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**Associations/Organizations**

American Association of University Women  
http://www.aauw.org/

American Educational Research Association  
http://www.aera.net/

Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies  
http://www.apaics.org/

Association of Black Women in Higher Education  
http://www.abwhe.org/

Association of Clinician for the Underserved  
http://www.clinicians.org/

The Black Collegian Online  
http://www.black-collegian.com/

Congress of Racial Equality  
http://www.core-online.org/

Council of National Psychological Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority Interests  

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)  
http://www.lulac.org/

National Association for Advancement of Colored People  
http://www.naacp.org/

National Association of Latino Elected & Appointed Officials (NALEO)  
http://www.naleo.org/

National Association for Women Business Owners  
http://www.nawbo.org/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Think Tanks**

American Enterprise Institute  

Aspen Institute  

Brookings Institution  
[http://www.brookings.edu/](http://www.brookings.edu/)

Bureau of Governmental Research  

The Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs  
[http://www.cceia.org/search_in](http://www.cceia.org/search_in)

Cato Institute  

Center for the American Woman and Politics  
[http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/](http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/)

Center for Equal Opportunity  

Center for National Policy  

Center for the New West  
[http://www.newwest.org/](http://www.newwest.org/)

Center for Responsive Politics  

Center for Strategic and International Studies  

Center for the Study of the Presidency
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http://www.cspresidency.org/

Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy
http://www.mccormack.umb.edu/centers/cwppp/index.php

Claremont Institute
http://www.claremont.org/search/default.asp

The Discovery Institute
http://www.discovery.org/

Economic Policy Institute
http://www.epi.org/

Economic Strategy Institute
http://www.econstrat.org/

Education Policy Institute
http://www.educationalpolicy.org/

Employee Benefit Research Institute
http://www.ebri.org/

Employment Policies Institute
http://www.epionline.org/

Empower America
http://www.freedomworks.org/about/about-freedomworks

Heartland Institute
http://www.heartland.org/

Hudson Institute
http://www.hudson.org/

Independence Institute
http://www.i2i.org/main/page.php?page_id=1

Independent Institute
http://www.independent.org/
Institute for Policy Innovation
http://www.ipi.org/

Institute for Socioeconomic Studies
http://www.socioeconomic.org/

Institute for Women's Policy Research
http://www.iwpr.org/index.cfm

The Levy Institute
http://www.levy.org/

The Locke Institute
http://www.thelockeinstitute.org/

The Massachusetts Institute for a New Economy
http://www.massinc.org/

National Academy of Social Insurance
http://www.nasi.org/

National Center on Education and the Economy
http://www.ncee.org/index.jsp;jsessionid=a8w1BgyaB-g8?setProtocol=true

National Regulatory Research Institute
http://people.virginia.edu/~rjb3v/T-tanks.html#E

Pacific Research Institute
http://www.ideas.org/

Progress and Freedom Foundation
http://www.pff.org/

Progressive Policy Institute
http://www.dlc.org/

Reason Foundation
http://reason.org/

Rand
http://www.rand.org/
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Twentieth Century Fund
www.tcf.org/
www.uiowa.edu/policult/politick/smithson/tcf.htm

Urban Institute
http://www.urban.org/

W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
http://www.upjohninst.org/
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**Government Departments**

Central Intelligence Agency
[https://www.cia.gov/](https://www.cia.gov/)

Defense Technical Information Center

Department of Agriculture

Department of Commerce

Department of Defense
[http://www.defenselink.mil/](http://www.defenselink.mil/)

Department of Education

Department of Energy

Department of Health and Human Services

Department of Homeland Security

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Department of Interior

Department of Justice

Department of Labor

Department of State
http://www.state.gov/

Department of Transportation

Department of Treasury
http://www.ustreas.gov/

Department of Veterans Affairs
http://www.va.gov/

Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)
http://www.doi.gov/

Federal Bureau of Investigation
http://www.fbi.gov/

Federal and State Judicial Opinions
Cornell Law School site
http://www.law.cornell.edu/opinions.html

Judicial Branch
http://www.uscourts.gov/

Legislative Branch
http://www.whitehouse.gov/our_government/legislative_branch/

National Security Agency
http://www.nsa.gov/

Peace Corps
http://www.peacecorps.gov/

U.S. Air Force
http://www.af.mil/

U.S. Agency for International Development
http://www.usaid.gov/
U.S. Army  
http://www.army.mil/

U.S. House of Representatives  
http://www.house.gov/

U.S. Library of Congress  
http://www.loc.gov/index.html

U.S. Mission to the U.N.  
http://www.usunnewyork.usmission.gov/

U.S. Navy  

U.S. Senate  
http://www.senate.gov/

U.S. Supreme Court  
The Legal Information Institute offers Supreme Court opinions under the auspices of Project Hermes, the court's electronic-dissemination project.  
http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/

White House  
http://www.whitehouse.gov/
Federal Agencies and Commissions

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
http://www.achp.gov/

Congressional Budget Office
http://www.cbo.gov/

Consumer Product Safety Commission
http://cpsc.gov/

Commodity Futures Trading Commission
http://www.cftc.gov/

Corporation For National Service
http://www.nationalservice.gov/

Environmental Protection Agency
http://www.epa.gov/

Federal Communications Commission
http://www.fcc.gov/

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
http://www.fdic.gov/

Federal Emergency Management Agency
http://www.fema.gov/

Federal Housing and Finance Agency
http://www.fhfa.gov/

Federal Trade Commission
http://www.ftc.gov/

Food and Drug Administration
http://www.fda.gov/

General Accountability Office
http://www.gao.gov/
General Services Administration
http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/home.do?tabId=0

Institute of Museum and Library Services
http://www.imls.gov/

National Archives and Records Administration
http://www.archives.gov/index.html

National Technology Transfer Center
http://www.nttc.edu/

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
http://www.nrc.gov/

Office of Management and Budget
http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/

Railroad Retirement Board
http://www.rrb.gov/default.asp

Securities and Exchange Commission
http://www.sec.gov/

Selective Service System
http://www.sss.gov/

Small Business Administration
http://www.sbaonline.sba.gov/

Smithsonian Institution
http://www.si.edu/

Social Security Administration
http://www.ssa.gov/
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U.S. International Trade Commission
http://www.usitc.gov/

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board
http://www.mspb.gov/sites/mspb/default.aspx/

United States Office of Government Ethics
http://www.usoge.gov/

United States Postal Service
http://www.usps.com/

Voice of America
http://www.voanews.com/english/About/

WomensNet
http://www.igc.org/
**Databases/Indexes**

Federal Consumer Information Center
http://www.info.gov/

FedStats
http://www.fedstats.gov/

FedWorld Information Network
http://www.fedworld.gov/index.html

Government Databases by Subject
http://www.ulib.iupui.edu/subjectareas/gov/dbsubject/intl

Government Information Locator Service (GILS) Database
http://www.gils.net/

Political Resources 2005
http://www.politicalresources.net/u-org_rights.htm

U.S.A.Gov
http://www.usa.gov/

U.S. Government Documents Ready Reference Collection

US Government Printing Office
http://www.gpoaccess.gov/
Workforce Diversity

Available: http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=8042&type=0

Summary

Immigrants are a substantial and growing segment of the U.S. labor force. In 2006, 23 million workers—one in seven workers in the United States—were foreign born, and half had arrived since 1990. During the past decade, foreign-born workers accounted for half of the growth of the U.S. labor force. In 2006, about 40 percent of foreign-born workers were from Mexico and Central America, and 25 percent were from Asia. To a considerable extent, educational attainment determines the role of immigrants in the labor market. Even as the number of native-born workers without a high school diploma is shrinking, the number of foreign-born workers without a diploma continues to increase. In 2006, among workers age 25 and older who lacked a diploma, nearly half were foreign born, and most were from Mexico and Central America. At the same time, many other immigrant groups were highly educated. The educational attainment of foreign-born workers from other regions was slightly higher than that of workers born in the United States; in particular, a higher percentage of those immigrants had taken graduate courses. Those differences in average educational attainment among immigrants by country of origin appear to reflect the basis on which foreign-born workers were admitted to the United States, rather than differences in educational levels in their home countries. For example, the average educational attainment among workers who came from India is roughly 16 years, even though the average educational attainment of the adult population in that country is well below the high school level; many workers from India were admitted to the United States because they had skills that were in demand. Many workers from Mexico and Central America were employed in jobs that required little formal education. Workers from that region earned much less, on average, than did the typical native worker. In 2006, three-quarters of workers born in Mexico and Central America were employed in occupations that have minimal educational requirements, such as construction laborer and dishwasher; only one-quarter of native workers held such jobs. On average, the weekly earnings of men from Mexico and Central America who worked full time were 55 percent those of native-born men; women from Mexico and Central America earned about 60 percent of the average weekly earnings of native-born women.

[abridged]


**Summary**

In our focus on accessions, we’ve accomplished much in the six months since I last testified. There has been notable progress in our enlisted and officer recruiting programs. Our enlisted recruiting mid-year results for FY 2009 show a 7 percent increase in minority accessions and a 4 percent increase in women compared to the same period in 2008. The enlisted reserve accessions so far this year show a 16 percent gain, and female accessions are up 11 percent over the same period last year as well. Our recruiting mission emphasis will strive to carry this positive trend through the remainder of the year. Our officer programs data shows that applicant pools are increasing. The College Student Pre-Commissioning Initiative (CSPI) candidate pools are at an all-time high. Of the current 42 candidates in the program, 48 percent are minority and 38 percent are female. The projected pool of applicants for the panel that meets later this spring is also shaping up to have the largest candidate pool of any CSPI selection panel we have ever convened. We expect between 60 and 70 applicants. That is a significant increase over the 48 applicants in 2008 and the 30 in 2007. For this upcoming panel, we project the female and minority candidates will make up between 65-70 percent of the candidates. The Academy class of 2013 (in final stages of the selection process for this year) had an overall applicant increase and a 23 percent increase in minority candidates over last year. With this applicant pool, we estimate there will be a slight increase over the 11 percent of minority cadets that entered the Academy last year. I expect a sustained strong female presence at the Academy and project that 25-30 percent of the incoming class will be female. I will be happy to report back the final candidate selection results to you in June. The incoming “Scholars Program,” the academy 1-year prep program, is currently projected to be made up of 50 percent minority cadet candidates and is expected to make strong future class contributions as well.


This report gives an overview of how the agencies are working to create a more diverse workforce and ways to increase minority/women owned (M/WBE) businesses into the procurement process. Leadership for the Public Service for the State of Missouri. The Office of Supplier and Workforce Diversity (OSWD) is concerned with ensuring that all businesses have the same opportunities to compete for the supply of goods and services as other qualified suppliers in the State of Missouri. We believe broadening our supplier base will gain access to new ideas and increase competition. This will better serve our agencies and the constituents of Missouri. The Office of Supplier and Workforce Diversity partners with organizations who support the mission of raising awareness for Supplier Diversity in the State of Missouri and seek opportunities for Minority or Women Business Enterprises. By working with these organizations, we engage in the following activities:

- Develop an effective framework to promote supplier diversity.
- Take action where possible to remove/minimize any challenges within the State of Missouri that may hinder Minority or Women Business Enterprises (M/WBE) in supplying goods and services to our agencies.
- Develop programs to encourage and empower Minority or Women Business Enterprises (M/WBE).
- Monitor, evaluate and communicate the progress that our program makes on a continuing basis to assess its impact.
- Develop and internal database of Minority or Women Business Enterprises (M/WBE).
- Raise awareness for supplier diversity by building a strong business case for doing business with Minority or Women Business Enterprises (M/WBE).
- Communicate best practices for implementing supplier diversity.
- Participate/Facilitate internal and external networking events with Minority or Women Business Enterprises. During Fiscal Year 07, OSWD diligently worked with each one of the agencies to strive to meet the goals established by Executive Order 05-30. In doing so, OSWD found that there are challenges to overcome to allow additional Minority or Women Business Enterprises to enter into the procurement process at the State of Missouri: Mandatory State Contracts. These types of contracts are commonly awarded to non M/WBE vendors; they also restrict the discretion that the agencies have to utilize an M/WBE vendor.

Available:

Summary

In August 2006, we reported to Congress on the results of our review, which Congress requested, of factors affecting Hispanic representation in the federal workforce and efforts being taken by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and other agencies related to Hispanic representation. We reported that EEOC and OPM require agencies to analyze their workforces to help ensure equal employment opportunity and that EEOC requires agencies to analyze subsets of their workforce to determine whether barriers to such opportunities may exist. As indicated in that report, and as discussed with Congress, this report contains additional data on Hispanic representation in various subsets of the federal workforce with some comparisons to Hispanic representation in the Civilian Labor Force (CLF). The data in this report provide a foundation for further analyses by agency officials and policymakers as they consider a broad spectrum of issues related to Hispanic representation in the federal workforce. These data include analyses by agency, selected occupation, occupational category, grade, and among new hires. For purposes of these analyses, the federal workforce governmentwide includes civilian employees of all cabinet-level departments, independent agencies, commissions, councils, and boards in the executive branch except the intelligence agencies, the Postal Service, and the Foreign Service (as of 2006). This report provides data on: (1) Hispanic representation for each of the 24 Chief Financial Officer Act agencies, using the CPDF for each of the years 1990-2006. The Central Personnel Data File (CPDF) is a database maintained by OPM that contains individual records for most federal employees and personnel actions. It is the primary governmentwide source for information on federal employees; (2) Hispanic representation in the CLF and governmentwide by EEOC's occupational categories. EEOC uses nine occupational categories for the federal workforce--officials and managers, professionals, technicians, sales, office and clerical, craft workers, operatives, laborers, and service workers. EEOC also requires private sector employers to report data using these nine categories; (3) Hispanic representation governmentwide by OPM's occupational categories. OPM, which is responsible for classifying federal occupations, uses six occupational categories; one covering blue-collar occupations, which includes occupations comprising the trades, crafts, and manual labor, and five covering white-collar occupations--professional, administrative, technical, clerical, and other white collar; (4) Hispanic representation in federal occupations and in similar…[abridged].
A high-performance organization relies on a dynamic workforce with the requisite talents, multidisciplinary knowledge, and up-to-date skills to ensure that it is equipped to accomplish its mission and achieve its goals. Such organizations typically (1) foster a work environment in which people are enabled and motivated to contribute to mission accomplishment and (2) provide both accountability and fairness for all employees. To accomplish these objectives, high-performance organizations are inclusive, drawing on the strengths of employees at all levels and of all backgrounds—an approach consistent with diversity management. For purposes of our review, diversity management is defined as a process intended to create and maintain a positive work environment where the similarities and differences of individuals are valued, so that all can reach their potential and maximize their contributions to an organization's strategic goals and objectives. As part of a request that GAO report on the federal government's performance in managing its diverse workforce, GAO was asked to identify (1) leading diversity management practices and (2) examples of the identified practices in the federal government. This report contains no recommendations. Of the experts in the field of diversity management we spoke with or whose publications we reviewed to identify leading diversity management practices, a majority cited the following nine practices as leading. Top leadership commitment—a vision of diversity demonstrated and communicated throughout an organization by top-level management. Diversity as part of an organization's strategic plan—a diversity strategy and plan that are developed and aligned with the organization's strategic plan. Diversity linked to performance—the understanding that a more diverse and inclusive work environment can yield greater productivity and help improve individual and organizational performance. Measurement—a set of quantitative and qualitative measures of the impact of various aspects of an overall diversity program. Accountability—the means to ensure that leaders are responsible for diversity by linking their performance assessment and compensation to the progress of diversity initiatives. Succession planning—an ongoing, strategic process for identifying and developing a diverse pool of talent for an organization's potential future leaders. Recruitment—the process of attracting a supply of qualified, diverse applicants for employment. Employee involvement—the contribution of employees in driving diversity throughout an organization. Diversity training—organizational efforts to inform and educate management and staff about diversity. [abridged]


Summary

For GAO, having a diverse workforce at all levels is an organizational strength that contributes to the achievement of results by bringing a wider variety of perspectives and approaches to policy development and implementation, strategic planning, problem solving and decision making. GAO’s Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness (O&I) is responsible for all functions and activities designed to promote diversity and maintain a work environment that is fair, unbiased, and inclusive. O&I’s analysis of performance appraisal data indicated that there were significant differences in appraisal averages for African American and Caucasian analysts. GAO contracted with the Ivy Planning Group to assess the factors that influenced the differences. Ivy issued its African American Performance Assessment Study report on April 25, 2008 and the Acting Comptroller General issued a memorandum on April 30, 2008 expressing his commitment to addressing all of the report’s recommendations. The subcommittee asked GAO’s Inspector General (IG) to examine the effectiveness of O&I and analyze the representation of women and minorities in the agency’s Senior Executive Service (SES) and managerial ranks (GS-15 and equivalent level). This testimony focuses on the results of the IG’s review and provides information on actions taken and planned to further enhance diversity at GAO.

Available:


Summary

This testimony discusses the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) efforts to identify and address barriers to equal employment opportunity (EEO) in its workforce. Since its inception in March 2003, DHS has faced a number of challenges, one of which is effectively and strategically managing its large workforce (about 216,000 employees) to respond to current and emerging 21st century issues. The federal government is faced with a workforce that is becoming increasingly eligible for retirement. We have reported that it is important for federal agencies, including DHS, to use available flexibilities to acquire, develop, motivate, and retain talented individuals who reflect all segments of society and our nation's diversity. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) Management Directive (MD) 715 provides that in order to attract and retain top talent, federal agencies are to identify barriers to EEO in the workplace, execute plans to eliminate barriers, and report annually to EEOC. This testimony is based on our report that we recently issued entitled Equal Employment Opportunity: DHS Has Opportunities to Better Identify and Address Barriers to EEO in Its Workforce. This testimony discusses (1) the extent to which DHS has taken steps, according to its MD-715 reports, to identify barriers to EEO in the workplace; (2) efforts DHS has taken to address identified barriers and what progress has been reported; and (3) how DHS oversees and supports its components in identifying and addressing barriers. For this work, we analyzed DHS's identified barriers and plans to address those barriers obtained from its fiscal year 2007 and 2008 reports. In addition, we reviewed DHS policies, guidance, directives, and diversity plans related to identifying and addressing barriers. We interviewed DHS officials from its Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL) and the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (OCHCO). We also reviewed MD-715 and EEOC instructions and guidance on MD-715, and interviewed EEOC officials from its Office of Federal Operations. We obtained information from the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Strategic Human Resource Policy Division on the availability of Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) data to federal agencies. Our report contains a more detailed discussion of our objectives, scope, and methodology. Our work was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. [abridged]
Summary

In April 2002, GAO identified the need to strengthen equal employment opportunity (EEO) oversight at three Department of Energy (DOE) national weapons laboratories and recommended that DOE and the Department of Labor's (DOL) Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) collaborate to ensure the laboratories complied with EEO requirements. GAO was subsequently asked to examine six other DOE laboratories and determine (1) whether differences exist for managerial and professional women and minorities compared with men and Whites in salaries, merit pay increases, separation patterns, and promotion rates; (2) what EEO concerns laboratory women and minorities have raised; and (3) what DOE and OFCCP have done to implement GAO's earlier recommendation.

For fiscal years 2001 through mid-2004, GAO found some statistically significant differences in salaries, merit pay increases, and separation patterns for managerial and professional women and minorities when compared with men and Whites, and differences in promotion rates when compared with White men. These differences remained despite holding constant factors such as age, education, and occupational category. Women were paid 2 to 4 percent less than men at five of the six laboratories, while minorities were paid about 2 percent less than Whites at one laboratory. Merit pay increases were comparable for all groups at three of the six laboratories. At the other three laboratories, merit pay increases were higher for women and minorities at one, higher for women at another, and lower for minorities at the third. Separation patterns for women and minorities were generally comparable to men and Whites. However, at one laboratory, women were more likely to leave than men, and at another laboratory, minorities were more likely to leave than Whites. At one laboratory, selected minority groups were promoted at a rate less than 80 percent of the rate for White men (a "rule of thumb" used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and OFCCP). Statistically significant differences do not prove or disprove discrimination; rather, they provide information at an aggregate level and may indicate a need for further investigation into their practical significance. Concerns of women and minority staff at the laboratories focused primarily on underrepresentation, the lack of career development opportunities, and the need for an improved laboratory work environment. Complaints investigated or resolved within the laboratories varied among the laboratories and included issues such as sexual harassment and a hostile work environment. [abridged]


Summary

The federal government has created a framework to provide for EEO by prohibiting unlawful discrimination based on such factors as race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, and disability, and offers redress when discrimination and retaliation have occurred. To further EEO and help bring about a diverse workforce, federal agencies are required to carry out affirmative employment and minority recruitment programs. EEOC and OPM have primary responsibility for ensuring that the government's policies for a fair, equitable, and inclusive workplace are carried out. In response to a congressional request that GAO provide information on the federal government's performance in promoting EEO and managing its diverse workforce, this report provides information on (1) the statutory and policy framework relating to EEO, affirmative employment, and workforce diversity and (2) the roles and responsibilities of EEOC and OPM within the framework and how these agencies carry out these roles and responsibilities. Various statutes, executive orders, and other executive policy form the framework of EEO policy that governs civil rights and personnel management in the federal workplace.


