

FRENCH-AMERICAN FOUNDATION POLICY PROGRAM

Equality of Opportunity in Education and Employment: French and American Perspectives



French-American
Foundation

French-American Foundation Policy Program

Equality of Opportunity in Education and Employment: French and American Perspectives

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

→ Equality of Opportunity in Education and Employment: French and American Perspectives.....	1
→ Why this Issue? Why Now?	1
→ Concrete Initiatives and Next Action Steps	2

INAUGURAL PROGRAM SEMINAR

→ Framing the Debate	3
→ Panel Summaries	4
→ Key issues and Follow-up.....	7
→ Seminar Participants	9
→ Steering Committee	10

OTHER PROGRAM EVENTS 11

CONTACTS 11

Shanny L. Peer, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Programs
French-American Foundation

French-American Foundation Policy Program

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT: FRENCH AND AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES

In 2006, the French-American Foundation launched a major new social policy program on French and American strategies to reduce the impact of discrimination and promote greater opportunity for minority and immigrant populations. This program focuses particularly on education and employment, critical policy vehicles for social integration.

As with previous social policy programs, our goal is to engage key decision-makers

and opinion leaders on a pressing issue of common concern in France and the United States, as well as to produce a significant impact on public debates and policy in both countries.

In its first year this program has received major initial funding from the Ford Foundation, with support also provided by the Florence Gould Foundation. Additional financing is being sought for program initiatives in development.

WHY THIS ISSUE? WHY NOW?

France and the United States share a belief in equality for all citizens. Yet, despite efforts by both countries, equality of opportunity remains elusive for many minorities and immigrants. Recent events – including Hurricane Katrina in the United States in 2005, and the riots which broke out a few months later in largely immigrant metropolitan areas across France – have fueled national debates about how best to address entrenched inequalities and counter discrimination.

We believe there is now a window for policy innovation. In France, the recent creation of a new government agency, the Independent High Commission for Equality and Against Discrimination (HALDE), demonstrates the government's commitment to address ethnic-based social inequalities and discrimination. Key French business leaders have taken the lead by creating a Diversity Charter for French employers. On a wider scale, the European Union has ranked the right to equal treatment as one of its top priorities, making 2007 the "European Year of Equal Opportunities for

All," and has instructed member States to devise effective anti-discrimination policies. Conversely, in the United States, gains made since the beginning of the civil rights movement have been slowed down and in some cases reversed by a series of Supreme Court decisions and state ballot initiatives since the 1990s.

In this context, a French-American dialogue can inform new strategies under consideration. French decision-makers are debating the use of racial and ethnic statistics, banned under French law, and asking whether new affirmative action policies (*discrimination positive*) can be adapted to the "color-blind" French model. Meanwhile, some U.S. states are abandoning race-based strategies in favor of an area-based approach that resembles certain French policies. At a time of active policy debate and reform, and given the contrasting approaches to affirmative action, pro-diversity initiatives, and the use of racial and ethnic statistics, this is an opportune moment for French-American exchange on these topics.

PROGRAM INITIATIVES

The goals of this program are to facilitate a French-American dialogue about effective policy approaches in education and employment, inform public debates, and influence policy making through evidence-based research and informed recommendations.

The French-American Foundation has ensured program participation from representatives

at the highest level from civil rights organizations and government agencies (NAACP-LDF, American Civil Liberties Union, and Leadership Conference on Civil Rights in the U.S.; HALDE, National Institute for Demographic Studies, and Representative Council of Black Associations in France, among others) as well as specialized scholars and experts.

→ **CONCRETE INITIATIVES** of the “Equality of Opportunity” program so far include:

- **An inaugural two-day seminar** on “Equality of Opportunity: French and American Perspectives on Education and Employment” (November 13-14, 2006) with selected French and American scholars and policymakers. A detailed seminar summary is provided on page 3.
- **A public roundtable discussion** on “*Discrimination Positive?: French Debates about Affirmative Action*” (November 15, 2006)
- **A public discussion with Justin Vaïsse** about the new book he co-authored with Jonathan Laurence, *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France* (February 13, 2007)

