST COMMON SOURCE OF VERIFICATION CONFUSION.

Sheet 3 (White Decomposition / J/WNJ calculation) uses RAW White%:
Raw White% = White students ÷ Total UG enrollment (CDS B2 Section B2 total).
Denominator includes international students. This matches what CDS B2 publishes directly.

Sheet 7 (Stacking Composite, Section A and all downstream) uses WHITE DOMESTIC %:
White(d)% = White students ÷ (Total UG − International UG).
Denominator excludes international students because the composite measures structural pressure on domestic applicant pools. These values are NOT in the companion CDS file.

Example (Harvard 2014-15): CDS B2 → Raw White = 2,905/6,636 = 43.8%. Sheet 7 White(d) = 2,905/(6,636−755) = 49.4%. Both are correct for their purpose.

RULE: When verifying Sheet 7 White values against CDS, always subtract the NRA count from the CDS total before dividing. The NRA count is in the companion file Enrollment Raw column 'Int'l (NRA)'.

9.4 INTERNATIONAL % SOURCE (D1 dimension)
Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment survey, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates from foreign countries ÷ total first-time degree/cert-seeking undergrads.

This is FIRST-TIME student data, not total UG stock. It comes from the companion file tab 'IPEDS International Enrollment', NOT from CDS B2. CDS B2 NRA counts are total-stock figures; they differ from first-time figures.

Baseline: Fall 2014 column. Current: Fall 2024 column. All nine values are verified to four decimal places in the March 2026 audit.

9.5 NE CORRIDOR SOURCE (D2 dimension)
Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment — Student Migration (EF-S survey), first-time UG by state of residence. Companion file tab 'IPEDS Geography (State Detail)'.

NE states: New York + New Jersey + Massachusetts + Connecticut.
Denominator: domestic first-time UG = total first-time UG − international first-time UG (same international count used for D1).

RULE: NE(d) = (NY+NJ+MA+CT) ÷ (Total first-time − Intl first-time). Both numerator and denominator come from IPEDS EF-S; do not mix with CDS B2 totals.

9.6 AID DOMESTIC ADJUSTMENT FORMULA (D4 dimension)
IPEDS SFA raw figures include international students in the denominator (confirmed via cohort-size cross-check). Since international students are largely ineligible for US need-based aid, we adjust to approximate domestic-only coverage:

Aid(d) = Raw IPEDS SFA 'Any Aid' % ÷ (1 − Intl%)

Example: Harvard AY2013-14 — Raw = 72%, Intl% = 13.03% → Aid(d) = 72% ÷ 0.8697 = 82.8%.

IMPORTANT: Brown and Stanford have nearly identical Aid(d) base values (~75.7%) despite different raw IPEDS figures (Brown 65%, Stanford 68%) because Brown's higher intl share offsets Stanford's higher raw rate. The March 2026 audit corrected Stanford's stored value from 75.73% to 75.67% (the Brown value is correct at 75.74%).

Aid% values are in the companion file tab 'IPEDS Financial Aid'. Intl% values are in 'IPEDS Intl-Adjusted Aid' and 'IPEDS International Enrollment'.

9.7 PRINCETON SPECIAL CASE — TWO DIFFERENT BASELINES
Princeton is the only school with different baseline years for the composite vs J/WNJ calculation:

COMPOSITE (Sheet 7): Uses Fall 2014-15 data throughout, just like the other eight schools. Princeton 2014-15: Total 5,258, White 2,417, NRA 579 → White(d) = 51.7%. This is in the companion file Enrollment Raw rows 16-18.

J/WNJ CALCULATION (Sheet 3): Uses CDS 2001-02 as the White% baseline (66.20%) because that era matches the CIRP/Hargadon Jewish enrollment instrument. The 0.107× J/WNJ ratio requires this matched baseline. Using the 2014-15 White% instead produces 0.171× (a cross-baseline artifact that appeared in earlier versions and was corrected in March 2026).

RULE: Princeton's J/WNJ of 0.107× is ONLY valid with the 2001-02 CDS White baseline (66.20%). Any recalculation that uses the 2013-14 or 2014-15 Princeton White% for the J/WNJ denominator is incorrect.

9.8 AUDIT TRAIL — MARCH 2026
Full computational audit completed March 10, 2026 against CDS_IPEDS companion file. Scope: all four dimensions (18 raw inputs per dimension), all nine composite scores, three sensitivity weightings, all J/WNJ ratios.

Changes made in March 2026:
- Princeton J/WNJ corrected: 0.171× (cross-baseline artifact) → 0.107× (CIRP/2001-02 baseline, DP Senior 2022-24 avg current). Sheet 3 formula chain repaired.
- Stanford Aid base corrected: 75.73% → 75.67% (68% raw ÷ (1−10.14%) = 75.67%; prior value matched Brown by coincidence). Cascade: Section B E25 delta updated; Section C I37 Mv:Aid unchanged (still 1.000 as max); all other schools' normalized Mv:Aid values adjusted < 0.005; composite scores unchanged.
- Yale, Cornell, Brown 2013-14 White% addendum added to companion file Enrollment Raw.
- This reviewer guide (Section 9) added to Sheet 0.

STATUS: All composite scores verified. All J/WNJ ratios verified. No errors found that affect any figure cited in the report.

Jewish Enrollment Stacking Analysis — v6: Source-verified data corrections (Feb 2026)

CDS = Common Data Set Section B2 (degree-seeking undergrad). Columbia = IPEDS EF (CC+SEAS+GS). Jewish figures: Hillel = Hillel International (local chapter est.); Alt = independent survey (Brandeis SSRI / Yale Chaplain / CIRP); Crimson = Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey (Harvard only). Preferred = analyst's recommended baseline for trend analysis (see Source Quality sheet).

School	CDS Base Year	CDS Curr Year	White % Base	White % Curr	Δ White (pp)	Hillel Base %	Hillel Base Yr	Hillel Curr %	Hillel Curr Yr	Alt Base %	Alt Base Yr	Alt Source	Alt Reliability	Crimson Base %	Crimson Curr %	White % Ba	Source: Ha	Pref. Curr	Pref. Curr	Pref. Curr
Harvard	2013-14	2024-25	44.8%	29.9%	-0.1489	25.0%	2006-08	7.1%	2024-25	14.0%	2015-16	Brandeis SSRI (eJP 2018)	HIGH	9.5%	5.4%	42.5%	Matches Br	0.071	2024-25	Same as Hi
Yale	2013-14	2024-25	47.3%	31.2%	-0.1612	27.0%	2013-14	11.8%	Mar 2026 (live	16.4%	2010s avg	Yale Chaplain's Office	MEDIUM	—	—			0.095	2024 (Chap	Chaplain's
Penn	2015-16	2024-25	43.7%	25.8%	-0.1795	26.0%	2013-14	11.0%	2024-25	16.0%	2015-16	Brandeis CMJS (inclusive)	HIGH	—	—			0.11	2024-25	Same as Hi
Princeton	2001-02	2024-25	66.2%	33.7%	-0.3255	13.0%	2013-14	8.6%	DP Senior Survey	10.5%	1988-2003 avg	CIRP via Hargadon (Princeton Alumni Weekly, Feb 2006); 15-yr avg 1988-2003;	HIGH (institutional:	—	—		CDS 2001-(	0.0987	2022-24 av	DP Senior S
Cornell	2013-14	2024-25	42.7%	31.1%	-0.1156	23.0%	2013-14	20.0%	2024-25	—	—	—	—	—	—			0.2	2024-25	Same as Hi
Columbia	2013	2024-25	39.2%	28.7%	-0.1052	22.0%	2013	15.7%	2024-25	—	—	—	⚠ Hillel 2013	—	—			0.157	2024-25	Same as Hi
Brown	2013-14	2024-25	43.3%	32.9%	-0.1035	20.0%	2013-14	23.9%	2024-25	—	—	—	BDH Fall 2024 intercept =	—	—			0.239	2024-25	Same as Hi
Dartmouth	2014-15	2024-25	48.0%	44.1%	-0.0394	11.0%	2014-15	8.9%	2024-25	—	—	—	—	—	—			0.089	2024-25	Same as Hi
Stanford	2013-14	2024-25	37.0%	23.0%	-0.1403	10.0%	2013-14	7.9%	2024-25	—	—	—	—	—	—			0.079	2024-25	Same as Hi

Gold background = Preferred Alt baseline available (Brandeis/CIRP/Chaplain) — use Alt series for trend analysis. Orange = Hillel estimates (inclusive; pre-2018 documented 40-60% overestimation). Green = Independent survey baselines (high/medium reliability). Blue = Crimson Freshman Survey (Harvard only; religion-only, freshmen only).

⚑ *WHITE % BASELINE NOTE: Six schools use AY 2013-14 baselines (Harvard, Yale, Brown, Cornell, Stanford, Columbia) sourced from each school's own published CDS B2. These 2013-14 values are NOT stored in the companion CDS/IPEDS file, which holds 2014-15 as its earliest row. Apparent discrepancies of 0.3–2.4pp when comparing files for those schools reflect the year difference — not errors. Penn (2015-16), Dartmouth (2014-15), and Princeton (2001-02) baselines ARE in the CDS file and cross-check exactly. Princeton's 2001-02 window is intentional: matched to CIRP survey period used to establish its Jewish enrollment baseline.*

Asian baseline figures in Sheets 9 and 10 corrected March 12, 2026 following CDS B2 primary source PDF verification. Five schools affected: Harvard, Princeton, Penn, Brown, Cornell. Composite scores in Sheet 7 unaffected — Asian was excluded from the four-factor model.

HARVARD JEWISH ENROLLMENT — THREE-SERIES SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Three independent measurement series for Harvard Jewish enrollment. Series differ in source, baseline period, identity definition, and population. All show the same directional decline; magnitude varies by series. Brandeis→Hillel is the preferred conservative estimate. Source: Hillel International; Brandeis SSRI (eJewishPhilanthropy May 2018); Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey.

A. SENSITIVITY TABLE — DECLINE MAGNITUDE BY SERIES

Series	Baseline Source	Baseline Figure	Baseline Year	Current Source	Current Figure	Current Year	Decline (pp)	Rel. Decline	Identity Definition
1 — Hillel → Hillel	Hillel International	**25.0%**	2006–08	Hillel International	**7.1%**	2024-25	**-17.9%**	**-71.6%**	UPPER BOUND: same source, different methodologies across time; pre-2018 Hillel documented 40-60% overestimate
2 — Brandeis → Hillel ★ PREFERRED	Brandeis SSRI random sample (eJP 2018)	**14.0%**	2015-16	Hillel International	**7.1%**	2024-25	**-6.9%**	**-49.3%**	PREFERRED / CONSERVATIVE FLOOR: independent rigorous baseline vs. current Hillel. If Hillel still inflated, true decline is larger.
3 — Crimson → Crimson	Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey	**9.5%**	C/O 2017 (entry 2013)	Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey	**5.4%**	C/O 2027 (entry 2023)	**-4.1%**	**-43.2%**	INTERNALLY CONSISTENT: same instrument. Freshmen only; religion-only (secular Jews excluded). Peak was 10.1% (C/O 2019).
3b — Crimson Peak → Crimson Current	Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey	**10.1%**	C/O 2019 (entry 2015)	Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey	**5.4%**	C/O 2027 (entry 2023)	**-4.7%**	**-46.5%**	Peak-to-current Crimson comparison. Steepest single drop: C/O 2020 (entry 2016) = 6.3%, a 3.8 pp fall in one cohort.

B. HARVARD CRIMSON FRESHMAN SURVEY — YEAR-BY-YEAR JEWISH SERIES

Graduation Class	Entry Year	Jewish %	White %	YoY Change (Jewish)	Notes
2017	2013	9.5%	61.7%	—	Baseline year
2018	2014	9.8%	62.1%	—	
2019	**2015**	**10.1%**	58.2%	—	PEAK — highest recorded
2020	**2016**	**6.3%**	55.7%	**-3.8%**	STEEPEST DROP: −3.8 pp in one cohort; SFFA litigation period
2021	2017	7.7%	52.1%	**1.4%**	Partial rebound
2022	2018	5.4%	46.0%	**-2.3%**	
2023	2019	5.3%	47.2%	**-0.1%**	
2024	2020	5.2%	49.8%	**-0.1%**	COVID cohort
2025	2021	7.4%	53.1%	**2.2%**	Post-COVID; may reflect class composition shift
2027	2023	5.4%	42.5%	**-2.0%**	Most recent (no 2026 survey)

WHITE DECOMPOSITION — REVISED: Jewish vs. White Non-Jewish (All 9 Schools)

Decomposes 'White' CDS category into White Jewish and White Non-Jewish. Assumes 90% of Jewish students identify as White in official categories (Pew Research; consistent with prior versions). Jewish baseline = PREFERRED series (Brandeis SSRI / CIRP / Chaplain where available; Hillel otherwise). CRITICAL CHANGE FROM PRIOR VERSION: Harvard baseline revised from ~25% (Hillel) to ~14% (Brandeis SSRI). This reduces the J/WNJ ratio from ~5× to ~3× and eliminates the 'nearly all White decline = Jews' claim for Harvard. Directional finding (Jews declined faster than White Non-Jews) survives across all schools where data is sufficient.

School	Pref. Baseline	Base Jewish %	Base White %	Base W-Jewish %	Base W-Non-Jewish %	Curr Jewish %	Curr White %	Curr W-Jewish %	Curr W-Non-Jewish %	Rel Δ W-Jewish	Rel Δ W-Non-Jewish	J/WNJ Ratio (computed)	Interpretation
Harvard	Brandeis SSRI 14% / CDS 2015-16	14.0%	0.4245	0.1260	0.2985	7.1%	0.2992	0.0639	0.2353	-49.3%	-21.2%	**2.33×**	Jews declined at
Yale	Chaplain 16.4%	16.4%	0.4734	0.1476	0.3258	0.095	0.3122	0.0855	0.2267	-42.1%	-30.4%	**1.38×**	G5 = Chaplain
Penn	Brandeis 16% incl	16.0%	0.4375	0.1440	0.2935	11.0%	0.2580	0.0990	0.1590	-31.3%	-45.8%	**0.68×**	Penn: Jews declined at
Princeton	CIRP/Hargadon 10.5%	10.5%	0.6620	0.0945	0.5675	9.9%	0.3365	0.0888	0.2477	-6.0%	-56.4%	**0.11×**	✅ Princeton INVERTS the pattern. Source: CIRP via Hargadon (PAW Feb 2006) → DP Senior Survey 2022-24
Cornell	Hillel ~22%	23.0%	0.4268	0.2070	0.2198	20.0%	0.3112	0.1800	0.1312	-13.0%	-40.3%	**0.32×**	Jews declined at
Columbia	Hillel ~22%	22.0%	0.3922	0.1980	0.1942	15.7%	0.2870	0.1413	0.1457	-28.6%	-25.0%	**1.15×**	Columbia: roughly
Brown	Hillel ~20%	20.0%	0.4327	0.1800	0.2527	23.9%	0.3292	0.2151	0.1141	+19.5%	-54.8%	**-0.36×**	White Non-Jews
Brown (BDH 20	BDH Fall 2024 14.1% (re	0.2	0.4327	0.18	0.2527	0.141	0.3292	0.1269	0.2023	-0.295	-0.199446	1.479097	⚠ CROSS-I
Brown (BDH 20	BDH Fall 2025 9.0% (reli	0.2	0.4327	0.18	0.2527	0.09	0.3292	0.081	0.2482	-0.55	-0.017808	30.8856	⚠⚠ CROS
Dartmouth	Hillel ~10%	11.0%	0.4804	0.0990	0.3814	8.9%	0.4410	0.0801	0.3609	-19.1%	-5.4%	**3.55×**	Jews declined at 3.55× the rate of White Non-Jews (Jews -19.1%, White Non-Jews -5.4%). Jews declined FASTER than White Non-Jews — mild disparity. Corrected: Hillel base 11% (was 10%).
Stanford	Hillel ~10%	10.0%	0.3702	0.0900	0.2802	7.9%	0.2299	0.0711	0.1588	-21.0%	-43.3%	**0.48×**	Stanford:

HARVARD: WHITE DECOMPOSITION SENSITIVITY BY BASELINE SELECTION

Version	Jewish Baseline	W-Jewish Base	W-Non-Jewish Base	W-Jewish Curr	W-Non-Jewish Curr	Δ W-Jewish	Δ W-Non-Jewish	Ratio	Source Issue
Upper Bound (Hillel ~25%)	25.0%	0.2250	0.1995	0.0639	0.2353	-71.6%	+17.9%	**N/A†**	*† Ratio N/A: with inflated Hillel baseline, White Non-Jewish share actually INCREASED +5.5% while Jews declined 71.6%. This means virtually all of the white category's pp decline came from Jews — but this is an artifact of the inflated baseline, not evidence of anti-Jewish targeting. Corrected (Brandeis baseline) shows*
Preferred (Brandeis 14% ★)	0.14	0.126	0.2985	0.0639	0.2353	-0.4929	-0.2118	2.3271	★ Preferred. Brandeis SSRI 14% (2015-16) → Hillel 7.1% (2024-25). J/WNJ = 2.33×. White baseline m
ALT: Crimson 9.5% base	0.095	0.0855	0.3390	0.0639	0.2353	-0.2526	-0.3060	0.8257	Crimson consistent-instrument. Crimson 9.5% (2008-09) → Crimson 5.4% (2023-24). J/WNJ ≈ 1.48×.

YALE: WHITE DECOMPOSITION SENSITIVITY BY INSTRUMENT SELECTION

Version	Jewish Baseline	W-Jewish Bas	W-Non-Jewish	W-Jewish Curr	W-Non-Jewish	Δ W-Jewish	Δ W-Non-Jewis	Ratio	Source Issue
Upper Bound: H	0.27	0.2430	0.2304	0.108	0.2042	-55.6%	-11.4%	4.89×	Upper bound scenario. Hillel 27% baseline is pre-2018 and likely inflated. Inclusive→inclusive instrument pairi
Cross-Method:	0.164	0.1476	0.3258	0.1062	0.2060	-28.0%	-36.8%	0.76×	⚠ Cross-methodology: religion-only base paired with inclusive current. Understates Jewish decline. Ratio ~0.7
Preferred: Chap	0.164	0.1476	0.3258	0.0855	0.2267	-42.1%	-30.4%	1.38×	★ Preferred: same instrument both ends (Chaplain religion-only). Jews −42.1%, White Non-Jews −30.4% → ra

Methodological note: The cross-method row (Chaplain→Hillel) produces a 0.75× ratio suggesting Yale is non-anomalous. This understates Jewish decline because it pairs a religion-only baseline with an inclusive current figure. On the consist

BROWN BDH ALTERNATIVE (updated with Fall 2025 data): A. Hillel→Hillel (preferred): J/WNJ = −0.356× (OUTPERFORMER; Jews +19.5%, White Non-Jews −54.8%). B. Hillel→BDH 2024 14.1% (cross-instrument ⚠): J/WNJ = 1.48× — artefact, not pr

CORRECTED NINE-SCHOOL TAXONOMY (White Decomposition Ratios, Preferred Baselines)

Tier	Schools	Ratio Range	Meaning	Analytical Implication
ANOMALOUS	Harvard (2.33×), Yale (1.39	>1.3×	Jews declined FA	H/Y = robust on preferred baselines; Dartmouth = Hillel-only, low confidence
PROPORTIONAL	Columbia (1.15×)	~1.0×	Near-parallel dec	GS denominator caveat applies
NORMAL DIVERS	Penn (0.68×), Stanford (0.4	0.40–0.70×	Jews declined LES	Princeton = 'normal Ivy' benchmark; Penn/Stanford Hillel-only
OUTPERFORMER	Princeton (0.11×, BENCHM	≤0.4×	Jews substantiall	Brown = strongest outperformer in dataset

DISTRIBUTION SYMMETRY ANALYSIS: Overperformers as Mirror Image of Anomalies

Princeton (0.107×) anchors the lower end. Harvard (2.33×) and Yale (1.39×) sit above; Harvard | BDH alt (religion-only 14.1% vs Hillel 20% base): J/WNJ 1.48× — cross-instrument artefact; Saxe-corrected: 0.06×.

School	J/WNJ Ratio	Distance from	Direction	White Δ (pp)	Key Observation
Harvard	2.33×	21.9× above	**ANOMALOUS (−)**	−14.9	Highest J/WNJ ratio on preferred baseline. Corrected from 1.83× (prior version used mismatched white baseline year).
Yale	1.39×	13.1× above	**ANOMALOUS (−)**	−16.1	Second worst; corrected from misleading cross-method 0.72×
Dartmouth	3.55×	33.3× above†	**ANOMALOUS (−)**	−3.9	†Hillel-only, low conf.; tiny White decline amplifies ratio
Columbia	1.15×	10.8× above	**PROPORTIONAL**	−10.5	Near-benchmark; GS caveat
Princeton	0.11×	— (BENCHMAR	**OUTPERFORMER**	−32.6 pp	CIRP via Hargadon (PAW Feb 2006) → DP Senior Survey 2024. Both religion-only. Baseline: 10.5% (1988-2003 avg). Current: 9.5% (Senior 2024, n=506, preferred); 9.4% (Frosh
Penn	0.68×	6.4× above	**NORMAL**	−18.9	LARGEST White decline → Normal tier. Diversification ≠ anomaly
Stanford	0.48×	4.6× above	**NORMAL**	−14.4	Similar to Princeton despite steeper White decline
Cornell	0.32×	6.5× above	**OUTPERFORMER**	−11.6	Mirror of Yale: similar White Δ, opposite Jewish outcome
Brown	−0.36×	INVERTED; >3.4	**OUTPERFORMER**	−10.4	Mirror of Harvard: Jews GREW while White Non-Jews collapsed 55%

KEY FINDING — MIRROR-IMAGE PAIRS:

Harvard (2.33×) ↔ Brown (N/C, INVERTED): Extreme outliers in opposite directions. Both have comparable stacking composite scores (0.584 vs 0.508). Neither is explained by aggregate structural pressure. Harvard ratio corrected from 1.83× — see methodology note al

Yale (1.39×) ↔ Cornell (0.32×): Similar White decline magnitude (−16.1 vs −11.6 pp) but opposite Jewish outcomes. Yale Jews declined 42% faster than White Non-Jews; Cornell Jews declined 70% SLOWER than White Non-Jews. ~4.3× gap in J/WNJ treatment ratio.

Penn (0.68×) sits at the Princeton benchmark despite having the LARGEST White decline (−18.9 pp) in the dataset. This is the single strongest piece of evidence that White decline magnitude does not determine Jewish outcome: the school that diversified the most

JEWISH ENROLLMENT DECLINE — ALL 9 SCHOOLS (Hillel & Preferred Baseline)

Shows Hillel-to-Hillel AND preferred-baseline-to-Hillel declines for all 9 schools. Preferred baseline uses best available independent source where documented. Brown anomaly: Hillel current (23.9%) > baseline (20%) — likely Hillel methodology change, not real increase. BDH poll shows 14% religion-only for Brown in Fall 2024. ★ = schools with independent corroboration of baseline.

BDH Fall 2024 (religion-only): 14.1% (n≈1,177)

School	★	Hillel Base	Hillel Base Yr	Hillel Curr	Hillel Curr Yr	H→H Decline (pp)	H→H Rel. Decline	Pref. Base	Pref. Base Src	Pref→H Decline (pp)	Pref→H Rel. Decline	Current Alt % (BDH	Pref. Curr	Pref. Curr	Pref→Pref	Pref→Pref
Harvard	★	25.0%	2006-08	7.1%	2024-25	**-0.1790**	**-71.6%**	14.0%	Brandeis SSRI ~2015-16	**-0.0690**	**-49.3%**					
Yale	★	27.0%	2013-14	11.8%	Mar 2026 (live	**-0.1520**	**-56.3%**	16.4%	-0.044	**-0.0460**	**-28.0%**					
Penn	★	26.0%	2015-16	11.0%	-0.15	**-0.1500**	**-57.7%**	16.0%	-0.05	**-0.0500**	**-31.3%**					
Princeton †	★	13.0%	2013-14	9.9%	2022-24 avg	**-0.0313**	**-24.1%**	10.5%	CIRP/Hargadon 1988-2003 avg	**-0.0063**	**-6.0%**		0.0987	DP Senior S	-0.0063	-0.06
Cornell		23.0%	0.23	20.0%	-0.03	**-0.0300**	**-13.0%**	23.0%	-0.03	**-0.0300**	**-13.0%**					
Columbia		22.0%	2013	15.7%	2024-25	**-0.0630**	**-28.6%**	22.0%	Same as Hillel (no alt)	**-0.0630**	**-28.6%**					
Brown		20.0%	2013-14	23.9%	2024-25	0.0390	⚠	— (Hillel only)	Hillel 20% is only available 2013 baseline; no alt baseline exists	N/A	N/A	14.0%	BDH Fall 2024 intercept poll (religion-only, n=1			
Dartmouth		11.0%	2014-15	8.9%	2024-25	**-0.0210**	**-19.1%**	11.0%	Same as Hillel (no alt)	**-0.0210**	**-19.1%**					
Stanford		10.0%	2013-14	7.9%	2024-25	**-0.0210**	**-21.0%**	10.0%	Same as Hillel (no alt)	**-0.0210**	**-21.0%**					

⚠ BROWN ANOMALY: Hillel currently reports ~23.9% vs baseline ~20%, implying apparent increase. However, Brown Daily Herald Fall 2024 intercept poll found 14% Jewish by religion (n=1,177). The most likely explanation is Hillel methodology change / re-enumeration, not a real increase. Brown should NOT be cited as a school where Jewish enrollment grew. The BDH 14% religion-only figure and Hillel 24% inclusive figure are measuring different things.

† PRINCETON (verified from deep-dive research): CIRP/Hargadon 10.5% baseline (1988–2003) → DP Senior Survey 8.3% (spring 2023) = −2.2 pp real decline. The apparent 12%→8% drop (NJ Jewish News 2015–16 → Hillel 2018) is predominantly a Hillel recalibration artifact. 2022 Hillel anomaly (600/11.46%) = reporting error, sole source Ivy Coach — DO NOT USE. Princeton white decomposition INVERTS the pattern: Jews declined at 0.69× the rate of White Non-Jews. Princeton is the STABILITY OUTLIER — its modest ~2pp decline makes Harvard/Yale declines more analytically anomalous. Brandeis CMJS confirmed NULL (no Princeton study). Princeton OIR

† YALE METHODOLOGICAL NOTE: The Pref→H column for Yale uses Chaplain 16.4% baseline → Hillel 12.0% current (cross-methodology: religion-only → inclusive). On the consistent Chaplain→Chaplain instrument (16.4% → 9.5%), the relative decline is −42.1%, not −26.8%. The cross-method figu

NOTE: C14-C17 show PREFERRED instrument-consistent current figure. Princeton: DP 9.87% replaces Hillel 8.6% as preferred current endpoint. Rationale: Hillel methodology changed c.2018 — pre-2018 overcounted, post-2018 undercounts v

SOURCE QUALITY MATRIX — Jewish Enrollment Baselines (All Schools)

Hillel pre-2018 baselines documented to overestimate by 40-60% vs. random-sample surveys (Saxe et al., eJewishPhilanthropy May 2018). Post-2018 Hillel figures appear to use narrower methodology. Analysis should use 'Preferred' baseline where available; Hillel where no alternative exists. ★ = independent corroboration available.

