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QUESTIONNAIRE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EMPLOYMENT EQUITY INCLUDING COVERING LETTER

April 2002

Dear Fellow Academic

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (AA) AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY (EE) IN HIGHER EDUCATION

I am a doctoral student at the University of Pretoria, and I am engaged in a study entitled “A Study of Affirmative Action and Employment Equity in Higher Education Institutions in Kwa Zulu-Natal”. The issue of Affirmative Action and Employment Equity, especially in Higher Education, continues to be a contentious one and very little research has been conducted in this area in South Africa to identify why this is so.

I humbly appeal to you for your co-operation in this research study. Your responses to the attached questionnaire will be of considerable benefit in addressing the concerns around Affirmative Action and Employment Equity and will contribute towards my making recommendations to the authorities concerned. This will be based on the invaluable data supplied by you that will be collated and analysed in a systematic and scientific manner.

The information that you provide will contribute to my deriving valuable insights into the attitudes towards and perceptions of practice and procedures related to Affirmative Action (AA) as a means of achieving Employment Equity (EE) in Higher Education Institutions. Further, insights into the conditions for achieving EE and the constraints, problems and challenges facing it are expected to emerge as well. Such findings in turn could contribute towards the development of effective programmes, programme management and policies designed to meet the needs and expectations of academic staff and managers in institutions of Higher Education.

Your institution/department has been identified in KwaZulu-Natal to participate in this study. I would appreciate it if you could kindly respond to the enclosed questionnaire, honestly and frankly.

Be assured that your responses will be STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. Since only GROUP results will be reported, reference will not be made to responses by individuals or individual institutions. Your answers will remain ANONYMOUS. However, should you wish to speak to me confidentially about the project, feel free to call me at (031) 2091231.
I understand that time is a precious commodity for Academics in Higher Education Institutions. Given the tight time frame I have for the completion of this study I make a humble appeal to you to complete this questionnaire within a week of receipt of the document. PLEASE SEAL ALL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES IN RETURN ENVELOPES PROVIDED AND SEND IT TO THE REGISTRY/INTERNAL MAIL OFFICE AT YOUR INSTITUTION.

I thank you for your assistance and assure you that the results of this study will be made available to you through your library.

P G PADAYACHEE
RESEARCHER

NB:

1. The 5 pages of the questionnaire are printed back to back.

2. If the space is not enough where written answers are required feel free to write on sheets of paper. Attach these and ensure that you write down the correct number of the question.

3. The following abbreviations are used:

   AA = Affirmative Action
   EE = Employment Equity

4. The ‘designated group’ are those who were previously disadvantaged during the apartheid regime and who are generally chosen as AA beneficiaries.

5. The purpose of using the former government's racial classification of 'African', 'Indian', 'Coloured' and 'White' is to monitor changes and effectiveness of AA/EE measures rather than to single out or distinguish between the groups for discriminatory purposes.

6. PERMISSION HAS BEEN GRANTED BY YOUR INSTITUTION TO CONDUCT THE SURVEY AMONG THE ACADEMIC STAFF.
QUESTIONNAIRE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (AA) AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY (EE)

TO BE ANSWERED BY PERMANENT ACADEMIC STAFF ONLY

PLACE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX OF YOUR CHOICE

SECTION A:

1. What position do you hold at the institution?
   Dean | HOD | Senior lecturer | Lecturer/Associate lecturer | Other (Specify)

2. Gender
   Male | Female

3. Race
   African | Indian | Coloured | White | Other. (Specify)

4. Highest Qualification
   Diploma | Degree | Postgraduate degree | Master's degree | PhD | Other. (Specify)

5. In your opinion which race/s and/or others should comprise the designated group (previously disadvantaged group) in Affirmative Action/Employment Equity programmes for South African institutions of Higher Education?

