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For over eight decades, the Legal Defense Fund (LDF) has been a stalwart advocate for the dignity and freedom of Black people in the United States. Having led the successful eradication of legal apartheid in the seminal case, Brown v. Board of Education, LDF continues to fight for the full equality and citizenship of Black Americans in their everyday lives, including challenging public and private policies and practices that deny Black Americans equal opportunities. Through litigation and policymaking, LDF has endeavored to dismantle segregation and break down barriers to opportunity in education, housing, employment, and other areas that shape the ability of Black people to thrive and reach their full potential.
Despite essential civil rights laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, systemic inequalities based on race, gender, and LGBTQ+ status persist in all aspects of American life. These laws require employers to ensure their policies and practices do not discriminate against people of color, women, LGBTQ+ people, and other protected groups, among other critical protections. Yet Black people continue to face barriers to equal employment opportunities. According to a study published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, Black workers remain disproportionately concentrated in lower-wage professions compared to white workers with the same level of education. Black workers also earn more than 20% less than similarly educated white workers, the study found.2

The need to secure full equality, as envisioned in Brown, is particularly urgent as the United States becomes increasingly diverse. People of color are expected to comprise the majority of Americans as soon as 2043, and people under 18 are already approaching this threshold. In addition, almost one in four people under the age of 30 identify as LGBTQ+, and our electorate will soon contain more people in that age group than any other. Yet after the Supreme Court’s June 2023 decision in Students for Fair Admissions v. President & Fellows of Harvard College and Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. University of North Carolina (SFFA), which struck down the use of race as a tip in higher education admissions, we are witnessing an unprecedented attack on measures that serve to advance equity across society. These attacks extend beyond the scope of the opinion and higher education to areas including employment, contracting, and grantmaking. In doing so, opponents of civil rights hope that employers and funders will abandon efforts to equalize opportunity, regardless of whether their legal arguments would prevail.

At this critical moment, employers, businesses, and funders have a moral, legal, and economic imperative to sustain a deep and substantive commitment to initiatives that create diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA). For too long, people of color, women, and LGBTQ+ people have been excluded, stigmatized, and undervalued. Many spaces within the workforce and in the business community have been unwelcoming and even hostile to their presence and their perspectives. Proactive and targeted measures are necessary to level the playing field so that all Americans can be valued and bring their full selves into the workplaces and communities of our multiracial democracy.

Advancing equity is also crucial to the success of our economy. Talent and potential are found in people of all backgrounds, and we are all deprived of their contributions if historically marginalized people struggle to access opportunity. Creating an environment where diverse people and business enterprises can thrive not only helps redress discrimination and ensure equal opportunity, but also benefits everyone by growing our economy. Because diversity fosters feelings of representation, recognition, and solidarity, employees seek out and invest in workplaces that share a commitment to this important value.3 Additionally, multiple studies have shown that diversity increases innovation and productivity in myriad types of fields and organizations.4

Most importantly, however, business and philanthropic actors are as duty bound now to comply with federal, state, and local anti-discrimination laws as they were before the SFFA decision. Indeed, the current climate of hostility in some workplaces has been exacerbated by the decision, requiring employers and other actors to redouble their efforts to ensure equal protection under the law for all employees and avoid legal liability. Thus, the business and philanthropic communities must remain vigilant in their strict compliance with federal, state, and local anti-discrimination laws. And they must continue to do all they can to ensure that opportunities and resources are equitably shared.

To support important, ongoing efforts to advance DEIA and equal opportunity, LDF offers this general guidance to employers and funders as they navigate the current legal landscape in the aftermath of the SFFA decision.5 As discussed below, employers have numerous lawful means of creating more diverse and inclusive workplaces and meeting their obligation to ensure equal opportunities for all. Employers should not cede ground by prematurely curtailing DEIA programs that are consistent with current law. Moreover, employers that abandon equity efforts risk increasing their own exposure to lawsuits by heightening the likelihood of discrimination against Black people and other protected groups in their workplace. As the United States becomes increasingly more diverse—and the demand for greater equity becomes ever more pressing—we must work together across sectors to ensure the success of our multiracial democracy. We at LDF welcome this collaboration.

---

THE NEED TO SECURE FULL EQUALITY, AS ENVISIONED IN BROWN, IS PARTICULARLY URGENT AS THE UNITED STATES BECOMES INCREASINGLY DIVERSE.
II. CURRENT LEGAL OBLIGATIONS TO ERADICATE BARRIERS TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

A. Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) prohibits covered employers from discriminating against employees based on their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Title VII’s prohibitions on discrimination cover both disparate treatment (i.e., explicitly treating employees differently based on a protected characteristic) and disparate impact (i.e., policies or practices that appear neutral but result in an unjustifiable discriminatory effect). Title VII’s prohibition against employment discrimination is broad and covers all terms and conditions of employment, including but not limited to hiring and firing, promotions and demotions, compensation decisions, and access to benefits. The statute’s coverage is broad to ensure that any discriminatory barrier to equitable employment is eradicated. Whether a particular fellowship or other pipeline program qualifies as “employment” for the purposes of Title VII is a fact-specific inquiry, but many programs may qualify.

Additionally, under Title VII, it is unlawful for an employer to retaliate or discriminate against an employee because they: 1) opposed a discriminatory employment practice; 2) made a formal charge of discrimination with an agency like the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the federal agency charged with enforcing federal anti-discrimination laws in the workplace; or 3) “testified, assisted, or participated” as a witness in an employment discrimination investigation or lawsuit.

Many DEIA programs are designed to help employers reduce barriers to equal employment opportunities and comply with Title VII. These programs typically do not involve using race or other protected characteristics as a criterion in hiring, promotion, pay, or other employment decisions. As such, these programs also are less vulnerable to “reverse discrimination” challenges. For example, the EEOC has stated that an employer may “adopt strategies to expand the applicant pool of qualified [Black] applicants, such as recruiting at schools with high Black enrollment,” without making hiring decisions based on race.

