

Chapter 1 : Affirmative Action: Court Decisions

Jul 03, Â· Race-based affirmative action has been losing support in the United States for some time with other "colorblind" methods of admissions gaining ground. But there are still compelling arguments.

History[edit] This section may be confusing or unclear to readers. In particular, it contains a very long narrative account without clear organization. Please help us clarify the section. There might be a discussion about this on the talk page. June This article may be too long to read and navigate comfortably. Please consider splitting content into sub-articles, condensing it, or adding or removing subheadings. June Origins[edit] Ideas for what we now call affirmative action came as early as the Reconstruction Era " in which a former slave population lacked the skills and resources for independent living. Nearly a century later "s , the discussion of policies to assist classes of individuals reemerged during the Civil Rights Movement. Civil rights guarantees that came through the interpretation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment affirmed the civil rights of people of color. Agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board were empowered to require employers found in violation of employment policies to take "affirmative action" on behalf of the victim s of those violations, such as reinstatement or back pay. Kennedy became the first to utilize the term "affirmative action" in its contemporary sense in Executive Order to ensure that government contractors "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin. This executive order was eventually amended and superseded by Lyndon B. In , the order was amended to include sex as well. The Wagner Act allowed workers to unionize without fear of being discriminated against, and empowered a National Labor Relations Board to review potential cases of worker discrimination. Ickes prohibited discrimination in hiring for Public Works Administration funded projects and oversaw not only the institution of a quota system, where contractors were required to employ a fixed percentage of Black workers, by Robert C. Weaver and Clark Foreman , [24]: I had no idea it was as terrible as that. The book was widely read, influential, and considered utopian for the times: From these very differences among our people has come the great human and national strength of America. The committee was disturbed by the state of race relations, and included the evacuation of Americans of Japanese descent during the war "made without a trial or any sort of hearing"Fundamental to our whole system of law is the belief that guilt is personal and not a matter of heredity or association. The plan opposed all segregation in the new post-war Armed Forces: It consisted of ten objectives that Congress should focus on when enacting legislation. Truman concluded by saying, "If we wish to inspire the peoples of the world whose freedom is in jeopardy, if we wish to restore hope to those who have already lost their civil liberties, if we wish to fulfill the promise that is ours, we must correct the remaining imperfections in our practice of democracy. His speech was a significant departure from traditional race relations in the United States. In front of 10, people at the Lincoln Memorial , the president left no doubt where he stood on civil rights. And again I mean all Americans. Executive Order and Executive Order Executive Order , named Regulations Governing for Employment Practices within the Federal Establishment, instituted fair employment practices in the civilian agencies of the federal government. The order created the position of Fair Employment Officer. Eisenhower When Eisenhower was elected President in after defeating Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson, he believed hiring practices and anti-discrimination laws should be decided by the states, although the administration gradually continued to desegregate the Armed Forces and the federal government. Kennedy In the presidential election , Democratic candidate and eventual winner John F. Kennedy "criticized President Eisenhower for not ending discrimination in federally supported housing" and "advocated a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission ". The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin". Federal contractors who failed to comply or violated the executive order were punished by contract cancellation and the possible debarment from future government contracts. The administration was "not demanding any special preference or treatment or quotas for minorities" but was rather "advocating racially neutral hiring to end job discrimination". The commission was

charged with "examining employment policies and practices of the government and of contractors" with regard to sex. The order supplemented to his previous executive order declaring it was the "policy of the United States to encourage by affirmative action the elimination of discrimination in employment". Johnson , the Texan Democrat and Senate Majority Leader from 1961-64, began to consider running for high office, and in doing so showed how his racial views differed from those held by many White Americans in the traditional South. In 1964, Johnson brokered a civil rights act through Congress. The commission was empowered to investigate allegations of minority deprivation of rights. He wanted a phrase that "gave a sense of positivity to performance under the order. The term "active recruitment" started to be used as well. This order, albeit heavily worked up as a significant piece of legislation, in reality carried little actual power. Lockheed was doing business with the Defense Department on the first billion-dollar contract. However, these plans were just that, voluntary. Many corporations in the South, still afflicted with Jim Crow laws , largely ignored the federal recommendations. This document was more holistic than any President Kennedy had offered, and therefore more controversial. It aimed not only to integrate public facilities, but also private businesses that sold to the public, such as motels, restaurants, theaters, and gas stations. Public schools, hospitals, libraries, parks, among other things, were included in the bill as well. Many conservatives accused it of advocating a de facto quota system, and claimed unconstitutionality as it attempts to regulate the workplace. Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey corrected this notion: He pledged that the bill required no quotas, just nondiscrimination. Richard Nixon The strides that the Johnson presidency made in ensuring equal opportunity in the workforce were further picked up by his successor Richard Nixon. In 1970, the Nixon administration initiated the " Philadelphia Order ". It was regarded as the most forceful plan thus far to guarantee fair hiring practices in construction jobs. Philadelphia was selected as the test case because, as Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur Fletcher explained, "The craft unions and the construction industry are among the most egregious offenders against equal opportunity laws. The plan was defined as "racial goals and timetables, not quotas" [24]: Gerald Ford After the Nixon administration, advancements in affirmative action became less prevalent. People began to look at affirmative action as a glorified issue of the past and now there were other areas that needed focus. Due to changes made in American society and governmental policies the United States is past the traditional assumptions of race relations. Barack Obama After the election and inauguration of Barack Obama in the election, a huge excitement swept the nation for the first African-American president of the United States. Many supporters and citizens began to hope for a future with affirmative action that would be secure under a black president. In 2003, education statistics denote the problems of college admissions in the US: Additionally, in an indirect manner, the Obama administration aimed to garner support for more federal money and funds to be allocated to financial aid and scholarships to universities and colleges within the United States. University of Texas where the Supreme Court decision which endorses "the use of affirmative action to achieve a diverse student body so long as programs are narrowly tailored to advance this goal. Donald Trump The Trump administration in its early years grappled with legislation and policies pertaining to affirmative action. The guidelines the administration set were aimed to curb a Supreme Court decision called Fisher vs. University of Texas at Austin. Recently, the public has been exposed to not just questions on the oppression and discrimination against African-Americans in education, but also Asian-Americans. In a lawsuit against Harvard University, the suit claims that the exclusive university is actively discriminating against Asian-Americans in their decision process. The Trump administration, amidst its current battle with the stance of affirmative, has backed the lawsuit possibly in hopes of winning over Asian-American support for the Republican Party. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. September 1961 Executive Order , [39] issued by President Kennedy Established the concept of affirmative action by mandating that projects financed with federal funds "take affirmative action" to ensure that hiring and employment practices are free of racial bias. Executive Order and Executive Order The Johnson administration embraced affirmative action in 1961, by issuing U. S Executive order , later amended by Executive order The order, as amended, aims "to correct the effects of past and present discrimination". It prohibits federal contractors and subcontractors from discriminating against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, skin color, religion, gender,

