

Nos. 20-1199 & 21-707

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PRESIDENT & FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE,
Respondent.

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURTS OF
APPEALS FOR THE FIRST AND FOURTH CIRCUITS

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* DEBORAH COHEN
AND 67 OTHER PROFESSORS
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

MARK A. PACKMAN
Counsel of Record
KRISTINE M. HANSEN
RACHEL H. JENNINGS
ETHAN H. KAMINSKY
DECEMBER L. HUDDLESTON
GILBERT LLP
700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 772-2320
packmanm@gilbertlegal.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. THIS COURT HAS REPEATEDLY HELD THAT THE NARROWLY TAILORED USE OF RACE IN UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS SERVES A COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTEREST.	5
II. ALL STUDENTS BENEFIT FROM A DIVERSE STUDENT BODY BECAUSE EXPOSURE TO STUDENTS FROM A WIDE RANGE OF BACKGROUNDS ENHANCES THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF ALL STUDENTS, WHETHER WHITE OR MINORITY.	8
A. All Students Benefit from Racial and Ethnic Diversity at Universities.	10
B. Diversity Within a University Student Body Leads to Additional Long-Term Benefits to Individuals, the Workforce, and Society at Large.	14
III. EFFORTS TO INCREASE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY DO NOT LEAD TO SEGREGATION OR SUPPRESSION OF FREE EXPRESSION.	16

A.	Racial and Ethnic Student Affinity Groups Are Part of a Long Tradition of Student Organizations.....	18
B.	The Proliferation of Student Affinity Groups Promotes Integration and the Robust Exchange of Ideas that <i>Grutter</i> Promised.....	20
1.	Student Affinity Groups Contribute to the Robust Exchange of Ideas on Campus Because They Introduce Debate on Topics That Would Otherwise Be Ignored.	21
2.	Student Affinity Groups Contribute to the Robust Exchange of Ideas on Campus by Providing Underrepresented and Minority Students with Support and Encouraging Them to Contribute Unique Perspectives to the Broader Campus Debate.	22
3.	The Proliferation of Student Affinity Groups Contributes to the Robust Exchange of Ideas Within Each Group Because Members Often Belong to More Than One Group, Which Further Increases the Overall Exchange of Ideas on Campus.....	23
4.	Student Affinity Groups Do Not Lead to Segregation, but Rather	

	Facilitate Integration and Collaboration.....	24
IV.	WHEN STATES HAVE PROHIBITED AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, DIVERSITY HAS SUFFERED.	25
A.	Statewide Bans on Race-Based Admissions Policies Have Resulted in Declines in Minority Student Admissions and Enrollment.	26
B.	Statewide Bans on Affirmative Action Have Led to a General Decline in Degree Attainment for Black Adults, as well as an “Opportunity Gap” in Education and Income.	35
	CONCLUSION.....	38
	APPENDIX: LIST OF <i>AMICI</i> – 67 CURRENT AND FORMER EDUCATORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION WHO SUPPORT RACE- CONSCIOUS ADMISSIONS.....	1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

<i>Fisher v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin</i> , 570 U.S. 297 (2013).....	6, 7, 8, 16
<i>Fisher v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin</i> , 579 U.S. 369 (2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i> , 288 F.3d 732 (6th Cir. 2002) (<i>en banc</i>) (Clay, J., concurring)	10
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i> , 539 U.S. 306 (2003).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke</i> , 438 U.S. 265 (1978) (opinion of Powell, J.).....	<i>passim</i>

State Statutes

Idaho Code § 67-5909A (2020).....	27
N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 187-A:16-a (2020)	27
Wash. Rev. Code. § 49.60.400 (1998).....	27

Rules

Sup. Ct. R. 37.3	1
Sup. Ct. R. 37.6	1

Regulations

Fla. Exec. Order No. 99-281 (1999), https://www.dms.myflorida.com/content/download/705/3389/file/ExecutiveOrder99-281.pdf	27
--	----

Constitutional Provisions

Ariz. Const. art. II, § 36 (2010)	27
Cal. Const. art. I, § 31 (1996)	27, 28
Mich. Const. art. I, § 26 (2006)	27
Neb. Const. art. I, § 30 (2008)	27
Okla. Const. art. II, § 36A (2020)	27

Other Authorities

Adam Harris, <i>What Happens When a College's Affirmative-Action Policy Is Found Illegal</i> , The Atlantic (Oct. 28, 2018), https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/10/when-college-cant-use-race-admissions/574126/	32
---	----

- Am. Council on Educ. & Am. Ass'n. of Univ. Professors, *Does Diversity Make a Difference?: Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms* (May 2000),
<https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/97003B7B-055F-4318-B14A-5336321FB742/0/DIVREP.PDF>.9, 10
- Am. Council on Educ., *On the Importance of Diversity in Higher Education* (June 2012),
<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/BoardDiversityStatement-June2012.pdf> 14
- Am. Fed'n of Tchrs., AFT Higher Educ., *Promoting Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the Faculty: What Higher Education Unions Can Do* (2010),
<https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/facultydiversity0310.pdf> 10
- Am. Univ., School of Educ. Online Programs, *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom* (July 24, 2019),
<https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/benefits-of-inclusion-and-diversity-in-the-classroom>11, 14, 16

- Amy S. Wells et al., *How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students*, The Century Found. (Feb. 9, 2016),
<https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/> 14
- Andrew Howard Nichols & J. Oliver Schak, *Broken Mirrors*, The Educ. Tr. (Mar. 6, 2019),
<https://edtrust.org/resource/broken-mirrors-black-representation>..... 26
- Andrew Howard Nichols & J. Oliver Schak, *Degree Attainment for Black Adults: National and State Trends*, The Educ. Tr. (2017),
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED593322.pdf>..... 35
- Andrew Howard Nichols, *Debunking 5 Myths about Affirmative Action*, The Educ. Tr. (Oct. 12, 2017),
<https://edtrust.org/the-equity-line/debunking-5-myths-affirmative-action/> 26
- Camille G. Caldera & Amanda Y. Su, ‘We Will Tell Our Stories’: *Students of Color Build Coalitions In Face of Threat to Affirmative Action*, Harv. Crimson (May 28, 2019),
<https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/5/28/admissions-coalition-building/> 24

- The Century Found., *The Benefits of Socioeconomically and Racially Integrated Schools and Classrooms* (Apr. 29, 2019), <https://tcf.org/content/facts/the-benefits-of-socioeconomically-and-racially-integrated-schools-and-classrooms/> 12
- Diane Seo, *Do Ethnic Clubs Unify or Divide?*, L.A. Times (May 12, 1996), <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1996-05-12-mn-3441-story.html> 18
- Editorial, *On the need for affinity housing*, The Williams Rec. (Apr. 17, 2019), <https://williamsrecord.com/73685/opinions/on-the-need-for-affinity-housing/>..... 22
- Eli Wald, *A Primer on Diversity, Discrimination, and Equality in the Legal Profession or Who is Responsible for Pursuing Diversity and Why*, 24 Geo. J. Legal Ethics 1079 (2011)..... 16
- Emily Moss et al., *The Black-white wealth gap left Black households more vulnerable*, Brookings (Dec. 8, 2020), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/12/08/the-black-white-wealth-gap-left-black-households-more-vulnerable/> 36

- Entering Class Profile, Class of 2024 (Fall 2021*)*, UF Law (Aug. 31, 2021), <https://www.law.ufl.edu/admissions/apply/entering-class-profile>..... 33
- Erwin Chemerinsky, Op.-Ed., *If the Supreme Court bans affirmative action, it continues the U.S. legacy of racial discrimination*, L.A. Times (Jan. 25, 2022, 11:31 AM PT), <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2022-01-25/op-ed-supreme-court-bans-affirmative-action-discrimination>..... 30
- First-Time Freshman Analysis Fall 2020*, Institutional Rsch. and Reporting, Univ. of Okla. (Sept. 2020), https://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Freshmen/FTF_Analysis_Fall_2020%20revised4.pdf..... 27
- First-Time Freshman Analysis Fall 2021*, Institutional Rsch. and Reporting, Univ. of Okla. (Sept. 2021), [https://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Freshmen/FTF_Analysis_Fall_2021.p](https://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Freshmen/FTF_Analysis_Fall_2021.pdf)df..... 27

- Gary Orfield & Dean Whitla, *Diversity and Legal Education: Student Experiences in Leading Law Schools*, in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action 143* (Gary Orfield & Michal Kurlaender eds., 2001) 12
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities*, Nat'l Ctr. for Educ. Stat., <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=667> 38
- History of Hillel*, Hillel Int'l, <https://www.hillel.org/about/hillel-story#:~:text=Founded%20in%201923%20and%20adopted,of%20Hillel's%20growth%20and%20evolution> (last visited July 21, 2022) 19
- How State Bans on Race-Sensitive Admissions Have Damaged Black Enrollments in Professional Schools*, The J. of Blacks in Higher Educ., https://www.jbhe.com/features/51_professional_schools.html (last visited June 22, 2022) 32
- J.D. Long-Garcia, *Newman Centers: A Brief History*, U.S. Catholic (Jan. 16, 2012), <https://uscatholic.org/articles/201201/newman-centers-a-brief-history/> 19