School	Source Type	Source	Year	Figure	Measure	Reliability	Use As	Key Limitation
Harvard	Hillel (pre-2018)	Hillel International	2006-08	~25%	Inclusive	**LOW** ⚠	Upper bound only	Documented 40-60% overestimate; no methodology published
Harvard	★ Brandeis SSRI	eJewishPhilanthropy / Saxe et al.	2015-16	~14%	Inclusive random sample	**HIGH ★**	PREFERRED baseline	Published; random sample; 44.7% RR; Harvard campus
Harvard	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~7.1%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Post-2018 recalibration; methodology less clear
Harvard	Crimson Survey	Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey	2013-2023	9.5%→5.4%	Religion-only; freshmen	**MEDIUM**	Corroborating trend	Freshmen only; religious self-ID; secular Jews excluded
Yale	Hillel (pre-2018)	Hillel International	2013-14	~27%	Inclusive	**LOW** ⚠	Upper bound only	No independent confirmation; Chaplain peaks at 19.9%
Yale	★ Chaplain's Office	Yale Chaplain's Office	2010s avg	~16.4%	Religion-only	**MEDIUM**	PREFERRED baseline	46% completion (c.2011-14); voluntary; undercounts secular Jews
Yale	Chaplain's Office	Yale Chaplain's Office	2024 (C/O 2028)	9.5%	Religion-only	**MEDIUM**	Current endpoint	Same methodology; consistent instrument
Yale	YDN Survey	Yale Daily News, 'Class of 2022: By the Nur	Fall 2018 (class	10%	Religion-only (exclusive	MEDIUM	Corroborating data p	n=864 of 1,578 enrolled (54.75% RR). Exclusive religion c
Penn	Hillel (pre-2018)	Hillel International	2013-14	~25%	Inclusive	**LOW** ⚠	Upper bound only	Documented 40-60% overestimate
Penn	★ Brandeis CMJS	Shain et al. (hdl.handle.net/10192/33071)	2015-16	13% / 16%	Religious / Inclusive	**HIGH ★**	PREFERRED baseline	Random sample; 44.7% RR; published; peer-reviewed
Penn	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~11%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Post-2018 recalibration
Penn	SSRI Unpublished	SSRI dataset (cited by Tablet 2018)	~2010	~20%	Religious	**LOW**	Do not use alone	Unpublished; no methodology; secondhand citation only
Princeton	Hillel est.	Hillel International	2013-14	~13%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Secondary reference	Less inflated than other schools; still ~2.5 pp over CIRP
Princeton	★ CIRP/Hargadon	Princeton Alumni Weekly (Feb 2006) — Fred Hargadon, Dean of Admission 1988-2003	1988-2003 avg	~10.5%	Religion-only	**HIGH ★**	PREFERRED baseline	Hargadon cited institutional CIRP/HERI data directly. First-hand institutional access. NOT an independently accessible dataset — cite as "CIRP via Hargadon (PAW, Feb 2006)." No
Princeton	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~8.6%	Inclusive	**LOW-MEDIUM** ⚠	Reference only — NOT preferred current endpoint	Hillel methodology shifted c.2018: pre-2018 overcounted (13% in 2013 inflated), post-2018 undercounts vs DP survey (8.6% vs DP 9.87%). H→H comparison is a methodology-shift artifact. PREFERRED current = DP Senior Survey 9.87% (C/
Princeton	**Hillel (pre-2018)**	NJ Jewish News / Times of Israel ('eruv construction' article)	~2015–16	12% (650/5,323)	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	**LOW-MEDIUM**	Historical mid-period snapshot	Pre-recalibration Hillel; named source (Rabbi Julie Roth, CJL). Saxe correction implies actual ~8-10%. Named sourcing adds credibility.
Princeton	**Hillel (anomalous)**	Hillel International via Ivy Coach blog compilation	2022	11.46% (600/5,236)	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	**LOW** ⚠	⚠ ANOMALY — do not use	No corroboration; likely reporting error. Sole source = Ivy Coach. Contradicts all adjacent data points.
Princeton	**Hillel (post-2018)**	Hillel International via Inside Higher Ed (Sara Weissman, May 2023)	2023	9.60% (500/5,236)	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	**LOW-MEDIUM**	Secondary reference (2022-23)	IHE secondary cite adds credibility. Hillel post-recalibration methodology uncertain.
Princeton	**Survey (DP) ★**	Daily Princetonian Senior Survey, Class of 2023	Spring 2023 / Spring 2024 / Fall 2024 (Frosh)	**8.3% (2023, n=~571) | 9.5% (2024**	Religious self-ID	**MEDIUM-HIGH ★**	**PREFERRED current endpoint ★**	DP Senior Survey 2024 (9.5%, n=506): PREFERRED current endpoint. DP Frosh Survey 2025 / Class of 2029 (9.4%, n=741): PREFERRED incoming. DP Senior Survey 2023 (8.3%, n=~571):
Cornell	Hillel	Hillel International	2013-14	~22%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Best available baseline	No independent corroboration
Cornell	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~20%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Relatively stable — smallest decline in cohort
Columbia	Hillel	Hillel International	2013	~22%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Best available baseline	GS inclusion in IPEDS denominator complicates comparison
Columbia	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~15.7%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Moderate decline; Columbia-specific denominator issue
Brown	Hillel	Hillel International	2013-14	~20%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Baseline only (with caveat)	Current Hillel > baseline — likely re-enumeration
Brown	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~23.9%	Inclusive	**LOW** ⚠	Do NOT use as trend endpoint	Apparent increase likely reflects methodology change
Brown	★ BDH Poll	Brown Daily Herald (Oct 2024)	Fall 2024	14%	Religion-only	**MEDIUM**	Alternative current (religion-only)	Intercept poll; n=1,177; non-random; religion-only definition
Brown	BDH Poll (Fall 2025)	Brown Daily Herald Fall 2025 Poll	2025 (Fall)	9.0%	Religion-only	MEDIUM	BDH 2025 alt current	Intercept poll n≈1,177. Same question as Fall 2024: "Hov
Dartmouth	Hillel	Hillel International	2014-15	~10%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Best available baseline	No independent corroboration
Dartmouth	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~8.9%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Modest decline; consistent with small White share decline
Stanford	Hillel	Hillel International	2013-14	~10%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Best available baseline	No independent corroboration
Stanford	Hillel (current)	Hillel International	2024-25	~7.9%	Inclusive	**MED-LOW**	Current endpoint	Moderate decline

IMPLICATIONS — How Revised Baselines Change the Analysis

Summary of what changes and what survives after applying Brandeis SSRI / Chaplain / CIRP baselines in place of pre-2018 Hillel figures. Four schools affected (Harvard, Yale, Penn, Princeton). Five schools unchanged (Cornell, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth, Stanford — no independent baseline available). Brown requires separate treatment due to Hillel anomaly.

A. CLAIM-BY-CLAIM STATUS AFTER BASELINE REVISION

Claim	Prior Version	Revised	Status	Strength	Notes
Harvard: headline decline magnitude	72–74% (Hillel ~25%→7.1%)	~49% (Brandeis 14%→7.1%)	⚠ **CHANGED**	Still significant	Present as range: '49% (conservative/Brandeis) to 72% (Hillel upper bound)'
Harvard: 3-series convergence	Not shown	Preferred series (2 & 3) converge	✅ **NEW STRENGTH**	Strong	Series 2 and 3 use independent baselines and different populations but reach same range. Series 1 convergence overstated in v4 — Series 1 is explicitly the upper bound, not part of the convergence.
Harvard: Phase 1 ratio (10× claim)	Jews declined 10× faster than Whites	3-5× depending on baseline	⚠ **CHANGED**	Still notable	10× claim is entirely Hillel-baseline artifact. 3-5× is defensible and still anomalous
Harvard: 'All white decline = Jews'	~90%+ of white decline attributable to Jews	~50% of white decline attributable	✗ **DOES NOT HOLD**	Do not use	At Brandeis baseline, White Non-Jews also declined substantially (-27%). Claim should be dropped
Harvard: Overall white decline ratio	Jews 2.6× white rate	Jews 1.8× white rate (Brandeis base)	⚠ **WEAKENED**	Moderate	Still directionally valid; ratio reduced. Use 1.8× with Brandeis baseline
Crimson: steepest drop timing	Not previously analyzed	C/O 2020 (entry 2016): −3.8 pp in one	✅ **NEW FINDING**	Strong	Largest single-year Jewish drop coincides with SFFA litigation period — analytically significant
Yale: 22-23% claimed baseline	27% Hillel / 22-23% 'Chaplain'	Chaplain peaks at 19.9% (2000s	✗ **OVERCLAIMED**	Revise	No independent source confirms 22%+. Use 16.4% (2010s avg) or 19.9% (2000s peak) with caveats
Yale: halving narrative	~27% → ~12% = −56%	~16.4% → ~9.5% = −42% (Chaplain	✅ **SURVIVES**	Strong	Chaplain-to-Chaplain is internally consistent; halving narrative intact at lower levels
Penn: 20%→13% decline	Widely cited as 2010→2016	Endpoint (13%) solid; baseline	⚠ **HALF-VERIFIED**	Use cautiously	Cite as 'Brandeis endpoint of 13-16% (2016) vs. SSRI unpublished 2010 baseline of ~20%'
Princeton: stability narrative	CIRP 10.5%→8.3% = −21% (DP preferred curr) or →8.6% = −18% (Hillel curr)	CIRP 10.5% → DP Senior Survey	✅ **SURVIVES (modified)**	Strong	Princeton's Jewish decline is smaller than Hillel-to-Hillel suggests. Use CIRP baseline.
Cross-institutional: Jews > Whites	Jews declined 50-72% vs Whites 8-42%	Jews declined ~43-49% vs Whites	✅ **SURVIVES**	Moderate-Strong	Direction holds; ratio compressed. Jews still declined faster than white category broadly

B. RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE CHANGES FOR REPORT

Section	OLD language	NEW language	Rationale
Harvard decline headline	*"Harvard Jewish enrollment fell ~72%"*	**"Harvard Jewish enrollment fell roughly 50% (conservati**	Three series converge on 43-50% as conservative floor
White decomposition ratio	*"Jews bore virtually all the white decline / 10× faster"*	**"Jewish enrollment declined approximately 3× faster than non-**	Drop 10× and 'virtually all' — not defensible at Brandeis baseline
Yale baseline	*"Yale Hillel estimated 22-27% in the baseline period"*	**"Yale Chaplain's Office data — the most consistent longitudinal**	Do not cite 22-27% without noting Chaplain data contradicts it
Sensitivity analysis	*(Not present)*	**Add Table: Three-Series Sensitivity showing 43-72%**	Convergence across three methods strengthens overall claim
Brown	*"Brown shows X% Jewish enrollment" (using current Hillel 24%)*	**"Brown Hillel reports ~24% (inclusive); Brown Daily**	Required caveat whenever Brown is cited

C. PRINCETON-SPECIFIC IMPLICATIONS (New — from deep-dive research)

Claim	Prior Version	Revised	Status	Strength	Notes
Princeton: headline decline magnitude	*~13%→8.6% = −34% (Hillel-to-Hillel) or ~10.5%→8.3% = −21% (CIRP→DP)*	**~2 pp real decline over 20+ years (CIRP**	✅ **CONFIRMED: modest decline only**	Strong — two sources converge at ~8.5%	CIRP→DP is the most methodologically honest comparison (same question type). Present Princeton as LOW-DECLINE OUTLIER contrasting with Harvard/Yale.
Princeton: 2015→2018 'decline' (12%→8.3%)	*12%→8.3% cited as evidence of accelerating decline*	**METHODOLOGY ARTIFACT. Pre-2018 Hillel**	✗ **DO NOT CITE as demographic decline**	High certainty — must correct	Saxe correction on NJ Jewish News 12% implies actual ~8–9% even at that time. The instruments changed; the student body didn't change that dramatically.
Princeton: 2022 Hillel anomaly (11.46%/600)	*Not previously analyzed*	**Reporting error. Sole source = Ivy Coach compilatio**	✗ **REMOVE from all analyses**	Must correct	If 2018 PDF (450) and 2023 Hillel (500) are both accurate, a 33% jump to 600 in 2022 with no explanation is almost certainly a data error.
Princeton: white decomposition ratio	*~2× (Jews declined 2× faster than White Non-Jews) — v2/v3 assumption*	**0.107× — Jews declined at 0.107× the rate of**	✗ **INVERTS DIRECTION — correct immediately**	Analytically significant	This is one of the most important Princeton corrections. Princeton's ratio of 0.107× makes Harvard's ~1.8× and Yale's ~2×+ ratios MORE anomalous by comparison.
Princeton: analytical role in nine-school analysis	*One of several schools with declining Jewish enrollment*	**Princeton is the STABILITY OUTLIER —**	✅ **NEW ANALYTICAL VALUE — strengthen argument**	Strong	This framing actually STRENGTHENS the nine-school analysis by showing: where Jewish decline is modest (Princeton), white decomposition ratios are ~1×. Where decline is severe (Harvard, Yale), ratios jump to 1.8–2×. Variation across schools is an asset, not a problem.
Princeton: Brandeis CMJS null result	*Assumed possible study*	**CONFIRMED NULL — no Brandeis CMJS**	✗ **CORRECT ANY IMPLICATION of Brandeis**	Must correct	Exhaustive CMJS catalog check. Princeton absent from all 51 Hotspots campuses and all Life on Campus studies. No Princeton equivalent exists.
Princeton: CIRP continuity post-2003	*CIRP implied as ongoing baseline*	**CIRP participation unconfirmed after**	✗ **CORRECT implication of continued CIRP**	Must clarify	Hargadon specifically said Princeton used CIRP; he retired 2003. No successor has disclosed CIRP data. Assume discontinued.
Princeton: next data opportunity	*Not identified*	**Contact Daily Princetonian editors for**	✅ **ACTION ITEM — high priority**	High feasibility	DP is a student publication — editors likely accessible. Data exists; question is whether they will share underlying tabulations.

D. YALE-SPECIFIC CORRECTIONS (New — from consistent-instrument analysis)

Claim	Prior Version	Revised	Status	Strength	Notes
Yale: White decomposition ratio	0.72× (Jews declined LESS tha	1.39× (Jews	⚠ CORREC	Strong — same instrum	Prior 0.72× was cross-methodology artifact (religio
Yale: Analytical classification	Grouped with Princeton/Penn	Yale is ANO	⚠ RECLASS	Analytically significant	Princeton provides the 'normal Ivy' baseline. Yale a
Yale: Cascading effect on nine-school	Not previously analyzed as di	Four-tier ta	✅ NEW	Strong	The taxonomy is the key analytical product of the v

STACKING PRESSURE INDEX — OECD/JRC HANDBOOK METHODOLOGY (v7, March 2026)

Min-max normalization | Equal dimension weighting | 50/50 level-movement split | Source: OECD/JRC Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators (2008) | v7 correction: standardized all four dimensions to Fall 2014 baseline; applied domestic adjustment consistently to NE corridor denominator.

SECTION A — RAW DIMENSION VALUES (before normalization)

Intl = first-time international UG share. NE(d) = NE corridor students as % of domestic first-time UG (NY+NJ+MA+CT). White(d) = White students as % of domestic total UG stock. Aid = % Any Aid (IPEDS SFA), domestic-adjusted. Domestic = total minus international. All baselines Fall 2014; current Fall 2024 (Aid: AY2023-24). | ⚑ AID NOTE: Aid Base/Curr = INTERNATIONAL-ADJUSTED rates [Raw IPEDS SFA ÷ (1 − Intl%)]. Removes intl students ineligible for need-based aid. E.g. Harvard: raw 72% → adj 82.75% (base), 87.15% (curr). Raw IPEDS SFA values are in companion CDS file > IPEDS Financial Aid sheet.

School	Intl Base	Intl Curr	NE Base(d)	NE Curr(d)	White Base(d)	White Curr(d)	Aid Base(d)	Aid Curr(d)
Brown	14.2%	17.5%	36.4%	33.1%	48.8%	37.7%	7573.0%	76.3
Columbia	16.7%	20.0%	40.9%	34.5%	45.0%	35.7%	6362.0%	71.2
Cornell	8.9%	10.1%	52.3%	52.3%	46.5%	34.4%	6593.0%	62.3
Dartmouth	8.0%	14.4%	33.1%	31.0%	52.3%	51.8%	6632.0%	70.1
Harvard	13.0%	17.4%	39.0%	38.2%	49.4%	35.2%	8275.0%	87.2
Penn	11.2%	12.9%	31.3%	30.0%	50.4%	29.7%	6866.0%	72.3
Princeton	13.0%	11.9%	38.2%	38.3%	51.7%	38.5%	7121.0%	77.2
Stanford	10.1%	16.6%	9.6%	9.4%	40.9%	26.4%	7567.3%	91.1
Yale	12.6%	12.0%	32.7%	32.0%	52.5%	35.1%	6752.0%	67.1

SECTION B — DELTAS (relative change; positive = more stacking pressure)

School	Δ Intl (rel%)	Δ NE (rel%)	Δ White (rel%)	Δ Aid (rel%)
Brown	+23.1%	+9.0%	+22.7%	+0.7%
Columbia	+19.5%	+15.7%	+20.7%	+11.9%
Cornell	+13.3%	-0.0%	+26.0%	-5.5%
Dartmouth	+80.1%	+6.4%	+1.0%	+5.7%
Harvard	+33.3%	+2.2%	+28.7%	+5.3%
Penn	+15.4%	+4.1%	+41.1%	+5.3%
Princeton	-8.0%	-0.4%	+25.5%	+8.4%
Stanford	+63.7%	+1.5%	+35.4%	+20.3%
Yale	-4.3%	+2.2%	+33.1%	-0.6%

SECTION C — NORMALIZED SCORES [0 = least stacking pressure in peer group; 1 = most]

School	Lv: Intl	Mv: Intl	Lv: NE	Mv: NE	Lv: White	Mv: White	Lv: Aid	Mv: Aid
Brown	0.746	0.353	0.552	0.588	0.554	0.544	0.487	0.241
Columbia	1.000	0.312	0.584	1.000	0.631	0.490	0.310	0.676
Cornell	0.000	0.240	1.000	0.024	0.685	0.628	0.000	0.000
Dartmouth	0.436	1.000	0.504	0.421	0.000	0.000	0.271	0.436
Harvard	0.738	0.469	0.667	0.174	0.653	0.694	0.862	0.419
Penn	0.287	0.266	0.480	0.282	0.867	1.000	0.349	0.417
Princeton	0.189	0.000	0.672	0.000	0.523	0.612	0.518	0.539
Stanford	0.660	0.814	0.000	0.119	1.000	0.863	1.000	1.000
Yale	0.198	0.042	0.525	0.172	0.655	0.803	0.166	0.192

SECTION D — COMPOSITE SCORES (50% level + 50% movement per dimension; equal weight across 4 dimensions)

School	D1: Intl	D2: NE	D3: White	D4: Aid	COMPOSITE	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier	Prior Score (v6 mixed)	Change
Stanford	0.737	0.059	0.931	1.000	**0.682**	0.48x	NORMAL	0.807	-0.125
Columbia	0.656	0.792	0.561	0.493	**0.625**	1.15x	PROPORTIONAL	0.608	+0.017
Harvard	0.603	0.421	0.673	0.640	**0.584**	2.33x	ANOMALOUS	0.548	+0.036
Brown	0.550	0.570	0.549	0.364	**0.508**	C (INVERTED)	OUTPERFORMER	0.498	+0.010
Penn	0.276	0.381	0.934	0.383	**0.494**	0.68x	NORMAL	0.498	-0.004
Dartmouth	0.718	0.462	0.000	0.354	**0.383**	3.55x	ANOMALOUS†	0.382	+0.001
Princeton	0.095	0.336	0.567	0.528	**0.382**	0.11x	OUTPERFORMER (BENCHMARK)	0.346	+0.035
Yale	0.120	0.349	0.729	0.179	**0.344**	1.39x	ANOMALOUS	0.342	+0.002
Cornell	0.120	0.512	0.656	0.000	**0.322**	0.32x	OUTPERFORMER	0.202	+0.120

SECTION E — SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS (ranking stability across level/movement weighting variants)

School	50/50 (primary)	30% Level 70% Movement	70% Level 30% Movement	Rank 50/50	Rank 30/70	Rank 70/30	Rank Stable?
Stanford	0.682	0.682	0.682	1	1	1	YES
Columbia	0.625	0.644	0.607	2	2	3	YES
Harvard	0.584	0.562	0.607	3	3	2	YES
Brown	0.508	0.496	0.521	4	5	4	YES
Penn	0.494	0.497	0.490	5	4	5	YES
Dartmouth	0.383	0.392	0.375	6	6	9	NO — 70/30
Princeton	0.382	0.383	0.381	7	7	6	YES
Yale	0.344	0.346	0.343	8	8	8	YES
Cornell	0.322	0.322	0.322	9	9	7	YES

SECTION F — FALSIFICATION COMPARISONS (stacking score should predict Jewish outcome; divergence = anomaly)

Comparison	School A	A Composite	A J/WNJ	School B	B Composite	B J/WNJ	Score Gap	J/WNJ Gap	Finding
Harvard vs Brown	Harvard	0.584	2.33x	Brown	0.508	C (INVERTED)	+0.076	2.69x	Harvard higher pressure
Penn vs Yale (secondary)	Penn	0.494	0.68x	Yale	0.344	1.39x	+0.150	0.71x	Penn HIGHER pressure
Yale vs Princeton	Yale	0.344	1.39x	Princeton	0.381	0.11x	-0.037	1.28x	Yale LOWER pressure
Dartmouth vs Princeton	Dartmouth	0.383	3.55x	Princeton	0.381	0.11x	+0.002	3.44x	Virtually identical composite

PRINCETON JEWISH ENROLLMENT — DEEP-DIVE (6 Source Categories, Verified Feb 2026)

KEY FINDING (UPDATED March 2026): Princeton is the STABILITY outlier and definitive control case. Best estimate: ~10% ±2% from late 1990s through ~2020, declining to ~9.5% (DP Senior Survey 2024, n=506; DP Frosh Survey 2025 [Class of 2029], n=741 — two most recent waves) on religion-only basis. Real decline: ~0.6 pp over 20+ years (CIRP religious self-ID → DP religious self-ID) — essentially flat. White decomposition (CDS 2001-02 matched baseline): W-Jewish −4.8% (updated with 9.5% current), W-Non-Jewish −56.4%. J/WNJ ≈ 0.085-0.107× (range: 9.5% current → 0.085×; 9.87% avg → 0.107×) (CORRECTED from 0.69×; old figure mixed instruments). Conservative ceiling: secularism adjustment implies total-inclusive Jewish at Princeton is flat or rising while religion-only appears slightly down. Domestic-adjusted J/WNJ ≈ 0.00×. Harvard 2.33× / Princeton 0.107× = 22× gap. Three null results confirmed: Brandeis CMJS, Princeton OIR, CIRP post-2003.

A. THREE-PHASE NARRATIVE

Phase	Period	Hillel/Reported Figure	Best Estimate (Corrected)	Mechanism	Primary Sources	Analytical Status
Phase 0 Historical Peak	Early 1980s (peak ~1982)	~18% (~800 students)	~15–18% (consistent across sources)	Pre-diversification peak. Princeton had actively recruited Jewish students. Decline began before 1999.	Jewish Journal 1999 (800→450); JTA 1967 baseline (~100/class by 1967); Oren Joining the Club (15% in 1961); Tablet Leibovitz 2022 (15% '80s–'90s avg)	WELL DOCUMENTED — three independent sources converge
Phase 1 Post-1999 Rebound & Plateau	~2000–~2015 (post-crisis period)	~13% (Unz 2012, Hillel) ~12% (NJ Jewish News 2015–16, 650/5,323)	~8–10% actual (applying Saxe 30–50% correction to pre-recalibration Hillel)	1999 media firestorm (DP, NYT, NY Observer) prompted active Jewish recruitment. Unz claims 30% rebound from ~10%→~13%. Saxe's documented 30–50% Hillel overestimation implies	Jewish Journal 1999 (~10%/450); Unz 2012 compilation (~13%); NJ Jewish News eruv article (~2015–16, 650/12%, sourced from Rabbi Julie Roth, CJL)	⚠ LIKELY OVERSTATED — Hillel pre-2018 documented inflated. Actual enrollment likely ~8–10%
Phase 2 Measurement Discontinuity	~2018 (Hillel recalibration)	~8.3% (450/5,394 — Hillel College Guide 2018 PDF, unverified)	~8–9% (likely real, but figure itself unverified)	Hillel methodology recalibration post-Saxe 2018. Apparent drop from 12%→8.3% is substantially an instrument change, not demographic shift. Note: 2022 Hillel figure of 11.46%	Hillel College Guide 2018 PDF (Elon CDN, row 47 of Top 60 Private Schools — subagent report, PDF not independently confirmed). Hillel 2017 Top 60 list (Princeton appeared); absent from 2014 Reform Judaism Top 60.	⚠ DISCONTINUITY — pre-2018 and post-2018 Hillel figures are different instruments. 2022 spike (600/11.46%)
Phase 3 Recent Period (Best-Documented)	2021–2025 (most reliable data)	DP inference ~10% (fall 2021) → DP 8.3% (spring 2023) → Hillel 8.6% (2024–25)	~8.3–8.6% (two independent sources converge)	DP Class of 2025 Frosh Survey (fall 2021) implies ~10% via '5× national rate' proxy. DP Class of 2023 Senior Survey (spring 2023): 8.3% explicit. Hillel 2024–25: 8.6%. Cross-method	DP Senior Survey C/O 2023 (8.3%, 571 resp., 44.1% RR) ★ PREFERRED; Hillel 2024–25 (8.6%, 450/5,236); IHE May 2023 (9.6%, citing Hillel 2023); DP Frosh Survey C/O 2027 (818/1,373, 59.6% RR — highest DP methodology, data locked in chart)	✅ MOST RELIABLE — two independent sources at ~8.5%. DP C/O 2027 raw data potentially obtainable from DP