or national origin. The order requires that contractors take affirmative action to ensure that "protected class, underutilized applicants" are employed when available, and that employees are treated without negative discriminatory regard to their protected-class status. The order specifically requires certain organizations accepting federal funds to take affirmative action to increase employment of members of preferred racial or ethnic groups and women. This plan must include goals and timetables for achieving full utilization of women and members of racial minorities, in quotas based on an analysis of the current workforce compared to the availability in the general labor pool of women and members of racial minorities. Duke Power Company U. Duke Power Company was a court case in December and was ruled in favor of the prosecutor in March. When compared to white candidates, African-Americans were accepted far less for positions. It was found that Whites that had been working the jobs who fulfilled neither requirement did it just as well as those who did. The Supreme Court ruled that under title VII of the Civil Rights Act that if the requirements were impeding minorities, the business had to demonstrate that the tests were necessary for the job. However, Justice Lewis F.

Chapter 2 : What Can We Learn from States That Ban Affirmative Action?

Nov 03, Â· Affirmative action is not about discrimination. It is about allowing colleges and universities to gauge potential when circumstances haven't allowed a young person to reach their potential yet.

Current Case Fisher v. Texas In , several high school seniors who had been denied admission at the University of Texas-Austin filed a lawsuit. The students argued that the University of Texas could not use race as a factor in admission processes if there were other race-neutral options that would have the same results on diversity. A federal district judge found in favor of the University of Texas, stating that the University had complied with the admission requirements laid out in Grutter v. Thus, the court decided that while race neutral options had been considered, these options were not a viable way for the University of Texas system to maintain and increase diversity. In January , a three-judge panel of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals heard the case and upheld the ruling in favor of the University of Texas. In June , the full court decided not to rehear the lawsuit, letting the decision of the three-member panel stand. Supreme Court agreed to hear the case in February In a Fischer I ruling released June , the Court did not overturn affirmative action generally, but did emphasize that affirmative action programs need to be more strictly reviewed. The Court explained that the program must pass a test of "strict scrutiny," proving an absence of alternatives that do not include race as a means to diversify the student body. Supreme Court ruled that using racial quotas in college admission decisions violated the Equal Protection Clause. Constitution, affirms that "no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. In a direct challenge to the Bakke decision, the U. Court of Appeals ruled in the Hopwood v. Texas case that race could not be a factor in admission decisions. The defendant, the state of Texas, appealed the decision to the Supreme Court, but the appeal was refused. Similarly, in the Johnson v. University of Georgia case, the U. The court ruled that adding a fixed number of points to the admission score of every non-white applicant is not an appropriate mechanism for achieving diversity. In and , two lawsuits challenged the constitutionality of using race in the admission processes at the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Law School. In , Jennifer Gratz was denied admission to the University of Michigan undergraduate program, and a year later Barbara Grutter was rejected from the University of Michigan Law School. Both plaintiffs argued that their academic credentials and extracurricular activities should have awarded them a spot at the University. The University of Michigan argued that its admission criteria were constitutional, and that the policies fostered a racially and ethnically diverse student body. In , the U. Supreme Courtruled in the Gratz v. Bollinger case that the point system used by the University of Michigan for undergraduate admissions was unconstitutional. The admissions policy was based on points, and it awarded points based on items such as race 20 points , athletic ability 20 points , depth of essay up to 3 points , leadership and service up to 5 points and personal achievement up to 5 points. The point system, therefore, automatically awarded admission points to underrepresented minorities. In the majority decision, Chief Justice Rehnquist stated that the University of Michigan had violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment by using an overly mechanized system as a way to include race in admission decisions. Bollinger case of was also decided in In a vote, the U. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger rulings are regarded as the most important since the Bakke decision. Most colleges and universities had previously followed the guidelines set forth by Bakke, stating that diversity is an integral component to a successful institution. The rulings also abrogated the Hopwood v. Texas ruling, thus permitting colleges in Texas and other states under the Fifth Circuit jurisdiction to reinstate affirmative action policies. Ramsay In , a case against the University of Maryland School of Medicine was filed on the grounds of admission discrimination. The plaintiff, Rob Farmer, had been denied admission to the School of Medicine. Farmer held that his grades and test scores were higher than those grades and test scores of accepted black students. The two schools, both historically black institutions, were encouraged to spend up to one million dollars per year to attract white students and diversify their student bodies. Jessie Tompkins and three other plaintiffs filed a case against the white-only scholarship program after being denied program funds. In , in the wake of a case settlement, Alabama State University changed the official language of the scholarship program, making it

racially inclusive. However, Tompkins rejected the settlement, arguing that changing the program language was not sufficient, as the program could still operate in a discriminatory manner. The case was later merged with a larger desegregation case.

Chapter 3 : Affirmative Action | Overview

Affirmative action, also known as reservation in India and Nepal, positive action in the UK, and employment equity (in a narrower context) in Canada and South Africa, is the policy of promoting the education and employment of members of groups that are known to have previously suffered from discrimination.