- Jeremy Ashkenas et al., *Even With Affirmative Action, Blacks and Hispanics Are More Underrepresented at Top Colleges Than 35 Years Ago*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 24, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/08/24/us/affirmative-action.html>.....29, 31
- Katherine W. Phillips, *How Diversity Works*, 311(4) Sci. Am. 43 (Oct. 2014)11, 12, 14, 15
- Katie Brown, *The Top 5 Ways That Diversity in Education Benefits Students Success*, Univ. of Fla. Coll. of Journalism and Commc'ns (May 20, 2020), <https://www.jou.ufl.edu/2020/05/20/the-top-5-ways-that-diversity-in-education-benefits-students-success/#:~:text=Ultimately%2C%20studies%20show%20that%20diversity,for%20students%20of%20all%20races> 13
- Kristin Tsuo, *Diversity for All: The Importance of Racial and Socioeconomic Diversity in Higher Education*, The Century Found. (July 14, 2015), <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/diversity-for-all-the-importance-of-racial-and-socioeconomic-diversity-in-higher-education/>10, 11, 15

Letters to the Editor, <i>Cornell's</i> ‘Segregation’ Issue, Wall St. J. (May 30, 1996), https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB833399113180083500	18
Liliana M. Garces, <i>Racial Diversity, Legitimacy, and the Citizenry: The Impact of Affirmative Action Bans on Graduate School Enrollment</i> , 36 The Rev. of Higher Educ. 93 (2012), https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1003835	29
Michelle J. Anderson, <i>Legal Education Reform, Diversity and Access to Justice</i> , 61 Rutgers L. Rev. 1011 (2009)	16
Mitchell J. Chang, <i>The Positive Educational Effects of Racial Diversity on Campus</i> , in <i>Diversity Challenged</i> (2001).....	12, 13
Mitra Akhtari et al., <i>The Effects of Race-Based Affirmative Action in Texas</i> , Univ. of Tex. at Austin Educ. Rsch. Ctr. (Nov. 2018), https://texaserc.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/41-UTA059-Brief-AffAction-10.31.18.pdf	26

- Nancy Cantor & Peter Englot, *Defining the Stakes: Why We Cannot Leave the Nation's Diverse Talent Pool Behind and Thrive, in The Future of Affirmative Action* (Richard D. Kahlenberg ed., 2014).....11, 12
- Peter Hinrichs, *The Effects of Affirmative Action Bans on College Enrollment, Educational Attainment, and the Demographic Composition of Universities*, 94 *The Rev. of Economics and Statistics* 712 (2012), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23261474>. 29
- Philip Trostel, *It's Not Just the Money: The Benefits of College Education to Individuals and to Society*, Lumina Issue Papers, Lumina Found. (Oct. 14, 2015), <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/its-not-just-the-money.pdf>. 37
- Pierce Wilson & Sabrina Eager, *Dartmouth Affinity Groups Provide Support, Community*, *The Dartmouth* (Sept. 7, 2021, 5:20 AM), <https://www.thedartmouth.com/article/2021/09/dartmouth-affinity-groups-provide-support-community> 22

- Rena Simkowitz, *History of Women and Women's Organizations at Harvard, in Students in Service and Leadership at Harvard: A Collection of Student Multimedia Essays from SOCIOL1130: Student Leadership and Service in Higher Education* (Manja Klemenčič ed., 2018),
<https://scalar.fas.harvard.edu/studentpower/2014-title-ix-complaint-against-harvard-cited-final-clubs> 19
- Richard D. Kahlenberg, *Achieving Better Diversity: Reforming Affirmative Action in Higher Education*, The Century Found. (Dec. 3, 2015),
<https://tcf.org/content/report/achieving-better-diversity> 11
- Scott E. Carrell et al., *The Impact of College Diversity on Behavior Toward Minorities*, 11(4) Am. Econ. J.: Econ. Pol'y 159 (Nov. 2019)12, 13
- Sophia Kerby, *10 Reasons Why We Need Diversity on College Campuses*, Ctr. for Am. Progress (Oct. 9, 2012),
<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/10-reasons-why-we-need-diversity-on-college-campuses/>13, 14, 15

Tiffany Jones & Andrew Howard Nichols, <i>Hard Truths: Why Only Race-Conscious Policies Can Fix Racism in Higher Education</i> , The Educ. Tr. (Jan. 2020), https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED603265.pdf	29
Tomas Monarrez & Kelia Washington, <i>Racial and Ethnic Representation in Postsecondary Education</i> , Ctr. on Educ. Data and Pol’y, The Urb. Inst. (last updated June 22, 2020), https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/102375/racial-and-ethnic-representation-in-postsecondary-education_1.pdf	31
<i>Ujamaa Residential College</i> , Student & Campus Life, Cornell Univ., https://scl.cornell.edu/residential-life/housing/campus-housing/upperlevel-undergraduates/program-houses/ujamaa-residential-college (last visited July 21, 2022).....	21
William Glaberson, <i>Accusations of Bias Roil Florida Law School</i> , N.Y. Times (Oct. 30, 2000), https://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/30/us/accusations-of-bias-roil-florida-law-school.html	33

Zachary Bleemer, <i>Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility After California's Proposition 209</i> , Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.10.2020, Ctr. for the Study of Higher Educ., UC Berkeley (Aug. 2020), https://cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/publications/rops.cshe.10.2020.bleemer.prop209.8.20.2020_2.pdf	29
---	----

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*¹

This brief is filed on behalf of Deborah Cohen and 67 additional *amici curiae*. Deborah Cohen is the Chair of the History Department and the Richard W. Leopold Professor of History at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. The author of multiple prize-winning books, she previously taught at Brown University and American University. She holds degrees from the University of California at Berkeley and Harvard University. She has over two decades of teaching experience.

The other *amici curiae* are current and former professors who teach, or have taught, at the undergraduate and graduate levels at universities throughout the United States in a wide variety of subjects.²

Collectively, *amici* have hundreds of years of experience in higher education. By virtue of their extensive teaching experience, *amici* have seen first-

¹ The position *amici* take in this brief has not been approved or financed by petitioners, respondents, or their counsel. See Sup. Ct. R. 37.6. Neither petitioners, respondents, nor their counsel had any role in authoring, nor made any monetary contribution to fund the preparation or submission of, this brief. All parties have consented to the filing of this brief; blanket letters of consent have been filed with the Clerk of the Court. See Sup. Ct. R. 37.3.

² *Amici* submit this brief only in their individual capacities, and not on behalf of the universities where they teach or have taught.

hand the benefits of diversity in higher education,
benefits *amici* seek to preserve.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Under this Court’s precedent, universities can consider race in making admissions decisions so long as (1) there is a compelling interest in using race, with diversity being one such interest; (2) the use of race is narrowly tailored to achieve the compelling interest; and (3) race is not considered in a mechanical fashion, but rather as part of a holistic process that evaluates each applicant individually based on multiple factors, including academic and non-academic achievements. *See* Argument I, *infra*.

Students for Fair Admissions (“SFFA”), an anti-affirmative action group, and the *amici* that support it, argue that this Court should reverse prior precedent and rule that admissions must be colorblind. SFFA and its supporters are wrong.

First, contrary to the unsupported claims of SFFA and its *amici*, the diverse student bodies that result from race-conscious admissions policies benefit all students because exposure to students from a wide range of backgrounds enhances the educational experiences of all students, whether White or minority. *See* Argument II, *infra*.

Second, several of SFFA’s *amici* contend that race-conscious admissions policies foster “neo-segregation” on campus and therefore impede the vibrant exchange of ideas. While SFFA purports to embrace diversity on campus and to object only to race-conscious admission policies, these *amici*, as shown in Argument III, *infra*, have dropped the pretense altogether. Instead, these *amici* attack the

very concept of diversity on campus, however achieved. But diversity on student campuses, and the resultant proliferation of student affinity groups on campus – which follow in a long tradition of student organizations centered on religious and gender identity – have facilitated a robust exchange of ideas this Court has anticipated it would.

Third, SFFA and its supporters argue that prohibiting affirmative action will not lead to less diversity in admissions. But, as Argument IV, *infra*, demonstrates, when states have prohibited affirmative action, diversity has suffered.

ARGUMENT**I. THIS COURT HAS REPEATEDLY HELD THAT THE NARROWLY TAILORED USE OF RACE IN UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS SERVES A COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTEREST.**

SFFA asks this Court to reverse its prior precedents upholding the narrowly tailored use of race in admissions programs. *See* Pet’r Br. 49. SFFA claims that the reasoning in these cases “cannot withstand” careful analysis. *Id.* at 50, 56 (internal quotations omitted). But SFFA is wrong and the Court should decline its request.