Summary

A high-performance organization relies on a dynamic workforce with the requisite talents, multidisciplinary knowledge, and up-to-date skills to ensure that it is equipped to accomplish its mission and achieve its goals. Such organizations typically (1) foster a work environment in which people are enabled and motivated to contribute to mission accomplishment and (2) provide both accountability and fairness for all employees. To accomplish these objectives, high-performance organizations are inclusive, drawing on the strengths of employees at all levels and of all backgrounds—an approach consistent with diversity management. For purposes of our review, diversity management is defined as a process intended to create and maintain a positive work environment where the similarities and differences of individuals are valued, so that all can reach their potential and maximize their contributions to an organization's strategic goals and objectives. As part of a request that GAO report on the federal government's performance in managing its diverse workforce, GAO was asked to identify (1) leading diversity management practices and (2) examples of the identified practices in the federal government.
Summary

The Senior Executive Service (SES) generally represents the most experienced and senior segment of the federal workforce. Having a diverse SES corps can be an organizational strength that contributes to the achievement of results by bringing a wider variety of perspectives and approaches to bear on policy development and implementation, strategic planning, problem solving, and decision making. In a January 2003 report (GAO-03-34), GAO provided data on career SES members by race, ethnicity, and gender as of October 2000. In March 2000, we reported similar data for the Postal Career Executive Service as of September 1999 (GAO/GGD-00-76). In response to a request for updated information on diversity in the top levels of government, GAO is providing information obtained from the Office of Personnel Management's Civilian Personnel Data File and the Postal Service on the representation of women and minorities in (1) the federal government's career SES, (2) the developmental pools from which the vast majority of potential successors for career senior level positions will come (i.e., GS-14 and GS-15), (3) the Postal Service's career officer and senior executive positions in the Postal Career Executive Service, and (4) the developmental pool of potential successors for senior level Postal Service positions as of the end of fiscal year 2006. Data in the Civilian Personnel Data File and provided by the U.S. Postal Service show that as of the end of fiscal year 2006, the overall percentages of women and minorities have increased since 2000 in both the federal career SES and the developmental pool for potential successors and the Postal Career Executive Service (PCES) and the developmental pool of potential successors (EAS levels 22 and above) since 1999. As we have testified, the federal government is facing new and more complex challenges in the 21st century because of long-term fiscal constraints, changing demographics, and other factors. SES members are critical to providing the strategic leadership needed to effectively meet these challenges. Racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in the federal government's senior ranks can be a key organizational component for executing agency missions, ensuring accountability to the American people in the administration and operation of federal programs, and achieving results. SES retirement eligibility is much higher than the workforce in general, and a significant number of SES retirements could result in a loss of leadership continuity, institutional knowledge, and expertise among the SES corps. In fact, OPM estimates that 90 percent of federal executives will be eligible for retirement over the next 10 years, and the Postal Service expects nearly half of its executives to retire within 5 years. This underscores the need for effective succession planning. [abridged]
Summary

Vigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws remains an essential responsibility of government. Moreover, diversity in the federal government can be a key component for executing agency missions and achieving results. Not only is it the right thing to do, but an inclusive work environment can improve retention, reduce turnover, increase our ability to recruit, and improve overall organizational effectiveness. In 2001, the Comptroller General changed the name of the Office of Civil Rights to the Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness and gave the office responsibility for creating a fair and inclusive work environment by incorporating diversity principles in GAO's strategic plan and throughout our human capital policies. Along with this new strategic mission, the Comptroller General changed organizational alignment of the Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness (O&I) by having the office report directly to him. Despite our continuing efforts to ensure a level playing field at GAO, more needs to be done. The data show that for 2002 to 2005 the most significant differences in average appraisal ratings were among African-Americans at all bands for most years compared with Caucasian analysts. Furthermore, the rating data for entry level staff show a difference in ratings for African-Americans in comparison to Caucasian staff at the entry-level from the first rating, with the gap widening in subsequent ratings. These differences are inconsistent with the concerted effort to hire analysts with very similar qualifications, educational backgrounds, and skill sets. In June 2006, we held an Senior Executive Service (SES) off-site meeting specifically focusing on concerns regarding the performance ratings of our African-American staff. Shortly thereafter, the Comptroller General decided that in view of the importance of this issue, GAO should undertake an independent, objective, third-party assessment of the factors influencing the average rating differences between African-Americans and Caucasians. We should approach our concern about appraisal ratings for African-Americans with the same analytical rigor and independence that we use when approaching any engagement. We must also be prepared to implement recommendations coming out of this review. Additional Efforts to Enhance Diversity Are Needed and Planned While we continue to have a major challenge regarding the average performance ratings of African-Americans, the percentages of African-Americans in senior management positions at GAO have increased in the last several years. GAO believes that the O&I monitoring reviews, direct access to top GAO management, and the other safeguards have played a significant role in these improvements. [abridged]


Summary

Hispanics are the fastest-growing segment of the civilian labor force, which is defined as those 16 and older (including federal workers) who are employed or looking for work and are not in the military or institutionalized. In August 2006, GAO reported on factors affecting Hispanic representation in the federal workforce and efforts being taken by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and other agencies, including the Small Business Administration (SBA)—an independent agency that aids, counsels, assists, and protects the interests of small business concerns (GAO-06-832). In May 2007, GAO issued a report that contained data on Hispanic representation in the federal government through fiscal year 2006 (GAO-07-493R). In April 2008, GAO testified on diversity in the Senior Executive Service (SES) and the senior ranks of the U.S. Postal Service (GAO-08-609T). In response to a request to provide updated information on minorities and Hispanics in the federal workforce, GAO is providing demographic data—with an emphasis on Hispanic representation—related to the federal government as a whole and SBA's workforce. GAO obtained these data from OPM's Central Personnel Data File (CPDF). Data in OPM's CPDF show that Hispanic representation government-wide for permanent and nonpermanent employees increased from 6.6 percent in 2000 to 7.7 percent in 2007. At SBA, Hispanic representation for 2007 among permanent and nonpermanent employees was 8.6 percent, which exceeded Hispanic representation government-wide, but represented a decline from 9.7 percent in 2000. For the SES, the highest nonpolitically appointed leaders in the federal workforce, GAO recently looked more closely at the workforce diversity of those who were career, or permanent, appointments (GAO-08-609T).


**Summary**

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created from a disparate group of agencies with multiple missions, values, and cultures into a cabinet department whose goals are to, among other things, protect U.S. borders and infrastructure, improve intelligence and information sharing, and prevent and respond to potential terrorist attacks. GAO designated the implementation and transformation of DHS as a high-risk area in 2003, and it remains so. While DHS has made progress, it continues to face challenges in transforming into an effective, integrated organization. In response to a request to provide information on diversity in DHS and steps DHS is taking to create and manage a diverse workforce, GAO is providing demographic data related to the federal government as a whole and DHS's workforce. GAO obtained these data from the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Central Personnel Data File (CPDF). GAO used its past work on leading diversity management practices (GAO-05-90) and reviewed data from DHS on its diversity management practices.


Summary

A highly publicized 1987 report entitled Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century issued dire warnings for the nation's employers in the next century, highlighting tight labor markets, mismatches between job requirements and workers' skills, and dramatic demographic changes. A companion report made similar predictions for the federal government. In examining the reports' implications for federal policymakers and workforce planners, GAO found that labor economists and other experts disagree that labor shortages and skill gaps are likely by the year 2000. Experts generally agree, however, that the demographic composition of the labor force has changed and will continue to do so in the future. While many of these workforce changes and conditions seem to be more prevalent in the federal workforce, federal workforce planners should not assume that labor shortages and skill gaps are a given. GAO believes that changes in the number of women, minorities, and older workers in the federal government can be addressed through a variety of human resources programs, such as child care, flexible work schedules, and diversity training. GAO found that: (1) Department of Labor economists and other experts do not agree with the reports' conclusion that labor shortages and skill gaps are likely to occur by 2000; (2) experts agree that the demographic composition of the labor force has changed and will continue to change; (3) OPM and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data indicate that many demographic workforce changes and conditions are more prevalent in the federal work force than in the private sector; (4) changes in the number of women, minorities, and older workers in the federal government could be addressed through a variety of human resource policies and programs, including child care, flexible work schedules, diversity training, and reemployment incentives; (5) failure to respond to changing demographic conditions could make the federal government more uncompetitive, since nonfederal employers are increasingly offering such programs; and (6) demographic differences within the federal workforce indicate that different policies and programs may be needed in different agencies and regions.
Summary

A high-performance organization relies on a dynamic workforce with the requisite talents, multidisciplinary knowledge, and up-to-date skills to ensure that it is equipped to accomplish its mission and achieve its goals. Such organizations typically (1) foster a work environment in which people are enabled and motivated to contribute to mission accomplishment and (2) provide both accountability and fairness for all employees. To accomplish these objectives, high-performance organizations are inclusive, drawing on the strengths of employees at all levels and of all backgrounds—an approach consistent with diversity management. For purposes of our review, diversity management is defined as a process intended to create and maintain a positive work environment where the similarities and differences of individuals are valued, so that all can reach their potential and maximize their contributions to an organization's strategic goals and objectives. As part of a request that GAO report on the federal government's performance in managing its diverse workforce, GAO was asked to identify (1) leading diversity management practices and (2) examples of the identified practices in the federal government. This report contains no recommendations. Of the experts in the field of diversity management we spoke with or whose publications we reviewed to identify leading diversity management practices, a majority cited the following nine practices as leading. Top leadership commitment--a vision of diversity demonstrated and communicated throughout an organization by top-level management. Diversity as part of an organization's strategic plan--a diversity strategy and plan that are developed and aligned with the organization's strategic plan. Diversity linked to performance--the understanding that a more diverse and inclusive work environment can yield greater productivity and help improve individual and organizational performance. Measurement--a set of quantitative and qualitative measures of the impact of various aspects of an overall diversity program. Accountability--the means to ensure that leaders are responsible for diversity by linking their performance assessment and compensation to the progress of diversity initiatives. Succession planning--an ongoing, strategic process for identifying and developing a diverse pool of talent for an organization's potential future leaders. Recruitment--the process of attracting a supply of qualified, diverse applicants for employment. Employee involvement--the contribution of employees in driving diversity throughout an organization. Diversity training--organizational efforts to inform and educate management and staff about diversity. Experts and the literature generally agree that a combination of the identified practices should be considered when an organization is developing and implementing diversity management.


**Summary**

The federal government faces large losses in its Senior Executive Service (SES), primarily through retirement but also because of other normal attrition. This presents the government with substantial challenges to ensuring an able management cadre and also provides opportunities to affect the composition of the SES. In a January 2003 report, GAO-03-34, GAO estimated the number of SES members who would actually leave service through fiscal year 2007 and reviewed the implications for diversity, as defined by gender, race, and ethnicity of the estimated losses. Specifically, GAO estimated by gender, race, and ethnicity the number of members of the career SES who will leave government service from October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2007, and what the profile of the SES will be if appointment trends do not change. GAO made the same estimates for the pool of GS-15s and GS-14s, from whose ranks the vast majority of replacements for departing SES members come, to ascertain the likely composition of that pool. More than half of the 6,100 career SES members employed on October 1, 2000, will have left service by October 1, 2007. Using recent SES appointment trends, the only significant changes in diversity would be an increase in the number of white women and an essentially equal decrease in white men. The percentage of GS-15s and GS-14s projected to leave would be lower (47 percent and 34 percent, respectively), and we project that the number of minorities still in the GS-15 and GS-14 workforce would provide agencies sufficient opportunity to select minority members for the SES. Estimates showed substantial variation in the proportion of SES minorities leaving between 24 large agencies and in the effect on those agencies’ gender, racial, and ethnic profiles. Minority representation at 10 agencies would decrease and at 12 would increase.

Agencies have an opportunity to affect SES replacement trends by developing succession strategies that help achieve a diverse workforce. Along with constructive agency leadership, these strategies could generate a pool of well-prepared women and minorities to boost the diversity of the SES ranks.


Summary

A high-performance organization relies on a dynamic workforce with the requisite talents, multidisciplinary knowledge, and up-to-date skills to ensure that it is equipped to accomplish its mission and achieve its goals. For GAO having a diverse workforce and Senior Executive Service (SES) corps is an organizational strength that contributes to the achievement of results by bringing a wider variety of perspectives and approaches to policy development and implementation, strategic planning, problem solving, and decision making. The Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness (O&I) was created by the Comptroller General in 2001 to transform the agency's diversity management practices. As such O&I is the principal adviser to the Comptroller General on diversity and equal opportunity matter. The subcommittee asked us to provide information on the diversity of GAO's Senior Executive Service and the agency's succession planning efforts. This testimony focuses on the diversity of GAO's workforce and leadership team and our efforts and processes for building and maintaining diversity in our SES and throughout our workforce. As our transformational diversity efforts have been implemented, the diversity of GAO's workforce and leadership team--SES/SL and Band III level staff--has improved. In 2000, minorities represented about 14 percent of the SES/SL corps. As of fiscal year 2007, about 18 percent of the SES members were minorities. Similarly, the representation of minorities at the Band III level--the SES feeder pool--increased from nearly 12 percent in 2000 to nearly 19 percent in 2007, and the representation of women in the SES as well as at the Band III and Band II levels increased. While we have made progress, we still have work to do. We are committed to improving the representation of all minority groups in the leadership team and in particular, representation of Hispanic and Asian American staff should be improved. The percentages of GAO's Hispanic staff members at the SES level and Asian American staff at the Band III level were lower than government wide percentages. However, for both of these groups, the percentages in the feeder pools--staff at the Band III and Band IIB levels--either equaled or exceeded the government wide percentages. Several processes help build and maintain diversity in GAO's SES and workforce. Incorporating our core diversity principles into several key processes has played an important role in helping GAO to meet its strategic objective to build and maintain a work environment that is fair, unbiased and inclusive and that offers the opportunity for all employees to realize their full potential. Our workforce planning and recruitment processes, training opportunities, reviews of human capital processes conducted by O&I, and the selection process for SES candidates help support our efforts to maintain and improve diversity in our SES.


**Summary**

Today's testimony discusses several important topics: (1) provisions of H.R. 3268, the GAO Act, that would bolster our ability to attract and retain a highly skilled and diverse workforce needed to serve the Congress and provide for operational improvements and administrative efficiencies; (2) steps we are taking to establish and maintain a constructive working relationship with the GAO Employees Organization, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE); and (3) my commitment to ensure fair and equitable treatment for all segments of our diverse workforce, as reinforced by our commissioning of a study of various performance assessment issues related to African-American Analysts at GAO. The GAO Act contains several distinct and critical components. A number of provisions are designed to benefit our employees and to provide a means to continue to attract, retain, and reward a top-flight workforce, while other provisions are aimed at helping us improve our operations and increase administrative efficiencies. We ask for Congressional support of these measures and have outlined each of them below. On September 19, 2007, our Band I and Band II Analysts, Auditors, Specialists, and Investigators voted to be represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE) for the purpose of bargaining with GAO management on various terms and conditions of employment. GAO management is committed to working constructively with employee union representatives to forge a positive labor-management relationship. Since September, GAO management has taken a variety of steps to ensure it is following applicable labor relations laws and has the resources in place to work effectively and productively in this new union environment. Our efforts have involved: (1) postponing work on several initiatives regarding our current performance and pay programs; (2) delivering specialized labor-management relations training to our Band III, Band III-equivalent, SES, and Senior Level staff; (3) establishing a new Workforce Relations Center within our Human Capital Office that is responsible for providing employee relations and labor relations advice and services to GAO management and leadership; (4) hiring a Workforce Relations Center director, who also serves as our chief negotiator in collective bargaining deliberations.
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

To address the challenges that the nation faces, it will be important for federal agencies to change their cultures and create the institutional capacity to become high-performing organizations. This includes recruiting and retaining a federal workforce able to create, sustain, and thrive in organizations that are flatter, results-oriented, and externally focused. In 2001, GAO identified strategic human capital management as a government wide high-risk area because federal agencies lacked a strategic approach to human capital management that integrated human capital efforts with their missions and program goals. Although progress has been made since that time, strategic human capital management still remains a high-risk area. This testimony, based on a large body of completed work issued from January 2001 through April 2008, focuses on (1) challenges that federal agencies have faced in recruiting and hiring talented employees, (2) progress in addressing these challenges, and (3) additional actions that are needed to strengthen recruiting and hiring efforts. In its prior reports, GAO has made a range of recommendations to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM)--the government's personnel agency--and to agencies in such areas as hiring, workforce planning, and diversity management; a number of these recommendations have since been implemented. GAO is making no new recommendations at this time. Numerous studies over the years have identified a range of problems and challenges with recruitment and hiring in the federal government. Some of these problems and challenges include passive recruitment strategies, unclear job vacancy announcements, and manual processes that are time consuming and paperwork intensive. In recent years, Congress, OPM, and agencies have made important strides in improving federal recruitment and hiring. For example, Congress has provided agencies with hiring flexibilities that could help to streamline the hiring process. OPM has sponsored job fairs and developed automated tools. Individual agencies have developed targeted recruitment strategies to identify and help build a talented workforce. Building on the progress that has been made, additional efforts are needed in the following areas: (1) Human capital planning: federal agencies will have to bolster their efforts in strategic human capital planning to ensure that they are prepared to meet their current and emerging hiring needs. Agencies must determine the critical skills and competencies necessary to achieve programmatic goals and develop strategies that are tailored to address any identified gaps. (2) Diversity management: developing and maintaining workforces that reflect all segments of society and our nation's diversity is another significant aspect of agencies' recruitment challenges. Recruitment is a key first step toward establishing a diverse workforce.


**Summary**

This report analyzes the gender and racial/ethnic diversity in the career Senior Executive Service (SES) governmentwide. GAO examines (1) whether the composition of the career SES changed during the 10-year period ending in fiscal year 1999 to include more minorities and women, (2) what proportion of women and minorities were appointed to the career SES annually during this 10-year period and whether the appointments reflected the SES "pipeline"--the group from which new SES members were generally appointed, and (3) how the representation of women and minority employees in the career SES as of fiscal year 1999 compared with other labor forces. GAO found that the representation of women and minorities in the career SES steadily increased during the 1990's, with the proportion of women going from 10 percent in 1990 to 22 percent in 1999. Similarly, the percentage of minority members went from seven percent to about 13 percent. The vast majority of these appointments came from within the ranks of GS-15 employees. Women and minorities had a somewhat lower representation in the SES when compared to other labor forces.
Summary

The federal government faces large losses in its Senior Executive Service (SES), primarily through retirement but also because of other normal attrition. This presents the government with substantial challenges to ensuring an able management cadre and also provides opportunities to affect the composition of the SES. In a January 2003 report, GAO-03-34, GAO estimated the number of SES members who would actually leave service through fiscal year 2007 and reviewed the implications for diversity, as defined by gender, race, and ethnicity of the estimated losses. Specifically, GAO estimated by gender, race, and ethnicity the number of members of the career SES who will leave government service from October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2007, and what the profile of the SES will be if appointment trends do not change. GAO made the same estimates for the pool of GS-15s and GS-14s, from whose ranks the vast majority of replacements for departing SES members come, to ascertain the likely composition of that pool.