SECTION B:

6. Place a cross (X) in the appropriate box of your choice.
   To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   6.1 AA and 'reverse discrimination' mean the same thing
   6.2 AA and 'tokenism' mean the same thing
   6.3 AA and 'entitlement' mean the same thing
   6.4 'Equality of opportunity' and 'Equity' mean the same in the context of AA/EE
   6.5 'Degrees of disadvantage' should be taken into account when providing opportunities for the designated group
   6.6 AA/EE efforts should be based on potential to succeed rather than academic merit alone
6.7 A rigid 'quota' system is the only method of ensuring the appointment of persons from the designated group

6.8 Goals and timetables are more acceptable methods of ensuring progress in AA/EE efforts

SECTION C:

7. How well informed are you about the Employment Equity Act (1998)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Not at all informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.1 Does your institution have an Affirmative Action (AA)/Employment Equity (EE) policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Did your institution disseminate information about its AA/EE policy to the academic staff of your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8.1 If yes, how did your institution go about disseminating such information about the AA/EE policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoranda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate/ Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D:

9. Place a cross (X) in the appropriate box of your choice

To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.1 Are you satisfied with the success of the AA/EE policy?</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 9.2 Are you satisfied with the communication about your institution's AA/EE efforts | |
| 9.3 Are you satisfied with the manner in which your institution implements AA/EE | |
9.4 Do you believe that AA/EE efforts promote a system of new inequalities at your institution

SECTION E:

10. Has your institution made provisions for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>A coherent staff development/mentoring programme for the designated groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>A written and communicated AA/EE plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Appropriate procedure to monitor and evaluate progress of the AA/EE plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Equity surveys amongst staff to determine staff perceptions, level of awareness etc., of AA/EE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Dissemination of progress reports on AA/EE efforts at your institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Appropriate grievance procedures related to the AA/EE plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Does your institution have appointed AA/EE Officer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>If NO, who fulfils the task of the AA/EE Officer at your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Is the AA/EE Officer/Person(s) indicated in Question 11.1 allocated a special office?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Is the power and autonomy vested in the AA/EE Officer/Person(s) indicated in Question 11.1 adequate to make important decisions on his/her own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Has the appointment of the AA/EE Officer/Person(s) indicated in Question 11.1 been helpful in achieving AA/EE objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.4.1</td>
<td>If YES, explain how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Has the monitoring of AA/EE policies and procedures been successful? Explain your answer.
### SECTION F:

13. **Place a cross (X) in the appropriate box of your choice.**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>My institution's internal/external communication reflects a commitment to AA/EE issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>My institution is becoming a more equitable and fair place to work in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>The AA/EE efforts at my institution are more than an attempt to appear politically correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>A diverse workforce at my institution will lead to better student/staff relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>AA/EE efforts result in white staff resentment towards the designated group for being preferred over them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Top management must drive the AA/EE policy and programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>My institution is guilty of &quot;fast tracking&quot; appointments from the designated groups without providing adequate staff development for them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>In developing the AA/EE programme/policy consultation was not inclusive of all academic staff from the lowest level upwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>AA/EE efforts result in Indian/Coloured staff resentment towards Africans being preferred over them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>AA/EE initiatives result in vast numbers of unqualified staff from the designated group being hired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>Indian/Coloured men are not performing to their optimum because they are frustrated about their perceived limited opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>White men are not performing to their optimum because they are frustrated about their perceived limited opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>Black women should be given greater preferential treatment over white women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>Women are given adequate priority as beneficiaries in the AA/EE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>AA/EE efforts has forced the lowering of appointment and promotion standards at my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION G:

14. Place a cross (X) in the appropriate box of your choice.

To what extent do you believe that the following serve/d as barriers to achieving EE at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>The institutional culture and climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>The identity, reputation and image of the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>My institution's inability to manage staff diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>My institution's failure to build the capacities of AA beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>The 'sink or swim' dilemma of new staff from the designated group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>The greater work load of women compared to majority of men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>The lack of advancement possibilities for women particularly in decision-making and leadership positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>The traditional masculine culture which provide a poor work environment for women to progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Negative attitudes towards and stereotyping of members from the designated groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Are there any other further barriers to EE at your institution which you would like to mention? List them.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
5. What is your understanding of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity and how are the principles of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity implemented at your institution?