B. FULL SOURCE INVENTORY — Chronological 1948–2025 (17 Sources + 3 NULL Results)

Category	Source	Year/Period	Figure	Type/Definition	Methodology / Population	Respondents / RR	Reliability	Use As	Key Caveat / Finding
Historical Reporting	JTA (Rabbi I.M. Levy, Princeton Hillel chaplain)	1948 & 1967	1948: ~75–100 total 1967: >100 per class (~13–20%)	Inclusive (est.)	Contemporary reporting; named primary source with direct institutional knowledge	Named source	**HIGH**	Historical baseline	Levy quote: '75-100 total in 1948, now >100 per class' by 1967. Implies rapid postwar growth from ~4% to ~13–20% in under 20 years.
Academic Literature	Dan A. Oren, Joining the Club (Yale UP, 1985)	1961 data (pub. 1985)	15% Princeton (Ivy comparison: Columbia 45%, Cornell 26%, Penn 25%, Harv 21%, Brown 13%)	Likely inclusive	Academic monograph; Ivy League comparison table; sources not fully specified	Institutional	**HIGH**	Historical Ivy benchmark	Princeton at 15% in 1961 = below Columbia/Penn but comparable to Harvard/Brown. Full Ivy table provides cross-institutional context.
Survey Data (CIRP)	**CIRP/HERI Freshman Survey via Hargadon, Princeton Alumni Weekly (Feb 2006) ★ PREFERRED BASELINE**	1988–2003 (15-yr average)	**10.5% (range 9–13%, year-to-year)**	Religious preference (CIRP question)	Annual survey of all incoming freshmen via Higher Education Research Institute (UCLA). Princeton participated; Harvard and Yale did NOT — they used Hillel. Likely ended with Hargadon's retirement (2003); no evidence of continued participation.	Full cohort invited annually	**HIGH ★**	**PREFERRED BASELINE (1988–2003)**	Hargadon disclosed directly in PAW essay rebutting Karabel. Range 9–13% = natural cohort variation. CIRP data is proprietary; this public disclosure is the only known Princeton CIRP figure. Post-2003 CIRP participation UNCONFIRMED — assume discontinued.
Academic Literature	Marcia Graham Synnott, The Half-Opened Door (Routledge, 2010 reissue preface)	Mid-1990s (pub. 2010)	10–12%	Likely inclusive (likely Hillel-sourced)	Academic monograph (Routledge); preface to 2010 reissue	Academic	**MEDIUM-HIGH**	Academic corroboration (mid-1990s)	Consistent with Hargadon CIRP 10.5%. If Hillel-sourced, Saxe correction would imply ~7–8%.
News / Contemporary	Jewish Journal ('The Princeton Puzzle') & New York Times (1999)	1999 (enrollment crisis coverage)	~10% (~450 students; down from ~800/18% in early 1980s)	Likely CIRP or institutional estimate	Contemporary reporting on 1999 media firestorm. DP broke story; four front-page articles. NYT followed. NY Observer covered.	Contemporary reporting	**HIGH**	Crisis benchmark (1999 nadir before rebound)	Decline from ~800 to ~450 = −44% from 1982 peak. Only one Orthodox male in 1999 freshman class (Rabbi Roth). Firestorm prompted active Jewish recruitment by Princeton.
Academic Literature	Jerome Karabel, The Chosen (Harvard UP/Basic Books, 2005) [Hacker Prize winner — APSA]	2005 (historical analysis)	~10% (1999); ~18% (1982 peak)	Mixed (historical compilation)	Academic history of admissions at HYP. Detailed policy analysis of how Early Decision, athletic recruitment, geographic diversity reduced Jewish numbers.	Academic monograph (Harvard/Basic Books)	**HIGH**	Academic historical context	Prompted Hargadon's 'Just Plain Wrong' PAW rebuttal — which is what disclosed CIRP data. Karabel's causal claims contested by Hargadon but underlying enrollment data largely confirmed.
Academic / Journalism	Ron Unz, 'Myth of American Meritocracy' (The American Conservative, 2012)	~2000–2012	~13% (post-1999 rebound; ~30% increase from ~10%)	Inclusive (Hillel compilation)	Compiled Hillel estimates across elite universities. Claims post-1999 rebound of ~30% at Princeton. Methodology criticized by Andrew Gelman (Columbia) and Nurit Baytch.	Hillel compilation (no primary research)	**LOW-MEDIUM (compiled Hillel; methodology contested)**	Trend indicator only (not primary source)	Useful as record of what Hillel reported circa 2011–12. Analytical conclusions on meritocracy contested. Hillel compilation itself has documented inflation.
HILLEL METHODOLOGY SHIFT — WHY HILLEL→HILLEL IS INVALID FOR PRINCETON:	NJ Jewish News / Times of Israel ('eruv construction' article) Sourced from Rabbi Julie Roth, CJL/Hillel	~2015–16	12% (650 / 5,323)	Inclusive (Hillel est., pre-2018)	Published news article referencing Hillel data; named source (Rabbi Julie Roth, Center for Jewish Life/Hillel director). Article references student from Class of 2018 and Roth's arrival 'fall of 2005.' Additional detail: 'About 10% of the Jews on campus are Orthodox' (per Rabbi Roth). 'When Roth arrived, ~60-80 attended Shabbat dinner; by 2015-16 that number had more	Named source (Rabbi Roth, CJL director)	**LOW-MEDIUM (pre-recalibration Hillel; but named sourcing)**	Best mid-period data point available	STRONGEST MID-PERIOD FIGURE available but pre-recalibration. Saxe 30–50% correction → actual ~8–9%. Named sourcing adds credibility vs. anonymous Hillel. Princeton described as having 'fewer Jews than other similar schools.'
Hillel (Post-recalibration UNVERIFIED)	Hillel College Guide 2018 PDF (Elon University CDN, row 47, Top 60 Private Schools) [NOT INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED]	2018	~8.3% (450 / 5,394)	Inclusive (Hillel, post-recalibration)	Hillel College Guide annual PDF. Reported by one subagent but PDF itself could not be fetched. If accurate: first post-recalibration snapshot. Note: 450 count is identical to current (2024-25) = flat since recalibration.	Hillel self-report (unverified)	**LOW-MEDIUM (unverified PDF; secondary report)**	First post-recalibration snapshot (if verified)	⚠ UNVERIFIED — cannot independently confirm. If accurate, implies 12%→8% transition is entirely recalibration artifact. Priority: attempt to access Elon CDN PDF directly.
News / Journalism	Tablet Magazine, 'The Vanishing Ivy League Jew' (Shira Telushkin, 2018)	2018	~10% (1999 context; no direct 2018 Princeton figure)	Historical reference	Journalism with national context. Cites NYT 1999 figure (10%, down from 18%). Provides national framing for Ivy Jewish enrollment decline.	Journalism (reputable)	**HIGH (journalism context; not primary data)**	National context (not Princeton primary)	No new Princeton-specific figure. Useful for national trend framing.
Survey Data (DP — indirect)	Daily Princetonian Frosh Survey, Class of 2025 (entering fall 2021)	Fall 2021	~10% (INFERRED — not explicit)	Religious self-ID (indirect inference)	Survey states respondents were 'roughly five times as likely to practice Judaism' as the average American (~2%), implying ~10% Jewish. Inference, not direct figure. Response rate not stated.	Not stated (inference only)	**MEDIUM (indirect; could be characterized differently)**	Corroborating indicator (fall 2021 ~10%)	If accurate, suggests ~10% as recently as fall 2021, with decline to 8.3% between 2021–2023. Treat cautiously — 'five times' could refer to practice vs. identity.
Hillel (Anomalous — DO NOT USE)	Hillel via Ivy Coach blog compilation	2022	11.46% (600 / 5,236) ⚠ ANOMALOUS	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	Ivy Coach compiled Hillel website snapshots across all eight Ivies. Princeton 600/5,236 implies 33% jump from 2018 level if 2018 PDF is accurate. No corroboration from any other source. Contradicts DP frosh inference of ~10% for same period.	Hillel website snapshot (Ivy Coach compilation)	**LOW ⚠ (anomalous; sole source = Ivy Coach)**	⚠ DO NOT USE — likely reporting error	Possible explanations: (a) Hillel temporary methodology overcorrection, (b) reporting error, (c) 2018 PDF figure was wrong. Remove from any longitudinal series. Add footnote if Princeton 2022 cited anywhere.
News / Journalism	Tablet Magazine, 'Ivy League Exodus' (Liel Leibovitz, ~2022)	~2022	'Believed to be 15% in the '80s and '90s' (broader period average)	Historical reference; no current figure	Original reporting including interviews with named sources. Orthodox group Yavne 'could identify fewer than 10 potential observant Jews in incoming classes.' 'Major Jewish donors have met with President Eisgruber to discuss perceived decline.'	Journalism with named sources	**MEDIUM (opinion/analysis; but original reporting)**	Corroborating context (donor concern documented)	15% figure for '80s–'90s is a broader average vs. 18% early-1980s peak. Orthodox decline notable. Donor concerns = institutional acknowledgment of issue.
Hillel (Post-recalibration)	Hillel International via Ivy Coach / Inside Higher Ed (Sara Weissman, May 8, 2023)	2023 (academic year 2022-23)	9.6% (500 / 5,236)	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	IHE article cites Hillel estimate. Quotes Saxe on difficulty of accurate counts and trend of Jewish students 'dispersing to more universities.'	Hillel website snapshot (IHE secondary cite)	**LOW-MEDIUM (IHE = reputable; Hillel methodology uncertain)**	Secondary reference (2022–23)	IHE's credibility adds weight vs. raw Ivy Coach. Saxe's framing implies current Hillel figures are more accurate than pre-2018.
News / Alumni	Princeton Alumni Weekly (PAW), alumni letter (October 2023)	October 2023	'Declined from 18% in the 1980s (NYT) to 9.6% today (Hillel)'	Historical comparison (secondhand)	Alumni letter in PAW; secondhand citation of NYT (1999) and Hillel (2023).	Alumni letter (secondhand cites)	**MEDIUM (secondhand; but published in official alumni magazine)**	Corroborating context (alumni awareness of issue)	No new primary data. Confirms institutional/alumni awareness of decline narrative.
Survey Data (DP — PREFERRED CURRENT)	**Daily Princetonian Senior Survey, Class of 2023 ★ PREFERRED CURRENT ENDPOINT**	Spring 2023	**8.3% (~571 / 1,296 seniors)**	Religious self-ID only (exclusive categories)	Online survey distributed to all seniors. Religion is standard demographic item. Respondents skewed more white and more female than overall class — could marginally affect Jewish % in either direction. Closest post-CIRP methodological match (religious preference self-ID).	571 respondents 44.1% RR	**MEDIUM-HIGH ★**	**PREFERRED current endpoint (religion-only, consistent with CIRP)**	Most rigorous Princeton-specific survey available for religion data. Convergence with Hillel 2024-25 (8.6%) via different instrument is the key cross-validation. Skew caveat is minor — consistent across years.
Hillel (Post-recalibration; current)	Hillel International website (2024–25 academic year)	2024–25	8.6% (450 / 5,236)	Inclusive (Hillel est.)	Hillel Princeton chapter current listing. CJL FAQ states '700 Jewish students' (450 UG + 250 grad = 700 matches). Princeton DEI reports note 'Jewish students report highest sense of belonging across faith groups' but publish NO enrollment percentages.	Hillel self-report (current)	**LOW-MEDIUM (post-recalibration; cross-validated by DP)**	Current inclusive endpoint (cross-validated)	Cross-validation: Hillel 8.6% (inclusive) + DP 8.3% (religious self-ID) = strongest available corroboration for current range. 0.3pp gap = roughly expected from religion-only vs. inclusive measurement.
NULL RESULT: Brandeis CMJS / SSRI	Brandeis Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies (CMJS) / Steinhardt Social Research Institute (SSRI)	—	*NO DATA*	*N/A — no Princeton study conducted*	Exhaustive search of CMJS research pages, ScholarWorks repository, and publications lists. CMJS campus studies cover: Brandeis, Penn, Harvard, Michigan, Florida, plus 51 campuses in post-Oct 7 Hotspots of Antisemitism series. Princeton absent from all.	N/A	**CONFIRMED NULL (very high confidence)**	Do not cite Brandeis as Princeton source	Absence likely reflects: (a) Princeton's smaller Jewish population = insufficient Birthright applicant pool; (b) Princeton admin never partnered with CMJS for registrar-based random sample study. No Princeton equivalent of the Penn 2015-16 rigorous study exists.
NULL RESULT: Princeton OIR / Admissions Data	Princeton Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and Office of Admission	—	*NO DATA*	*N/A — no religious affiliation reporting*	Princeton's OIR publishes class profiles with race/ethnicity, geography, financial aid — but NOT religion. The Common Application dropped its religion question entirely in 2021. Princeton never systematically tracked religion through admissions. Princeton's DEI reports (annual since ~2022) mention Jews in campus climate context but contain NO	N/A	**CONFIRMED NULL**	Do not imply any institutional tracking	Princeton's DEI report (4th annual, 2024): 'Jewish students report the highest sense of belonging across faith groups' — framing confirms awareness but no data. Common App question removal (2021) means no future institutional data will be generated.
NULL RESULT: CIRP Post-2003	CIRP/HERI Freshman Survey — Princeton participation post-2003	2004–present	*NO DATA*	*N/A — participation not confirmed*	No evidence found that Princeton continued CIRP participation after Hargadon's retirement (2003). CIRP data is proprietary to participating institutions; not publicly available at school level. The religious-preference data source that produced the 10.5% figure may simply have stopped.	N/A	**CONFIRMED NULL (post-2003)**	Do not imply CIRP continuity beyond 2003	This creates a genuine 20-year data gap (2003–2023) in rigorous religious self-ID data. DP Senior Survey 2023 is the first comparable data point — same question type, reasonable RR.

C. PRINCETON WHITE DECOMPOSITION — CORRECTED CALCULATION (REVERSES DISPARATE-IMPACT PATTERN)

CORRECTED CALCULATION (March 2026): Using CIRP baseline (10.5%, religion-only, 1988-2003 avg) and DP Senior Survey 2024 (9.5%, n=506) — preferred current; also DP Frosh Survey 2025 (9.4%, n=741). Prior 3-yr avg: 9.87% (2022-24).. White Jewish = Jewish% × 90% (Pew). White Non-Jewish = CDS White% − White Jewish. CDS baseline: Princeton 2001-02 (Total 4613, White 3054 = 66.20%), contemporaneous with CIRP era. CDS current: 2024-25 (Total 5709, White 1921 = 33.65%). W-Jewish: 9.45% → 8.55% = −9.5% (using 9.5% current). W-Non-Jewish: 56.75% → 24.77% = −56.4%. J/WNJ = 0.085× (9.5% current) or 0.107× (9.87% avg). Both firmly in STABILITY tier. REPLACES prior 0.69× figure which erroneously paired CIRP religion-only baseline (10.5%) with CDS 2013-14 white share — mismatched both instrument era and baseline year. Old 0.69× was itself an improvement over the original mixed-instrument 0.69× (CIRP baseline + Hillel current). See Source Quality Matrix for instrument comparability analysis.

Measure	Baseline (CIRP/CDS)	Current (DP/CDS)	Change	Notes
Jewish % (preferred)	10.5% (CIRP/Hargadon 1988-2003)	9.87% (DP 3-yr avg 2022-24)	**−0.63 pp**	Religion-only both ends; matched instrument
White Jewish % (×90%)	9.45%	8.88%	**−0.57 pp**	Pew 90% White-Jewish overlap factor
White Total % (CDS B2)	66.20% (2001-02)	33.65% (2024-25)	**−32.55 pp**	Degree-seeking UG; 2001-02 matched to CIRP era
White Non-Jewish % (White − W-Jew)	56.75%	24.77%	**−31.98 pp**	Residual; calculated
White Jewish relative decline	—	—	**−6.0%**	(8.88−9.45) / 9.45
White Non-Jewish relative decline	—	—	**−56.4%**	(24.77−56.75) / 56.75
J/WNJ ratio	**—**	**—**	**0.107×**	**★ CORRECTED: Jews declined at 0.107× the rate**

D. THREE CONFIRMED DATA GAPS — What Remains Irrecoverable

Gap	Period	What Would Help	Feasibility	Priority
CIRP data post-2003	2004–2022	Confirm whether Princeton continued CIRP participation. If	LOW — CIRP data proprietary; would require Princeton IR cooperation	**LOW — probably discontinued 2003**
Hillel year-by-year 2004–2017	2004–2017	Systematic Wayback Machine crawl of archived Hillel	MEDIUM — Wayback has archives but Princeton Hillel URLs blocked in prior search	**MEDIUM — would fill the 13-year Hillel gap**
DP Interactive Chart Data (multiple surveys with locked charts)	C/O 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028	Contact DP editors directly for underlying data. C/O 2027 survey	HIGH — DP editors control data; likely obtainable with direct request	**★ HIGHEST PRIORITY — C/O 2027 could extend trend data 2 additional cohorts**

NINE-SCHOOL DIVERSIFICATION CONTEXT — Racial, Socioeconomic, International, Geographic

Sources: CDS B2 (race/ethnicity); CDS Pell cohort / IPEDS SFA (financial aid); IPEDS EF (international & geography). PREVIOUSLY: Sheet covered Harvard/Yale/Princeton/Brown/Cornell only. Expanded to all nine schools March 2026 to match composite index scope. Penn, Columbia, Dartmouth, Stanford confidence: MEDIUM or lower — treat as directional.

SECTION 1: RACIAL & ETHNIC DIVERSIFICATION (CDS B2 · Δ percentage points, ~2014→2024)

School	Baseline	Δ White (pp)	Δ Asian (pp)	Δ Hispanic (pp)	Δ Black (pp)	Conf.	Notes
Harvard	2014-15	-13.9	+4.8	+2.1	+2.3	HIGH	*Large Asian gain. Pell modest. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS despite mid-range diversification.*
Yale	2014-15	-15.8	+5.4	+6.6	+2.6	HIGH	*Asian +5.4pp (16.5%→21.9%), confirmed CDS B2 2014-15. Comparable to Harvard (+4.7pp). J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS despite similar structural profile.*
Princeton	2014-15	-12.3	+2.6	+2.0	+1.1	MED-HIGH	★ *Middle-of-peer on every dimension. J/WNJ: NORMAL — the control case.*
Penn	2015-16	-18.0	+9.5	+1.3	+1.6	MEDIUM	*Largest White decline (−18pp). Large Asian gain (+9.5pp). J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Columbia	2014	-9.8	+1.9	+2.0	+0.1	MEDIUM†	*† GS denominator complicates comparison. Smallest Asian gain (+1.9pp). J/WNJ: PROPORTIONAL.*
Dartmouth	2014-15	-3.9	+-1.0	+1.7	-0.6	MED-LOW	*Smallest White decline (−3.9pp). Asian DECLINED (−1.0pp). J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS (Hillel-only).*
Brown	2014-15	-10.0	+10.0	+1.9	+2.1	MEDIUM	*Largest Asian gain (+10.0pp). Pell DECLINED. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	2014-15	-10.9	+9.6	+2.0	+0.9	MED-LOW	*Large Asian gain (+9.6pp), comparable to Brown. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Stanford	2014-15	-14.5	+9.7	+0.3	+1.1	MED-LOW	*Large Asian gain (+9.7pp). Large White decline (−14.5pp). J/WNJ: NORMAL.*

★ KEY FINDING: Brown and Cornell show the largest Asian enrollment gains (+10.0pp, +9.6pp) in the dataset — comparable in scale to Penn (+9.5pp) and Stanford (+9.7pp) — yet sit in the OUTPERFORMER tier. Dartmouth shows Asian DECLINE (−1.0pp) yet is in the ANOMALOUS tier. Asian growth does not predict Jewish outcome. Yale 2014 Asian base

SECTION 2: SOCIOECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION (Pell Grant % · IPEDS SFA any-aid, ~2013→2024)

School	Pell ~2013	Pell ~2024	Δ Pell (pp)	Aid% [illegible]	Aid% [illegible]	J/WNJ Ratio	Notes
Harvard	16.5%	20.0%	+3.5	72%	72%	2.327×	*Aid flat (72%→72%). J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Yale	11.6%	25.0%	+13.4	59%	59%	1.383×	*Largest Pell gain (+13.4pp). Most aggressive low-income push. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Princeton	18.0%	22.0%	+4.0	62%	68%	0.107×	★ *Strong Pell gain (+4pp). Aid rose +6pp — highest aid gain. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Penn	16.5%	19.0%	+2.5	61%	63%	0.680×	*Modest Pell gain. Aid rose slightly. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Columbia	14.0%	20.0%	+6.0	53%	57%	1.150×	*Moderate Pell gain. Aid rose +4pp. J/WNJ: PROPORTIONAL.*
Dartmouth	15.0%	20.0%	+5.0	61%	60%	3.552×	*Moderate Pell gain. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS†.*
Brown	18.9%	13.6%	-5.3	65%	63%	-0.360×	⚠ *Only school with Pell DECLINE (−5.3pp). Aid flat. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	15.0%	18.0%	+3.0	60%	56%	0.320×	*Modest Pell gain. Aid FELL (60%→56%). J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Stanford	17.0%	22.0%	+5.0	68%	76%	0.480×	*Moderate Pell gain. Aid rose +8pp to 76% — highest in dataset. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*

★ KEY FINDING: Brown is the ONLY school with a Pell DECLINE (−5.3pp) and is the outperformer. Stanford has the highest aid rate (76%) and normal outcomes. Cornell has the lowest aid rate (56%) after falling, and is an outperformer. Yale shows the largest Pell expansion (+13.4pp) and is anomalous. No consistent directional pattern across nine schools.

SECTION 3: INTERNATIONAL ENROLLMENT (IPEDS EF · First-Time UG %, 2014→2024)

School	Intl% 2014	Intl% 2024	Δ (pp)	Norm. Score	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier	Notes
Harvard	13.0%	17.4%	+4.4	0.603	2.327×	**ANOMALOUS**	*Steady growth +4.4pp. Norm score 0.603 — mid-high. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Yale	12.6%	12.0%	−0.6	0.120	1.383×	**ANOMALOUS**	⚠ *Essentially FLAT (−0.6pp). Norm score 0.120 = lowest in peer group. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Princeton	13.0%	11.9%	−1.1	0.095	0.107×	**NORMAL ★**	★ *DECLINED −1.1pp. Lowest absolute growth. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Penn	11.3%	13.3%	+2.0	0.276	0.680×	**NORMAL**	*Modest growth +2.0pp. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Columbia	13.9%	19.7%	+5.8	0.656	1.150×	**PROPORTIONAL**	*Large growth +5.8pp. Norm score 0.656. J/WNJ: PROPORTIONAL.*
Dartmouth	8.0%	14.4%	+6.4	0.718	3.552×	**ANOMALOUS†**	*Large growth +6.4pp. Norm score 0.718 = 2nd highest. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS†.*
Brown	14.2%	17.5%	+3.3	0.550	-0.360×	**OUTPERFORMER**	*Growth +3.3pp. Similar to Harvard. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	8.9%	10.1%	+1.2	0.120	0.320×	**OUTPERFORMER**	*Modest growth +1.2pp. Norm score 0.120. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Stanford	8.1%	14.6%	+6.5	0.737	0.480×	**NORMAL**	*Large growth +6.5pp. Norm score 0.737 = highest. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*

★ KEY FINDING: Yale has the lowest international normalized score (0.120) in the peer group — near-zero international growth pressure — yet sits in the ANOMALOUS tier. Stanford and Dartmouth score highest (0.737, 0.718) and sit in NORMAL / ANOMALOUS† tiers respectively. More international growth is weakly associated with BETTER Jewish

SECTION 4: GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSIFICATION (IPEDS EF State Origin · NE+Mid-Atlantic %, 1992→2024)

School	NE% 1992	NE% 2024	Δ NE (pp)	Norm. Score	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier	Notes
Harvard	49.7%	38.3%	−11.4	0.421	2.327×	**ANOMALOUS**	*Modest NE decline −4.1pp (vs 1992). Norm 0.421. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Yale	42.5%	32.1%	−10.4	0.349	1.383×	**ANOMALOUS**	*Large NE decline −10.4pp. Norm 0.349. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS.*
Princeton	39.2%	38.3%	−0.9	0.336	0.107×	**NORMAL ★**	★ *NE essentially unchanged (−0.9pp). Least geographic diversification. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Penn	45.0%	38.5%	−6.5	0.381	0.680×	**NORMAL**	*Moderate NE decline. Norm 0.381. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*
Columbia	35.0%	28.0%	−7.0	0.792	1.150×	**PROPORTIONAL**	*Largest NE corridor relative exposure (0.792 = highest in dataset). J/WNJ: PROPORTIONAL.*
Dartmouth	42.0%	29.0%	−13.0	0.462	3.552×	**ANOMALOUS†**	*Large NE decline. Norm 0.462. J/WNJ: ANOMALOUS†.*
Brown	57.9%	38.7%	−19.2	0.570	-0.360×	**OUTPERFORMER**	*Largest NE decline of all −19.2pp. Norm 0.570 > Harvard 0.421. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	51.6%	52.5%	+0.9	0.512	0.320×	**OUTPERFORMER**	*NE essentially stable (+0.9pp). Highest NE concentration. J/WNJ: OUTPERFORMER.*
Stanford	13.4%	11.3%	−2.1	0.059	0.480×	**NORMAL**	*Low NE exposure throughout (norm 0.059 = lowest). Never a Northeast school. J/WNJ: NORMAL.*

★ KEY FINDING: Brown has the largest NE corridor decline of any school (−19.2pp vs Harvard −4.1pp) — its normalized NE score (0.570) formally exceeds Harvard's (0.421) — and is the outperformer. Princeton has near-zero NE movement and is the NORMAL benchmark. Cornell's NE share is stable yet it is an outperformer. No consistent NE→Jewish-

SECTION 5: MASTER SYNTHESIS — All Nine Schools, All Four Dimensions vs Jewish Outcome

School	Δ White (pp)	Pell Trend	Intl 2014→24	NE Shift	Composite Score	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier
Harvard	-13.9	*Modest +3.5pp*	+4.4 pp	−11.4 pp	0.584	2.327×	**ANOMALOUS**
Yale	-15.8	*Large +13.4pp*	−0.6 pp	−10.4 pp	0.344	1.383×	**ANOMALOUS**
Princeton	-12.3	*Strong +4.0pp*	−1.1 pp	−0.9 pp	0.381	0.107×	**NORMAL ★**
Penn	-18.0	*Modest +2.5pp*	+2.0 pp	−6.5 pp	0.494	0.680×	**NORMAL**
Columbia	-9.8	*Moderate +6.0pp*	+5.8 pp	−7.0 pp	0.625	1.150×	**PROPORTIONAL**
Dartmouth	-3.9	*Moderate +5.0pp*	+6.4 pp	−13.0 pp	0.383	3.552×	**ANOMALOUS†**
Brown	-10.0	*DECLINED −5.3pp*	+3.3 pp	−19.2 pp	0.508	-0.360×	**OUTPERFORMER**
Cornell	-10.9	*Modest +3.0pp*	+1.2 pp	+0.9 pp	0.322	0.320×	**OUTPERFORMER**
Stanford	-14.5	*Moderate +5.0pp*	+6.5 pp	−2.1 pp	0.682	0.480×	**NORMAL**

★ MASTER FINDING: No single diversification dimension — and no combination of them — consistently predicts Jewish enrollment outcomes across the nine-school peer group. Brown leads on geographic diversification, had Pell decline, and grew Jewish enrollment. Yale shows below-average diversification pressure on three of four dimensions yet sits in

SOURCES: §1 CDS B2 race/ethnicity (all schools, verified). §2 CDS Pell cohort; IPEDS SFA any-aid rate. §3 IPEDS EF first-time international. §4 IPEDS EF state origin NE+Mid-Atlantic. † Columbia: denominator includes General Studies; figures directional. ★ Yale 2014-15 Asian: 906/5,477 = 16.5%; 2024-25: 1,483/6,758 = 21.9%. Source: Yale OIR CDS 2014-15 (April 2015), confirmed primary. Brown 2024-25 Asian %:

EXCLUDED VARIABLES — Asian Enrollment, Athletic Recruitment & Dimension Selection Rationale

This sheet documents the variables explicitly tested for inclusion in the four-factor OECD/JRC composite index and excluded, with supporting data. The report states (Section III): "Asian enrollment growth was explicitly assessed for inclusion in the four-factor composite stacking model and excluded on methodological grounds: its cross-institutional correlation with Jewish enrollment change is weak (r=+0.27) and runs in the wrong direction — more Asian growth correlates with better Jewish outcomes." This sheet provides the underlying data for that claim.

SECTION A: ASIAN ENROLLMENT GROWTH — Nine Schools vs Jewish Enrollment Outcome

Inclusion test: A dimension was included if it met all three criteria: (1) quantifiable from public data, (2) directionally applicable to Jewish applicants, (3) cross-institutional pattern corroborates narrative falsification. Asian growth satisfies (1) and (2) but fails (3): cross-institutional correlation with Jewish enrollment change is near zero.

School	Asian% Base	Asian% Curr	Δ Asian (pp)	Jewish Δ (pref.)	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier	INCLUDED?	Notes
Harvard	18.8%	23.6%	+4.8	−49.3%	2.327×	**ANOMALOUS**	**NO — excluded**	*Modest Asian gain. Anomalous J/WNJ.*
Yale	16.5%	21.9%	+5.4	−42%	1.383×	**ANOMALOUS**	**NO — excluded**	*Asian +5.4pp (16.5%→21.9%), confirmed CDS B2 2014-15 (Yale OIR). Comparable to Harvard (+4.7pp). Both anomalous J/WNJ despite similar Asian growth.*
Princeton	20.9%	23.5%	+2.6	−9.5%	0.107×	**NORMAL ★**	**NO — excluded**	*Moderate Asian gain. Normal J/WNJ.*
Penn	20.1%	29.6%	+9.5	−31%	0.680×	**NORMAL**	**NO — excluded**	*Large Asian gain (+9.5pp). Same as Brown/Cornell. Normal J/WNJ.*
Columbia	16.8%	18.7%	+1.9	~−28%	1.150×	**PROPORTIONAL**	**NO — excluded**	*Smallest Asian gain (+1.9pp) in dataset. Proportional J/WNJ.*
Dartmouth	14.1%	13.1%	−1.0	~−19%	3.552×	**ANOMALOUS†**	**NO — excluded**	*Asian DECLINED (−1.0pp). Anomalous J/WNJ — wrong direction for hypothesis.*
Brown	12.8%	22.9%	+10.0	+20%	-0.360×	**OUTPERFORMER**	**NO — excluded**	*Largest Asian gain (+10.0pp). Jewish enrollment GREW. OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	17.2%	26.8%	+9.6	−13%	0.320×	**OUTPERFORMER**	**NO — excluded**	*Large Asian gain (+9.6pp). Jewish modestly declined. OUTPERFORMER.*
Stanford	19.0%	28.7%	+9.7	~−21%	0.480×	**NORMAL**	**NO — excluded**	*Large Asian gain (+9.7pp). Normal J/WNJ.*

★ EXCLUSION FINDING: Penn, Brown, and Cornell all show ~10pp Asian growth — the maximum in the dataset. Penn: −31% Jewish. Cornell: −13% Jewish. Brown: +20% Jewish. Identical Asian pressure; three different outcome tiers. Dartmouth shows Asian DECLINE yet has the worst J/WNJ ratio (3.55×). Pearson r (Asian Δ vs Jewish % change, n=9 schools with available data) = +0.27 (p=0.48, not significant). Direction is POSITIVE — more Asian growth weakly correlates with BETTER Jewish outcomes — the opposite of the displacement hypothesis. EXCLUDED from composite index on dual grounds: (1) no significant correlation, (2) wrong directional sign.

⚑ REPLICATION NOTE: r = +0.274 computed from enrollment counts (Asian n ÷ Total UG), not from % cells in companion CDS file. Yale 2014-15 base (906/5,477 = 16.5%) confirmed from Yale OIR CDS B2 2014-15 — that cell was NULL in CDS prior to Mar 7 fix. Brown 2024-25 Asian % formula corrected Mar 7 (was =F34/C34, now =F35/C35); count 1,653 was always correct and was used here. Recomputing with n=8 (Yale excluded) gives r=+0.280. Corrected March 12, 2026 following CDS B2 primary source PDF verification of Asian baseline counts for Harvard, Princeton, Penn, Brown, and Cornell.

SECTION B: ATHLETIC RECRUITMENT — Available Data (Appendix F.1)

Athletic recruitment rates are not uniformly available from public data. Figures below from SFFA trial exhibits, school publications, and institutional research. Jewish applicants concentrate in the academic credential pool that athletic preference displaces. Falsification test: if athletic recruitment drives Jewish decline, schools with higher recruit rates should show larger Jewish drops.

School	Recruit Rate	Data Quality	J/WNJ Ratio	Tier	INCLUDED?	Notes
Harvard	~10–11%	*HIGH — SFFA trial exhibits + Crimson*	2.327×	**ANOMALOUS**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Recruits 10–11%. Anomalous J/WNJ.*
Yale	~13%	*HIGH — Yale Daily News 2023*	1.383×	**ANOMALOUS**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Recruits ~13%. Same as Brown. Anomalous J/WNJ.*
Princeton	~15%	*HIGH — Princeton Alumni Weekly (C/O 2023)*	0.107×	**NORMAL ★**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*★ Recruits ~15% — higher than Harvard. Normal J/WNJ.*
Brown	~13%	*HIGH — Ivy Coach 2023 (220+ spots, ~13%)*	-0.360×	**OUTPERFORMER**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Recruits ~13% — higher than Harvard. OUTPERFORMER.*
Cornell	~9%	*MED — Cornell Institutional Research (UG only)*	0.320×	**OUTPERFORMER**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Recruits ~9% — lower than Harvard. OUTPERFORMER.*
Penn	~8%	*MED — SFFA adjacent estimates*	0.680×	**NORMAL**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Recruits ~8% — lowest of documented. Normal J/WNJ.*
Dartmouth	~16%	*MED — directional (small class amplifies rate)*	3.552×	**ANOMALOUS†**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Highest rate (~16%). Anomalous J/WNJ but Hillel-only.*
Stanford	~10%	*LOW — directional estimate*	0.480×	**NORMAL**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Estimate only. Normal J/WNJ.*
Columbia	~12%	*LOW — directional estimate*	1.150×	**PROPORTIONAL**	**NO — not quantifiable for composite**	*Estimate only. Proportional J/WNJ.*

★ EXCLUSION FINDING: Brown recruits ~13% athletes (higher than Harvard ~10–11%) and is the outperformer. Princeton recruits ~15% (highest of documented schools) and produces the expected normal outcome. No consistent relationship between recruit rate and J/WNJ ratio. Additionally, athletic recruitment rates are not consistently available in public data across all nine schools, making normalization for a composite index methodologically unsound. EXCLUDED from composite index.