More than half of the 6,100 career SES members employed on October 1, 2000, will have left service by October 1, 2007. Using recent SES appointment trends, the only significant changes in diversity would be an increase in the number of white women and an essentially equal decrease in white men. The percentage of GS-15s and GS-14s projected to leave would be lower (47 percent and 34 percent, respectively), and we project that the number of minorities still in the GS-15 and GS-14 workforce would provide agencies sufficient opportunity to select minority members for the SES. Estimates showed substantial variation in the proportion of SES minorities leaving between 24 large agencies and in the effect on those agencies' gender, racial, and ethnic profiles. Minority representation at 10 agencies would decrease and at 12 would increase. Agencies have an opportunity to affect SES replacement trends by developing succession strategies that help achieve a diverse workforce. Along with constructive agency leadership, these strategies could generate a pool of well-prepared women and minorities to boost the diversity of the SES ranks.
Summary

Over the years, Committees and members of Congress have requested information about employee equal opportunity and diversity issues at the U.S. Postal Service (USPS). This report follows up on our past reports concerning diversity issues at the USPS and responds to the request of the Ranking Minority Members of the House Committee on Government Reform and its Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization for more current information on the representation of minorities and women at the USPS. Our objective was to provide data on the makeup (numbers and percentages) for each equal employment opportunity (EEO) group--white, black, Hispanic, Asian-American and Pacific Islander (AAPI), American Indian and Alaskan Native (AIAN), and Native Hawaiian (Hawaiian)--and gender group of USPS career employees for USPS fiscal years 2000 through 2002. Information contained in this report was obtained from USPS databases, which we deemed sufficiently reliable for the informational purpose of this engagement. According to the USPS data, the USPS career employee workforce has declined over the course of the last three fiscal years from 786,446 in fiscal year 2000 to 751,650 in fiscal year 2002. Although the number of minorities and women also declined over this 3-year period, their representation in the workforce remained fairly constant, about 36 and 38 percent, respectively. Relative to the Current Population Survey (CPS), black and AAPI men and women in the USPS were fully represented, while Hispanic and AIAN men and women and white women were underrepresented in the USPS workforce. Overall, the representation of minorities in the USPS workforce exceeded their representation in the U.S. workforce each year, while the representation of women was less than their representation in the U.S. workforce each year. The percentage representation of minorities and women at higher-grade levels was generally less for each of the three years than their representation in the USPS workforce. The percentage representation of white males at higher-grade levels was generally greater than their representation in the USPS workforce for each of the three years. The number of USPS workforce promotions steadily declined over the three fiscal years decreasing from 7,114 in fiscal year 2000 to 5,320 in fiscal year 2002--a decrease of about 26 percent. On the other hand, the proportion of USPS workforce promotions received by minorities and women remained relatively constant over the three fiscal years. For the three fiscal years, minorities received an average of about 30 percent of the promotions while representing, on average, about 36 percent of the workforce for the same period…[abridged]
Reference List: Under-represented Populations

**Government Accountability Office. U.S. Postal Service: Diversity in the Postal Career Executive Service. GGD-00-76. 30 March 2000.**

Available: http://www.gao.gov/products/GGD-00-76

**Summary**

Women and minorities made about 35 percent of the Postal Service's executive ranks at the end of fiscal year 1999. In comparison, women and minorities made up about 58 percent of the Postal Service's overall workforce. During the last five years, women and minority representation in the Postal Career Executive Service rose by about four percentage points. With respect to selections for Postal Service executive positions in fiscal year 1999, women and minorities represented about 33 percent of Postal Service executives before the selections, and they were chosen for 25, or about 42 percent, of the 59 selections for executive jobs. The Postal Service has several efforts planned or under way to increase diversity among its Postal Career Executive Service. GAO noted that: (1) at the end of FY 1999, women and minorities represented about 35 percent of the PCES executive workforce compared to their representation of about 58 percent in the Service's overall workforce; (2) similarly, their representation among PCES executives for each specific women and minority Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) category was lower than their representation in the corresponding EEO categories in the Service's overall workforce; (3) with respect to the 42 occupied officer positions below the Deputy Postmaster General, women and minorities held 13, or about 31 percent, as of the end of FY 1999; (4) over the last 5 fiscal years women and minority representation among PCES executives has generally increased by about 4 percentage points; (5) most of this change occurred during the last 2 years of the period and was primarily accounted for by the increase in the representation of white women; (6) over the 5-year period, white women's representation has consistently increased while that of Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian women also generally increased after FY 1997; (7) with regard to officers, over the 5-year period, women and minority representation increased by 6 percentage points; (8) regarding the career Senior Executive Service (SES), women and minority representation among the PCES executive workforce was somewhat higher than that in the career SES in the federal workforce and much higher when compared to the civilian career SES workforce at Department of Defense; (9) finally, with respect to selections for PCES executive positions, in FY 1999, women and minorities represented about 33 percent of PCES executives before the selections, and they were selected for 25 of the 59 selections for executive positions; (10) also, women and minority representation as a group among the selections was the same as their representation in the PCES potential successor pool for all the positions; (11) outside hires accounted for 17 percent of all of the executive selections and 24 percent of the 25 women and minority…[abridged]


Summary

Minority employees at the EPA reported for a number of years that the agency had discriminated against them based on their race and retaliated against them for filing complaints. These issues were aired at hearings held by the House Committee on Science at which EPA said it would take actions to ensure a fair and discrimination free workplace. GAO was asked to review (1) the accuracy of EPA's equal employment opportunity (EEO) data, (2) various issues about the processes used to resolve discrimination complaints, and (3) the disciplinary actions taken for managers who discriminate. EPA had difficulty providing accurate EEO data because of a data system that the agency believes was unreliable and was further compromised by data entry problems. When GAO identified problems with the information EPA provided, the agency manually reconstructed data for fiscal years 1995 through 2002. The reconstructed data indicate that during this period 548 EPA employees filed 679 discrimination complaints, and the agency closed 588 complaints. Complaints were closed with 125 dismissals, 48 withdrawals, 178 settlements, 5 remands, and 222 agency decisions not supporting the claimant. GAO cannot attest to the accuracy of these numbers but believes they are indicative of the situation at EPA. EPA recently procured new software to facilitate accurate tracking and reporting of EEO information and believes the software will rectify data problems. EPA has never had official standard operating procedures for complaint processing, which are required by regulation. Rather, EPA said that complaints were processed under general guidance provided by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) until draft procedures, prepared in July 2001, were put into use. EPA has taken a long time to process discrimination complaints with cases averaging 650 days from filing to closing over fiscal years 1995-2002. A major contributing factor was that investigations, which are supposed to be done in 180 days, averaged a total of 465 days. The firms used by EPA failed to conduct thorough investigations and their reports did not provide complete or factual accounts of the incidents leading to the complaints. As a result, investigations often had to be redone, adding to the amount of time needed to complete them. Over the last year, EPA has discontinued the use of these firms and contracted with new ones that it believes are doing a much better job. EPA has also increased its own staffing for EEO matters to try to reduce processing times. EPA does not have a specific process for determining whether managers involved in discrimination complaints did in fact...[abridged]
Summary

A 1981 U.S. District Court decision found that the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) had discriminated against African American special agents in a number of personnel practices. Over the years, the plaintiffs and DEA had agreed to remedies in many of these areas. However, minority representatives continued to raise issues in three areas—hiring, promotion, and discipline. GAO was asked to examine DEA's current processes for hiring, promoting, and disciplining special agents, and provide information about racial, ethnicity, and gender differences in these three areas. During the October 1997 through March 2002 period, African American, Hispanic, and white applicants to be special agents passed DEA's medical requirements and interview process at about the same rates. However, African American and Hispanic applicants had lower passing rates on (1) the test of an applicant's ability to recall and write about a video of a drug-related enforcement action and (2) suitability requirements measured through a background investigation and other tests. DEA's hiring procedures are based on criteria in federal regulations, professional standards, and standards established by subject matter experts. However, DEA had not studied its hiring requirements to see why its procedures resulted in different selection rates and whether they could be modified to reduce differences while maintaining the high standards necessary for special agents. There were no statistically significant differences in promotion rates among the various racial, ethnic, and gender groups during fiscal years 1997 through 2001. DEA has a rigorous and validated competency-based process that uses job simulations to assess capabilities at the target grade level. However, the job-relatedness of a key step involving recommending special agents for promotion had not been established and our analysis showed that African American and Hispanic special agents were recommended for promotion at significantly lower rates. Despite differences in recommendation rates, DEA's promotion decisions mirrored the race, ethnic, and gender makeup of the agency's special agent workforce. Additionally, the agency, working with a diverse panel of special agents, subsequently developed a revised recommendation process. At the time of GAO's review, DEA and the African American representatives were involved in mediation to reach final agreement. Disciplinary data for fiscal years 1997 to 2001 showed that the proportion of African American, Hispanic, and women special agents disciplined for misconduct was significantly higher than their representation in the DEA special agent workforce.
Summary

Allegations of racial profiling at the Department of Energy's (DOE) weapons laboratories raised questions about the equitable treatment of minorities and women in personnel actions at these laboratories. The former secretary of energy reiterated a policy of zero tolerance of discrimination of any kind and said that he expected and required full compliance with both the spirit and letter of all civil rights laws, regulations, and policies. The current secretary has reaffirmed this commitment. In 2000, the percentage of minority employees at each of the laboratories ranged from 19 percent at Lawrence Livermore to 34 percent at Los Alamos. The minority population at the laboratories increased from 1995 to 2000 but not for each minority group at each laboratory. For fiscal years 1998 through 2000, GAO found statistically significant differences in some personnel actions, but not in others, when minority men and women and white women in managerial and professional job categories were compared with white men in these categories. Comparing men and women of same race or ethnicity, GAO found that white, Asian, and Hispanic women earned less than did their male counterparts. GAO found that management promotions for minority men and women and white women generally met 80 percent of the promotion rate for white men. Because of data limitations, GAO could not determine whether minority men and women and white women were as likely as white men to be hired by the laboratories. Minority and female laboratory staff raised concerns in four areas—recruiting, pay, promotion, and laboratory work environment. These data are from recent laboratory surveys and studies, a DOE 2000 Task Force Against Racial Profiling, and formal complaints investigated by OFCCP from 1990 through 2001. DOE and OFCCP must work together to ensure that the laboratories meet EEOC requirements.


**Summary**

A commitment to recruitment, hiring, management and governance practices that increase diversity in the workplace first requires the establishment of a baseline or benchmark against which changes in diversity may be measured. In fall 2008, 111 signers submitted data using a “Benchmark Template.” Completing these templates required signers to input quantitative data on the racial and gender diversity of the signers’ leadership team and boards; employees; and customers, consumers and services. The signers also answered a number of survey questions about CEO commitment to diversity; mentoring/training on diversity issues for management; recruitment strategies for identifying a diverse pool of candidates for board members and hires; civic and other initiatives to understand and promote diversity, inclusion and racial/ethnic and gender equality; and others. (See the Benchmark Template in Appendix A.) Finally, data were gathered about the size of the organization/corporation (e.g., number of employees and annual revenue/budget). The target year was calendar year 2007. Given that this benchmarking effort took place just six months after the founding of Commonwealth Compact, there are some caveats when considering the results. First, of the 127 signers at the time of data collection, 111 submitted data, for a remarkably high response rate of 87 percent. Given this high response rate, we can say with confidence that the findings presented here are representative of the companies, organizations and institutions that have signed onto Commonwealth Compact. They are not necessarily representative, however, of all private, non-profit or public companies, organizations and institutions in the state. Those who signed on may already be more receptive to a diverse workforce and leadership, for example. Second, potential sources of bias are introduced by the fact that not all respondents answered all questions. Third, because the number of total signers is relatively small, variation in responses may skew results in a way that would not happen with a larger number of cases. However, the excellent response rate provides a valuable corrective by allowing for relatively substantial Ns (number of signers) in most cases.
**Hardy-Fanta, C. & Stewartson, D. A Seat at the Table? Racial, Ethnic and Gender Diversity on Corporate, Hospital, Education, Cultural and State Boards. Boston: Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy, McCormack Graduate School, University of Massachusetts Boston. 11 May 2007.**

**Available:** [http://www.mccormack.umb.edu/centers/cwppp/documents/SeatAtTable.pdf](http://www.mccormack.umb.edu/centers/cwppp/documents/SeatAtTable.pdf)

**Summary**

UMass Boston has undertaken a number of projects. The first was a public opinion survey conducted around the time of the November 2006 elections. The report, *Transformation and Taking Stock: A Summary of Selected Findings from the McCormack Graduate School Diversity Survey*, included a comprehensive look at race relations in the Commonwealth at a time of significant transition—demographically and politically. This report was followed by *A Benchmark Report on Diversity in State and Local Government*, which focused on the percentage of positions filled by gubernatorial appointment to selected senior-level positions in government (and on selected boards and commissions) as well as on elected and appointed positions in ten cities and towns in Greater Boston. This new study rounds out this series on diversity on governing bodies filled through appointments. For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, however, researchers at the McCormack Graduate School’s Center for Women in Politics & Public Policy undertook a comprehensive study of who sits on the boards of directors/trustees of the top corporations, hospitals, higher education institutions (both private and public) and a sample of major cultural institutions. These are important decision-making positions and we are pleased to share our findings on the racial and gender diversity—or lack thereof—on these for-profit and not-for-profit boards. Researchers at the Center identified the board members of 88 top corporations, 65 hospitals, 66 private and public colleges and universities, and 23 cultural institutions. We ultimately identified almost 4,500 individuals sitting at the board tables; the level of cooperation (in large part due to the talent and perseverance of our researchers) was remarkable: we gathered information on gender for 95 percent and on race/ethnicity for 75 percent of these board members. Major Findings Diversity by Race/Ethnicity Figure 1 shows the breakdown by race/ethnicity and sector (details for each sector are provided below).


Summary

The Pipeline to Public Service Initiative asked the McCormack Graduate School’s Center for Women in Politics & Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston to ascertain the racial diversity in state and local government. The project had the following three goals: To identify the race (and gender) of those holding top-level positions filled through gubernatorial appointments, e.g., secretaries, commissioners, directors, deputy commissioners/directors, and undersecretaries, in the Commonwealth’s executive offices and major departments. To compile the same information for members of the most influential boards and commissions in the Commonwealth filled through gubernatorial appointments. To assess the diversity of elected and appointed officials in ten cities and towns in Greater Boston with the highest percentages of people of color: Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Framingham, Lynn, Malden, Quincy, Randolph, and Somerville. To determine the race/ethnicity of gubernatorial appointments, we used publicly available information to compile lists of those holding each position. We then contacted the office in charge, or the individuals directly, to ask how each person self-identified in terms of race/ethnicity. See the Appendix for a complete list of executive positions and a list of boards and commissions whose members were included in the analysis. The data for statewide appointments are current as of November 17, 2006, and reflect appointments made during or prior to the Romney administration. To determine the diversity of municipal officials for each city/town required first collecting the race of elected officials serving as mayors or members of city/town councils, boards of selectmen/aldermen for each of the ten cities/towns. We did the same for the elected school committees/boards for these cities/towns. We then identified the boards and commissions that exist in each of the cities/towns under study and identified those that were (1) appointed by the executive official of the city/town; (2) most important in terms of policy influence; and (3) comparable across the ten cities/towns. See Appendix for a list of the boards/commissions were included in our analysis; please note that not all boards/commissions exist in all the cities/towns and some boards/commissions were not included because they did not meet one of the criteria listed above. Information on municipal officials is current as of January 19, 2007.


Summary

In this paper, we document the continuing decline in employment and labor force participation of black men between the ages of 16 and 34 who have a high school education or less. We explore the extent to which these trends can be accounted for in recent years by two fairly new developments: (1) The dramatic growth in the number of young black men who have been incarcerated; and (2) strengthened enforcement of child support policies. We use micro-level data from the Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Groups (CPS-ORG), along with state-level data over time on incarceration rates and child support enforcement, to test these hypotheses. Our results indicate that post-incarceration effects and child support policies both contribute to the decline in employment activity among young black less-educated men in the past two decades, especially among those age 25-34.

Available: [http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA390584](http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA390584)

**Summary**

The demographic composition of the national workforce has undergone significant change over the last three decades. Today's workforce is increasingly comprised of more women, minorities, and older workers. These trends are expected to continue well into the 21st Century. The impact of changing national workforce demographics will be particularly felt in the public sector because the federal workforce is already disproportionately comprised of older workers and minorities when compared to the civilian labor force. It's important to identify changing civilian workforce demographics within the federal government and explore the implications of these changes on managing the future workplace. What conclusions can we draw from these projected trends? How will the needs, preferences and expectations of the future federal workforce differ from today's civil servant? What can leaders do today to identify, understand, and manage the growing workforce diversity anticipated in the future? By understanding the implications of changing demographic patterns, the federal government can conduct workforce planning needed to remain a competitive employer, maximize workforce productivity, and enhance recruitment and retention efforts.
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

Hispanics represent one of the fastest growing segments of the older population, and thus could be an important target for employer efforts to attract and retain older workers. This report examines older Hispanic workers and the contributions they make to employers and the economy. It describes the older Hispanic population and documents the work experiences of older Hispanics—the number and share that are employed, where they work, and how much they earn—and their attitudes toward work. The portrait of older Hispanic workers that emerges from this overview shows a group that should appeal to many employers, yet faces significant labor market challenges. Older Hispanics participate in the labor force at relatively high rates and work in a wide range of occupations and industries, although Hispanic men are disproportionately represented in construction. Survey results for older Hispanic workers indicate that they are dependable, in that they rarely miss work. The vast majority report that they enjoy their jobs, suggesting that they are engaged and productive employees. Many are also fluent in English as well as Spanish, which makes them valuable employees to companies hoping to benefit from the purchasing power of the growing Hispanic market. Nonetheless, many older Hispanics face substantial challenges in the workplace. They earn low wages and few benefits. In fact, their relatively strong attendance records may partially reflect an inability to afford time off due to lower wages and less access to paid leave. They also tend to work in physically demanding jobs that are often difficult to maintain into later life. Finally, the 2007-2009 recession, which has reduced employment rates and earnings for all groups, has hit older Hispanics especially hard. The report's discussion of approaches to increase employment prospects for older Hispanics focuses on employer practices as well as policy options. Issues addressed include training, flexibility, caregiving, recruitment strategies, and workplace culture.


Summary

In the workplace, as in many aspects of their lives, Afro-Americans as a group are systematically unconnected to the essential network resources that most other Americans take for granted. Their workplace isolation involves far more than the impenetrable "glass ceilings" associated with the nation's boardrooms. It is pervasive, hampering working-class laborers seeking well-paying jobs on a construction work crew just as it does upwardly mobile college graduates. This isolation can be addressed, but only partially, by access to improved educational opportunities. Such opportunities might be able to compensate for network deficiencies in the long run, mainly through introducing Afro-American students to other students with wider network ranges, but the process is painfully slow. For a group as unconnected as Afro-Americans, it may take multiple generations. Speeding up this process requires affirmative action. The fundamental insight of network sociologists is that characteristics of a person's network of ties to others structure the flow of information that both socializes him as he grows up and provides social resources critical for competent functioning as an adult. Economic behavior in particular, as noted by Mark Granovetter in Getting a Job, is "heavily embedded in other social processes that closely constrain and determine its course and results." Without denying the importance of individual attributes in accounting for success, network sociologists nevertheless consider past and present structures of network ties and their attendant information flows to be of at least equal importance in explaining a person's achievements. As sociologists Nan Lin, Walter Ensel, and John Vaughn explain, the network approach "challenges the assumption that the labor market is essentially an open and competitive arena where specifications for a job and the necessary skills and competence are easily matched and where information about job and applicant availability is widely diffused."


Summary

In his book *On Toleration*, the political philosopher Michael Walzer sorts tolerant regimes into several types. Prominent among them are the multinational empire, which, like the British and Ottomans, gives considerable local autonomy to ethnic and religious groups provided they don't make trouble; nation-states like France, which publicly and officially enshrine a dominant national culture but leave minorities and dissidents alone; and immigrant societies, which formally proclaim no single ethnic or religious preference and demand merely that everyone tolerate everyone else. Walzer regards America as the world's preeminent example of the immigrant society. And so it was, in Mencken's day and through at least the 1950s. Now, however, it is something more akin to a multicultural society, or a rainbow society, or a diversity society: one in which diversity is not only tolerated but encouraged and sometimes even enforced. Except on the far right, even people who have their doubts about diversity typically give it lip service. We are all multiculturalists now. Even so, a new tension now strains multiculturalism. Diversity in America is increasing—increasing, as Kenneth Prewitt argues in the article following, to the point where standard categories of diversity are breaking down. We are becoming so diverse that we are no longer sure what we mean by diversity. Meanwhile, affirmative action, bilingual education, multiculturalism, and other institutions and ideologies of the rainbow society—new though they may seem—are already three decades old. They are beginning to show their age, and a new generation, less burdened by America's history of discrimination, increasingly questions their relevance and effectiveness. How is diversity changing the country? In light of the changes, what next for policy? In this issue of the *Brookings Review*, an assortment of scholars and analysts considers both questions. Although they do not, and could not, arrive at any one conclusion, they have in common the premise that diversity is not what it was even a decade or so ago. Like the country it shapes and then reshares, diversity is new every day.


Summary

If your friends and colleagues are like mine, they tend to orient their domestic travel plans around cherished ethnic restaurants. So do I. But many carry their enthusiasm a step further, seeing the extraordinary variety and quality of ethnic cuisine now available in the United States as evidence of the unalloyed benefits flowing from our racial and ethnic diversity. I call this syndrome "sushiology." For a more nuanced view of the profound demographic changes sweeping the United States, talk to a priest in a typical Catholic parish in southern California. The priest might, like the rest of us, wax poetic about his favorite local ethnic restaurants. But he will also note the daunting problems of, say, putting on Sunday mass for parishioners who speak English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Tagalog. Should there be a separate mass in each language? Or should masses be multilingual, with different parts in various languages? Whichever he chooses, someone will feel neglected. And in any case, he must find priests with the needed language skills. Language is only the most obvious problem introduced by diversity. In a small town in Iowa large numbers of new Latino immigrants create resentment among long-time Anglo parishioners when they bring little children to church and let them roam about during services. Such resentments are typically attributed to Anglo "insensitivity" or "racism." But as the Wall Street Journal recently reported, intense animosities have flared between newly arrived Mexicans and more established Puerto Ricans and Dominicans in a predominantly Latino parish in the Bronx. No wonder the Hispanic Jesuit Alan Figueroa-Deck, writing in the liberal Catholic magazine America, criticizes the hierarchy's "ideology of multiculturalism" and points to the remarkable success of Evangelical and Pentecostal Protestants in building ethnically homogeneous congregations among Latinos. Clearly, diversity's beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Does diversity work? And how well? Surprisingly, neither question gets much attention. The benefits and costs of diversity have yet to be adequately evaluated in light of specific problems or objectives. In this brief space I will move beyond the anecdotal evidence? Beyond sushiology? And review some findings of social scientists who have systematically examined the consequences of racial and ethnic diversity. Not surprisingly, these findings conflict. But at the very least, they show the sushiologists' view to be wildly optimistic. A more sober perspective is needed, one that remembers what political and social thinkers have long understood: that diversity is typically associated with dissent and conflict. Why is this downside of diversity so consistently overlooked?
CBO employs individuals who have the specialized skills necessary to perform the complex economic and budgetary analyses that the Congress requires. Roughly 80 percent of its professional staff members hold Ph.D.s or master’s degrees (see Figure 1); about 40 percent hold Ph.D.s, mostly in economics, and an additional 40 percent hold master’s degrees, generally in public policy or administration. The other 20 percent have bachelor’s degrees. (Those staff fill roles principally in administrative fields, such as information technology and editing.) Because of the specialized skills needed at CBO, the organization faces a substantial challenge in achieving a diverse workforce, given the demographics of individuals who complete the necessary educational requirements. According to the most recent Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED), there were approximately 1,000 recipients of doctorates in economics in 2005.1 Only 30 percent of those newly minted Ph.D. economists were women (see Table 1). An additional recruiting difficulty for CBO is that foreign nationals make up the majority—more than two thirds in 2005—of recipients of doctorates in economics. Although the agency hires some non-U.S. citizens, the small proportion of U.S. citizens among new Ph.D.s in economics nonetheless limits the pool from which CBO can attract candidates. What is perhaps even more striking is that among the U.S. citizens who came into the labor market from that pool, only 4.3 percent (44 people in the entire nation) were identified as members of a minority group. Those numbers are even more disheartening in light of the small share of the overall number of new Ph.D. economists who enter government service—only 16 percent in 2005. The characteristics of graduates are somewhat less of a problem in recruiting master’s-level employees. For example, data from the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration suggest that 57 percent of those completing master’s degrees in 2005 were female, and 28 percent were identified as members of minority groups.