6. What structures and policies do you have at your institution for the implementation of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity? Explain in detail.

7. What are the main steps taken by your institution to ensure the successful implementation of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity?

8. What do you consider to be the main obstacles in the implementation of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity plans at your institution?
8. How do you monitor and evaluate the success or failure of Affirmative Action/Employment Equity plans at your institution?

9. What additional support is required by your institution to make your Affirmative Action/Employment Equity plans successful?

10. Are there any additional remarks you wish to make?
NEWSPAPER HEADLINES IN SOUTH AFRICA RELATED TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY SINCE 1990

- Emigration considered by a quarter of SA's whites (Sunday Times, 6 May 1990)
- Positive discrimination does not improve performance (Die Burger, 3 August 1990)
- Natal University 'not lowering its standards' (The Natal Witness, 9 August 1990)
- Assembly will thrash out issue of university access (Weekly Mail, 26 August 1990)
- Blacks must cultivate self-reliance to develop (The Cape Times, 28 August 1990)
- Affirmative Action : One knows too little (Die Burger, 6 December 1990)
- This is how affirmative action erodes values (Die Burger, 7 December 1990)
- The dangers of affirmative action (Die Burger, 22 December 1990)
- Efforts to boost blacks fall down (Sunday Times, 26 May 1991)
- Whites helped since 1910 (City Press, 13 October 1991)
- Lawyers to appoint a quota of black articled clerks (Beeld, 24 December 1991)
- No need to fear Affirmative Action (The Weekly Mail, 8-14 1991)
- Blacks must overcome feelings of low esteem (The Citizen, 25 May 1992)
- Affirmative action a moderate success (Rapport, 2 August 1992)
- Affirmative action starts (Businessmen believe new government will favour promotion for blacks first) (Sowetan, 10 August 1992)
- Affirmative action a priority in South Africa (The Star, 19 August 1992)
- Top men leave civil service (Rapport, 30 August 1992)
- A quota system might be the way of the future SA (Business Day, 7 September 1992)
- Public Servants fearful (Business Day, 16 September 1992)
- Need determines affirmative action says Org (Minister answers caucus of upset officials (Beeld, 23 October 1992)
- Letter on affirmative action draws strong criticism in Pretoria Council (Beeld, 29 October 1992)
- Affirmative action secretly introduced in civil service (officials wander if the ship is sinking) (Beeld, 10 November 1992)
- Affirmative action should play a role in policy on competition (Beeld, 15 January 1993)
- Insecure officials want answers today (Beeld, 15 January 1993)
- Fight for affirmative action gets underway (Sowetan, 25 January 1993)
- Black advancement now a business buzzword (Sowetan, 30 January 1993)
- Affirmative action quotas do not solve the basic problem (Business Day, 4 April 1993)
- A just answer to past wrongs (Not Tokenism, Affirmative action backed by law is the solution) (Sowetan, 3 May 1993)
- Affirmative action part of reconciliation (Beeld, 28 July 1993)
- Affirmative action could boomerang (In America it is a blot on your name) (Rapport, 8 August 1993)
- Catch-up policy (Rapport, 9 January 1994)
- Affirmative action could boomerang expensively (Sake Rapport, 13 February 1994)
- Future government may act on affirmative action (Sunday Times, 16 May 1993)
- The New Discrimination (The Sunday Times, 24 October 1993)
- Affirmative action, pro and con (The Star, 25 April 1994)
- Affirmative Action laws 'if necessary' (The Natal Mercury, 17 May 1994)
- Scramble for equity (Sunday Finance, 29 May 1994)
- Affirmative action coherency stressed (Business Day, 22 August 1994)
- Viva Pure Potential! - the answer to AA (The Star, 7 February 1995)
- Affirmative Action for Wits academics (Mail & Guardian, 9 February 1995)
Weapon of a new society (Affirmative action must balance the scales and bridge gaps) (Sowetan, 23 February 1995)

