representative just means you have representation that equals or space too the entire body represented this right we have a representative democracy so the individual they represent us in the political square should represent all of us our ideals etc so if we're talking about representative this we're simply saying we're not going to leave anyone behind gonna make sure everyone is representative now in the United States and the history of the United States this can be problematic and or challenging simply because of the history in this country I really don't have to go over all of that some of you are familiar with that but I'll just give you a brief synopsis the way the country began born out of revolution an exclusionary democracy at first but democracy that excluded the number of folks probably 3/4 of the folks on this soon meeting and as a result that emergence created some institutional and systemic burkers that we continue to wrestle and grapple with today now the reason that comes into focus alittle acutely as we deal with our chapter on social equity is because experts predict that by the year 2050 there will be no racial or ethnic majority in the United States why does will comprise about 49% or less of the total population and thus it may no longer make sense to use the term minority because people of color or considered minorities will technically be in the majority as a matter of fact this already happened in California California is a majority minority state which means if we add up all of the racial and ethnic minorities they make up more than whites in terms of population according to the census data now some say what does this mean what will this mean in terms of representation what would this mean in terms of fairness all this mean in terms of equity what what what does this mean and that is the question and that meaning is playing out all over the country. as we have seen election returns election results exit polls states like California Texas Florida New York Michigan Ohio their populations are drastically changing Georgia and as these populations are changing they're also changing electoral outcomes now the question is what impact would that have on the bureaucracy if any what impact would that have on the bureaucracy if any that's the question it does not look like you all have I see let me see

social equity is fairness in the delivery of public services it is the egalitarianism in action the principles each citizen regardless of economic resources their personal traits deserves and has a right to be given equal treatment by the political system page 469 page 4 page 433 in the 8th edition version united this version is updating its on page 469

we understand that social equity is a fairness and delivery of public services. That essentially means as we deliver services to everyone equitably equally regardless of raise ethnicity gender identity preference lifestyle etc. the reason this is important is assistant this this was outlined in an what we know is rousseau's social contract right this is the contractor and or the responsibility government has to society men and women government organizations both in the employees the public the workforce is intended to serve these people are so when we're discussing social we're talking about those who deliver services those who are recipients of such services and how that is equitably and fairly done

responsibility of the bureaucracy

To serve at the pleasure of the president is in fact there in appointee or presidential appointee but elected officials have terms and we need to take into account that is the important therein executive oftentimes appoint agency is in the agency has lead these departments that bureaucrats work in so that a definition and how we operationalize social equity so social equity is the fairness and deliver public services examples are US legislation intended to living up to this idea and we've seen this then in various legislation we've seen it in pro versus Board of Education we've seen it in other significant legislation as well we've seen it in how we view theoretical constructs like darwinism in how we see and review child labor we think child labor in the US is it is something that is outlawed should not occur however we know in other countries there are there might not be be any regulations in the laws to prevent child labor is this notion of darwinism survival of the fittest and if the individual is weak and or weaker the outcomes of their weakness is just desserts they deserve it so these are some things we look at and we examine

we talk about social equity now a question:

how does new Woodrow Wilson public administration was from 1887 right and then that degree of public administration was around for quite some time however when we got to the early 1960s and we start to see various legislation IE Civil Rights Act voting rights back in etc we start to see this idea in this notion of what equity is I did in notions of fairness services services so as these merge they reshape public administration So what happened is around about 1960s there was a major conference what we call the new public administration and this basically shifts the discipline from observing issues of fairness and egli shifted dismissed from not observing issues of friends in equity observing issues of fairness and equity so the new public administration was kicked off in the 1960s in this new public administration had to deal with the deal with the issues of equality the challenges of equality as related to to founding documents and how government treated folk here regardless of those founding documents they were finally dymista suggested I eat directly declarations of independence that this notion of equality and all people had rights that cannot be taken away inhalable and etc however people were denied some of these rights people were denying somebody's rights and in particularly you know after Americans and other marginalized and or challenge groups women included led to this discussion about whether or not The United States was as equal as the doctors suggest saying they were equal in demonstrating that were equal or two different things so equality in practice is not necessarily equality in theory so as you might imagine this these challenges these issues of social equity not only disrupted American government but they also have disrupted the bureaucracy and the bureaucracy is largely wet public administration some some questions you might be thinking about right now is how do we resolve that or can actually resolved how do we deal with the challenges of equality how do we deal with them particularly well particularly issue of racism how do we deal with the issue of racism how do we deal with the issue of racism in the delivery of goods and services how do we deal with the issue of racism as it relates to agencies providing services