**Summary**

As the newest Federal Department, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has a dynamic and critical mission, and in FY 2007, gross budget authority of nearly $34.8 billion and more than 160,000 employees. The diversity of the senior career leadership of the Department of Homeland Security is of special concern because members of the Federal career Senior Executive Service (SES) serve just below Presidential appointees. Involved in most activities of Federal agencies, SES employees are one of the keys to the stability and continuity of the Federal government. The diversity of the modern career SES is an important asset for successful governance in a modern democratic state. But DHS has not done well with the diversity of this vital government leadership cadre. For example, as of March 2007: African Americans were 8.5 percent of the Executive Branch career SES but only 6.5 percent of the career DHS SES. Asians were 2.3 percent of the Executive Branch career SES but only 1.7 percent of the career DHS SES. All other racial groups were together 1.7 percent in the Executive Branch career SES but only 0.7 percent of the career DHS SES. Women were 28.9 percent in the Executive Branch career SES but only 25.3 percent of the career DHS SES. Indeed, there are major DHS organizational components that have little or no representation of diversity in their career SES. To realize its potential, become the agency Congress intended, and fulfill the expectations of the American people, DHS must actively seek to bring to bear divergent perspectives on every aspect of its operations. Failure to develop a culture that incorporates, recognizes, and promotes diversity as an organizational strength is not only counterproductive to the organizational goals but a disservice to the American taxpayer.


Summary

U.S. Senator Daniel K. Akaka (D-HI) and Congressman Danny K. Davis (D-IL) introduced the Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act of 2009 today in the House and Senate to enhance diversity in the Senior Executive Service. The bill would: [1] Require federal agencies to submit a plan to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on how the agency is removing barriers to minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities to obtain appointments in the Senior Executive Service (SES); [2] Encourage agencies, to the extent practicable, to include minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities on the Executive Resource Boards that review SES candidates; and [3] Re-establish the Senior Executive Service Resource Office (SESRO) at OPM to manage and oversee the Senior Executive Service and to ensure SES diversity through strategic partnerships and mentorship programs.
Leadership for the Public Service

Available:  
http://www.thepresidency.org/Publications/Declaration_on_Civility_and_Inclusive_Leadership.php

Summary

The United States faces extraordinary opportunities as well as a series of formidable challenges that threaten our national security and well-being at home and abroad. From terrorist threats to the homeland, ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq and the over-extension of our Armed Forces and Reserves, to the potential insolvency of Social Security and our rising "twin deficits," these challenges grow increasingly complex and interconnected each day. Yet even as they steadily restrict our freedom of action, we remain a deeply polarized nation unable to reach a strategic consensus on the way forward. However, the opportunities for the expansion of freedom and democracy around the world are increasing daily. In response to these crises, *The Declaration on Civility and Inclusive Leadership* aims to inspire the nation's leaders to exercise civility and inclusive leadership, which are essential tools for forging national unity and marshalling the best talent, regardless of political affiliation. With over 200 signatories, including the current and former diplomats and government officials, university presidents and professors, corporate executives, military officials, sports figures and religious scholars who comprise the National Committee to Unite a Divided America, the Declaration has wide support from both extremes of the political divide and from all walks of life.


**Summary**

This research draws on the nation’s first comprehensive database of elected leadership of color to provide a multi-cultural, multi-office, and multi-state look at the contours and context of descriptive representation by race and gender and with women of color at the center of analysis. We find that key to the persistent trend of growth in elective office holding of the nation’s Black, Latino, and Asian American communities in recent decades is the expanding size of women of color elected officials. Compared to whites, gender gaps in descriptive representation are smaller among nonwhite groups. Although the proportion of nonwhite population may impact the degree of electoral success, we find parity ratios to vary by race, gender, level of office, and state. For example, states that have the highest share of the black population did not produce the highest level of representation of Black women. Finally, we find that gender differences within each race are generally significant, but far greater racial differences are found among men and women of color elected officials—especially at the municipal and school board levels of offices. We conclude that women of color have played a significant role in advancing descriptive political representation of people of color and of women in the United States as a whole.

Available:  http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS105407

Summary

The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) quality initiative supports and encourages the deliberate identification and cultivation of a well-trained, diverse corps of future leaders along with the creation of leadership opportunities for all levels of staff as a fundamental component of delivering high quality legal services. It is the most effective way of ensuring the continued strength, relevance and competence of legal services staff who are engaged daily with the challenges of providing access to justice to low-income clients. The LSC Leadership Mentoring Pilot Program (Pilot Program) was created to focus attention on the importance of leadership mentoring and the purposeful development of leadership opportunities for all staff. It is one effort designed to assist programs in providing the necessary support for the development of well-trained, diverse, new leaders in a changing legal services environment. Client eligible populations continue to grow more diverse with the passing of each year. Long-time legal services leaders are reaching retirement age and legal services programs have newer staff members who are excited about leadership development and leadership opportunities. In 2004, when LSC began to develop a leadership mentoring initiative, there were 145 LSC-funded programs. Data reported to LSC for 2004 revealed that for executive directors, the average years in the legal profession was 27.7 years and that more than 40% had been in their positions for more than 25 years. 1 At the next levels of senior management within programs, deputy director and director of litigation positions, similar patterns also were reflected. Additionally, gender and racial diversity within these management levels was significantly limited.2 This data demonstrated several concerns. While there had been a low rate of attrition in the position of executive director, it was likely that retirement was in the near future for a growing number. Data also showed that despite inclusiveness being a fundamental value of legal services, there was limited diversity in the executive management of programs. Data reported for 2006 is not substantially different. In the coming years, LSC-funded programs will have opportunities to provide broader access to leadership activities to all staff. The deliberate development of well-trained, diverse, committed leaders will benefit LSC-funded programs, their clients and their communities, and programs will be better positioned to provide high quality, culturally competent legal services.


Summary

The House Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia and the Senate Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia will hold a hearing entitled “Managing Diversity of Senior Leadership in the Federal Workforce and Postal Service” on Thursday, April 3, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building. The hearing will examine the views of various governmental and non-governmental officials on the “Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act” (H.R. 3774 and S. 2148). The hearing will also discuss efforts within the Executive Branch and Postal Organizations to create a diverse senior executive service as part of a larger strategy to improve the overall diversity of their respective workforces.
Race/Ethnicity and Politics
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

While the wages earned by whites and nonwhites in the United States have become closer over the past quarter-century, a gap persists. In 2005, the median hourly wage of black men was $12.48, compared with $17.42 for white men (Mishel, Bernstein, and Allegretto 2007). According to past research, differences in the education, skills, and experiences of white and nonwhite workers along with differences in the industries and types of firms that employ them account for some of this gap; however, differences in these factors can themselves be the result of discrimination. Whether such factors as test scores can totally explain the difference in race wage differentials is a point of debate. Some claim that any remaining gap in wages after taking into account workers’ skills and backgrounds and the characteristics of their employers reflects discrimination in the labor market. Others suggest that unobserved but very real differences in workers and jobs account for the remaining pay gap. Another potential explanation for differences in wages across race and ethnicity is differences in the type of jobs workers hold—what the job requires and what the worker does. Employers who know workers’ job skills sort them into different types of jobs; this may account for some of the pay differences between racial and ethnic groups. Since these job characteristics are often unavailable in the data researchers commonly use, they have rarely been considered in understanding pay differentials. This brief uses data from the 2007 Survey of Employers in the Low-Skill Labor Market to examine the differences in jobs held by workers of different races and ethnicities and the impact of these differences on wages (see box for more information about the survey). We focus on the less-skilled labor market because many workers in this sector are either newly entering the labor market or struggling to make ends meet. Policymakers are concerned about how to improve these workers’ earnings generally, along with specific issues for young black men and immigrant workers. Understanding racial and ethnic wage differences for less-skilled workers and the potential role of discrimination will help address the need for and creation of targeted policies to improve wages for these workers.

Available: http://epi.3cdn.net/57b2ab76928042fd8f_5am6bn33z.pdf

Summary
Unemployment will continue to rise at least into the second quarter of 2010, according to the latest projections from Moody’s Economy.com, putting states already experiencing record high unemployment in an even worse position. Further analysis by the Economic Policy Institute of Moody’s state projections extends them to include race and gender, showing that African Americans and Hispanics will bear a disproportionately heavy burden. Nationally, black unemployment is expected to reach 16%, the Hispanic rate 13.3%, and the white rate 8.6%.1—up from 14.7%, 12.2%, and 7.8%, respectively, in the quarter that ended on June 30. Hispanic unemployment in California and Nevada is expected to approach 18% by this time next year. Among the major racial and ethnic groups, African Americans consistently have historically had and continue to have the highest unemployment rate. In California, however, Hispanic unemployment surpassed black unemployment in the second quarter of this year and is projected to remain higher into 2010. The direst situation will face African Americans in Michigan, where their unemployment in the second quarter of 2010 is expected to reach 24.9%—the peak national unemployment rate experienced during the Great Depression. The employment situation will be only slightly better in Ohio and Alabama, where one in five blacks are projected to be unemployed. Increasing joblessness will continue to plague the nation as a whole into 2010, and its effects will be disproportionately borne by blacks and Hispanics. In 14 states and the District of Columbia, the black unemployment rate will exceed 15%; Hispanic unemployment will pass 15% in California and Nevada. After the peak, it will also take years before unemployment rates return to their typical levels.


**Summary**

On May 21, 2008, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Chair Naomi C. Earp, in partnership with the Social Security Administration (SSA) Commissioner Michael J. Astrue, announced the creation of a Federal Hispanic Work Group. This event marked the culmination of a series of discussions between the Chair and representatives of the Hispanic federal and EEO communities. The Hispanic Work Group was directed to examine concerns about federal sector employment including, but not limited to, hiring, leadership development and retention. More importantly, the Work Group was given the responsibility of formulating recommendations designed to enhance and refocus federal Hispanic employment plans, and to remove barriers and level the playing field to encourage greater opportunities for Hispanic applicants and employees throughout the federal government. The Work Group was tasked with issuing a report containing both assessments of the problems, as well as issues and recommendations on how to resolve them. The enclosed report constitutes the Work Group’s recommendations to the EEOC Chair. The Work Group divided itself into a series of sub-groups to focus on specific aspects of this problem. The sub-groups included: (a) recruitment and hiring; (b) retention; (c) leadership development; (d) Hispanic Employment Program Managers; (e) accountability; and (f) science, technology, engineering and mathematics. These sub-groups examined data and various facets of the issues, interviewed stakeholders and experts, and developed recommendations to the EEOC Chair. The Work Group also considered a host of creative ideas and concepts that fell beyond the purview of either the Commission or federal agencies to implement. Included among these are the following: require an agency’s annual budget appropriation to be contingent upon satisfactory EEO performance; pass the Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act; and expand federal employment opportunities to those who are not citizens. These concepts, though noteworthy, could not be included in this report inasmuch as they would require action by the Legislative branch of government.


Summary
One of the most profound changes in America’s demography this century will be its shifting race and ethnic makeup. The rise of immigration from Latin America and Asia, the higher fertility of some minorities and the slow growth of America’s aging white population will have profound impacts on the nation’s demographic profile, with important implications for the electorate. The significance of these changes on identity politics, new racial coalitions and reactions to immigration have already been seen in the 2008 presidential sweepstakes. Yet, these shifts are only the tip of the iceberg of what can be expected in future election cycles as Hispanic, Asian, and Black Americans make up ever larger shares of the electorate. This chapter discusses the shifts playing out in 2008, but with an eye toward what they will mean in the future. It begins by examining the magnitude of new minority population growth, how it differs from past election cycles, and the lag that immigrant minorities experience in translating their growth into actual voting power. It then goes on to discuss how these groups differ from each other on basic social and demographic profiles and on key political issues, with special emphasis on immigration.


Summary

The number of minority-owned farms is declining at a more rapid rate than other farms, which has called into question the treatment of minority farmers in receiving federal assistance. Moreover, for years, minority farmers have reported that Agriculture Department (USDA) officials do not treat them in the same way as nonminority farmers in the conduct of the agency's programs, particularly in decisions made in USDA's country offices and district loan offices. This testimony, which draws on a January 1997 report (GAO/RCED-97-41), (1) identifies the Farm Service Agency's efforts to treat minority farmers in the same way as nonminority farmers in delivering program services; (2) examines the representation of minorities in county office staffing and on county committees in the counties with the highest number of minority farmers; and (3) examines data on the disposition of minority and nonminority farmers' applications to participate in the Agricultural Conservation Program and the direct loan program at the national level and in five county and five district loan offices for fiscal years 1995 and 1996. GAO noted that: (1) FSA's Civil Rights and Small Business Development Staff oversees the agency's efforts to achieve fair treatment for minority farmers; (2) in fiscal years 1995 and 1996, the Staff closed 28 complaints of discrimination against farmers on the basis of race or national origin and found discriminatory practices in 2 of the 28 cases; (3) the Staff also conducted 13 management reviews of field offices and found no evidence of unfair treatment; (4) finally, according to the Staff, they are in the midst of training all FSA personnel on civil rights matters and the Staff projects that this training will be completed by the end of 1997; (5) GAO did not evaluate the quality and thoroughness of the Staff's activities; (6) with respect to the representation of minority employees in FSA's field offices, USDA's database showed that, as of October 1996, 32 percent of the employees serving the 101 counties with the highest number of minority farmers are members of a minority group; (7) moreover, for the same period, 89 percent of these minority employees were either county executive directors or program assistants; (8) minority farmers makeup about 17 percent of the farmer population in these counties; (9) furthermore, in 36 of the 101 counties, at least one minority farmer is a member of the county committee; (10) the applications of minority farmers for ACP for fiscal year 1995 and for the direct loan program from October 1994 through March 1996 were disapproved at a higher rate nationwide than for nonminority farmers; (11) GAO found that disapproval rates for…[abridged]
Summary

This report summarizes some of the major findings of a survey of 749 Massachusetts adults which focuses on matters related to race, public policy, confidence in public institutions, and political behavior. Since a principal objective of the poll is to elicit views from diverse perspectives, the respondents include significant numbers from all major racial groups: Whites (N=433), Latinos (N=113), Asian Americans (N=103), and Blacks or African Americans (N=100). The data was collected in October and November 2006. On some items, there are comparisons with data derived from a similar poll conducted in 1998. The poll was undertaken during a time of great change in Massachusetts. A demographic transformation has been underway over the last several years in which the complexion of the state has literally been and continues to be transformed. At the heart of this change is the increasing number of people of color in the Commonwealth, led most dramatically by the pace of growth in the Latino and Asian populations. In the last five years alone, the Asian population has grown by 22.9%, the Latino population by 14.5% and the Black population by 9.7%. More recently, of course, Massachusetts is in the midst of a transformation of another kind – the election of the state’s first and the nation’s second African American as governor, Deval Patrick. All of those who care about the future of the state could benefit from some stock taking with respect to the attitudes, experiences, and aspirations of residents from all sectors of the Commonwealth. As with any poll, this is a snapshot taken in a dynamic environment. It is critical in the weeks ahead for these results to help inform what should be a vigorous period of discussion, analysis, and activism in many arenas regarding the near and long term future of Massachusetts.

**Available:**

**Summary**

The course of American racial and ethnic politics over the next few decades will depend not only on dynamics within the African-American community, but also on relations between African Americans and other racial or ethnic groups. Both are hard to predict. The key question within the black community involves the unfolding relationship between material success and attachment to the American polity. The imponderable in ethnic relations is how the increasing complexity of ethnic and racial coalitions and of ethnicity-related policy issues will affect African-American political behavior. What makes prediction so difficult is not that there are no clear patterns in both areas. There are. But the current patterns are highly politically charged and therefore highly volatile and contingent on a lot of people's choices. Today the United States has a thriving, if somewhat tenuous, black middle class. By conventional measures of income, education, or occupation at least a third of African Americans can be described as middle class, as compared with about half of whites. That is an astonishing—probably historically unprecedented—change from the early 1960s, when blacks enjoyed the "pervasive equality" of almost uniform poverty in which even the best-off blacks could seldom pass on their status to their children. Conversely, the depth of poverty among the poorest blacks is matched only by the length of its duration. Thus, today there is greater disparity between the top fifth and the bottom fifth of African Americans, with regard to income, education, victimization by violence, occupational status, and participation in electoral politics, than between the top and bottom fifths of white Americans. An observer from Mars might suppose that the black middle class would be highly gratified by its recent and dramatic rise in status and that persistently poor blacks would be frustrated and embittered by their unchanged or even worsening fate. But today's middle-class African Americans express a "rage," to quote one popular writer, that has, paradoxically, grown along with their material holdings. In the 1950s and 1960s, African Americans who were well-off frequently saw less racial discrimination, both generally and in their own lives, than did those who were poor. Poor and poorly educated blacks were more likely than affluent or well-educated blacks to agree that "whites want to keep blacks down" rather than to help them or simply to leave them alone. But by the 1980s blacks with low status were perceiving less white hostility than were their higher-status counterparts.


**Summary**

I was very pleased when the editor asked me to give my views of the impact of African Americans in politics, because my service in the U.S. House of Representatives has given me a very good vantage point from which to observe this. I know it is fashionable to think poorly of some political institutions, Congress among them, but there is one significant virtue possessed by at least a part of Congress that is too rarely noticed: the Democratic Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives is one of the few genuinely integrated institutions in the United States. We are making progress in overcoming prejudice of various sorts in many parts of our country, but in few places have we succeeded as markedly as with the 233 Democratic Members of the U.S. House. Because of the diversity of the Democratic voters in this country, we have among those 233 Democrats a large number of people from groups that are still too often excluded from positions of influence. Race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation are simply no barriers within the Democratic organization in the House from positions of leadership. We stick very strictly to a system in which people are advanced into leadership positions by their seniority, unless they have proven to be abusive or incompetent, and even in those positions to which people are elected by the entire Membership without regard to seniority, we have achieved the goal of judging people on their merits and not on their particular personal characteristics. This is exemplified by our Speaker, Nancy Pelosi; our second ranking Majority Leader, Steny Hoyer, who is a man of Norwegian descent; and by our third ranking official, the Majority Whip, Jim Clyburn, who was a leader in overcoming the obstacles to participation in South Carolina politics on the part of African Americans.
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

The great W.E.B. DuBois predicted in his classic *The Souls of Black Folk* that "the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line." He was right. America has grappled with the insidious evil of racism throughout the past century. We have made important progress in advancing civil rights and improving race relations. But we know we have much more to do to eradicate all the barriers to racial equality and harmony in our country. Almost one hundred years after DuBois made his prediction, the "color line" is still a sad and central fact of American life. We at the Brookings Institution believe that as we approach the turn of a new century—and a new millennium—we have the opportunity and obligation to bring renewed energy, focus, and commitment to resolving the racial issues that still divide our great nation. The diverse and distinguished group of contributors to this issue of the *Brookings Review* offer their perspectives on the topic of "Black America: Progress and Prospects." I believe the scholarship, the experience, and the insights they share in these pages will make a positive and lasting contribution to this most important of public debates.

Let's start with a few contrasting numbers. 60 and 2.2. In 1940, 60 percent of employed black women worked as domestic servants; today the number is down to 2.2 percent, while 60 percent hold white-collar jobs. 44 and 1. In 1958, 44 percent of whites said they would move if a black family became their next door neighbor; today the figure is 1 percent. 18 and 86. In 1964, the year the great Civil Rights Act was passed, only 18 percent of whites claimed to have a friend who was black; today 86 percent say they do, while 87 percent of blacks assert they have white friends. Progress is the largely suppressed story of race and race relations over the past half-century. And thus it's news that more than 40 percent of African Americans now consider themselves members of the middle class. Forty-two percent own their own homes, a figure that rises to 75 percent if we look just at black married couples. Black two-parent families earn only 13 percent less than those who are white. Almost a third of the black population lives in suburbia.


Available:

http://www.upjohninst.org/publications/wp/9427.html

Summary

Workers in rural areas earn lower wages than nonrural workers and previous evidence has attributed these differences to lower returns to worker characteristics. This paper builds on that data by examining racial and gender differences within the broader group of rural workers. While there is extensive evidence on both the structure of wages and the source of racial wage differentials between Whites and Blacks, there is no such evidence for those in either group living in rural areas. Nor is there much evidence in this literature for American Indians. This paper's contribution to the literature is two-fold. First, it broadens the existing evidence regarding rural workers by focussing on racial and gender differences. Second, it provides new evidence of the structure of wages faced by American Indians, a group typically ignored in empirical research due to data problems. The results reveal that only 14 percent of the 24 percent total wage difference between Whites and American Indians for males are unexplained by observable personal and job characteristics, but 66 percent of the 11 percent wage difference remains unexplained for females. Comparing Whites and Blacks, 44 percent of the 31 percent wage difference is unexplained for males, while 97 percent of the 15 percent wage difference is unexplained for females. With the rural focus, Whites are more similar to American Indians, both experiencing very small wage returns to education. However, in both samples, Blacks suffer disproportionately severe penalties for low educational attainment. For all three races, females enjoy much higher returns to education than males.