SECTION C: VARIABLE INCLUSION/EXCLUSION DECISION TABLE — OECD/JRC Composite Index

Variable	Directionally Applicable?	Quantifiable (Public Data)?	Cross-Institutional	Inclusion Decision	Notes
International growth	*YES — Jewish pool is domestic-heavy*	*YES — IPEDS EF first-time*	*WEAK POSITIVE (wrong*	**INCLUDED**	*Included despite weak pattern; directionally valid and quantifiable.*
NE corridor contraction	*YES — ~45% of US Jews in NE/Mid-Atl*	*YES — IPEDS EF state origin*	*WEAK POSITIVE (wrong*	**INCLUDED**	*Included; Brown falsification strongest evidence against.*
White share decline	*YES — captures aggregate diversity pressure*	*YES — CDS Section B2*	*MODERATE (White Decomposition is*	**INCLUDED**	*Included; directly related to denominator in J/WNJ analysis.*
Financial aid expansion	*YES — Jewish applicants disproportionately higher-income*	*YES — IPEDS SFA any-aid*	*DIRECTIONAL (Stanford top, normal*	**INCLUDED**	*Included; domestic-adjusted to control for intl denominator inflation.*
Asian enrollment growth	*YES — competes for credential-based slots*	*YES — CDS Section B2*	*WEAK POSITIVE r=+0.27 (wrong*	**EXCLUDED — wrong direction + not significant**	*Brown +10pp Asian, outperformer. Dartmouth −1pp, anomalous. r=+0.27 (wrong direction).*
Athletic recruitment	*YES — displaces academic credential pool*	*PARTIAL — not uniform across all 9*	*NO consistent pattern*	**EXCLUDED — data gap + r ≈ 0**	*Brown recruits more than Harvard; Princeton more than Harvard. Both falsify.*
Legacy preference	*YES — Jewish alumni over-represented (historical ~25%)*	*PARTIAL — Harvard SFFA data only*	*UNVERIFIABLE cross-institutionall*	**EXCLUDED — data gap**	*Directionally tested in Appendix F; cross-institutional normalization not possible.*
SAT/credential shift	*YES — Jewish applicants above White avg on SAT*	*PARTIAL — inconsistent cross-school*	*FALSIFIED by direct SAT*	**EXCLUDED — falsified**	*Jewish students tracked Asian SAT profile, not White. Credential compression cannot explain 2.7× gap.*
Post-Oct 7 dynamics	*POSSIBLE — reputational effects on applicants*	*NO — no systematic application data*	*NOT TESTABLE with public*	**EXCLUDED — not quantifiable**	*Tested narratively in Appendix F.6; no systematic data available.*
Socioeconomic targeting (Pell)	*YES — Jewish applicants higher-income avg*	*YES — CDS Pell cohort*	*INCONSISTENT (Brown Pell declined, outperform*	**EXCLUDED as standalone (captured in Aid dimension)**	*Brown only school with Pell decline and is outperformer. Captured directionally via Aid dimension.*

★ METHODOLOGY NOTE: The four included dimensions were selected because they are (1) quantifiable from public IPEDS/CDS data, (2) directionally applicable to Jewish applicants, and (3) their cross-institutional patterns provide independent corroboration of the narrative falsifications in Section III of the report. Including Asian growth or athletic recruitment would not change the core finding: Harvard and Brown have near-identical composite scores regardless of whether these excluded variables are added, while their Jewish enrollment outcomes diverge by 91 percentage points.

SOURCES: Asian data: CDS B2 (verified, Enrollment Raw sheet of CDS_IPEDS file). Athletic data: SFFA v. Harvard trial exhibits (2018); NBER WP 26316 (Arcidiacono); Yale Daily News 2023; Princeton Alumni Weekly C/O 2023; Cornell IR; Best Colleges/Ivy Coach 2023. J/WNJ ratios: Sheet 3 (White Decomposition). Composite scores: Sheet 7 (Stacking Composite v7).

Crimson Selection Bias Analysis

HARVARD JEWISH ENROLLMENT: TREND ANALYSIS & DATA VALIDATION

HJAA Research | Harvard Jewish Alumni Alliance | March 2026

PURPOSE OF THIS ANALYSIS

This workbook synthesizes two independent data sources — the Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey and Hillel International College Guide — to document the decline in Jewish undergraduate enrollment at Harvard. Because neither source is individually definitive, this analysis (1) quantifies the trend from each source independently, (2) documents known limitations and selection bias in the Crimson survey, and (3) demonstrates that despite those limitations, the directional conclusion is robust and consistent across both sources.

KEY FINDINGS

• Crimson Survey (incoming freshmen):

Jewish % fell from ~10% (Classes of 2017–2019) to ~5–6% (Classes of 2022–2027) — a decline of roughly 45–50% in relative share over approximately eight years.

• Hillel International (whole undergrad):

Post-2016 methodology series shows Jewish enrollment fell from 12% (2016–2017) to 7% (2022–2025), a decline of 42% in relative share. Peak pre-revision figures were 25% (2013–2015).

• Both sources agree on direction:

Despite different populations (incoming class vs. all undergrads) and different methodologies, both sources show a sustained, significant decline beginning around 2016–2020.

• Harvard is an outlier vs. peer institutions:

Among Ivy League schools, Harvard shows the steepest Hillel-reported decline (-70% from peak). Yale (-47%), Penn (-56%), and Columbia (-53%) also declined sharply, but Cornell, Dartmouth, Princeton, and Stanford show more modest declines. Brown is anomalous (increase).

• Selection bias does not reverse the conclusion:

The Crimson freshman survey consistently over-represents white and Northeast students — the demographic groups with the highest Jewish population density. This means the Crimson figures likely overstate Jewish %, making the true decline at least as large as reported.

IMPORTANT CAVEATS & LIMITATIONS

⚠ *Hillel figures are self-reported estimates; no audited external benchmark exists for Jewish enrollment.*

⚠ *The Crimson survey does not correct for non-response bias. Senior survey (not analyzed here) does correct for demographic bias.*

⚠ *Hillel revised its Harvard figure sharply downward in March 2016 (from 25% to 12%). The pre-2016 and post-2016 series are not comparable; only the post-2016 series is used for trend analysis.*

⚠ *Crimson and Hillel measure different populations: Crimson = incoming freshman class; Hillel = all undergraduates.*

⚠ *Brandeis CMJS (2018) found Hillel overcounts Jewish enrollment by 25–65% at five campuses studied. Hillel figures should be treated as upper-bound estimates.*

WORKBOOK CONTENTS

HARVARD JEWISH ENROLLMENT TREND: CRIMSON SURVEY vs. HILLEL INTERNATIONAL

Two independent sources — both show sustained decline

SECTION A: Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey — Jewish % of Incoming Class

Class Year	Entering Fall	Jewish % (Crimson)	Bias-Adj Low (÷1.10)	Bias-Adj High (+0%)	Respondents (approx.)	Notes
2017	2013	**9.5%**	8.6%	9.5%	79% (Crimson)	
2018	2014	**9.8%**	8.9%	9.8%	70% (Crimson)	
2019	2015	**10.1%**	9.2%	10.1%	70% (Crimson)	
2020	2016	**6.3%**	5.7%	6.3%	70% (Crimson)	
2021	2017	**7.7%**	7.0%	7.7%	50% (Crimson)	
2022	2018	**5.4%**	4.9%	5.4%	65% (Crimson)	
2023	2019	**5.3%**	4.8%	5.3%	55% (Crimson)	
2024	2020	**5.2%**	4.7%	5.2%	76% (Crimso	*COVID year — small class*
2025	2021	**7.4%**	6.7%	7.4%	78% (Crimson)	
2026	2022	N/A	—	—	6–78% respo	*Data not in survey file*
2027	2023	**5.4%**	4.9%	5.4%	6.8% (Crimson)	

SECTION B: Hillel International — Harvard Jewish Enrollment (Post-2016 Methodology Only)

Year	Hillel Jewish N	Total UG N	Hillel %	Notes
2016	**803**	6,694	**12.0%**	*Methodology change from 25% — new series begins here*
2017	**803**	6,712	**12.0%**	
2018	**780**	6,712	**11.6%**	*Minor downward revision Jul 2018*
2019	**700**	6,712	**10.4%**	*Downward revision Apr 2019*
2020	**585**	6,712	**8.7%**	*Downward revision Oct 2020*
2021	**585**	6,712	**8.7%**	
2022	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**	*Downward revision Oct 2021–Apr 2022. Note: Hillel published 7% (whole number); arithmetic from stated N gives 494÷671*
2023	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**	
2024	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**	
2025	**494**	7,061	**7.0%**	*Latest Hillel figure — 7%*

NOTE — PRE-2016 HILLEL SERIES (NOT USED FOR TREND): Hillel reported Harvard Jewish enrollment at 1,675 students / 25% of undergraduates from 2013 through October 2015. In March 2016, the figure dropped to 803 / 12% in a single update — almost certainly reflecting a methodology revision, not actual enrollment change. The two series are not comparable and cannot be combined into a single trend line. All trend analysis uses only the post-2016 series (12% → 7%).

SECTION C: Source Convergence — Do Both Series Point the Same Direction?

CONVERGENCE ASSESSMENT: Yes. The two sources measure different populations (incoming class vs. all undergrads) and use different methodologies, but both independently document a sustained, significant decline in Jewish representation:

• Crimson freshman survey: ~10% (2017–2019 classes) → ~5–6% (2022–2027 classes) = approximately -45% to -50% relative decline
• Hillel post-2016 series: 12% (2016–2017) → 7% (2022–2025) = approximately -42% relative decline

IVY LEAGUE + STANFORD: JEWISH ENROLLMENT TREND COMPARISON (Hillel International, 2013–2026)

Source: Hillel International College Guide, verified via Wayback Machine | HJAA Research, March 2026

SUMMARY: PEAK vs. CURRENT JEWISH ENROLLMENT (Hillel)

School	Peak Period	Peak Jewish N	Peak %	Latest Year	Latest Jewish N	Latest %	Absolute Drop	Relative Drop
Harvard	**2013–201**	**1,675**	**25%**	**2025**	**494**	**7.0%**	**(1,181)**	**(70%)**
Penn	2013–201	2,500	26%	2025	1,100	11.0%	(1,400)	**(56%)**
Columbia†	2013–201	3,000	30%	2025	1,400	15.7%	(1,600)	**(53%)**
Yale	2013–201	1,500	27%	2026	800	11.8%	(700)	**(47%)**
Princeton	2013–201	650	13%	2026	450	8.6%	(200)	**(31%)**
Stanford	2014–201	700	10%	2025	600	7.9%	(100)	**(14%)**
Dartmouth	2014	450	11%	2025	400	8.9%	(50)	**(11%)**
Cornell	2013–201	3,000	23%	2025	2,500	20.0%	(500)	**(17%)**
Brown	018 (stabl	1,000	15%	2025	1,700	23.9%	700	**70%**

† Columbia peak figure (30%) uses Hillel denominator of ~10,000. Stacking Analysis uses IPEDS-adjusted Colun

Harvard shows the steepest relative decline of any institution tracked: -70% from peak (1,675 → 494 students; 25% → 7%). Penn, Columbia, and Yale also show declines exceeding 45%. Harvard's decline is not merely part of a universal trend — it is an outlier to the downside even within the group of Ivy-plus schools experiencing the largest drops. NOTE: 'Relative Drop' is calculated as (Latest N − Peak N) ÷ Peak N — i.e., based on student headcount, not percentage-point change. For Brown, this represents an increase from

HILLEL % TIME

School	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020–21	2022–23	2024	2025–26	Trend
Harvard*	**25%**	**25%**	**25%**	**12%**	**12%**	**11%**	**10%**	**9%**	**7–8%**	**7%**	**7%**	**▼ Sharp de**
Yale	27%	28%	27%	27%	27%	15%	13%	13%	13%	12%	11.8%	▼ Moderate
Penn	25%	26%	26%	26%	18%	17%	17%	17%	16–17%	16%	11%	▼ Moderate
Columbia	30%	30%	39%*	20%*	24%	24%	24%	24%	17–22%	23%*	15.7%	▼ Unreliable
Cornell	23%	23%	21%	21%	21%	21%	17%	17%	17%	20%	20%	▼ Mild decli
Princeton	13%	13%	12%	10%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8–10%	10%*	8.6%	▼ Mild decli
Dartmouth	11%	11%	10%	10%	10%	—	9%	9%	9%	9%	8.9%	▼ Stable-to-
Stanford	10%	10%	10%	10%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	7.7%	7.9%	▼ Mild decli
Brown	20%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	19%	19%	19–24%	23.9%	23.9%	▲ INCREAS

** Harvard 2013–2015 figures are from Hillel's pre-2016 methodology (which was revised sharply downward in March 2016 — almost certainly a methodology change, not enrollment change). Harvard's post-2016 series begins at 12% and trends downward to 7%. Columbia's figures are unreliable due to inconsistent total UG denominator (see Audit tab in source file). Princeton showed a temporary partial recovery to 10% in Jan 2024, subsequently reversed to 8.6% by Mar 2026. COLUMBIA BASELINE DENOMINATOR NOTE: The 30% peak figure in this table uses Hillel's reported denominator of ~10,000 students. The companion Stacking Analysis*

HARVARD CRIMSON FRESHMAN SURVEY: SELECTION BIAS FRAMEWORK

How to interpret Crimson Jewish enrollment figures given known survey methodology limitations

WHAT THE CRIMSON SURVEY IS

The Harvard Crimson administers an anonymous online survey to all incoming freshmen at the start of each academic year. Participation is voluntary. The survey covers demographics (including religion and ethnicity), family income, secondary school, and admissions profile. Results are published in the Crimson in February each year. The methodology note states explicitly that the survey 'does not correct for selection bias.'

WHAT SELECTION BIAS MEANS HERE

Selection bias arises when survey respondents are systematically different from non-respondents in ways that affect the variables being measured. For religious affiliation, this matters because some demographic groups may be more or less likely to respond to a voluntary survey — and those groups may not be distributed randomly across religious identities.

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE BIAS DIRECTION

Comparing Crimson-reported race/ethnicity figures against official CDS (Common Data Set) enrollment data across 11 class years (Classes of 2017–2027) reveals a consistent, directional pattern:

• White students are over-represented in Crimson by approximately 8–14 percentage points vs. CDS domestic enrollment.
• Hispanic students are consistently under-represented by 2–4 percentage points.
• Black students show a mixed pattern: over-represented in 6 of 10 measured class years (gaps of +1.8 to +4.5pp), near parity in 3, and under-represented in 1. No consistent directional bias for Black students.
• International students are excluded from the domestic-basis comparison.

Northeast students are also over-represented vs. IPEDS state-of-origin data on a domestic-rebased basis (+0.9pp in 2018, +2.1pp in 2027). The Midwest shows a larger and growing over-representation (+2.3pp in 2018, +5.1pp in 2027). Southeast and West are under-represented, with California (large Jewish population) notably under-sampled (−3 to −5pp).

HOW BIAS AFFECTS JEWISH ENROLLMENT FIGURES

Jewish Americans are concentrated among white, Northeast-origin students — precisely the group the Crimson over-samples. This means the Crimson survey almost certainly overstates Jewish enrollment as a percentage of the incoming class.

Quantifying the overstatement precisely is not possible without knowing the exact non-response rate by religion. However, if we assume Jewish students respond at a rate proportional to the white/Northeast

CRITICAL IMPLICATION: BIAS STRENGTHENS THE TREND ARGUMENT

The existence of consistent upward bias in Jewish representation does NOT weaken the argument that Jewish enrollment has declined. It strengthens it:

• If the survey systematically over-represents Jewish students in all years, then the TRUE enrollment in each year is lower than reported.
• If the BIAS IS CONSISTENT across years, the TREND is still valid — the measured decline is real, not an artifact of changing bias.
• More importantly: if the survey already overstates Jewish %, and STILL shows a sharp decline, then the true decline is at least as large — and plausibly larger — than what the Crimson reports.

The bias operates as a conservative floor. The Crimson data understates the severity of the decline

WHAT CANNOT BE CONCLUDED

The Crimson survey cannot support precise point-in-time claims about absolute Jewish enrollment percentage. Statements like 'exactly 5.4% of the Class of 2027 is Jewish' are not defensible given the absence of non-response bias correction.

What IS defensible: 'The Crimson survey, which likely overstates Jewish enrollment, nonetheless shows Jewish representation among incoming Harvard freshmen fell from approximately 10% in 2019 to

RECOMMENDED CITATION LANGUAGE FOR HJAA USE

"According to the Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey — which has documented a consistent over-representation of white and Northeast students relative to official enrollment data — Jewish representation among incoming Harvard freshmen declined from approximately 10% (Classes of 2017–2019) to approximately 5–6% (Classes of 2022–2027). Because the survey's known bias runs in the direction of overstating Jewish enrollment, the actual decline is likely at least as large as reported. This trend is independently corroborated by Hillel International data showing Harvard's Jewish

CHART-READY DATA — Harvard Jewish Enrollment Trend

Use this sheet as source data for charts. All figures cross-referenced to source tabs.

CHART A: Crimson Freshman Survey — Jewish % by Class Year (entering fall)

Class Year	Entering Fall	Jewish % (Crimson)	Bias-Adj Low	Bias-Adj High (filed)
2017	2013	**9.5%**	8.6%	9.5%
2018	2014	**9.8%**	8.9%	9.8%
2019	2015	**10.1%**	9.2%	10.1%
2020	2016	**6.3%**	5.7%	6.3%
2021	2017	**7.7%**	7.0%	7.7%
2022	2018	**5.4%**	4.9%	5.4%
2023	2019	**5.3%**	4.8%	5.3%
2024	2020	**5.2%**	4.7%	5.2%
2025	2021	**7.4%**	6.7%	7.4%
2027	2023	**5.4%**	4.9%	5.4%

CHART B: Hillel International — Harvard Jewish % (Post-2016 Methodology)

Year	Jewish N	Total UG N	Hillel %
2016	**803**	6,694	**12.0%**
2017	**803**	6,712	**12.0%**
2018	**780**	6,712	**11.6%**
2019	**700**	6,712	**10.4%**
2020	**585**	6,712	**8.7%**
2021	**585**	6,712	**8.7%**
2022	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**
2023	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**
2024	**494**	6,712	**7.4%**
2025	**494**	7,061	**7.0%**

CHART C: Ivy League Comparison — Hillel % Decline from Peak to Latest

School	Peak %	Latest %	elative Decli
Harvard	25%	7.0%	**(70%)**
Penn	26%	11.0%	**(56%)**
Columbia	30%	15.7%	**(53%)**
Yale	27%	11.8%	**(47%)**
Princeton	13%	8.6%	(31%)
Cornell	23%	20.0%	(17%)
Stanford	10%	7.9%	(14%)
Dartmouth	11%	8.9%	(11%)
Brown	15%	23.9%	**70%**

STATISTICAL VALIDATION — Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey (Jewish Enrollment)

All response rates are as published in the Harvard Crimson survey methodology notes | CIs use conservative (lower-bound) N | HJAA Research, March 2026

SECTION 1 — PUBLISHED RESPONSE RATES AND APPROXIMATE SURVEY N

The Crimson's methodology statement specifies the approximate share of the freshman class that completed the survey. Exact counts are not published. These figures are the only official published information about survey N. 'Survey N' = Class size × published response rate floor. 'Jewish N' = Survey N × Jewish % (assumes all survey respondents answered the religion question — see Critical Unknown note below). CIs use binomial normal approximation with conservative N floor.

Class	Entering Fall	Class Size (CDS)	Published RR	Survey N (≥)	Jewish % (Filed)	Jewish N (approx.)	95% CI Low	95% CI High	Notes
2017	2013	1,657	Nearly 80%	1,309	9.5%	~124	7.9%	11.1%	
2018	2014	1,650	More than 70%	1,171	9.8%	~114	8.1%	11.5%	
2019	2015	1,659	More than 70%	1,177	**10.1%**	~118	8.4%	11.8%	Peak year anchor
2020	2016	1,659	More than 70%	1,177	6.3%	~74	4.9%	7.7%	
2021	2017	1,685	More than 50%	859	7.7%	~66	5.9%	9.5%	Floor only (>50%); widest CI uncertainty
2022	2018	1,652	Roughly 65%	1,073	5.4%	~57	4.0%	6.8%	
2023	2019	1,644	Roughly 55%	904	5.3%	~47	3.8%	6.8%	
2024	2020	1,402	Roughly 76%	1,065	5.2%	~55	3.9%	6.5%	
2025	2021	1,949	Roughly 78%	1,520	7.4%	~112	6.1%	8.7%	Anomalous spike — see Section 4
2027	2023	1,644	45.8% (exact)	752	**5.4%**	~40	3.8%	7.0%	Exact RR (45.8%); lowest survey N in series

⚠ CRITICAL UNKNOWN: The religion question is one question within the survey. Survey respondents may have skipped it. We have no data on religion-question completion rate. The Jewish N estimates above assume 100% of survey respondents answered the religion question. If 10% skipped it, Jewish N for Class of 2027 falls from ~41 to ~37, widening the 95% CI from [3.8%, 7.0%] to [3.7%, 7.2%] — material but not large. CIs are used as approximations and are disclosed as such.

SECTION 2 — FORMAL HYPOTHESIS TESTS: Is the 2019 → 2027 Decline Statistically Significant?

Two-proportion z-test comparing Jewish % in Class of 2019 (peak) against each subsequent year. H_0: Jewish share is unchanged. H_1: Jewish share has declined. One-tailed test. N uses the conservative floor response rate from published Crimson figures. Three religion-question completion scenarios shown (100%, 90%, 80%) to demonstrate robustness.

Comparison	n (2019)	n (Year 2)	p (2019)	p (Year 2)	z-stat (100% q)	p-value (100% q)	z-stat (80% q)	p-value (80% q)	Significance
2019 vs 2020	1,177	1,177	10.1%	6.3%	3.36	0.000388	3.01	0.001322	*** p<0.001
2019 vs 2021	1,177	859	10.1%	7.7%	1.86	0.031359	1.66	0.047986	* p<0.05
2019 vs 2022	1,177	1,073	10.1%	5.4%	4.14	0.000017	3.7	0.000107	*** p<0.001
2019 vs 2023	1,177	904	10.1%	5.3%	4	0.000032	3.58	0.000174	*** p<0.001
2019 vs 2024	1,177	1,065	10.1%	5.2%	4.33	0.000007	3.87	0.000054	*** p<0.001
2019 vs 2025	1,177	1,520	10.1%	7.4%	2.48	0.006501	2.22	0.013158	** p<0.01
2019 vs 2027	1,177	752	10.1%	5.4%	3.66	0.000127	3.27	0.000535	*** p<0.001

*** p<0.001 ** p<0.01 * p<0.05 ns = not significant
The 2019→2027 decline is statistically significant at p<0.001 even assuming only 80% of survey respondents answered the religion question. The 2019→2021 comparison is less significant (p=0.025) reflecting the partial-recovery in Class 2021.

SECTION 3 — TREND TESTS: Mann-Kendall (Non-Parametric) and Linear Regression

Test	Statistic	Value	p-value	Interpretation
Mann-Kendall (non-parametric)	Kendall's τ	-0.5394 (−1 = perfectly decreasing)	0.0311	Significant monotonic decline (p=0.031). Non-parametric — no normality assumption.
OLS Linear Regression	Slope (pp/year)	-0.4714 pp/year	0.0109	95% CI: [-0.752, -0.191] pp/year. R^2=0.576.

NOTE ON THE 2025 SPIKE (7.4%): Class of 2025 is anomalously high relative to surrounding years. This reduces the Mann-Kendall tau from its theoretical maximum. The more robust framing is not a linear trend but a structural shift between two periods: Classes 2017–2019 averaged 9.8% (SD 0.30%), while Classes 2022–2027 averaged 5.7% (SD 0.93%). Excluding the anomalous 2025, the late-period mean is 5.3%. No year after 2021 approaches the 2017–2019 range, even at the upper bound of the 95% CI.

SECTION 4 — TWO-PERIOD REGIME: Recommended Statistical Framing

Period	Years Included	N obs	Mean Jewish %	SD	Min	Max	Period Mean Diff	t-stat	p-value (Welch's)
Early (2017–2019)	2017, 2018, 2019	3	**9.80%**	0.30%	9.50%	10.10%	**+4.06%**	8.998	0.000232
Late (2022–2027)	2022, 2023, 2024, 2025	5	**5.74%**	0.93%	5.20%	7.40%	—	—	—

CAUTION: Welch's t-test above treats each class year as an independent observation (n=3 vs n=5). This overstates statistical power — the years are not truly independent. The test is presented as supporting evidence only. The primary statistical evidence is the two-proportion z-test in Section 2, which is the correct test for comparing two proportions from large populations.

SECTION 5 — MULTI-RELIGION COMPARISON: Rebutting the Self-Identification Bias Argument

A potential counter-argument is that Jewish students became less likely to self-identify on the Crimson survey due to campus climate concerns post-Oct 2023 — i.e., the measured decline reflects hiding, not actual enrollment change. The multi-religion data rebuts this: Protestant students declined MORE in relative terms (-70%) than Jewish students (-43%), with no plausible campus-climate reason for Protestants to conceal their identity. The parsimonious explanation for all religious groups declining is national secularization. Jewish decline is steeper than Catholic and Protestant on an absolute basis, suggesting a real enrollment component on top of the secularization trend.

Religion	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2027
Jewish	**9.5%**	**9.8%**	**10.1%**	**6.3%**	**7.7%**	**5.4%**	**5.3%**	**5.2%**	**7.4%**	**5.4%**
Catholic	22.3%	19.1%	17.1%	17.8%	19.5%	20.2%	17.5%	17.4%	16.9%	16.4%
Protestant	20.1%	17.9%	17.0%	16.9%	15.9%	15.4%	16.5%	16.0%	14.5%	6.1%
No Religion (Ag+At)	32.4%	35.6%	37.9%	40.4%	37.8%	38.5%	43.5%	40.6%	41.3%	46.1%

Religion	2017 (base)	2027 (latest)	Abs. Change (pp)	Relative Change	Trend direction
Jewish	**9.5%**	**5.4%**	**-4.1%**	**-43%**	▼ Declining
Catholic	22.3%	16.4%	-5.9%	-26%	▼ Declining
Protestant	20.1%	6.1%	-14.0%	-70%	▼ Declining
No Religion (Ag+At)	32.4%	46.1%	+13.7%	+42%	▲ Increasing

KEY FINDING: Protestant self-identification declined −70% in relative terms (20.1% → 6.1%), more than double the Jewish relative decline (−43%). Catholic declined −26%. No Religion rose +42%. All religious groups are declining. If the decline reflected Jewish students hiding their identity due to campus climate, the Jewish decline would be uniquely large and would show acceleration post-2023. Instead, Protestant declined MORE, which is inconsistent with the hiding hypothesis. Conclusion: secularization is the primary driver of all religious declines; Jewish enrollment decline is an additional factor specific to Jewish students.

SECTION 6 — SUMMARY: What Withstands Statistical Scrutiny vs. What Requires Qualification

✓ STANDS UP UNDER SCRUTINY

1. The trend is statistically significant. Two-proportion z-test (2019 vs 2027): z=3.66, p<0.001, robust to all plausible religion-question completion rates and to use of conservative (floor) response rates.

2. The result is non-parametrically confirmed. Mann-Kendall test (p=0.031) confirms a monotonic downward trend without normality assumptions.

3. The self-identification bias argument is rebutted. Protestant declined −70% in relative terms (more than Jewish at −43%), with no plausible campus-climate motivation. The decline reflects both secularization and enrollment change, not identity concealment.

4. Both independent sources agree. Crimson (incoming class, self-ID) and Hillel (all undergrads, headcount) independently document −43% and −42% relative declines respectively. Convergence across two methodologically distinct sources is strong evidence.

⚠ REQUIRES QUALIFICATION

1. Absolute levels are approximate. The 95% CI for Class of 2027 is [3.8%, 7.0%] — a 3.2pp range. The exact Jewish N is ~33–41 depending on religion-question completion rate (unknown). Statements like 'exactly 5.4% of the Class of 2027 is Jewish' are not defensible.

2. Response rate declined from ~79% (2017) to 45.8% (2027), increasing variance in recent years. The Class of 2027 CI is wider than the Class of 2019 CI due to this asymmetry.

3. The 2025 spike (7.4%) is not fully explained. Class 2025 is anomalously high. This is acknowledged as survey noise; the two-period framing (Section 4) is more robust than a linear trend claim for this reason.

4. Self-identification ≠ enrollment. The Crimson measures 'share of respondents who identified as Jewish.' Students who did not complete the survey, or who skipped the religion question, are not counted. This is a consistent limitation in every year, but should be stated explicitly in any published use of these figures.

✗ NOT DEFENSIBLE

1. Precise point-in-time absolute levels (e.g., 'exactly 5.4%'). Given approximate N and unknown religion-question completion rate, point estimates without CIs should not be published without qualification.

2. The claim that the decline is uniquely caused by anti-Jewish admissions bias. The data documents a decline; it does not identify causation. Secularization, application patterns, international applicant displacement, and admissions policy changes are all consistent with the data. The data supports the factual claim, not the causal claim.

CRIMSON SURVEY vs. CDS/IPEDS: RACE/ETHNICITY SELECTION BIAS ANALYSIS

Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey (voluntary) compared to official CDS Section B2 enrollment data | Classes of 2017–2027

SECTION A — SOURCE DATA: CDS Section B2 (Official Harvard First-Year Enrollment)

All figures from Harvard Office of Institutional Research Common Data Set, Section B2: First-Time, First-Year Students. Source URL: https://oira.harvard.edu/common-data-set/ Domestic = Total minus International (NRA). All counts are official filed CDS numbers, not estimates.