This Court has long held that there is a compelling governmental interest in achieving and maintaining diversity in our Nation’s educational system, and, accordingly, it has upheld race-conscious admissions programs directed at obtaining a “critical mass” of minority students. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 343 (2003); *Fisher v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin*, 579 U.S. 369 (2016) (“*Fisher II*”); *see also Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 269 (1978) (opinion of Powell, J.). This Court has held that universities can consider race in making admissions decisions so long as (1) there is a compelling interest in using race, with diversity being one such interest; (2) the use of race is narrowly tailored to achieve the compelling interest; and (3) race is not considered in a mechanical fashion, but rather as part of a holistic process that evaluates each applicant individually based on multiple factors, including academic and

non-academic achievements. *See, e.g., Fisher II*, 579 U.S. at 388.

This Court repeatedly has approved state efforts to ensure diversity in educational institutions for the benefit of all students. *See, e.g., Bakke*, 438 U.S. at 315 (opinion of Powell, J.) (stating that “the interest of diversity is compelling in the context of a university’s admissions program”); *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 330; *Fisher II*, 579 U.S. at 388. These rulings were not made in error: they are consistent with the text and history of the equal protection clause.

Most recently, in *Fisher II*, this Court again recognized that its prior precedents establish that achieving diversity at institutions of higher learning is a compelling governmental interest. 579 U.S. at 381. As this Court explained, “a university may institute a race-conscious admissions program as a means of obtaining ‘the educational benefits that flow from student body diversity.’” *Id.* (quoting *Fisher v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin*, 570 U.S. 297, 310 (2013) (“*Fisher I*)). In so doing, this Court emphasized that a university is owed “considerable deference” in defining those characteristics that are central to its identity and educational mission, including diversity. *Id.* at 388. As this Court’s decisions from *Bakke* to *Fisher II* have explained, enrolling a diverse student body “promotes cross-racial understanding, helps to break down racial stereotypes, . . . enables students to better understand persons of different races,” and “better prepares students for an increasingly diverse

workforce and society.” *Id.* (quoting *Fisher I*, 570 U.S. at 330; *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 328).

Deference, of course, is not a blank check. A university’s use of race in admissions must be narrowly tailored to achieving diversity, including by being used as part of a holistic assessment of each individual. In *Grutter*, for example, this Court upheld the University of Michigan Law School’s admissions system because it “did not mechanically assign points but rather treated race as a relevant feature within the broader context of a candidate’s application.” *Fisher II*, 579 U.S. at 372 (citing *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 337, 343–44). In *Fisher I*, this Court reiterated that a fixed quota system for race is inappropriate, but that consideration of race is permissible where the university can demonstrate that a “nonracial approach” would not promote its interest in the educational benefits of diversity. *Fisher I*, 570 U.S. at 310–12. As this Court summarized in *Fisher II*, “Though ‘[n]arrow tailoring does not require exhaustion of every conceivable race-neutral alternative’ or ‘require a university to choose between maintaining a reputation for excellence [and] fulfilling a commitment to provide educational opportunities to members of all racial groups,’ it does impose ‘on the university the ultimate burden of demonstrating’ that ‘race-neutral alternatives’ that are both ‘available’ and ‘workable’ ‘do not suffice.’” 579 U.S. at 377 (alterations in original) (quoting *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 339, then *Fisher I*, 570 U.S. at 312).

This Court has thus already addressed the issue of race-conscious admissions in *Bakke*, *Grutter*,

Fisher I, and *Fisher II*, each time reaffirming that universities can consider race in making admissions decisions to achieve educational diversity and refusing invitations to reverse that conclusion. This Court should decline requests by the SFFA to reverse these precedents. A rule that a university's consideration of race in its admissions process is always unconstitutional would be disruptive and would deprive students of the opportunity to study on diverse campuses that the Court's precedents have sought to protect.

II. ALL STUDENTS BENEFIT FROM A DIVERSE STUDENT BODY BECAUSE EXPOSURE TO STUDENTS FROM A WIDE RANGE OF BACKGROUNDS ENHANCES THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF ALL STUDENTS, WHETHER WHITE OR MINORITY.

SFFA and its supporters argue that seeking to create diverse student bodies by considering race in the application process harms both the applicants who are denied admission and the minority groups whom it supposedly helps. They wrongly assert that racial preferences exacerbate rather than reduce racial prejudice, and deny evidence of the educational benefits of race-based admissions. Pet'r Br. 53–55 (arguing that the educational benefits identified by this Court in *Grutter* were “unpersuasive,” and that underrepresented minorities are treated as *instruments* to provide educational benefits to mostly White students rather than beneficiaries of racial preference programs); *see also* Brief of Project 21 as *Amicus*

Curiae in Support of Petitioner 23–25, 32–33 (May 9, 2022) (race-based diversity policies instrumentalize racial minorities and disproportionately benefit wealthy members of favored races); Brief of Legal Insurrection Foundation as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Petitioner 8–20 (May 9, 2022) (arguing that use of race in admissions has not achieved the promised “robust exchange of ideas”); Brief of The Claremont Institutes’ Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Petitioner 2–5 (May 9, 2022) (“Claremont Br.”) (asserting that *Grutter* should be abandoned because schools have demonstrated they are not interested in fostering a robust exchange of ideas). As demonstrated below, the petitioners and their *amici* are incorrect.

Scholarly research supports the conclusion that all students benefit from racial and ethnic diversity on college campuses and demonstrates that those benefits outlast a student’s time on a college campus and have proven positive impacts on American business and our society. Indeed, “barring higher education institutions from access to a diverse student population denies them a singularly important tool for preparing students for their own futures and for the future of our society.”³

³ Am. Council on Educ. & Am. Ass’n. of Univ. Professors, *Does Diversity Make a Difference?: Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms* 5 (May 2000) (hereinafter *Does Diversity Make a Difference*), <https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/97003B7B-055F-4318-B14A-5336321FB742/0/DIVREP.PDF>.

**A. ALL STUDENTS BENEFIT FROM RACIAL
AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY AT
UNIVERSITIES.**

Ample studies have shown that exposure of students to a wide range of backgrounds enhances the educational experiences of all students.⁴ Scholarly research has shown, for example, that diversity at universities improves the “intellectual engagement, self-motivation, citizenship, and cultural engagement, and academic skills like critical thinking, problem-solving, and writing – for students of all races.”⁵ Ninety percent of faculty members in one study said that diversity did not reduce student quality or educational substance, and many strongly believed it enriched the educational experience of White students.⁶

⁴ See, e.g., *id.* at 3 (racial and ethnic diversity positively affects college students); Am. Fed’n of Tchrs., AFT Higher Educ., *Promoting Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the Faculty: What Higher Education Unions Can Do* 4 (2010), <https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/facultydiversity0310.pdf> (same). See also *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 288 F.3d 732, 760 (6th Cir. 2002) (*en banc*) (Clay, J., concurring) (quoting Michigan’s expert Professor Patricia Gurin as concluding that “[s]tudents learn better in a diverse educational environment,” and “patterns of racial segregation and separation historically rooted in our national life can be broken by diversity experiences in higher education”).

⁵ Kristin Tsuo, *Diversity for All: The Importance of Racial and Socioeconomic Diversity in Higher Education*, The Century Found. (July 14, 2015), <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/diversity-for-all-the-importance-of-racial-and-socioeconomic-diversity-in-higher-education/>.

⁶ *Does Diversity Make a Difference*, *supra* note 3, at 3–4 (diversity positively influenced students’ beliefs about the

According to an article from The Century Foundation, students with interracial interactions showed significant gains in critical thinking and problem-solving skills when compared to students in non-diverse groups.⁷ Some researchers posit that diverse groups outperform non-diverse ones because varying perspectives increase the number of approaches to finding solutions.⁸ “Diversity jolts us into cognitive action in ways that homogeneity simply does not.”⁹ In a 2004 study involving more than 350 students from three universities, researchers determined that a dissenting opinion on a social issue by a Black person presented to White people was considered more novel, and led to broader thinking, than presentation of the same dissenting view by a White person, demonstrating the value in learning within diverse environments.¹⁰

quality of their education, and helped all students achieve the essentials goals of the university).

⁷ Tsuo, *supra* note 5; *see also* Am. Univ., School of Educ. Online Programs, *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom* (July 24, 2019) (hereinafter *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom*), <https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/benefits-of-inclusion-and-diversity-in-the-classroom> (reporting outperformance by diverse groups in problem-solving scenarios).

⁸ Nancy Cantor & Peter Englot, *Defining the Stakes: Why We Cannot Leave the Nation’s Diverse Talent Pool Behind and Thrive*, in *The Future of Affirmative Action* 27, 28–30 (Richard D. Kahlenberg ed., 2014); Richard D. Kahlenberg, *Achieving Better Diversity: Reforming Affirmative Action in Higher Education*, The Century Found. (Dec. 3, 2015), <https://tcf.org/content/report/achieving-better-diversity>.

⁹ *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom*, *supra* note 7; Katherine W. Phillips, *How Diversity Works*, 311(4) *Sci. Am.* 43, 46 (Oct. 2014).

¹⁰ Phillips, *supra* note 9, at 45.