Education Program Affirmative action policies are those in which an institution or organization actively engages in efforts to improve opportunities for historically excluded groups in American society. Affirmative action policies often focus on employment and education. In institutions of higher education, affirmative action refers to admission policies that provide equal access to education for those groups that have been historically excluded or underrepresented, such as women and minorities. Controversy surrounding the constitutionality of affirmative action programs has made the topic one of heated debate. In 1961, President Kennedy was the first to use the term "affirmative action" in an Executive Order that directed government contractors to take "affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin. Affirmative action policies initially focused on improving opportunities for African Americans in employment and education. Board of Education decision in outlawing school segregation and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 improved life prospects for African Americans. In 1968, however, only five percent of undergraduate students, one percent of law students, and two percent of medical students in the country were African American. President Lyndon Johnson, an advocate for affirmative action, signed an Executive Order in 1961 that required government contractors to use affirmative action policies in their hiring to increase the number of minority employees. In the following years, colleges and universities began adopting similar recruitment policies, and over time the enrollment rates for African American and Latino students increased steadily. According to data from the National Center on Education Statistics NCES, in 1975, 70 percent of white high school graduates immediately enrolled in college, compared to 56 percent of African American graduates and 61 percent of Hispanic graduates. The updated report finds that in 2003, 69 percent of white high school graduates immediately enrolled in college, compared to 65 percent of African American graduates and 63 percent of Hispanic graduates. The Affirmative Action Debate The use of race as a factor in the college admissions process has been, and continues to be, a hotly debated topic. Supporters of affirmative action make the following arguments: Affirmative action is more of a process than just an admissions policy. Colleges and universities reach out to groups that are underrepresented and urge students to apply. Institutions often offer financial aid to underrepresented students and provide on-campus support programs to improve their academic success. Affirmative action programs have resulted in doubling or tripling the number of minority applications to colleges or universities, and have made colleges and universities more representative of their surrounding community. Statistics show that after California abolished its affirmative action programs in 1996, the minority student admissions at UC Berkeley fell 61 percent, and minority admissions at UCLA fell 36 percent. Graduates who benefited from affirmative action programs say that they have received better jobs, earned more money, and ultimately are living better lives because of the opportunity they received. Diversity in higher education provides an educational advantage for all students, both personally and intellectually. We exist in a global, multicultural society, and in order to achieve success, employers and employees must be able to work effectively with the diverse society that surrounds them. Affirmative action policies are necessary in order to compensate for centuries of racial, social, and economic oppression. Generally, individuals with higher socioeconomic status have more opportunities than those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Supporters believe that certain racial or ethnic groups are disadvantaged because they are frequently in lower income brackets and consequently are not exposed to the same resources as students from higher socioeconomic classes. Affirmative action was created to ensure fair admission practices and to rectify a long period of racial discrimination. The policy is outdated, however, and causes a form of reverse discrimination by favoring one group over another, based on racial preference rather than academic achievement. Further, there is concern that minority groups may be stigmatized and treated differently by peers and professors who may believe that the success of minority groups in higher education

institutions is unearned. Likewise, the programs may be illegal under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color or national origin by recipients of federal financial assistance. Affirmative action policies lower standards and make students less accountable. If standards for test scores, grade point average, etc. Affirmative action policies do not necessarily help economically disadvantaged students. A study by the Hoover Institution found that affirmative action tends to benefit middle- and upper-class minorities. Many opponents believe that diversity in higher education is extremely important, but that affirmative action only serves to amplify racial prejudice. Because there is no correlation between skin color and intelligence, affirmative action programs are unnecessary. Moreover, affirmative action programs are condescending to the underrepresented groups since it is implied that the groups need affirmative action in order to succeed in higher education. States should focus on other policies or programs that encourage equal opportunity, such as setting high expectations for all students and improving their college readiness.

Chapter 4 : Affirmative action - Wikipedia

Open Future Affirmative action should be based on class, not race. Focusing on the disadvantaged of all races is fairer and more appealing, writes Richard Kahlenberg, a scholar.

Rothstein insists throughout the review that I focus exclusively on low-income African-Americans while ignoring middle class ones. That is not true. As I argue in the book, only about 30 percent of black children live in middle class neighborhoods and not all of these children are poor. As Rothstein himself points out, proximity to poverty is a common, lived experience for African American families of varying incomes. If universities were to follow my proposal of giving special consideration to any high achiever that lives in a neighborhood or goes to a school where 20 percent or more of their peers are poor, this would help the vast majority of black and Latino children who currently suffer the disadvantages of segregation, which is one of the chief contributors to minority achievement gaps. I also argue that any high achiever that comes from low family wealth deserves affirmative action, precisely for the reasons Rothstein identifies, i. I also argue that standardized tests should be optional or not used at all, that financial aid should return to being need based, that legacy preferences should be scrapped and that institutions that are serious about diversity should work with partner organizations like the Posse Foundation and Questbridge that are astute at finding disadvantaged achievers that can do the work at elite institutions. All of these strategies will redound to the benefit of not just poor black achievers but also middle class black achievers. News rankings, a lot more middle class black natives as opposed to advantaged African immigrants would have a shot. I believe I have more confidence than Rothstein does that middle class black students can compete if they can access decent schools, which brings me to my final point. Much more critical to remedying the under-representation of middle class African-Americans than affirmative action is remedying the separate and unequal product they receive in K education. And creating a saner, more cohesive politics is critical to fixing what is wrong with K education. The energy and friction around race-based affirmative action distracts us from the more important work of building cross-racial alliances for fairer public policies that will expand opportunity for struggling people of all colors. Progressives who care about diversity can try to hold on to what remains of race-based affirmative action, or they can work for something more transformative. I think my proposals are more radical, more responsive to the entrenched legacy of racial discrimination, and more unifying than simply using the blunt instrument of race and waiting for the composition of the Supreme Court to change. It is titled *Place, Not Race* because Professor Cashin wants competitive universities to emphasize recruitment of students from a poor place, not students from non-poor neighborhoods who are members of an exploited race. She does, as her letter indicates, say that middle-class students from families with low wealth should also be recruited, but gives no guidance regarding how little wealth might qualify students of all races for such special treatment and, as her book title states, she considers this a lower priority. Her account of this exchange in *Place, Not Race* is worth reproducing verbatim: Garre [the UT lawyer] reasoned: The top ten percent plan admitsâ€. He may have received his dental degree from a historically black university, like Howard or Meharry. He is more likely than the white dentist to be the first generation in his family to have middle-class status. His son may not have graduated in the top ten percent of his class at a mostly white middle-class high school but still has academic qualifications that prepare him to succeed at a selective university like UT, without remediation. Were he not burdened by the ongoing effects of a multi-century, state-sponsored, unconstitutional racial caste system, the son might have been among the more qualified of the qualified and been more certain of regular admission. Such students from middle-class neighborhoods should be the priority in efforts to remedy multi-generational state-sponsored racial caste policy. By contrast, the top ten percent of students from segregated low-income high schools too frequently can succeed at places like UT only with a lot of special attention and remediationâ€”services more appropriately delivered by community colleges and less selective state universities. We have public community colleges and less selective state universities for that purpose, while the mission of selective colleges is to train the academic elite. It is at such competitive places, like the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Michigan, and the University of Texas at Austin,