In addition to DEIA programs, some employers have implemented affirmative action programs that may consider race or gender as one factor in employment decisions. Consistent with Title VII’s remedial purpose, employers may consider race or gender in employment decisions in limited circumstances to “correct the effects of past discrimination and to prevent present and future discrimination.” The EEOC has promulgated regulations governing such affirmative action by employers, consistent with current case law.

Affirmative action plans in employment may be developed voluntarily or may be ordered by a court or administrative agency to remedy a finding of discrimination. According to the EEOC, affirmative action is appropriate when existing or contemplated employment practices are likely to cause an adverse impact; when facts reveal that it is necessary to correct the effects of prior discriminatory practices; or when there is a limited labor pool of qualified people of color or women for employment or promotional opportunities that has been historically limited by employers, labor organizations, and others. The plan must contain: 1) a “reasonable self-analysis” that there have been measurable, negative effects of prior discrimination on the labor pool; 2) a “reasonable basis” for the program highlighting the areas where there is a discrepancy or underutilization of people of color or women; and 3) “reasonable action,” including specific practical steps the employer will take to correct this discrepancy.


Section 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, codified as 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (Section 1981), prohibits private sector discrimination on the basis of race, color, and ethnicity when making and enforcing contracts. The text of Section 1981 requires that all citizens have the same rights “enjoyed by white citizens” in contractual relationships. Unlike Title VII, Section 1981 only prohibits disparate treatment in private contracting; it does not recognize a disparate impact theory of discrimination. Specifically, in order to successfully bring a claim under Section 1981, a plaintiff must show: 1) they are a member of a protected class; 2) the defendant intended to discriminate on the basis of race or ethnicity; and 3) the discrimination interfered with the equitable making or enforcement of contracts. Additionally, under Section 1981, a plaintiff bears the burden of proving
that their race or citizenship was the “but for” cause of their denial of contracting rights.20

Courts have interpreted Section 1981’s prohibition on racial discrimination in private contracting to apply to the private employment context.21 Courts have also held that the affirmative action principles applicable under Title VII are also applicable under Section 1981.4 However, there are several notable differences between Section 1981 protections and Title VII protections. Unlike Title VII, Section 1981 protects independent contractors from discrimination,22 requires no numerical threshold of employees for enforcement,23 permits liability claims against individual supervisors,24 has a longer statute of limitations of four years (as compared to as little as 180 days to file a charge of discrimination under Title VII),25 and does not require plaintiffs to file a claim with the EEOC or a state agency before filing a lawsuit. And, as stated above, unlike Title VII, Section 1981 does not permit a cause of action with a disparate impact theory of discrimination.

Recently, plaintiffs have attempted to bring claims under Section 1981 to challenge private-sector DEIA initiatives. However, as will be discussed below, some of these lawsuits have been dismissed for plaintiffs’ failure to satisfy the requirements listed above or for procedural reasons.

C. Executive Order 11246 — Equal Employment Opportunity

Executive Order 11246—Equal Employment Opportunity (EO 11246) prohibits federal contractors who generate over $10,000 per year in business from the federal government from discriminating in employment decisions on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin.26 Importantly, EO 11246 requires that federal contractors take affirmative action to ensure applicants and employees are treated equally, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin. EO 11246’s prohibition against discriminatory treatment covers any employment decision made by a federal contractor, including but not limited to promotions, demotions, or selection for training, including apprenticeships. However, it does not require or allow covered employers to make employment decisions on the basis of race or other protected characteristics, including hiring and promotion decisions. Instead, employers may use both race-conscious and race-neutral tactics that are not employment decisions, such as targeted recruiting, to increase the representation of underrepresented groups. Furthermore, EO 11246 prohibits contractors from discriminating against employees or applicants who inquire about, discuss, or disclose their compensation or that of others, subject to certain limitations.

D. Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.27 Both for-profit and nonprofit entities, as well as state and local governments, that receive federal grants to provide services must comply with Title VI. However, “federal financial assistance” does not include government procurement contracts—i.e., contracts in which goods or services are sold or purchased by the government at fair market value.28 Such federal contractors are not subject to Title VI unless the federal contract includes a subsidy.29 Moreover, Title VI does not govern the relationship between an entity that receives federal financial assistance and its employees unless a primary objective of the federal financial assistance is to provide employment,30 or where the employment discrimination affects the ability of beneficiaries to participate meaningfully in and/or receive the benefits of a federally-assisted program in a nondiscriminatory manner—for example, where segregated faculty prevent students of color from receiving equal educational opportunities.31 Except in those limited circumstances, employers’ nondiscrimination obligations to their employees are governed by Title VII, not Title VI.

E. State Law Civil Rights Protections

Some states have civil rights laws that are more robust than their federal counterparts. Private corporations might be subject to these state laws depending on where they are located and where they conduct business. For example, California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act protects more categories of people from employment discrimination than those covered under federal law. Specifically, California’s nondiscrimination protections cover ancestry; religious dress and grooming practices; marital status; medical conditions, including genetic characteristics; breastfeeding and medical conditions related to breastfeeding; reproductive health decision-making; and traits associated with race, including but not limited to hair texture and natural hairstyles.32 Additionally, New York State law requires that state contractors have an affirmative action program to ensure that people of color and women are afforded equal employment opportunities.33 And New York’s Human Rights Law permits employers to carry out a plan to increase employment for people of color where unemployment numbers for that group are significantly higher than state-wide unemployment.34 In addition to California and New York, several other states permit bona fide, voluntary affirmative action plans in employment. Such permissible affirmative action plans usually follow EEOC guidance.

Unfortunately, some states have also passed laws that prohibit otherwise lawful employment actions. For example, Florida’s Senate Bill 266 prohibits universities from spending funds on programs advocating for diversity, equity, and inclusion, including among their employees. Likewise, Texas’s Senate Bill 17 prohibits public universities from maintaining DEI offices and policies, assigning employees or third-party consultants to perform the duties of a DEI office, soliciting DEI statements from job candidates, and holding mandatory diversity training. These laws may be subject to challenge under the U.S. Constitution.

