Why 80-20 opposes SCA5?

(1) Socioeconomic affirmative action works
(2) “Pipeline” broken, must fix earlier
(3) SCA5 is a flawed distraction

After Prop 209, UC/CSU leads the nation in diversity
• 41% students: Pell Grant recipients (low income)
• 42% students: first in family to attend college
• 27243 more Hispanics enrolled than white (2013)
• Black students’ 4-year graduation up 260%
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Hernandez: “The best and the brightest are not getting into colleges”

- What is SCA5?
  - Allow racial discrimination by
    - Remove “public education” from CA constitution
    - Remove “UC/Public School System” from “State”

Passed CA Senate in strict party-line vote: Democrats Yes, Republicans No
Halted by AsAm uprising with 116K signatures in 3 weeks
Hispanics dominated 2013 enrollment: 1389 (UC) & 25854 (CSU) more than white

Common false claims about Prop 209:
(1) Minority plummeted
(2) Asian skyrocketed

Prop209 redistributed “minorities” to better match academic preparation to institution

CSU: http://www.calstate.edu/as/stat_reports/ethnicity.shtml
Black enrollment & graduation increased after Prop 209

4-year graduation went from 147 to 386

Without the stigma from racial preferences, UC diplomas are more valuable
UC 4-year graduation rates a disaster

Academic preparation matters!

We can’t afford to pass better qualified students

50%

Prop 209 passed in Y1996
27% “minorities” didn’t graduate in 6 years

UC: 6-Year Graduation Rates by Ethnicity vs Freshmen Enrollment Year

Prop 209 passed in Y1996

Precious state funding is wasted by attrition
“Pipeline” crisis in early education

• The 2013 data:
  • Only **29.1%** of all Hispanic 12th grade completed UC/CSU required A-G courses, of those **74.3%** were admitted
  • In comparison, 47.1% White are eligible, 53.4% admitted

• But Hernandez claimed:
  • “qualified high school graduates (are) being overlooked and ignored under Prop 209”

http://www.sacbee.com/2014/05/04/6374257/viewpoints-uc-should-trumpet-minority.html

California Dept. of Education, Data Reporting Office 03/24/2014:
http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/stgradnum.asp?cChoice=StGrdEth&cYear=2012-13&ProgramName=All&cTopic=Graduates&cLevel=State&myTimeFrame=S

“Racial preferences” debate on false premise deflects attention, permanently condemn kids of all races to dysfunctional schools, including 70.9% of Hispanics
Student decisions also impact enrollments

UC freshman matriculation rate

How do you respond to UC offers?

If others matriculate at the AsAm rate:
- Hispanic: 13% ↑
- Black: 22% ↑
- White: 32% ↑

Asians eagerly accept UC offers, Hernandez blames UC policy, logic?
US “Pipeline” lags behind other nations

- Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)
  - 2009: 30th in math and 23rd in science out of 65 countries surveyed

“An absolute wake-up call for America”
-Arne Duncan, Education Secretary

“We must invest in early education, raise academic standards”
We do not live in a bubble: American competitiveness at stake

Obama addressed Morehouse graduates (05/19/13)

• “...in today’s hyperconnected, hypercompetitive world, with a billion young people from China and India and Brazil entering the global workforce alongside you, nobody is going to give you anything you haven’t earned. And whatever hardships you may experience because of your race, they pale in comparison to the hardships previous generations endured – and overcame”.

• “But if you stay hungry, keep hustling, keep on your grind and get other folks to do the same – nobody can stop you.”
Race to the top, not rush to the bottom

“The Preuss School UCSD” model
a “race neutral” fix to “pipeline”

- Charter school built and run by UCSD
- Eligibility: Low income family with non-college parents
- Diversity: 68% Hispanic, 10% Black, 19% Asian, 3% White

- “5th best in California, 42nd nationwide” by US News & World Report 2014
- “Top transformative HS in the nation” by Newsweek
- Academic Performance Index (API): 888
- ~100% college bound

Promote this working solution statewide, thanks UC!
What value to instill in our children?

I am a American.
I am not a monkey by color. Bryan6
“I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.”

Do you have a dream?
Ron Unz

“The Myth of American Meritocracy”
Asian American enrollment at Ivy League mysteriously converged to $17\pm2\%$, even as population doubled in the last 20 years.

http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/the-myth-of-american-meritocracy/
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Why socioeconomic considerations work
Why racial preference helps wrong kids
Why racial preference is not a tie breaker
Socioeconomic considerations work, UC/CSU leads the nation in diversity

- 2011-12: 41% (74933) UC students are Pell Grant recipients
  - Majority have family income <$50K
- 2007-08: 42% UC students are the first in the family to receive college education

http://accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/2013/2.6.1/AF14-2.6.1-UW.png
Racial preference helps the wrong kids with the right skin colors

• ~86% of African Americans in highly selective colleges are from upper or middle class families
  “The College and Beyond” data set on 94000 students, assembled by the “Mellon Foundation”, analyzed by William Bowen & Derek Bok in their book “The Shape of the River”