where controversies over race-based affirmative action have arisen before making their way to the Supreme Court. The challenge faced by conscientious admissions officers at these universities, and others like them, is how to give a nudge to qualified African Americans who, but for the ongoing effects of unconstitutional practices, would have more likely been admitted anyway. A few of these applicants will be found in poor neighborhoods, but many more will be found in middle-class neighborhoods where they attend high schools with relatively higher levels of average academic performance. Affirmative action is the wrong tool for assisting underprivileged students who are not members of this caste. We live in a country with unacceptable levels of economic inequality and with too little inter-generational mobility. The solution to this is not affirmative action but progressive economic policy: Such policies will enable many more students from low-income neighborhoods to succeed in K schools and then in post-secondary education and will make it more likely that in the next generation their own children will become competitive for the most selective colleges. Affirmative action cannot shoulder the entire burden of the fight against American inequality and blocked mobility. Certainly, progressive admissions officers at elite universities should aim for greater diversity, because diversity enriches the educational experience. And they should contribute to efforts to enhance upward mobility by making special efforts to identify qualified students of all races from the lower social classes. But such efforts, while praiseworthy, are voluntary policy choices; unlike affirmative action for African Americans, they are not constitutionally required. As I said in my review, it is necessary for selective colleges to adapt their admissions policies to what the current Court will allow, and this requires pretending to be colorblind while designing subterfuges to increase shares of African American students. My distress about the argument of Sheryll Cashin and her allies is not that they support such accommodations to Supreme Court requirements. The election of a Democratic president in and the retirement of a Republican justice will not, however, guarantee such a return. A new court majority will not proclaim loudly what liberals fear to whisper. Among other arguments, I write: It is quite another to contend, wrongly, that our constitution inherently demands color-blindness. Rothstein and I agree that African-Americans endure a legacy of discrimination and we both support affirmative action, however we have very different perspectives on how it should operate. Twice he has criticized me for advocating for place instead of race as a factor in university admissions, without acknowledging the several other reforms I recommend, strategies that would disproportionately benefit middle-class black achievers. I argue that the lessons of affirmative action—“with its holistic consideration of merit and its de-emphasis of test scores”—should be applied to revolutionize the entire admissions process. Citing the research of Caroline Hoxby, Douglas Massey, and numerous other scholars, I contend that universities must do things differently if they are sincere about finding and including the high achieving students of color who do exist. I also argue that affirmative action should return to its original purpose of remedying discrimination, using accurate modern markers of the legacy of American apartheid: I give both proposals equal billing in my recommendation to replace race. As I write on page Given the strong public opposition to use of race in college admissions and the risk of legal challenges under the tightened Fisher standard, it would make sense to tailor affirmative action to those who are actually disadvantaged by structural barriers. For many but not all black youth, those disadvantages include exposure to concentrated poverty in segregated schools and neighborhoods and low family wealth. Rothstein acknowledges that I support consideration of low family wealth, but skewers me for not being more specific about how I would define it. No book is perfect. My goal was to write an accessible narrative that presents new ideas without being overly prescriptive. I exhort universities to innovate and give special consideration to high achievers that have to overcome structural barriers, particularly the enduring structures of Jim Crow. Rothstein gives me no credit for covering that factor, he must be concerned with something else. On page 79 I write: I think the real source of Mr. With relatively low-cost interventions and a brief orientation, high-achieving students from low opportunity schools who gain entrance to UT by graduating in the top ten percent of their class are able to succeed. Universities must develop better screens for grit. Holding on to race as a factor in admissions, for the benefit of the most advantaged minorities, gives them little incentive to try. Rothstein supports the very elitism and opportunity hoarding that I seek to undermine. As the daughter of a black dentist, a proud Meharrian who taught me to believe in myself and the greatness of the gene pool that survived the Middle Passage and Jim

Crow, I disagree. It is segregation, not black skin, that must be accounted for if America is ever going to atone for its original sins. Many universities will fight over him. At least he is in the game. As I tell my sons in an epilogue letter, they will excel academically if they choose to put in the time. Rothstein also does not acknowledge a growing irony with race-based affirmative action—that its beneficiaries increasingly are immigrants who do not descend from or currently suffer the legacy of Jim Crow. His arch faith in race-based affirmative action as a remedy for native sons suffering in a racial caste system seems misplaced. He offers a litany of public policies that would help disadvantaged people, but those recommendations are useless without a strategy for moving beyond our racially divided, broken politics. Even the liberal Warren Court did not begin to enforce the promise of *Brown v. Board* until a civil rights revolution changed popular sentiments about formal segregation. Public opposition to using race in college admissions will not go away. But most Americans will support strategies that help achievers of all colors overcome unfair structural barriers. Freedom is not free. Racial justice must be won with sweat equity. As I argue in *Place, Not Race*, the logical route to more fairness and equality is overt efforts at reconciliation and coalition building among the rainbow of people currently locked out of the American Dream. This concedes my point. As I documented in the book review, she repeatedly denounces race-based policies throughout. Readers of the book itself can decide whether she, or I, has mischaracterized the argument of *Place, Not Race*. Certainly, high school graduates who are fully qualified for competitive colleges can be found in high poverty communities, and conscientious admissions officers can recruit them. But it is not so that ten percent of such graduates are fully qualified, or that they all or even most are better candidates for selective universities than qualified African Americans who live in middle class neighborhoods. Race-based affirmative action should increase the share of African Americans accepted from this pool of qualified candidates. It should do so because such affirmative action remains needed to remedy the consequences of slavery and Jim Crow, in the absence of which qualified African Americans would not continue to be under-represented on selective campuses.

Chapter 5 : Affirmative action: It's time for liberals to admit it isn't working.

Affirmative Action and People with Disabilities - Explains why people with disabilities should be included in affirmative action programs and what contractors' affirmative action obligations are pertaining to outreach and recruitment of people with disabilities.

Generally, it means giving preferential treatment to minorities in employment, businesses and admission to universities. It was also originally developed to correct years of discrimination and to give boosts to disadvantaged groups. With the diversity of our society today, it seems that the programs coming with the policy have been successful. However, many people already think that it is no longer necessary and that it would lead to problems more than it has solved. While they claim that this move would generate positive results, there are always two sides to every story. So, let us take a closer look at the pros and cons of Affirmative Action.

