Message from Bill Howard, General Counsel

Access, completion and success are three key goals of SUNY’s mission to serve students. And it all starts with access. Although we like to think that there is at least one good place among SUNY’s 64 campuses for every qualified New Yorker who wishes to engage in higher education, it is certainly true that not every aspiring student can have a place at each of the institutions. Thus, at least since Bakke v. University of California Board of Regents in 1978, and on to Grutter and Gratz v. University of Michigan in 2003, who gets in to certain institutions and what criteria are used for admissions purposes have been questions of supreme importance here at SUNY as across the country. This special edition of the General Counsel Update is intended to bring you the latest news and advice on this topic, in light of the Supreme Court’s most recent foray into affirmative action in higher education admissions, its decision in the case of Fisher v. University of Texas while also highlighting two other important decisions.

The analysis here is only a first step, and the Office of General Counsel will continue to monitor these cases and provide guidance to you, our clients. Please reach out to campus counsel as your campus reviews its admissions programs in light of the Fisher decision.

Fisher v. Texas

The Supreme Court’s opinion in Fisher v. Texas vacates a decision of an appeals court and sends the case back for additional process. The Court restated that diversity can be a compelling factor, but clarified that how a college achieves diversity is subject to strict scrutiny.

Vance v. Ball State University

In Vance v. Ball State University, the Supreme Court affirmed a decision limiting who is considered a supervisor for employment law cases.

University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar

In University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar, the Supreme Court discusses retaliation in the context of employment law. SUNY policy prohibits retaliation.
In Brief: A History of Affirmative Action in Admissions at the Supreme Court

Fisher is only the latest in a string of Supreme Court cases that have shifted college and university options in building a diverse student body. Click any case to read a short history.

- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke
- Hopwood v. Texas
- Grutter v. Bollinger
- Gratz v. Bollinger
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin

Spotlight: Concurring and Dissenting Opinions

Although concurring and dissenting opinions are not binding, they can reveal a Justice’s alternative opinion. This section analyzes the opinions of Justices Scalia, Thomas, and Ginsburg.
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What the Fisher Decision Means for SUNY

In Fisher, the Supreme Court restated the need for a strict review both of the determination of a college that a diverse class is important (though such a review is deferential to the institution) as well as the methods the institution uses to achieve that goal. Click here to learn more about the decision’s meaning for SUNY.

Spotlight: Reviewing SUNY Admissions Practices

Each SUNY Office of Admissions should undertake a review of its policies and procedures, as well as their effectiveness, in building a diverse student body. This article discusses factors that offices should consider in that review.

What the Vance Decision Means for SUNY

The decision in Vance clarifies who is a supervisor for the purposes of discrimination complaints. The Supreme Court has laid out different standards for complaints of discrimination by supervisors and by co-workers, and today’s decision is important in illustrating which employees fit into the role of supervisor. To learn more about the decision’s meaning for SUNY, click here.

Spotlight: Undergrad Admissions

This article discusses the impact of the case on undergrad admissions.

What the Nassar Decision Means for SUNY

The decision in Nassar may make it more difficult for plaintiffs to prove allegations of retaliation. That being said, the case also reaffirms the importance of ensuring that alleging discrimination does not affect terms and conditions of employment for the complainant. To learn more about the decision’s meaning for SUNY, click here.

Spotlight: Graduate Admissions

This article discusses the impact of the case on graduate admissions.

Office of General Counsel Legal ListSrvs: Join the Clery Act, Title IX, or FOIL ListSrvs or Compliance ListSrv

General Counsel Update is issued quarterly by the SUNY Office of General Counsel and is sent to a broad array of SUNY System and Campus leadership and professionals who work with Counsel’s Office. If you would like to be added to the distribution list, or have any other questions about General Counsel Update, please contact Associate Counsel Joseph Storch at joseph.storch@suny.edu. Learn more about our office at http://www.suny.edu/counsel/index.cfm.

The Office of General Counsel provides comprehensive legal services to support one of the United States’ leading state systems for higher education. We protect and defend the University’s legal interests, providing legal advice to the Board of Trustees, System Administration, the State University’s campuses, and other components of SUNY. We track legal developments, issue legal guidance to campus professionals and provide training on understanding and complying with legal requirements.

The articles above and related links are for informational purposes only and do not represent legal advice. The SUNY Office of General Counsel cannot provide legal advice to students or employees of the State University of New York on personal matters.