

The views expressed herein are solely those of the individual authors, not of the University of Michigan or any other entity.

The Gender Impact of the Proposed Michigan Civil Rights Initiative

Susan W. Kaufmann
Associate Director, CEW

Anne K. Davis
Graduate Research Assistant, CEW

Revised November 2005

The Center for the Education of Women
University of Michigan
330 E. Liberty Ann Arbor, MI 48104
ph: 734.998.7250 fax: 734.998.6203

The Michigan Civil Rights Initiative (MCRI) is a proposed amendment to the state constitution, submitted to be on the ballot in November 2006, that would prohibit all state and local government entities, including schools, from discriminating or granting preferential treatment based on race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in public employment, public education or government contracting¹. Although described as a civil rights initiative, the MCRI appears to confer no additional civil rights on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity or national origin. With proper enforcement, moreover, existing state and federal laws seem to be clear and adequate. Title IV of the 1964 federal Civil Rights Act protects against discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin in any program receiving federal funding²; Title VII prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex and national origin³; and the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, passed in Michigan in 1976, protects against discrimination in employment, education, public services and public accommodations on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, age, height, weight, religion, familial status or marital status⁴. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination in education⁵. The Equal Protection Clause of the Michigan State Constitution duplicates the federal equal protection clause, and guarantees the equal protection of the laws⁶. Executive Order 11246 also forbids discrimination and requires affirmative action for certain classes of workers at federal contractors and subcontractors⁷. Some municipalities protect additional groups against discrimination.

In California, Proposition 209⁸, a nearly identical initiative passed in 1996, has been used to erode legal, court-sanctioned efforts by state and local governments to reach out to women and minorities in order to reverse historic discrimination and exclusion by providing fair and equal access to opportunity. Programs providing access and exposure to education, employment and business opportunity have been challenged, eliminated or amended. Affected programs include:

- Elementary and high school level reading, science and math programs for female and minority students⁹.
- Summer and after-school programs targeted to either girls or boys, or to children in racial, national or ethnic groups¹⁰.
- Outreach and funding for women and minority math, science and technology teachers¹¹.
- Programs helping women and minorities become apprentices in the skilled trades¹².
- Higher education funding for minority health professionals¹³.
- Scholarships, fellowships and grants at all levels of education that take into consideration gender, race, ethnicity or national origin.¹⁴
- Affirmative action in public contracting, including not only those efforts with explicit goals but also outreach programs and notification of bidding opportunities for women and minority owned businesses¹⁵.

Passage of ballot initiatives is only the first step in determining the policy implications; often, the courts are called on to interpret the language so that policy decisions can be made. In California, Governor Pete Wilson filed a lawsuit

against the State Personnel Board in order to establish the scope of the initiative. Ward Connerly, the sponsor of Prop. 209 and, later, the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative, joined him in this suit and continued to pursue the case after Governor Gray Davis defeated Pete Wilson. The decision in this suit, which came to be known as *Connerly v. State Personnel Board*, states, “Proposition 209 . . . prohibits discrimination against or preferential treatment to individuals or groups regardless of whether the governmental action could be justified under strict scrutiny.” A strict scrutiny standard requires that a suspect statutory classification (for example, a classification based on race) serve a compelling government purpose and be narrowly tailored to achieve that purpose. The court’s decision confirmed that, under California law (unlike federal law), gender classifications are subject to this strict scrutiny standard. *Connerly v. Personnel Board* declares that, except in narrow circumstances, Proposition 209 would invalidate those California statutes that employ gender or race based classifications for the purpose of targeting programs or services.