List of Pros of Affirmative Action 1. It ensures diversity is in place. This policy is a way to make sure that diversity is achieved and maintained in workplaces and schools, thus helping create tolerant communities as it exposes individuals to various ideas and cultures that are different from their own. Diversity is desirable and will not always occur if left to chance. The ability to interact with other nationalities and races should be part of the education process, which can alleviate problems experienced by many students who live very segregated lives. Normally, opinions of other groups of people are based on stereotypes, but interaction would allow students to learn that members opposite races are people too, more or less just like themselves. Since most people desire diversity, it is important to make sure colleges and universities will represent a wide range of backgrounds, but without Affirmative Action, this diversity is much less likely to occur. It will even be possible that schools become segregated like the ones in the past. Elite schools might once again become increasingly dominated by students from majority groups. Take note that diversity is so important, and we cannot leave it to chance. It helps disadvantaged individuals with advancing. Affirmative Action has helped disadvantaged people coming from other parts of the country, where there are not very many opportunities for them, to be able to advance where they otherwise could not. Simply put, the policy gives everyone an equal playing field. It offers a boost to disadvantaged students. Students who started at a disadvantage need a boost, and this policy has made it happen. Generally speaking, these involved mostly minority students. Usually coming from lower-income families, they would have lesser opportunities to attend private schools, unlike white students. However, we should take note that sincere and hard-working minority students are every bit as capable as white students, but because of the disadvantages they experience, they were not having the same paper qualifications. Now Affirmative Action makes sure to even the playing field a bit for these students. It promotes equality for all races. Again, the policy makes sure this does not happen. It breaks stereotypes regarding color. Without Affirmative Action, some stereotypes may never be broken. For many years, black people were considered less capable than whites, and it took the implementation of the policy to give these people the chance to show they are every bit as capable. This and other stereotypes have started to change and will continue to change with the help of this policy. It promotes more work and study. Affirmative Action has drawn people to areas of work and study that they may never consider otherwise. Whether it is women being brought into technology fields, men being brought into nursing or minorities being brought into the Ivy League schools, it is still important to bring all people to all educational or career paths. It is needed to compensate minorities for centuries of slavery or oppression. During the first several centuries in the US, white people were seen enslaving and oppressing Native Americans, black people and other minorities. Now, Affirmative Action is implemented to also provide a way to compensate their descendants for the wrong-doings suffered by their ancestors. It lets minority students get into advanced education. Students with ethnic minority backgrounds need a helping hand to enjoy privileges that are generally ignored by other races. With the policies behind Affirmative Action, all deprived students are encouraged to enter an advanced educational system. It assures equality in the workplace. When implemented inside the workplace, this policy will be the most effective way to ensure the candidates from ethnic groups are provided with the chance to prove themselves as having efficient capabilities as the candidates from other races. It offers protection from

hatred. Though nothing can shield every individual from all the hatred they would encounter in life, Affirmative Action can at least help tremendously by enforcing strict and even harsh punishments on anyone who is found guilty of personal assault due to race, gender or sexual orientation. The law makes many people think twice before committing an act that is filled with hatred or violence. List of Cons of Affirmative Action 1. It can serve as a reverse discrimination. Primarily, Affirmative Action was designed to end unfair treatment and discrimination of anyone based on color, but in effect, it has done the opposite. White people who are more qualified and are working harder can be passed over strictly because of their color. Contrary to the usual stereotypes, many groups under the minorities have fallen into the middle or upper class, while many white people are now living in poverty. Looking at the way things are set up now, a poverty-stricken white student who uses hard work and discipline to become the best could unfortunately be passed over by a rich minority student who is not putting much effort at all. This definitely does not justify the past discrimination against certain minority groups. It destroys the idea of a meritocracy. Based on its current set-up, Affirmative Action has put race as the dominant factor in employee recruitment and school admission procedures, where it is believed that the best people for certain positions should be put there, regardless of color and race. It can still reinforce stereotypes and racism. People who are given a position solely based on the stipulations of this policy are often not qualified, and the idea that all people under that race are all not qualified is perpetuated. Plus, Affirmative Action presupposes that all people having the same color of skin are from the lower class, therefore needing help. It can generate unfavorable results for businesses and schools. As previously stated, workers and students, who are put into a position through this policy, are often not fully ready for the task. This can be bad not only for the business or school, but also for these workers and students themselves, as self-esteem will be lowered. Take into consideration an AA Minor League baseball player to be suddenly asked to bat cleanup in the majors or a high school science fair contestant to be suddenly asked to take a job for rocket science at NASA. Of course, there is possibility that they will be successful, but it is more likely that they are just being over their heads. Also, educational institutions, such as Yale and Harvard, employ high SAT and GPA requirements, and forcing them to lower standards to achieve a minority quota can make it difficult for some students to keep up. This does not imply that minority students are less capable, but points out that those students who do not meet these requirements are probably not prepared to take on challenges they are not qualified to face. In fact, the far-lower graduation rate of minorities can prove that they are too often going to schools that do not match their abilities. It can lower the accountability standards that are needed to push employees and students to perform better. Though some workers and students are self-motivated, an extra push or incentive is needed for most people to do their best. By setting lower hiring or school admission standards, the level of accountability is also lowered. It is important to reward discipline, hard work and achievement, to not do it simply because a student is a member of a certain race, nor punish him because he is not. It has a flaw with regards to diversity. Simply having different people at a workplace or university does not necessarily mean diversity of opinion is achieved. Remember that people with the same color do not necessarily have the same opinion or even culture. It would help lead a truly color-blind society. When you are applying for a job or filling out a college application, are you often asked about things, such as skin, hair and eye color, as well as height? Probably, never—unless, it is for an athletic or modeling position. This is because these details do not have any effect on your ability to do a job or succeed at school. There is no association between these details and discipline, intelligence, ambition, character and other essentials, rendering such information useless. It demeans true minority achievement. A good example of this is the success labeled as result of Affirmative Action, instead of ability and hard work. Taking into consideration influential figures, such as Barack Obama, Condi Rice, Oprah Winfrey, Colin Powell and Herman Cain, do you think they have gotten to where they are now through such a policy, or hard work? All of them achieved success through hard work, and because they are articulate and bright. The same thing can be said of minority lawyers, doctors, business leaders and other professionals. Their achievements are too often demeaned by other people who believe they got their positions through preferential treatment. As a result, minority groups would then work harder to earn respect. It can be condescending to minorities. This is true when people say minority groups need Affirmative Action to succeed. It is difficult to remove, even after discrimination issues

have been eliminated. Times change, where society will learn and grow, and racism can dissolve over time. Even race extortionists had admitted that the US is already worlds ahead of where it was in the s. Discrimination has become a thing of the past in almost all areas of the country. But still, a lot of Affirmative Action policies are remaining in place, even when the majority of citizens would agree that they are no longer necessary. Unfortunately, legislators are moving slowly and are haggling over everything. It is really difficult for them to get multiple branches of the government and hundreds of people to agree on anything. Plus, the agenda of politicians often do not match of those of the people, and special interest groups and corruption can influence government officials into inaction. Conclusion The government, as a whole, maintains a position somewhere in the middle with regards to issue on keeping or removing Affirmative Action. The policy still remains supported by the federal government and is legal everywhere in the country, except for Texas and California where other policies have been adopted. On your end, do you think the policy is still viable based on the pros and cons listed above?