Summary

Herman Melville exaggerated 160 years ago when he wrote, "You cannot spill a drop of American blood without spilling the blood of the world." However, the results of the 2000 Census show that his words accurately describe the United States of today. Two decades of intensive immigration are rapidly remaking our racial and ethnic mix. The American mosaic—which has always been complex—is becoming even more intricate. If diversity is a blessing, America has it in abundance. But is diversity a blessing? In many parts of the world the answer has been no. Ethnic, racial, and religious differences often produce violence—witness the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the genocide in Rwanda, the civil war in Sudan, and the "Troubles" in Northern Ireland. Against this background the United States has been a remarkable exception. This is not to say it is innocent of racism, bigotry, or unequal treatment—the slaughter of American Indians, slavery, Jim Crow segregation, and the continuing gap between whites and blacks on many socioeconomic indicators make clear otherwise. However, to a degree unparalleled anywhere else, America has knitted disparate peoples into one nation. The success of that effort is visible not just in America's tremendous prosperity, but also in the patriotism that Americans, regardless of their skin color, ancestral homeland, or place of worship, feel for their country. America has managed to build one nation out of many people for several reasons. Incorporating newcomers from diverse origins has been part of its experience from the earliest colonial days—and is ingrained in the American culture. The fact that divisions between Congregationalists and Methodists or between people of English and Irish ancestry do not animate our politics today attests not to homogeneity but to success—often hard earned—in bridging and tolerating differences. America's embrace of "liberty and justice for all" has been the backdrop that has promoted unity. The commitment to the ideals enshrined in the Declaration of Independence gave those denied their rights a moral claim on the conscience of the majority—a claim redeemed most memorably by the civil rights movement. America's two-party system has fostered unity by encouraging ethnic and religious groups to join forces rather than build sectarian parties that would perpetuate demographic divides. Furthermore, economic mobility has created bridges across ethnic, religious, and racial lines, thereby blurring their overlap with class divisions and diminishing their power to fuel conflict.
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

The United States of America, "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," began as a slave society. What can rightly be called the "original sin" slavery has left an indelible imprint on our nation's soul. A terrible price had to be paid, in a tragic, calamitous civil war, before this new democracy could be rid of that most undemocratic institution. But for black Americans the end of slavery was just the beginning of our quest for democratic equality; another century would pass before the nation came fully to embrace that goal. Even now millions of Americans recognizably of African descent languish in societal backwaters. What does this say about our civic culture as we enter a new century? The eminent Negro man of letters W. E. B. Du Bois predicted in 1903 that the issue of the 20th century would be "the problem of the color line." He has been proven right. At mid-century the astute Swedish observer of American affairs, Gunnar Myrdal, reiterated the point, declaring the race problem to be our great national dilemma and fretting about the threat it posed to the success of our democratic experiment. Du Bois must have relished the irony of having a statue named Liberty oversee the arrival in New York's harbor of millions of foreigners, "tempest tossed" and "yearning to breathe free," even as black Southern peasants--not alien, just profoundly alienated--were kept unfree at the social margins. And Myrdal observed a racist ideology that openly questioned the Negro's human worth survive our defeat of the Nazis and abate only when the Cold War rivalry made it intolerable that the "leader of the free world" should be seen to preside over a regime of racial subordination.
National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Education Fund.  


**Summary**

Latino candidates continue to reach new milestones in Congress and state houses across the nation. In State Senates, Latinos are also demonstrating significant political progress in communities with emerging Latino populations. Latinos in Congress: In the U.S. House, all Latino incumbents won their re-election campaigns. They will be joined by New Mexico Public Regulation Commissioner Ben R. Lujan (D), who will become the first Latino to represent New Mexico in Congress since Governor Bill Richardson (D), whose tenure in Congress ended a decade ago. With Lujan’s election, there will be 24 Latinos serving as voting members in the U.S. House of Representatives. None of the Latino U.S. Senators were up for re-election in 2008. Latinos in State Senates: Latinos saw a net gain of 5 seats, increasing the total from 61 to 66 nationwide. Wyoming has gained its first Latino State Senator, with the victory of State Representative Floyd Esquibel (D) in District 8. In Tennessee, State Representative Dolores Gresham (R) won her election bid, and will become the first Latina in the Tennessee State Senate. In Massachusetts, community activist Sonia Chang-Diaz (D) will become the first Latina elected to the Massachusetts State Senate, and the second Latino to have ever served in that legislative body. In Utah, Luz Robles (D) will become the second Latino to serve in Utah’s State Senate. Latinos in state lower houses: In state lower houses, there was a modest decrease in the total number of Latinos from 190 to 177. This is due in part to the departure of Latino State Representatives who were seeking higher office, and four sitting State Representatives emerged victorious in their State Senate contests. On pages 21-24, the Profile sets forth tables which include the number of Latino candidates for federal and state legislative offices, and the Latino electoral gains for each state.

Available:  http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS113268

Summary

The National Forum on Education Statistics (Forum) is pleased to present Managing an Identity Crisis: Forum Guide to Implementing New Federal Race and Ethnicity Categories. One goal of the Forum is to improve the quality of education data gathered for use by policymakers and program decision makers. An approach to furthering this goal has been to pool the collective experiences of Forum members to produce “best practice” guides in areas of high interest to those who collect, maintain, and use data about elementary and secondary education. Standardizing the way data systems record students’ race and ethnicity is one of these high-interest areas. This best-practice guide is developed to assist state and local education agencies in their implementation of the new federal race and ethnicity categories—thereby reducing redundant efforts within and across states, improving data comparability, and minimizing reporting burden. It serves as a toolkit from which users may select and adopt strategies that will help them quickly begin the process of implementation in their agencies. Data, information systems, and program staff in states and school districts comprise the primary audience for this guide. The vendors of student and staff information systems for these agencies are a secondary, but important, audience. This guide covers all stages and aspects of implementation, from developing procedures at the state level to actual re-identification of a student’s or staff member’s race and ethnicity.


Summary

Like earlier generations of black legislators on Capitol Hill, the 86 African Americans who entered Congress in the period from 1971 through 2007 generally ranked far above the norm in terms of education, professional attainment, and civic achievements. Successful careers in state government propelled the large numbers of African Americans elected to Congress in the 1990s. Like all the previous generations of black Members, these individuals were typical of their peers among the general membership of the House and Senate—composed largely of business, law, public service, and other professional elites. They were exceedingly well educated, as was the general congressional membership, and their level of education ranked far above the statistical averages for the general U.S. population. They also largely experienced trends that were prevalent among the general congressional population, including a decline in prior military experience and a higher median age at first election.

Available:  [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17931](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS17931)

Summary

This Interim Report to the President of the United States is submitted by the President's Advisory Commission on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders which is composed of fourteen private and non-profit sectors members, as well as community members working at the local and state government levels who have experience in issues and matters of concern to the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. The Commission was established by Executive Order 13125 to advise the President through the Secretary of Health and Human Services on (1) ways to improve the quality of life of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders through increased participation in federal programs where they may be underserved; (2) ways to increase public-sector, private-sector, and community involvement in improving the health and wellbeing of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders; and (3) ways to foster research and data on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. The report's findings and recommendations solely reflect the views of the Commission with the exception of Appendix E. Appendix E consists of Summaries of Federal Department and Agency Snapshots, Inventories and Fiscal Year 2001 Plans, which were submitted by the respective agencies in response to a request for information made by the Commission.


Summary

On a typical day in the 1890s, thousands of immigrants arrived at Ellis Island in New York. For many, learning English and acculturating to America would be the work of years, even decades. But often it would be a matter of only a few weeks or even days before they received a visit from a Tammany Hall ward heeler or before friends or family brought them along to some event at the local precinct hall. Long before many of those newcomers fully understood what it was to be American, they knew quite well what it meant to be a Democrat or a Republican. Today—just as it was a hundred years ago—the foreign-born share of the American population is at a peak. The recent wave of immigration differs both demographically and politically from that of a century ago, of course. Today's immigrants originate in Latin America and Asia, not in southern, central, and eastern Europe. But how quickly and how well immigrant newcomers are absorbed into American society may depend less on where they come from than on what they find when they get here. Once at the center of U.S. politics from the moment they arrived, immigrants are now much closer to the fringes. That is no accident. The centripetal forces drawing immigrants into electoral politics in 1900 have been succeeded by a set of strong and persistent centrifugal forces that discourage the full electoral participation and political assimilation that earlier generations of immigrants enjoyed. Nineteenth-century immigrants arrived to find important political groups eager to satisfy their material needs. Political parties, especially the many urban political machines, needed immigrants' votes and did their best to get them—accelerating the newcomers' political assimilation in the process. Today, the American political system, less in need of new immigrants' votes, does little to bring them into the world of campaigns and elections. Three big changes in American politics—the diminishing role of the parties, the rise of a new kind of campaigning, and (ironically) efforts to get more minorities into government—have left immigrants on the outside looking in.

**Summary**

Since the U.S. Constitution first instructed that a slave be counted as only three-fifths of a person, the census has been caught up in America's racial dilemmas. Today it is torn by controversies over affirmative action, evolving racial identities, and minority undercounts. In *Counting on the Census?* Peter Skerry confirms the persistence of minority undercounts and insists that racial and ethnic data are critical to the administration of policies affecting minorities. He rejects demands that the census stop collecting such data. But Skerry also rejects the view that the census is a scientific exercise best left to the experts, and argues that it is necessarily and properly a political undertaking. To those advocating statistical adjustment of the census, Skerry insists that the consequences of minority undercounts have been misunderstood and exaggerated, while the risks of adjustment have been overlooked. Scrutinizing the tendency to equate census numbers with political power, Skerry places census controversies in the broader context of contemporary American politics and society. He traces our preoccupation with minority undercounts to the pervasive logic of an administrative politics that emphasizes the formal representation of minority interests over minority political mobilization and participation. Rather than confront the genuine social and political problems of the disadvantaged, political elites turn to adjustment to tweak outcomes at the margin. In such a context, where ordinary Americans already feel bewildered by and excluded from politics, the arcane techniques of adjustment would undermine public confidence in this most fundamental function of government. Finally, in a society where racial and ethnic identities are more fluid than ever, Skerry calls for greater realism about the limited accuracy of census data—and for greater tolerance of the untidy politics that accompanies the diversity we have come to value.


This case presents the question whether Title VII and the Equal Protection Clause allow a government employer to reject the results of a civil-service selection process because it does not like the racial distribution of the results. Specifically: 1. When a content-valid civil-service examination and race-neutral selection process yield unintended, racially disproportionate results, do a municipality and its officials racially discriminate in violation of the Equal Protection Clause or Title VII when they reject the results and the successful candidates to achieve racial proportionality in candidates selected? 2. Does an employer violate 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(l), which makes it unlawful for employers “to adjust the scores of, use different cut-off scores for, or otherwise alter the results of, employment related tests on the basis of race,” when it rejects the results of such tests because of the race of the successful candidates?
**Summary**

This report presents an analysis of information on the members of the 51 state advisory committees of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission). These state advisory committees exist to provide information on state and local civil rights issues to the Commission. This analysis contains information on state and advisory committee member demographics and the members' occupations. Information on the members was obtained from the Commission from the most recent charter for each advisory committee at the time of our analysis. We obtained our state demographic information from U.S. census data except for data on religion and politics. Religion data was obtained from The American Religious Identification Survey 2001.1 The political data was obtained from The 2004 Political Landscape by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. We are providing this information so that readers may see how the advisory committees' membership reflects various criteria. For more detailed information on the old and new membership criteria, please see our report entitled U. S. Commission on Civil Rights: The Commission Should Strengthen Its Quality Assurance Policies and Make Better Use of Its State Advisory Committees (GAO-06-343). We gathered the information and conducted our analysis between April 2005 and March 2006. A more detailed discussion of our scope and methodology can be found in our report. We conducted our work in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.
With this report, the Commission examines the Bush administration’s statements and actions with respect to civil rights and the quest for equality. Chapter 2 covers the administration’s commitment to civil rights based on public messages and actions to promote civil rights, including its political appointments and judicial nominations, and funding for enforcement. Traditionally, civil rights advances have grown out of policy that furthers equal educational opportunity, affirmative action, housing, immigration, and voting rights. Chapter 3 examines the administration’s progress on these fronts among others. As civil rights have evolved, other groups have become involved in the fight for equality. Chapter 4 examines the policies and initiatives that have either moved those groups, including immigrants, Native Americans, persons with disabilities, women, and gay men and lesbians, toward or away from equality. Chapter 5 assesses the administration’s actions toward new or inherited other programs designed to promote access to federal services for individuals traditionally neglected. Finally, the Commission assesses whether the administration’s efforts, cumulatively, have advanced or retarded civil rights. The Commission reviewed public statements and documents, policy briefs, budget data, and executive orders. In addition, staff analyzed the policies that executive Cabinet agencies implemented. To the extent clarification was needed, staff contacted agencies. Staff also conducted an extensive literature review, with special emphasis on reports, studies, statements, and publications offered from scholars, political analysts, government sources, experts on presidential leadership, and affected communities. Staff consulted historical documents to establish context for understanding modern-day antidiscrimination targets. This evaluation does not comprehensively review all administration policies or initiatives, but selects based on applicability to civil rights and prominence within the administration’s overall agenda. The Commission considered several factors when making its selection: whether a policy or initiative involved a matter of longstanding civil rights interest; whether it was based on a campaign promise; whether it stemmed from events demanding immediate attention; and whether it grew from a new opportunity or the President’s own ideology. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess the outcomes of individual civil rights initiatives. Because many are still in the planning stages, it would be premature to measure effectiveness. Rather, this review regards the administration’s overall agenda and its potential to advance civil rights.
Summary

For decades, there have been allegations of discrimination in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) programs and workforce. Reports and congressional testimony by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, a former Secretary of Agriculture, USDA's Office of Inspector General, GAO, and others have described weaknesses in USDA's programs—in particular, in resolving complaints of discrimination and in providing minorities access to programs. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 authorized the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights (ASCR), giving USDA an executive that could provide leadership for resolving these long-standing problems. This testimony focuses on USDA's efforts to (1) resolve discrimination complaints, (2) report on minority participation in USDA programs, and (3) strategically plan its efforts. This testimony is based on new and prior work, including analysis of ASCR's strategic plan; discrimination complaint management; and about 120 interviews with officials of USDA and other federal agencies, as well as 20 USDA stakeholder groups. USDA officials reviewed the facts upon which this statement is based, and we incorporated their additions and clarifications as appropriate. GAO plans a future report with recommendations. ASCR's difficulties in resolving discrimination complaints persist—ASCR has not achieved its goal of preventing future backlogs of complaints. At a basic level, the credibility of USDA's efforts has been and continues to be undermined by ASCR's faulty reporting of data on discrimination complaints and disparities in ASCR's data. Even such basic information as the number of complaints is subject to wide variation in ASCR's reports to the public and the Congress. Moreover, ASCR's public claim in July 2007 that it had successfully reduced a backlog of about 690 discrimination complaints in fiscal year 2004 and held its caseload to manageable levels, drew a questionable portrait of progress. By July 2007, ASCR officials were well aware they had not succeeded in preventing future backlogs—they had another backlog on hand, and this time the backlog had surged to an even higher level of 885 complaints. In fact, ASCR officials were in the midst of planning to hire additional attorneys to address that backlog of complaints including some ASCR was holding dating from the early 2000s that it had not resolved. In addition, some steps ASCR had taken may have actually been counter-productive and affected the quality of its work. For example, an ASCR official stated that some employees' complaints had been addressed without resolving basic…[abridged]
Women in the Public Sector


**Summary**

During the last two decades, women have made remarkable strides in academia: They are graduating from colleges and universities in record numbers and making striking gains in doctoral programs. In academic year 2000–01, for example, women made up 44 percent of doctoral recipients, up from 32 percent in 1980–81 (see Appendix A, Table 1). In the 1980s and 1990s, women also made impressive gains in faculty appointments at all ranks, growing from about one-fourth of the full-time faculty to more than one-third (see Appendix A, Table 2). Despite these gains, women remain underrepresented at the highest echelons of higher education. Women make up more than one-half of instructors and lecturers and nearly one-half of assistant professors, but they represent only one third of associate professors and one-fifth of full professors (see Appendix A, Table 2). On average, compared to men, women earn less, hold lower-ranking positions, and are less likely to have tenure.1 For four-year institutions, the differences are more pronounced (see Appendix A, Table 3). This report focuses on women who took their fight for tenure to the courts. Drawing on 19 cases supported by the American Association of University Women Legal Advocacy Fund since 1981, we document the challenge of fighting sex discrimination in academia. In the process, we illustrate the overt and subtle forms of sex discrimination that continue to bar women from tenure, the most venerated and secure status of academia. Sex discrimination in tenure decisions is not just unfair; it also has repercussions in the workplace and in society in general. Universities and colleges have been powerful cultural institutions in western culture since medieval times. Today, the college degree has become the standard credential used by employers to screen applicants for most better-paying jobs. Tenured faculty control curriculum and grading and, in so doing, play a central role in determining this credential. As teachers and mentors, professors help shape the intellect and social conscience of their students and, hence, of our society. Offering students a faculty as diverse as the world they live in and ensuring the fairness of the promotion process is thus of tremendous importance. In academia as in the rest of the workplace, female workers are now commonplace. Women expect to work throughout their lives, and a majority of women work for pay even when their children are infants and toddlers. So far women have not achieved parity in positions of leadership, and they are still underrepresented in upper management and high-paying jobs throughout the work force, despite the fact that more women have professional degrees.


Summary

On the 25th anniversary of Title IX it seems fitting to suggest that America is a more equal, more educated and more prosperous nation because of the far-reaching effects of this legislation. Much has been accomplished in the classroom and on the playing field and we have many reasons to celebrate the success of Title IX in expanding our nation's definition of equality. With Title IX, we affirm what can be accomplished when we allow all Americans--men and women--an equal opportunity to be their best. What strikes me the most about the progress that has been achieved since Title IX was passed in 1972 is that there has been a sea change in our expectations of what women can achieve. More important, women have shown skeptics again and again that females are fully capable of being involved as successful and active participants in every realm of American life. Women astronauts from Sally Ride to Shannon Lucid have made their mark in space even as Mia Hamm and Michelle Akers have led the women's national soccer team to Olympic glory and the World Championship. Women have entered the medical and legal professions in record numbers and we have seen a fourfold increase in women's participation in intercollegiate athletics. The great untold story of success that resulted from the passage of Title IX is surely the progress that has been achieved in education. In 1971, only 18 percent of all women, compared to 26 percent of all men, had completed four or more years of college. This education gap no longer exists. Women now make up the majority of students in America's colleges and universities in addition to making up the majority of recipients of master's degrees.

Available:  [http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2008/05_women_lawless_fox.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2008/05_women_lawless_fox.aspx)

**Summary**

Extensive research shows that when women run for office, they perform just as well as men. Yet women remain severely under-represented in our political institutions. In this report, we argue that the fundamental reason for women’s under-representation is that they do not run for office. There is a substantial gender gap in political ambition: men tend to have it, and women don’t. Our results are based on the Citizen Political Ambition Panel Study, a research project we have been conducting over the course of the last seven years. In 2001, we surveyed more than 3,700 lawyers, business leaders and executives, educators, and political activists about whether they ever considered running for office. We re-surveyed more than 2,000 of these individuals in 2008. Because we surveyed well-matched pools of men and women who work in professions that most typically precede a political candidacy, we can provide the first comprehensive investigation of the process by which women and men decide to enter the electoral arena. We can also determine the extent to which political ambition has changed over time. We offer clear and compelling evidence that women, even in the highest tiers of professional accomplishment, are substantially less likely than men to demonstrate ambition to seek elected office. These results hold regardless of age, partisan affiliation, income and profession. In addition, despite the historic events of the last seven years – such as the war in Iraq, frustration with the political process, and the emergence of a more diverse group of political candidates and leaders – overall levels of political ambition for women and men have remained fairly constant. In 2008, men continue to enjoy more comfort, confidence and freedom than women when thinking about running for office. We link this persistent gender gap in political ambition to several factors. Women are less likely than men to be willing to endure the rigors of a political campaign. They are less likely than men to be recruited to run for office. They are less likely than men to have the freedom to reconcile work and family obligations with a political career. They are less likely than men to think they are “qualified” to run for office. And they are less likely than men to perceive a fair political environment. In the end, this report documents how far from gender parity we remain, as well as the barriers and obstacles we must still overcome in order to achieve it. But our results also offer guidance to organizations and individuals seeking to increase the number of women in elected positions. Recruiting women candidates, disseminating information about the electoral environment and working with women to quell their anxiety about campaigning can help narrow the gender gap in political ambition and increase women’s numeric representation.


Summary

Women continue to enter the workforce at record levels and laws on the state and federal levels prohibit gender discrimination in the workplace. Yet employment discrimination persists and women’s wages remain lower than men’s wages for comparable positions and occupations. With the 2005 publication of GETTING EVEN: Why Women Don’t Get Paid as Much as Men and What To Do About It by Economist and former Massachusetts Lieutenant Governor Evelyn Murphy, the issue of wage equity is finally receiving the widespread and sustained attention it deserves. This resource guide provides an overview of the issues related to the wage gap between men and women (the “horizontal wage gap”) and between women earning top salaries and women engaged in low-wage work (the “vertical wage gap”). In addition, this guide summarizes federal and state pay equity legislation and offers action opportunities for advocates to work to decrease the wage gap and ensure gender equity in all employment sectors and workplaces.


**Summary**

A basic personnel policy, set out by law, is to create a competent, honest, and productive federal workforce that reflects the nation's diverse population. While improvements have occurred, the federal civilian workforce still does not reflect the nation's diversity; white women and Hispanics in the federal workforce continue to lag behind their representation in the nation's civilian workforce. This testimony focuses on the representation status of women and minorities in the federal workforce, particularly at the upper grade levels and in jobs that typically lead to those grades. GAO also discusses the need (1) to improve the statistical criteria used to measure women and minority representation and (2) for more emphasis on collecting and/or analyzing recruiting, hiring, training and development, promotion, and separation data to better identify barriers to women and minorities.

