



Dear Frank,

Thank you for submitting your proposal. A printable summary is below. Your confirmation number is 19969. A confirmation email will be sent to you within 24 hours.

Applicants will be notified of the status of the proposed project on February 2, 2018.

If you have questions or need assistance regarding your application please contact the AIR Grant staff at 850-391-7109 or grants@airweb.org.

SUMMARY

Personal Information	
Name	Dr. Frank Fernandez
Informal Name	Frank
Affiliation	University of Houston
Unit/Department	
Title	Assistant Professor
Year began this position	
Email	ffernand@central.uh.edu
Alternate Email	frankjfernandez@gmail.com
Cell Phone	760-222-5963
Preferred Mailing Address	3657 Cullen Boulevard Room 112H Houston, Texas 77204 United States Phone: 713-743-6657
Secondary Address	
Demographics	
Highest degree	
Discipline of highest degree	
Position description	
Staff members in IR office	
Campus type	
Years of experience in IR	
IR Roles	
Year of birth	
Race/Ethnicity	
Gender	
Grant Type	
I am applying for a:	
	Research Grant
Financial Representative	
Name	
	Lena Mitchell

Affiliation	University of Houston
Department	College of Education Office of Research
Title	Research Administrator
Address	3657 Cullen Boulevard
	Office 466EA
City	Houston
State or Province	TX
Zip or Postal Code	77204
Country	United States

Additional Contacts

Name	Hyun Kyoung Ro
Affiliation	Bowling Green State University
Department	Department of Higher Education & Student Affairs
Title	Assistant Professor
Address	330 Education Building
	Bowling Green State University
City	Bowling Green
State or Province	OH
Zip or Postal Code	43403
Country	United States

Project Description

Project title:

Examining Gender and Race Intersectionality in Public Law School Admissions and Enrollment – A Multi Institutional Analysis

Statement of the research problem and national importance (limit 750 words):

- What is the research problem this proposal intends to address?
- How does this topic relate to the research priorities areas of access, affordability, and value of legal or graduate/professional education?
- Why is this topic of national importance?
- Why is it timely to conduct this research at this time?

U.S. law schools and the American legal profession are hampered by a lack of diversity (American Bar Association, 2008). After much progress around the turn of the century, women are again underrepresented, compared to men, in the ranks of early-career lawyers (Nance & Madsen, 2014). In fact, the underrepresentation of women in the pipeline for the legal profession stands in stark contrast to other professions, such as medicine (Nance & Madsen, 2014). Additionally, estimates suggest that by 2030, approximately "100,000 additional black attorneys and more than 230,000 additional Hispanic attorneys would need to join the ranks of the profession to approach parity with the general population" (Redfield, 2009, p. 10). Although scholars tend to address the underrepresentation of women or racial minorities in law schools and professions, they tend to approach sex and race separately (e.g., Johnson, 2013; Olivas, 2005; Nussbaumer, 2006; Randall, 2006; Strickland, 2001). Crenshaw (1989) introduced the idea of intersectionality between race and sex to argue that it is important to have women of color (and their unique perspectives) represented in legal discussions around topics such as rape and domestic violence. As Crenshaw (1989) argued, we need an intersectional approach that acknowledges that women of color may face additional challenges in law school admissions (or enrollment) than white women or men of color.

It is timely to consider intersectionality between race and sex in law school admissions in light of landmark challenges to law school and university admissions. Some law schools use race-conscious admissions to increase diversity in admissions and enrollments, but affirmative action programs have been and continue to be challenged in the courts (Flanagan, 2017; Jayakumar & Garces, with Fernandez, 2015) and are being scrutinized by the U.S. Department of Justice (Savage, 2017). Moreover, many states have banned consideration of race or sex in university admissions (Fernandez & Garces, 2015). Recent Supreme Court cases have revolved around Barbara Grutter (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003), and Abigail Fisher (Fisher v. University of Texas, 2013; Fisher v. University of Texas, 2016)—both of whom were white women who argued that they were wronged by race-conscious admissions. Diversity in admissions is not just about access to legal education and the legal profession, it is also important to recognize the educational benefits of diversity and the relationship between diversity and the quality or value of a law school education (e.g., Nance & Madsen, 2014; Reynoso & Amron, 2002). Thus, it is especially timely and of national importance to have a better understanding of the need to consider race—and sex—in law school admissions and enrollment.