Chapter 6 : Affirmative Action | Definition of Affirmative Action by Merriam-Webster

Affirmative action in the United States is a set of laws, policies, guidelines, and administrative practices "intended to end and correct the effects of a specific form of discrimination."

The only question is whether or not the hammer is big enough! Then, in the course of writing a book about the history of the color line and our efforts to erase it, I took a closer look at the origins of affirmative action, and its results. Advertisement In part because of recent Supreme Court cases like Fisher v. Texas , the current national conversation about affirmative action has focused mostly on its use in college admissions, but my focus here will be on affirmative action in the white-collar workplace, the failure of which I observed up close during my years in the advertising industry. Race-conscious policies in college admissions and corporate hiring are different creatures, with different pros and cons, but I came to see that they also share some common, troubling flaws. Proponents of affirmative action tend to glorify the program by lumping it in with the great liberal victories of the civil rights movement. Advertisement But neither Kennedy nor Johnson ever implemented anything resembling what we now describe as affirmative actionâ€™i. So while the great liberal crusade of the s produced victories in the area of civil rights, it did little in the way of producing actual jobs for black Americans; in some states, black unemployment under Kennedy and Johnson actually went up, hence the frustration that exploded in the urban riots of Watts, Newark, and elsewhere. When Vietnam forced Johnson out of office, the task of implementing a program of reparative economic justice for the victims of slavery and segregation fell to our 37th president, Richard Milhous Nixon. That Richard Nixon was racist is well beyond disputeâ€™he believed that, moral objections to abortion aside, the practice was justified in the case of mixed-race pregnancies. Asians are smart and industrious. Jews are crafty but lack moral fiber, and so on. The president was quite generous on the subject of what black people were good at: You look at the World Series. What would Pittsburgh be without a hell of a lot of blacks? Nixon just had a limited opinion of what blacks were capable of earning. The way in which affirmative action was implemented speaks volumes about the motivations behind it. Prior to the Philadelphia Plan, under Kennedy and Johnson, affirmative action had always meant to take affirmative action to ensure discrimination was not taking place. Now, affirmative action meant imposing racial preferences and quotas. After its launch in Philadelphia, the program was rolled out in dozens of other cities nationwide. In the meantime, the White House was busy stuffing racial-preference policies into the federal bureaucracy wherever it could find room. In the spring of , Nixon expanded affirmative action mandates from government procurement contracts and applied them to any institution that received any federal funds of any kind, which brought universities, research institutionsâ€™basically everyoneâ€™into the fold. Then Nixon issued Executive Order , which called for affirmative action in all government employment, bringing huge numbers of black workers onto the federal payroll. Racial preferences, as we know them today, were now sewn into the fabric of the country. Nixon departing for the Republican National Convention, August Photo courtesy Jack E. Blacks had always enjoyed relatively better employment prospects in the public sector, and affirmative action greatly enhanced that. By the early s, 57 percent of black male college graduates and 72 percent of black female college graduates were employed in government positions. The private sector also went on a hiring binge. Impelled by the fear of more urban riots, the Fortune launched a flotilla of affirmative action programs aimed at getting as many black hires in the door as quickly as possible. While they never embraced Nixon, black Americans and their white liberal champions fell in love with quotas and set-asides. Many of the moderate and liberal Republicans in the White House had faith in affirmative action, too. Even some conservatives were on board. Prominent Nixon-supporter William F. The president, however, felt differently. Vietnam, China, the Soviet Unionâ€™these were his main preoccupations. Staunch opposition to school busing and fair housing would appease suburban white voters. Given the immediate positive impact that affirmative action had, it was perfectly reasonable for liberals to want to believe that it could be, at long last, an answer to economic discrimination and structural inequality. For starters, the quotas and mandates put in place were almost comically easy to evade. The skilled labor unions required to admit blacks engaged in practices known as checkerboarding putting all the black hires on

government-contracted job sites while ignoring the quotas everywhere else and motorcycling shuffling black hires from job site to job site depending on where federal inspectors were slated to show up. Quotas may have seemed like a positive development, and they did produce some jobs, but they also turned black employment into a numbers game—and gave employers a way to game the numbers. Advertisement Affirmative action in state, local, and federal government offered decent jobs with decent wages, but the side effect of all this government hiring was to relieve the white collar private sector from having to truly confront the issue in its own staffing. Again, these were decent jobs with decent wages, but they diverted blacks from the business units where real decisions were made. Affirmative action offered the illusion of reparative justice wrapped up in the rhetoric of empowerment, but its net result was to absorb and neutralize black demands for equality, not fulfill them. Haldeman and John D. Ehrlichman aboard Air Force One in Photo courtesy Oliver F. And it was squarely at this group that he aimed his policies. Advertisement For the unemployed black male teenager, Nixon had a very different social program to offer. Did millions of people do well under affirmative action? A bribe only works if you actually give somebody something. While some black people used quotas and set-asides as a foothold to climb into genuine positions of power, the effect of affirmative action overall was to funnel upwardly mobile blacks into a separate employment pipeline where their aspirations were held in check, where they exercised very little authority, and where their progress depended on government intervention. Thanks to affirmative action, the black middle class was now vested in the very system the civil rights revolution had sought to overthrow. When affirmative action was first implemented, it was not met with a broad backlash from white America. Liberals, who had once disdained racial quotas as being antithetical to true liberty and justice, embraced them for the short-term leverage they provided. Republicans, once in favor of set asides and preferences as a cheap and easy solution for appeasing blacks, now saw them as a wedge issue useful for stirring up disaffected whites. Then Ronald Reagan was elected president and started undermining racial preferences just as quickly as Richard Nixon had put them in place. But of course Reagan started rolling back affirmative action. Affirmative action was created by the Republican establishment to protect the Republican establishment. Once that group felt protected, once it was Morning in America and the riots had been reduced to occasional flare-ups in Liberty City and Crown Heights, affirmative action had largely fulfilled its purpose: Blacks had been pacified enough that their needs could be safely ignored. So why not start winding it down? The problem with winding it down was that black Americans were now invested in it, had banked their hopes on it. By embracing affirmative action as a solution to economic disparity, the liberal establishment encouraged black Americans to double down on something that was never intended to close the economic gap in the first place. This report tracks every interaction that takes place between that company and minority job candidates: All of this information is diligently, exhaustively compiled. Then nobody reads it. In a good year they review around 4 percent of these AAP filings. Of that, they investigate less than 1 percent. The best example of this is the industry that dominates so much of our economy today: If you were around that culture, you became a part of it. And because of the social segregation that pervades our society, very few black people were around to be a part of it. Some would purport to remedy this by fixing the tech industry job pipeline: The big success stories of the Internet age—Instagram, YouTube, Twitter—all came about in similar ways: The process is organic, somewhat accidental, and it moves really, really fast. A system has to have rules in order for authorities to make sure that those rules are being applied fairly to people of color. The legal profession is very mature. It has lots of rules. Municipal labor unions have rules. Affirmative action treats workplace discrimination like a bureaucratic, process-based problem. In reality, workplace discrimination stems from a very nebulous social and cultural problem. Only social and cultural integration can do that—the kind of integration Nixon opposed while he was advancing affirmative action. Steve Jobs in Unlike the Hobbesian state of nature that is the 21st-century job market, college admissions are a methodical, bureaucratic process where the special circumstances of minority students can be given extra weight and duly monitored for enforcement. But does collegiate affirmative action, like its workplace cousin, just come too late in the game? In his memoir *Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby*, Yale Law professor Stephen Carter—who describes himself as both a beneficiary and a victim of racial preferences—makes a sound argument. If a 5-year-old from a disadvantaged background is given a leg-up to get into a good