Available: 

Summary

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 extended protections against sex discrimination to students and employees at institutions receiving federal assistance for educational programs or activities. In the 32 years since Title IX was enacted, women have made significant gains in many fields, but much attention has focused on women's participation in the sciences. Because of the concern about women's access to opportunities in the sciences, which receive billions of dollars in federal assistance, this report addresses: (1) how do the Department of Education (Education), the Department of Energy (Energy), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) ensure that federal grant recipient institutions comply with Title IX in math, engineering, and science; (2) what do data show about women's participation in these fields; and (3) what promising practices exist to promote their participation? Four federal science agencies have made efforts to ensure that grantees comply with Title IX in the sciences by performing several compliance activities, such as investigating complaints and providing technical assistance, but most have not conducted all required monitoring activities. Agency officials at Energy, NASA, and NSF told us that they refer complaints to Education and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where they are investigated. However, only Education has monitored its grantees by conducting compliance reviews--periodic, agency-initiated assessments of grantees to determine if they are complying with Title IX. Women's participation in the sciences has increased substantially in the last three decades, especially in the life sciences, such as biology. The proportion of women science students has grown, but to a lesser extent at the graduate level than the undergraduate level. Meanwhile, the proportion of faculty in the sciences who are women has also increased, but they still lag behind men faculty in terms of salary and rank. However, studies indicate that experience, work patterns, and education levels can largely explain these differences. Studies also suggest that discrimination may still affect women's choices and professional progress. We found several examples of agencies and grantees that have instituted practices designed to foster greater women's participation in the sciences. While some of the practices are aimed at encouraging more women to pursue the sciences, others provide time off and fewer teaching duties so faculty can balance work and family life. Finally, a few practices seek to expand the recruiting pool for jobs… [abridged]


Summary

In 2003, GAO found that women, on average, earned 80 percent of what men earned in 2000 and workplace discrimination may be one contributing factor. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Department of Labor (Labor) enforce several laws intended to prevent gender pay discrimination. GAO examined (1) how EEOC enforces laws addressing gender pay disparities among private sector employers and provides outreach and what is known about its performance, and (2) how Labor enforces laws addressing gender pay disparities among federal contractors and provides outreach and what is known about its performance. GAO analyzed relevant laws, regulations, monitoring reports, and agency enforcement data and conducted interviews at the agencies’ central offices and two field offices experienced in gender pay cases. GAO recommends that EEOC and OFCCP monitor performance of their enforcement efforts related to gender pay and that OFCCP ensure its planned new data system uses reliable data, measure performance of its outreach efforts, evaluate the mathematical model used to target contractors, provide links between pertinent guidance, and devise a unique violation code to track any non-compliance with the self-evaluation requirement. EEOC agreed with GAO’s recommendation; Labor neither agreed nor disagreed; and both provided additional perspective on their enforcement efforts. EEOC addresses gender pay discrimination primarily by responding to individual charges, initiating investigations, and conducting outreach, but the agency does not fully monitor gender pay enforcement efforts. EEOC prioritizes incoming charges of discrimination against employers that appear to merit further investigation, and GAO’s analysis of EEOC data showed that charges of gender pay discrimination were prioritized for investigation more frequently than non-gender pay charges.


Summary

In light of concerns that a pay gap may continue to exist between men and women in the workplace, you asked us to examine pay disparity issues and the role the federal government has played in enforcing anti-discrimination laws. In agreement with your staff, we addressed these questions in two separate, consecutive reports, the first of which focused on enforcement and outreach efforts in the private sector and among federal contractors. This second report addresses the following question: To what extent has the pay gap between men and women in the federal workforce changed over the past 20 years and what factors account for the gap? To answer this question, we used two approaches to analyze data from the Central Personnel Data File (CPDF)—maintained by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM)—covering a 20-year period. First, we looked at “snapshots” of the federal workforce at three points in time (1988, 1998, and 2007) to show changes in the federal workforce over a 20-year period.4 Second, we examined the cohort (or group) of employees who joined the federal workforce in 1988 and tracked their careers over the course of 20 years to look for differences in the pay gap in this group. We used CPDF data to generate summary statistics on the federal workforce and to perform multivariate analyses, which we used to identify the amount of the gender pay gap attributable to differences in measurable factors—such as work-related and demographic characteristics of men and women. To further inform our analyses, we reviewed existing literature and reports on gender and pay and interviewed officials at the Office of Personnel Management and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). We conducted our work from March 2008 to March 2009 in accordance with all sections of GAO’s Quality Assurance Framework that are relevant to our objectives. The framework requires that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to meet our stated objectives and to discuss any limitations in our work.
Summary

As we celebrate the 35th anniversary of Title IX (Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) on June 23, 2007, it is appropriate to take a moment to consider the significant strides we have made towards providing an education to all students, male and female, free of discrimination. As one of the nation’s landmark civil rights laws, Title IX has opened countless doors for women and girls. While Title IX has attracted much attention in the areas of interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics, it profoundly affects all aspects of education far beyond the playing field. As we continue to work towards the elimination of sex discrimination in education, it is important that we reflect on how much we have accomplished and on what students and educators can achieve when everyone—regardless of sex—is given an equal opportunity to succeed. Congress entrusted the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the United States Department of Education (Department) with the responsibility of enforcing Title IX in education programs and activities receiving financial assistance from the Department. In response to growing concern about disparities in the educational experiences of male and female students, Congress enacted the law to eliminate sex discrimination in the classroom, in course offerings, in athletics, in extracurricular activities, and in employment in education programs. Many of today’s students would be quite surprised by our nation’s education landscape before Title IX was enacted. Back then, there were far fewer female students on college campuses. Female students at the secondary and postsecondary levels often were steered towards courses that were perceived to be “more appropriate” for women to study, and faculty members were overwhelmingly male. Women were much less likely to receive undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate degrees, particularly in academic areas that were once considered “traditionally male.” Women and girls comprised a shockingly low percentage of the student athletes at high schools and colleges, and school support for female athletes and teams was often remarkably inadequate. Today, in part because of Title IX, the Department’s vigorous enforcement of the law, and our nation’s commitment to the elimination of sex discrimination, we have removed many obstacles and greatly increased the ability of women and girls to take advantage of the opportunities previously denied them. This is also due in no small part to the efforts of our nation’s education institutions at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.


**Summary**

Like all history, the story of women in Congress is defined by change over time: From a complete lack of representation in Congress before 1917, women have advanced to party leadership at the start of the 21st century. At times during the near century that women have served in Congress, change has been almost imperceptible, as exemplified by the subtle shift in women’s committee assignments after World War II. At other times, change has been bold and dramatic, as evidenced by the 1992 “Year of the Woman” elections. Several questions, important not only to women’s history in Congress but also to the development of Congress itself, have recurred throughout the process of researching and writing these profiles of U.S. Congresswomen. How have women Members of Congress reacted to the political culture and traditions of Capitol Hill? Have women changed the way Congress conducts its business, or have they modified their behavior to conform with the institution? Have the experiences of the women Senators differed from those of women Representatives and, if so, what might account for these differences? What kinds of experiences do Congresswomen have in common, despite the differences in their legislative styles and political ideologies?
Summary

This study seeks to answer the question: Given the wealth of talent and resources women possess—and the state offers—why is it so tough for women to gain representation in Boston City Hall? To answer this question, and to document the efforts women have made over almost 100 years, we examine the history of women who have run for and won—or lost—election to the Boston City Council in the 20th century. How does the structure and culture of a given urban political arena (i.e., “Boston politics”) affect women’s opportunities as elected officials? What is women’s political culture and how has it differed from patriarchal models of urban political culture? What constitutes political ambition and participation for women? How do women fare in Boston compared to other capital cities in the United States? This history of women and the Boston City Council uses public records, media reports, and oral histories with candidates and elected officials to tell a story that fills a gap in scholarship regarding the roles of women in Boston city politics. First, we will provide a brief description of the historical context—how “Boston politics” has shaped, hindered, or, in some cases, promoted women’s election to the City Council. Second, using data gathered from historical records, oral histories, interviews, and other sources, we will provide a chronological history of women who ran, won, and lost their bids for election. Finally, the paper concludes with an analysis of the reasons it has been so difficult for women to gain anything approaching equal representation on the Boston City Council. This analysis includes systemic constraints such as bias in gender roles and expectations; traditional notions about women’s capabilities and responsibility; familiarity with the political process; the role of gatekeepers; and fundraising and other forms of support.
Summary

Previous research has found that, despite improvements over time, women generally earned less than men in both the general and federal workforces, even after controlling for factors that might explain differences in pay. To determine the extent to which the pay gap exists in the federal workforce, GAO addressed the following question: To what extent has the pay gap between men and women in the federal workforce changed over the past 20 years and what factors account for the gap? This testimony is based on a report that GAO is releasing today (GAO-09-279). The gender pay gap—the difference between men’s and women’s average salaries—declined significantly in the federal workforce between 1988 and 2007. Specifically, the gap declined from 28 cents on the dollar in 1988 to 19 cents in 1998 and further to 11 cents in 2007. For the 3 years we examined, all but about 7 cents of the gap can be explained by differences in measurable factors such as the occupations of men and women and, to a lesser extent, other factors such as education levels and years of federal experience. The pay gap narrowed as men and women in the federal workforce increasingly shared similar characteristics in terms of the jobs they held, their educational attainment, and their levels of experience. For example, the professional, administrative, and clerical occupations—which accounted for 68 percent of all federal jobs in 2007—have become more integrated by gender since 1988. Some or all of the remaining 7 cent gap might be explained by factors for which we lacked data or are difficult to measure, such as work experience outside the federal government. Finally, it is important to note that this analysis neither confirms nor refutes the presence of discriminatory practices. GAO’s case study analysis of workers who entered the workforce in 1988 found that the pay gap between men and women in this group grew overall from 22 to 25 cents on the dollar between 1988 and 2007. As with the overall federal workforce, differences between men and women that can affect pay explained a significant portion of the pay gap over the 20-year period. In particular, differences in occupations explained from 11 to 19 cents of the gap over this period. In contrast, differences in breaks in federal service and use of unpaid leave explained little of the pay gap. However, the results of this analysis are not necessarily representative of other cohorts.
Issues in Affirmative Action Programs
February 2009.


**Summary**

According to its mission statement, a primary goal of the American Bar Association is to "promote respect for the law." In the interest of mandating racial preferences in admissions, however, the ABA has just ordered law schools to do the opposite--in fact, to violate the law--and is resorting to blackmail to achieve its end. Meeting in Chicago this past weekend, the ABA's Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar voted in favor of "equal opportunity and diversity" standards. Under these standards, any law school that seeks to maintain or acquire ABA accreditation will be required to engage in racial preferences in hiring and admissions, regardless of any federal, state or local laws that prohibit of such policies. Since only graduates of ABA-accredited schools may take the bar exam in the vast majority of states, the association has, in effect, a legal monopoly on accreditation standards. The new Standard 211, styled "Equal Opportunity and Diversity," will govern admissions and faculty hiring policies. It says nothing about treating people from different groups equally, and lots about "diversity"--a code word for affirmative action preferences. "Consistent with sound legal education policy and the Standards," part (a) says that a law school must provide "full opportunities for the study of law and entry into the profession by members of underrepresented groups, particularly racial and ethnic minorities," and it must also commit "to having a student body that is diverse with respect to gender, race and ethnicity." Part (b) says, "Consistent with sound educational policy and the Standards, a law school shall demonstrate by concrete action a commitment to having a faculty and staff that are diverse with respect to gender, race and ethnicity." This sounds innocuous, since law schools can reasonably differ on what constitutes "sound legal education policy." Some might think that the educational benefits of a racially heterogeneous student body justify significant racial preferences; others might give more weight to data showing significant educational costs resulting from preferences. An empirical study by Richard Sander of UCLA, for example, confirms anecdotal evidence that student beneficiaries of such preferences tend to struggle in law school and end up at the bottom of their classes. Statistics published in the year 2000 also reveal that under current affirmative action policies, 42% of all African-American matriculants to law school either never graduate or never pass the bar (compared with 14% of whites). Some schools might conclude dooming a huge percentage of African-American students to failure is contrary to sound educational policy, and limit their "diversity" efforts to recruitment and retention.

Available: [http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/242/99/](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/242/99/)

Summary

Racially Disparate Probabilities of Admission For Applicants with the Same Grades and Test Scores Computed from 1995 undergraduate admissions data provided by the University of Michigan to the Center for Equal Opportunity. Jennifer Gratz, who is white, applied in 1995 to the University of Michigan College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA), and was rejected. Gratz's GPA was 3.8; her ACT score, 25. This placed her at the 70th percentile of all applicants in grades, and somewhat above the 30th percentile in test scores. Her fellow Plaintiff-Petitioner in this case, Patrick Hamacher, also white, applied for admission into the fall 1997 freshman class of the LSA, and was rejected. His grade-point average was 3.0, and his ACT score was 28. If the competition in 1997 was similar to that in 1995, his grades were between the 10th and 20th percentiles, and his score at about the 60th. The table below provides a profile of the racial disadvantage faced in 1995 by white and Asian, as compared with black and Hispanic, applicants with the same grades and test scores. The disadvantage is not as large in Michigan's undergraduate college as in its Law School. For applicants to the latter, the racial disparities at most percentiles are huge. Whereas, for LSA hopefuls, the difference falls to 10 percentage points by the 50th percentile, and continues to shrink. In 1995, the college admitted 74% of its 16,000 applicants; that same year, the Law School accepted only 27% of 4000.

Available: [http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/241/99/](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/241/99/)

Summary

Barbara Grutter, who is white, applied in 1996 to the Michigan Law School and was rejected. Many minority applicants with much lower undergraduate grade point averages (UGPA) and law school aptitude test scores (LSAT) were accepted. Testifying in Grutter's behalf, Prof. Kinley Larntz displayed the different rates of admission for racially favored and other applicants, using grids of cells codetermined by grades and scores. For example, Grutter's UGPA was 3.81; her LSAT score, 161. This placed her in the cell of applicants with UGPAs of 3.75 and above, and LSATs of 161 - 163. In this cell the 1995 admission rate for Favored Minority Applicants was 100%: three out of three, while the rate for Other Applicants was 9%: 13 out of 138. Grutter's UGPA was much higher than the 1995 median for all applicants (3.49), while her LSAT was slightly lower than the median (162). An applicant having the median scores would place in the cell with UGPAs of 3.25 - 3.49 and LSATs of 161 - 163. The 1995 admission rate in this cell for Favored Minority Applicants was again 100%: seven out of seven; the rate for Other Applicants was 5%: 10 out of 191. The Favored Minority Applicants included African, Mexican, Puerto Rican and Native Americans. The Other Applicants were Caucasian, Asian and Pacific Island, and Other Hispanic Americans, as well as Foreigners and Students of Unknown Identity. The racially disparate rates of admission for similarly qualified applicants presented in Prof. Larntz's 1995 grid were not challenged in cross-examination, and were emphasized in Judge Bernard Friedman's opinion. Why the presentation concentrated on 1995 rather than on the next year, when Grutter actually applied, is not clear. But no one at trial suggested that the size of the disparities varied much from 1995 through 2000.

Available: [http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/235/99/](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/235/99/)

Summary

Federal and State Bills Would Require Universities to Detail Affirmative Action Policies. The Center for Equal Opportunity has drafted both federal and state legislation that would, respectively, require federally-funded universities and state-run institutions to reveal whether and how they grant admission preferences on the basis of race and ethnicity. The federal bill has been shared with Senate education committee staff, and the state legislation has been submitted to the American Legislative Exchange Council, an association of state legislators. “It is hard to see how anyone could object to either of these bills,” said CEO president Linda Chavez. “Even those who support the use of racial and ethnic admission preferences cannot argue that such discrimination ought to take place in secret. Taxpayers have the right to know whether government and government-supported institutions are engaging in racial and ethnic discrimination and, if so, whether they are following the rules the Supreme Court has laid out limiting such discrimination.”

The two Bills can be accessed here:

[FEDERAL LEGISLATION: RACIAL AND ETHNIC PREFERENCE DISCLOSURE ACT](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/235/99/)

[STATE LEGISLATION: RACIAL AND ETHNIC PREFERENCE DISCLOSURE ACT](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/235/99/)

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30754](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30754)

**Summary**

DLA’s workforce is comprised of over 21,000 civilian and military employees located in 48 states and 28 countries. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) set forth in Management Directive 715 the Six Essential Elements of a Model Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program. Essential Element B of a model EEO program is integration of EEO into an agency’s strategic mission. In DLA, EEO is a component of the Agency’s strategic mission to sustain a diverse workforce. The DLA Corporate EEO Director and staff assists the DLA Director, Commanders, managers, and supervsors to address the participation rates of minority groups, women, and people with disabilities, particularly in DLA’s major occupations and leadership ranks. DLA Corporate EEO participated in the Agency’s Strategic Plan and Balanced Scorecard’s development and initiatives. DLA Corporate EEO also contributed to the DLA Strategic Management System (SMS) by participating in the planners’ group meetings and planning conferences. In addition, DLA Corporate EEO had representation on DLA’s Leadership Council; the Enterprise Leadership Development Program (ELDP) Working Group; and the Strategic Review Group (SRG). In Fiscal Year (FY) 2008, DLA converted about 21% of its workforce (4,555 employees out of a total workforce of 21,644) to the National Security Personnel System (NSPS). As a consequence, DLA has created four additional workforce tables, A3-N, A4-N, B3-N, and B4-N, to identify the race, national origin, sex, and disability breakout of the employees in NSPS. The job series codes established for GS positions are used for NSPS positions too. See the Conversion Charts for GS employees to Non-Supervisory and Supervisory NSPS employees located at Part 8 of this report. The DoD mandated that supervisors and managers’ NSPS performance indicators and contributing factors include diversity and EEO-related performance related criteria in the associated descriptors for the performance appraisal process. [abridged]
Summary

A 1995 United Nations report estimated that white Americans, if ranked as a separate nation, would lead the world in well-being, a measure that combines life expectancy, educational achievement, and income. African Americans, in contrast, would rank a depressing twenty-seventh, while Hispanic Americans would rank even lower at thirty-second. The authors of the UN report observed: "full equality still is a distant prospect in the United States, despite affirmative action policies and market opportunities." The words affirmative action do not appear in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the foundation document for contemporary human rights discourse. The declaration does, however, contain two intellectual anchors for affirmative action. First, the declaration repeatedly endorses the principle of human equality. Second, it declares that everyone has the right to work, to an adequate standard of living, and to education. The declaration does not command that all will share equally, but it does suggest strongly that there are minimum levels of employment, education, and subsistence that all should share. If a nation finds that citizens of one race? Or sex or religion? Endure a markedly inadequate standard of living, then, the declaration suggests, it has an obligation to uncover the cause of, and respond to, that endurance. If we take seriously the promises of employment, education, and sustenance made in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the discrepancies in racial well-being in the United States noted by the United Nations report demand affirmative government attention. It seems implausible that such marked differences would occur with no discrimination lurking in the background.


Summary

How well has the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) succeeded in creating a federal workforce that is discrimination free and reflects the nation's population? GAO found general increases in the employment of women and minorities at federal agencies. All groups of women and minorities have gained in representation relative to white men at all grade levels. Yet some groups, such as Hispanic men and women, are not fully represented in the federal workforce. EEOC requires agencies to prepare five-year affirmative employment plans. Many agencies were late, some very much so, in submitting plans. In addition, agencies often failed to critically analyze these plans. Nonetheless, EEOC approved the tardy or incomplete plans. GAO also testified that (1) EEOC sometimes mandated the use of out-of-date data for affirmative action planning; (2) EEOC did not sufficiently encourage agencies to analyze trends in hiring, training and development, promotion, and separation that would provide more information useful for achieving affirmative action goals; and (3) neither EEOC nor the Office of Personnel Management helped agencies collect information on the minority and gender composition of the applicant population, information that would help in recruiting. Although strong leadership at EEOC is essential, the President and Congress need to underscore the need for assertive affirmative employment programs at agencies and hold senior managers accountable for achieving a representative workforce, particularly at higher grade levels.


**Summary**

In April 2005 GAO reported on the EEO policy framework in the federal workplace and the roles of EEOC and OPM. This report, in response to a congressional request, provides information on (1) federal agency EEO and human capital managers' views of the EEO framework requirements; (2) their views on the usefulness of guidance and feedback from EEOC and OPM concerning these requirements; and (3) how and to what extent EEOC and OPM coordinate in developing policy, providing guidance, and exercising oversight. EEO and human capital officials in federal agencies we surveyed said that some requirements of the EEO framework contribute more than others to achieving EEO, affirmative employment, and workforce diversity, and in influencing human capital policies, practices, and strategic planning. They also said that some requirements are very similar or redundant, such as EEOC's affirmative employment program and OPM's program for recruiting minorities and women. This creates duplication of effort as agencies sometimes have to submit the same information in different reports to EEOC and OPM. Further, the officials said they experienced added administrative burden because of inconsistent requirements. The officials also said that guidance from EEOC on EEO, affirmative employment, and workforce diversity issues was more frequent and more useful than that from OPM. Some officials questioned the usefulness of feedback from EEOC and OPM on their agencies' performance or submitted reports. Less than half reported that the feedback was useful or very useful and a substantial number of respondents reported that they received no feedback from OPM. In addition, EEO and human capital officials expressed the strong view that both OPM and EEOC could be doing more to help their agencies. We found little evidence of coordination at the operating level between EEOC and OPM in developing policy, providing guidance, and exercising oversight, despite overlapping responsibilities in federal workplace EEO. For example, EEOC and OPM officials do not routinely review reports that the other agency receives from federal agencies, even though those reports deal with similar matters. In addition, EEOC and OPM officials do not coordinate with each other when conducting on-site reviews of EEO-related matters at agencies. Good management practice as well as federal statute and executive order call for coordination, and not doing so results in lost opportunity to realize consistency, efficiency, and public value in EEO policy making and oversight.