Following this interpretation by the California courts¹⁶, breast cancer screening and battered women’s shelters were some of the programs that faced legal challenges¹⁷ in suits filed by the National Coalition of Free Men, Los Angeles Chapter (CFM) or its members. In *Blumhorst v. Jewish Family Services of Los Angeles*, an individual CFM member directly sued battered women’s shelters for violating equal protection and sought the elimination of state funding as a remedy¹⁸. Funding for battered women’s shelters was preserved when the courts found that Blumhorst lacked standing because, although he claimed to be a survivor of domestic violence, he was not in need of services when he called shelters seeking to be admitted.¹⁹ In that case, Blumhorst had also argued that section 11139 of the California Government Code²⁰, which exempts lawful programs serving the disabled, the aged, minorities and women from challenges under state anti-discrimination law, was unconstitutional. The trial court upheld its constitutionality. Because the appellate court found that Blumhorst lacked standing, it did not review his claim that the statute was unconstitutional. Findings in the *Connerly* and *Blumhorst* cases on the issue of standing to challenge gender-targeted programs appear to conflict; advocates and attorneys anticipate further challenges.²¹

Subsequently, in *Coalition of Free Men v. State of California*, the Coalition and one of its members challenged all programs providing services or funding for women in California. They based their claim for standing to sue in the *Connerly v. Personnel Board* decision addressing the use of gender- or race-based classifications. The Coalition’s lawsuit was filed as both a taxpayer action and a citizen action to prevent an illegal expenditure of public funds. The law under which the Coalition filed, according to the Court of Appeal, “does not authorize general challenge with no reference to specific application of statute.” The plaintiffs were found not to have standing to sue because they had not claimed a personal interest or involvement with any of the targeted statutes and had, therefore, not demonstrated that they had suffered or been threatened with harm.²²

Although these suits have not succeeded so far, it remains possible that the Coalition of Free Men or other individuals or groups will achieve standing in future lawsuits. In addition, the necessity of mounting defenses consumed scarce resources of time and money, for chronically under-funded shelters as well as the state.

As Michigan law appears to offer no protection directly comparable to section 11139 of the California Government Code, programs providing services for women such as breast cancer screening and domestic violence services could well be at risk here, depending on the direction of judicial involvement and interpretation. The MCRI is intended to apply to “all functions and all levels of state and local government in Michigan”²³. It does not provide for exceptions for the health and well-being of affected populations, but instead seeks a blanket ban on targeted programs based in race, gender and ethnicity.

Immediately following the passage of Prop. 209, the State of California stopped collecting information about race, gender and ethnicity in employment and contracting²⁴ at the behest of then Governor Pete Wilson. This resulted in a break in the availability of data that could be used to analyze the absence or presence of discrimination in state-funded and -administered programs²⁵.

The California State Colleges and Universities continued to collect data internally, however, and institutional analysis found that hiring of women faculty dropped immediately and dramatically on a number of campuses²⁶. A report issued in May 2005 by four faculty members at the University of California Davis reveals that the peak in hiring of women faculty members in the University of California system overall occurred in 1994 when 37% of new faculty hires were women. By 1999, it had declined to 25%. At Davis, the percentage of women hired as new faculty members dropped from 52% in 1994 to 13% in 1998. According to Prof. Gyöngy Laky, one of the authors of the report, “here we were [at Davis], preferring and hiring white men at rates of 87%, way beyond their 59% presence in available pools, when for almost a decade more than 45% of all Ph.D.’s had been granted to women. With Prop. 209, we had, it seemed, created an effective affirmative action program for white men.”²⁷

In addition, the number of women and minorities enrolled in and completing medical, computer science and technology programs and entering the workforce declined, probably because of the elimination of recruiting, admissions, outreach, counseling, tutoring and policies that take race and gender into account in order to increase participation²⁸. Across all affected fields and campuses, hiring and enrollment have only recently approached the levels of 10 years ago²⁹, reflecting a decade of lost opportunities to make further progress. In 2001 the California Appellate Court and California State Legislature restored race and gender data collection, enabling the state to resume attention to equality of opportunity³⁰.