elementary school, that is not likely to be a stigma he will carry around as an adult”and you really have to try hard to begrudge helping out a 5-year-old. It serves as a diminishment of her talent and hard work. As much as affirmative action might help her get a foot in the door, it becomes a burden she has to carry from that day forward. Starting young would also likely increase the effectiveness of affirmative action. Those gaps get wider with each passing year, as privileged kids get greater access to pre-K and extra tutoring until, come college application time, the gaps have become chasms. That hardly seems like a solution. Affirmative action becomes more contentious, more stigmatizing, harder to enforce, and less effective the older its purported beneficiaries are. You integrate the workplace by integrating the high school cafeteria. Or, better yet, the elementary school playground. Affirmative action remains exactly what Richard Nixon said it was. Today, the statistics on black and white inequality are so unchanging that they can be recited by rote: The black unemployment rate holds steady at double the white unemployment rate; the median net worth for black households is about 7 percent of white households; annual per capita income for blacks is 62 cents for every dollar of per capita income for whites. Nixon achieved exactly what he set out to do.

Chapter 7 : Affirmative action in the United States - Wikipedia

Affirmative action is a set of public policies that were designed for the elimination of discrimination toward race, color, sex, etc. These policies are under attack today because of the unfairness toward the more qualified people.

June 26, Senior Fellow Race-based affirmative action has faced a number of legal challenges over the past two decades. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action that voters have the right to decide on issues of affirmative action in their state. For university leaders who have relied on race-based affirmative action as their main tool for promoting diversity on campus, this is troubling. In all likelihood, more universities will be sued for their consideration of race in admissions, and more states will decide to ban affirmative action. The silver lining is that universities forced with finding new paths to higher education diversity can look to public universities in states that have already banned race-based affirmative action for a useful roadmap to navigate this challenge. States That Ban Affirmative Action Eight states currently ban race-based affirmative action at all public universities. California, Washington, Michigan, Nebraska, Arizona, and Oklahoma all passed bans through voter referenda. In Florida, Governor Jeb Bush issued an executive order creating the ban. And in New Hampshire, the legislature passed a bill banning the consideration of race. Together, these eight states educate 29 percent of all U. In addition, Texas had a ban in place from to based on a lower court order. And the University of Georgia voluntarily dropped consideration of race based on lower court challenges and made the change permanent. Together, all ten of these states offer data on what happens when universities are forced to pursue diversity without considering race. Promising New Diversity Strategies In nearly all of these states, public flagship universities responded to the bans on affirmative action by implementing new methods of promoting racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity on campus. Here are the top five strategies they used: Creating Percent Plans Texas, California, and Florida all created programs to guarantee admission to public colleges for top graduates from each high school in the state. At their most basic level, these programs generate geographic diversity. But since high schools are frequently segregated by class and race, percent plans also create socioeconomic and racial diversity by opening the door to graduates from under-resourced high schools. These are students who may never before have considered attending a major research university. And the university gives a leg up to students who faced disadvantages but showed impressive academic performance in light of those challenges. Funding New Financial Aid Programs Financial aid is a crucial ingredient in supporting low-income students once enrolled, and comparing aid packages can be an important factor as students decide where to enroll. A number of states created new financial aid policies to increase support for low-income students, encouraging them to apply. In Nebraska, for example, the Collegebound Nebraska program now offers free tuition at any of the University of Nebraska campuses for all Nebraska residents who are Pell Grant recipients and maintain a full-time enrollment with a minimum GPA. Improving Recruitment and Support Universities also increased outreach and support for low-income students. The University of Florida, for example, created a special program to reach out to first-generation students , who are the first in their families to attend college, and encourage them to apply. The university also supports them once enrolled, giving them full scholarships with no loans and running special leadership and mentoring programs. Dropping Legacy Preferences Legacy preferences, which give a leg up to children of alumni, disproportionately benefit white, wealthy applicantsâ€”indirectly harming the admissions chances of disadvantaged applicants. Colleges Are Seeing Results The most basic test of these new strategies is seeing if they produced at least as much racial and ethnic diversity on campus as the race-based affirmative action programs they replaced. Based on my analysis , at 7 out of 11 public flagship universities for which data was available, enrollment of African American and Latino students under race-neutral admissions reached or exceed the level seen in the year before the ban. This is good news. The silver lining of increasing obstacles to race-based considerations is that colleges have been forced to look at socioeconomic status, which is an important factor in disadvantage and diversity that admissions offices have largely overlooked in the past. At the University of Texas at Austin , for example, the percent plan has made huge strides in bringing low-income and middle-class students to campus. If more states or universities face bans on affirmative action,

colleges can borrow and adapt the successful admissions, financial aid, and recruitment strategies developed and implemented by universities that were forced to build diversity without directly considering race. Better yet, colleges can implement some of these strategies proactively, on top of any existing race-based plans. They will also be prepared in case race-based affirmative action is outlawed in their state. And they will benefit immediately from a broader conception of diversity on campus.