Given these differences at the state and local level, it is imperative that businesses consult all relevant state and local laws with the assistance of counsel if possible.

F. Obligations to Shareholders

The corporate board and management of publicly traded companies have a variety of obligations to their shareholders, including fiduciary duties. In at least one case, which was dismissed, opponents of civil rights argued that a corporation’s DEIA policies breached those duties.35 If managers breach a fiduciary duty, a shareholder can bring suit on behalf of the corporation.36 However, a shareholder may not maintain a lawsuit “if it appears that the plaintiff does not fairly and adequately represent the interests of shareholders . . . in enforcing the right of the corporation.”37 This rule “prevent[s] shareholders from suing in place of the corporation in circumstances where the action would disserve the legitimate interests of the company or its shareholders.”38
In June 2023, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard/UNC* that the race-conscious admissions programs at Harvard and the University of North Carolina (UNC) were unconstitutional. Specifically, the Court ruled that the universities’ admissions policies violated the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause, which prohibits state actors—like UNC—from denying anyone equal protection of the law. The Court noted that an act that would violate the Equal Protection Clause also violates Title VI, which prohibits federally funded institutions—like Harvard—from engaging in racial discrimination. The Court reasoned that those universities’ consideration of an individual student’s race—“however well-intentioned and implemented in good faith”—failed to pass constitutional muster under strict scrutiny as it was not narrowly tailored to a compelling government interest. In so holding, the Court upended almost five decades of precedent by applying a radical and much more stringent interpretation of strict scrutiny than it had applied in previous affirmative action cases.

Importantly, the *SFFA* decision is limited to the use of race-conscious admissions programs in higher education and does not apply beyond this narrow context. As recently as 2016, the Court held that the pursuit of the educational benefits of diversity was a compelling government interest that could justify the limited consideration of race in college admissions. While the Court’s decision did not overrule that precedent, it nevertheless found that Harvard’s and UNC’s articulated interests in the educational benefits of diversity—though “plainly worthy” and “commendable goals”—were insufficiently coherent and measurable to justify giving a tip to an applicant based solely on the applicant’s race. The Supreme Court also held that, under a strict scrutiny analysis, the race-conscious admissions policies at Harvard and UNC were insufficiently narrowly tailored because the consideration of race, as one of 40 factors at UNC and as one of more than 100 factors at Harvard, negatively impacted white and Asian American applicants. According to the Supreme Court’s ruling, college admissions are a zero-sum game, wherein a tip for one applicant necessarily disadvantages all other applicants. The Court further criticized the means used to achieve the educational benefits of diversity, considering racial categories like “Asian American” or “Hispanic” to be imprecise. The Court also concluded that the admissions policies were not sufficiently narrowly tailored because, according to the Court, a person’s race could influence their perspective or identity amounted to racial stereotyping. Moreover, the Court held that race-conscious admissions programs at Harvard and UNC lacked a “logical end point,” and accused the schools of using impermissible “racial balancing.”

Notably, the Court ruled that nothing in its opinion should be construed to prohibit universities from considering an applicant’s discussion of how race affected their life, be it through discrimination, inspiration, or otherwise. The Court recognized that what an applicant shares about their experiences with race could indicate “courage and determination” or “that student’s unique ability to contribute to the university.”

In addition, the Court recognized that race-conscious measures remain permissible where there is an interest in “remediating specific, identified instances of past discrimination that violated the Constitution or a statute.” Indeed, the Court reaffirmed in *Allen v. Milligan*, a voting rights case decided in the same term as *SFFA*, that government actions undertaken to ensure that opportunities are “equally open” to people of all races are permissible practices consistent with the Equal Protection Clause.

Moreover, race-neutral efforts to increase diversity remain constitutional. In *SFFA*, Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh made explicit in his concurrence that “governments and universities still can, of course, act to undo the effects of past discrimination in many permissible ways that do not involve classification by race.” Justice Clarence Thomas also acknowledged the use of race-neutral policies in his concurrence, stating that “[r]ace-neutral policies may thus achieve the same benefits of racial harmony and equality.”
IV. IMPACT OF THE SFFA DECISION ON PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, CONTRACTING, AND GRANTMAKING

While the Supreme Court’s SFFA decision has emboldened opponents of civil rights to challenge programs that create equal employment opportunities, it did not pertain to the body of law governing private employment, contracting, grantmaking, or many other contexts. As U.S. EEOC Chair Charlotte A. Burrows confirmed, “the decision in [SFFA] … does not address employer efforts to foster diverse and inclusive workforces to engage the talents of all qualified workers, regardless of their background.” It remains lawful … to ensure that workers of all backgrounds are afforded equal opportunity in the workplace.”

Because Title VII and Section 1981 are different legal frameworks than those at issue in SFFA, and because interpretations of the Equal Protection Clause and Title VI in higher education have developed a unique body of law, the SFFA decision has no direct precedential value in areas outside of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education. Litigants arguing otherwise are attempting to expand the scope of the decision, but lower courts remain bound by prior precedent interpreting Title VII and Section 1981, which is described above.

Many of the challenges, both pre- and post-SFFA, to employer policies designed to promote diversity and equal opportunity have not survived judicial scrutiny at the early stages of the litigation because the plaintiffs could not show that they were harmed by the policies at issue, and we expect future cases to face similar obstacles. Moreover, because opponents of civil rights will have to bring new cases, it will likely take years for successful challenges to progress through the courts to alter the law if they ultimately prevail. Nevertheless, policies that are overtly race-conscious are more likely to be closely scrutinized than policies that use race-neutral measures to achieve diversity goals, and organizations must ensure that all policies comply with existing constitutional and statutory anti-discrimination requirements.