“Simply interacting with people from different backgrounds encourages group members to prepare better, to anticipate alternative viewpoints, and to be ready to work towards consensus,” fostering deeper inquiry and producing more effective teams.¹¹

In addition to enhancing students’ educational experiences, racial diversity on university campuses increases the likelihood that students will socialize across racial lines and discuss racial matters.¹² This in turn has a positive impact on student retention, overall college satisfaction,

¹¹ The Century Found., *The Benefits of Socioeconomically and Racially Integrated Schools and Classrooms* (Apr. 29, 2019), <https://tcf.org/content/facts/the-benefits-of-socioeconomically-and-racially-integrated-schools-and-classrooms/> (citing Phillips, *supra* note 9, at 42–47); *see also* Cantor & Englot, *supra* note 8, at 28 (individuals with differing life experiences “strongly enrich the quality, creativity, and complexity of group thinking and problem-solving” that occurs); Gary Orfield & Dean Whitley, *Diversity and Legal Education: Student Experiences in Leading Law Schools*, in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action 143* (“Diversity Challenged”) (Gary Orfield & Michal Kurlaender eds., 2001) (copy of relevant pages lodged with Clerk of the Court) (law students surveyed reported that educational diversity improves their ability to work and socialize with people of other races and ethnicities).

¹² *See* Mitchell J. Chang, *The Positive Educational Effects of Racial Diversity on Campus*, in *Diversity Challenged* 175 (2001); Scott E. Carrell et al., *The Impact of College Diversity on Behavior Toward Minorities*, 11(4) *Am. Econ. J.: Econ. Pol’y* 159, 161 (Nov. 2019) (explaining that the theory that interpersonal contact can be an effective way of reducing prejudice between groups was first introduced by Williams Jr. (1947) and Allport (1954)).

and intellectual and social self-confidence among students.¹³ For example, one study of the United States Air Force Academy analyzed whether interactions with Black peers affected White students' decisions to seek a Black roommate sophomore year. The study found "suggestive evidence that diversity itself leads to meaningful increases in subsequent cross-race interaction for White students who had relatively little exposure to blacks," provided that the diversity was not achieved by lowering academic standards.¹⁴ The Center for American Progress has similarly noted the positive impact of increased racial diversity at universities on near- and long-term intergroup relations.¹⁵ Students' interracial experiences – for both minorities and non-minorities – can lead to breaking down stereotypes formed during youth in homogenous environments, increased exploration of preconceived notions, and increased tolerance and acceptance of others.¹⁶

¹³ See Chang, *supra* note 12.

¹⁴ Carrell et al., *supra* note 12, at 160–61 (finding no effect on future behavior where White students interacted with Black students in the bottom third of the high school performance distribution).

¹⁵ Sophia Kerby, *10 Reasons Why We Need Diversity on College Campuses*, Ctr. for Am. Progress (Oct. 9, 2012), <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/10-reasons-why-we-need-diversity-on-college-campuses/>.

¹⁶ Katie Brown, *The Top 5 Ways That Diversity in Education Benefits Students Success*, Univ. of Fla. Coll. of Journalism and Commc'ns (May 20, 2020), <https://www.jou.ufl.edu/2020/05/20/the-top-5-ways-that-diversity-in-education-benefits-students->

B. DIVERSITY WITHIN A UNIVERSITY STUDENT BODY LEADS TO ADDITIONAL LONG-TERM BENEFITS TO INDIVIDUALS, THE WORKFORCE, AND SOCIETY AT LARGE.

Attending diverse universities benefits not only the students that attend these universities, but also the workforce and our Nation.

First, exposure to diversity in college better prepares students for the increasingly diverse workforce they will encounter at their jobs.¹⁷ According to the Century Foundation, 96 percent of major employers say it is vital that employees are “comfortable working with colleagues, customers, and/or clients from diverse cultural backgrounds.”¹⁸

success/#:~:text=Ultimately%2C%20studies%20show%20that%20diversity,for%20students%20of%20all%20races; *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom*, *supra* note 7; Phillips, *supra* note 9, at 46 (diversity permits consideration of perspectives beyond those formed earlier in life).

¹⁷ Kerby, *supra* note 15 (more than one-half of all U.S. babies today are people of color, and by 2050 our nation will have no clear racial or ethnic majority) (citing *Progress 2050*, Ctr. for Am. Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/projects/progress-2050/>).

¹⁸ Amy S. Wells et al., *How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students*, The Century Found. (Feb. 9, 2016), <https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/>; *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom*, *supra* note 7. See also Am. Council on Educ., *On the Importance of Diversity in Higher Education* (June 2012), <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/BoardDiversityStatement-June2012.pdf> (education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens).

Prior exposure to diversity prepares employees for this critical aspect of their jobs.¹⁹

Second, diversity in the educational system creates a necessary pipeline for diversity in the Nation's professional ranks. In *Bakke*, Justice Powell explained that the Nation's leaders must be trained through wide exposure to differing viewpoints. 438 U.S. at 312 (opinion of Powell, J.). Fortune 500 companies agree that diversity is good for the bottom line; more than sixty of these companies – including Coca-Cola, General Electric, Johnson & Johnson, and many others – supported race-based admission policies in an amicus brief submitted in *Grutter*.²⁰ In a study conducted by Forbes, 85 percent of respondents said diversity is crucial for their businesses, and approximately 75 percent plan to leverage diversity to achieve their business goals.²¹ Studies consistently show that diversity also drives innovation and fosters creativity – key components to competitiveness in business. For example, a 2003 study of executives at 177 national banks revealed that for banks focused on innovation, increases in racial diversity were related to better financial performance.²²

Finally, educational diversity strengthens our democracy because "[i]n order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry,

¹⁹ Tsuo, *supra* note 5 (measuring the impact of diversity experiences on students thirteen years post-graduation).

²⁰ Kerby, *supra* note 15.

²¹ *Id.*

²² Phillips, *supra* note 9, at 44.

it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity.” *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 332.²³ Studies have also shown that educational diversity increases students’ post-graduation civic engagement,²⁴ which this Court has noted is “essential if the dream of one Nation, indivisible, is to be realized.” *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 332.

III. EFFORTS TO INCREASE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY DO NOT LEAD TO SEGREGATION OR SUPPRESSION OF FREE EXPRESSION.

As discussed above, in *Grutter*, this Court upheld the use of race-conscious admissions in higher education because achieving a critical mass of underrepresented minorities on campus creates diversity, which enables a robust exchange of ideas. *Grutter*, 539 U.S. at 333; *see also Fisher I*, 570 U.S. at 310–15 (reaffirming *Grutter*). Seeking to overturn this longstanding – and recently and repeatedly

²³ The Court’s recognition of the importance of diversity in the legal profession is well supported by academic studies. *See, e.g.*, Michelle J. Anderson, *Legal Education Reform, Diversity and Access to Justice*, 61 Rutgers L. Rev. 1011 (2009); Eli Wald, *A Primer on Diversity, Discrimination, and Equality in the Legal Profession or Who is Responsible for Pursuing Diversity and Why*, 24 Geo. J. Legal Ethics 1079, 1101 (2011) (ABA stating that the absence of diversity in government threatens to delegitimize the law itself).

²⁴ *See, e.g.*, *The Benefits of Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom*, *supra* note 7 (describing a Century Foundation study and U.S. Department of Education statement confirming students’ experiences with diversity increased community engagement).

affirmed – precedent, SFFA argues that race-conscious admissions policies are not necessary to achieve diversity on campus.

Several *amici* in support of SFFA go one step further and attack *Grutter*’s premise: they argue against diversity on campus itself and claim that it leads not to a robust exchange of ideas, but to “neo-segregation” and censorship. *See, e.g.*, Claremont Br. 5; Brief of National Association of Scholars as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Petitioner 8 (May 6, 2022) (“NAS Br.”). According to these *amici*, diversity produces “neo-segregation,” and constricts the robust exchange of ideas on campus because underrepresented minority students tend to congregate and even form affinity groups to represent their interests on campus. *Id.*²⁵

These anti-diversity *amici* never back up this argument with statistical evidence, or adequately prove a causal connection between diversity on campus and restricted campus speech. If their argument sounds familiar, that is because it had been raised and debated in public for decades before

²⁵ Several *amici* in support of SFFA even advance the risible notion that underrepresented students form affinity groups because they cannot compete academically with the broader student body, hoping to avoid “academic competitiveness.” *See* Brief of Gail Heriot & Peter N. Kirsanow as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Petitioner 7 (May 9, 2022) “Gail Br.” ; NAS Br. 9 (same). This argument is rarely made with respect to White students, including the students who join organizations like the Federalist Society, for obvious reasons.

Fisher II.²⁶ Nothing has changed, and neither should the result.

To be sure, increased diversity on campus has resulted in a proliferation of student affinity groups. But the anti-diversity *amici* present racial and ethnic student affinity groups as some new phenomenon when these affinity groups are part of a long tradition of student associations on campus. Further, the anti-diversity *amici* are wrong about these student affinity groups' effect on campus. Affinity groups neither produce "neo-segregation" nor endanger academic freedom; instead, they integrate campuses, and produce a robust exchange of ideas. In other words, these student affinity groups represent *Grutter*'s promise fulfilled.