Women-owned businesses in California reported an immediate decline, not only in the direct awarding of state government contracts after Prop. 209 passed, but also in the number of bid opportunities communicated³¹. Affirmative action programs are used to ensure transparency and openness in the bidding process,

as well as to encourage outreach and participation. After Prop. 209 was implemented, subcontracting opportunities were no longer distributed to the directory of registered women- and -minority owned businesses, leading to a sharp decline in the opportunities available to disadvantaged business enterprises³². Prop. 209 has not only affected state- and local-level contracting, however. Despite language guaranteeing the protection of programs required to maintain compliance with Federal guidelines³³, a recent California Supreme Court decision applied Prop. 209 and found that programs enacted to remedy past discrimination and maintain compliance with federal funding requirements were in violation³⁴, which may further reduce contracting opportunities.

In Michigan there are no longer participation requirements for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in state contracting, nor is such participation tracked for exclusively state-funded programs³⁵. Participation goals continue, however, and data collection is required for federally funded programs. In 2004 Disadvantaged Business Enterprises received 10.76% of Michigan Department of Transportation federally funded highway contracts overall. Women received 6.79% of federal contracts³⁶. According to the California Supreme Court, the federal government would have to threaten to revoke state funding for contracting in order for the state to be able to continue reaching out to women contractors. Should this standard be applied in Michigan, the impact on women-owned businesses could be severe³⁷.

Another apparent consequence of Prop. 209 has been a steep and rapid decline in women employed in the skilled trades. "While the number of construction jobs [in California] have increased since 1996 ...the percentage of women in the trades has dropped by a third³⁸." Nationally, however, the percentage of women in the trades has increased during those years.

Initially, Prop. 209 implementation efforts dealt with the elimination or amendment of state-level affirmative action programs, but subsequent legal challenges have targeted local and municipal programs as well. California courts have consistently construed the Proposition broadly, striking down not only those programs that were designed for women, or racial and ethnic minorities, or included participation goals, but also those that sought to remedy documented patterns of discrimination. In Michigan, the intended scope of the initiative is all functions and all levels of state and local government³⁹. Should the MCRI pass, and implementation proceed according to the intent of the amendment, the following kinds of programs could be vulnerable:

- Gender-specific community and public health programs, such as breast, cervical and prostate cancer screening, breastfeeding promotion, or prenatal smoking cessation.
- Domestic violence programs.
- Education outreach programs that take place using public facilities or funding and specifically target participants based on race, sex or ethnicity, including science, math or technology programs for girls.
- Summer and after-school programs for either boys or girls, like technology camp for girls.

- Recruitment and support programs for high school and community college students in career education programs that are nontraditional for their gender, such as men in nursing or women in skilled trades.
- Apprenticeship, education and training programs for non-traditional occupations.
- Higher education funding for minority health professionals, who, along with women, are more likely to practice in under-served communities.
- Outreach and funding for women and minority math, science and technology teachers.
- Review systems designed to monitor and address barriers to achieving full participation, such as discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, or disability.
- Government outreach programs that ensure that women- and minority-owned businesses have a fair chance to secure government contracts.
- Scholarships, fellowships and grants at all levels of education that take gender, race, ethnicity or national origin into account.
- Efforts to ensure adequate representation of women and minorities on boards and commissions, including advisory boards dealing with corrections, education and public health.⁴⁰

Although the passage of Prop. 209 has not yet resulted in challenges to single-sex athletic teams, community and school-based programs, if publicly supported, could be subject to the MCRI, depending upon interpretation by the courts.

The kinds of programs that have been lost or altered in California are still very important to women and families. Women have made significant gains in employment and education during the last thirty years, helped along by civil rights laws that forbid discrimination and require efforts to promote equal opportunity. Nonetheless, there are still many fields, often the best paying, where women have made only small inroads. The average woman working full time still earns less than the average man, which results in the loss of much-needed income for women and their families⁴¹. Additionally, women's life experiences can differ from men's in ways that constrain their educational and employment opportunities and cause them to need particular services from government, employers, or educational institutions more often than men do. Some of the barriers women face more often than men include:

- Being single parents,
- Being impoverished by divorce,
- Having primary responsibility for child care, elder care and home-making,
- Experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault or sexual harassment as obstacles to education and employment,
- Being involved in the welfare system, which supports only very limited education,
- Receiving lower wages, and
- Facing these barriers in addition to the impact of racial or ethnic discrimination.