1. Private Employment and Fellowships

The SFFA decision does not change covered employers’ obligations under Title VII or Section 1981. As noted above, private employers’ relationship with their employees—even for those employers that receive federal financial assistance—is generally covered by Title VII, not Title VI. As explained above, Title VII has long prohibited employers from using race or other protected characteristics as a criterion for employment decisions—such as hiring, firing, and other actions that impact the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment—except to address discrimination through a valid affirmative action plan. Section 1981 similarly prohibits racial discrimination in the making and enforcement of employment contracts, but permits affirmative action plans to redress prior discrimination. Policies and practices that do not explicitly consider race are permissible under Section 1981, and are also permissible under Title VII unless they have an unjustified, disparate impact on protected groups.

Indeed, the Court in SFFA cited prior Title VII caselaw upholding a race-based remedy to address prior discrimination.

The SFFA decision did not alter the legality of employer DEIA programs, particularly because these programs usually do not involve the use of race in employment decisions. As discussed further below, courts have previously held that many DEIA programs are lawful and are not evidence of discriminatory intent in an employment decision.

While the legality of an organization’s particular DEIA program is a fact-specific inquiry, courts have upheld the following types of programs against a variety of challenges:

- **Diversity Policies and Statements:** Numerous cases have held that the existence of a diversity policy or a statement reflecting a desire to increase diversity is not itself evidence of discrimination.

- **Anti-Bias Training:** Courts have dismissed challenges to anti-bias trainings, holding that they do not create a hostile work environment, nor are they a racially discriminatory employment practice that could form the basis of a retaliation claim.

- **Recruiting:** Courts have held that efforts to address disparities in the applicant pool and to expand the number of qualified candidates by actively recruiting underrepresented groups are lawful.

- **Goals:** Aspirational diversity goals have been recognized as lawful. These goals need not satisfy the stricter standards for affirmative action programs, provided they are achieved through race-neutral means. While employers can encourage managers to engage in DEIA activities, they should not tie performance evaluations or compensation to achieving numerical goals for hiring, promotion, or retention.
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS IN PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT ALSO REMAIN LAWFUL FOLLOWING THE SFFA DECISION. UNLIKE IN THE EDUCATION CONTEXT, EMPLOYERS HAVE LONG BEEN PROHIBITED FROM USING RACE AS A CRITERION IN AN EMPLOYMENT DECISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF REAPING THE BENEFITS OF DIVERSITY.

rights have filed suit challenging DEIA programs both before and after SFFA, many of these challenges have failed on multiple legal grounds. Affirmative action programs in private employment also remain lawful following the SFFA decision. Unlike in the education context, employers have long been prohibited from using race as a criterion in an employment decision for the purpose of reaping the benefits of diversity. The case law holds that the only permissible reason for an employer to consider race in an employment decision is to remedy past discrimination, whether at a particular company or within an industry more generally. Nothing in the decision or reasoning of SFFA purports to alter the law in this area, as the justification for using race in employment decisions was already narrow.

Finally, SFFA did not alter employers’ obligations to root out discrimination, including by eliminating policies and practices that create unfair barriers to employment for people of color and people in other protected categories. Employers that roll back existing DEIA programs risk erecting new barriers to equal employment opportunities for people of color, opening themselves up to possible discrimination claims under Title VII, and creating challenges to hiring and retaining a diverse workforce.
2. Federal Contractors and Other Recipients of Federal Funds

Federal contractors, like other private employers, are governed by Section 1981 and often by Title VII. As noted in the previous section, the SFFA decision did not change employers’ obligation to offer equal employment opportunities, including through DEIA measures.

Federal contractors must also comply with Executive Order 11246, which, as discussed above, requires all federal contractors and subcontractors to engage in “affirmative action.” However, unlike the affirmative action programs at issue in SFFA, EO 11246 and related regulations by OFCCP do not permit the use of race as a criterion in hiring, employment, or personnel decisions.78

Indeed, while federal contractors must set goals for hiring and promoting employees of color and other protected groups if contractors find that they are underrepresented in their workforce, federal regulations expressly prohibit contractors from giving a preference based on race to meet these goals.79 Instead, employers must meet their affirmative action goals through measures that are not race-based employment decisions, such as reassessing policies that impose barriers to equal employment opportunities or engaging in adequate recruiting and outreach.

Finally, SFFA’s discussion of Title VI is likely to have limited impact on the practices of federal contractors. As noted above, many federal contractors are not subject to Title VI, nor are most employer-employee relationships. To the extent that any federal contractor or employer is covered by Title VI, they were already forbidden from making race-based employment decisions unless they were remediating past discrimination through a valid affirmative action plan under Title VII.

However, certain federal programs that more directly consider race in the decision-making process have been challenged.80 For example, on July 19, 2023, the District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, in Ultima Services Corporation v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, found that the federal government’s presumption that members of particular racial groups are “socially disadvantaged”—and therefore eligible for government contracting preferences as “socially and economically disadvantaged businesses”—violated the Equal Protection Clause.81 Following the district court’s decision in Ultima, the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) reached out to all contractors who previously qualified under the presumption and asked them to submit documentation demonstrating that they qualified as a socially and economically disadvantaged business because they had experienced individual discrimination.82 The SBA also created an expedited process to review that documentation.83 On September 29, 2023, the SBA began accepting new applications under the revised criteria.84 The litigation in Ultima and similar cases is ongoing.

3. Grantmaking, Investments, and Corporate Donations

While the SFFA decision did not change the law governing how organizations can administer grant programs or make investments or donations, programs that target specific racial groups are likely to receive additional legal scrutiny, as demonstrated by recent litigation. For example, private venture capital funds have seen challenges to grant programs created to support businesses led by women of color.85 Opponents of civil rights have argued that grants, investments, and corporate donations that seek to benefit particular racial groups violate Section 1981.86 Some of these challenges have failed at early stages because the plaintiffs could not show that there was an existing or future contract which the defendant impaired or blocked.87 While there is little controlling case law on whether grants are contracts covered by Section 1981, at least one court has held that they are.88

Moreover, while the First Amendment may bar using Section 1981 to force organizations to donate to entities whose message they do not support,89 some courts have held that does not equate to a First Amendment right to distribute funds based on the race of the recipient.90 This is a controversial and evolving area of law, which requires caution and thoughtfulness to avoid arguments that may actually conflict with an organization’s overall diversity and equity goals and commitments.