**A. RACIAL AND ETHNIC STUDENT
AFFINITY GROUPS ARE PART OF A
LONG TRADITION OF STUDENT
ORGANIZATIONS.**

Student affinity groups do not represent a break in tradition for campus life, but a continuation. Religious student groups have been a fixture on campuses across this country for more than a century. For example, Catholic student groups like the Newman Club began appearing on campuses across the country as early as the 1880s

²⁶ See, e.g., Diane Seo, *Do Ethnic Clubs Unify or Divide?*, L.A. Times (May 12, 1996), <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1996-05-12-mn-3441-story.html>; Letters to the Editor, *Cornell's 'Segregation' Issue*, Wall St. J. (May 30, 1996), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB833399113180083500> (debating Black student residence halls).

when Catholic students were admitted in significant numbers.²⁷ Jewish student groups likewise began appearing on campuses across the country at least as early as the 1920s, when Jewish students were admitted in significant numbers.²⁸ Gender-specific student groups also have a long history on college campuses, and have existed since universities began admitting women in significant numbers.²⁹

Religion- and gender-specific affinity groups serve a valuable purpose: they provide affiliate students with a sense of community and facilitate discussions on topics of special interest to those groups. Tellingly, the anti-diversity *amici* do not object to these affinity groups, or any others that are not predominantly Black or Hispanic. There is no claim, for example, that Asian-American affinity groups contribute to “neo-segregation.” While the

²⁷ See J.D. Long-Garcia, *Newman Centers: A Brief History*, U.S. Catholic (Jan. 16, 2012), <https://uscatholic.org/articles/201201/newman-centers-a-brief-history/> (Newman Club beginning on University of Wisconsin campus as early as 1883).

²⁸ See *History of Hillel*, Hillel Int'l, <https://www.hillel.org/about/hillel-story#:~:text=Founded%20in%201923%20and%20adopted,of%20Hillel's%20growth%20and%20evolution> (last visited July 21, 2022) (first Hillel opened up at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign in 1923).

²⁹ Rena Simkowitz, *History of Women and Women's Organizations at Harvard*, in *Students in Service and Leadership at Harvard: A Collection of Student Multimedia Essays from SOCIOL1130: Student Leadership and Service in Higher Education* Manja Klemenčič ed., (2018), <https://scalar.fas.harvard.edu/studentpower/2014-title-ix-complaint-against-harvard-cited-final-clubs> (speech by Drew Gilpin Faust, the then Dean of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and later president of Harvard).

anti-diversity *amici* nominally attack Black and Hispanic student groups, their real gripe is with the fact that there are now enough Black and Hispanic students on campus to form affinity groups in the first place.

B. THE PROLIFERATION OF STUDENT AFFINITY GROUPS PROMOTES INTEGRATION AND THE ROBUST EXCHANGE OF IDEAS THAT *GRUTTER* PROMISED.

The anti-diversity *amici*'s argument that student affinity groups create "neo-segregation" on campus and prevent the robust exchange of ideas that this Court championed in *Grutter* falls flat. First, student affinity groups facilitate a robust exchange of ideas because they tend to discuss topics of special concern to their members, which would not otherwise be discussed on campus, and they then introduce those new perspectives to the campus at large. Second, student affinity groups contribute to the robust exchange of ideas on campus by encouraging members to participate in classroom discussions with non-members on issues of general concern. Third, the proliferation of student affinity groups leads to greater integration and a more robust exchange of ideas on campus because students often have more than one identity and belong to more than one affinity group. Finally, the proliferation of student affinity groups leads to greater integration on campus because they tend to collaborate on issues of mutual concern, and introduce members to each other, facilitating a more robust exchange of ideas.

1. Student Affinity Groups Contribute to the Robust Exchange of Ideas on Campus Because They Introduce Debate on Topics That Would Otherwise Be Ignored.

Student organizations host conferences and lectures on topics that would likely otherwise be ignored on campus. Consider Cornell's Ujamaa residential community, a Black-centric student association that anti-diversity *amici* cite as evidence that race-conscious admissions lead to greater segregation on campus and a less robust exchange of ideas. See Gail Br. 8-9. The Ujamaa Residential College has hosted "lectures by internationally renowned speakers, dinners hosted by affiliated faculty members," and hosts the "the State of Black America Conference, the annual Festival of Black Gospel, and the weekly student-organized forum Unity Hour – at which lively and educational discussions are never in short supply."³⁰ These events are open to the entire campus; the ideas and perspectives shared at these events might not otherwise be expressed on campus. Students who belong to the Ujamaa house share those ideas and perspectives in writing, history, international relations, and science courses, where they are discussed by the broader campus community.

³⁰ *Ujamaa Residential College*, Student Campus Life, Cornell Univ., <https://scl.cornell.edu/residential-life/housing/campus-housing/upperlevel-undergraduates/program-houses/ujamaa-residential-college> (last visited July 21, 2022).

2. Student Affinity Groups Contribute to the Robust Exchange of Ideas on Campus by Providing Underrepresented and Minority Students with Support and Encouraging Them to Contribute Unique Perspectives to the Broader Campus Debate.

Student groups formed around racial and ethnic identities exist to give students a sense of comfort and belonging on campus, which, in turn, provides them the confidence and voice to raise issues of specific concern to that group or to challenge old ideas with new perspectives. As the students themselves have explained, “allowing for a space where students can express their identities without fear of tokenization or marginalization will encourage students to exist more freely in the broader campus community, rather than recede from it.”³¹

³¹ See Editorial, *On the need for affinity housing*, The Williams Rec. (Apr. 17, 2019), <https://williamsrecord.com/73685/opinions/on-the-need-for-affinity-housing/>; Pierce Wilson & Sabrina Eager, *Dartmouth Affinity Groups Provide Support, Community*, The Dartmouth (Sept. 7, 2021, 5:20 AM), <https://www.thedartmouth.com/article/2021/09/dartmouth-affinity-groups-provide-support-community> (One student explained how affinity groups “gave me the confidence to move around this campus. Just knowing that there are people who look like me, that can relate to the things that I’ve dealt with, it helped a lot.”).

3. The Proliferation of Student Affinity Groups Contributes to the Robust Exchange of Ideas Within Each Group Because Members Often Belong to More Than One Group, Which Further Increases the Overall Exchange of Ideas on Campus.

The anti-diversity *amici* have pointed to the proliferation of affinity groups as evidence of “neo-segregation.” See, e.g., NAS Br. 8-10. While the proliferation of student affinity groups may give the appearance of an ever-dividing campus, that appearance is superficial and does not hold up to closer inspection because students often belong to more than one group. Consider how a religious Black woman’s experience on campus is affected by the creation of a Black student affinity group. Before the Black student group existed, she might only have joined a religious group or a women’s affinity group and been exposed to debate and various perspectives on issues of special concern to those groups. Now, with the creation of a Black student affinity group, she might be a member of multiple groups, and might bring perspectives and ideas to which she was exposed at one group to the others. Far from increasing segregation, the proliferation of groups exponentially increases dialogue among students, and contributes to a “robust exchange of ideas” within each group on campus that would not otherwise exist.

4. **Student Affinity Groups Do Not Lead to Segregation, but Rather Facilitate Integration and Collaboration.**

The presence of racial- and ethnic-specific student affinity groups encourages dialogue and coalition-building. Consider how a broad array of student organizations on Harvard's campus responded to the trial in this very case: they coalesced in support of race-conscious admissions and diversity on campus, each bringing its own perspective to the debate. As Harvard's student newspaper reported, "students from different affinity groups united to protest publicly and host teach-ins to show their support for affirmative action and diversity at large."³² That same report quoted leaders of student groups explaining how the lawsuit itself "provided a coalition-building opportunity for students of color," and how despite "differences racially between our student groups," they came together to "act in solidarity with these other minority groups and communities of color." *Id.* Indeed, on Harvard's campus, groups co-hosted events to "hear [each] other's perspectives" and "first[-]hand accounts of black students or Latinx students" on campus as it related to admissions. *Id.*

³² Camille G. Caldera & Amanda Y. Su, 'We Will Tell Our Stories': *Students of Color Build Coalitions In Face of Threat to Affirmative Action*, Harv. Crimson (May 28, 2019), <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/5/28/admissions-coalition-building/>.

IV. WHEN STATES HAVE PROHIBITED AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, DIVERSITY HAS SUFFERED.

SFFA and its supporters argue that prohibiting affirmative action will not lessen diversity in admissions. They point to data from states that have eliminated race-based admissions, arguing that this Court's decision in *Grutter* erroneously assumes that diversity cannot be achieved by any other means than affirmative action. However, they rely on very limited data from a small sample of institutions that is unrepresentative of the experiences of minority students who have been affected by statewide bans on race-conscious admissions policies.³³ Petitioners' and their allies' arguments overlook significant data evidencing the sharp declines in diversity in college acceptances and enrollment since states' implementation of affirmative action bans. Moreover, petitioners and their supporters argue that educational missions have not been undermined in any measurable way in universities that are prohibited from considering race in admissions.³⁴ But this argument overlooks the decline in degree attainment and the persistent disparities in wealth and income for minority groups since the implementation of such bans.