→ **NEXT ACTION STEPS:**

- **A study tour and report on the “percentage plans”** introduced in state university systems in several U.S. states, including Texas and California, to increase student diversity. Similar plans – inspired by the American example - have been proposed by French policymakers, and our goal is to identify lessons learned from the U.S. experience which could inform the design of a French percentage plan
- **A U.S. study tour for a French delegation**, in partnership with the HALDE, to examine (1) the legal framework of anti-discrimination law in the U.S.; (2) the role of civil rights organizations in defending minority and immigrant rights; and (3) academic research on discrimination, and on anti-discrimination policies
- **The creation of a “toolkit”** (in French) about successful approaches used by American businesses to eliminate discrimination and increase employee diversity, for distribution to French employers and business organizations
- **A scholar-in-residence program** abroad for a legal scholar or civil rights litigator specializing in anti-discrimination law
- **An exchange for young leaders** of U.S. and French civil rights organizations and NGOs engaged in defending minority and immigrant rights
- **Special issue publications** in several peer-reviewed journals, including *French Politics, Culture, and Society*, and *Sociétés contemporaines*

INAUGURAL PROGRAM SEMINAR *November 13-14, 2006*

The Equality of Opportunity program was launched on November 13-14, 2006, with a roundtable discussion bringing French and American scholars together with a select group of policymakers to engage in an in-depth dialogue about discrimination, segregation, affirmative action and anti-discrimination policies, particularly in education and employment. The seminar was open only to invited participants and “observers” to ensure the highest level of dialogue among the gathered experts. The inaugural seminar also generated ideas for future program initiatives.

FRAMING THE DEBATE

Daniel Sabbagh’s opening remarks framed the debate for the two-day seminar by underlining key differences in the French and American legal contexts: “Whereas there is no provision in the U.S. Constitution as far as race is concerned, in France, Article 1 of the 1958 Constitution provides that ‘the Republic (...) ensures the equality of all citizens before the law, *without any distinction of origin, race or religion*’. In short, the French Constitution is indisputably color-blind. Not only race-based *discriminations* are prohibited—all race-based *distinctions* are. It is illegal to label, classify or count citizens by religion, race or national origin. Therefore, no public or private entity is allowed to collect such data, and no public policy may explicitly target subsets of the population defined by those forbidden criteria.”

Beyond this legal contrast, Daniel Sabbagh underlined another major discrepancy in public debates on equal opportunity and discrimination in France and the U.S.: “Whereas in the United States the notion of ‘race’ is still widely used, in France, the term has been rejected in both mainstream and scientific discourse: the delegitimization of racism has entailed the disqualification of ‘race’ as a descriptive category altogether.”

Daniel Sabbagh then explained the specific scheme of affirmative action policy in France. “French affirmative action programs cannot be explicitly race-based; they officially embody an area-based and class-based approach. In France, the case is often made that officially color-blind yet

arguably race-oriented measures may have the advantage of remaining faithful to the universalistic orientation of French public law while also avoiding the divisive effects that more explicit forms of designation would trigger. From a U.S.-centered point of view, however, because first- and second-generation immigrants are statistically concentrated in those areas targeted for preferential treatment, France’s purportedly color-blind affirmative action policies may be conceptualized as an indirect kind of race-oriented affirmative action.”

In his conclusion, Daniel Sabbagh wondered if the French and American approaches might, in fact, be converging. This convergence would lie “not only in the rhetoric employed to justify affirmative action policies – with French advocates of affirmative action borrowing the diversity argument from their American counterparts – but also in terms of the policies themselves, with the United States slowly moving toward a French-like model of formally ‘color-blind’ but arguably ‘race-oriented’ policies.” The higher education “percentage plans” would represent one example of this trend toward “color blindness” in the U.S.

He ended with a question: “Will the November 2005 riots in France prove conducive to the introduction of race-based affirmative action, through a process similar to what happened in the United States at the end of the sixties? Can such a process take place in France, too? Should one look forward to it?”

PANEL SUMMARIES

→ INTRODUCTORY PANEL

In the introductory panel, Owen Fiss analyzed the two principles which have driven the American civil rights experience. The first, antidiscrimination, is individualistic and seeks to make certain that individuals are treated fairly in a competitive process. Antisubordination, conversely, is structural rather than transactional, and its goal is to address social stratification rather than individual unfairness. Whereas theories of compensatory justice look to the past, the anti-subordination principle looks forward and seeks to eliminate an unjust structure that exists in the present. “For the law,” he concluded, “the issue is the justness of the social structure, not how it came into being.”