4. Obligations to Shareholders

Finally, the SFFA decision did not address or alter the obligations of corporate boards and managers to their shareholders. While opponents of civil rights have argued that DEIA initiatives violate the fiduciary duties of corporate boards and management, to date, many such shareholder derivative suits have failed for a variety of reasons.91
V. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a nation, we cannot afford to forgo the talents and gifts of people who have long been denied equal access to opportunities. We must overcome the challenges of the current moment and push for lasting changes to ensure that those who are currently underrepresented in many economic spheres—Black, Latinx, Indigenous, Asian American, and Pacific Islander individuals—enjoy an equal opportunity to thrive. Our ability to compete in an increasingly global economy, develop scientific and technological innovations, foster the health of our increasingly multicultural democracy, and overcome the complex challenges of climate change and other crises depends on our ability to produce leaders and a well-trained workforce capable of navigating and thriving in a racially diverse society. Moreover, as noted above, investing in DEIA programs and other equity initiatives creates workplaces where everyone feels welcomed and valued. Indeed, as Intel explained to Congress in 2019: “Improving ethnic and gender diversity in the U.S. technology workforce represents an economic opportunity that could create $470 billion to $570 billion in new value for the technology industry and valued. Indeed, as Intel explained to Congress in 2019: “Improving ethnic and gender diversity in the U.S. technology workforce represents an economic opportunity that could create $470 billion to $570 billion in new value for the technology industry and the U.S. economy.”

In light of the growing number of challenges in the wake of SFFA, some organizations might consider ending their DEIA efforts to avoid legal exposure. But dialing back DEIA efforts may cause an organization to incur significant legal risks. Notably, public companies have faced lawsuits for failing to follow through on commitments they made to increase diversity and inclusion in their workplaces. According to Bloomberg, almost 40 lawsuits have been filed within the last three years against companies that allegedly made misleading statements about diversity and equity commitments. For example, on September 26, 2023, a Wells Fargo shareholder filed a shareholder derivative complaint against the company, alleging that its hiring managers engaged in sham interviews with racially and ethnically diverse candidates to give the false impression of success in its DEIA initiatives.

Importantly, organizations must be mindful of their continuing obligation to root out discrimination in their workplaces before they take the drastic step of halting or pulling back DEIA efforts. Title VII forbids intentional discrimination or the use of policies or practices that, while seemingly neutral on their face, have the effect of discriminating against people because of their race, color, national origin, or other protected characteristics. The EEOC has signaled its intention to increase focus on systemic barriers to equal opportunity in the workplace. As a result, it is imperative for employers to identify and remove discriminatory policies and practices to avoid legal liability. The successful implementation of an effective diversity and inclusion program can assist companies and government agencies alike with the vital task of identifying policies and practices that may stifle equity in the workplace, even if unintentionally.

To further a shared commitment to racial equity and justice, it is imperative for the business and philanthropic communities to use this opportunity to leverage their influence, resources, and power to move our country closer to fulfilling the promise of equal opportunity for all. To that end, we suggest implementing the following recommendations to unequivocally demonstrate a steadfast commitment to advancing equity and inclusion and supporting the health of our multicultural democracy.

Communicate the value of diversity and equal opportunity. Explain to employees, board members, shareholders, lawmakers, and the public why DEIA means to the organization, its importance, and how it impacts the organization’s mission and goals. Moreover, include DEIA as an aspirational goal in the corporate boardroom to the mailroom. Be sure to incorporate the advancement of racial equity into the organization’s environmental, social, and corporate responsibility efforts. For example, communicate that the organization believes in equal opportunity, inclusion, and belonging, and that accordingly, the organization prioritizes creating a supportive and empowering workplace for all employees, including intentionally creating safe spaces for employees from marginalized and underrepresented groups. Such efforts boost morale and create a healthier workplace for everyone. Likewise, ensure stakeholders understand that DEIA programs are lawful because they do not use race as a motivating factor in employment decisions, but instead allow employers to use recruiting, mentoring, training, and other measures to expand opportunity; create and maintain an inclusive workplace; and reduce discrimination and bias for all workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicate the value of diversity and equal opportunity</th>
<th>Build robust pipelines</th>
<th>Expand recruitment efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish aspirational goals</td>
<td>Diligently comply with anti-discrimination laws</td>
<td>Remove or significantly limit criminal history and credit checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster an inclusive work environment</td>
<td>Support Employee Resource Groups and mentorship programs</td>
<td>Partner with minority-owned firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data and measure progress on key diversity and inclusion metrics</td>
<td>Conduct an equity audit</td>
<td>Modify the application process for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remain steadfast in the laudable and lawful goal of advancing equity and inclusion.
An organization may wish to explain to stakeholders that their DEIA efforts boost morale and goodwill, help retain important talent, minimize exposure to lawsuits and administrative complaints alleging violations of anti-discrimination laws, enhance customer service and technological innovation, and promote better decision-making and outcomes. Leverage the data about how diversity contributes to financial success to explain why it is a business necessity that measurably improves outcomes. Organizations should undertake periodic assessments of their communications concerning DEIA programs to ensure that these communications accurately and effectively describe the organization’s activities.