**Summary**

The Supreme Court decided one year ago that racial preferences at public universities are legal, as long as they aren't too mechanically applied. But this has proved cold comfort to affirmative action supporters besieged by evidence that preferences can't deliver the results desired. With the constitutional issue resolved, Americans are asking whether affirmative action helps students in the first place. Just what is affirmative action supposed to do? Educators trumpet the virtues of "diverse" campuses, but their enthusiasm dates suspiciously to a 1972 court decision suggesting diversity as a legal justification for preferences. Ordinary Americans are more practical. Those sympathetic to affirmative action assume that it offers concrete benefits to disadvantaged students. They hope that preferences will narrow our nation's painful racial divide along such metrics as income, literacy, homeownership and health. But affirmative action in this sense is a myth. Admissions preferences do not offer practical empowerment to struggling citizens. They do not bridge society's racial chasms. They do not address real social problems. For one thing, affirmative action does not send more minorities to college. Most four-year colleges and universities in America are not selective; they take anyone with a standard high school education and a Pell grant. This means that race-based preferences are relevant only to the 20-30 percent of American colleges that enjoy substantially more applicants than places. Students attending these schools have many other college options. The reason that more minority students don't get college degrees has nothing to do with competitive admissions policies. The truth is that most minority students leave high school without the minimum credentials necessary to attend any four-year school, selective or not. Freshmen must be "college ready" at virtually all four-year colleges. This means that students must be literate, must have a high school diploma, and must have taken certain minimum coursework. Overwhelmingly, minority students are not college ready. Dr. Jay Greene of the Manhattan Institute found that only 20 percent of black students and 16 percent of Hispanic students leave high school with these basic requirements. Minority under-representation in college is the direct result of the public schools' failure to prepare minority students. It is a failure that affirmative action does not remedy -- college-ready minorities already attend college just as often as their white counterparts.


Summary

The roots of affirmative action in employment lie in a set of Executive Orders issued by U.S. Presidents since the 1960's. Executive Order 10925 (issued in 1961) introduced the phrase "Affirmative Action," encouraging employers to take action to ensure non-discrimination. Executive Order 11246 (1965) required federal contractors and subcontractors (currently, with contracts of $50,000 or more) to identify underutilized minorities, assess availability of minorities, and if available to set goals and timetables for reducing the underutilization. Executive Order 11375 (1967) extended this to women. Federal contractors may be sued and barred from contracts if they are judged to be discriminating or not pursuing Affirmative Action, although this outcome is rare (Stephanopoulos and Edley, 1995). But Affirmative Action is not just limited to contractors; it can be imposed on non-contractor employers by courts as a remedy for past discrimination, and it can be undertaken voluntarily by employers. While universities may be bound by affirmative action in employment in their role as federal contractors, there are no explicit federal policies regarding Affirmative Action in university admissions. Rather, universities have voluntarily implemented Affirmative Action admissions policies that give preferential treatment to women and minority candidates. Court decisions have shaped (and continue to shape) what public universities can and cannot do. Preferential admissions policies initially came under attack in the *Bakke v. University of California Regents* (1978), in which the Supreme Court declared that policies that set aside a specific number of places for minority students violated the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which bars states from depriving citizens of equal protection of the laws. However, while this decision is viewed as declaring strict quotas illegal, it is also interpreted as ruling that race can be used as a flexible factor in university admissions. Most recently, the Supreme Court in 2003 struck down the undergraduate admissions practices at the University of Michigan in the case of *Gratz v. Bollinger, et al.*, finding that the point system used by the university in its consideration of race (and other criteria) was too rigid. At the same time, in *Grutter v. Bollinger, et al.*, it upheld the University's law school admissions procedures, finding that the more flexible treatment of race in this case satisfied the state's compelling interest in expanding the pool of minority candidates admitted to this prestigious school. [abridged]
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Summary

With voters in Colorado and Nebraska preparing to vote on proposals to bar affirmative action, supporters and defenders of the consideration of race in admissions decisions are releasing new research to bolster their positions. The Center for Equal Opportunity -- a group that has worked for years to bar the consideration of race and ethnicity -- on Wednesday issued findings about admissions to the law school at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. Those data show significant race and ethnicity gaps in the LSAT scores and college grades of applicants who were admitted in recent years to the law school. At the same time, two sociologists have just published an analysis suggesting that affirmative action is in decline -- and has never been as widespread as some imagine in states that have barred the use of race in admissions decisions. 'The Declining Significance of Race' For all the debate about the consideration of race in admissions, and the Supreme Court's ruling that colleges may continue to do so (in some circumstances), a new article in the *American Journal of Education* (University of Chicago Press) builds on earlier research by the authors to show that affirmative action is in decline in American higher education. Eric Grodsky of the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities and Demetra Kalogrides of the University of California at Davis have been analyzing data from the College Board on colleges' admissions policies and have previously documented that since 1995, the percentage of colleges considering race has been falling - regardless of the impact of various state bans on affirmative action. Their new study builds on this research, and finds that affirmative action -- far from being as widespread in higher education as its critics portray -- isn't the norm. By 2003, only about one third of private colleges nationally and of public institutions without legal prohibitions on affirmative action said that they considered race in admissions, the study finds. In addition, they note that the prevalence of affirmative action isn't necessarily a cause for the movement to abolish it. In 1986, prior to the state bans that started to appear because of court rulings and referendums, 44 percent of colleges in states that would eventually ban affirmative action said that they considered race in admissions, the study finds. In the rest of the country, that percentage was 57 percent. That institutions pulled back in both groups of states isn't surprising, the authors write, even though colleges in most states didn't face the direct necessity to do so. "As the legal environment changes, or even as it is perceived to change, risk-averse institutions may simply abandon or repackage their affirmative action programs to avoid scrutiny, abandoning race-conscious admissions as one component of a broader effort to continue to attract diverse classes of students."

Available: [http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/345/100/](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/345/100/)

**Summary**

Our study of the admission policies of 47 colleges and universities across America yielded the following conclusions. The average difference in academic credentials among those admitted, whether measured by test scores or by grades and high-school class rank, between blacks and whites, and to a lesser extent between Hispanics and whites, is very large. There are few such differences between whites and Asians. Racial and ethnic preferences play a far more important role in admissions than has been previously acknowledged. Blacks have far greater probabilities of admission than do similarly qualified whites at a large variety of schools, Hispanics have substantially greater probabilities of admission than do whites, and Asians have similar probabilities of admissions. All of these conclusions take into account both test scores and grades. (We include both the complete logistic regression equations we used to predict admissions and new probability plots to explain further the effects of preferences on the probability of admission.) Racial and ethnic preferences in admissions are pervasive and national in scope. They are not restricted to any region of the country. The more selective colleges and universities are more likely to use preferences for black applicants than are their less selective counterparts, but few colleges and universities use no black-white preferences at all. Fewer schools have preferences for Hispanics and only a handful of schools have preferences for Asians or whites.

Available: 

Summary

Affirmative action policy—by which I mean ethno-racial preferences in the allocation of socially valuable resources—is even more divisive and unsettled today than at its inception more than 30 years ago. Affirmative action's policy context has changed dramatically since 1970. One change is legal. Since the Supreme Court's 1978 Bakke decision, when Justice Lewis Powell's pivotal fifth vote endorsed certain "diversity"-based preferences in higher education, the Court has made it increasingly difficult for affirmative action plans to pass constitutional muster unless they are carefully designed to remedy specific past acts of discrimination. Four other changes—the triumph of the nondiscrimination principle; blacks' large social gains; evidence on the size, beneficiaries, and consequences of preferences; and new demographic realities—persuade me that affirmative action as we know it should be abandoned even if it is held to be constitutional. As we know it is the essential qualifier in that sentence. I propose neither a wholesale ban on affirmative action ("ending" it) nor tweaks in its administration ("mending" it). Rather, I would make two structural changes to curtail existing preferences while strengthening the remaining ones' claim to justice. First, affirmative action would be banned in the public sector but allowed in the private sector. Second, private-sector institutions that use preferences would be required to disclose how and why they do so. These reforms would allow the use of preferences by private institutions that believe in them enough to disclose and defend them, while doing away with the obfuscation, duplicity, and lack of accountability that too often accompany preferences. Affirmative action could thus be localized and customized to suit the varying requirements of particular contexts and sponsors.

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS103519](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS103519)

Summary

The November 2004 publication of Richard Sander’s *Systemic Analysis of Affirmative Action in American Law Schools* in the Stanford Law Review set off an intense debate in American legal education. While previous debate focused on the extent to which race was or should be a factor in law school admissions, Sander’s research suggested a different question: do large racial preferences have demonstrably counterproductive effects on at least some intended beneficiaries? While other scholars had taken up this particular issue before, Professor Sander performed a quantitative analysis to support his work, using databases that were unavailable when the previous generation of research was undertaken. Some aspects of Sander’s work may achieve broad agreement, such as data on the disparate performance of blacks and whites on grades, graduation and bar passage. However, other aspects have already sparked significant disagreement. Many of Sander’s critics take issue with his contention that racial disparities in law school academic performance and bar passage rates are a result of an academic “mismatch,” whereby the intended beneficiaries of large racial preferences are admitted to law schools for which they are not otherwise academically qualified. These questions took on particular policy significance when the American Bar Association’s Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions of the Bar proposed Standard 211 in February 2006, which would require law schools seeking accreditation to demonstrate a commitment to diversity by “concrete action.” At the same time, the Council proposed Interpretation 211-1 of this standard. Interpretation 211-1 simply stated that “A constitutional provision or statute that purports to prohibit consideration of gender, race, ethnicity, or national origin is not a justification for school’s noncompliance with the standard.” Critics argued that the standard, when read together with the interpretation, suggested that federal, state, and local laws may be disregarded when they conflict with the standard. Critics also contended that the standard and its interpretation would impinge on law schools’ freedom to establish their own admissions criteria. The Council later revised the proposed Interpretation to clarify that law schools subject to such provisions would have to demonstrate their commitment to diversity by other means.

Available:  http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS13235

Summary

The United States Commission on Civil Rights is deeply concerned about the impact of Governor Jeb Bush’s One Florida Plan (“Plan”) on remedying the state’s history of legal discrimination in state contracting and achieving the goal of diversity and equal higher education opportunity in Florida. Unlike the election-mandated or court-ordered anti-affirmative action measures in California and Texas, Governor Bush self-compellingly issued Executive Order 99-281 on November 9, 1999, ending race-conscious affirmative action in Florida one year before voters could face a ballot question instigated by Ward Connerly asking them to eliminate affirmative action in the state. Bush’s One Florida Plan includes a ban on the consideration of race and gender in state contracting and university admissions. Instead, Bush proposes increasing minority participation in state contracting by requiring the state procurement officers to try to find qualified minority businesses. In addition, the Plan guarantees state university admissions to high school seniors in the top 20 percent of their class, without regard to SAT or ACT scores. Bush would add $20 million to the student financial aid budget to pay the expenses. The development of specifics were left to a task force of education leaders who would make recommendations to the Board of Regents. What the Regents and Bush’s cabinet approved in higher education failed to include were the kinds of details that would make the Florida Plan at least as palatable as the Ten Percent Plan instituted in Texas. In Texas, the legislature, following the lead of African American and Latino legislators and education experts, adopted a Ten Percent Plan (“Ten Percent Plan” or “Texas Plan”) in response to the appeals court decision in *Hopwood v. Texas*, which outlawed race-conscious affirmative action programs in Texas higher education. The Texas Plan (House Bill No. 588), enacted in 1997, entitles the top 10 percent of the graduating class of each accredited high school in Texas to attend the University of Texas at Austin (“UT-Austin”), the university system’s flagship campus, Texas A&M University (“Texas A&M”), or any other state university. Colleges and universities are permitted to require an essay, letters of recommendation, admissions and placement tests, fees, and an official high school transcript. Under the Ten Percent Plan, the students must take the ACT or SAT but only to determine the need for academic support and to track whether the scores can predict the success or failure of the students.
Issues in Graduate Public Policy and Administration Education

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

Summary

OPM projections show that nearly 61,000 full-time permanent Federal employees will retire in FY 2008 and that the number of retirements will peak between 2008 and 2010 – just as the incoming President is seeking to launch his new Administration. Over the next five years, the Federal government will lose more than 550,000 employees. And that number doesn’t factor in the hundreds of thousands of new jobs the President wants to fill that were previously held by private sector contractors. For government procurement, a wave of retirements could be especially critical. Contracting officers oversee about $400 billion a year in spending and there are concerns that not enough mid-career professionals will be left to replace retirees because of budget and staff cuts in the 1990’s that thinned those ranks. In fact, while the federal acquisition workforce remains largely flat – increasing about three (3) percent since FY 1999–Federal contracting dollars more than doubled during that same period! Because of efforts to downsize the Federal workforce without similarly reducing its functions, the government has also come to rely more and more on the private sector. The problems is especially telling in areas such as intelligence (staffing surges post September 11, 2001 attacks), defense (to maintain operations because personnel have been pulled away on military duty), and information technology (as the demand for complex technology has soared). As a result of all of the above, the number of contract workers has grown to 7.5 million, four times bigger than the Federal civilian workforce. The risk of this approach, is that government could wind up “outsourcing its brain”. Any one of these would be a major challenge for an incoming Administration. But their convergence creates a “perfect management storm” – to paraphrase the well-known movie and book – for the incoming President. Never before has government management mattered more. Never before then have we needed new and big ideas on government management. Never before have we needed strong managers and leaders in government. And never before have we been so bereft of both. Or so argued University of Maryland professor, Donald Kettl, in a recent article in *The Public Manager.* Kettl claims that “For the first time in more than a generation, no obvious ‘big idea’ resides at the executive branch’s core”. So, no PPBS, no MBO, no ZBB, no Reform ’88, no NPR or ReGo, no PMA. So no three or four letter acronym for reforming and improving government. What does all this mean for the HR professional? Is there an “opportunity” amidst this “HR crisis”?


Summary

Higher education often frames its recruitment strategies through the metaphor of the "pipeline." That metaphor has become unduly restrictive and in some cases inimical to the development of programs that recognize the need for multiple kinds of preparation and multiple avenues into the academy and from the academy into public service. This paper explores the demographic challenges to the pipeline paradigm and suggests alternative metaphors for program design.


Summary

Data from the Office of Personnel Management in the US suggests that although the numbers of minorities has risen in the past decade their representation in high ranking positions is not reflective of the rise in overall population numbers. The growing gap in the number of minorities at the executive level is causing concern among scholars and policy makers over achieving a representative bureaucracy. Thus, it is important to take a step back, and examine the pipeline issue by studying what Graduate Programs do, and learn what they could do, to increase enrollment and graduation rates of underrepresented populations that include students/faculty from African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, Immigrants, and women among others. The intent of the study is to identify means and practices employed to increase the number of students from underrepresented minority groups in public administration/policy/affairs/management programs; what range of skills of the public service profession are enhanced, and what knowledge base is conveyed to assist with their potential representation and advancement in the public service. We seek to empirically identify the practices employed in recruiting, supporting, training, and graduating of students from underserved populations in various public policy, public management, public affairs, public administration and similar programs throughout the nation. The findings presented in this presentation are based upon a survey including over a third of the NASPAA accredited Schools. The study has been sponsored by the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service at the City College of New York along with support from the Ford Foundation and the Simon Fraser University based International Comparative Policy Analysis (ICPA) Forum.

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

**Summary**

Vigilance and constant effort are required to achieve diversity in the public service and to sustain it. As an ever-moving goal line, it is a constant struggle. If “differentness” made no difference, there would be little need to pursue it as a goal. The difference it makes is huge, however, in terms of public policy, empowerment, and economic opportunity. These remarks emphasize three points: First, diversity advances the quality of our democracy. Second, it makes for more sustainable decisions. But, third, it is resisted because it changes the status quo.

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

**Summary**

The presentation provides statistical data on workforce diversity in the Federal Government, including where there is underrepresentation compared to the Civilian Labor Force. In addition, information will be provided on the types and locations the jobs most in demand and student and disability programs that may lead to entry into the Federal service.
O’Hare, M. *Address: Why is the Pipeline Clogged? What Challenges and Opportunities Confront the Public Service/Administration/Policy Programs?* First Symposium in Series: Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York – CUNY. New York, NY. 30 October 2009.

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

**Summary**

Diversifying the public service community is a challenge at least as refractory and as important as any of the other items on the long sad list of work we haven't finished, from getting more women into top-level science to activating conservative voices in my classroom. Moving any of these numbers will obviously require parallel efforts at every step in the parenting/motivating/educating/employing/retaining pipeline, and I have little to tell this audience about most of them. I am going to talk about professional and pre-professional education, recognizing that the K-12 system systematically underprepares disadvantaged students for this experience even more than it shortchanges others. Improving the education my colleagues don’t provide (but depend on) would actually be more useful, but we have to start somewhere, and if not here, where? and if not now, when? and if not us, who?

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

**Summary**

High performing public organizations make it their business to hire the very best talent available and they assure that their workforce represents the full spectrum of views and experiences of the citizens they serve. This model of recruiting and retaining a well qualified workforce can help assure that the organization becomes and/or remains dynamic, creative, and able to both listen and respond to a diverse citizen population. The challenges to building such a workforce include appointing and developing leaders, managers and supervisors who understand the power of diversity, an HR department that is imaginative and creative in their recruitment and education strategies, and a political and career leadership who understand the power of diversity and are willing to make the investments required to assure the recruitment and retention of underserved populations.

Available: [http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/ci/rangel/research.cfm)

**Summary**

The future is filled with change and requires our leaders to develop a workforce that is both dynamic and inclusive. Success depends on how well we transition today’s workforce through unpredictable changes faced now and into the future. Although it is difficult to visualize and prepare for events that haven’t happened, we must think innovatively on how we can develop talent to anticipate and meet the critical needs of the public we serve. When considering the future of a workforce, we turn to human capital planning experts to enable the best investment into our employees and our organization. In comparison to the term human resources, human capital promotes a paradigm that is more closely related to strategically managing and investing in our workforce’s talent at all levels. This investment involves a unique partnership of leaders and employees as they achieve career and organizational goals. For the future workforce to achieve the goals of an organization, aspects of high-level human capital planning must address issues such as the retirement wave, succession management, and diversity of talent for parity with the public served, and so much more. In general, proper implementation of these aspects will ensure nimbleness and agility of the current and future workforce to withstand forces of our changing environments: political, economical, technological, and geographical to name a few. For instance, we have seen when such nimbleness and agility allowed us to properly respond to natural disasters and economical changes. Therefore a discussion of this caliber not only must expand on the aforementioned subjects, but also must depict how investments will yield the greatest return. Any leader, academician, or practitioner must skillfully analyze the current state of an organization and implement a number of cutting-edge considerations from this presentation to build a more effective and efficient workforce.
Presented at the 2009 Conference of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration – Panel on Perspectives on Diversity. 17 October 2009.
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Trends in Minority Involvement in Higher Education

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25566](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25566)

**Summary**

Institutions of higher education have attempted to diversify their faculty by recruiting women and minorities. Those efforts, however, have been implemented without understanding how women and minority faculty fit in an institution dominated by men, especially White men. In particular, recruitment has taken place without an understanding of the social forces that shape the professional socialization and workplace satisfaction of women and minority faculty. The use of affirmative action in academia to increase the representation of women and minority faculty, for example, has often resulted in workers' perception that they are tokens or outcomes of reverse discrimination practiced on White men (Delgado, 1991; Niemann, 1999). By no means is the term minority faculty in this monograph used to identify a homogeneous population. Rather, the term is used as a descriptive category to discuss the workplace experiences of non-White faculty. As such, the term minority faculty includes Latinos, Blacks, Asians, and American Indians. It is not possible to examine the workplace experiences of each minority group, given the limits of the research literature. In particular, the research literature on minority faculty focuses primarily on the experiences of Latinos and Blacks. The research literature does not so much omit Asian and American Indian faculty from study as it recognizes its limitations in making substantive comparisons between minority groups (Pavel et al., 1998; Yen, 1996). That is, more information is simply available on Black and Latino faculty than on Asian or American Indian faculty. As a result, comparisons between the groups run the risk of being conceptually weak, given a lack of data and information for some of the groups. In an attempt to address the need for substantive comparisons in the minority faculty population, this monograph examines the relative differences between minority groups in the faculty population when the data permit comparisons. The term women faculty, on the one hand, is a descriptive category that includes women's experiences in the workplace. The term is used to discuss and contrast the academic experiences of women and men faculty in the workplace. On the other hand, the term is not homogeneous in its use; in particular, the term is not designed to bury the workplace experiences of minority women faculty. To this end, the workplace experiences of minority and White women faculty are compared and contrasted to identify commonalities and differences between them. In this manner, the understanding of how minority status and gender are associated with the workplace experiences of minority women faculty is enhanced (Aguirre et al., 1994; Calasanti & Smith, 1998).

Available:  [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31809](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS31809)

**Summary**

All types of financial aid have been shown to have a positive influence on college enrollment, regardless of the students race or ethnicity (St. John & Noell, 1989). Today, financial aid is central to the successful enrollment and retention of low-income students. For the majority of these students (90 percent), receiving financial assistance is critical in paying for college. Moreover, the availability of funds to meet tuition and other college-going costs not only impacts students decisions on whether to attend college, but it also greatly influences their choice of college. Surveys indicate that student loans, specifically, play an enormous role in all student decisions regarding college (e.g., Baum & Saunders, 1998). For minority students, whose financial aid does not meet college costs, the difference can be problematic. Having sufficient funds enhances college students academic performance, facilitates their social integration on campus, and increases their chances of persistence to graduation (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). This digest examines the various financial sources minority students use to meet the costs of a higher education, some of which were created with the specific goal of promoting their college attendance. It concludes with recommendations for public policy to increase the availability of aid for college attendance based on student experiences with existing practices.