Chapter 8 : Affirmative Action, Race or Class: An Exchange

Race-based affirmative action has faced a number of legal challenges over the past two decades. After the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Fisher v. University of Texas, colleges must demonstrate they are using race in admissions only when "necessary," meaning no other methods could produce the same results.

Affirmative action in China There is affirmative action in education for minority nationalities. This may equate to lowering minimum requirements for the National University Entrance Examination, which is a mandatory exam for all students to enter university. Israel[edit] A class-based affirmative action policy was incorporated into the admission practices of the four most selective universities in Israel during the early to mids. In evaluating the eligibility of applicants, neither their financial status nor their national or ethnic origins are considered. The emphasis, rather, is on structural disadvantages, especially neighborhood socioeconomic status and high school rigor, although several individual hardships are also weighed. This policy made the four institutions, especially the echelons at the most selective departments, more diverse than they otherwise would have been. In the negotiation for status as worthy peers, emphasizing gender signals that a woman is an "imposter", someone who does not rightfully belong in the position she is claiming to fill. This suggests that affirmative action can have applications for different groups in Israel. Reservation in India Reservation in India is a form of affirmative action designed to improve the well-being of backward and under-represented communities defined primarily by their caste. Malaysia provides affirmative action to the majority because in general, the Malays have lower incomes than the Chinese, who have traditionally been involved in businesses and industries, but who were also general migrant workers. Sri Lanka[edit] In the Standardization policy of Sri Lankan universities was introduced as an affirmative action program for students from areas which had lower rates of education than other areas due to missionary activity in the north and east, which essentially were the Tamil areas. Successive governments cultivated a historical myth after the colonial powers had left that the British had practised communal favouritism towards Christians and the minority Tamil community for the entire years they had controlled Sri Lanka. However, the Sinhalese in fact benefitted from trade and plantation cultivations over the rest of the other groups and their language and culture as well as the religion of Buddhism was fostered and made into mediums for schools over the Tamil language, which did not have the same treatment and Tamils learned English instead as there was no medium for Tamil until near independence. The British sending the missionaries to the north and east was for the protection of the Sinhalese and in fact showed favouritism to the majority group instead of the minorities to maintain trading relationships and benefits from them. The Tamils, out of this random benefit from learning English and basic education excelled and flourished and were able to take many civil service jobs to the chagrin of the Sinhalese. The myth of Divide and Rule is untrue. The policy, were it not implemented would have prevented the civil wars ahead as the policies had no basis and in fact is an example of discrimination against the Tamil ethnic group. In addition to these linguistic quotas, women may get preferential treatment in recruitment for certain public sector jobs if there is a gender imbalance in the field. France[edit] No distinctions based on race, religion or sex are allowed under the French Constitution. Some schools, in neighborhoods labeled "Priority Education Zones", are granted more funds than the others. Students from these schools also benefit from special policies in certain institutions such as Sciences Po. After the Sarkozy election, a new attempt in favour of Arab-French students was made, but Sarkozy did not gain enough political support to change the French constitution. However, some French schools do implement affirmative action in that they are obligated to take a certain number of students from impoverished families. All appointments of males as directors will be invalid as long as the quota is not met, and monetary penalties may apply for other directors. There are programs stating that if men and women have equal qualifications, women have to be preferred for a job; moreover, the disabled should be preferred to non-disabled people. This is typical for all positions in state and university service as of [update] , typically using the phrase "We try to increase diversity in this line of work". In recent years, there has been a long public debate about whether to issue programs that would grant women a privileged access to jobs in order to fight discrimination. According to Stefan Zillich , quotas should be "a possibility" to help

working class children who did not do well in school gain access to a Gymnasium University-preparatory school. This suggests that the law has had a marginal effect on the sex of the chair and the boards remain internally segregated. Although at the beginning of our observation period, only 7 of 91 prominent directors were women. The gender balance among prominent directors has changed considerable through the period, and at the end of the period, women and men were prominent directors. By applying more restrictive definitions of prominence, the proportion of directors who are women generally increases. If only considering directors with at least three directorships, When considering directors with seven or more directorships, all of them are women. Thus, affirmative action increase the female population in the director position.

Chapter 9 : Affirmative action: How colleges can achieve student diversity without it

Aug 02, Â· Affirmative action has proved to be one of the most effective tools for expanding opportunity and promoting diversity for students of color. Race-conscious admissions policies have made campuses.

How colleges can achieve diversity without it By Denise-Marie Ordway If American colleges were to halt race-based admissions decisions, they could still ensure a racially diverse student body if they started giving preference to lower-income students while also urging more minorities to apply, a new analysis suggests. The change would be expensive, however. In fact, the analysis, published in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, indicates schools would have trouble affording this two-pronged approach. For many colleges in the United States, especially highly selective ones, race is one of several factors used to choose the next class of students. But race-based affirmative action has become increasingly unpopular. Multiple states, including California and Florida, have banned public colleges and universities from considering race in admissions decisions, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. In , the U. Meanwhile, in July , the U. Reardon and his colleagues were curious whether a race-neutral policy â€” giving preference to students with a lower socioeconomic status SES â€” could produce the same level of student diversity as race-based affirmative action. They examined data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of to estimate college admissions weights for students of different racial and income groups. They used data from that survey and other sources to build a model to simulate how different admissions policies would impact campus diversity over the span of three decades. The model was comprised of a system of 40 institutions and 10, new college-age students for each simulated year â€” a model designed to represent all degree-granting colleges and universities nationwide. They limited their model, however, to students from the four largest racial groups: Here are some other key takeaways from their page study: The most selective colleges give more weight to applications from black and Hispanic students in admissions decisions. But there is little or no evidence that lower-tier schools give preference to black or Hispanic students. Selective schools tend to give slightly more weight to students with a lower SES. Lower-income students seem to be penalized, though, by the admissions process at less selective schools, which give preference to higher-income students. The researchers suggest income-based admissions decisions work in two directions. On the other hand, many colleges, particularly very selective colleges, actively recruit and admit low-SES students. Neither does race-targeted recruitment. When combined, however, the two efforts could be as effective as race-based affirmative action. In certain scenarios, they could be slightly more effective at increasing Hispanic enrollment at top-ranking colleges. Looking for more research on college student diversity? Check out this collection of research on affirmative action and our write-up on Asians in higher education. This photo, obtained from Wikimedia Commons , is being used under a Creative Commons license. No changes were made. July 11, We welcome feedback. Please contact us here.