Women in Michigan who work full time, year round earn \$.67 to every dollar earned by a comparably employed man, ranking Michigan 49th among the states for equality⁴². Because of the large Michigan wage gap, higher education is particularly important for women. With only a high school diploma, a Michigan woman working full-time, year-round earns \$25,400, while a man earns \$38,700. A college degree improves income for both men and women, though women continue to lag. While a man with a four-year college degree earns \$60,100, a woman earns \$42,000, only slightly more than a man without a college degree⁴³. National studies have found that even after adjusting for education, experience, job classification and union membership, there is a portion of the wage gap that can only be explained by sex discrimination⁴⁴.

Women's wages are critical not only for their own well-being, but for their families'. As men's wages have failed to keep pace with inflation in the last 35 years⁴⁵, families have come to rely on two incomes in order to reach or remain in the middle class⁴⁶. In fact, increases in real income for families since 1979 are primarily the result of women entering the workforce⁴⁷. In Michigan, the loss of manufacturing jobs is accelerating these trends.

Recent concern that women are out-stripping men in college enrollment "masks tremendous differences by academic level, age, race/ethnicity, and income⁴⁸." Among white, middle- or upper-class 18 to 24-year-olds, women and men are very close to parity; however, gender gaps among African-American, Native American and Hispanic students are large, particularly among low-income students⁴⁹. This results in an overall difference between women and men, which is largely the result of two factors: a large number of women who are over 25 and have returned to school (often to improve their earning potential), and low enrollment levels by African American and Hispanic men, particularly men of low socio-economic status. Men continue to earn more professional and doctoral degrees than women⁵⁰. Women's participation also varies greatly by field.

Despite advances in women's enrollment over all, Michigan ranked 36th in the nation in 2000 for the proportion of its female population with a four-year college degree or more⁵¹. While more Michigan women than the national average complete one to three years of college, fewer women than the national average complete four or more years. For many women, access to childcare and to services that take women's experiences into account is crucial to their ability to complete a degree⁵².

Women still lag significantly behind men in physical sciences, technology, engineering, mathematics and business degrees, particularly at advanced levels, and therefore in the jobs for which those degrees are required, as well as in the skilled trades and other heavily "male" jobs. "By 2010, one in four new jobs will be 'technically oriented,' or involve computing, however women fall far behind in earning computer technology degrees and working in computer technology related professions⁵³." Not only does that shortfall keep women from well-paying, high-demand careers with which they can support themselves and their families, but it also deprives the state and the nation of the brainpower and training so necessary to drive an information-based economy⁵⁴ and compete in

the global marketplace. "Current workforce projections indicate that unless more women and minority men are attracted to science, the United States will not have the trained personnel necessary to meet its needs⁵⁵." The difference in preparation for technology-based jobs between men and women is one cause of the large wage gap between men's and women's earnings in Michigan and a significant barrier to economic growth.

Evidence from California suggests that Prop. 209 has eroded access to services, education, job training, and other opportunities for women. There is ample evidence to support expectations that passage of the MCRI in Michigan would result in a similar pattern of lost services and restricted opportunities. Redevelopment of the Michigan economy from a manufacturing to a knowledge base will require a highly qualified and technologically educated workforce, in which women's talents and skills will be indispensable. Full access to opportunity strengthens not only women, but also their families, communities, and the state.

¹ "Mission Statement." (n.d.). Retrieved June 2004, from Michigan Civil Rights Initiative Web site: www.michigancivilrights.org.

² Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*

³ Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*

⁴ Michigan Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act. Act 453 of 1976 MCLA 37.2101 *et seq.*, M.S.A. 3.548(101) *et seq.*

⁵ Title IX of the Education Amendments Of 1972 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688. Title 20 – Education. CHAPTER 38 - Discrimination Based On Sex Or Blindness

⁶ State Constitution (Excerpt) Constitution Of Michigan Of 1963; Const. 1963, Art. I, § 2, Eff. Jan. 1, 1964

⁷ Executive Order 11246 of Sept. 24, 1965, appears at 30 FR 12319, 12935, 3 CFR, 1964-1965 Comp. p. 339

⁸ "Proposition 209," passed November 5, 1996, enacted, now embodied in the California Constitution, Article I, Section 31 13.41. Hereafter Prop. 209.

⁹ Women are considered to be underrepresented in particular fields, not in education overall. Compounded effects of gender, race and income also affect eligibility for particular programs. California Education Code 69560 *et seq.* The CAL-SOAP program was authorized to fund programs "designed to increase the accessibility of postsecondary educational opportunities to low-income and ethnic minority elementary and secondary school students". These programs included reading, math, science, SAT preparation, academic preparation and college outreach and information. CAL-SOAP now specifies "low-income, elementary and secondary school students or geographic regions with documented low-eligibility or college participation rates, and who are first in their families to attend college." California Education Code 8630 and 8631: The California Summer Science and Technology Academy was "developed and operated to identify public high school pupils with high academic potential in mathematics, science, and technology, with an emphasis on females and minority members, to participate in university-based research programs." Post Prop. 209, reference to females and minority members was removed from programs.

¹⁰ Proposition 209 clearly states that "The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting." This includes outreach programs that specifically target race, gender and ethnicity. The Early Academic Outreach Program, which includes summer school, after school and weekend classes targeted low-income and ethnically underrepresented students pre-209. Now targets "under-resourced communities." California Education Code 8630 and 8631: The California Summer Science and Technology Academy was "developed and operated to identify public high school pupils with high academic potential in mathematics, science, and technology, with an emphasis on females and minority members, to participate in university-based research programs." Post Prop. 209, reference to females and minority members was removed from programs.

¹¹ *Connerly v. State Personnel Board No. C032042*, Cal. Ct. App., 3rd Dist., 9/4/2001

¹² California Labor Code 1777.5 and 3075.1 governed affirmative action in apprenticeship programs. California Public Contract Code 10115-10115.15. Governor Wilson issued an executive order March 10, 1998 that ordered state agencies to "cease any enforcement of the minority and women business enterprise

participation goals and the good faith effort requirements related thereto under Public Contract Code §10115 et seq.” “In the absence of affirmative action programs and monitoring, employers have been left at best without direction or motivation to provide equal opportunity for tradeswomen. At worst, the vestiges of the male-dominated construction industry have returned. While federal affirmative action programs remain intact, some contractors returned to old practices of exclusion. Some employers believe and have told tradeswomen that because there is no more affirmative action, they no longer have to hire women.” “Proposition 209 and the Decline of Women in the Construction Trades.” The Discrimination Research Center and Equal Rights Advocates. June 2004.

¹³ California Health and Safety Code, Sections 128330-128370; 128375-128401; 128425-128450 now specify under-representation in profession as qualifying attribute. Formerly known as Minority Health Professionals Education Foundation, now Health Professions Education Foundation.

¹⁴ California Codes, Education Code Section 69640-69656. The Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) now specify “socioeconomic handicaps” and language, social, and economic disadvantages. Education Code §§ 87100, et seq. were found to violate Prop. 209 on 9/4/2001. This section governed the “steps that the district will take in eliminating improper discrimination or preferences in its hiring practices” (Section 87102. (a)); The Millennium Scholarship Program, established in 2000 at UC San Diego was cancelled because it was in violation of Prop 209. Schevitz, Tanya. “Audit Finds Campus Needs Extra \$1 Million to Pay for Violating Affirmative Action Ban.” *San Francisco Chronicle*. Tues. Sept. 11, 2001. Page A-3.