Available: [http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/237/99/](http://www.ceousa.org/content/view/237/99/)


**Summary**

The Center for Equal Opportunity has uncovered over 60 racially discriminatory programs at Virginia Tech, in addition to at least 10 such programs that were earlier identified by the state Attorney General’s office. CEO found these programs in the course of responding to a request from the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR), which is investigating a complaint against Virginia Tech filed in April by CEO. “The amount of discrimination that is occurring at Virginia Tech is appalling,” said CEO president Linda Chavez. “The school needs to reinstate its ban on racial and ethnic discrimination in its programs,” she said. The programs that CEO has identified discriminate on the basis of race and ethnicity in a variety of contexts, ranging from financial aid and scholarships to internships and mentoring. The programs permeate the university and are found at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, in the sciences, humanities, engineering, and elsewhere. CEO has asked that OCR include the various identified programs in its investigation.

Available: http://www.urban.org/Publications/411301.html

**Summary**

The Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation (LSAMP) Program was established in 1991 by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to develop strategies to increase the quality and quantity of minority students who successfully complete baccalaureate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and who continue on to graduate studies in these fields. The Urban Institute was commissioned to conduct an evaluation of the LSAMP Program, an evaluation that would answer questions about the structure and implementation of LSAMP and its impact on students, participating institutions of higher education (IHEs), and the diversity of the STEM workforce. The information presented here comes from the Urban Institute's multiyear evaluation of the LSAMP Program. The Urban Institute's evaluation of this program included both process and summative components, seeking to understand both the program's implementation and its success in meeting stated goals. The process component of the evaluation utilized qualitative methods to identify aspects of the LSAMP projects that promoted or inhibited the achievement of program goals. The analyses indicate that, at the institutional level, a supportive environment that includes adequate provision of resources and support of faculty and high-level administrators facilitated the achievement of program goals; at the Alliance level, collaborative activities among partner institutions that result in the leveraging and sharing of both tangible and intangible resources were similarly important. Lack of financial resources and an adverse national, state, or institutional political climate were the most common challenges to program success. The process evaluation also revealed that, despite expected variation in practices among Alliances, a recognizable LSAMP model does emerge. That model can be understood as a merging of two prominent streams of research and theory: a model of student retention (the Tinto model), which emphasizes integration of students into the academic institution, and the notion of "disciplinary socialization," which is the process through which students become socialized into science as a profession. In order to answer questions about the program's impact on participating institutions and to examine educational and career outcomes for participating students, the summative component of the evaluation utilized a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Institutional impacts were measured using interviews with program staff and Alliance site visits, while student outcomes were explored through a retrospective survey of funded LSAMP participants who graduated from the program between 1992 and 1997.


**Summary**

The primary objective of this paper is to provide information about minorities (blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans) in economics, at various stages in the education pipeline, and in the labor market. Despite sustained increases in the numbers and percentages of minorities earning bachelors degrees and Ph.D.s, the absolute numbers remain very small -- only about 36 new Ph.D.s per year, including permanent residents. Minority economists are relatively under-represented on four-year college faculties and in government employment. The paper also discusses activities by the AEA’s committee on minority groups, aimed at increasing minority representation in the profession.

Available:  [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS9548](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS9548)

**Summary**

Since Title IX’s enactment in 1972, women’s participation in higher education academic programs has increased significantly, whether measured by the proportion of students enrolled in higher education who are women, numbers of women enrolled, or the proportion of women who have received degrees in certain fields of study in which men were the predominant degree recipients. In 1950, about one-quarter of undergraduate students were women. Women’s share of undergraduate enrollment increased to 43 percent in 1971 and 56 percent in 1997. Women’s participation in a number of predominantly male fields such as business, law, and medicine has also increased greatly although changes in other predominantly male fields, such as engineering and physical science, have been smaller. [abridged]
**Summary**

The purpose of this report is to provide information concerning minority undergraduate participation in postsecondary education based on the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:90) and to examine postsecondary persistence among racial–ethnic groups using the longitudinal component of NPSAS:90: Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS:90/92). After a dramatic increase in minority enrollment in the 1960s and 1970s, there was uneven progress made in the decade between 1980 and 1990. For example, the proportion of black, non-Hispanic students enrolled in institutions of higher education changed little between 1980 and 1990, ranging from 9.2 percent of the higher education population in 1980 to 8.7 percent in 1998, and rising again to 8.9 percent in 1990. It is encouraging to note, however, that the share of black, non-Hispanic students increased to 9.6 percent in 1992. This recent increase in black, non-Hispanic enrollment rates was noted for both males (7.6 to 8.2 percent) and females (10.0 to 10.8 percent). American Indians/Alaskan Natives also experienced little growth in enrollment in the 1980s, but their enrollment increased from 103,000 to 119,000 between 1990 and 1992, representing an increase of 0.1 percent in their proportion among all undergraduates enrolled in higher education (0.7 to 0.8 percent). Among black, non-Hispanic undergraduates, nearly two-thirds of students enrolled were women, compared with 53 percent of Hispanics and 55 percent of white, non-Hispanic students. Black, non-Hispanic and Hispanic students were more likely to be enrolled in private, for-profit institutions (20 percent and 15 percent, respectively), and less likely to be enrolled in 4-year colleges or universities than were white, non-Hispanic students. American Indians/Alaskan Natives were also less likely than white, non-Hispanic students to be enrolled in 4-year institutions. On the other hand, American Indians/Alaskan Natives, black, non-Hispanics, and Hispanic undergraduates were no less likely than white, non-Hispanic students to aspire to a bachelor’s or advanced degree. Undergraduates who attended historically black colleges or universities (HBCUs) were more likely to aspire to an advanced degree than were students at other 4-year colleges or universities. Persistence rates for 1989–90 beginning postsecondary students pursuing a bachelor’s degree tended to be higher for Asian/Pacific Islander students than for black, non-Hispanic or Hispanic students.


Summary

There is widespread recognition within the academic community of the need to inform various constituencies of the economic value that colleges and universities convey to their host communities. This report examines data from the National Center for Education Statistics and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics to determine the short-term economic impact of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) on their regional economies. The economic impact analysis results help to document the economic roles that HBCUs play in their communities. The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, defines an HBCU as: “…any historically black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of black Americans.” There are 103 HBCUs operating in the 50 states and the District of Columbia, and 101 are Title IV institutions. Many HBCUs are located in the South and are near areas with relatively low levels of economic well-being, where the generation of economic activity is particularly important. The short-term economic impact of an HBCU is defined as the change in overall economic activity that is associated with HBCU-related spending. For each HBCU, economic impacts were estimated for four important categories of college/university related expenditures: (1) spending by the institutions for wages and salaries, (2) spending by the institutions for other budget categories (e.g., outlays for items other than wages and salaries), (3) spending by undergraduate students who attended the institutions, and (4) spending by the graduate and professional students who attended the institutions. [abridged]
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25013](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25013)

Summary

Research over the years has begun to provide important guidance in understanding how to achieve diversity while improving the social and learning environments for students from different racial/ethnic backgrounds. One key to enacting diverse learning environments lies in understanding and developing programs and policies to improve the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity, which involves understanding the environment from the perspectives of members from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, creating opportunities for improved race relations that permeate the classroom and extracurricular lives of students, and realizing the educational benefits of diverse learning environments for students who will need to be prepared to meet the demands of a complex, diverse society. Given the extensive effort and progress colleges and universities have made toward diversification in the last 20 to 30 years, it is important to reflect on how learning and educational objectives can be maximized. What is the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity? To improve the climate, one must conceptualize it in relation to racial/ethnic diversity so that its impact can be assessed. In higher education research, the campus climate has been defined as the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members (Peterson and Spencer 1990). These common attitudes and perceptions have been conceptualized as malleable and distinguishable from the stable norms and beliefs that may constitute an organizational culture. This perspective of the climate is modified by researchers who have begun to systematically assess the climate by examining the perceptions and attitudes of various groups on campus, and it is greatly enhanced by theories of race relations and social psychology when the psychological climate is related to racial/ethnic diversity. [abridged]

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS84154](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS84154)

**Summary**

Institutions that may receive funding under Titles III and V include Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges, Hispanic Serving Institutions, Alaska Native Serving Institutions, Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions, and other postsecondary institutions that serve low-income students. In fiscal year 2006, these programs provided $448 million in funding for over 500 grantees, nearly double fiscal year 1999 funding of $230 million. GAO examined these programs to determine (1) how institutions used their Title III and Title V grants and the benefits they received from using these grant funds, (2) what objectives and strategies the Department of Education (Education) has developed for Title III and Title V programs, and (3) to what extent Education monitors and provides assistance to these institutions. This testimony updates a September 2004 report on these programs (GAO-04-961). To update our work, GAO reviewed Education policy and planning documents, and program materials and grantee performance reports; interviewed Education officials; and analyzed Education data on grantee characteristics. Education made changes to improve monitoring and assistance in response to our 2004 recommendations, but further progress is needed.
Summary

The availability of new types of data on doctorates, the significant changes in doctoral education known to have occurred in the past 25 years, and the close of the 20th century make this a good time to reexamine the long-term trends in U.S. doctoral education. NSF’s Division of Science Resources Statistics commissioned this report to explore these trends and to make the results available to the public. Cosponsors of the report are the National Institutes of Health, the National Endowment for Humanities, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The volume is organized into chapters, beginning with an introduction. Chapter 2 traces the development of doctoral education in the United States from its beginnings in the last half of the 19th century and presents general trends on numbers of institutions and doctorate recipients from the early 1900s to 1999. The third chapter addresses the fields of study in which Ph.D.s receive their doctorates, as well as Ph.D.s’ demographic characteristics, including sex, citizenship status, race/ethnicity, age, disability status, marital status and dependents, and the educational attainment of their parents. The data presented in chapter 3 provide the background for the topics presented in chapters 4 through 6. Each of these four chapters begins with a summary of data highlights. Chapter 4 begins the exploration of the educational path followed by Ph.D.s after they leave secondary school. It considers attendance at 2-year colleges; attainment of bachelor’s, master’s and professional degrees, including foreign bachelor’s degrees; fields of bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees, including field switching between the baccalaureate and the doctorate; the primary source of support in graduate school and in doctoral study; activity in the year before receipt of the doctorate; education-related debt; and the time required to earn the doctorate after receiving the baccalaureate. Chapter 5 continues this exploration by providing information on the leading undergraduate and graduate institutions involved in the education of Ph.D.s. The last chapter, “After the Doctorate,” examines the immediate plans of Ph.D.s for employment or further study after graduation, including how definite those plans are and whether the new graduates plan to stay in the United States. [abridged]

Available:  [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS84020](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS84020)

**Summary**

An institution of higher education is eligible to receive funds from the amounts made available under this section if such institution is — “(1) a part B institution (as defined in section 322 (20 U.S.C. 1061)); “(2) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502 (20 U.S.C. 1101a)); “(3) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316 (20 U.S.C. 1059c)); “(4) an Alaska Native-serving institution or a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b) (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b))); “(5) a Predominantly Black Institution (as defined in subsection (c)); or “(6) an Asian and Pacific Islander-serving institution (as defined in subsection c)).

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS39240](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS39240)

**Summary**

Equal opportunity in higher education is a right protected by federal laws. Throughout most of the 20th century, however, long-established discriminatory admissions policies at the nation’s universities seriously hampered minority access to higher education. Since a college degree opens doors to professional employment opportunities and graduate education, many of the nation’s schools began establishing policies so that people of color could benefit from higher education to the same extent as their white counterparts. For example, in the 1970s, affirmative action found its place in college admissions policies, and substantively redressed the entrenched discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities and women. Still, by the 1980s, it was evident that minorities and women were more commonly admitted to less prestigious institutions. As America’s population becomes more diverse, policies intended to provide minorities equal access to higher education, as the law requires, must be sustained. [abridged]


Summary

In 2002, Black students were more than twice as likely as Hispanic students to attend an institution where they made up at least 80 percent of the total enrollment, reflecting in part the existence of institutions established principally to educate Black Americans. Twenty-nine percent of all students enrolled in degree-granting institutions in 2002 were racial/ethnic minorities—that is, they were American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, or Hispanic. This indicator first compares the percent minority enrollment across types of institutions and then examines two measures of racial isolation: the percentage of minority students who were attending institutions with low- and high-minority enrollments (defined as less than 20 percent and 80 percent or more, respectively); and for Asians/Pacific Islanders, Blacks, and Hispanics, how many of their own racial/ethnic group were at the institutions they attended. At each type of 4-year institution, roughly one-quarter of students (24–26 percent) were minorities (see first chart below and table 31-1). Public 2-year institutions had proportionately more minority students (36 percent) than 4-year institutions. Although the percentages of students who were minorities were similar across types of 4-year institutions, minority students who attended doctoral and master’s institutions were more likely to be at an institution with a low-minority enrollment than at one with a high-minority enrollment; however, minority students who attended other 4-year institutions were more likely to be at an institution with a high-rather than low-minority enrollment. For minority students, the likelihood of attending an institution with a high concentration of their own racial/ethnic group depends partly, but not entirely, on the size of the group. In 2002, Black and Hispanic students accounted for similar percentages of total enrollment (12 and 10 percent, respectively), and about one-fifth of each group attended institutions where they were the majority (see second chart below). However, Blacks were more than twice as likely as Hispanics to attend an institution where they made up at least 80 percent of the total enrollment (12 vs. 5 percent). Asians/Pacific Islanders accounted for a relatively low proportion of overall enrollment (6 percent); consequently, two-thirds of them attended an institution where less than 20 percent of the total enrollment was Asian/Pacific Islander. These overall patterns for individual racial/ethnic groups varied by type of institution (see table 31-3).
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Available: [http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/impact.html](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/impact.html)

**Summary**

In the last three decades, Congress has enacted a number of civil rights statutes prohibiting discrimination in educational programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. These statutes are: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (prohibiting race, color, and national origin discrimination); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (prohibiting sex discrimination); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (prohibiting disability discrimination); Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (prohibiting disability discrimination by public entities); and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (prohibiting age discrimination). The civil rights laws represent a national commitment to end discrimination in education. The laws mandate bringing the formerly excluded into the mainstream of American education. And these laws also are designed to help deliver the promise that every individual has the right to develop his or her talents to the fullest. The federal civil rights laws have helped bring about profound changes in American education and improved the educational opportunities of millions of students. Many barriers that once prevented minorities, women, individuals with disabilities, and older persons from freely choosing the educational opportunities and careers they would like to pursue have been eliminated. As we continue to work for the effective enforcement of the civil rights laws, it is important that we also look at the impact of the laws on students facing discrimination who attend our elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities. This fact sheet was undertaken to provide useful information about the impact of the civil rights laws, along with other efforts at the national, state, and local level, in bringing about equal access and opportunity for all students. There is no single research or data base that provides comprehensive information on the impact of the civil rights laws. However, there is information from a variety of sources that indicates progress in removing barriers to equal educational opportunity.
Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide information concerning minority undergraduate participation in postsecondary education based on the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:90) and to examine postsecondary persistence among racial–ethnic groups using the longitudinal component of NPSAS:90: Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS:90/92). After a dramatic increase in minority enrollment in the 1960s and 1970s, there was uneven progress made in the decade between 1980 and 1990. For example, the proportion of black, non-Hispanic students enrolled in institutions of higher education changed little between 1980 and 1990, ranging from 9.2 percent of the higher education population in 1980 to 8.7 percent in 1988, and rising again to 8.9 percent in 1990. It is encouraging to note, however, that the share of black, non-Hispanic students increased to 9.6 percent in 1992. This recent increase in black, non-Hispanic enrollment rates was noted for both males (7.6 to 8.2 percent) and females (10.0 to 10.8 percent). American Indians/Alaskan Natives also experienced little growth in enrollment in the 1980s, but their enrollment increased from 103,000 to 119,000 between 1990 and 1992, representing an increase of 0.1 percent in their proportion among all undergraduates enrolled in higher education (0.7 to 0.8 percent). Among black, non-Hispanic undergraduates, nearly two-thirds of students enrolled were women, compared with 53 percent of Hispanics and 55 percent of white, non-Hispanic students. [abridged]
Reference List: Under-represented Populations


Available: http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinst-list-tab.html

Summary

Minority Institutions. This list of minority institutions was compiled based on the definition of “minority institution” found in § 365(3) the Higher Education Act (HEA) (20 U.S.C. 1067k(3)), and on Fall 2005 enrollment data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). NCES has determined that each of the colleges and universities on this list reported an enrollment of a single minority group, as the term “minority” is defined under § 365(2) of the HEA (20 U.S.C. 1067k(2)), or combination of those minority groups, that exceeded 50 percent of its total enrollment. For the purposes of this list, “minority” is defined as American Indian, Alaska Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin) and Hispanic. [1] This list does not include Asians or Pacific Islanders, because IPEDS enrollment data does not disaggregate Pacific Islanders from Asians. [abridged]
Americans overwhelmingly agree that diversity in our schools, neighborhoods, workplaces, and community organizations is enormously positive. In the past, many educational institutions have tried to reach this important goal by giving preferences to certain individuals based on their race or ethnicity. People of goodwill have reached different conclusions about the merits of these policies. But there are serious and important reasons for educational institutions to look for new alternatives. Policies granting preferences on the basis of race and ethnicity raise constitutional questions and are increasingly being overturned in the courts. Moreover, voters in various jurisdictions have passed state and local initiatives restricting the use of racial preferences. These legal and policy trends mean that we must work together to look for new solutions. This publication describes innovative "race-neutral" programs being implemented across the country. Educational institutions will find that there are dozens of race-neutral options available to them. They will also find that the early results from these programs are promising. Moreover, the initial positive results are only the beginning; the full advantages of many of the race-neutral alternatives described in this publication will not be fully felt until they are seriously implemented and several classes of students have been able to benefit from them. This publication does not endorse any particular program discussed in these pages. Rather, our hope is to foster innovative thinking about using race-neutral means to produce diversity among educational institutions. The purpose of this publication is to help create a positive climate in which such race-neutral alternatives can be seriously considered.


**Summary**

The President’s Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), appointed by George W. Bush, has completed its third annual report under presidential Executive Order 13256. The annual report for fiscal years 2004-05, *Fulfilling the Covenant—The Way Forward*, not only details the performance of the 32 designated federal agencies and departments during 2004-05, but also presents a five-year perspective on several of those agencies and departments, including the performance of three model agencies with dedicated HBCU programs. In addition, the annual report offers a longer-range view of agency progress over the decade 1995-2005. The annual report updates the assessment of the progress of the designated agencies and departments toward achieving the 10 percent goal first articulated in the 2001-02 annual report (i.e., the goal of ensuring that the total amount of federal funds awarded to all HBCUs equals 10 percent of the total amount of federal funds awarded to all institutions of higher education, or IHEs). The board believes that three matters deserve special attention by the president, the secretary of education and the heads of the designated departments and agencies. 1. Annual increases in the amounts of federal dollars awarded to the HBCU community, including the percentage of funds awarded through federal grants, contracts and cooperative agreements, obscure the increasing gap in dollars awarded when compared to the dollars awarded to all institutions of higher education. 2. Increasing the number of dedicated HBCU programs that are focused on capacity building, as defined in Section 6 of Executive Order 13256, is important to realizing the HBCU funding goal in the executive order and to close the gap between HBCUs and IHEs in the funding provided by the designated agencies. 3. Critical steps must be taken both to strengthen agency accountability and enhance their performance, and to improve the White House Initiative on HBCUs, U.S. Department of Education and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) coordination to ensure better monitoring and oversight.

Available: [http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS35821](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS35821)

**Summary**

In the early 1980s, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development began to focus attention on the important but sometimes overlooked local accomplishments of colleges and universities that primarily serve minority students. Not only were these institutions of higher education committed to helping African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students reach their full potential, many of them also were involved in stabilizing and improving nearby neighborhoods. Over the past two decades HUD has focused more attention and directed more assistance to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian Institutions. We have encouraged these respected schools of higher education to work as partners with their neighboring communities and empowered them with Federal funds and programs that could attract additional resources. The result has been a significant increase in neighborhoods that have gone from distressed to desirable and a marked increase in the number of minority students who choose careers in urban affairs. Today, HUD’s Office of University Partnerships (OUP) works with scores of schools and hundreds of their initiatives throughout the Nation. With four separate grant programs, OUP gives minority-serving institutions the financial tools and technical assistance they need to help people and places. Our new report on HUD’s grant programs for minority-serving institutions is filled with examples of the creativity and zeal these grantees display.
Summary

Senator ALLEN. In my view, increasing access to technology provides our young people with an important tool for educational and future economic success. We are all aware that access to the Internet is not a luxury; it is a necessity. And because of the rapid advancement and growing dependence on technology, being digitally connected and digitally proficient becomes more and more important. Today, we are here to discuss Senate Bill S. 196, the Digital and Wireless Technology Program Act, the legislation that I introduced this year to allow Minority Serving Institutions an opportunity to acquire technology equipment, hardware and software, digital network technology, and wireless infrastructure such as wireless fidelity or WiFi, to develop and provide educational services. Sixty percent of all jobs require information technology skills, and jobs in information technology pay significantly higher salaries than jobs in the non-information technology fields. Students who lack access to information technology tools are at an increasing disadvantage, both academically and economically, for jobs. Consequently, it is important that all institutions of higher education provide their students with access to the most current technology and digital equipment. Many Minority Serving Institutions, however, still lack basic information and digital technology infrastructure. A study completed by the Department of Commerce and the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education indicated these following points. No historically black college or university requires computer ownership for their undergraduate students. That may have changed since that report, but as of the date of that report, none did. Thirteen Historically Black Colleges or Universities were reported to have no students, not one, owning a personal computer. That may not be the case for yours, but 13 out of 103 had no one owning a personal computer. Another point. Over 70 percent of the students at Historically Black Colleges and universities rely on universities to provide computers. However, only 50 percent provide students with access to computers in computer laboratories, libraries, classrooms, or other locations. Another point: Only 3 percent of Historically Black Colleges and universities have financial aid available to help students close the computer ownership gap.