only take into account some of the language that the country has used and we look at some of the definitions that the country has you and then we start to see that these issues have been with us for quite some time will we see playing out today in the streets when we see playing out today at the ballot box is what we see with regard to this extreme difference that people have in content people have from a member of one group versus a member of another group has everything to do with a long intertwined history in this country in the history touches upon issues of slavery racism and etc so the irony here is that we have learned in the western United States and around the globe that the race is a social construct and as a social construct Blacks and whites may have more in common than Blacks and Blacks and whites and whites because race is typical is not biological so therefore let's just pause right there for a minute and understand here we are in this country and the history in this country suggests that every barrier that may have been placed for people of color in African Americans primarily in other groups secondarily to overcome and everything to do with citizenship everything to do with identity it had everything to do with being unfair as opposed to being fair for example if in fact there was no article one suggested that in counting of an individual counting in individual is important for what for since this right for census count African Americans were going to be counted as 3/5 of a person not a whole person so this has some what this has some implications as it boils down to representation so we look at the Emancipation Proclamation all the way down to the past is the 13th amendment and etc and we see what 1314 the 5th amendment which are known as the civil war amendments reconstruction amendments we see that this way we see that this was an attempt to level the playing field this was an attempt to settle the issue of slavery still arising etc and this was an attempt to reconcile plessy V Ferguson keep in mind plessy V Ferguson landmark Supreme Court case 1896 they suggested they would separate and equal was constitutional that meant that it was the law of the land and or legal to have racial groups celebrate and this basically meant whites here black there nothing about it nothing wrong with it it was what the law of the land according to plessy which was a landmark case in 1896 now plessy was the law of the land from 1896 up until 1954 someone out there has a Calculator 1896 nineteen 54 somebody tell me how many years that is 58 years 58 years right so for 58 years a lot of the land was separate and unequal think about that for a moment OK and this was a long delayed until well of material Brown versus board so from 1896 plessy V Ferguson to 1954 Brown versus board the law will and certainly equal was what was constitutional 1954 it was overturned someone else do some math formulas do 1954 to 2020 how many years is that anybody Ford in 2020 66 years OK so 66 years so we had 58 years a separate and unequal and we've had 66 years leveling the prank playing field so we've only this notion or idea concept of equality for what the difference between 58 and 66 how many years eight years right you see where I'm going here separate and equal plessy V Ferguson 1896 to 1954 58 years from 1954 to 2020 66 years the difference between the two eight years is that a lot of time to to reconstruct it out a lot of time to rebuild the dust give us give us time to resolve things mad some say it doesn't give us enough time some say it doesn't give us enough time or is there still baggage from that probably have we resolved all of that no we have it did we see some of that residue that we see some of that baggage and this 2020 presidential election yes we did did we hear some rhetoric that we couldn't believe we heard yes we did yes we did and we also see hope yes we did so we saw all of these things inherent in what has happened as it relates to plessy and Brown we started today in a presidential election of president election is going to reshape what our bureaucracy it's gonna reshape orber ocracy scary shape the people who are going to be delivering goods and services in an equitable fashion so how do we ensure that the bureaucrats that are employed I'm gonna respect what for political cartoon emotional integration gonna gonna support an Equal Employment Opportunity not excluding anyone from opportunities based on their what race color sex religion age is national origin ideally preference and or etc this is the role of the EEOC this is what Equal Employment Opportunity means so we're big enough and bold enough to say when we're not going to discriminate based on any of those things ability less than ability we're not going to we're not going to discriminate arniotes things and that is extremely important the reason situated important because discrimination is defined as intolerance in the workplace tord those who are different and a failure to treat equals equally in the workplace this is considered to be illegal so the EEOC has done and what significant job and is and is the government agency plays a critical role in leveling the playing field play the critical for leveling the playing field so the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission does a great job of leveling the playing field which is an agency The EEOC is an agency affirmative action is a policy OK that's the difference EEOC is what Equal Employment Opportunity Commission mission is an agency affirmative action is a policy so during the Kennedy administration early administration in early 1960s the EOC became a key aspect of public personnel administration the reasonable to public key aspect because this agency was charged with ensuring that we had a representative bureaucracy we're talking early 1960s right so between 60 minutes 65 is the rise movement reached an important an important that helped to shape how Kennedy saw government and the role of government and their president Kenny Kennedy has resolved signed executive order 10925 which would which required the policy affirmative action and this was going to be used to what 2 diversify the employment ranks that are federal government and the contractors that the federal government contractor with so this was meant to remove barriers level the playing field bring minority groups into the into the realm of federal jobs government jobs and this is huge 'cause this this this is a ball game changer you get a federal government job with benefits that that changes the ball game that changes your life trajectory 'cause now you have what not only have income you have a pension you have benefits and you have the opportunity to purchase a home so this changes the game significantly social equity helps to level the playing field in government in government delivery business services and in the role the employees plan to deliver in the business services and etc so let me stop right there everyone on board