¹⁵ Percentage goals and outreach, known as “good faith efforts,” requirements in regard to women- and - minority owned businesses in the California Public Contract Code were found to violate the California Constitution, Article I, Section 31, known as Prop. 209: *Connerly v. State Personnel Board No. C032042*, Cal. Ct. App., 3rd Dist., 9/4/2001

¹⁶ After Prop. 209 passed, Governor Pete Wilson filed suit against five state agencies that maintained mandated affirmative action programs. Three were upheld, and two disallowed (women and minority owned business participation goals and bond service contracts). Ward Connerly filed an appeal (then Governor Gray Davis chose not to appeal), and in *Connerly v. State Personnel Board* the Court reversed the lower court decision, finding all five state agencies in violation of Prop. 209. The National Coalition of Free Men then filed suit against the State of California regarding more than 30 programs that target women based on this finding (*NCFM LA v. State of California*, pending hearing date).

¹⁷ *Blumhorst v. Jewish Family Services of Los Angeles* (challenging domestic violence shelters for women, suing shelters directly) and *Coalition of Free Men v. State of California* (challenging all programs targeted to women).

¹⁸ Fukuroda, Marci. “Men’s Groups Threaten Women’s Shelters Through Litigation” UCLA Women’s Center Newsletter, Spring 2004. <http://www.women.ucla.edu/Newsletter/Shelters.htm>

¹⁹ The Court initially found that funding for battered women’s shelters was protected under California Government Code 11139, and that the claimants lacked proper standing to file the suit. (October 2003) The Appellate Court declined to find on the merits of the case, and upheld the lack of standing of the claimants (filed 2/14/05). The claimant has indicated intent to re-file, and to expand the challenge to other areas. Additionally, though the suit was filed against 9 individual shelters, the challenge was based on the funding, which was specifically authorized for the provision of services to women and children by the State of California. The Claimant challenged the State to cease funding in a separate suit (*Coalition of Free Men v. The State of California*). The decision in *Connerly v. Personnel Board*, which stems from Prop 209, is cited as supporting the suit.

²⁰ California Government Code 11139, which states that “This article shall not be interpreted in a manner that would adversely affect lawful programs which benefit the disabled, the aged, minorities, and women.”

²³ “Mission Statement.” (n.d.). Retrieved June 2004, from Michigan Civil Rights Initiative Web site: www.michigancivilrights.org.

²⁴ On March 10, 1998 the Governor issued executive order W-172-98 that ordered that state agencies cease “all actions, programs, and regulations which seek to monitor, promote or comply with the minority or women business enterprise goals or the good faith efforts related thereto.” This governed the collection of data on employment and contracting in regards to gender, race or ethnicity. The order was upheld in *Barlow v. Davis*, 6/11/1999: Alameda County Super. Ct. No. 796308-9

²⁵ “Proposition 209 and the Decline of Women in the Construction Trades.” The Discrimination Research Center and Equal Rights Advocates. June 2004.

²⁶ “New Appointments of Ladder Rank Faculty at the University of California, Pre and Post Proposition 209.” Office of Academic Advancement; Office of the Provost, The University of California. December 2000; Greenwood, M.R.C. “Testimony to Senate Select Committee on Government Oversight.” University of California, Santa Cruz. <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/testimony.html>

²⁷ West, Martha S., Laky, Gyöngy, Lokke, Kari and U, Kyaw Tha Paw. “Unprecedented Urgency: Gender Discrimination in Faculty Hiring at the University of California,” 21. May 2005.

<http://www.law.ucdavis.edu/PDFs/unprecedented.pdf>

²⁸ Babco, Eleanor and Ellis, Richard. "Women in Science and Technology: the Sisyphean Challenge of Change" STEM Workforce Data Project: Report 2. Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology. 2004; Hudgings, Janice, Humphreys, Sheila and Hernan, Patrick. "A Six-Year Picture of Women Graduate Students in EECS," unpublished paper, UC Berkeley and Mount Holyoke, 1999.