Class	CDS Year	Total FY	Intl (NRA)	Domestic	Hispanic	Black	White	Asian*	Two+	Unknown	Source URL
2027	2023-24	1,644	250	1,394	179	169	458	411	137	33	https://oira.
2026	2022-23	1,644	252	1,392	193	165	476	403	123	20	https://oira.
2025	2021-22	1,949	287	1,662	228	186	650	431	139	19	https://oira.
2024	2020-21	1,402	125	1,277	180	154	482	337	99	19	https://oira.
2023	2019-20	1,644	214	1,430	195	146	559	370	127	28	https://oira.
2022	2018-19	1,652	205	1,447	176	167	600	347	126	24	https://oira.
2021	2017-18	1,685	192	1,493	195	160	647	334	123	31	https://oira.
2020	2016-17	1,659	193	1,466	187	132	640	354	120	25	https://oira.
2019	2015-16	1,659	218	1,441	176	109	623	314	93	122	https://oira.
2018	2014-15	1,650	187	1,463	182	118	695	317	120	29	https://oira.
2017	2013-14	1,657	185	1,472	167	116	715	306	110	48	https://oira.

** CDS Asian = all Asian subgroups combined (includes South Asian). The Crimson reports East Asian and South Asian separately; for comparison purposes, Crimson Asian + South Asian are combined. † CDS B2 also reports American Indian/Alaska Native (AIAN) and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (NHPI) as separate small categories. These are omitted from this table — the domestic total minus (H+B+W+A+Two++Unknown) equals the AIAN+NHPI combined count, ranging from 2 to 12 students per class year. This is not a data error. Class of 2019 'Unknown' count (122) is anomalously high relative to all other years (3–33); flagged as a data quality issue. Class of 2026 omitted from bias comparison: no Crimson religion data available. Class of 2024 total (1,402) reflects the COVID-reduced class.*

SECTION B — WHITE % COMPARISON: Crimson Survey vs. CDS Official (Domestic Basis)

CDS White % (Domestic) = White ÷ (Total − International). Crimson White % = as reported in the freshman survey. Gap = Crimson % minus CDS domestic %. Positive gap = Crimson over-represents white students. Relative over-sample factor = Crimson White % ÷ CDS White %.

Class	Entering Fall	CDS White (count)	CDS Dom. (count)	CDS White % (dom.)	Crimson White %	Gap (pp)	Relative Factor	Interpretation
2027	2023	458	1,394	**32.9%**	**42.5%**	**+9.6%**	1.29×	Moderate over-representation
2025	2021	650	1,662	**39.1%**	**53.1%**	**+14.0%**	1.36×	LARGE over-representation
2024	2020	482	1,277	**37.7%**	**49.8%**	**+12.1%**	1.32×	LARGE over-representation
2023	2019	559	1,430	**39.1%**	**47.2%**	**+8.1%**	1.21×	Moderate over-representation
2022	2018	600	1,447	**41.5%**	**46.0%**	**+4.5%**	1.11×	Small over-representation
2021	2017	647	1,493	**43.3%**	**52.1%**	**+8.8%**	1.20×	Moderate over-representation
2020	2016	640	1,466	**43.7%**	**55.7%**	**+12.0%**	1.28×	LARGE over-representation
2019	2015	623	1,441	**43.2%**	**58.2%**	**+15.0%**	1.35×	LARGE over-representation
2018	2014	695	1,463	**47.5%**	**62.1%**	**+14.6%**	1.31×	LARGE over-representation
2017	2013	715	1,472	**48.6%**	**61.7%**	**+13.1%**	1.27×	LARGE over-representation

KEY FINDING: White students are consistently over-represented in the Crimson survey relative to official CDS domestic enrollment data. The gap ranges from +4.5 percentage points (Class of 2022, the smallest gap) to +15.0 percentage points (Class of 2019) across all years. The relative factor ranges from 1.11× (Class of 2022) to 1.36× (Class of 2025). This pattern is consistent across all 10 class years with available data — it is not a single-year anomaly.

SECTION C — HISPANIC AND BLACK % COMPARISON: Crimson Survey vs. CDS Official (Domestic Basis)

Class	CDS Hispanic % (dom.)	Crimson Hispanic %	Gap (pp)	CDS Black % (dom.)	Crimson Black %	Gap (pp)	Direction Hispanic	Direction Black
2027	12.8%	9.4%	**-3.4%**	12.1%	11.1%	**-1.0%**	Under	Under
2025	13.7%	13.4%	**-0.3%**	11.2%	15.7%	**+4.5%**	~Parity	Over
2024	14.1%	13.4%	**-0.7%**	12.1%	15.8%	**+3.7%**	~Parity	Over
2023	13.6%	11.1%	**-2.5%**	10.2%	10.1%	**-0.1%**	Under	~Parity
2022	12.2%	6.5%	**-5.7%**	11.5%	10.7%	**-0.8%**	Under	~Parity
2021	13.1%	10.2%	**-2.9%**	10.7%	11.4%	**+0.7%**	Under	~Parity
2020	12.8%	13.1%	**+0.3%**	9.0%	11.4%	**+2.4%**	~Parity	Over
2019	12.2%	12.5%	**+0.3%**	7.6%	11.2%	**+3.6%**	~Parity	Over
2018	12.4%	11.9%	**-0.5%**	8.1%	11.0%	**+2.9%**	~Parity	Over
2017	11.3%	10.8%	**-0.5%**	7.9%	9.7%	**+1.8%**	~Parity	Over

KEY FINDING — Hispanic: Consistently under-represented relative to CDS domestic. Gap ranges from near-parity (−0.3pp, Class 2020) to −5.7pp (Class 2022). More pronounced in recent classes; earlier classes (2017–2020) were near parity.

KEY FINDING — Black: MIXED pattern — NOT consistently under-represented. Black students are OVER-represented in the Crimson in 6 of 10 class years (Classes 2017–2020, 2024–2025; gaps of +1.8 to +4.5pp), near parity in 3 years (Classes 2021–2023), and under-represented in only 1 year (Class 2027, −1.0pp). The direction cells in the table above correctly reflect this year-by-year pattern.

SECTION D — BIAS MECHANISM AND IMPLICATION FOR JEWISH ENROLLMENT FIGURES

WHAT THE BIAS MEANS:

The Crimson survey consistently over-samples white students and under-samples Hispanic and Black students. This is a structural non-response bias — certain groups are more likely to complete the voluntary survey than others.

IMPLICATION FOR JEWISH ENROLLMENT FIGURES:
Jewish students at Harvard are disproportionately concentrated in the white student population. Because the survey over-samples white students (by a factor of approximately 1.20× to 1.40×), it almost certainly over-samples Jewish students as well. The direction of the bias on Jewish enrollment figures is UPWARD — the Crimson overstates Jewish %. The magnitude cannot be precisely quantified without religion-stratified response rate data, but a relative adjustment of 10–40% is plausible given the

CRIMSON SURVEY vs. IPEDS: GEOGRAPHIC (STATE OF ORIGIN) SELECTION BIAS ANALYSIS

Harvard Crimson regional distribution compared to IPEDS first-time enrollment by state of residence | Two snapshot years

SCOPE NOTE: IPEDS provides only two usable snapshots — 2014 and 2024. IPEDS 2014 captures Fall 2014 first-time entrants, a precise match for the Crimson Class of 2018. IPEDS 2024 captures Fall 2024 first-time entrants (Class of 2028); this is used here as the closest available proxy for the Crimson Class of 2027 (Fall 2023 entrants) — a ONE-YEAR TIMING MISMATCH. The geographic distribution of Harvard's admitted class is unlikely to shift materially in a single year, but this approximation should be acknowledged when citing these figures. Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey EF component, state-of-residence, Harvard UNITID 166027.

SECTION A — REGIONAL DEFINITIONS (Matching Crimson Survey Buckets)

NORTHEAST: ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, PA, DE, MD, DC (12 states/territories)
SOUTHEAST: VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL, AL, MS, TN, KY, LA, AR (12 states)
MIDWEST: OH, IN, IL, MI, WI, MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NE, KS (12 states)
SOUTHWEST: TX, OK, NM, AZ (4 states)
WEST: CA, OR, WA, NV, ID, MT, WY, UT, CO, AK, HI (11 states)
INTERNATIONAL: All non-US domestic (excluded from domestic-basis comparisons)

SECTION B — IPEDS RAW STATE DATA FOR HARVARD (First-Time Undergraduates by State of Residence)

Region	State	IPEDS 2014 (Class ~2018)	IPEDS 2024 (Class ~2027)	Source
Northeast	Maine	16	18	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	New Hampsh	32	24	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Vermont	9	11	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Massachuse	86	110	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Rhode Islanc	9	7	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Connecticut	50	41	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	New York	154	115	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	New Jersey	61	48	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Pennsylvania	35	30	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Delaware	1	1	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	Maryland	31	27	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Northeast	District of Co	13	8	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Virginia	28	29	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	West Virginia	0	4	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	North Carolir	10	19	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	South Carolir	1	6	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Georgia	25	23	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Florida	39	30	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Alabama	1	10	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Mississippi	2	3	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Tennessee	6	15	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Kentucky	3	4	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Louisiana	6	10	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southeast	Arkansas	6	5	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Ohio	19	15	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Indiana	4	4	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Illinois	36	29	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Michigan	13	9	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Wisconsin	3	11	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Minnesota	13	11	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Iowa	5	5	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Missouri	4	10	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	North Dakota	1	0	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	South Dakota	2	1	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Nebraska	1	5	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Midwest	Kansas	4	1	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southwest	Texas	52	48	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southwest	Oklahoma	5	5	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southwest	New Mexico	10	1	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
Southwest	Arizona	11	14	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	California	143	122	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Oregon	7	9	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Washington	31	14	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Nevada	2	1	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Idaho	1	5	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Montana	4	8	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Wyoming	1	4	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Utah	5	8	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Colorado	24	20	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Alaska	5	6	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
West	Hawaii	8	10	IPEDS EF Survey, NCES (Harvard UNITID 166027)
TOTAL — Northeast		**497**	**440**	47.9% of known-state domestic (2014) | 45.2% (2024)
TOTAL — Southeast		**127**	**158**	12.2% of known-state domestic (2014) | 16.2% (2024)
TOTAL — Midwest		**105**	**101**	10.1% of known-state domestic (2014) | 10.4% (2024)
TOTAL — Southwest		**78**	**68**	7.5% of known-state domestic (2014) | 7.0% (2024)
TOTAL — West		**231**	**207**	22.3% of known-state domestic (2014) | 21.3% (2024)

SECTION C — GEOGRAPHIC BIAS: CRIMSON vs. IPEDS REGIONAL BREAKDOWN (Domestic-Rebased)

Crimson % (Domestic-Rebased) = Crimson raw regional % ÷ (1 − Crimson International %). This removes international students from the Crimson denominator so both series are on a comparable domestic-only basis. IPEDS % = Regional count ÷ Total known-state domestic (excludes 'state unknown'). Gap = Crimson domestic-rebased % minus IPEDS %. Positive = Crimson over-represents that region.

Region	Crimson 2018 (raw)	Crimson 2018 Intl excl.	IPEDS 2014	Gap (pp) 2018	Crimson 2027 (raw)	Crimson 2027 Intl excl.	IPEDS 2024	Gap (pp) 2027	Interpretation
Northeast	43.1%	**48.8%**	**47.9%**	**+0.9%**	39.4%	**47.2%**	**45.2%**	**+2.1%**	Slight over-rep. Both years. Supports some Jewis
Southeast	10.6%	**12.0%**	**12.2%**	**-0.2%**	11.1%	**13.3%**	**16.2%**	**-2.9%**	Growing under-rep. FL/NY Jewish effect partially
Midwest	11.0%	**12.4%**	**10.1%**	**+2.3%**	12.9%	**15.5%**	**10.4%**	**+5.1%**	Growing over-rep. (NE/Midwest bias may be corr
Southwest	6.8%	**7.7%**	**7.5%**	**+0.2%**	6.1%	**7.3%**	**7.0%**	**+0.3%**	Near parity both years
West	16.9%	**19.1%**	**22.3%**	**-3.1%**	13.7%	**16.4%**	**21.3%**	**-4.8%**	Significant under-rep. CA under-sampled — OFF

SECTION D — WHAT GEOGRAPHIC BIAS MEANS FOR JEWISH ENROLLMENT FIGURES

NUANCED FINDING — Geographic bias on Jewish enrollment is smaller and more ambiguous than racial bias:

1. NORTHEAST OVER-REPRESENTATION (+1–2pp): NY, NJ, MA, CT — the states with the highest Jewish population density — are slightly over-represented. This SUPPORTS upward Jewish bias, but the effect is modest.

2. WEST UNDER-REPRESENTATION (−3 to −5pp): California, which has the second-largest Jewish population of any state, is significantly under-represented. This OFFSETS the Northeast bias and works AGAINST Jewish over-representation in the Crimson.

3. MIDWEST OVER-REPRESENTATION (+2–5pp): The Midwest over-representation is larger than Northeast. However, Jewish population density in the Midwest is lower than the coasts, so this bias has a SMALLER effect on Jewish figures than the Northeast or West biases.

CRIMSON JEWISH % — SELECTION BIAS ADJUSTMENT ANALYSIS

Step-by-step derivation of bias-adjusted Jewish enrollment range | Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey

STEP 1 — BASIS FOR ADJUSTMENT: White Over-Sampling Factor

The white racial over-sampling factor (Crimson White % ÷ CDS domestic White %) ranges from 1.11× (Class of 2022) to 1.36× (Class of 2025) across all 10 measured class years. The central estimate is approximately 1.28×.

Because Jewish students at Harvard are disproportionately white-identifying, the survey over-samples Jewish students in proportion to its over-sampling of white students. However, within white students, Jewish students may not respond at systematically different rates than non-Jewish white students. This introduces uncertainty: the Jewish bias factor could be anywhere from below the observed minimum white factor (1.10×, conservative floor — slightly below the observed minimum of 1.11×) to slightly above the observed maximum (1.40×, upper bound — slightly above the observed maximum of 1.36×).

STEP 2 — FILED CRIMSON JEWISH % BY CLASS YEAR (Source: Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey)

Source: Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey, Religion sheet. URL: https://features.thecrimson.com/2023/freshman-survey/makeup/ (varies by year). Values are as reported; no correction for non-response bias. Class of 2026 omitted — no religion data in survey file.

Class Year	Entering Fall	Jewish % (Filed)	Cons. Adj. ÷1.10	Central Adj. ÷1.25	Max. Adj. ÷1.40	Cons. Range Low–High	Notes
2017	2013	**9.5%**	8.6%	7.6%	6.8%	6.8% – 9.5%	
2018	2014	**9.8%**	8.9%	7.8%	7.0%	7.0% – 9.8%	
2019	2015	**10.1%**	9.2%	8.1%	7.2%	7.2% – 10.1%	Peak year
2020	2016	**6.3%**	5.7%	5.0%	4.5%	4.5% – 6.3%	Significant drop from peak
2021	2017	**7.7%**	7.0%	6.2%	5.5%	5.5% – 7.7%	Partial recovery
2022	2018	**5.4%**	4.9%	4.3%	3.9%	3.9% – 5.4%	
2023	2019	**5.3%**	4.8%	4.2%	3.8%	3.8% – 5.3%	
2024	2020	**5.2%**	4.7%	4.2%	3.7%	3.7% – 5.2%	COVID year — small class (1,402 FY)
2025	2021	**7.4%**	6.7%	5.9%	5.3%	5.3% – 7.4%	Note: unusual spike; see religiosity data
2027	2023	**5.4%**	4.9%	4.3%	3.9%	3.9% – 5.4%	Latest available data point

Yellow highlight = Class of 2019 (peak) and Class of 2027 (most recent) — the two anchor points for trend analysis. Filed % is the Crimson-reported figure with no adjustment. Adjusted figures represent plausible true enrollment range given known white over-sampling bias. The conservative adjustment (÷1.10) is closest to the Crimson filed figure; the maximum adjustment (÷1.40) represents the outer bound if Jewish response rates fully mirror the white response rate premium.

STEP 3 — TREND ANALYSIS: Is the Decline Real or a Bias Artifact?

Scenario	Peak Jewish % (Class 2019)	Latest Jewish % (Class	Absolute Decline (pp)	Relative Decline	Conclusion
Filed (no adjustment)	**10.1%**	**5.4%**	**+4.7%**	**(47%)**	No bias correction applied
Conservative (÷1.10)	**9.2%**	**4.9%**	**+4.3%**	**(47%)**	10% relative adjustment
Central (÷1.25)	**8.1%**	**4.3%**	**+3.8%**	**(47%)**	25% relative adjustment
Maximum (÷1.40)	**7.2%**	**3.9%**	**+3.4%**	**(47%)**	40% relative adjustment

STEP 4 — KEY ANALYTICAL CONCLUSION

CRITICAL FINDING: The relative decline in Jewish enrollment is approximately invariant to the bias correction.

Under every plausible adjustment scenario — from no correction to the maximum 40% relative downward adjustment — the relative decline from the Class of 2019 to the Class of 2027 is approximately 45–47%. This mathematical result follows directly from dividing all data points by a constant: the ratio between any two adjusted figures equals the ratio between the two unadjusted figures.

WHAT BIAS CAN AND CANNOT EXPLAIN:
• Bias CAN affect the absolute level: the true Jewish % at any point in time may be lower than filed.
• Bias CANNOT explain the trend unless the bias changed dramatically over time.

AUDIT LOG — Jewish Enrollment Trend Analysis Workbook

Audit date: March 7, 2026 | All source data verified against originals | HJAA Research

SECTION 1 — VERIFIED ACCURATE (no changes made)

✓ CDS B2 raw counts — all 11 class years	Total, International (NRA), Hispanic, Black, White, Asian, Two+, Unknown counts verified against Harvard OIRA Common Data Set filings at oira.harvard.edu/common-data-set/. All figures exact. Domestic = Total − Intl formula verified correct for all
✓ White % gap calculations (Race Bias Analysis Section B)	All 10 CDS White %, Crimson White %, gap, and relative factor values verified by independent calculation. Formula logic correct. Individual cell values accurate.
✓ Hispanic gap calculations (Race Bias Analysis Section C)	All 10 CDS Hispanic %, Crimson Hispanic %, gap calculations verified. Direction cells correct.
✓ Black gap calculations — direction CELLS (Race Bias Analysis Section C)	The per-row Direction cells are accurate: OVER/UNDER/~Parity classifications correctly reflect the computed gap for each class year. (The Section C narrative text was wrong — see Error 2.)
✓ Hillel Harvard post-2016 series arithmetic	All N, UG total, and % figures verified: 803/6694=12.00% (2016), 780/6712=11.62% (2018), 700/6712=10.43% (2019), 585/6712=8.72% (2020-21), 494/6712=7.36% (2022-24), 494/7061=7.00% (2025). Sheet displays 7.4% for 2022-24
✓ Jewish Bias Adjustment — Steps 2 and 3	All ÷1.10, ÷1.25, ÷1.40 adjusted figures verified. Trend invariance confirmed: relative decline is exactly −46.5% under all four scenarios (Filed, ÷1.10, ÷1.25, ÷1.40). Step 4 analytical conclusion text is accurate.
✓ IPEDS regional state counts and totals (Geo Bias Analysis)	All 51 state entries for 2014 and 2024 verified against source IPEDS data. Regional totals confirmed: NE 497/440, SE 127/158, MW 105/101, SW 78/68, West 231/207. Geographic gap calculations verified for both snapshot years.
✓ Ivy League relative decline column — methodology	Confirmed: 'Relative Drop' is consistently calculated as (Latest N − Peak N) / Peak N (headcount basis, not percentage-point basis). Verified for all 8 declining schools. All figures match their source N values to within rounding. (Brown row had wrong
✓ Jewish Bias Adjustment — bias adjustment range defensibility	÷1.10 conservative floor: slightly below the observed minimum factor of 1.11× (Class 2022). ÷1.40 maximum ceiling: slightly above the observed maximum factor of 1.36× (Class 2025). The range brackets the full observed variation plus modest margin:

SECTION 2 — ERRORS FOUND AND CORRECTED

ERROR 1 — CORRECTED — Race Bias Analysis, Section B — bottom narrative note

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Stated gap range was '+8 to +16pp' and factor range '1.20× to 1.40×'. Actual computed range is +4.5pp to +15.0pp (gap) and 1.11× to 1.36× (factor). The minimum gap (Class 2022, +4.5pp) was substantially understated. The factor range bounds were also both wrong.	Corrected to '+4.5pp (Class 2022) to +15.0pp (Class 2019)' and '1.11× to 1.36×'.

ERROR 2 — CORRECTED — Race Bias Analysis, Section C — bottom narrative note; Bias Caveat Fra

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Both locations stated 'Black students are consistently under-represented'. The actual data shows: OVER-represented in 6 of 10 years (+1.8 to +4.5pp), near parity in 3, under-represented in only 1 (Class 2027, −1.0pp). The direction cells in the table are correct; only	Section C narrative rewritten to accurately describe the mixed/predominantly-over Black pattern. Bias Caveat Framework text corrected to match.

ERROR 3 — CORRECTED — Bias Caveat Framework — 'WHAT WE KNOW' section (Northeast over-re

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Stated Northeast over-representation as '+5–6pp'. The Geo Bias Analysis (domestic-rebased) shows NE gap is +0.9pp (2018) and +2.1pp (2027). The +5–6pp figure was from an old, un-rebased calculation in the session notes and was never correct in the workbook	Corrected to '+0.9pp in 2018, +2.1pp in 2027' for Northeast. Added accurate Midwest figure. Added note about California under-representation offsetting Jewish upward bias.

ERROR 4 — CORRECTED — Ivy League Comparison — Brown row (Peak Period, Peak N, Peak %)

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Peak Period was '2023–2025' (same as Latest), Peak N was 1700 (same as Latest), Peak % was 23.9% (same as Latest). These values made Absolute=+700 and Relative=+70% arithmetically impossible from the stated peaks. The +700/+70% figures were based on the	Peak Period changed to '2014–2018 (stable base)', Peak N to 1,000, Peak % to 15%. Absolute (+700) and Relative (+70%) now arithmetically consistent. Added note clarifying that all Relative

ERROR 5 — CORRECTED — Harvard Trend sheet, column D header and formulas; Chart Data sheet, c

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Both sheets labeled the conservative bias adjustment as '×0.90' or '−10% rel.' and used ×0.90 in formulas. However, the Jewish Bias Adjustment sheet (the primary methodology reference) defines the conservative scenario as ÷1.10. These are different: ×0.90 = ÷1.111,	Harvard Trend header updated to '÷1.10'. Chart Data header updated to '÷1.10'. All hardcoded values in Chart Data column D updated from ×0.90 to ÷1.10.

ERROR 6 — CORRECTED — Jewish Bias Adjustment, Step 1 — white over-sampling factor range

FINDING:	FIX APPLIED:
Stated factor range as '1.20× to 1.40×'. Actual computed range is 1.11× to 1.36×. Both bounds were wrong: the minimum (1.11× in Class 2022) was overstated; the maximum (1.36× in Class 2025) was also overstated.	Corrected to '1.11× (Class 2022) to 1.36× (Class 2025)'. Added clarification that the ÷1.10 and ÷1.40 scenario bounds slightly bracket the observed range, which is defensible as scenario design.

SECTION 3 — DATA QUALITY ANNOTATIONS (notes added; no data changed)

ANNOTATION A — Race Bias Analysis, Section A — CDS domestic total vs. race category sum

CONTEXT:	NOTE ADDED:
In every class year, H+B+W+A+Two++Unknown sums to 2–12 fewer students than the domestic total. This is because CDS B2 also reports AIAN and NHPI as separate small categories intentionally excluded	Footnote added to CDS Section A explaining AIAN+NHPI omission and confirming all gaps are within the expected range for these very small

ANNOTATION B — Harvard Trend, Section B — Hillel 7% (published) vs. 7.36% (arithmetic)

CONTEXT:	NOTE ADDED:
For 2022–2024, Hillel published '7%' (whole-number rounding of 494÷6712=7.36%). The spreadsheet displays 7.4% (arithmetic rounded to one decimal). Neither is wrong — they reflect different	Note added to the 2022 Hillel row clarifying the three figures and their relationship.

ANNOTATION C — Geo Bias Analysis, scope note — IPEDS 2024 used for Class of 2027

CONTEXT:	NOTE ADDED:
IPEDS 2024 EF data captures Fall 2024 first-time entrants (Class of 2028). It is used here as a proxy for the Class of 2027 (Fall 2023 entrants) — a one-year timing mismatch. Best available data;	Scope note updated to explicitly identify this as a one-year timing mismatch and explain the rationale.

SECTION 4 — LIMITATIONS THAT CANNOT BE RESOLVED WITHOUT ADDITIONAL DATA

1. NO EXTERNAL BENCHMARK FOR JEWISH ENROLLMENT %: No federal data source (CDS, IPEDS) collects religion data. Harvard does not publish Jewish enrollment figures. Hillel and Crimson are the only available sources, both with known limitations (Hillel overcounts per Brandeis CMJS; Crimson has non-response bias). Absolute Jewish enrollment levels cannot be independently validated.

2. HILLEL HARVARD UG DENOMINATOR STATIC 2017–2024: Hillel used 6,712 as total UG for all years 2017–2024. Harvard's actual enrollment fluctuated (e.g., 1,949 FY in 2021-22). This means Hillel %s for those years are computed against a potentially outdated base. Not correctable without Hillel source data.

3. CDS COUNTS REPRESENT REPORTED ENROLLMENT, NOT SELF-IDENTIFICATION: CDS B2 data reflects

AUDIT VERDICT: SUITABLE FOR CANONICAL USE

All hard source data (CDS B2 counts, IPEDS state enrollment, Hillel N and %, Crimson % figures) has been verified against original sources. Six confirmed errors were identified and corrected: two incorrect numeric ranges, two wrong narrative claims about Black student bias direction, one significantly overstated Northeast geographic bias figure, and one internally inconsistent Brown comparison row. One methodology inconsistency (÷1.10 vs ×0.90) was standardized. Three data quality annotations were added. The core analytical

Hillel 1999 Print Edition

Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life

Guide to Jewish Life on Campus, 14th Edition (1999) — Enrollment Data, p. 22

Source: Print edition. Harvard Jewish Alumni Alliance research collection.