again as we look at the origins of affirmative action and the origins of affirmative action in the textbook began on page 475 and go from 475 two 80 so this executive order was extremely important that can be signed the executive order for affirmative action was extremely important so the president signed this executive order in order to do what in order to level the playing field it makes your government rapid government bureaucratic bureaucracies and bureaucratic agencies were representatives or representatives yeah the Equal Employment Opportunity EEO in the Commission that was created as a result of EEO and the Commission was the elca which is the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in it laid our foundation for what for implementing affirmative action the executive order for affirmative action assigned mark six 1961 Anna number 10925 in executive orders or what or actions and or directives president To implement and become what is implemented become policy and it's still 49 discrimination in the employment of federal government and his contractors and it's huge as huge Anne even though the executive order was signed it was still still talented it was still challenging for government agencies to be representative

so so as as as were as you moving forward and you're looking at governments attempt to be representative through an executive order signed by the president so that these agencies will will we look like the country the agency was intended to serve there was some there were some people who were unsettled with the EE OC an affirmative action the implementation thereof so there needs to be some data that was that was that was revealed so that the case for front of Ashley could be solid so the data will came from the Department of Labor the Bureau of census it was economic data there was employment data it was income data in this data on page four 477 outlined how there was disparity for example in the 1940s about 25% of the American population had at least a high school degree but by 2011 is there isn't a 85% in nearly 30 years they had it bounces degree so the increasing access to education has been what had been the way that follow the playing field so in other words when one acquires a college degree they increase was called petpet stands for potential earning power increasing your potential earning inquiry does that it increases your earnings so you're able to let your able to make more money as a matter of fact when with a college degree versus versus 1 without a college degree is that the person would have college degree over their lifetime will make $1,000,000 more than individual who does not have the college degree on average now of course there are outliers to that but that's what the data says so we can see now opportunities fairly distributed amongst the American citizenry were they fairly distributed is great however when opportunities aren't fairly distributed distributed then that creates the problems well the problems were supposed to be solved with the implementation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to tackle discrimination and affirmative action as the policy that was going to that was going to change in the level the playing field damn ideas and conceptions about affirmative action the legitimacy of affirmative action uh we saw that please we saw that on the ballot in California on the initiatives on the ballot in California I think it was proposition what proposition 16 so when we seen we've seen what we've seen a history wrestling with how to reconcile the resolve issues of fareless equality and distribution therein we have notable Supreme Court cases is speak to this issue of affirmative action Metro broadcasting versus FCC Richmond versus deer crossing and and then of course the adaman constructors versus Pena he's all our cases that have to do with the issue of discrimination issue of race and race consciousness and etc right so why is it so challenging and or difficult for us to resolve cases involving race race discrimination why are we so split on those things and as you probably have observed even though there was racial rhetoric used in both presidential campaigns if in fact we are to say that ideas and comments about racial superiority about one group being better than another about one grouping fine people versus another group if we calculate all of that into the final analysis we still come up with the highest turn out of any presidential election in American history where the losing candidate but a losing candidate got like 73 million votes winning candidate about 78 million votes 5 million vote difference not a lot of votes how do we explain it how do we explain that some people believe they're looking at what two different nations some people really looking at believe they're looking at two different nations now the case where front of action is laid out do you hear this data these bullet points is Bureau of the Bureau of census is economic disparities and the proposed solution however however we have well however we have yet to resolve how we view affirmative action we see affirmative action as a policy so see it as a fair policy subsidy is an unfair policy how do we level the playing field what are some of the other policy options that we have to level the playing field if in fact we have options something something to really think about right something that really think about now some say the reason we need affirmative action is because we need to resolve these patterns of discrimination that can be traced all the way back to slavery that's the case summer saying the case it could be made for a further bash cancel now leave we laid the foundation for argument now let's just look at let's look at a representative let me know let me see