→ PANEL 1

Panel 1 considered the **“Categories for Discrimination and Antidiscrimination: Race, Class, Religion.”** In the United States, as in France, discriminatory behaviors are increasingly predicated upon a mix of factors, including race or ethnicity, nation of origin, class, gender, and – particularly in the French case – religion. Panelists in this first session explored the relationship between these grounds for discrimination in the two countries. They examined the interactions among various categories for discrimination: Kimberlé Crenshaw, for example, focused on what she calls the “intersectionality” of gender and race discrimination in the U.S. Valérie Amiraux examined whether the concept of religious discrimination is relevant in contemporary France, and underlined the difficulty of differentiating between religious and racial or ethnic discrimination regarding France’s Muslim population. The panelists also considered the extent to which one category may be substituted for another, whether in discourse (when “Muslim” or “immigrant” are used to designate Arab, for example) or in public policies which address discrimination indirectly through the use of a proxy. Eric Fassin discussed the use of class as a proxy for race in France, and race as a proxy for class in the U.S. Emmanuelle Saada introduced a historical perspective by exploring how current debates about racism in France often mistakenly assume there is a direct lineage between contemporary forms of racism toward the post-colonial immigrant population and the French colonial past.

→ PANEL 2

Panel 2 explored questions about **“The Measurement of Discrimination.”** Debates about the contemporary relevance of discrimination have been obscured by a lack of rigorous measurement techniques. In France, in particular, the absence of official statistics on race, ethnicity, and national origin creates additional challenges to assess either the impact of discrimination or the effects of equal opportunity policies. Panelists were invited to discuss the obstacles to developing more reliable measurements of discrimination, and examined different theoretical and statistical models for quantifying discrimination. Patrick Simon compared international approaches in discrimination analysis, and in the design of anti-discrimination legislation. Devah Pager discussed the dominant methods that have been applied by researchers to study discrimination, including studies of perception, attitude surveys, statistical analyses, laboratory experiments, and field experiments. In his presentation, Arnaud Lefranc explained how ethnic disadvantage is measured in the French labor market, particularly for second-generation migrants; he concluded that assessing the extent of discrimination in the French workplace requires more and better data than is currently available. Alfred Blumrosen described the large-scale study he conducted of employment discrimination in the United States (“REALITIES” report at www.eeo1.com). He suggested that the statistical methodology developed in that study could be applied in the French context, since it does not require the development of a national statistical database on race or ethnicity.

→ **PANEL 3**

The topic of Panel 3 was **“The Process of Employment Discrimination.”** Panelists were invited to discuss the heterogeneous nature of employment discrimination, and to draw analytical distinctions between direct (disparate treatment) and indirect (disparate impact) discrimination, intentional and unconscious discrimination. Linda Hamilton Krieger explained the social-cognition approach to understanding the processes of employment discrimination. This approach distinguishes between deliberate discrimination and unintentional discrimination resulting from unconscious cognitive processes including categorization, in-group favoritism, and intergroup bias. Krieger concluded that “laws may be color-blind, but people generally are not,” which makes “color blindness” ineffectual as a normative anchor for equal opportunity law and policy. Frederick Schauer explored anti-discrimination norms and rules in employment decisions. He noted that if some characteristic is viewed as predictive, even imperfectly, of job performance, employers sometimes use attributes such as gender or race as proxies for qualifications they seek in an employee. The problem lies in the nefarious effects of using race as a proxy, and not in the use of proxies in general. Eric Cédiey described the experimental testing methodology called “situational testing” applied by the International Labour Office (ILO) to measure the real life behavior of recruiters throughout the hiring process; he participated in a recent ILO situational testing experiment done in France (results at www.ismcorum.org). Roxane Silberman presented results from a statistical analysis which suggests that second-generation French immigrants from North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa are suffering levels of employment discrimination similar to those they faced in the 1980s.