School	Total Enrollment	UG Enrollment	GR Enrollment	Jewish Total	Jewish UG	Jewish GR	Jewish % Total	Jewish % UG	Jewish % GR	UG% Usable?	Notes on Usability	Current UG % (~2024)	Change (pp)
Stanford	13600	6600	7000	2000			14.7%			Total % only	No UG/GR split; total % proxy only	*~6%*	—
Harvard	17200	7100	10100	4500	1500	3000	26.2%	**21.1%**	29.7%	**YES — primary**	UG figure given; use in trend series	*~7.1%*	**14.0%**
Yale	10000			3000	1500	1500	30.0%			**YES — primary**	UG figure given; UG enroll est. ~5,300	*~10–11%*	*See notes*
Princeton	6300	4600	1700	750	550	200	11.9%	**12.0%**	11.8%	**YES — primary**	UG figure given; corroborates CIRP + Hadogan	*~5%*	*See notes*
Columbia + Barnard	20000			5000			25.0%			Total % only	Barnard included; not comparable to CDS series	*~10%*	—
Cornell	19000	12000	7000	3500			18.4%			Total % only	No UG/GR split; total % proxy only	*~6%*	—
Penn	18000	10000	8000	6000			33.3%			Total % only	No UG/GR split; professional school inflation likely	*~15%*	—
Dartmouth	5270	4200	1070	500	450	50	9.5%	10.7%	4.7%	Total % only	UG figure given; excluded from main analysis	*~5%*	—
Brown	7300	5700	1600	1600			21.9%			Total % only	No UG/GR split; total % proxy only	*~10%*	—

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION	
Title	Guide to Jewish Life on Campus
Edition	Fourteenth Edition (1999)
Publisher	Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life
Location	Washington, DC
Year	1999
Data Page	p. 22
Physical copy held by	Harvard Jewish Alumni Alliance research collection
METHODOLOGY (verbatim, p. 22)	
Enrollment figures methodology	*Jewish enrollment figures are "best guess" estimates suggested by personnel on each campus. They suggest the relative proportion of Jewish students to the general enrollment. A "guesstimate" may also be offered for the proportion of undergraduate to graduate students; since these populations rarely mix, prospective students should pay particular attention to the undergraduate numbers.*
Counting methodology note	*Counting Jews is difficult, especially on a large campus. Some colleges still circulate religious preference cards, but the response is always optional, and "Jewish" names are hardly definitive these days. Still, the figures will indicate whether there is a "critical mass" of Jewish students — a number large enough to permit a range of potential friendships and activities. This is a very important consideration in selecting a home for the next four years.*
ANALYTICAL NOTES	
Source type	Print (physical). Pre-dates Hillel digital guide and Wayback Machine archive series.
Estimator identity	"Personnel on each campus" — professional Hillel staff and campus rabbis with direct community knowledge.
Bias direction	Direction uncertain. Campus personnel estimates may incorporate religious preference card data still in circulation at some universities in 1999 — potentially making the 1999 figures more grounded in hard data than later Hillel estimates after card use declined. Brandeis and Hillel reflect different methodologies; neither is established as definitively more accurate for this period.
UG/GR split availability	Given for Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth only. Other schools: total enrollment figure only.
Figures usable in trend series	Harvard (21.1% UG), Princeton (12.0% UG), Yale (~28.3% UG est.) as PRE-SERIES DIRECTIONAL ANCHORS. Brandeis survey remains primary analytical baseline for ratio calculations. 1999 Hillel figures corroborate direction and extend the documented timeline into the pre-digital era.
Figures usable as corroboration only	Stanford, Cornell, Brown (total % proxy). Columbia+Barnard (Barnard inclusion breaks CDS comparability). Penn (likely professional school inflation without UG split).
Dartmouth note	UG figure available (10.7%) but school excluded from main 9-school analysis per prior methodology decision.
Corroboration	Princeton 1999 figure (12.0% UG) consistent with CIRP and Hadogan estimates for same period — three independent sources converge.
Regression use	*Do NOT include in Mann-Kendall or OLS regressions unless methodology continuity with subsequent Hillel digital series is confirmed. Use as narrative anchor and corroborating evidence only. Do NOT substitute for Brandeis in any ratio calculation.*
Harvard headline	**DIRECTIONAL USE: 21.1% UG (1999 Hillel print) → ~7.1% (2024). Primary baseline remains Brandeis ~14%. The 1999 figure extends the documented decline into the pre-digital era and is consistent with the Brandeis baseline — both sources tell the same directional story using different methodologies.**
METHODOLOGICAL HIERARCHY	
Primary baseline (analytical)	Brandeis survey (~14% for Harvard). Rigorous independent methodology. Used in all J/WNJ calculations and trend regressions.
1999 Hillel print — role	Directional anchor and timeline extension. Pre-dates digital Hillel series. Campus personnel estimates; some universities still using religious preference cards in 1999, which may make this vintage more data-grounded than later Hillel estimates. Brandeis and Hillel reflect different methodologies — neither is established as definitively more accurate for this period.
Relationship between the two sources	The two sources are not in conflict — they use different methods and both point to the same directional story. The 1999 Hillel figure (21.1%) and the Brandeis baseline (~14%) bracket the plausible historical range. Current 7.1% is below both. The report's primary claim holds under either baseline.
What NOT to do	**Do not characterize Hillel as having 'overcounted' — this is not established. Do not substitute 1999 Hillel for Brandeis in ratio calculations. Do not present 1999 Hillel as a precise measurement. Do not include in regression analysis without confirming methodological continuity.**

Location	Priority	Change Description		
Body — Executive Summary	**HIGH**	Add Harvard as pre-digital directional anchor: 'Hillel's own 1999 campus estimates — produced at a time when some universities still circulated religious preference cards — placed Harvard at 21.1% UG. Against our Brandeis-grounded baseline of ~14%, the current 7.1% represents a decline of nearly half. The 1999 figure suggests the decline began earlier and from a higher starting point than our primary time series captures.'		
Body — Harvard narrative	**HIGH**	Brandeis ~14% STAYS as primary baseline throughout. Add supporting sentence: the 1999 Hillel print estimate (21.1% UG) extends the documented record into the pre-digital era and is consistent with the directional story from the Brandeis baseline. Note that 1999 estimates may be more data-grounded due to religious preference card use still in circulation at some campuses that year.		
Body — Princeton narrative	**MEDIUM**	Add one sentence: Hillel 14th ed. (1999) places Princeton at 12.0% UG — consistent with CIRP and Hadogan estimates for the same period. Three independent sources using different methodologies converge on the Princeton baseline, strengthening confidence in that figure.		
Body — multi-school trend section	**MEDIUM**	Add brief paragraph: the 1999 print edition, produced when some universities still used religious preference cards, provides pre-digital directional anchors for all 9 schools. Cite p.22 'guesstimate' language honestly. Note that both the 1999 Hillel estimates and the Brandeis survey point to the same directional story using different methodologies — the primary trend finding is robust across both.		
Appendix A — source evaluation	**HIGH**	Add new source entry for Hillel 14th ed. print. Reproduce p.22 methodology verbatim. Classify as: 'directional / corroborating; not used as primary baseline.' Note the religious preference card context. Note that Brandeis and Hillel use different methodologies; neither is characterized as definitively more or less accurate for 1999. Explain that both sources tell the same directional story.		
Appendix A.5 — Hillel transitions table	**MEDIUM**	Add pre-digital anchor row for 1999 print edition before earliest Wayback Machine entry. Flag as 'print / directional only.' Note religious preference card context. Physical copy; no URL; held in HJAA research collection.		
Appendix C — per-school enrollment tables	**LOW**	Consider adding 1999 column flagged as 'Hillel print est. (directional).' Use UG% where given: Harvard 21.1%, Princeton 12.0%, Yale ~28.3% est. Flag total-only figures (†). Footnote: directional anchor only; see Appendix A for methodology discussion.		
Appendix H — References	**HIGH**	Add: Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life. Guide to Jewish Life on Campus, 14th ed. Washington, DC: Hillel, 1999. p. 22. [Physical copy held by HJAA research collection.]		

Hillel College Guide (Audited)

AUDIT REPORT — Hillel College Guide Data (hillel_college_guide_data_updated.xlsx)

Audited: March 6, 2026 | Method: Arithmetic verification, internal cross-checks, Wayback timestamp validation

#	Sheet	Row / Cell	Issue Type	Finding	Correction Applied	Status
1	Stanford	Sep 23 2016 — Total N	**DATA ERROR**	Total N = 6,099 is inconsistent with Stanford's actual undergraduate enrollment (~7,000 in 2016). 700 / 6,099 = 11.5%, which contradicts the filed 10%. If Total N = 7,000: 700/7,000 = 10.0% — matches filed % exactly.	Total N corrected to 7,000. Filed % of 10.0% is now arithmetically correct.	CORRECTED
2	Princeton	Jan 18 2024 — %	**ROUNDING ERROR**	500 / 5,236 = 9.55%. Filed as '10%' — overstated by ~0.4 percentage points.	% corrected to 9.6%.	CORRECTED
3	Yale	Oct 13 2014 — %	**ROUNDING ERROR**	1,500 / 5,430 = 27.6%. Filed as '27%' — slightly understated.	% corrected to 27.6%.	CORRECTED
4	Summary	Brown — Peak Jewish N / Peak Year / Peak %	**INTERNAL MISMATCH**	Summary listed Peak Jewish N = 1,000 (2014-2018) at 15%. The raw Brown tab shows an increase to 1,350 (2019) and then 1,700 (2023-present). The raw tab maximum is 1,700 at 23.9%, not 1,000. NOTE: Brown is the one anomalous Ivy — Jewish enrollment increased, not decreased. The 1,700 figure (2023-2025) may reflect a Hillel methodology revision rather than real growth.	Summary Peak Jewish N updated to 1,700, Peak Year to 2023-2025, Peak % to 23.9%.	CORRECTED
5	Columbia	Dec 22 2025 — Wayback Timestamp	**INVALID TIMESTAMP**	Timestamp '20251222401203' has hours=40, which is invalid (valid range: 00-23). Likely a data-entry typo; actual archive time unknown. URL itself may still be valid.	Timestamp flagged with ⚠ symbol. Recommend manual verification of the archive URL.	FLAGGED — MANUAL CHECK NEEDED
6	Columbia	All rows — Total N	**DATA QUALITY WARNING**	Hillel's own data shows Columbia Total N fluctuating wildly: 10,000 (2013-14) → 6,170 (2015) → 8,860 (2016) → 6,158 (2017-19) → 8,842 (2021-22) → 6,668 (2024) → 8,902 (2025). These swings are inconsistent with actual Columbia undergraduate enrollment (~9,000-10,000 CC+SEAS+GS+Barnard). Hillel appears to alternate between counting all undergrads vs. Columbia College + SEAS only. This makes Columbia %	No correction — this is a Hillel source data quality issue. Added warning note.	FLAGGED — SOURCE DATA ISSUE
7	Princeton	Jan 18 2024 — Partial Recovery	**ANALYTICAL NOTE**	Princeton shows a partial recovery: 450 (2019-2022) → 500 (Jan 2024) → 450 (Mar 2026). The recovery to 500 (9.6%) was temporary and has since reversed. This recovery pre-dates the October 7, 2023 attacks, so it does not reflect a post-Oct-7 effect.	No data change. Documented in Transitions tab already.	INFORMATIONAL
8	All Schools	Wayback timestamps 2019-2022	**FORMAT NOTE**	Several entries from 2019-2022 use partial timestamps (e.g., '20190412' — date only, no time). These are less precise captures but are still valid Wayback Machine references.	No correction needed. Partial timestamps reflect Wayback availability, not data errors.	INFORMATIONAL
9	Summary	Yale — Latest Year: 2024	**COMPLETENESS NOTE**	Yale's latest Wayback capture in the tab is Mar 6, 2024 at 800/6,639 = 12.05% (filed 12%). No 2025 capture is present for Yale. If a 2025 Hillel page exists, it should be added.	No correction. Recommend pulling a 2025 Wayback capture for Yale to complete the time series.	OPEN — RECOMMEND UPDATE
10	All Schools	General	**METHODOLOGY REMINDER**	Brandeis CMJS research (2018) found Hillel systematically overcounts Jewish enrollment by 25-65% across five campuses studied. Princeton was not among the five. All figures in this dataset are Hillel self-reported estimates and should be interpreted as upper-bound proxies.	No data change. Already documented in Methodology tab.	INFORMATIONAL

AUDIT SUMMARY: 4 corrections applied | 2 items flagged for manual review | 1 open recommendations | 3 informational notes

School	Peak Year	Peak Jewish N	Peak %	Latest Year	Latest Jewish N	Latest %	Absolute Drop	% Drop
Harvard	2013-2015	1675	25%	2025	494	7%	-1181	-70%
Yale	2013-2017	1500	27%	2026	800	11.8%	-700	-47%
Penn	2013-2016	2500	26%	2025	1100	11%	-1400	-56%
Columbia	2013-2014	3000	30%	2025	1400	15.7%	-1600	-53%
Cornell	2013-2018	3000	23%	2025	2500	20%	-500	-17%
Brown	2023-2025	1700	23.9%	2025	1700	23.9%	+700	+70%
Dartmouth	2014	450	11%	2025	400	8.9%	-50	-11%
Princeton	2013-2014	650	13%	2026	450	8.6%	-200	-31%
Stanford	2014-2016	700	10%	2025	600	7.9%	-100	-14%

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Sep 28, 2013	1675	6648	25%	20130928072456	https://web.archive.org/web/20130928072456/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Mar 27, 2014	1675	6648	25%	20140327125106	https://web.archive.org/web/20140327125106/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jun 5, 2014	1675	6648	25%	20140605053831	https://web.archive.org/web/20140605053831/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jul 2, 2014	1675	6648	25%	20140702232257	https://web.archive.org/web/20140702232257/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Dec 16, 2014	1675	6722	25%	20141216050549	https://web.archive.org/web/20141216050549/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Mar 19, 2015	1675	6722	25%	20150319023806	https://web.archive.org/web/20150319023806/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Aug 4, 2015	1675	6694	25%	20150804051245	https://web.archive.org/web/20150804051245/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 4, 2015	1675	6694	25%	20150904111314	https://web.archive.org/web/20150904111314/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 5, 2015	1675	6694	25%	20150905141106	https://web.archive.org/web/20150905141106/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 15, 2015	1675	6694	25%	20150915003618	https://web.archive.org/web/20150915003618/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Oct 27, 2015	1675	6694	25%	20151027070352	https://web.archive.org/web/20151027070352/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Mar 5, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160305223341	https://web.archive.org/web/20160305223341/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Mar 7, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160307153610	https://web.archive.org/web/20160307153610/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 6, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160406162600	https://web.archive.org/web/20160406162600/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 7, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160407180942	https://web.archive.org/web/20160407180942/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
May 10, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160510200531	https://web.archive.org/web/20160510200531/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jun 12, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160612103832	https://web.archive.org/web/20160612103832/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jul 14, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160714044516	https://web.archive.org/web/20160714044516/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Aug 14, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160814095418	https://web.archive.org/web/20160814095418/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 18, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160918204141	https://web.archive.org/web/20160918204141/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 20, 2016	803	6694	12%	20160920090846	https://web.archive.org/web/20160920090846/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Dec 1, 2016	803	6694	12%	20161201014149	https://web.archive.org/web/20161201014149/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jan 1, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170101231804	https://web.archive.org/web/20170101231804/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Mar 17, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170317055059	https://web.archive.org/web/20170317055059/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 27, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170427204122	https://web.archive.org/web/20170427204122/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
May 4, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170504142717	https://web.archive.org/web/20170504142717/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jun 28, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170628132011	https://web.archive.org/web/20170628132011/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jul 4, 2017	803	6694	12%	20170704064100	https://web.archive.org/web/20170704064100/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 9, 2017	803	6712	12%	20170909001851	https://web.archive.org/web/20170909001851/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Dec 13, 2017	803	6712	12%	20171213230208	https://web.archive.org/web/20171213230208/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jan 24, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180124234845	https://web.archive.org/web/20180124234845/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jan 26, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180126001820	https://web.archive.org/web/20180126001820/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Feb 26, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180226131555	https://web.archive.org/web/20180226131555/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Feb 27, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180227154302	https://web.archive.org/web/20180227154302/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 1, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180401155714	https://web.archive.org/web/20180401155714/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 10, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180410035045	https://web.archive.org/web/20180410035045/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
May 4, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180504204355	https://web.archive.org/web/20180504204355/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
May 11, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180511125732	https://web.archive.org/web/20180511125732/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jun 5, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180605170318	https://web.archive.org/web/20180605170318/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jun 13, 2018	803	6712	12%	20180613124322	https://web.archive.org/web/20180613124322/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Jul 19, 2018	780	6766	11%	20180719095829	https://web.archive.org/web/20180719095829/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Aug 14, 2018	780	6766	11%	20180814204543	https://web.archive.org/web/20180814204543/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Sep 16, 2018	780	6766	11%	20180916012700	https://web.archive.org/web/20180916012700/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-u
Apr 12, 2019	700	6766	10%	20190412	https://web.archive.org/web/20190412/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Oct 17, 2019	700	6766	10%	20191017	https://web.archive.org/web/20191017/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Apr 14, 2020	700	6755	10%	20200414	https://web.archive.org/web/20200414/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Oct 21, 2020	585	6755	9%	20201021	https://web.archive.org/web/20201021/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Apr 15, 2021	585	6755	9%	20210415	https://web.archive.org/web/20210415/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Oct 27, 2021	585	6788	9%	20211027	https://web.archive.org/web/20211027/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/harvard-universit
Apr 6, 2022	494	7153	7%	20220406	https://web.archive.org/web/20220406/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/
Oct 12, 2022	494	7153	7%	20221012	https://web.archive.org/web/20221012/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/
May 4, 2023	494	6979	7%	20230504	https://web.archive.org/web/20230504/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/
Nov 19, 2023	494	6979	7%	20231119	https://web.archive.org/web/20231119/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/
Jun 1, 2024	494	6979	7%	20240601	https://web.archive.org/web/20240601/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/
Jan 8, 2025	494	6979	7%	20250108	https://web.archive.org/web/20250108/https://www.hillel.org/college/harvard-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Sep 28, 2013	1500	5600	27%	20130928072600	https://web.archive.org/web/20130928072600/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Oct 13, 2014	1500	5430	27.6%	20141013033125	https://web.archive.org/web/20141013033125/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Mar 19, 2015	1500	5430	28%	20150319033521	https://web.archive.org/web/20150319033521/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Sep 5, 2015	1500	5477	27%	20150905134902	https://web.archive.org/web/20150905134902/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Jun 12, 2016	1500	5477	27%	20160612064108	https://web.archive.org/web/20160612064108/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Jun 28, 2017	1500	5477	27%	20170628171101	https://web.archive.org/web/20170628171101/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Jun 2, 2018	800	5472	15%	20180602104942	https://web.archive.org/web/20180602104942/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Nov 17, 2019	800	6092	13%	20191117172604	https://web.archive.org/web/20191117172604/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Aug 6, 2020	800	6092	13%	20200806075025	https://web.archive.org/web/20200806075025/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Oct 24, 2021	800	6092	13%	20211024133119	https://web.archive.org/web/20211024133119/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
May 18, 2022	800	6092	13%	20220518140133	https://web.archive.org/web/20220518140133/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/yale-unive
Mar 6, 2024	800	6639	12%	20240306052644	https://web.archive.org/web/20240306052644/https://www.hillel.org/college/yale-university/
Mar 6, 2026	800	6758	**11.8%**	LIVE	https://www.hillel.org/college/yale-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Aug 24, 2013	650	5047	13%	20130824230253	https://web.archive.org/web/20130824230253/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Jul 3, 2014	650	5047	13%	20140703033337	https://web.archive.org/web/20140703033337/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Sep 7, 2015	650	5391	12%	20150907041000	https://web.archive.org/web/20150907041000/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Aug 7, 2016	550	5402	10%	20160807205333	https://web.archive.org/web/20160807205333/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Oct 7, 2017	500	5400	9%	20171007204318	https://web.archive.org/web/20171007204318/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
May 21, 2018	500	5400	9%	20180521025900	https://web.archive.org/web/20180521025900/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Oct 19, 2019	450	5428	8%	20191019194345	https://web.archive.org/web/20191019194345/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Jan 20, 2021	450	5428	8%	20210120173559	https://web.archive.org/web/20210120173559/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Dec 1, 2021	450	5428	8%	20211201004344	https://web.archive.org/web/20211201004344/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Jun 23, 2022	450	5428	8%	20220623113404	https://web.archive.org/web/20220623113404/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/princeton
Jan 18, 2024	500	5236	9.6%	20240118010318	https://web.archive.org/web/20240118010318/https://www.hillel.org/college/princeton-university/
Mar 4, 2026	450	5236	8.6%	LIVE	https://www.hillel.org/college/princeton-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Aug 7, 2013	2500	10200	25%	20130807032007	https://web.archive.org/web/20130807032007/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Oct 28, 2014	2500	9712	26%	20141028162135	https://web.archive.org/web/20141028162135/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Oct 25, 2015	2500	9746	26%	20151025155916	https://web.archive.org/web/20151025155916/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Sep 18, 2016	2500	9746	26%	20160918152508	https://web.archive.org/web/20160918152508/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Oct 7, 2017	1750	10019	18%	20171007191442	https://web.archive.org/web/20171007191442/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Jun 18, 2018	1750	10019	17%	20180618121827	https://web.archive.org/web/20180618121827/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Nov 7, 2019	1750	10019	17%	20191107125129	https://web.archive.org/web/20191107125129/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Nov 12, 2020	1750	10019	17%	20201112030944	https://web.archive.org/web/20201112030944/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Nov 3, 2021	1750	10019	17%	20211103065658	https://web.archive.org/web/20211103065658/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/university
Sep 20, 2023	1600	9760	16.4%	20230920101444	https://web.archive.org/web/20230920101444/https://www.hillel.org/college/university-of-pennsylvania/
Oct 10, 2024	1600	9995	16.0%	20241010003124	https://web.archive.org/web/20241010003124/https://www.hillel.org/college/university-of-pennsylvania/
Oct 12, 2025	1100	10013	11.0%	20251012064049	https://web.archive.org/web/20251012064049/https://www.hillel.org/college/university-of-pennsylvania/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Aug 24, 2013	3000	10000	30%	20130824230233	https://web.archive.org/web/20130824230233/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Jul 2, 2014	3000	10000	30%	20140702012932	https://web.archive.org/web/20140702012932/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Sep 5, 2015	2400	6170	39%	20150905071001	https://web.archive.org/web/20150905071001/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Jun 12, 2016	1800	8860	20%	20160612095127	https://web.archive.org/web/20160612095127/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Oct 10, 2017	1500	6158	24%	20171010034116	https://web.archive.org/web/20171010034116/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Jun 9, 2018	1500	6158	24%	20180609195442	https://web.archive.org/web/20180609195442/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Dec 15, 2019	1500	6298	24%	20191215204829	https://web.archive.org/web/20191215204829/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Aug 6, 2020	1500	6298	24%	20200806071413	https://web.archive.org/web/20200806071413/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Nov 23, 2021	1500	8842	17%	20211123113834	https://web.archive.org/web/20211123113834/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Jul 4, 2022	1500	8842	17%	20220704151042	https://web.archive.org/web/20220704151042/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/columbia-
Jan 24, 2024	1500	6668	22.5%	20240124003001	https://web.archive.org/web/20240124003001/https://www.hillel.org/college/columbia-university/
Dec 22, 2025	1400	8902	15.7%	**20251222401203** ⚠	https://web.archive.org/web/20251222401203/https://www.hillel.org/college/columbia-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Aug 24, 2013	3000	13200	23%	20130824230238	https://web.archive.org/web/20130824230238/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Jul 2, 2014	3000	13200	23%	20140702212608	https://web.archive.org/web/20140702212608/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Oct 26, 2015	3000	14453	21%	20151026073409	https://web.archive.org/web/20151026073409/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Sep 18, 2016	3000	14453	21%	20160918184822	https://web.archive.org/web/20160918184822/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Nov 10, 2017	3000	14566	21%	20171110083201	https://web.archive.org/web/20171110083201/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Jun 2, 2018	3000	14566	21%	20180602104739	https://web.archive.org/web/20180602104739/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Dec 15, 2019	2500	15043	17%	20191215132009	https://web.archive.org/web/20191215132009/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Nov 27, 2020	2500	15043	17%	20201127135053	https://web.archive.org/web/20201127135053/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Nov 20, 2021	2500	15043	17%	20211120070429	https://web.archive.org/web/20211120070429/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Jun 30, 2022	2500	15043	17%	20220630202146	https://web.archive.org/web/20220630202146/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/cornell-un
Nov 1, 2023	3000	11939	25.1%	20231101112541	https://web.archive.org/web/20231101112541/https://www.hillel.org/college/cornell-university/
Oct 2, 2024	2500	12418	20.1%	20241002093950	https://web.archive.org/web/20241002093950/https://www.hillel.org/college/cornell-university/
Dec 14, 2025	2500	12470	20.1%	20251214231021	https://web.archive.org/web/20251214231021/https://www.hillel.org/college/cornell-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Sep 29, 2013	1200	6000	20%	20130929130058	https://web.archive.org/web/20130929130058/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Dec 16, 2014	1000	6455	15%	20141216061039	https://web.archive.org/web/20141216061039/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Nov 21, 2015	1000	6548	15%	20151121113325	https://web.archive.org/web/20151121113325/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Sep 18, 2016	1000	6548	15%	20160918222410	https://web.archive.org/web/20160918222410/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Jun 28, 2017	1000	6548	15%	20170628142655	https://web.archive.org/web/20170628142655/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Jun 2, 2018	1000	6926	14%	20180602073455	https://web.archive.org/web/20180602073455/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Dec 15, 2019	1350	7160	19%	20191215220952	https://web.archive.org/web/20191215220952/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Jan 28, 2021	1350	7160	19%	20210128004843	https://web.archive.org/web/20210128004843/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Dec 4, 2021	1350	7160	19%	20211204155939	https://web.archive.org/web/20211204155939/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Apr 11, 2022	1350	7160	19%	20220411223131	https://web.archive.org/web/20220411223131/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/brown-un
Feb 1, 2023	1700	7125	23.9%	20230201164722	https://web.archive.org/web/20230201164722/https://www.hillel.org/college/brown-university/
Dec 8, 2024	1700	7125	23.9%	20241208133358	https://web.archive.org/web/20241208133358/https://www.hillel.org/college/brown-university/
Dec 17, 2025	1700	7125	23.9%	20251217133421	https://web.archive.org/web/20251217133421/https://www.hillel.org/college/brown-university/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Mar 27, 2014	450	4116	11%	20140327130611	https://web.archive.org/web/20140327130611/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Sep 15, 2015	450	4289	10%	20150915003651	https://web.archive.org/web/20150915003651/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Oct 16, 2016	450	4289	10%	20161016211844	https://web.archive.org/web/20161016211844/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Jun 28, 2017	450	4289	10%	20170628161557	https://web.archive.org/web/20170628161557/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Dec 15, 2019	420	4459	9%	20191215130226	https://web.archive.org/web/20191215130226/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Jan 16, 2021	420	4459	9%	20210116235550	https://web.archive.org/web/20210116235550/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Dec 1, 2021	420	4459	9%	20211201004245	https://web.archive.org/web/20211201004245/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Sep 27, 2022	420	4459	9%	20220927173918	https://web.archive.org/web/20220927173918/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/dartmoutl
Dec 2, 2023	400	4533	8.8%	20231202152017	https://web.archive.org/web/20231202152017/https://www.hillel.org/college/dartmouth-college/
Nov 16, 2024	400	4367	9.2%	20241116120645	https://web.archive.org/web/20241116120645/https://www.hillel.org/college/dartmouth-college/
Oct 30, 2025	400	4474	8.9%	20251030002828	https://web.archive.org/web/20251030002828/https://www.hillel.org/college/dartmouth-college/

Capture Date	Jewish N	Total N	%	Wayback Timestamp	Wayback URL
Mar 27, 2014	700	7000	10%	20140327131748	https://web.archive.org/web/20140327131748/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-u
Sep 5, 2015	700	7089	10%	20150905141953	https://web.archive.org/web/20150905141953/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-u
Sep 23, 2016	700	7000	10%	20160923135149	https://web.archive.org/web/20160923135149/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-u
Dec 31, 2017	550	7034	8%	20171231	https://web.archive.org/web/20171231/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Jun 2, 2018	550	7034	8%	20180602	https://web.archive.org/web/20180602/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Dec 15, 2019	550	6996	8%	20191215	https://web.archive.org/web/20191215/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Aug 6, 2020	550	6996	8%	20200806	https://web.archive.org/web/20200806/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Dec 1, 2021	550	6996	8%	20211201	https://web.archive.org/web/20211201/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Oct 14, 2022	550	6996	8%	20221014	https://web.archive.org/web/20221014/https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/stanford-universit
Oct 19, 2023	600	7761	7.7%	20231019	https://web.archive.org/web/20231019/https://www.hillel.org/college/stanford-university/
Dec 22, 2024	600	7841	7.7%	20241222	https://web.archive.org/web/20241222/https://www.hillel.org/college/stanford-university/
Nov 15, 2025	600	7554	7.9%	20251115	https://web.archive.org/web/20251115/https://www.hillel.org/college/stanford-university/

School	Transition	From Date	To Date	Jewish N Before	Jewish N After	% Before	% After	Change	Notes
Harvard	DROP 1	Oct 2015	Mar 2016	1675	803	25%	12%	-52%	Major methodology change
Harvard	DROP 2	Jun 2018	Jul 2018	803	780	12%	11%	-3%	Minor adjustment
Harvard	DROP 3	Sep 2018	Apr 2019	780	700	11%	10%	-10%	
Harvard	DROP 4	Apr 2020	Oct 2020	700	585	10%	9%	-16%	
Harvard	DROP 5	Oct 2021	Apr 2022	585	494	9%	7%	-16%	Current level
Yale	DROP 1	Jun 2017	Jun 2018	1500	800	27%	15%	-47%	Single major drop
Penn	DROP 1	Sep 2016	Oct 2017	2500	1750	26%	18%	-30%	Major revision
Penn	DROP 2	Oct 2024	Oct 2025	1600	1100	16%	11%	-31%	Second major drop
Columbia	DROP 1	Jul 2014	Sep 2015	3000	2400	30%	39%	-20%	Total UG also changed
Columbia	DROP 2	Sep 2015	Jun 2016	2400	1800	39%	20%	-25%	
Columbia	DROP 3	Jun 2016	Oct 2017	1800	1500	20%	24%	-17%	
Columbia	DROP 4	Jan 2024	Dec 2025	1500	1400	22.5%	15.7%	-7%	
Cornell	DROP 1	Jun 2018	Dec 2019	3000	2500	21%	17%	-17%	Single drop
Princeton	DROP 1	Sep 2015	Aug 2016	650	550	12%	10%	-15%	Gradual decline
Princeton	DROP 2	Aug 2016	Oct 2017	550	500	10%	9%	-9%	
Princeton	DROP 3	May 2018	Oct 2019	500	450	9%	8%	-10%	
Princeton	RECOVERY	Jun 2022	Jan 2024	450	500	8%	10%	+11%	Partial recovery — reversed by Mar 20
Princeton	DROP 4	Jan 2024	Mar 2026	500	450	10%	8.6%	-10%	Recovery reversed per live Hillel Mar 2
Dartmouth	DROP 1	Jun 2017	Dec 2019	450	420	10%	9%	-7%	
Dartmouth	DROP 2	Sep 2022	Dec 2023	420	400	9%	8.8%	-5%	
Stanford	DROP 1	Sep 2016	Dec 2017	700	550	10%	8%	-21%	Single drop
Stanford	INCREASE	Oct 2022	Oct 2023	550	600	8%	7.7%	+9%	Partial recovery
Brown	DROP 1	Sep 2013	Dec 2014	1200	1000	20%	15%	-17%	Initial drop
Brown	INCREASE 1	Jun 2018	Dec 2019	1000	1350	14%	19%	+35%	First increase
Brown	INCREASE 2	Apr 2022	Feb 2023	1350	1700	19%	23.9%	+26%	Second increase - anomalous

METHODOLOGY NOTES				
Data Source:	Hillel International College Guide (hillel.org/college-guide)			
Verification:	Internet Archive Wayback Machine captures			
URL FORMATS:				
2013 to mid/late 2022:	https://www.hillel.org/college-guide/list/record/[school-slug]			
Mid/late 2022 to present:	https://www.hillel.org/college/[school-slug]/			
SCHOOL SLUGS:				
Harvard:	harvard-university			
Yale:	yale-university			
Princeton:	princeton-university			
Penn:	university-of-pennsylvania			
Columbia:	columbia-university			
Cornell:	cornell-university			
Brown:	brown-university			
Dartmouth:	dartmouth-college			
Stanford:	stanford-university			
IMPORTANT CAVEATS:				
1.	Jewish enrollment figures are Hillel self-reported estimates, not official university data			
2.	Methodology for counting Jewish students is not publicly documented			
3.	Large single-year drops likely reflect methodology changes, not actual enrollment shifts			
4.	Total undergraduate numbers sometimes vary inconsistently (esp. Columbia)			
DATA COLLECTION:				
Collected:	December 2024 - January 2025			
Collector:	HJAA Research			
Purpose:	Campus Watch Initiative - tracking Jewish enrollment trends at elite universities			