**Build robust pipelines.** Organizations should make every effort to maximize their talent pipelines. Towards this end, organizations may wish to: (a) objectively identify promising candidates for internal promotions and board membership (while ensuring that candidates from underrepresented communities are not overlooked) and give them robust opportunities to develop their talents; (b) ensure that all internship and mentoring programs are open to students of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, other Minority-Serving Institutions, and other universities that serve a disproportionate share of students from communities that are underrepresented in the organization’s economic sector and, to the extent these are new partnerships, work closely with the educational institutions to make these programs a success; and (c) create pipeline programs, like Emerging Manager Programs or fellowship programs, with communities, schools, or institutions that serve a disproportionate share of individuals that are underrepresented in the organizations’ economic sector.

**Expand recruitment efforts.** Employers should periodically assess whether their pool of applicants reflects the racial demographics of the labor pool of available workers in the relevant job market, and whether the industry more broadly lacks diversity. If applicants from identifiable groups (e.g., Black applicants) are underrepresented, the employer should make a reasonable effort to identify why they are not attracting applicants from the underrepresented group by reviewing and evaluating current recruitment methods, among other strategies. Employers should make every effort to maximize the number of underrepresented applicants in the applicant pool from which it selects its employees, interns, and board members. If such efforts do not yield an increase in the number of underrepresented applicants within a reasonable amount of time (e.g., two years), the employer should re-evaluate its recruitment efforts and explore additional measures to increase the number of underrepresented applicants in the applicant pool.

Employers may wish to increase the number of underrepresented candidates in the applicant pool with strategies that include: (a) encouraging all personnel to actively participate in recruitment efforts; (b) ensuring that the organization’s representatives attend diversity career fairs and career fairs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, other Minority-Serving Institutions, and other universities that serve a disproportionate share of students from communities that are underrepresented in the organization’s applicant pool; (c) arranging for the organization’s representatives to recruit via student organizations or professional organizations that serve underrepresented candidates interested in that particular industry; (d) consulting professional organizations that provide support to members of the underrepresented community for suggestions to improve recruitment of workers from that
AS A NATION, WE CANNOT AFFORD TO FORGO THE TALENTS AND GIFTS OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE LONG BEEN DENIED EQUAL ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITIES.

community; (e) advertising job vacancies with professional and civic organizations that serve the underrepresented community and in print, audio, video, and internet media outlets whose audience includes a substantial share of the underrepresented community; and (f) holding job vacancies open for a reasonable amount of time (e.g., at least 30 days) to allow time for interested candidates to apply.

Establish aspirational goals. Organizations can and should establish aspirational goals to achieve greater equity and inclusion. However, organizations should be careful about how aspirational goals are used. If an investigation reveals that Black candidates are sorely underrepresented in the applicant pool even though they are well-represented in the labor pool of available workers in relevant job categories within the pertinent geographic area, it may be helpful to adopt a numerical goal to guide recruitment efforts. For example, a company facing such a challenge may have an aspirational goal of increasing the share of applications it receives from Black applicants by 50% each year until the representation of Black applicants in its applicant pool is on par with the representation of Black people in the labor pool of available workers in relevant job categories within the pertinent geographic area. If the company does not meet its goal, it may wish to reassess and recalibrate its recruitment strategies to identify any remaining barriers to equal opportunity. An organization could also set an aspirational goal that the composition of its workforce or senior management team reflects the relevant labor pool in the area, provided that the organization is scrupulous about using only lawful means (e.g., increased recruiting) to try to achieve those goals while ensuring that race plays no role in actual hiring, promotions, or other employment decisions. Organizations should avoid tying anyone’s compensation to the achievement of numerical goals regarding hiring, promotion, pay, and other employment decisions, so that race is not a motivating factor in those employment decisions.

For example, many organizations have long relied on informal preferences for candidates who bear the traditional indicia of what their economic sector considers an elite pedigree (e.g., almost exclusively hiring candidates with a degree from a university listed at the top of the U.S. News and World Report rankings). Likewise, some organizations have partnered with universities to host mentorship or internship programs but have only partnered with Predominantly White Institutions. Careful consideration should be given to whether such choices are serving the organization’s mission; whether they are valid predictors of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for a given role; or whether they merely serve to artificially depress the likelihood that candidates from underrepresented communities are given a fair opportunity to interview and be meaningfully considered for a position. In addition, all technology used in hiring, such as resume screening tools or testing, should be independently audited to identify and eliminate algorithmic bias that may unfairly screen out qualified candidates from underrepresented communities.

Diligently comply with anti-discrimination laws. Companies, philanthropic organizations, and other entities must comply with applicable civil rights laws that require them to provide an equal opportunity to all applicants. Legal counsel should monitor developments in the law to ensure continued compliance. It may be advisable to periodically conduct a privileged review of recruiting, hiring, pay, assignment, retention, promotion, and termination policies to identify and remove obstacles that prevent all individuals from enjoying equal opportunities. This should involve taking a hard look at the criteria for employment decisions to avoid inadvertently excluding or disadvantage candidates from certain communities by preferring unnecessary credentials that not all candidates have a fair chance to earn.

For example, some organizations have listed at the top of the U.S. News and World Report rankings. Likewise, some organizations have partnered with universities to host mentorship or internship programs but have only partnered with Predominantly White Institutions. Careful consideration should be given to whether such choices are serving the organization’s mission; whether they are valid predictors of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for a given role; or whether they merely serve to artificially depress the likelihood that candidates from underrepresented communities are given a fair opportunity to interview and be meaningfully considered for a position. In addition, all technology used in hiring, such as resume screening tools or testing, should be independently audited to identify and eliminate algorithmic bias that may unfairly screen out qualified candidates from underrepresented communities.

To learn more about this issue, please consult guidance from the U.S. Department of Justice and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Likewise, as discussed below, ensure that criminal background and credit checks are not unfairly excluding applicants from underrepresented communities from consideration.

Written job vacancy announcements should inform readers that the organization is an equal opportunity employer that does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, religion, ethnic group, disability, or national origin. Likewise, vacancy announcements should reassure potential applicants that no person shall be disqualified from employment, solely or in part, because of a prior conviction, unless it is a job-related conviction. Vacancy announcements should use gender-neutral language and avoid superfluous technical jargon that can implicitly discourage applications from promising candidates in underrepresented communities.