→ **PANEL 4**

Panel 4 focused on **“Segregation, Education, and Institutions.”** This panel addressed the question of social and racial segregation by focusing on the interactions between residency and local institutions, particularly educational ones. Panelists examined urban and school policies, institutional strategies, and considered the impact of residential and school segregation on educational success and social mobility. Georges Felouzis described a study he conducted to determine the extent and impact of ethnic segregation among middle schools in the city of Bordeaux. Because there are no statistics on race and ethnicity in France, no such systematic descriptive study had previously been done, and his study used students’ first names as an indicator of their possible immigrant origin. Results of the study showed sharply unequal distribution of students of immigrant origin, and pointed to a strong correlation between the degree of concentration of such students and weak scholastic performance. In his presentation, Franck Poupeau explored why the *“carte scolaire”* (French school zoning system) is under attack. Opponents claim that this system solidifies socio-economic segregation, primarily because of the relationship between residency and schooling, but Poupeau argues that dismantling it will not necessarily lead to a broader choice of schools for families, and may in fact accentuate school segregation. Dalton Conley examined different explanations given for the persistent racial inequality in the United States during the post-civil rights era. He asserted: “It’s class – family resources – not race that matters” for high school and college completion, welfare usage, and teenage childbearing, for instance. “It’s not that race doesn’t matter” he argued, “it’s just that race works through family wealth levels, creating an intergenerational cycle of inequality.”

→ PANEL 5

Panel 5 assessed **“Color-blind’ Alternatives to Affirmative Action in Higher Education.”** In recent years several U.S. states have partly or entirely replaced race-based affirmative action policies with other admissions policies in higher education, such as officially color-blind “percentage plans.” Meanwhile, in France, several experimental programs are underway to open higher education to underrepresented groups, without referring explicitly to students’ race or ethnicity. Panelists compared these approaches to more traditional affirmative action policies, and considered their relative advantages and disadvantages in terms of ethnic mix, educational effectiveness, equity and social justice, as well as political legitimacy. The first panelist, Gary Lavergne, described the “Texas 10% plan” which was introduced in the state’s University of Texas system in 1997 after the abolishment of race-based admissions procedures. He said it is difficult to conclude whether the system “works” or not as a replacement for affirmative action, because “it all depends on the policy you want to achieve,” whether it be more minority students, greater socio-economic diversity, or broader geographic representation, for example. On the other hand, Glenn Loury provided an economic analysis of color-blind admissions policies in higher education, arguing that such policies lead colleges to shift weight from academic traits that predict performance to social traits that proxy for race. Loury estimates the efficiency cost of “blind” versus “sighted” affirmative action is comparable to the cost colleges would incur if they were to ignore standardized test scores in making admissions decisions. Agnès Van Zanten described some of the experimental programs designed to increase socio-economic diversity among students entering the elite French *grandes écoles*; these include the Institut d’Etudes Politiques program which recruits students from high schools in certain priority education zones outside of Paris, and the one-on-one tutoring program introduced by the ESSEC (*Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Economiques et Commerciales*). Patrick Weil argued for the creation of a “percentage plan” in France, similar to the Texas plan, which would grant students finishing in the top 5% or 6% of their high school graduating class admission to a *classe préparatoire* intended to prepare them for entry to a *grande école*.

→ PANEL 6

Panel 6 concluded the seminar with **“Policy Perspectives on Affirmative Action in France and the United States.”** In her introductory remarks, Alison Bernstein highlighted the unprecedented comparative approach of this seminar, bringing together scholars and policy makers from both countries to examine policy initiatives to combat ethnic inequality and social exclusion. She underscored the importance of social justice for the Ford Foundation, which has supported affirmative action policies. This panel raised numerous questions: how do anti-discrimination policies differ across national contexts? What can be learned from several decades of affirmative action in the United States, and how can these lessons be adapted to France? What works, what doesn’t, what should be attempted in the future?

The first panelist, Theodore Shaw, hailed the achievements of the civil rights movement and affirmative action policies, which have ensured greater equality of opportunity for racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. However, he stressed that race is still an issue in the United States, and that there is still a long way to go before attaining racial equality, especially now that affirmative action policies are under attack, and sometimes even abandoned, as they have been in California, Michigan, Washington State and Texas. Theodore Shaw explained how affirmative action opponents distorted the reasoning behind this concept, and how courts now use the pretext of “color blindness” to rule out race-based policies and programs in the educational system. Theodore Shaw and Julie Fernandes recalled that such decisions have been adopted by referenda, and emphasized the importance of engaging public opinion on these issues. For Julie Fernandes, social activism and grassroots movements are key to promoting greater equality. The mobilization of public opinion through proper information is therefore crucial. In her conclusion, Julie Fernandes deplored that programs in favor of ethnic and racial minorities are often dropped once they are successful.