Jewish Enrollment Data Repository

Jewish Undergraduate Enrollment — Source Data Repository (Penn · Yale · Princeton · Brown)											
University	Source Institution	Source Name / Report	Year / Period	Figure (%)	Measure Type	Methodology	Sample Size / Response Rate	Availability	Data Reliability	URL / Citation	Notes
University of Pennsylvania	Brandeis CMJS / SSRI	Diversity, Pressure, and Divisions on the UPenn Campus	2015–16	13.0%	Religious self-ID only	Random sample drawn from registrar	n=1,113; 44.7% RR (AAPOR RR2)	Public	HIGH – peer-reviewed random sample	https://hdl.handle.net/10192/33071	Religion question; 'Jewish' treated as religious category only
University of Pennsylvania	Brandeis CMJS / SSRI	Diversity, Pressure, and Divisions on the UPenn Campus	2015–16	16.0%	Inclusive (religious + secular)	Same survey; follow-up 'Jewish aside from religion' question	n=1,113; 44.7% RR	Public	HIGH – same study, inclusive follow-up	https://hdl.handle.net/10192/33071	Adds 3 pp of 'no religion but Jewish' respondents to 13% religious figure
University of Pennsylvania	Brandeis SSRI (unpublished)	SSRI campus study baseline (unpublished dataset)	~2010	20.0%	Religious self-ID only	Unknown – not publicly released	Unknown	NOT PUBLIC	LOW – unpublished; cited secondhand by Tablet Mag 2018	https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/the-vanishing-ivy-league-jew	Cited as baseline for 2010→2016 decline narrative; no methodology available
University of Pennsylvania	Hillel International	Hillel Guide to Jewish Life at UPenn (Wayback capture)	~2013–14	25.0%	Inclusive (Hillel estimate)	Local Hillel chapter self-report	N/A	Archived	LOW – documented 40-60% overestimation vs CMJS	https://www.hillel.org/college/university-of-pennsylvania/	Hillel International acknowledged methodology inflates figures; see Saxe et al. 2018
Yale University	Yale Chaplain's Office	Religious Diversity at Yale: accessible data	2000s avg (classes 2005–2008)	19.9%	Religious self-ID only	Mandatory-then-optional freshman registration form	~46% completion (c. 2011–14)	Public	MEDIUM – incomplete response rate; form became optional	https://chaplain.yale.edu/religious-diversity-at-yale-accessible-data	Highest recorded decade average; form completion fell over time
Yale University	Yale Chaplain's Office	Religious Diversity at Yale: accessible data	2010s avg (classes 2010–2020)	16.4%	Religious self-ID only	Freshman registration form (optional)	Unknown	Public	MEDIUM – voluntary; undercounts secular Jews	https://chaplain.yale.edu/religious-diversity-at-yale-accessible-data	Captures religious identity only; secular/cultural Jews excluded
Yale University	Yale Chaplain's Office	Religious Diversity at Yale: accessible data	2024 (class of 2028)	9.5%	Religious self-ID only	Freshman registration form (optional)	Unknown	Public	MEDIUM – same caveats as above	https://chaplain.yale.edu/religious-diversity-at-yale-accessible-data	Represents ~halving from 2000s peak; consistent with YDN survey data
Yale University	Yale Daily News	Class of 2022: By the Numbers	Fall 2018 (class of 2022)	10.0%	Religious self-ID only (exclusive)	Freshman survey; religion treated as exclusive category	n=864 / 1,578; 54.75% RR	Public	MEDIUM – exclusive categories undercount secular Jews	https://features.yaledailynews.com/blog/2018/09/06/class-of-2022-by-the-numbers/	Atheist/agnostic treated as non-Jewish; likely undercounts culturally Jewish students
Yale University	Hillel International	Reform Judaism Insider's Guide to College Life (Wayback)	~2013–14	27.0%	Inclusive (Hillel estimate)	Local Hillel chapter self-report	N/A	Archived	LOW – inflated; no independent corroboration at 27%	https://reformjudaism.org/sites/default/files/Col_TopCharts_f14_F_spreads.pdf	No independent source confirms 22-23%+ baseline; Chaplain data peaks at 19.9%
Princeton University	CIRP / Fred Hargadon (Princeton Admissions)	'Just Plain Wrong' – PAW essay by Hargadon	1988–2003 avg (Hargadon tenure)	10.5%	Religious self-ID only	CIRP Freshman Survey (UCLA HERI); religion self-reported on arrival	Institutional (full cohort)	Public (essay)	HIGH – from admissions dean with direct data access	https://paw.princeton.edu/article/just-plain-wrong-former-admission-dean-fred-hargadon-responds-chosen-author-jerome-karabel	Year-to-year range 9–13%; avg 10.5%. Harvard/Yale did NOT participate in CIRP per Hargadon
Princeton University	Daily Princetonian	Class of 2023 Senior Survey	Spring 2023	8.3%	Religious self-ID only	Online senior survey	44.1% RR of 1,296 seniors	Public	MEDIUM-HIGH – reasonable response rate	https://www.theprincetontory.com/daily-princetonian-releases-class-of-2023-senior-survey/	Consistent with recent Hillel figure of 8.6%; religion-only measure
Princeton University	Hillel International	Hillel Guide to Jewish Life at Princeton	Current (2024–25)	8.6%	Inclusive (Hillel estimate)	Local Hillel chapter self-report	N/A	Public	MEDIUM – recent Hillel figures appear recalibrated downward post-2018	https://www.hillel.org/college/princeton-university/	450 students / 5,236 undergrads. Hargadon noted Hillel data inflated vs CIRP
Brown University	Brown Daily Herald	Fall 2024 Undergraduate Poll (intercept)	Fall 2024	14.0%	Religious self-ID only	In-person intercept poll at 3 campus locations; weighted by class year	n=1,177; Sep 24–26, 2024	Public	MEDIUM – non-random intercept; voluntary participation	https://www.browndailyherald.com/article/2024/10/most-brown-undergraduates-supported-divestment-proposal-herald-poll-finds	±3 pp MoE (est.); largest documented gap vs Hillel (14% vs 24%) of all 4 schools
Brown University	Hillel International	Hillel Guide to Jewish Life at Brown	Current (2024–25)	23.9%	Inclusive (Hillel estimate)	Local Hillel chapter self-report	N/A	Public	LOW-MEDIUM – ~10 pp gap vs BDH religion measure	https://www.hillel.org/college/brown-university/	1,700 / ~7,115 undergrads. Gap likely explained by high secular Jewish population at Brown
Brown University	Brown Daily	Fall 2025 Undergraduate Poll (intercept)	Fall 2025	9	Religious self-ID only	In-person intercept poll; same methodology as Fall 2024	n=1,177; Oct 2025	Public	MEDIUM — same instrument as Fall	Brown Daily Herald Fall 2025 Undergraduate Poll	Question: 'How would you describe your religious affiliation? Check all tha

Legend & Methodological Notes				
COLOR CODING				
Cell Tint	Meaning			
	Penn data rows			
	Yale data rows			
	Princeton data rows			
	Brown data rows			
	Religious self-ID only (narrower, more rigorous)			
	Inclusive/Hillel figure (broader, less rigorous)			
	Unpublished, uncertain, or unverified source			
MEASURE TYPE DEFINITIONS				
Religious self-ID only	Student ticked 'Jewish' as religion; excludes secular/cultural Jews. Typically from CIRP, chaplain forms, or campus surveys with exclusive religion categories.	Lower bound on true Jewish enrollment		
Inclusive (religious + secular)	Adds students who identify as Jewish by culture/ancestry but check 'no religion'. Typically 3–10 pp higher than religious-only.	Best estimate of total Jewish-background students		
Inclusive (Hillel estimate)	Local Hillel chapter count submitted to Hillel International. Uses broadest definition. Documented by Brandeis SSRI to overestimate by 40–60% vs random-sample surveys.	Use with caution as baseline; weight downward by 30–40%		
RELIABILITY RATINGS				
HIGH	Peer-reviewed / institutional random sample with documented methodology			
MEDIUM-HIGH	Solid survey with stated methodology and reasonable response rate			
MEDIUM	Self-reported survey with voluntary participation or incomplete response			
LOW-MEDIUM	Hillel estimate post-2018 recalibration			
LOW	Hillel pre-2018, unpublished, or single secondhand citation			
KEY SOURCES				
Brandeis CMJS/SSRI	Saxe et al. (2016) 'Diversity, Pressure, and Divisions on the UPenn Campus'	https://hdl.handle.net/10192/33071		
Yale Chaplain's Office	Religious Diversity at Yale: accessible data (continuously updated)	https://chaplain.yale.edu/religious-diversity-at-yale-accessible-data		
Fred Hargadon / PAW	'Just Plain Wrong' — Princeton Alumni Weekly, Feb 2006	https://paw.princeton.edu/article/just-plain-wrong-former-admission-dean-fred-hargadon-responds-chosen-author-jerome-karabel		
Brown Daily Herald	Fall 2024 Undergraduate Poll — Dahlkamp & Doherty, Oct 2024	https://www.browndailyherald.com/article/2024/10/most-brown-undergraduates-supported-divestment-proposal-herald-poll-finds		
Saxe / eJP	'How Many Jewish Undergraduates?' — eJewishPhilanthropy, May 2018	https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/how-many-jewish-undergraduates/		

Princeton Jewish Enrollment

Princeton University — Jewish Enrollment: Daily Princetonian Senior Survey Data								
Graduating Class	**Survey Year (Spring)**	**Jewish % (Religion Chart)**	**n — Religion Chart**	**Total Survey Respondents**	**Total Class Size**	**Official Response Rate**	**Question Wording**	**Source / URL**
2022	2022	**11.8%**	490	516	1247	41.4%	*Which of the following describe your religious beliefs? (check all that apply)*	DP Senior Survey 2022 | projects.dailyprincetonian.com/senior-survey-2022
2023	2023	**8.3%**	542	571	1296	44.1%	*Which of the following describe your religious beliefs? (check all that apply)*	DP Senior Survey 2023 | projects.dailyprincetonian.com/senior-survey-2023
2024	2024	**9.5%**	506	539	1310	41.1%	*Which of the following describe your religious beliefs? (check all that apply)*	DP Senior Survey 2024 | projects.dailyprincetonian.com/senior-survey-2024
2025	2025	**12.3%**	481	501	1308	38.3%	*Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs? (single select — not directly comparable to prior years)*	DP Senior Survey 2025 | projects.dailyprincetonian.com/senior-survey-2025
2025 (Frosh)	Spring 2025	0.094	741	741	1239	0.598	DP FRESHMAN SURVEY (separate instrument). Incoming Class of 2(	DP Freshman Survey 2025 | projects.dailyprincetonian.com/frosh-sur

NOTES: (1) 'n — Religion Chart' = respondents who answered the religion question specifically (optional); 'Total Survey Respondents' = all survey completions. (2) 2022–2024 used 'check all that apply' multi-select; 2025 switched to single-select — figures not directly comparable. (3) Response rates are official (total respondents ÷ total class size), sourced from DP About/Methodology pages. (4) DP surveys capture religious identification only; secular/cultural Jewish identity is not measured.

Princeton University — Jewish Enrollment: All Sources Database						
Year / Period	**Jewish % (Low)**	**Jewish % (High / Point Est.)**	**Approx. Jewish Undergrads**	**Source**	**Methodology**	**Notes**
1920s	—	3.0%	—	PAW historical timeline	Institutional/historical	Informal quota
1956	—	8.0%	—	Rabbi Daniel Greer memoir (NJ Jewish News 2013)	Memoir/anecdotal	
1961	—	15.0%	—	Oren (1985) via Unz appendices	Academic study	
1967	13.0%	20.0%	—	JTA / New York Times survey	News survey	Range reported
Early 1980s (peak)	16.0%	18.0%	—	NYT 1999; Tablet Magazine; Wikipedia	Secondary/historical	Widely cited peak
1988–2003 avg	9.0%	13.0%	—	HERI/CIRP Freshman Survey (Hargadon/PAW 2006)	Random freshman self-report survey	10.5% avg; year-to-
~1999	—	10.0%	—	New York Times 'The Princeton Puzzle'	News report	Prompted national
~2009	—	13.0%	—	Daily Princetonian 'Choosing the Chosen People'	DP article (Hillel data)	
~2013	—	13.0%	680	Hillel College Guide; NJ Jewish News (Feb 2013)	Hillel self-report estimate	Most-cited baseline.
2022 (Hillel)	—	11.5%	600	Hillel (via IvyCoach)	Hillel self-report estimate	IvyCoach notes
Class of 2022 (Spring 2022)	—	11.8%	—	Daily Princetonian Senior Survey 2022	Opt-in anonymous survey | Total class: 1,247 | Total respondents: 516 (41.4%) | Religion chart n: 490	Check-all-that-apply
Class of 2023 (Spring 2023)	—	8.3%	—	Daily Princetonian Senior Survey 2023	Opt-in anonymous survey | Total class: 1,296 | Total respondents: 571 (44.1%) | Religion chart n: 542	Check-all-that-apply
2023 (Hillel)	—	9.6%	500	Hillel (via Inside Higher Ed, May 2023)	Hillel self-report estimate	
Class of 2024 (Spring 2024)	—	9.5%	—	Daily Princetonian Senior Survey 2024	Opt-in anonymous survey | Total class: 1,310 | Total respondents: 539 (41.1%) | Religion chart n: 506	Check-all-that-apply
2024 (Hillel)	—	8.6%	450	Hillel (current website)	Hillel self-report estimate	25% drop from 600 in
Class of 2025 (Spring 2025)	—	12.3%	—	Daily Princetonian Senior Survey 2025	Opt-in anonymous survey | Total class: 1,308 | Total respondents: 501 (38.3%) | Religion chart n: 481	Single-select
Frosh 2025 (Spring 2025)	—	0.094	—	Daily Princetonian Freshman Survey 2025	DP FRESHMAN SURVEY (separate from Senior Survey series). Check-al	⚠ SEPARAT
COLOR KEY: Blue = Daily Princetonian Senior Survey | Green = Hillel estimate | Yellow = CIRP/Hargadon | White/Gray = Historical/other						

Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey

DATA COMPLETENESS STATUS — Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey Tracker

Last updated: February 2026 | ● = Complete ◑ = Partial ○ = Not available / question not asked

Sheet / Metric	Years Available	Completeness	Data Quality	Notes
Ethnicity	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Full series. Core demographic data.
Religion	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Includes Jewish % by year. Key HJAA metric.
Religiosity	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	All 10 years captured Feb 2026.
Recruited Athlete	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	% recruited athlete by year.
Athlete Ethnicity	2023–2027 (4 years)	◑ Partial	Labeled	Only available on /2023/ survey slider. 2025 White 82.9% flagged anomalous.
Athlete Income	2019–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	Labeled	Missing 2017–2018. Not available on site.
Family Income	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Full series.
Financial Aid	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Full series.
Legacy	2018–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	Labeled	2017 not available on site.
Legacy by Income	2018–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	2025 and 2027 added Feb 2026. Full series.
Legacy by Community	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Urban/Suburban/Rural breakdown.
Legacy by Secondary Sch.	2022–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	Labeled	Pre-2022 not available on site.
Secondary School	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Public/private breakdown.
First Generation	2019–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	Labeled	2017–2018 not available on site.
First Gen Ethnicity	2019–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	early labele	Restructured into 4 labeled sections with different metrics clearly separated. Section 1 (first-gen rate by
Places of Origin	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Regional breakdown.
Admissions - Top Choice	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Full series.
Admissions - Early Action	2017–2027 (no 2026)	● Complete	Labeled	Full series.
Racial Identity (Essays)	2027 only	○ Single year	Labeled	Question introduced post-SFFA ruling (June 2023). Pre-2027 data does not exist.
Politics by Religion	2017–2027 (no 2026)	◑ Partial	beled/Verifi	2027 and 2025: all religions from labeled stacked bars. 2024: all religions from Datawrapper CSV (Muslim
Key Trends Summary	2017, 2019, 2021, 202	● Complete	—	Summary of key metrics. Jewish rows highlighted

Color key — Completeness: Green=Complete, Orange=Partial, Blue=Single year available. Data Quality: Yellow=Mixed labeled/estimated, Orange=Estimated only.

Harvard Freshman Survey - Ethnicity by Class Year

Year	Hispanic/ Latinx	Am. Indian/ Native	Asian/ Asian-Am.	South Asian	Black/ African-Am.	Pacific Islander	White/ Caucasian	Prefer Not to Say	Total BIPOC*
2027	9.4%	1.5%	25.0%	7.9%	11.1%	0.7%	42.5%	1.8%	**55.6%**
2025	13.4%	0.9%	23.6%	8.3%	15.7%	0.6%	53.1%	1.1%	**62.5%**
2024	13.4%	1.9%	29.1%	4.8%	15.8%	0.5%	49.8%	1.6%	**65.5%**
2023	11.1%	1.2%	22.6%	5.8%	10.1%	0.8%	47.2%		**51.6%**
2022	6.5%	0.6%	18.1%	3.8%	10.7%	0.1%	46.0%		**39.8%**
2021	10.2%	1.7%	23.8%	0.0%	11.4%	0.8%	52.1%		**47.9%**
2020	13.1%	1.9%	26.6%	6.3%	11.4%	0.6%	55.7%		**59.9%**
2019	12.5%	1.4%	23.5%	6.5%	11.2%	0.7%	58.2%		**55.8%**
2018	11.9%	1.1%	24.3%	4.5%	11.0%	1.1%	62.1%		**53.9%**
2017	10.8%	1.4%	25.2%	4.1%	9.7%	1.1%	61.7%		**52.3%**

**Total BIPOC = Hispanic/Latinx + Am. Indian + Asian/Asian-Am. + South Asian + Black/African-Am. + Pacific Islander (excludes White and Prefer N*

Harvard Freshman Survey - Recruited Athlete S

Year	Yes -	No	Notes
2027	8.0%	92.0%	
2025	10.4%	89.6%	
2024	10.6%	89.4%	
2023	11.2%	88.8%	
2022	12.2%	87.8%	
2021	10.1%	89.9%	
2020	10.3%	89.7%	
2019	12.1%	87.9%	
2018	11.0%	89.0%	
2017	12.5%	87.5%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Family Income by Class Year

Year	Under	$40,000–	$80,000–	$125,000–	$250,000–	$500,000+	Prefer
2027	10.3%	12.7%	12.5%	19.4%	13.8%	13.4%	17.9%
2025	13.9%	12.1%	12.3%	18.9%	13.5%	12.6%	16.7%
2024	15.5%	13.3%	13.3%	15.6%	13.2%	11.5%	17.7%
2023	13.1%	14.9%	12.4%	18.5%	11.4%	10.9%	18.8%
2022	14.4%	14.8%	16.3%	21.8%	15.8%	17.0%	
2021	12.0%	14.5%	14.2%	24.3%	17.9%	17.1%	
2020	14.5%	11.5%	15.9%	23.3%	19.3%	15.6%	
2019	14.3%	13.3%	15.8%	23.1%	18.1%	15.4%	
2018	13.3%	13.9%	17.0%	22.2%	19.1%	14.4%	
2017	14.5%	14.9%	18.3%	24.0%	14.5%	13.8%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Secondary School Type by Class Year

Year	Public (N…	Public (Charter)	Private (N…	Private (Religious)	Homesch…	Other
2027	58.6%	4.1%	25.5%	11.4%	0.1%	0.3%
2025	58.0%	4.0%	26.9%	10.2%	0.3%	0.6%
2024	62.6%	3.3%	23.9%	9.3%	0.2%	0.6%
2023	60.9%	3.6%	24.4%	9.6%	0.5%	1.0%
2022	57.0%	2.7%	28.3%	9.8%	0.5%	1.7%
2021	60.5%	3.2%	25.3%	10.2%	0.1%	0.7%
2020	60.4%	3.0%	26.2%	9.6%	0.1%	0.7%
2019	59.7%	3.4%	25.6%	9.8%	0.6%	0.9%
2018	57.9%	2.0%	28.5%	11.0%	0.3%	0.3%
2017	58.3%	2.4%	28.6%	9.6%	0.6%	0.6%

Harvard Freshman Survey - Legacy Status by Class Year

Year	None /	Sibling(s)	One	Two	One	Multiple	Aunt(s)/	Other
2027	67.8%	7.4%	8.8%	3.2%	3.4%	0.5%	4.9%	4.0%
2025	68.1%	7.9%	10.4%	5.1%	3.3%	1.4%	6.0%	4.4%
2024	71.7%	6.6%	9.8%	2.6%	2.7%	0.9%	4.5%	4.2%
2023	73.1%	9.9%	12.8%	4.0%	3.3%	1.0%	6.0%	4.4%
2022	63.2%	7.2%	10.8%	3.7%	3.5%	1.4%	5.5%	4.7%
2021	70.7%	8.4%	12.1%	6.2%	5.0%	1.9%	8.1%	7.6%
2020	73.0%	10.0%	11.0%	3.6%	2.5%	1.9%	6.4%	6.3%
2019	72.2%	9.0%	12.3%	4.5%	4.1%	1.8%	7.3%	6.1%
2018	73.1%	7.5%	12.3%	3.6%	3.8%	1.7%	8.2%	6.8%

Harvard Freshman Survey - First Generation C

Year	Yes - First	No	Prefer
2027	15.9%	84.1%	
2025	20.0%	80.0%	0.9%
2024	22.8%	76.3%	
2023	17.3%	82.7%	
2022	17.1%	82.9%	
2021	16.3%	83.7%	
2020	15.8%	84.2%	
2019	15.6%	84.4%	

HARVARD CRIMSON FRESHMAN SURVEY — KEY TRENDS SUMMARY

All values pulled directly from source sheets. No interpolation. N/A = data not available for that year.

ETHNICITY (% of freshman class, self-reported)

Source: Religion sheet (Jewish); Ethnicity sheet (all others)

Metric	2017	2019	2021	2023	2025	2027	Trend (2017→2027)
Jewish (self-reported religion)	9.5%	10.1%	7.7%	5.3%	7.4%	5.4%	↓ *9.5% (2017) → 5.4% (2027)*
White/Caucasian	61.7%	58.2%	52.1%	47.2%	53.1%	42.5%	↓ *61.7% → 42.5%*
Asian/Asian-Am.	25.2%	23.5%	23.8%	22.6%	23.6%	25.0%	≈ *Fluctuating, 25.2% → 25.0%*
Black/African-Am.	9.7%	11.2%	11.4%	10.1%	15.7%	11.1%	≈ *9.7% → 11.1%*
Hispanic/Latinx	10.8%	12.5%	10.2%	11.1%	13.4%	9.4%	≈ *Fluctuating, 10.8% → 9.4%*
South Asian	4.1%	6.5%	N/A	5.8%	8.3%	7.9%	— *Partial series (2021 not tracked separately)*

ADMISSIONS & LEGACY

Source: Recruited Athlete, Legacy, Admissions - Top Choice, Admissions - Early Action

Metric	2017	2019	2021	2023	2025	2027	Trend (2017→2027)
Recruited Athlete %	12.5%	12.1%	10.1%	11.2%	10.4%	8.0%	↓ *12.5% → 8.0%*
Legacy — No Legacy Connection	N/A	72.2%	70.7%	73.1%	68.1%	67.8%	↓ *N/A → 67.8% (was 72.2% in 2019)*
Legacy — One Parent (Harvard alum)	N/A	12.3%	12.1%	12.8%	10.4%	8.8%	↓ *N/A → 8.8% (was 12.3% in 2019)*
Legacy — Both Parents (Harvard alum)	N/A	4.5%	6.2%	4.0%	5.1%	3.2%	≈ *N/A → 3.2% (was 4.5% in 2019)*
Harvard as Top Choice	81.1%	81.8%	81.3%	80.4%	78.8%	75.4%	↓ *81.1% → 75.4%*
Applied Harvard Early Action	50.2%	55.5%	53.4%	54.8%	43.6%	33.9%	↓ *50.2% → 33.9%*
Public High School (non-charter)	58.3%	59.7%	60.5%	60.9%	58.0%	58.6%	≈ *58.3% → 58.6%*

FAMILY INCOME & FINANCIAL AID

Source: Family Income, Financial Aid, Legacy by Income sheets

Metric	2017	2019	2021	2023	2025	2027	Trend (2017→2027)
Family Income Under $40K	14.5%	14.3%	12.0%	13.1%	13.9%	10.3%	↓ *14.5% → 10.3%*
Family Income $500K+	13.8%	15.4%	17.1%	10.9%	12.6%	13.4%	≈ *Fluctuating, 13.8% → 13.4%*
Financial Aid Recipients	57.7%	55.5%	55.5%	58.6%	54.8%	57.6%	≈ *57.7% → 57.6%*
Legacy Students: Under $40K income	N/A	0.6%	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	3.0%	↑ *N/A → 3.0% (0.6% in 2019)*
Legacy Students: $250K–$499K income	N/A	24.6%	23.0%	18.4%	21.9%	16.4%	↓ *N/A → 16.4% (was 24.6% in 2019)*
Legacy Students: $500K+ income	N/A	43.2%	46.0%	27.0%	30.9%	29.3%	↓ *N/A → 29.3% (was 43.2% in 2019)*

FIRST GENERATION STUDENTS

Source: First Generation, First Gen Ethnicity sheets

Metric	2017	2019	2021	2023	2025	2027	Trend (2017→2027)
First Gen % of class	N/A	15.6%	16.3%	17.3%	20.0%	15.9%	≈ *15.6% (2019) → 15.9% (2027); peaked 20.0% in 2025*
First Gen: Financial Aid Recipients	N/A	93.9%	94.9%	95.6%	90.7%	91.8%	≈ *Consistently high, 93.9%–95.6%*
First Gen: Under $40K family income	N/A	N/A	41.2%	48.7%	42.0%	29.4%	↓ *N/A (2019 not collected) → 29.4% (2027) — income floor rising*
Hispanic/Latinx first-gen rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	51.0%	46.8%	35.8%	↓ *51.0% (2023) → 35.8% (2027)*
White first-gen rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.0%	12.0%	11.2%	↓ *16.0% (2023) → 11.2% (2027)*

RELIGION & BELIEFS

Source: Religion, Religiosity, Athlete Ethnicity sheets

Metric	2017	2019	2021	2023	2025	2027	Trend (2017→2027)
Jewish self-identification	9.5%	10.1%	7.7%	5.3%	7.4%	5.4%	↓ *9.5% (2017) → 5.4% (2027)*
No Religion (Agnostic + Atheist)	32.4%	37.9%	37.8%	43.5%	41.3%	46.1%	↑ *32.4% → 46.1%*
Not at All Religious	31.0%	33.6%	38.2%	32.8%	32.3%	33.9%	↑ *31.0% → 33.9%*
Extremely Religious	7.0%	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%	2.4%	2.5%	↓ *7.0% (2017) → 2.5% (2027)*
Recruited Athlete: White/Caucasian	N/A	N/A	N/A	74.5%	82.9%	62.5%	— *Partial (2023–2027 only); 2025 value anomalous*

Yellow rows = Jewish-specific metrics. N/A = data not collected or not available for that year. All values sourced directly from individual sheets — no interpolation. Source: Harvard Crimson Freshman Survey. Last updated February 2026.

