

Shift in Admissions Practices Triggered by Affirmative Action Ruling



In a landmark decision [issued in June](#), the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled to prohibit the practice of race-conscious admissions in higher education. This ruling is expected to bring about significant changes in the admissions practices of law schools, urging them to shift away from relying solely on standardized test scores, such as the LSAT, and adopt a more comprehensive approach in evaluating applicants.

The decision by the Supreme Court holds implications for educational institutions across the nation. The ruling stemmed from cases involving Harvard University and the University of North Carolina, where admissions policies that considered an applicant's race were deemed to be in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution. While applicants are still permitted to discuss their racial background in personal statements, educational institutions are now prohibited from making admissions decisions based explicitly on race.

This shift is expected to prompt law schools to reassess their admissions criteria. John Sailer, a fellow at the National Association of Scholars, predicts that many institutions will veer away from strict objective standards and seek alternative methods to achieve diversity while remaining compliant with the new ruling. Already, some schools have started exploring creative solutions to maintain a diverse student body.

See also: [Stephen Miller Cautions Schools of Lawsuit Risks for Disregarding Supreme Court's Affirmative Action Ruling](#)

Law schools, particularly those in states that previously relied on race-conscious admissions, now face the challenge of redefining their approach. California and Michigan law schools, for instance, have long been barred from using race as a factor in admissions. Schools in other states must swiftly adapt to the changing landscape or potentially face legal actions.

Knowledge is power, and knowing your earning potential is no exception. Check out [LawCrossing's salary surveys](#) to gain valuable insights.

Law school leaders emphasize the need for a more holistic evaluation process to mitigate the potential loss of diversity. This approach involves taking into account an applicant's life experiences, background, and potential to contribute to the academic community. Timothy Lynch, Vice President and General Counsel for the University of Michigan, acknowledges that the Supreme Court's decision presents a heightened challenge but believes that institutions can navigate this complex terrain with dedication.

The Law School Admission Council (LSAC), responsible for administering the LSAT, suggests that schools can utilize questions already present in their standard applications. These questions cover aspects like first-generation college attendance, participation in pre-law programs for underrepresented individuals, and eligibility for Pell Grants.

However, there are concerns that some institutions might attempt to find alternative means to achieve discriminatory outcomes. Critics, including Stephen Miller, President of America First Legal and former adviser to President Donald Trump, have issued warnings to law schools against devising admissions strategies that circumvent the Supreme Court's ruling. Miller has made it clear that any attempts to subvert the ruling through pretext or proxy will lead to legal action.

Don't waste time searching for legal updates. Subscribe to JDJournal and get the latest news conveniently in one place.

Miller's organization, America First Legal, has conveyed a strong message to law schools, urging them to unequivocally terminate all forms of preferential treatment based on race, national origin, or sex. They have called for transparency and the implementation of policies that ensure fairness and equal opportunity.

Don't be a silent ninja! Let us know your thoughts in the comment section below.