Removing barriers should be our aim (The Natal Witness, 9 March 1995)

Lets have affirmative action ... without the discrimination (Post, 15-18 March 1995)

Survival of an african identity (Mail & Guardian, 30 March 1995)

Affirmative Action 'is a loaded term' (The Natal Witness, April 4, 1995)

Affirmative Action aids all (Business Day, 7 April 1995)

Someone today is more equal than others (Rapport, 17 December 1995)

Affirmative Action needs a compromise (The Natal Mercury, 23 July 1995)

De Klerk, Sanlam express alarm over affirmative action (The Natal Mercury, 30 July 1995)

White Backlash (The Sunday Times, 27 January 1997)

Affirmative Action loses its ranking (Sunday Times Business Times, 7 December 1997)

Black economic empowerment 'has failed' (The Mercury Business Report, 12 March 1999)

'Empowerment not just for darkies' (The Mercury Business Report, 12 March 1999)

Danger signs for empowerment (The Daily News, 12 March 1999)

Affirmative procurement is correcting imbalances (The Mercury Business Report, 31 May 1999)

Perils of Whiteness (The Mercury, 5 July 1999)

Let's return to the best person for the job (The Daily News, 19 July 1999)

Affirmative Action Discriminates (The Daily News, 11 August 1999)

Affirmative Action Needs a Rethink (The Mercury, 19 August 1999)

Time to revisit and redefine affirmative action (The Sunday Tribune, 22 August 1999)

Black empowerment needs new vision (The Sunday Tribune, 29 August 1999)

Black companies demand share of State projects (The Daily News, 16 September 1999)

Time to get serious about empowerment (The Daily News, 9 November 1999)

Seeking to redress the balance (The Mercury Business Report, 10 November 1999)

'Quick fix' projects slated (The Mercury Business Report, 16 November 1999)

Affirmative Action a logical solution (The Daily News, 11 January 2000)

Forget black or white, go for South African Mosaic (The Mercury Business Report, 1 February 2000)

Affirmative Action 'needs a time-frame': FW calls for sunset clause. (The Natal Mercury, 2 February 2000)

Empowerment loses impetus (The Sunday Tribune, 20 February 2000)

Skills are critical too, not just skin colour (The Natal Mercury Business Report, 1 May 2000)

Blacks robbed of plum jobs (The Mercury, 25 May 2000)

Racial engineering in the form of Affirmative Action and the Employment Equity Act could cause a major setback in the reconciliation process (Sunday Tribune, 8 October 2001)

Equity panic hurts blacks (The Sunday Times, 11 August 2002)

Cricket quotas scrapped (The Mercury, 10 June 2002)

Survey shows Indians missing out on promotion to top jobs (The Sunday Times, 7 July 2002)

Colour test for coaches (The Mercury, 9 July 2002)

Democratic freedom is enjoyed by only a few (The Mercury, 10 August 2002)