<http://mtholyoke.edu/~jhudging/eecswomen.html>; American Association for University Women. "Tech Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age." 2000; "California's Future: It Starts Here--UC's Contributions to Economic Growth, Health, and Culture: An Impact Study for The University of California." Prepared by ICF Consulting. March 2003.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itstartshere/report/fullreport.pdf>; The California Council on Science and Technology. "Issues Impacting Baccalaureate Degrees in Science and Engineering." February 2002. www.ccst.us/ccst/pubs/cpa/download/CPA_4_CCST.pdf

²⁹ "University of California, University-wide New Appointments of Ladder Rank Faculty: 1984-85 through 2002-2003." Office of Academic Advancement; Office of the Provost, The University of California.

November 2003; "California's Future: It Starts Here--UC's Contributions to Economic Growth, Health, and Culture: An Impact Study for The University of California." Prepared by ICF Consulting. March 2003.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itstartshere/report/fullreport.pdf>

³⁰ In 2001 the California Assembly restored data collection after the Appellate Court found that all data collection did not violate either Prop. 209 or equal protection, (*Connerly v. Personnel Board*), a decision that was affirmed by Governor Schwarzenegger as recently as March 2004 in executive Order S-6-04. He stated that "under both state and federal law, state agencies have a responsibility to maintain statistical information on the composition of their workforce, and state agencies are required by federal law to identify racial, gender and ethnic under-representation in their workforce. I fully expect that all state agencies will comply with this responsibility and maintain meaningful information on the composition of the state workforce." Governor Schwarzenegger's veto of AB 227 <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/ga/vetoed2004.asp>

³¹ "Contra Costa County, which kept collecting data after its minority business program was terminated, reported more than a three-fold drop in minority- and women-owned business with the county between 1997 and 1999." Sun, Sep. 07, 2003, Barlow Guest Commentary. Leadership Council on Civil Rights.

<http://www.lccr.com/One%20race%20data%20ban%20had%20bad%20effects.htm>; Katz, Nancie L. "How Prop 209 Affects Claudia Ramsey's Shop" *The Christian Science Monitor*, Tue, Nov. 18, 97.

<http://www.search.csmonitor.com/durable/1007/11/18/us/us.5.html>; "Reaching for the Dream, Profiles In Affirmative Action: The Programs and the People Whose Lives they Changed." A project of The American Civil Liberties Union; Asian Pacific American Legal Center; California Women's Law Center and civil rights organizations. www.aclu-sc.org/News/Publications/

³² "Proposition 209 and the Decline of Women in the Construction Trades." The Discrimination Research Center and Equal Rights Advocates. June 2004; Katz, Nancie L. "How Prop 209 Affects Claudia Ramsey's Shop" *The Christian Science Monitor*, Tue, Nov. 18, 97. <http://www.search.csmonitor.com/durable/1007/11/18/us/us.5.html>; Parker, Beth A. "The Impact Of Proposition 209 On Education, Employment And Contracting Opportunities For Women In California", Equal Rights Advocates.

³³ Prop. 209 clause (Sec. 31(e))

³⁴ *Coral Construction, Inc. v. City & County of San Francisco* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 6 Feb. 24, 2004. No. A101842.

³⁵ Affirmative action programs and data collection were discontinued under Governor John Engler. Core, Harold. Telephone Interview. June 2, 2004.

³⁶ Day-La Bo, Jean. Telephone Interview. March 9, 2005; Previous data: "Transportation Facts and Figures, Finance." Michigan Department of Transportation. 2001; US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration: *Highway Statistics 2001, Obligation of Federal Funds Administered by the Federal Highway Administration During Fiscal Year 2001*, <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ohim/hso1/fa4b.htm>

³⁷ Sec 31(e) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as prohibiting action which must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the state; Dahlberg, Carrie Peyton. "SMUD Forges Ahead in Minority-bid Appeal" *The On-Line Division of the Sacramento Bee*. 10/27/03. <http://sacbee.com/content/news/story/11162478p-12078599c.html>

³⁸ "Proposition 209 and the Decline of Women in the Construction Trades." The Discrimination Research Center and Equal Rights Advocates. June 2004; Stoops, Nicole. "Current Population Reports: Educational Attainment in the United States: 2003". US Census Bureau

³⁹ "Mission Statement." (n.d.). Retrieved June 2004, from Michigan Civil Rights Initiative Web site: www.michigancivilrights.org.