³³ See generally Brief of Amici Curiae Oklahoma and 18 Other States in Support of Petitioner (May 9, 2022) ("Okla. Br.").

³⁴ *Id.*

**A. STATEWIDE BANS ON RACE-BASED
ADMISSIONS POLICIES HAVE
RESULTED IN DECLINES IN MINORITY
STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND
ENROLLMENT.**

States recognize that affirmative action policies help to alleviate disparities in educational achievements. Texas, for example, reinstated race-based admissions policies after *Grutter*. A 2018 study conducted by the University of Texas's Education Research Center found that minority groups benefited from the re-implementation of affirmative action. The study tracked the changes in college applications and found that affirmative action policies, in fact, played an important role in increasing minority students' secondary school efforts, college applications, and college graduation rates in Texas.³⁵ The state's research and decision to lift its ban on race-based admissions policies prove

³⁵ Mitra Akhtari et al., *The Effects of Race-Based Affirmative Action in Texas*, Univ. of Tex. at Austin Educ. Rsch. Ctr. (Nov. 2018), <https://texaserc.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/41-UTA059-Brief-AffAction-10.31.18.pdf>. Note, however, that even without affirmative action bans at private elite institutions, liberal arts colleges, and public flagships, Black and Latino students remain underrepresented compared to the percentage of college-aged Black and Latino students. See Andrew Howard Nichols, *Debunking 5 Myths about Affirmative Action*, The Educ. Tr. (Oct. 12, 2017), <https://edtrust.org/the-equity-line/debunking-5-myths-affirmative-action/>; Andrew Howard Nichols & J. Oliver Schak, *Broken Mirrors*, The Educ. Tr. (Mar. 6, 2019), <https://edtrust.org/resource/broken-mirrors-black-representation>.

that affirmative action can often increase diversity in higher education.


Since this Court’s 1978 decision in *Bakke*, several states have nonetheless issued statewide bans on the use of racial preferences in admissions decisions.³⁶ These bans have significantly reduced admissions of Black and other minority students. For example, Oklahoma enacted such a ban in November 2012. In its *amicus* brief, it states that since the ban, “there has been no long-term severe decline in minority admissions at the University of Oklahoma.”³⁷ However, the percentage of Black freshman students enrolled at the University of Oklahoma dropped from 6 percent in 2019 to 3.9 percent in 2020 and 4.2 percent in 2021.³⁸ Similarly, the percentage of freshman Native American students fell significantly, from over 9 percent in 2019 to only 2.5 percent in 2020 and 3.1 percent in

³⁶ See Idaho Code § 67-5909A (2020); Okla. Const. art. II, § 36A (2020); N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 187-A:16-a (2020); Ariz. Const. art. II, § 36 (2010); Neb. Const. art. I, § 30 (2008); Mich. Const. art. I, § 26 (2006); Fla. Exec. Order No. 99-281 (1999), <https://www.dms.myflorida.com/content/download/705/3389/file/ExecutiveOrder99-281.pdf>; Wash. Rev. Code. § 49.60.400 (1998); Cal. Const. art. I, § 31 (1996).

³⁷ See Okla. Br. 10.

³⁸ *First-Time Freshman Analysis Fall 2020*, Institutional Rsch. and Reporting, Univ. of Okla. (Sept. 2020), https://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Freshmen/FTF_Analysis_Fall_2020%20revised4.pdf; see also, *First-Time Freshman Analysis Fall 2021*, Institutional Rsch. and Reporting, Univ. of Okla. (Sept. 2021), https://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Freshmen/FTF_Analysis_Fall_2021.pdf.

2021. The following table summarizes these changes:



Severe and steady declines in minority admissions and enrollment have also taken place at public universities in other states that implemented bans earlier. Proposition 209 was enacted in California in 1996, prohibiting state institutions from using race, ethnicity, or sex as criteria in public education, public employment, and public contracting.³⁹ Proposition 209 led to a decline in college applications from and the enrollment of underrepresented minorities, including reduced Black and Hispanic student enrollment at every

³⁹ Cal. Const. art. I, § 31 (1996).

University of California (“UC”) campus.⁴⁰ After the 1998 implementation of the ban, underrepresented minority applicants became substantially less likely to earn admission and enroll at UC. For example, in 1990, 8 percent of students enrolled at UC Berkeley were Black. However, after the 1998 ban, Black enrollment declined to only 4 percent, then to 2 percent in 2015, even though Blacks made up 9 percent of the population in California.⁴¹ Similarly, at the University of California, Los Angeles (“UCLA”), admission rates for underrepresented minorities plummeted from 52.4 percent in 1995 to 24 percent in 1998. As a result, the percentage of underrepresented minorities fell by more than one-

⁴⁰ Zachary Bleemer, *Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility After California’s Proposition 209*, Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.10.2020, Ctr. for the Study of Higher Educ., UC Berkeley (Aug. 2020), https://cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/publications/rops.cshe.10.2020.bleemer.prop209.8.20.2020_2.pdf; Liliana M. Garces, *Racial Diversity, Legitimacy, and the Citizenry: The Impact of Affirmative Action Bans on Graduate School Enrollment*, 36 *The Rev. of Higher Educ.* 93, 100 (2012), <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1003835>; Peter Hinrichs, *The Effects of Affirmative Action Bans on College Enrollment, Educational Attainment, and the Demographic Composition of Universities*, 94 *The Rev. of Economics and Statistics* 712, 719-720 (2012), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23261474>.

⁴¹ Tiffany Jones & Andrew Howard Nichols, *Hard Truths: Why Only Race-Conscious Policies Can Fix Racism in Higher Education*, *The Educ. Tr.* (Jan. 2020), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED603265.pdf>; Jeremy Ashkenas et al., *Even With Affirmative Action, Blacks and Hispanics Are More Underrepresented at Top Colleges Than 35 Years Ago*, *N.Y. Times* (Aug. 24, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/08/24/us/affirmative-action.html>.

half: from 30.1 percent of the entering class in 1995 to 13.6 percent in 2012.⁴²

Interestingly, the decline in minority representation at UC came even as the minority population in California increased.⁴³ For example, at UCLA the proportion of Latino first-year students declined from 23 percent in 1995 to a mere 17 percent in 2011, even though the proportion of Latino college-aged persons in the state increased from 41 percent to 49 percent during that period.⁴⁴ The proportion of Black freshmen at UCLA declined from 8 percent in 1995 to 3 percent in 2011, even though the proportion of Black college-aged persons in California increased to 9 percent during that same period.⁴⁵ A table summarizing this decline is included below:

⁴² Erwin Chemerinsky, Op.-Ed., *If the Supreme Court bans affirmative action, it continues the U.S. legacy of racial discrimination*, L.A. Times (Jan. 25, 2022, 11:31 AM PT), <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2022-01-25/op-ed-supreme-court-bans-affirmative-action-discrimination>.

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *Id.*

Percentage of Latino and Black Freshmen at UCLA		
	1995	2011
Latino Freshman	23%	17%
Black Freshman	8%	3%

Today, Black and Latino students remain underrepresented at UC.⁴⁶ A 2020 Urban Institute study compared the percentage of Black and Latino students in the state's overall population to the percentage of those attending college in the state.⁴⁷ At UC San Diego in 2017, 18.4 percent of students identified as Hispanic. Yet the potential market of 18- to 24-year-old Hispanic students statewide for more selective institutions like San Diego is 39.4 percent. Meanwhile, only 1.5 percent of students at UC San Diego identified as Black in 2017.

Schools in Michigan saw similar declines in enrollment after that state banned affirmative

⁴⁶ Ashkenas et al., *supra* note 41.

⁴⁷ Tomas Monarrez & Kelia Washington, *Racial and Ethnic Representation in Postsecondary Education*, Ctr. on Educ. Data and Pol'y, The Urb. Inst. (last updated June 22, 2020), https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/102375/racial-and-ethnic-representation-in-postsecondary-education_1.pdf.

action. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, Black enrollment at the University of Michigan dropped nearly 10 percent – from 1,615 to 1,476 – in the three years following the state’s enactment of Proposition 2, which eliminated race-conscious admission policies.⁴⁸

A similar phenomenon can be seen in higher education in Florida. Following the governor’s executive order in 2000 banning race-based preferences in decisions for admission at state-operated universities, Black enrollment has fallen significantly, particularly at the graduate and professional school level. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (“JBHE”) reports that since the ban went into effect, the greatest impact has been felt at the state’s two most prestigious law schools.⁴⁹ At the University of Florida Levin College of Law, in 2000, there were 53 Black students in the entering class. By 2004, however, the number had dropped by more than one-half, to only 22 Black first-year law students.⁵⁰ This year, Black first-year

⁴⁸ Adam Harris, *What Happens When a College’s Affirmative-Action Policy Is Found Illegal*, The Atlantic (Oct. 28, 2018), <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/10/when-college-cant-use-race-admissions/574126/>.