>>>



PANEL 6

>>>

For Claude-Valentin Marie, the creation in 2005 of a new government agency, the Independent High Commission for Equality and Against Discrimination (HALDE, at www.halde.fr), demonstrates a growing awareness of ethnic-based social inequalities and discrimination issues in France. He explained that initially the HALDE has emphasized the legal aspect of its mission: “In France, anti-discrimination legislation is in its infancy, and we still have to build the tools to treat legal cases appropriately.” On the other hand, Louis-Georges Tin expressed reservations about this legalistic approach to discrimination. In his opinion, lawsuits are only a reaction to discriminatory behaviors. Louis-Georges Tin called for a proactive integration policy from the French authorities, especially the HALDE. On the same topic, Claude-Valentin Marie underscored that the youth who are asking for integration are, in many cases, already French citizens, born in France to parents who emigrated from former French colonies. He underlined that the French national community has never been homogeneous, and that it may be time to redefine the concept of community. On this note, Louis-Georges Tin criticized the color-blind French notion of “universalism,” which ignores minorities and thereby denies their existence. With the creation of the Representative Council of Black Associations (CRAN), the French Black community came into the public eye and dispelled the taboo on the word “Black”, which is still rarely used publicly. Tin supports the use of racial and ethnic statistics (since the seminar, the CRAN has published a poll on discrimination experienced by Blacks in France; see www.lecran.org), arguing they are merely a tool to measure discrimination. Claude-Valentin Marie acknowledged that statistics can be useful for capturing social realities and devising legal strategies or affirmative action type policies. However, he remained extremely cautious about the collection and use of ethnic statistics by employers. In his view, statistics should only be kept under the aegis of an institution such as the National Commission for Information Technology and Civil Liberties (CNIL).

KEY ISSUES AND FOLLOW-UP

Some of the key issues that emerged over two days of discussion and debate, and the related follow-up steps in development (contingent on program funding), include:

- **Use of racial and ethnic statistics.** There was general agreement among the American seminar participants about the necessity and value of using statistical data to measure discrimination and social inequities tied to race, as well as to assess the impact of interventions designed to reduce the effects of discrimination and promote social equity. As Owen Fiss observed, “If we didn’t have these statistics, we would not have been able to measure the growth of a black middle class in the U.S. over the past fifty years.” However, there is still considerable debate in France about whether and how to introduce the use of racial and ethnic statistics, and French seminar participants expressed a range of opinions on this question. **Follow-up:** *French Politics, Culture and Society* will publish a special issue on the controversy over the collection of statistical data on race and ethnicity in France, with articles contributed by several French seminar participants.
- Another question focused on the potential **convergence of French and American approaches towards the use of “color-blind” policies** aimed at achieving more equity, or more diversity, without referring explicitly to race (often using proxies such as geography or social class), particularly in higher education admissions policies. **Follow-up # 1)** The design and impact of color-blind admissions policies in higher education in France and the U.S. will be examined in a special issue of *Sociétés contemporaines*, to be edited by Daniel Sabbagh and Agnès Van Zanten, members of the FAF Equality of Opportunity steering committee. **Follow-up # 2)** The French-American Foundation will conduct a study tour and publish a report on the “percentage plans” introduced in higher education in some U.S. states, including Texas,

Florida, California, and Washington State, with a view to informing the design of a similar plan under consideration in France.

