Affirmative action in higher ed sustained with caveats.
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Affirmative action is yet another example of higher education policies that include race and ethnicity as one of the factors in considering students for admission. This concept is often discussed due to oppression of any kind. This concept has been employed in many spheres and one of those has been to promote diversity in higher education in the basis that many universities have effectively discriminated against admitting and/or promoting minorities. Two weeks ago the Supreme Court announced a decision on affirmative action that originated in the first time race and ethnicity as one of the factors in considering the University of Texas's admission policies that include race-conscious programs. Writing for the majority, Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote that 25 years from now a decision on affirmative action policies would no longer be seen as a decision on race. The case on which the U.S. Supreme Court made its decision last Monday was a challenge by a student, Abigail Fisher, who sued the University of Texas at Austin in 2008 and is now asking the court to reverse a decision by the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that had upheld the constitutionality of race-conscious admissions policies at the university. The 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed a lower court decision that found the university not to have a compelling interest in race-conscious admissions policies given that Justice Elena Kagan had recused herself from the case. The Supreme Court heard this case. The first time was in 2013 when Fisher appealed a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which found the University of Texas not guilty of discriminatory practices. The university then went to the appeals court telling them to reverse the case. The appeals court effectively affirmed its prior decision and Fisher appealed that to the Supreme Court. Last month's decision to uphold the admissions policy was considered a win for the university. Had Justice Anthony M. Kennedy writing for the majority recused herself when the case was heard, the decision might have been different. As it was, she was not a part of the decision and Kennedy had recused herself because while being the U.S. Solicitor General, she had worked for the university. Her recusal left just seven justices, and those who had recused, by a vote of 5 to 4 to uphold the admissions policy that gives a positive factor in the consideration of students for admission who are African American, U.S. Hispanic and 40 percent of black students in the state (Texas). The court held that students from Texas who did not make the 10 percent cut-off, as well as students from elsewhere, are considered for admission based on many other factors including race and ethnicity. The university established that Texas applicants for admission would not be compared against one another but would be considered on a separate list for consideration. College admissions based on affirmative action were first adopted in the courts in the past example, in 2003 in Grutter v. Bollinger (regarding the University of Michigan's law school) and in 2006 in Gratz v. Bollinger (regarding the University of Michigan's undergraduate program) Students from Texas who did not make the 10 percent cut-off, as well as students from elsewhere, are considered for admission based on many other factors, including race. The university has established that Texas applicants would not be compared against one another but would be considered on a separate list for consideration. The university established that students from Texas who did not make the 10 percent cut-off, as well as students from elsewhere, are considered for admission based on many other factors, including race. The university has established that Texas applicants would not be compared against one another but would be considered on a separate list for consideration.

In the meantime, if you know that you're going to be impaired, get a designated driver or take a cab. Find another way to get home, but don't drive and drink and don't drive impaired.