⁴⁹ *How State Bans on Race-Sensitive Admissions Have Damaged Black Enrollments in Professional Schools*, The J. of Blacks in Higher Educ., https://www.jbhe.com/features/51_professional_schools.html (last visited June 22, 2022).

⁵⁰ Other factors, including a public dispute among University of Florida Levin College of Law faculty regarding racial diversity of professors, may have contributed to the decline in Black enrollment immediately following the 2000 ban on race-

enrollments rebounded to 35, which is still 34 percent below the level that existed prior to the enactment of the ban. At the Florida State University College of Law, there were 23 Black students in the entering class in 2000.⁵¹ Notably, this year there are only 10 Black students in the first-year class. Likewise, JBHE reports that at the University of Florida's medical school, there were 12 Black first-year students in the class that enrolled in 2000, the year immediately before the ban on race-sensitive admissions went into effect. The following year, the number of entering Black medical students dropped nearly in half, and this year there are 10 Black students in the first year of medical school at the University of Florida.

The effects of statewide affirmative action bans have also gone beyond the undergraduate level in states other than Florida. According to JBHE, in 1997 the regents' ban on affirmative action took effect for graduate programs in the UC system. That year, Black admits dropped from 77 to 18, a decrease of 76.6 percent. Black first-year enrollments dropped from 20 in 1996 to only one in 1997.

conscious admissions. See William Glaberson, *Accusations of Bias Roil Florida Law School*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 30, 2000), <https://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/30/us/accusations-of-bias-roil-florida-law-school.html>.

⁵¹ Note, between 2000 and 2022, University of Florida Levin College of Law reduced the size of its entering class from over 400 students in previous years to 241 students in 2021, potentially contributing to a decline in the number of Black matriculants. See *Entering Class Profile, Class of 2024 (Fall 2021*)*, UF Law (Aug. 31, 2021), <https://www.law.ufl.edu/admissions/apply/entering-class-profile>.

Similarly, in 1994, the year before the affirmative action admissions plan was announced, Black enrollments at the UCLA law school reached an all-time high of 46 Black students. The next year, after the ban was announced, Black enrollments dropped by more than one-half, to two Black students. In 1997, when the ban took effect, there were only 10 black first-year law students at UCLA. By 1999, only three Black first-year law school students enrolled at UCLA.⁵²

The impact of the ban on race-sensitive admissions at California's elite state-operated law schools is also reflected in the rates of admission. In 2005 only 36, or 10.7 percent, of the 336 Black applicants to the Boalt Hall Law School at the University of California, Berkeley were accepted for admission. In 1996, before the ban on affirmative action went into effect, nearly 20 percent of all Black applicants were admitted. At the UCLA School of Law, only 8 percent of Black applicants were admitted in 2005. In 1996, more than 26 percent of Black applicants were admitted. At the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, the affirmative action ban had a similar impact. In 1996, before the ban went into effect, there were 11 Black students who matriculated at the business school, while in 1997, the number dropped to five Black students. JBHE reports that in 2005 there was only one Black student in the entering class at the Haas School. In 1996, however, Blacks were 4.5

⁵² *Id.*

percent of the entering students at the Haas School. This year the figure is 0.4 percent.

The data described above shows that, contrary to petitioners' views, eliminating race-based preferences in admissions decisions negatively impacts minority students and leads to less diversity in colleges and professions. As a result, several states that have implemented bans, including California, Florida, and Michigan, have not been able to reflect the states' full diversity in their state universities since the bans went into effect.

B. STATEWIDE BANS ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HAVE LED TO A GENERAL DECLINE IN DEGREE ATTAINMENT FOR BLACK ADULTS, AS WELL AS AN "OPPORTUNITY GAP" IN EDUCATION AND INCOME.

As a result of statewide bans on affirmative action, there has generally been a decline in degree attainment for Black adults. Among Black adults, ages 25 to 34, the percentage with a college degree has declined to 30 percent. Degree attainment among younger White adults, however, is nearly 10 percent higher than it is for older White adults.⁵³ That is, the current level of degree attainment for Blacks is lower than the attainment levels of Whites

⁵³ Andrew Howard Nichols & J. Oliver Schak, *Degree Attainment for Black Adults: National and State Trends*, The Educ. Tr. (2017), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED593322.pdf>.

in 1990 – over a quarter of a century ago.⁵⁴ In certain states, including Oklahoma and Washington – states that banned race-based admission policies – the percentage of degree attainment among Black students in the state has been ranked below average.⁵⁵

As a result, minority groups continue to experience disparities that extend beyond higher education. There is an “opportunity gap” and persistent disparities in education and income, leaving minorities with fewer opportunities to build generational wealth. In today’s economy, a college degree is increasingly beneficial. Generally, unemployment rates are lower for people with higher educational attainment. For example, in 2016, the net worth of a typical White family was reported to be \$171,000 – nearly ten times greater than that of a typical Black family.⁵⁶ That data proves that there is a gap in wealth between Black and White households, reflecting a society that still denies equal opportunities to *all* of its citizens. Furthermore, aside from mere financial benefits, degree attainment is associated with larger social benefits, including less crime and incarceration, better health, and higher levels of voting and

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 1.

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 3.

⁵⁶ Emily Moss et al., *The Black-white wealth gap left Black households more vulnerable*, Brookings (Dec. 8, 2020), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/12/08/the-black-white-wealth-gap-left-black-households-more-vulnerable/>.

political engagement.⁵⁷ Without equitable access to higher education, Black communities and other minority groups are relegated to an overall lesser quality of life. Thus, eliminating affirmative action in higher education reaches far beyond college admissions, and has real world social consequences, especially for the minority groups that are most impacted.

Certain *amici* rely on earnings from graduates of the University of Michigan to argue that incomes after bans on race-based admissions did not fall.⁵⁸ But they ignore the impact specifically on Black and minority groups. While these *amici* make the claim that “[University of Michigan] Wolverines are no less desirable to businesses and employers now that they are graduating from a school with race-neutral admissions,”⁵⁹ it is presumable that White graduates are the main beneficiaries, because the earnings do not account for the 10 percent decline in Black students who were not enrolled following the ban.

Further, the petitioners state that “the ability of students to thrive in the workforce without attending schools that racially balance their student body is further demonstrated by the success of Historically Black Colleges and Universities

⁵⁷ Philip Trostel, *It's Not Just the Money: The Benefits of College Education to Individuals and to Society*, Lumina Issue Papers, Lumina Found. (Oct. 14, 2015), <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/its-not-just-the-money.pdf>.

⁵⁸ See Okla. Br. 17.

⁵⁹ *Id.*

(HBCUs).”⁶⁰ However, HBCUs are the exception. HBCUs were established with the principal purpose of educating Black Americans during a time of legal segregation when Black people were not permitted to attend predominantly White institutions.⁶¹ Petitioners argue that while HBCUs do not meet respondents’ definition of “diversity” which is claimed to be necessary for minority students’ success, they are correct that HBCUs play a major role in providing access to higher education and wealth mobility.⁶² However, HBCUs were merely the first line-of-defense against racism in higher education. Affirmative action still plays a necessary role in admissions for even HBCU graduates who go on to obtain law and medical degrees and attend other graduate school programs at colleges and universities that are not HBCUs.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should affirm its precedent and uphold the race-conscious admissions programs of the President & Fellows of Harvard College and the University of North Carolina.

⁶⁰ *Id.* at 17-18.

⁶¹ *Historically Black Colleges and Universities*, Nat’l Ctr. for Educ. Stat., <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=667>.

⁶² *See* Okla. Br. 18.

August 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

MARK A. PACKMAN

Counsel of Record

KRISTINE M. HANSEN

RACHEL H. JENNINGS

ETHAN H. KAMINSKY

DECEMBER L. HUDDLESTON

GILBERT LLP

700 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE

Suite 400

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 772-2320

packmanm@gilbertlegal.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

APPENDIX

**APPENDIX: LIST OF *AMICI* – 67 CURRENT
AND FORMER EDUCATORS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION WHO SUPPORT
RACE-CONSCIOUS ADMISSIONS**

Barbara A. Atwood
Mary Anne Richey
Professor of Law
Emerita

*Co-Director, Family
and Juvenile Law
Certificate Program*

James E. Rogers
College of Law
The University of
Arizona

Tucson, Arizona

Celia B. Barnes Ph.D.
*Associate Professor of
English*

Lawrence University
Appleton, Wisconsin

Roger M. Baron
Professor Emeritus
School of Law
University of South
Dakota
Vermillion, South
Dakota

Vilna Bashi Treitler
*Osborn Professor of
Sociology*

Department of
Sociology, Weinberg
College of Arts &
Sciences

Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Mary Beth Beazley
Professor of Law

William S. Boyd
School of Law
University of Nevada,
Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

Martha Biondi
Lorraine H Morton
Professor of African
American Studies and
Professor of History
 Department of African
 American Studies,
 Weinberg College of
 Arts & Sciences
 Northwestern
 University
 Evanston, Illinois

Mark S. Brodin
Professor and Michael
& Helen Lee
Distinguished Scholar
 Boston College Law
 School
 Newton,
 Massachusetts