Except as part of a valid affirmative action program, race should not be a motivating factor behind any employment decision or a part of the selection criteria for any employment benefit. Instead, selection criteria might include a longstanding demonstrated interest in serving underserved communities to remedy service gaps or persistent social inequities. While these criteria may attract candidates from those underserved communities, race should not serve as a proxy for a willingness to serve in those underserved communities. But race should not serve as a proxy for a willingness to serve in those underserved communities. Other permissible considerations include skills, such as multilingualism, needed to successfully navigate an increasingly diverse marketplace; the ability to foster and maintain cross-cultural connections; and a demonstrated ability to overcome adversity.
and Latino households tend, on average, to have literacy
is not exclusive to any specific race or ethnicity.

Remove or significantly limit criminal history and credit checks. Ensure that a person’s criminal or credit history does not unduly prevent a candidate from advancing. Indeed, “studies have consistently found that African American and Latino households tend, on average, to have lower credit scores than [white] households.”97 As a result, “[t]he growing list of credit checks ... may disproportionately screen otherwise qualified racial and ethnic minorities out of jobs, leading to discriminatory hiring practices, and further exacerbating the trend where unemployment for African American and Latino communities is elevated well above the rate of [their white counterparts].”98 Given this, many states and localities prohibit the use of credit reports in employment decisions.99

Criminal history checks can likewise improperly screen out qualified underrepresented candidates, and, because of racial discrimination at every stage of the criminal legal system, criminal history checks have an adverse disparate impact on Black and Latinx candidates. Accordingly, at the very least, employers who plan to conduct criminal background checks during the application process should do so after a conditional offer has been made. Moreover, any consideration of an employee or potential employee’s criminal record should be limited to recent job-related convictions and serve a legitimate business purpose. Any arrests that did not result in a conviction should not be considered.

For more on how criminal background checks can have a racially disparate impact in violation of Title VII, see the LDF Thurgood Marshall Institute’s report Barred from Work: The Discriminatory Impacts of Criminal Background Checks in Employment. Organizations should ask their legal counsel to consider how criminal background checks may also cause an adverse racially disparate impact that violates state and local laws, as well as Title VII.

Foster an inclusive work environment. Periodically assess the organization’s culture to ensure that everyone feels welcome to bring their full selves to work. For example, consider whether the idea of “professionalism” within the organization allows for religious garb, cultural or natural hairstyles, fluid gender identities, and flexible work hours to accommodate caregiving responsibilities. Assess the organization’s dress and grooming code to ensure that it enables everyone to bring their authentic selves to work. Ensure that actual job performance determines opportunities for advancement, rather than narrow and outdated perceptions of professionalism that disadvantage members of underrepresented groups. Scrutinize whether prevailing notions of professionalism influence plum assignments, participation in client pitches and networking events, and other career opportunities. Adopt policies that support work/life balance and accommodate employees with caregiving responsibilities by, for example, providing flexibility in work hours and remote work, if possible, as well as generous family leave that is available to all parents of children and encompasses care for elderly and other family members. Invest in anti-bias trainings and other experiences— paired with organizational policies and leadership commitment—that promote greater understanding and inclusivity to help the organizational culture evolve so that all employees feel welcomed and valued.

Support Employee Resource Groups and mentorship programs. Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) are voluntary affinity groups that provide a safe, supportive space for employees to: (a) discuss strategies for navigating the particular challenges associated with a certain shared identity and (b) celebrate the joys, customs, and heritage associated with a certain community. Although members of ERGs may share a common aspect of their identity, such groups—and the events they host—should be explicitly open to all. Provide administrative and financial support generously and equally to all ERGs to minimize the burden of organizing meetings and events and providing honorariums to speakers. The contributions of employees to the operation of ERGs should be recognized as a valued demonstration of leadership and dedication to the organization. Likewise, employees should be given the bandwidth to attend ERG meetings during the workday so that attendance is possible for employees who have obligations outside of normal work hours. ERGs can help address the specific needs of employees from underrepresented groups and ensure that they have a meaningful voice in the operation and direction of the organization, as well as effective access to mentorship and pipelines for promotion within the organization.

Foster an inclusive work environment. Periodically assess the organization’s culture to ensure that everyone feels welcome to bring their full selves to work. For example, consider whether the idea of “professionalism” within the organization allows for religious garb, cultural or natural hairstyles, fluid gender identities, and flexible work hours to accommodate caregiving responsibilities. Assess the organization’s dress and grooming code to ensure that it enables everyone to bring their authentic selves to work. Ensure that actual job performance determines opportunities for advancement, rather than narrow and outdated perceptions of professionalism that disadvantage members of underrepresented groups. Scrutinize whether prevailing notions of professionalism influence plum assignments, participation in client pitches and networking events, and other career opportunities. Adopt policies that support work/life balance and accommodate employees with caregiving responsibilities by, for example, providing flexibility in work hours and remote work, if possible, as well as generous family leave that is available to all parents of children and encompasses care for elderly and other family members. Invest in anti-bias trainings and other experiences— paired with organizational policies and leadership commitment—that promote greater understanding and inclusivity to help the organizational culture evolve so that all employees feel welcomed and valued.

Collect data and measure progress on key diversity and inclusion metrics. Collect data and keep records of the demographic makeup of the applicant pool, candidates invited to interview, candidates who made it to a second or third round of interviews, and candidates offered a position to ensure that the candidate pool reflects the full range of available talent. If it is determined that service providers from certain communities are underrepresented among the group of candidates, assess the reasons for the underrepresentation and devise a plan to broaden the candidate pool to reflect the full range of available talent.