Implement job equity or face state's wrath (Sunday Tribune Business Report, 13 October 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DOCUMENT/ REPORT/ ORDERS/ VOTES/LAWSUITS/ CASES</th>
<th>ISSUED BY WHOM</th>
<th>MAJOR PROVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.O. 10925</td>
<td>John F Kennedy</td>
<td>Affirmative Action is introduced for the first time by instructing federal contractors to take Affirmative Action to ensure that applicants are treated equally without regard to race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin. The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Civil Rights Act of 1964</td>
<td>U.S. Congress</td>
<td>Landmark legislation prohibiting employment discrimination by large employers (over 15 employees), whether or not they had government contracts. Established by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>E.O. 11246</td>
<td>Lyndon B Johnson</td>
<td>Required all government contractors and subcontractors to use Affirmative Action to expand job opportunities for minorities ensuring that applicants are employed without regard to race, colour, religion or natural origin. Established Office of Federal Contractors Compliance (OFCC) in the Department of Labour to administer the order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/REPORT/ORDERS/VOTES/LAWSUITS/CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>E.O. 11375 Amendment of E.O. 11246</td>
<td>Lyndon B Johnson</td>
<td>Included Affirmative Action for women; federal contractors now required to make good-faith efforts to expand employment opportunities for women and minorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Order No 4</td>
<td>Richard M Nixon</td>
<td>Authorized flexible goals and timetables to correct underutilization of minorities by federal contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Order No 4</td>
<td>Richard M Nixon</td>
<td>Was revised to include women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>E.O. 11625</td>
<td>Richard M Nixon</td>
<td>Directed federal agencies to develop comprehensive plans and specific programme goals for a national Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) contracting programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Memorandum: Permissible Goals and Timetables in State and Local Government</td>
<td>Richard M Nixon</td>
<td>Distinguished between proper goals and timetables and impermissible quotas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>U.S. Supreme Court</td>
<td>University of California v. Bakke</td>
<td>Upheld the use of race as one factor in choosing among qualified applicants for admission. At the same time, it also ruled unlawful the University Medical School’s practice of reserving 18 seats in each entering class of 100 for disadvantaged minority students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>E.O. 12138</td>
<td>President Jimmy Carter</td>
<td>Created a National Women’s Business Enterprise Policy and required each agency to take Affirmative Action to support women’s business enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/ REPORT/ ORDERS/ VOTES/LAWSUITS/ CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>United Steel Worker of America, AFL-CIO v. Weber</td>
<td>The Supreme Court</td>
<td>Ruled that race-conscious Affirmative Action efforts designed to eliminate a conspicuous racial imbalance in an employer's workforce resulting from past discrimination are permissible if they are temporary and do not violate the rights of White employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>E.O. 12432</td>
<td>President Ronald Reagan</td>
<td>Directed each federal agency with substantial procurement or grant making authority to develop a (MBE) development plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Repeal of E.O. 11246</td>
<td>Members of Reagan Administration</td>
<td>Efforts by some in the Reagan administration to repeal Executive Order 11246 were thwarted by defenders of Affirmative Action, including other Reagan administration officials and members of Congress from both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>The Sheet Metal Workers International Association v. EEOC</td>
<td>The Supreme Court</td>
<td>Upheld a judicially-ordered 29% minority 'membership admission goal' for a union that had internationally discriminated against minorities, confirming that courts may order race-conscious relief to correct and prevent future discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/ REPORT/ ORDERS/ VOTES/LAWSUITS/ CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Johnson v Transportation Agency, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>The Supreme Court</td>
<td>The Supreme Court ruled that a severe underrepresentation of women and minorities justified the rules of race or sex as one factor in choosing among qualified candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>City of Richmond v J A Croson Co</td>
<td>The Supreme Court</td>
<td>The Supreme Court struck down Richmond's minority contracting programme as unconstitutional, requiring that state or local Affirmative Action programme be supported by compelling interest and be narrowly tailored to ensure that the programme furthers that interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Adarand Constructors, Inc, v. Pena</td>
<td>The Supreme Court</td>
<td>The Supreme Court held that a federal Affirmative Action programme is constitutional when it is narrowly tailored to accomplish a compelling government interest-such asremedying discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The Policy of Clinton's Administration</td>
<td>President Bill Clinton</td>
<td>President Bill Clinton reviewed all Affirmative Action guidelines by federal agencies and declared his support for Affirmative Action programmes by announcing the Administration's policy of mend it, don't end it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/REPORT/ORDERS/VOTES/LAWSUITS/CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>The Regents of the University of California</td>