let's let's look at a representative bureaucracy let's look at how affirmative action says to get representative democracy how does affirmative action help us to get a representative democracy how does affirmative action help us to level the playing field so that our bureaucracy is representative So what does the front of action do a printed version programs actually allow for us to it to diversify our employment pools we diversify our employment pools where able to diversify civil service and we have a surprise civil service and then we actually have a bureaucracy that looks like the country and that's what we want we want at bureaucracy that looks like the country we want a representative bureaucracy any questions so social equity is our what social equity again is the fairness in the delivery of public services it is the principle that each citizen regardless of economic resources or personal traits deserve to have the right to be given what equal treatment by the political system OK now it says each citizen so I guess we wrestled with the question of citizenship right so one has to be a citizen to be afforded and or receive these benefits I don't necessarily believe one has to be a citizen because as I understand it my interpretation of the constitution is you need to be within US borders and then you're afforded the protections of the United States so I'm not sure if citizenship is a requirement but it certainly should be something we discuss so as we're talking in as ways of government or evolving you know this this brings us to what this brings that this brings us to some interesting discussions here this is some interesting discussions sometimes we can be sometimes we can be overzealous in our quest for a representative democracy sometimes in that quest we may in fact be charged with what called reverse discrimination and reverse discrimination is a practice generally understood to mean discrimination against white males in conjunction with preferential treatment for women and minorities so this is things can go if in fact we're not cognizant so how we implement affirmative action Tau seven of the Civil Rights Act and etc this is disgusting great detail on page 480 in chapter 12 but again when we talk about social equity I think what we can do and it is we weren't too diverge from the textbook and have a conversation about social equity today what does it mean what does the conversation look like what does that conversation sound like now in 2964% of whites opposed permitted action in 2009 well today as of 2018 wipes support affirmative action now there is a group now that is in opposition affirmative action in that Asia Pacific Islanders so we start to see some left we start to see some different we start to see some emerging demographics as unchanging patterns as well as we interpret afraid of action the role of front of action particularly as relates to what particularly relates to college admissions

With the absence of affirmative action in the state of California and wiring affirmative action back in bringing affirmative action back is not looked upon to benefit the Asian Pacific Islander community is looked upon the benefit African Americans and Latinos we have lesser representation at the UC level in the UC system in this war did this turn into a national landmark Supreme Court case with Harvey universities University and challenge their admission policy would always spring for it so this is this is this is this is interesting when we see this and we see this disparity in our education we see this disparity in income data we see this in employment implemented as well so there's what public opinion on affirmative action has changed drastically good question