- Some panelists, notably Claude-Valentin Marie, remarked on the **sophistication of American anti-discrimination law and the diversity of American scholarly approaches to understanding discrimination**, including the sociological, social-psychological and economic approaches illustrated by some of the seminar presentations. Claude-Valentin Marie underlined that the French and European legal frameworks against discrimination are still being developed, and said the French approach needs to move beyond a strictly legal perspective to incorporate a more broadly social point of view. **Follow-up # 1)** The French-American Foundation has proposed to organize a study tour for a French delegation, in partnership with the HALDE, which would focus on (1) the framework of anti-discrimination law in the U.S.; (2) the role of civil rights organizations and other NGOs in defending minority and immigrant rights; and (3) academic research on discrimination and anti-discrimination efforts studied from various disciplinary perspectives. **Follow-up # 2)** The French-American Foundation will commission an article on an area of scholarly research that is virtually absent from French debates on discrimination, i.e. the social cognition approach to discrimination, for publication in France. The article will be coupled with a two-month scholar-in-residence program for the author, an American legal scholar, to offer seminars to a targeted audience in France.
- Seminar discussions emphasized the **importance of context, and particularly legal context, to address discrimination and devise effective interventions**. One topic discussed was the transferability of instruments from one national context to another. Seminar participants also expressed an interest in understanding which approaches and policies are cross-cutting, and in developing a common vocabulary to discuss issues related to discrimination and anti-discrimination policies. This would require attention to the context – political, legal, social, cultural – as it defines the issues and imposes limits on the ability to define a common vocabulary. **Follow-up:** see HALDE study tour and scholar-in-residence program described above.
- Several seminar participants emphasized the **crucial role played by NGOs in combating discrimination and promoting minority rights**. Valérie Amiraux suggested that French NGOs and advocacy organizations could benefit from learning about different legal strategies used by American organizations which they could pursue to defend, for example, minority rights. **Possible follow-up:** create a forum for exchange among young leaders of French and American NGOs involved in discrimination and anti-discrimination efforts, civil rights, minority rights, grass-roots advocacy, and related issues.
- Several participants underlined the importance of, in Jackie Berrien’s words, **“telling the story of the successes of affirmative action.”** If these successes are not told, they are obscured. Participants also emphasized the positive role the media can play in educating the public and dispelling myths. This applies to the U.S. as well as to France, since some of what Kimberlé Crenshaw referred to as the “myths about affirmative action” appear to have found fertile ground in France as well. **Possible follow-up:** Publish a series of articles on the affirmative action experience in the U.S. by different contributing authors in a prominent French newspaper or magazine.
- Several seminar participants suggested **sharing the research that has already been done on discrimination, anti-discrimination, the use of statistical data, affirmative action policies, and diversity initiatives** in France and the United States. **Possible follow-up:** publicize some of this information on our website.

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

→ **INTRODUCTORY PANEL**

- **Shanny L. Peer**, Director of Policy Programs, French-American Foundation
- **Daniel Sabbagh**, Senior Research Fellow, Center for International Research and Studies (*Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques*)
- **Owen Fiss**, Sterling Professor of Law, Yale Law School

→ **PANEL 1: Identifying the Categories for Discrimination and Antidiscrimination: Race, Class, Religion**

- **Ann Morning**, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, New York University (chair)
- **Kimberlé Crenshaw**, Professor of Law, UCLA Law School and Columbia School of Law
- **Éric Fassin**, Sociologist, École Normale Supérieure
- **Emmanuelle Saada**, Associate Professor, Columbia University Center for French and Francophone Studies and École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales
- **Valérie Amiraux**, CNRS, Marie Curie Fellow, Robert Schuman Center for Advanced Studies, European University Institute

→ **PANEL 2: The Measurement of Discrimination**

- **Dennis Parker**, Director of the Racial Justice Program, American Civil Liberties Union (chair)
- **Arnaud Lefranc**, Economist, Université de Cergy-Pontoise and Robert Schuman Center for Advanced Studies, European University Institute
- **Devah Pager**, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Princeton University
- **Patrick Simon**, Research Fellow, Institut National d'Études Démographiques
- **Alfred Blumrosen**, Thomas Cowan Professor of Law Emeritus, Rutgers University

→ **PANEL 3: The Process of Employment Discrimination**

- **Susan P. Sturm**, George M. Jaffin Professor of Law and Social Responsibility, Columbia University School of Law (chair)
- **Linda Hamilton Krieger**, Professor of Law, University of California at Berkeley, Boalt Hall School of Law
- **Frederick Schauer**, Frank Stanton Professor of the First Amendment, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- **Roxane Silberman**, Senior Research Fellow, CNRS (Centre Maurice Halbwachs)
- **Éric Cediey**, Political Scientist, Centre d'Observation et Recherche sur l'Urbain et ses Mutations (CORUM)

→ **PANEL 4: Segregation, Education, and Institutions**

- **Wayne Meisel**, President of the Bonner Foundation (chair)
- **Dalton Conley**, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center for Advanced Social Science Research, New York University
- **Georges Felouzis**, Professor of Sociology, Université Victor-Segalen, Bordeaux II
- **Franck Poupeau**, Research Fellow, Centre de Sociologie Européenne

→ **PANEL 5: Assessing “Color-blind” Alternatives to Affirmative Action in Higher Education**

- **Joël Vallat**, Principal of the Lycée Louis-le-Grand (chair)
- **Gary Lavergne**, Director of Admissions Research and Policy Analysis, Office of Admissions, University of Texas at Austin
- **Agnès Van Zanten**, Senior Research Fellow, CNRS (Observatoire Sociologique du Changement – Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris)
- **Patrick Weil**, Senior Research Fellow, CNRS (Centre d’Histoire Sociale du XXe Siècle – Université Paris I)
- **Glenn Loury**, Merton P. Stoltz Professor of the Social Sciences, Brown University