<td>They all voted to end Affirmative Action programmes at all University of California campuses. Beginning in 1997 for graduates school and 1998 for undergraduate admission. Officials at the university were no longer allowed to use race, gender, ethnicity or national origin as a factor in admissions decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>The Glass Ceiling Company</td>
<td>Released a report on the endurance of barriers that deny women and minorities access to decision-making positions and issued a recommendation &quot;that corporate America use Affirmative Action as a tool ensuring that all qualified individuals have equal access and opportunity to compete based on ability and merit&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>California's Proposition 209</td>
<td></td>
<td>By a narrow margin in the November election, Prop 209 abolished all public-sector Affirmative Action programmes in the state in employment, education and contracting. Clause (C) of Prop 209 permitted gender discrimination that is &quot;reasonably necessary&quot; to the &quot;normal operation&quot; of public education, employment and contracting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/ REPORT/ ORDERS/ VOTES/LAWSUITS/ CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Hopword v. Texas</td>
<td>The USA Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit</td>
<td>The USA Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled against the University of Texas. Decided that its law school's policy of considering race in the admissions process was a violation of the Constitution's equal-protection guarantee. The USA Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal of the ruling because the programmes at issue was no longer in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Programmes</td>
<td>Voters in Houston</td>
<td>Supported Affirmative Action programmes in city contracting and hiring by rejecting an initiative to banish such efforts. Houston proved that the wording of an initiative is a critical factor in influencing the voters' response. Instead of deceptively focusing attention on &quot;preferential treatment&quot; voters were asked directly if they wanted to &quot;end Affirmative Action programmes&quot;. They said 'no'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Challenge of California's Prop 209</td>
<td>The USA Supreme Court</td>
<td>By declining to review the case, the court did not decide the case on its merits but allowed Prop 209 to go into effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/REPORT/ORDERS/VOTES/LAWSUITS/CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>The USA House Judiciary Committee</td>
<td>The USA House Judiciary Committee voted 17-9, on a bipartisan basis, to defeat legislation aimed at dismantling federal Affirmative Action programmes for women and minorities. Representative George Gekas who moved to table the bill said that the bill was “useless and counterprotective ..... I fear that forcing the issue at this time could jeopardize the daily progress being made in ensuring equality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights</td>
<td>Bill Lann Lee</td>
<td>Faced opposition to his confirmation because of his support for Affirmative Action when he worked for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Lawsuits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawsuits were filed against the University of Michigan and the University of Washington School of Law regarding their use of Affirmative Action policies in admissions standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DOCUMENT/ REPORT/ ORDERS/ VOTES/LAWSUITS/ CASES</td>
<td>ISSUED BY WHOM</td>
<td>MAJOR PROVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>USA House of Representatives v USA Senate</td>
<td>USA House of Representatives and USA Senate</td>
<td>Both the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate thwarted attempts to eliminate specific Affirmative Action programmes. First both Houses rejected amendments to abolish the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise programme funded through the Transportation Bill, and then the House rejected an attempt to eliminate use of Affirmative Action in admissions in Higher-Education programmes funded through the Higher Education Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ban on use of Affirmative Action in admissions</td>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>Ban on use of Affirmative Action on admissions at the University of California. Berkeley had a 61 percent drop in minority admissions, and UCLA had a 36 percent decline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Sir/Madam

I do understand that being an employee of a Higher Education Institution time is precious commodity, given the heavy workloads you have. In view of the tight time frames that I have for the completion of my study, I make a humble appeal to you, the name of research, to help me distribute the questionnaires to the PERMANENT ACADEMIC STAFF only for completion. Please note that as responses are STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL an envelope is supplied for each questionnaire. The completed questionnaire must be placed in a sealed envelope and returned to the registry or internal mail office at your institution. I will collect them personally. In view of the fact that the academic staff are also heavily burdened I would appreciate it if you could constantly remind them that the completed questionnaires are due after a week from despatch. Note also that permission has been granted by your institution to distribute the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No Rcd.</th>
<th>No. Rtd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name:
Collector/Distributor

Tel. No.

Thank you very much for your time.

P G PADAYACHEE
Tel. No. (031)-2091231 Cell: 0837781231