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6–3 decision holding: Race-conscious admissions policies used by Harvard and UNC violate the 14TH Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Court’s decision overturns more than 40 years of SCOTUS precedents permitting colleges/universities to adopt admissions programs that consider an applicant’s race as part of a holistic evaluation process.
MORE THAN 40 YEARS OF SCOTUS PRECEDENTS OVERTURNED


- The goal of achieving a diverse student body is a compelling interest, i.e. multiple benefits flowing from having a diversity student body;

- A holistic evaluation process furthers that compelling interest by considering race as one positive factor in admissions decisions.
The Supreme Court majority concluded that:

• Harvard and UNC did not meet the 14th Amendment Equal Protection Clause strict scrutiny test, requiring that they prove that their race-conscious admissions program “furthers compelling governmental interests” and that the use of race is “narrowly tailored” (“necessary”) to achieve that interest.

• Educational benefits that flow from achieving a diverse student body are “commendable goals,” but are not compelling;

• Harvard and UNC’s admissions programs: (1) lacked measurable objectives; (2) used race to disadvantage and to stereotype students; and (3) had no end date or other goal to mark a stopping point.
“[N]othing in this opinion should be construed as prohibiting universities from considering an applicant’s discussion of how race affected his or her life, be it through discrimination, inspiration, or otherwise.”

BUT:

• “The student must be treated based on his or her experiences as an individual—not on the basis of race.”

• “A benefit to a student who overcame racial discrimination, for example, must be tied to that student’s courage and determination. Or a benefit to a student whose heritage or culture motivated him or her to assume a leadership role or attain a particular goal must be tied to that student’s unique ability to contribute to the university.”
SCOTUS Dissenting opinion (J. Sotomayor, joined by J. Kagan, J. Jackson):

“[T]he Court cements a superficial rule of colorblindness as a constitutional principle in an endemically segregated society where race has always mattered and continues to matter. The Court subverts the constitutional guarantee of equal protection by further entrenching racial inequality in education, the very foundation of our democratic government and pluralistic society.”

“To be clear, today’s decision leaves intact holistic college admissions and recruitment efforts that seek to enroll diverse classes without using racial classifications. Universities should continue to use those tools as best they can to recruit and admit students from different backgrounds based on all the other factors the Court’s opinion does not, and cannot, touch.”
SCOTUS Dissenting opinion (J. Jackson, joined by J. Sotomayor, J. Kagan):

“With let-them-eat-cake obliviousness, today, the majority pulls the ripcord and announces ‘colorblindness for all’ by legal fiat. But deeming race irrelevant in law does not make it so in life. And having so detached itself from this country’s actual past and present experiences, the Court has now been lured into interfering with the crucial work that UNC and other institutions of higher learning are doing to solve America’s real-world problems.”
MOVING FORWARD: ACHIEVING DIVERSITY OF STUDENT BODY IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

- “comprehensive review process” (see, University of California system)
- socioeconomic diversity
- geographic diversity
- first-generation college applicants
- recruitment from community colleges
- standardized tests optional/not required for application
- recruitment from a broad range of high schools (e.g., H.S. in economically disadvantaged areas)
- percent plans (e.g., admitting top-9% of students from HS into public universities; UC system)
- increase financial assistance and support
- eliminating/reducing legacy admissions and recruitment of athletes
- DEI to create inclusive climate and provide supportive resources for students admitted to the college/university.
We can expect attempts in the courts and in state legislatures to extend Harvard/UNC to higher education programs such as:

• scholarships
• financial aid
• employment decisions/actions
• DEI (e.g. mandatory DEI training for faculty and students; DEI faculty statements, etc.)
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