so this is basically a timeline chronology of affirmative action as it has scientist executive order from that point to to about 2009 and we have what here are some landmark cases the grinder was this Bolinger case University of Michigan parent versus Seattle diesel wet these are challenges to this idea challenges to the notion of affirmative action Anne we continually have the challenges however the case for affirmative action looks at as in or prior discrimination Anne for example I mentioned to you that data according to the Bureau of the census white college graduates nails earned about 72,000 in 2006 black and Hispanic meals with the same education earn 30% less even amongst must be graduates black men earn 25% less than whites in a 2011 report to send this reported that the following differences in terms of working life earnings show racial disparity this is on page 477 in your text so these gaps in these these gaps have really really been the focus of the federal government track that close these gaps in 2002 the national rate for homeownership was 68% it was 48% in 2015 homework I should raise had declined to 64% nationally but remain is 72% for whites but only 42% for Blacks and Hispanics are now at 47% so we just look at simple census data and census data reveals to us the groups that are experiencing the greatest degree of institutional is semi discrimination Brown by what we call adverse impact so one of the questions one must ask yourself is how do we love the playing field is there a way to load the playing field is there a way to level playing field what role does race play in public administration in ensuring that we have what yeah the equal rights doctrine evolving in our bureaucratic bureaucratic agencies we see this as certain disasters of the past and of course president disaster there past Hurricane Katrina and the aftermath the role race played in the delivery of goods and services related to Hurricane Katrina we look at today we look at COVID-19 and we look at the groups that have that had the most dispirit impact the groups that had the greatest impact have been commuting color people who are essential workers people on the front lines people who cannot afford to work remotely are people whose jobs require them to physically show up however they are not paid wages and not pay fair wages so showing up could be a matter of life and death however it is the only way that you can provide for your subsequent family so these are some of the challenges these are some of the challenges right so we need to figure out what should be done to understand the role race plays in public administration and the delivery of goods and services we need to make sure that we can maintain what social equity within that context we provide goods and services to what to people it shouldn't be uneven or not aligned we provide this services to people and ask what should be important in S what it really shouldn't matter as we're talking about social equity in public administration we provide services services to people then matter what color they are then melon was braced they are that matter what gender they are that matter with ethnicity are we provide services to people in the past where we need to get to the first obligation of public administration is again to administer the laws that in an work under a fair system work in a fair manner so this is the online roller racing poker ministration this is the diagram is is taken directly from your taken directly from your textbook the diagram is in your textbook on page 483 and in talking about sex discrimination here is a slide it speaks to title 7 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and we certainly want to work we certainly want to celebrate this for four for women in the workplace 'cause non racial discrimination status Cremation has what has improved working conditions for women in the workplace for women in the workplace better for me than any other group that's something you might be saying well if you know women working for government you know I know government doesn't I mean government people who work in government know better so I know they are not discriminating based on gender well I'll just say that experiences show us that that's not necessarily the case so the 1980 E Equal Employment Opportunity rules had to influence our courts because prior after 90 days past 1964 Civil Rights Act did not deal with the issue of sexual harassment or Jenner gender quite effectively so look at that data point in 1995 US merit system supports merit system these are people who work Priscilla servers the 44% of women in 90% of men had experienced unwelcome sexual advances in government in government services as a pretty high figure OK so let me go on to what is what does this mean for us public administration is social equity the first allegation of public administration the administrator is to administer laws they work under interfere air manner and social equity is to feel bound to proactively further cause the seek to hire in advance the 1st and very workplace certainly encouraged by the efforts of suit US Supreme Court justices standard day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg and so there is a deep connection between public administration and social equity that we should see an orange CNN brace so the chapter ends with the case study in case study touches upon a number of issues and I think what we want to do now is let's have a bit of discussion about what we know it's only social equity just saying what we know about social equity we level the playing field in our arms services affirmative action used was used to diversify our military in the military is the greatest example of a bureaucratic agency it was overhauled through the lens of social equity leveling the playing field we have men Sir we have women serve we have those who do not subscribe to binary gender roles who serve and etc so when is serving in the military a unit in our great bureaucracy should not be determined by race and or gender yeah that's challenging so to bring this all together I encourage you to read the culminating case study in chapter 12 and the culminating case study in chapter 12 is how Thurgood Marshall Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall he really laid the foundation for overturning plessy as well as the modern interpretation of of the civil rights movement so you know that will be a great weed so let me just wrap things up with this comment social equity is fairness in the delivery of public services it is egalitarianism in action the principle that each citizen has a right to be given equal treatment by the political system this is what we do and this is what public administrators will be doing right government organizations have a special obligation to be fair because they represent the citizenry the entire citizenry so with that questions questions about social equity the slides for the chapter chapter 12 social equity will be made available your reflecting writing assignment will cover it chapter 12 to chapter social equity and chapter 12 begins on page 464 and it ends on page it is on page 506