⁴⁰ Michigan. "State Programs Impacting Women." Michigan Women's Commission. 12/2004

⁴¹ "The Status of Women in the States: Politics, Economics, Health, Rights and Demographics." November 2004. Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C.

⁴² "The Status of Women in Michigan: Politics, Economics, Health, Rights and Demographics." November 2004. Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C., Table 4.3.

⁴³ "Women's Education and Earnings in Michigan." Report of the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. January 2005, Figure 4.

-
- ⁴⁴ A 1989 report by the national Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences confirmed earlier research by the National Academy of Sciences in 1981 that found that one-half to one-fourth of the earning differential between men and women could not be explained by legitimate difference in education, training, experience and characteristics of jobs. Fay C.H.¹; Risher H.W.² "Contractors, Comparable Worth and the New OFCCP: Déjà Vu and More": Compensation & Benefits Review, October 2000, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 23-33(11); Levine, Linda. *The Gender Wage Gap and Pay Equity: Is Comparable Worth the Next Step?* Bethesda, MD: Congressional Research Service, 2003, Bernstein, Jared. "Slowdown in male earnings leads to smaller gender wage gap" Economic Snapshot: Economic Policy Institute. January 2005. http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/webfeaturessnapshots_20050105; "Explaining Trends in the Gender Wage Gap" Washington D.C: The Council of Economic Advisors, June 1998.
- ⁴⁵ Contractors, Comparable Worth and the New OFCCP: Déjà Vu and More": Compensation & Benefits Review, October 2000, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 23-33(11); Levine, Linda. *The Gender Wage Gap and Pay Equity: Is Comparable Worth the Next Step?* Bethesda, MD: Congressional Research Service, 2003
- ⁴⁶ "The Status of Women in Michigan: Politics, Economics, Health, Rights and Demographics." November 2004. Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C., Table 4.3.
- ⁴⁷ DeNavas-Walt, Carmen, Proctor, Bernadette D., Mills, Robert J. US Census Bureau. "Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2003." Current Population Reports: Consumer Income. Published August 2004. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p60-226.pdf>; "The Status of Women in Michigan: Politics, Economics, Health, Rights and Demographics." November 2004. Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C.
- ⁴⁸ "Women's Education and Earnings in Michigan." Report of the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. January 2005
- ⁴⁹ Freeman, Catherine E. "Trends in Educational Equity of Girls & Women: 2004." National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education. NCES 2005-016.
- ⁵⁰ U.S. Department of Education. The National Center for Education Statistics, *The Digest of Education Statistics: 2003; Chapter 3: Postsecondary Education* (Washington, D.C., 2004 <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2005025>
- ⁵¹ "Women's Education and Earnings in Michigan." Report of the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. January 2005
- ⁵² Kaufmann, Susan W. et al. "Michigan: a 'Smart State' for Women?" University of Michigan, Center for Education of Women. January 2000.
- ⁵³ American Association for University Women. "Tech Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age." 2000.
- ⁵⁴ "Newsletter: Gender and Technology" Anita Borg Institute for Women and Technology. 2004.
- ⁵⁵ Campbell, Patricia B. "Working Together, Making Change: Working in and out of School to Encourage Girls in Math and Science". Office of Educational Research and Improvement. US Department of Education; National Science Foundation. National Science Board. *The Science and Engineering Workforce: Realizing America's Potential*, Washington D.C. (NSB 03-69). www.nsf.gov/nsb/documents/2003/nsb0369/nsb0369.pdf