Partner with minority-owned firms. Ensure that investment firms, auditors, legal counsel, and vendors that are owned by people of color, are meaningfully included in the pool of applicants to be considered for the organization’s portfolio of partners, suppliers, and service providers. Periodically assess the pool of candidates that the organization considers for such roles to determine whether the candidate pool reflects the entire range of available talent. If it is determined that service providers from certain communities are underrepresented among the group of candidates, assess the reasons for the underrepresentation and devise a plan to broaden the candidate pool to reflect the full range of available talent.

Collect data and measure progress on key diversity and inclusion metrics. Collect data and keep records of the demographic makeup of the applicant pool, candidates invited to interview, candidates who made it to a second or third round of interviews, and candidates offered a position to ensure that the candidate pool reflects the full range of available talent. If it is determined that service providers from certain communities are underrepresented among the group of candidates, assess the reasons for the underrepresentation and devise a plan to broaden the candidate pool to reflect the full range of available talent.

Partner with minority-owned firms. Ensure that investment firms, auditors, legal counsel, and vendors that are owned by people of color, are meaningfully included in the pool of applicants to be considered for the organization’s portfolio of partners, suppliers, and service providers. Periodically assess the pool of candidates that the organization considers for such roles to determine whether the candidate pool reflects the entire range of available talent. If it is determined that service providers from certain communities are underrepresented among the group of candidates, assess the reasons for the underrepresentation and devise a plan to broaden the candidate pool to reflect the full range of available talent.
organization's leadership. These metrics should facilitate an understanding of the effectiveness and value of DEIA programs, how such measures can be fine-tuned to yield even better results, and how such programs further the organization's mission and/or business priorities.

Conduct an equity audit. Also known as a “racial equity audit” or a “civil rights audit,” a number of companies have found this exercise helpful in assessing whether any current policies or practices deny anyone an equal opportunity based on a protected category. An equity audit can offer valuable, tailored guidance on a broad array of measures to advance equality in the workplace. Such an audit may include an evaluation of whether an organization's recruitment, hiring, assignment, retention, pay, promotion, and termination practices and policies are marred by obstacles to equal opportunity that unfairly deny some candidates a fair chance to succeed. Likewise, an audit might determine whether algorithmic bias is distorting an organization's operations and hindering its ability to leverage the talents and potential of both workers and potential customers from underrepresented communities. In addition, an equity audit might use quantitative and qualitative analyses to evaluate whether measures adopted to foster DEIA and/or ESG goals have been supported and legally sound. Frivolous allegations or practices deny anyone an equal opportunity. Some are attempting to break down barriers to opportunity and ensure equality for all.

Modify the application process for funding. Funders should carefully determine whether their application process presents an insurmountable administrative hurdle to promising organizations and individuals. Thus, funders may want to conduct an in-depth analysis to determine ways to simplify and streamline the application process to equalize access for promising applicants with limited resources and experiences with grants. In addition, funders may wish to identify potential applicants, emerging managers, or partners by performing their own search, perhaps after immersing themselves in the community of target candidates. Funders should be intentional about ensuring that this search is broad enough to include all candidates who meet the funders' parameters, and they may want to consult with experts in the field and local stakeholders.

Remain steadfast in the laudable and lawful goal of advancing equity and inclusion. Although the SFFA decision has no direct precedential impact on business, employment, or philanthropy, it has emboldened those who oppose equal opportunity. Some are attempting to change current law—a slow process that likely will take years to progress through the courts with no guarantee of success. Multiple organizations have received demand letters or have been subject to lawsuits, pressuring them to retreat from efforts to advance equal opportunity. It is, of course, imperative to have legal counsel make a careful assessment of whether any accusations are factually supported and legally sound. Frivolous allegations should not deter anyone from their obligations to break down barriers to opportunity and ensure equality for all.

Invest in civil rights. Review financial investments and ventures to ensure that resources are aligned with core civil rights efforts to provide pathways to education and economic opportunity for underrepresented communities (especially Black families), full voting access for all eligible voters, and meaningful criminal justice reform. Establish standards for federal, state, and local political donations to avoid giving to candidates and organizations that advance anti-civil rights positions or spread misinformation about DEIA and its benefits for all.

Get involved in local community activities. Encourage employees and partners to engage with the local communities where headquarters and offices are located. Employees and partners should be encouraged to volunteer with and donate to worthy causes, get informed about the issues that affect these communities, and vote in every election, including local elections for school board members, judges, prosecutors, and other important officials. Provide employees with paid time off to vote. LDF monitors voter suppression, which can be reported here.

Publicly support racial justice. Take a public position in support of racial justice and encourage colleagues to do the same (e.g., with an open letter, press statement, or newspaper advertisement). Monitor legal developments that affect efforts to advance equal opportunity and racial justice and amplify support for equity and inclusion through the organization. Successful examples include 82 leading corporations and business groups submitting amicus briefs to the Supreme Court in the SFFA case to reaffirm how the American economy derives direct benefits from employees educated in diverse settings, and the Executive Leadership Council, a group of prominent Black executives, issuing an open letter to the nation’s CEOs urging them to commit to DEIA initiatives. Organizations that may be hesitant to make such public pronouncements individually should consider supporting these efforts through a trade group or another business organization.
VI. CONCLUSION

We all benefit when people from every background can access economic opportunity and contribute their talents in the workplace. DEIA programs and other measures aimed at increasing access to employment, funding, and other opportunities are essential to our multiracial democracy, ensuring that everyone can thrive and that companies have the skills and perspectives needed to solve the complex challenges of today. Opponents of civil rights have sought to expand the scope of the Supreme Court’s decision in Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard/UNC to challenge and chill these programs. But rolling back DEIA programs and similar measures can create legal risk for employers and other entities and harm the organizations themselves, depriving them of the insight and contributions of talented individuals who, for too long, have been underrepresented or excluded from certain spaces. It is therefore imperative for employers, funders, and government contractors to continue to invest in lawful efforts to increase access to opportunity and ensure the success of our economy and our democratic institutions.
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