• Racial preference skew up socioeconomic statistics
  • Fisher v. UT Austin:
    • “Race neutral” “Top 10%” plan produced 4.5% black 16.9% Latino in 2004 which defense lawyer argued are too socioeconomically poor that the university must bring in more affluent minorities through “race-conscious” plan to achieve diversity within diversity, leading Justice Kennedy to comment “what counts is race above all”.
  • University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
    • Amicus brief to “Fisher” admitted race neutral solution could increase URM from 15% to 16%, but wouldn’t adopt because it will drop SAT by 56 points, and GPA by 0.10 point and affect other aspects of school prestige

http://www.utexas.edu/vp/irla/Documents/ACR%20The%20University%20of%20North%20Carolina%20at%20Chapel%20Hill.pdf
Racial preference is not a tie-breaker, it severely distorts academic standards

• College


• Medical School

Prop 209 has been conclusively studied

• Prop 209 negatively impact upper class minorities with the right skin colors, but positively impact others

• “Affirmative Action Bans and the “Chilling Effect”, Kate Antonovics

• “Affirmative Action and University Fit: Evidence from Proposition 209” Peter Arcidiacono et al.

• “University Differences in the Graduation of Minorities in STEM Fields: Evidence from California” Peter Arcidiacono et al.

• Available at [http://public.econ.duke.edu/~psarcidi/](http://public.econ.duke.edu/~psarcidi/)
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Explain the 80-20 position
How “no quota” quota works?

Don’t confuse these three concepts:
(1) “SCA5”
(2) “affirmative action”
(3) “racial preferences”
“Asian Americans are the new Jews”


• 80-20 Amicus Brief to Supreme Court in Fisher v. UT Austin
  • “Vague, pretexual standards employed to limit AsAm enrollment are indistinguishable from those utilized to impose quotas against Jews throughout much of the past century”

• Jewish “quota” is well documented
  • “holistic”, “geographic diversity” in the context of college admission was introduced with explicit purpose to limit Jews


• No university ever admitted having imposed Jewish “quota”
  • No university will ever admit to Asian “quota”

SCA5 also extends racial preferences to primary and secondary educations

• 80-20 Amicus Brief to 5th Circuit Court in Fisher v. UT Austin
  • “Viewed historically as faceless members of a “yellow horde,” in years past, individuals of Chinese descent were often the victims of state action directed at “race” that was meant to serve the greater public good. The onus extended to Chinese American children who sought to attend public schools.”

• Dangerous precedents in California
Asian Americans are strongly for “race neutral” college admissions

- 80-20 conducted open & neutral survey in 2012
- Specifically asked are you For or Against “race neutral & merit-based” college admissions
- 50,227 people responded
- For 97%, Against 3%

http://www.80-20educationalfoundation.org/projects/colleges.asp

Don’t confuse people with vague questions such as are you for “affirmative action”? Specify which kind of “affirmative action”.

Most Americans are for socioeconomic considerations but not racial preferences

Public Support for Racial and Economic Affirmative Action, in Three Polls

Source: EPIC/MRA poll (conducted January 29–February 3, 2003); Los Angeles Times poll (conducted January 30–February 2, 2003); and Newsweek poll (conducted January 16–17, 2003).

“A Better Affirmative Action: State Universities that Created Alternatives to Racial Preferences”
A Century Foundation Report by Richard D. Kahlenberg & Halley Potter
Historical context of “Affirmative Action” is non-preferential, the diametric opposite of today’s

- Kennedy EO 10925 (in 1961), Johnson EO 11246 (in 1965)

“take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin”

- SCA5 is anti-affirmative action
  - Favors a majority
  - Force racial solution when socioeconomic approach works
  - Shift attention away from real problems in earlier education
Equal opportunity ≠ Equal result

• “Equal Protection Clause in the 14th Amendment
  • “No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law”

• Equal opportunity is measured against individual merits
• Equal opportunity never guarantees equal results

• “Proportional representation”, aka. “Racial balancing”, had failed all Supreme Court challenges
  • Freeman v. Pitts, 503 U.S. 467, 494 (1992)
  • DeFunis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312 (1974)
  • Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1948)
Why we should be for merit and against racial preferences

• “The State, however, may not proceed by racial classification to force strict population equivalencies for every group in every occupation, overriding individual preferences. The Equal Protection Clause commands the elimination of racial barriers, not their creation in order to satisfy our theory as to how society ought to be organized.... A segregated admissions process creates suggestions of stigma and caste no less than a segregated classroom, and in the end it may produce that result despite its contrary intentions.... One other assumption must be clearly disapproved: that blacks or browns cannot make it on their individual merit. That is a stamp of inferiority that a State is not permitted to place on any lawyer. All races can compete fairly at all professional levels. So far as race is concerned, any state-sponsored preference to one race over another in that competition is in my view "invidious" and violative of the Equal Protection Clause.” Justice William O. Douglas, DeFunis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312 (1974)
Why we should be for merit and against racial preferences

• "Racial balancing is not transformed from 'patently unconstitutional' into a compelling state interest simply by relabeling it 'racial diversity.'“, Parents Involved v. Seattle, (2007)

• “One of the principal reasons race is treated as a forbidden classification is that it demeans the dignity and worth of a person to be judged by ancestry instead of his or her own merit and essential qualities.” Rice v. Cayetano, 528 U.S. 495, 517 (2000)

• “Preferring members of any group for no reason other than race or ethnic origin is discrimination for its own sake.” Regents of UC v. Bakka, 438 U.S. 265 (1978)
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