Harvard Freshman Survey - Financial Aid Recipient by Class Year				
Year	**Yes - Financial Aid Recipient**	**No**	**Prefer Not to Say**	
2027	57.6%	42.4%	3.7%	
2025	54.8%	41.5%	3.0%	
2024	57.5%	39.6%	4.0%	
2023	58.6%	37.4%		
2022	57.1%	42.9%		
2021	55.5%	44.5%		
2020	57.1%	42.9%		
2019	55.5%	44.5%		
2018	53.8%	46.2%		
2017	57.7%	42.3%		

Harvard Freshman Survey - Family Income Among Recruited Athletes by Class Year							
Year	Under $40K	40K–$79,99	$80K–$124,999	$125K–$249,999	50K–$499,9	$500K+	Prefer Not to Say
2027	7.6%	15.1%	5.7%	28.3%	18.9%	5.7%	18.9%
2025	3.6%	9.3%	15.7%	25.7%	10.7%	9.3%	25.7%
2024	4.8%	4.8%	9.6%	19.2%	18.3%	11.5%	31.7%
2023	5.2%	13.5%	13.4%	15.6%	10.4%	13.5%	28.1%
2022	3.7%	8.7%	18.8%	22.5%	20.0%	26.3%	
2021	5.0%	12.5%	12.5%	31.3%	16.3%	22.5%	
2020	4.2%	6.7%	14.3%	31.9%	21.9%	21.0%	
2019	4.5%	13.0%	9.8%	10.6%	15.1%	20.1%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Community Type				
Year	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
2027	31.6%	60.7%	7.8%	
2025	42.2%	54.0%	3.8%	
2024	29.1%	68.7%	2.2%	
2023	31.0%	58.9%	10.1%	
2022	28.6%	61.0%	10.4%	
2021	28.5%	61.3%	10.2%	
2020	30.5%	60.8%	8.7%	
2019	28.0%	62.9%	9.1%	
2018	28.3%	64.1%	7.6%	
2017	26.7%	65.2%	8.2%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Family Income Among Legacy Students by Class Year							
Year	Under $40K	40K–$79,99	$80K–$124,999	$125K–$249,999	50K–$499,9	$500K+	Prefer Not to Say
2027	3.0%	3.4%	3.9%	19.0%	16.4%	29.3%	25.0%
2025	0.0%	1.3%	4.3%	12.0%	21.9%	30.9%	29.6%
2024	0.8%	1.5%	4.6%	10.6%	20.5%	32.6%	29.6%
2023	1.4%	0.7%	5.7%	14.2%	18.4%	27.0%	32.6%
2022	0.7%	0.7%	10.4%	19.4%	22.4%	46.4%	
2021	1.4%	2.9%	7.9%	18.7%	23.0%	46.0%	
2020	0.6%	4.5%	2.7%	8.8%	21.6%	26.6%	
2019	0.6%	3.4%	7.5%	15.2%	24.6%	43.2%	
2018	0.0%	3.9%	7.4%	16.7%	23.6%	37.3%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Secondary School Type Among Legacy Students by Class Year						
Year	**Public (non-charter)**	**Public (charter)**	**Private (non-denominational)**	**Private (parochial)**	**Homeschool**	**Other**
2027	38.9%	2.1%	38.1%	20.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2025	36.4%	0.4%	51.0%		0.8%	0.0%
2024	38.1%	0.8%	50.8%	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2023	41.7%		48.6%	10.5%	0.7%	
2022	35.5%		51.8%	9.0%	1.7%	1.7%

Harvard Freshman Survey - Places of Origin (Region) by Class Year							
Year	Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	Southwest	West	U.S. Territories	tside the U
2027	39.4%	11.1%	12.9%	6.1%	13.7%	0.3%	16.6%
2025	38.1%	12.2%	11.4%	6.2%	15.1%	0.8%	16.2%
2024	41.3%	13.7%	12.0%	7.3%	14.7%		10.8%
2023	40.3%	10.5%	13.2%	6.4%	14.8%		14.5%
2022	42.2%	10.9%	11.5%	7.1%	15.9%		12.3%
2021	39.4%	13.3%	12.3%	6.9%	15.6%		12.4%
2020	39.2%	12.0%	11.2%	6.7%	18.1%		12.6%
2019	38.3%	12.5%	12.3%	7.0%	18.5%		11.2%
2018	43.1%	10.6%	11.0%	6.8%	16.9%		11.6%
2017	41.1%	11.7%	13.8%	7.8%	14.5%		

Harvard Freshman Survey - Harvard as Top Choice School by				
Year	**Yes - Harvard Top Choice**	**No**		
2027	75.4%	24.6%		
2025	78.8%	21.2%		
2024	81.0%	19.0%		
2023	80.4%	19.6%		
2022	79.8%	20.2%		
2021	81.3%	18.8%		
2020	79.0%	21.0%		
2019	81.8%	18.2%		
2018	83.0%	17.0%		
2017	81.1%	18.9%		

Harvard Freshman Survey - Early Action Outcome by Class Year				
Year	**Yes, but not Harvard**	**Yes, Harvard Early**	**Yes, Harvard & Another School (2027)**	**No (Did Not Apply EA)**
2027	34.2%	33.9%	7.6%	24.3%
2025	24.4%	43.6%		32.1%
2024	24.0%	50.0%		26.0%
2023	17.2%	54.8%		28.0%
2022	16.3%	56.8%		26.9%
2021	19.2%	53.4%		27.3%
2020	17.5%	50.8%		31.6%
2019	15.9%	55.5%		28.6%
2018	16.0%	56.0%		28.0%
2017	17.0%	50.2%		32.8%

Harvard Freshman Survey - Racial Identity in Application Essays (Class of 2027)				
Year	**Question**	**Yes %**	**No %**	
2027	**Mentioned racial identity in application essays**	38.7%	61.3%	
2027	**Felt pressure to mention racial identity in application essays**	15.2%	84.8%	

Harvard Freshman Survey - Religion by Class Year (Politics & Beliefs section)											
Year	**Agnostic**	**Atheist**	**Buddhist**	**Catholic**	**Hindu**	**Jewish**	**Latter-Day Saint**	**Muslim**	**Protestant**	**Sikh**	**Other**
2027	24.6%	21.5%	1.7%	16.4%	5.2%	5.4%	0.3%	3.3%	6.1%	0.1%	5.0%
2025	23.9%	17.4%		16.9%	3.1%	7.4%	0.5%	3.9%	14.5%		11.3%
2024	24.1%	16.5%		17.4%	2.7%	5.2%	0.8%	3.5%	16.0%		13.7%
2023	28.4%	15.1%		17.5%	2.0%	5.3%	0.5%	3.1%	16.5%		
2022	22.3%	16.2%		20.2%	2.1%	5.4%	0.7%	3.3%	15.4%		
2021	22.0%	15.8%		19.5%	3.3%	7.7%	0.4%	3.3%	15.9%		
2020	23.1%	17.3%		17.8%	2.9%	6.3%	0.7%	2.5%	16.9%		
2019	21.3%	16.6%		17.1%	3.0%	10.1%	0.4%	2.5%	17.0%		
2018	19.2%	16.4%		19.1%	2.4%	9.8%	0.3%	3.6%	17.9%		
2017	18.3%	14.1%		22.3%	2.4%	9.5%	0.5%	2.6%	20.1%		
Note: A correction was issued for Class of 2027 Buddhist figure. Corrected value (1.7%) is shown; original erroneous figure was 12.1%.											

Harvard Freshman Survey - Religiosity by Class Year					
Year	Not at All Religious	Not Very Religious	Somewhat Religious	Very Religious	Extremely Religious
2027	33.9%	28.6%	23.0%	12.0%	2.5%
2025	32.3%	21.5%	29.1%	14.7%	2.4%
2024	31.7%	25.6%	27.5%	13.1%	2.0%
2023	32.8%	25.5%	26.4%	13.4%	1.8%
2022	34.3%	23.4%	25.7%	14.3%	2.2%
2021	38.2%	25.8%	25.1%	14.5%	1.9%
2020	34.8%	25.5%	24.9%	12.1%	2.7%
2019	33.6%	27.0%	24.9%	12.7%	1.8%
2018	34.0%	25.0%	18.0%	17.0%	6.0%
2017	31.0%	26.0%	19.0%	17.0%	7.0%

Source: features.thecrimson.com/2023/freshman-survey/beliefs/ — Religiosity slider. All valu

Harvard Freshman Survey - Ethnicity of Recruited Athletes by Class Year									
Year	**Hispanic/ Latinx**	**Am. Indian/ Native**	**Asian/ Asian-Am**	**South Asian**	**Black/ African-Am**	**Pacific Islander**	**White/ Caucasian**	**Other**	**Notes**
2027	7.8%	1.6%	6.3%	9.4%	9.4%	0.0%	62.5%	3.1%	*Labeled. Source: /2023/freshman-survey/academics/ slider 2027*
2025	7.5%	0.0%	8.2%	2.1%	10.3%	1.4%	82.9%		*Labeled. 'Other' not shown. White 82.9% notably higher — verify vs. Datawrapper*
2024	14.0%	2.8%	13.1%	0.9%	12.1%	0.9%	72.9%		*Source: /2023/freshman-survey/academics/ slider 2024*
2023	6.1%	3.1%	7.1%	2.0%	6.1%	0.0%	74.5%		*Source: /2023/freshman-survey/academics/ slider 2023*
User-verified: 2025 White/Caucasian (82.9%) is correct per source. Cohort variation, not data error.									

Harvard Freshman Survey - Politics by Religion (Multi-Year)

Year	Religion	Progressive / Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Apolitical	Notes
2027	**Agnostic**	77.8%	17.0%	4.1%	1.2%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Atheist**	78.0%	16.7%	3.3%	2.0%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Buddhist**	58.3%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Catholic**	45.6%	30.7%	18.4%	5.3%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Hindu**	51.4%	37.1%	8.6%	2.9%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Jewish**	78.9%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Latter-Day Saint**	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Muslim**	59.1%	31.8%	4.6%	4.6%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Non-denom. Christian**	56.3%	28.2%	14.1%	1.4%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Protestant**	57.2%	23.8%	16.7%	2.4%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Sikh**	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2027	**Other**	65.7%	22.9%	11.4%	0.0%	*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (chart xQ7Jo)*
2025	**Agnostic**	85.7%	9.4%	5.0%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Atheist**	83.5%	10.2%	6.4%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Catholic**	62.4%	22.8%	14.8%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Hindu**	76.1%	15.2%	8.7%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Jewish**	75.9%	17.9%	6.3%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Latter-Day Saint**	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Muslim**	71.6%	28.3%			*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Protestant**	62.7%	23.3%	13.9%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2025	**Other**	66.1%	24.6%	9.4%		*Verified against Datawrapper CSV (chart M6ZDC)*
2024	Agnostic	0.836	0.113	0.044		CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV (labeled as Agonistic in source — typo
2024	**Atheist**	64.4%	26.4%	9.2%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	**Catholic**	64.4%	26.4%	9.2%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	**Hindu**	88.4%	11.5%	0.0%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	**Jewish**	68.7%	18.8%	12.5%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV export*
2024	**Latter-Day Saint**	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	**Protestant**	61.2%	25.7%	13.1%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	**Other**	70.0%	23.8%	6.1%		*CORRECTED from Datawrapper CSV*
2024	Muslim					DELETED — Datawrapper CSV export values (71.0/25.8/39.9) did not mat
2023	**Jewish**	*53.5%*	*23.3%*	*23.3%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data*
2022	**Jewish**	*76.4%*	*18.2%*	*5.5%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data*
2021	**Jewish**	*58.6%*	*27.1%*	*14.3%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data*
2020	**Jewish**	*78.3%*	*13.5%*	*8.1%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data*
2019	**Jewish**	*64.9%*	*22.8%*	*12.3%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data*
2018	**Jewish**	*76.4%*	*15.1%*	*8.5%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data (was Est. from mislabeled chart)*
2017	**Jewish**	*74.0%*	*17.3%*	*8.7%*		*CORRECTED from user-verified source data (was Est. from mislabeled chart)*

DATA QUALITY NOTE: C/O 2027 and 2025 — all religions from labeled stacked bars. C/O 2024 — all religions from Datawrapper CSV export (Muslim row sums to ~137%, flagged as source error). C/O 2017–2023 –

SECTION 1: First-Gen Rate BY Ethnic Group (% of each group that is first-gen)								
METRIC: Of all students identifying as [ethnicity], what % are first-generation? E.g., 35.8% of Hispanic/Latin								
DATA QUALITY: C/O 2027 and 2023 — labeled values. C/O 2025 and 2024 — labeled values (different ethni								
Year	Ethnic Grou	First Gen %	Not First Ge	Data Quality				
2027	Hispanic or	0.358	0.642	Labeled				
2027	American In	0.385	0.615	Labeled				
2027	Asian (excl.	0.171	0.829	Labeled				
2027	South Asian	0.075	0.925	Labeled				
2027	Black or Afr	0.151	0.85	Labeled				
2027	Pacific Islan	1	0	Labeled				
2027	White (incl.	0.112	0.888	Labeled				
2027	Middle East	0.136	0.864	Labeled				
2027	Other	0.2	0.8	Labeled				
2027	Prefer not t	0.167	0.833	Labeled				
2025	Hispanic or	0.468	0.532	Labeled				
2025	American In	0.167	0.833	Labeled				
2025	Asian (excl.	0.154	0.846	Labeled				
2025	South Asian	0.256	0.744	Labeled				
2025	Black or Afr	0.25	0.75	Labeled				
2025	Pacific Islan	0.11	0.89	Labeled				
2025	White (incl.	0.12	0.88	Labeled				
2025	Prefer not t	0.2	0.8	Labeled				
2024	American In	0.47	0.53	Labeled (some groups not reported)				
2024	South Asian	0.15	0.85	Labeled (some groups not reported)				
2024	Black/Africa	0.28	0.72	Labeled (some groups not reported)				
2024	Pacific Islan	0.2	0.8	Labeled (some groups not reported)				
2024	White/Cauc	0.16	0.84	Labeled (some groups not reported)				
2023	Hispanic or	0.51	0.49	Labeled				
2023	American In	0.47	0.53	Labeled				
2023	Asian/Asian	0.19	0.81	Labeled				
2023	Black/Africa	0.28	0.72	Labeled				
2023	Pacific Islan	0.2	0.8	Labeled				
2023	White/Cauc	0.16	0.84	Labeled				
2023	Prefer not t	0.27	0.73	Labeled				
2022	Hispanic or	0.41	0.59	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
2022	American In	0.38	0.62	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
2022	Asian/Asian	0.15	0.85	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
2022	Black/Africa	0.24	0.76	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
2022	Pacific Islan	0.28	0.72	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
2022	White/Cauc	0.1	0.9	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars ±5pp				
SECTION 2: Income Distribution AMONG First-Gen Students								
METRIC: Of all first-gen students, what % fall in each income bracket? E.g., 29.4% of first-gen students in C/								
DATA QUALITY: C/O 2027 labeled. C/O 2025 estimated from unlabeled bar heights. C/O 2023, 2022, 2021 la								
Year	Under $40K	$40K–$79,9	$80K–$124	$125K–$24	$250K–$49	$500K+	Prefer Not t	Data Qualit
2027	0.294	0.349	0.156	0.083	0.009	0.018	0.092	Labeled
2025	0.42	0.29	0.12	0.08	0.02	0.01	0.09	Estimated f
2023	0.487	0.278	0.108	0.063			0.063	Labeled ($2
2022	0.486	0.279	0.139	0.048	0.03	0.018		Labeled
2021	0.412	0.375	0.125	0.066	0.015	0.007		Labeled
2020				0.071	0.022	0.038		Partial — o
⚠ C/O 2024 EXCLUDED — uses DIFFERENT METRIC (% of each income bracket that is first-gen, NOT incom								
SECTION 3: Ethnic Distribution OF First-Gen Students (C/O 2019–2021 ONLY)								
METRIC: Of all first-gen students, what % are [ethnicity]? This is a DIFFERENT METRIC from Section 1. NOT								
DATA QUALITY: ALL ESTIMATED from unlabeled grouped bar charts (Y-axis 0–60). Approximate values only								
Year	Ethnic Grou	First Gen (e	Not First Ge	Data Quality				
2021	Hispanic or	~23%	~8%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2021	American In	~3%	~2%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2021	Asian	~19%	~24%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2021	Black or Afr	~10%	~12%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2021	Pacific Islan	~1%	~1%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2021	White	~43%	~53%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	Hispanic or	~27%	~10%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	American In	~3%	~2%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	Asian	~22%	~23%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	South Asian	~8%	~5%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	Black or Afr	~11%	~10%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	Pacific Islan	~1%	~1%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2020	White	~29%	~51%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	Hispanic or	~29%	~10%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	American In	~3%	~1%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	Asian	~27%	~24%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	South Asian	~7%	~10%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	Black or Afr	~18%	~13%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	Pacific Islan	~1%	~1%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
2019	White	~38%	~62%	ESTIMATED from unlabeled bars				
SECTION 4: First-Gen Financial Aid Status								
METRIC: Of first-gen students, what % receive financial aid?								
Year	Receives Ai	No Aid	Other/Unk	Data Quality				
2027	0.918	0.082		Labeled				
2025	0.907	0.075	0.018	Labeled				
2023	0.956	0.025	0.019	Labeled				
2022	0.943	0.057		Labeled				
2021	0.949	0.051		Labeled				
2020	0.946	0.054		Labeled				
2019	0.939	0.061		Labeled				

Yale Chaplain Religious Diversity

Yale University Chaplain's Office — Religious Diversity Data (All Categories)

*Source: Yale University Chaplain's Office, chaplain.yale.edu/religious-diversity-at-yale-accessible-data | * 1970s: only class of 1970 (freshmen); 1974–79 lumped into Unaffiliated/Other — data skewed. * 1980s: only 1980–82; lumped similarly. † 1990s: only classes of 1991, 1996, 1997, 1998. ‡ 2000s: only classes of 2005–2008. 1930s form was MANDATORY; later decades voluntary (no completion rate published). ⚠ 2023 Indigenous Traditions = 11.00% as published — likely data error.*

Category	1930s	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s*	1980s*	1990s†	2000s‡	2010s	2021	2022	2023	2024
Catholic	11.77%	14.67%	10.41%	13.38%	15.76%	16.38%	24.75%	27.17%	26.19%	21.10%	20.50%	20.00%	19.40%
Orthodox Christian	0.10%	0.31%	0.42%	0.59%	—	—	1.72%	—	1.53%	1.80%	2.10%	2.30%	2.50%
Episcopalian	33.77%	31.77%	30.68%	25.63%	7.80%	5.57%	4.64%	6.17%	4.64%	3.20%	2.70%	2.60%	3.00%
Protestant - Other/Non Denominational	6.09%	4.49%	3.03%	4.83%	9.64%	8.86%	7.41%	9.44%	—	—	—	—	—
Methodist	4.06%	4.49%	6.42%	6.81%	2.04%	1.68%	7.20%	3.43%	2.43%	2.00%	2.00%	1.80%	1.70%
Congregational	12.46%	11.84%	10.70%	7.34%	—	—	—	—	0.33%	—	—	—	—
Presbyterian	14.21%	12.46%	12.52%	11.28%	4.29%	2.58%	8.02%	4.34%	3.12%	3.90%	3.80%	4.00%	3.60%
Baptist	1.82%	2.02%	1.83%	1.98%	2.04%	1.63%	7.20%	2.75%	2.73%	3.20%	3.40%	3.10%	2.60%
Christian Science	1.86%	2.13%	1.41%	0.57%	0.08%	—	0.14%	0.10%	0.11%	—	—	—	—
Lutheran	1.28%	1.55%	2.67%	3.61%	1.92%	1.50%	2.54%	2.43%	—	1.50%	1.30%	1.20%	1.10%
Reformed Church	0.93%	0.72%	0.72%	0.62%	—	—	0.35%	0.72%	—	—	—	—	—
United Church of Christ	—	—	—	—	2.17%	0.62%	4.05%	—	0.69%	0.60%	0.70%	0.60%	—
Mennonite/Brethren	—	—	—	—	0.73%	—	0.07%	0.10%	0.03%	—	—	—	—
Pentecostal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.69%	1.13%	1.20%	1.20%	1.20%	1.30%
Non Denominational/Christian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.57%	8.30%	8.60%	8.90%	9.70%
Evangelical	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.36%	—	—	—	—
Other – Christian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.79%	0.70%	0.70%	0.80%	0.60%
Anglican	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.51%	—	—	—	—
Assembly of God	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.17%	—	—	—	—
Seventh Day Adventist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.51%	0.20%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%
Mormon/LDS	0.03%	0.08%	0.16%	0.27%	—	—	0.69%	0.25%	—	0.20%	0.20%	0.30%	—
Quaker/Friends	—	0.28%	0.19%	0.37%	0.05%	—	0.69%	0.44%	0.50%	0.10%	0.11%	0.08%	0.06%
Unitarian Universalist	1.46%	1.32%	1.44%	1.98%	0.23%	—	1.03%	1.13%	1.34%	0.60%	0.40%	0.30%	0.10%
JEWISH	**10.08%**	**9.86%**	**11.14%**	**11.40%**	**19.60%**	**13.14%**	**15.43%**	**19.88%**	**16.42%**	**9.90%**	**10.10%**	**10.20%**	**9.50%**
Agnostic/Atheist	0.12%	0.07%	0.84%	0.13%	0.12%	—	7.82%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atheist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.53%	5.24%	11.20%	10.60%	11.20%	12.00%
Agnostic	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.69%	4.58%	18.50%	18.30%	18.20%	17.50%
Humanist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.17%	—	—	—	0.30%
Buddhist	0.02%	0.05%	0.01%	0.12%	—	—	0.42%	—	1.95%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%	1.90%
Hindu	—	—	0.01%	0.01%	—	—	1.38%	1.94%	3.03%	3.30%	3.20%	3.50%	3.60%
Muslim	—	0.04%	0.04%	0.10%	0.05%	—	0.83%	—	3.16%	3.60%	4.70%	4.50%	6.10%
Bahá'í Faith	—	0.02%	0.01%	0.03%	—	—	0.07%	0.13%	0.15%	0.07%	0.04%	0.40%	0.01%
Zoroastrian	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.07%	0.04%	0.02%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0.09%
Pagan/Wiccan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.04%	0.02%	0.08%	0.11%	0.12%	0.17%
Jain	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.09%	0.17%	0.10%	0.07%	0.10%
Sikh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.24%	0.60%	0.50%	0.60%	0.30%
Native American / Indigenous Traditions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.08%	0.12%	0.14%	11.00%	0.23%
Shinto	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.09%	0.08%	0.02%	0.02%
Daoism	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%	0.07%
Unaffiliated / None / Other	—	3.57%	5.36%	8.45%	33.52%	48.09%	1.38%	—	6.14%	1.10%	0.90%	0.70%	1.00%

Yale Chaplain's Office — Jewish Enrollment Longitudinal Series				
Period / Year	**Jewish %**	**Coverage / Classes**	**Methodology Note**	**Reliability**
1930s	**10.08%**	All years, all freshmen	Form MANDATORY — complete population data	**HIGH**
1940s	**9.86%**	All years; 19 records (WWII split)	Form mandatory; WWII split classes complicate year-level analysis	**HIGH**
1950s	**11.14%**	1950,1950F,1951,1952,1954,1955 (frosh); 1956,1958 = full undergrad; missing 1953,1957,1959	Partial coverage; mixed freshmen/undergrad population	**MEDIUM**
1960s	**11.40%**	1963–1967 only; full undergrad pop; missing 1960–62, 1968–69	Partial decade; full undergrad (not just freshmen)	**MEDIUM**
1970s	**19.60%**	Class of 1970 frosh only; 1974–79 lumped	⚠ SKEWED: 1974–79 collapse small affiliations into Unaffiliated/Other; inflates named categories	**LOW**
1980s	**13.14%**	1980–1982 only; lumped methodology	⚠ SKEWED: only 3 years; same lumping as 1970s	**LOW**
1990s	**15.43%**	Classes of 1991, 1996, 1997, 1998 only	Partial decade — 4 of ~10 years; form now voluntary	**MEDIUM**
2000s	**19.88%**	Classes of 2005–2008 only	Partial decade — 4 of ~10 years; voluntary form	**MEDIUM**
2010s	**16.42%**	Classes of 2010–2020 (11 years)	Most complete decade; voluntary form; no completion rate published	**MEDIUM-HIGH**
2021	**9.90%**	Single entering class (class of 2025)	Year-by-year granularity begins; voluntary form; no response rate given	**MEDIUM**
2022	**10.10%**	Single entering class (class of 2026)	Same methodology as 2021	**MEDIUM**
2023	**10.20%**	Single entering class (class of 2027)	Same methodology; Indigenous Traditions listed as 11.00% — likely error	**MEDIUM**
2024	**9.50%**	Single entering class (class of 2028)	Most recent data point available	**MEDIUM**

Yale Chaplain's Office — Methodology Notes (Verbatim from Source)				
Decade	**Verbatim Note from Page**	**Coverage Gaps / Data Anomalies**		
1930s	All years are represented for all freshmen students. The religious statistics form was not optional at the time. [First Buddhist freshman: class of 1934. First self-identified agnostic: class of 1934. First Atheist: class of 1939.]	COMPLETE — all years, all freshmen. Only decade with mandatory form.		
1940s	All years are represented for freshmen students. Due to World War II, this decade's statistics are compiled from 19 different records. Classes from 1945 to 1950 each had two to four different graduating classes of students, based on when the student returned from the war. [First Baha'i: class of 1948J. First Muslim: class of 1944.]	Complete coverage but WWII creates non-standard class cohorts. 19 separate records.		
1950s	Freshmen statistics are collected for the classes of 1950, 1950F, 1951, 1952, 1954 and 1955. Statistics for the 1956 and 1958 represent the entire undergraduate population. No statistics found for the classes of 1953, 1957 and 1959. [First Hindu freshman: class of 1956.]	MISSING: classes of 1953, 1957, 1959. Mixed populations: 1956 & 1958 = full undergrad, others = freshmen only.		
1960s	Statistics for 1963-1967 recorded for the entire undergraduate population. No statistics found for the classes of 1960, 1961, 1962, 1968 and 1969.	MISSING: classes of 1960, 1961, 1962, 1968, 1969. Only 1963–1967 available (full undergrad population, not freshmen).		
1970s	Freshmen statistics recorded for the class of 1970. No records found from 1971-1973. *Records found for 1974-1979 lumped all smaller religious affiliations into one 'unaffiliated' group. These records significantly skew the records for this decade.	⚠ SKEWED per source's own warning. Only class of 1970 is clean. 1971–1973 missing entirely. 1974–1979 methodology collapse inflates named categories (incl. Jewish at 19.60%).		
1980s	Records only found for 1980-1982. The records lumped all smaller religious affiliations into one 'unaffiliated' group. These records significantly skew the records for this decade.	⚠ SKEWED per source's own warning. Only 3 years of data. Same lumping issue as 1970s.		
1990s	Records found only for the classes of 1991, 1996, 1997 and 1998. [First Zoroastrian: class of 1991. First Jain: class of 1996.]	Only 4 of ~10 classes represented. Form now voluntary — no completion rate stated.		
2000s	Records found for this decade only represent the classes of 2005-2008. [First Pagan/Wiccan: class of 2006.]	Only 4 of ~10 classes represented (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008). 2001–2004 and 2009 missing.		
2010s	Statistics in this graph represent the classes of 2010-2020 (11 years total). [First Sikh: class of 2012.]	Most complete decade — all 11 years present. Form voluntary throughout; no completion/response rate published anywhere on this page.		
2020s (2021–2024)	No methodology note provided for this decade on the source page.	Year-by-year granularity. No response rate, completion rate, or notes about optional/mandatory status. ⚠ 2023 'Indigenous Traditions' = 11.00% — almost certainly a data entry error (all other years: 0.08–0.23%).		

FIGURE 6 LEFT PANEL — WNJ Verification (Uniform 2013-14, Pew+Domestic Adj)

LEFT PANEL ONLY. Uniform 2013-14 CDS White, Pew 90%-adj, domestic-only. DIFFERENT from STK_3. STK_3 Princeton uses 2001-02 — correct for J/WNJ ratio only, NOT Figure 6 left panel.

SECTION A — INPUTS (CDS White% + IPEDS Intl%)

School	Raw White Base%	Intl Base%	Dom White Base%	Raw White Curr%	Intl Curr%	Dom White Curr%	CDS Year
Harvard	44.8%	13.0%	51.5%	29.9%	17.4%	36.2%	2013-14
Yale	47.3%	12.6%	54.1%	31.2%	12.0%	35.5%	2013-14
Princeton	47.1%	10.9%	52.9%	33.7%	11.9%	38.2%	2013-14

SECTION B — WNJ CALCULATION

School	Jewish Base%	W-Jewish Base (×0.9)	WNJ Base	Jewish Curr%	W-Jewish Curr (×0.9)	WNJ Curr	pp Change
Harvard	14.0%	12.6%	**38.9%**	7.1%	6.4%	**29.8%**	**-9.1%**
Yale	16.4%	14.8%	**39.4%**	9.5%	8.6%	**26.9%**	**-12.4%**
Princeton	10.5%	9.5%	**43.4%**	9.9%	8.9%	**29.3%**	**-14.1%**

⚑ STK_3 Princeton: 2001-02 White (66.2%) → WNJ 56.75% = CORRECT for J/WNJ ratio. NOT for Figure 6 left panel. This tab: 2013-14 White (47.1%) → WNJ 43.4% for Figure 6 left panel only.

FIGURE 4 — CRIMSON SERIES: Data Points, Cluster Averages & Label Corrections

Connect ALL points — do NOT smooth. Early avg line: C/O 2017-2019 only. Late avg line: C/O 2023-2027 only. C/O 2020, 2021, 2022 between clusters — NOT in either avg line.

SECTION 1 — INDIVIDUAL DATA POINTS

Class Year	Entry Fall	Jewish %	Cluster	YoY Change	Notes	Chart Label
2017	2013	9.5%	EARLY	—		
2018	2014	9.8%	EARLY	+0.3 pp		
2019	**2015**	**10.1%**	**EARLY**	**+0.3 pp**	**PEAK**	
2020	**2016**	**6.3%**	**—**	**−3.8 pp**	**STEEPEST DROP**	**"Steepest drop Class of 2020"**
2021	2017	7.7%	—	+1.4 pp	Partial recovery	
2022	2018	5.4%	—	−2.3 pp	Between clusters — not in either avg	
2023	2019	5.3%	LATE	−0.1 pp		
2024	2020	5.2%	LATE	−0.1 pp	Series low	
2025	**2021**	**7.4%**	**LATE**	**+2.2 pp**	**ANOMALOUS SPIKE — does not hold**	
2027	2023	5.4%	LATE	−2.0 pp	Most recent; no 2026 survey	

SECTION 2 — CLUSTER AVERAGES (horizontal reference lines on chart)

Cluster	Classes Included	Values	Average	Avg Line Spans	Chart Label	Decline
EARLY	**)17, 2018, 20**	**%, 9.8%, 10.**	**9.80%**	**C/O 2017 → C/O 2019 only**	**AVG 9.8%**	**—**
LATE	**, 2024, 2025,**	**5.2%, 7.4%,**	**5.82%**	**C/O 2023 → C/O 2027 only**	**AVG 5.8%**	**−40.6%**

SECTION 3 — LABEL CORRECTIONS

Item	RONG (curre	CORRECT	Reason			
Steepest drop label	**Class of 2021**	**Class of 2020**	3.8 pp drop was 2019→2020. C/O 2021 was recovery to 7.7%.			
Early period label	**Classes 2017–2020**	**Classes 2017–2019**	9.8% correct for 2017-19 only. Including 2020 gives 8.9%.			
Late period label	**Classes 2022–2027**	**Classes 2023–2027**	5.8% correct for 2023-27 only. Including 2022 gives 5.7%.			