Prudence L. Carter
Sarah & Joseph Jr.
Dowling Professor
 Department of
 Sociology
 Brown University
 Providence, Rhode
 Island

Frank A. Fritz III
Senior Fellow &
Adjunct Professor
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

Marie-Amélie George
Associate Professor of
Law
 Wake Forest
 University School of
 Law
 Winston-Salem, North
 Carolina

Leslie C. Griffin
Boyd Professor of Law
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

Deborah Hensler
Judge John W. Ford
Professor of Dispute
Resolution
 Stanford Law School
 Stanford, California

Laura J. Hines
Centennial Teaching
Professor
Director, Shook,
Hardy & Bacon
Center for Excellence
in Advocacy
 School of Law
 University of Kansas
 Lawrence, Kansas

Robert H. Jerry II
Floyd R. Gibson
Missouri Endowed
Professor-Emeritus
 University of Missouri
 School of Law
 Columbia, Missouri

Timothy Jost
Robert L. Willett
Family Professor of
Law, Emeritus
 The Washington and
 Lee University School
 of Law
 Lexington, Virginia

Kenneth S. Klein
Louis and Hermione
Brown Professor of
Law
Associate Dean for
Assessment and
Teaching
 California Western
 School of Law
 San Diego, California

Michael A. Lawrence
Professor of Law
Past Foster Swift
Professor of
Constitutional Law
 Michigan State
 University College of
 Law
 East Lansing,
 Michigan

Sylvia Lazos
Justice Myron Leavitt
Professor
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

David Levine
Raymond Sullivan
Professor of Law
 Hastings College of
 the Law
 University of
 California
 San Francisco,
 California

Lawrence C. Levine
Gordon D. Schaber
Health Law & Policy
Professor of Law
Associate Dean for
Diversity, Equity and
Inclusion
 McGeorge School of
 Law
 University of the
 Pacific
 Sacramento,
 California

Heather Love
Professor of English
 Department of
 English
 University of
 Pennsylvania
 Philadelphia,
 Pennsylvania

Cameron M. Lue Sang
Assistant Dean of
Admissions and
Financial Aid
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

Patrick Luff
Former Professor
 Luff Law Firm, PLLC
 Dallas, Texas

James L. Mahoney
Gordon Fulcher
Professor in Decision-
Making, Professor of
Sociology, and
Professor of Political
Science
 Department of
 Sociology and
 Department of
 Political Science,
 Weinberg College of
 Arts & Sciences
 Northwestern
 University
 Evanston, Illinois

Sharon Marcus
*Former Dean of the
 Humanities at
 Columbia,
 Orlando Harriman
 Professor of English
 and Comparative
 Literature*
 Department of
 English &
 Comparative
 Literature
 Columbia University
 New York, New York

Wendy K. Mariner
 JD, LLM, MPH
*Professor Emerita,
 Health Law, Ethics &
 Human Rights*
 School of Public
 Health
 Boston University
 Boston,
 Massachusetts

Leo P. Martinez
*Managing Director,
 Andersen; Dean
 Emeritus and Faculty
 Emeritus*
 Hastings College of
 Law
 University of
 California
 San Francisco,
 California

Stephen McCaffrey
*Carol Olson Endowed
 Professor of*
International Law
 McGeorge School of
 Law
 University of the
 Pacific
 Sacramento,
 California

Ann C. McGinley
*William S. Boyd
 Professor of Law
 Co-Director,
 Workplace Law
 Program*
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas

Las Vegas, Nevada
 Daniel S. Medwed
*University
 Distinguished
 Professor of Law and
 Criminal Justice*
 Northeastern
 University School of
 Law
 Boston,
 Massachusetts

Patricia W. Moore
Professor of Law
 St. Thomas University
 College of Law
 Miami Gardens,
 Florida

Gregory Munro
Professor Emeritus
 Alexander Blewett III
 School of Law
 University of Montana
 Missoula, Montana

Robert L. Nelson
*Professor of Sociology
 and Law*
*MacCrate Research
 Chair, American Bar
 Foundation*
 Department of
 Sociology, Weinberg
 College of Arts &
 Sciences
 Northwestern
 University
 Evanston, Illinois

Luís A. Nunes Amaral
*Erastus Otis Haven
 Professor*
 McCormick School of
 Engineering
 Northwestern
 University
 Evanston, Illinois

Leslie Paik
Professor
 School of Social and
 Family Dynamics
 Arizona State
 University
 Tempe, Arizona

Mary Pattillo
Harold Washington
Professor of Sociology
and Chair,
Department of African
American Studies
Department of
Sociology, Weinberg
College of Arts &
Sciences
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Jeremy Paul
Professor of Law
Northeastern
University School of
Law
Boston,
Massachusetts

Christine Percheski
Professor of Sociology
Department of
Sociology, Weinberg
College of Arts &
Sciences
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Becky Pettit
Barbara Pierce Bush
Regents Professor of
Liberal Arts
Department of
Sociology Population
Research Center,
College of Liberal Arts
The University of
Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Monica Prasad
Professor of Sociology
Department of
Sociology, Weinberg
College of Arts &
Sciences
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Lincoln Quillian
Professor of Sociology
Faculty Fellow,
Institute for Policy
Research
Associate Chair
Department of
Sociology, Weinberg
College of Arts &
Sciences
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Dana Rabin
Chair of the History
Department
College of Liberal Arts
& Sciences
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Deborah A. Ramirez
Professor of Law;
Chair, Criminal
Justice Task Force;
Faculty Co-Director,
Center for Law, Equity
and Race (CLEAR)
Northeastern
University School of
Law
Boston,
Massachusetts

Seth Rockman
Associate Professor of
History
Brown University
Providence, Rhode
Island

Sonia Elise E. Rolland
Professor of Law
Northeastern
University School of
Law
Boston,
Massachusetts

Catherine Ross
Dunham
Professor of Law
Elon University
School of Law
Greensboro, North
Carolina

John E. Rumel
Professor of Law
University of Idaho
College of Law
Boise, Idaho

Rebecca L. Scharf
Professor of Law
William S. Boyd
School of Law
University of Nevada,
Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

Michael Hunter
Schwartz
*Dean and Professor of
Law*
McGeorge School of
Law
University of the
Pacific
Sacramento,
California

Marjorie A. Silver
*Director of Externship
Programs*
Professor of Law
Jacob D. Fuchsberg
Law Center
Touro University
Central Islip, New
York

Michael Sinha
*Assistant Professor of
Law*
Saint Louis
University School of
Law
St. Louis, Missouri

Jennifer Smith
Profesor of Law
Florida AMU College
of Law
Tallahassee, Florida

Michael Stamm
Professor
Department of
History, College of
Social Science
Michigan State
University
East Lansing,
Michigan

Joan Steinman
Professor of Law
Emerita,
University
Distinguished
Professor Emerita
 Chicago-Kent College
 of Law
 Illinois Institute of
 Technology
 Chicago, Illinois

Jeffrey W. Stempel
Doris S. & Theodore
B. Lee Professor of
Law
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

Jean Sternlight
Saltman Professor of
Law & Founding
Director Saltman
Center for Conflict
Resolution
 William S. Boyd
 School of Law
 University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas
 Las Vegas, Nevada

Brian L. Sykes Ph.D.
Associate Professor &
Chancellor's Fellow
Inclusive Excellence
Term Chair
Professor
Director of Graduate
Studies
 Department of
 Criminology, Law and
 Society
 Departments of
 Sociology and Public
 Health (by courtesy)
 University of
 California, Irvine
 Irvine, California

Shauhin Talesh
Professor of Law
By courtesy, Professor
of Sociology and
Criminology, Law &
Society
Director, Law &
Graduate Studies
Program
 School of Law
 University of
 California, Irvine
 Irvine, California

Keeanga-Yamahtta
Taylor PhD.
*Professor of African
American Studies*
Department of African
American Studies,
Weinberg College of
Arts & Sciences
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois

Beth Thornburg
*Professor Emeritus of
Law*
Dedman School of
Law
Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, Texas

David B. Thronson
*Associate Dean for
Experiential
Education*
Alan S. Zekelman
*Professor of
International Human
Rights Law*
*Director, Talsky
Center for Human
Rights*
Michigan State
University College of
Law
East Lansing,
Michigan

J.H. (Rip) Verkerke
*T. Munford Boyd
Professor of Law and
Director,
Program for
Employment and
Labor Law Studies*
University of Virginia
School of Law
Charlottesville,
Virginia

Michael Vitiello
*Distinguished
Professor of Law*
McGeorge School of
Law
University of the
Pacific
Sacramento,
California

Brian Wall
*Associate Dean for
Student Affairs*
William S. Boyd
School of Law
University of Nevada,
Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

Rhonda Wasserman
*Professor Emerita of
Law*
University of
Pittsburgh School of
Law
Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania

Charles E. Wilson
*Emeritus Associate
Professor*
Moritz College of Law
The Ohio State
University
Columbus, Ohio

Jared Wunsch
*Former Chair of
Mathematics*
Northwestern
University
Evanston, Illinois