→ **PANEL 6: Policy Perspectives on Affirmative Action in France and the United States**

- **Alison Bernstein**, Vice President, Knowledge, Creativity, & Freedom Program, The Ford Foundation (chair)
- **Theodore M. Shaw**, Director-Counsel and President of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF)
- **Julie Fernandes**, Senior Policy Analyst and Special Counsel, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
- **Claude-Valentin Marie**, Vice-President of the Haute Autorité de Lutte Contre les Discriminations et pour l’Égalité (HALDE)
- **Louis-Georges Tin**, Associate Professor, University of Orléans; spokesperson for the Conseil Représentatif des Associations Noires
- **Jacqueline Berrien**, Deputy Director-Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF)

→ **SEMINAR STEERING COMMITTEE:**

- **Devah Pager**, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Princeton University
- **Shanny L. Peer**, Director of Policy Programs, French-American Foundation
- **Daniel Sabbagh**, Senior Research Fellow, Center for International Research and Studies (*Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques*)
- **Agnès Van Zanten**, Senior Research Fellow, CNRS (Observatoire Sociologique du Changement – Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris)

OTHER PROGRAM EVENTS SPONSORED BY THE FRENCH-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

→ **NOVEMBER 15, 2006**

In a public roundtable discussion on “*Discrimination Positive?: French Debates About Affirmative Action*,” held at NYU’s Maison Française (with the Maison Française and Institute of French Studies as co-sponsors), panelists discussed approaches to combating discrimination and promoting greater equality within French society, especially for minorities and immigrants, and considered whether affirmative action policies can be an appropriate – and effective – remedy in the French context.

The panelists were:

- **Kimberlé Crenshaw**, Professor of law, UCLA Law School and Columbia School of Law, editor of *Critical Race Theory* (New York, Free Press, 1995) and Executive Director of the African American Policy Forum
- **Joël Vallat**, Principal of the Lycée Louis-le-Grand and President of the *Association des proviseurs de lycées à classes préparatoires aux grandes écoles*
- **Patrick Weil**, Senior Research Fellow, CNRS; author of *La République et sa diversité: immigration, intégration, discriminations* (Paris, Le Seuil, 2005)
- **Daniel Sabbagh**, Senior Research Fellow, Center for International Research and Studies, author of *L’Egalité par le droit: les paradoxes de la discrimination positive aux Etats-Unis* (Paris, Economica, 2003)

→ **FEBRUARY 12, 2007**

Justin Vaïsse discussed his new book, co-authored with Jonathan Laurence, entitled *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France* (Brookings Institution Press, 2006) in a talk at the Harvard Club.

→ **PROGRAM INITIATIVES IN DEVELOPMENT for 2007-2009**

As outlined on pages 7 to 8, the program will continue for several years and involve research, publications, exchanges, a scholarship-in-residence program and study tours.

CONTACTS

Shanny L. Peer, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Programs
The French-American Foundation
212.829.8800 x12
speer@frenchamerican.org

Margaret Bensfield
The Rosen Group
212.255.8455 x214
margaret@rosengrouppr.com

→ **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** on this program and the inaugural seminar can be found on our web site at www.frenchamerican.org

Statement of Purpose

The French-American Foundation is the principal non-government link between France and the United States at leadership levels and across the full range of the French-American relationship.

The purpose of the French-American Foundation is to strengthen the French-American relationship as a vital component of the trans-Atlantic partnership.

Founded in 1976, the French-American Foundation is also committed to ensuring that the French-American relationship should be vivid and relevant for the new generations that have come of age since the end of the Cold War.

The French-American Foundation is an independent, non-partisan, not-for-profit qualifying tax-exempt organization as described in section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Code. Funding of the French-American Foundation is derived from the generosity of its individual and institutional donors, as well as from the personal, corporate and foundation support dedicated to financing the French-American Foundation's portfolio of programs.

The French-American Foundation is not a grant-making foundation itself, although it does offer a selected number of prizes and awards in pursuit of its core purpose.

French-American
Foundation

28 West 44th Street
Suite 1420
New York, NY 10036

Tel: (212) 829-8800
www.frenchamerican.org