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the underrepresentation of women of color in law schools and to take a more nuanced approach to diversity challenges in the pipeline to the legal profession through the lens of intersectionality. The proposed research project will use multilevel mixed-effects logistic estimation to analyze a multi-institutional dataset of law school admissions and enrollment data. Conceptually, we draw upon Crenshaw's (1989) work to examine the intersection of race and sex in law school admissions and enrollment decisions. Without intersectionality as a conceptual lens, women of color tend to be aggregated with men of color or white women (Crenshaw, 1989). The study is guided by two research questions: (a) Were women of color (i.e., Black women, Latina women, Asian women) statistically less likely to be admitted to law schools after controlling for Law School Admission Test (LSAT) scores, undergraduate grade point average (GPA), and state residency? (b) Among admitted women of color, which law school characteristics (e.g., law school tuition, law school ranking) were related to the applicants' decisions to enroll at a law school?

We will address our research questions by analyzing, publicly available data from 25 law schools collected by a research project on the Scale and Effects of Admissions Preferences in Higher Education (Project SEAPHE). Preliminary analyses show that Black women and Hispanic women were less likely to be admitted to law schools. These preliminary findings hold interesting implications for law school admissions practices and affirmative action policy. Most reports and research studies discuss race and sex as separate categories, but we show that it is important to consider the two together. Redfield (2009) indicates that hundreds of thousands of additional Black and Hispanic lawyers are needed so that the profession will be representative of the population. Our preliminary findings suggest that we should be intentional about ensuring that women of color are included in efforts to recruit, admit, and retain, diverse students.

Review the literature and establish a theoretical grounding for the research (limit 1000 words):

- What has prior research found about this problem?
- What is the theoretical/conceptual grounding for this research?

Prior Scholarship

There is a significant body of literature which concludes that women and Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented in law schools or in the legal profession, relative to their shares of the U.S. population (e.g., American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Profession, 2017; Nance & Madsen, 2014; Nussbaumer, 2006; Randall, 2006; Redfield, 2009). However, there is a dearth of research that addresses law school access issues for women of color. Nance and Madsen's (2014) study of diversity in the legal profession points out that during the 1990s and early 2000s, progress for white women overshadowed the lack of access for women of color. Furthermore, Taylor (2015) notes that in recent years there have been proportional increases in the representation of minorities in U.S. law schools, but he concludes that the increases are actually attributed to large declines in the number of white students who enrolled in law schools in the wake of the Great Recession.

Research indicates that law school admissions processes (and subsequent disparities in admissions and enrollments) are shaped by an overreliance on LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs—due in large part to the ways that law school rankings are calculated (e.g., Holmquist, Schultz, Zedeck, & Oppenheimer, 2014; Johnson, 2013; Olivas, 2005; Nussbaumer, 2006; Randall, 2006; Strickland, 2001). Holmquist and colleagues (2014) acknowledge that law schools "admit students based on standards and practices that, while not discriminatory in a legal sense, undeniably favor white applicants" (p. 565). However, scholars do not have a clear understanding of the extent to which women of color may have even lower odds of being admitted through

the typical law school admissions process than white women or men of color.

Diversifying law schools and professions by increasing more women of color is critical because diversity is positively related to the quality of a law school education. Students in law schools learn from diverse peers. Dark (1996) provides interesting, self-reported data on advanced law students' perspectives of how they benefited from diversity in a torts course. Dark (1996) argues: "Diversity issues affect and shape legal doctrine, application of the law, and judicial and administrative processes. Consequently, students who will practice law . . . need to be conversant with and understand the nuanced ways in which these issues affect what they will do as lawyers" (p. 542). In Dark's (1996) data, many students acknowledge that having diverse peers resulted in a value-added aspect to their legal education. For example, one student concluded: "I have learned that the law can attempt to do the right thing, but because the law is created by people and people have different values, it is very difficult to have a singular "right" answer" (Dark, 1996, p. 561). Additionally, many white, male professors prefer not to bring up issues related to diversity, even when those issues are relevant to the legal material at hand; instead, they rely on women or racially and ethnically diverse students to initiate such conversations (Deo, Woodruff, & Vue, 2010). The literature on the educational benefits of diversity in law schools resonates with Crenshaw's (1989) work, which points to the need to incorporate women of color's perspectives in legal seminars that address topics such as rape and domestic violence.

Conceptual Framework

This project uses an intersectionality conceptual framework to study law school admissions and enrollment decisions among women of color. The intersectionality perspective is an extension of critical race theory and has been referred to as "critical race feminism" (Bowman, Roberts, & Rubinowitz, 2006, p. 56). Crenshaw (1989) first used the term "intersectionality" to describe how black women experience discrimination in ways that are different than men of color because of the combination of racism and sexism in society. An intersectionality framework treats social identities and power structures as necessarily intertwined. Crenshaw's (1991; 2014) recent work includes women of different racial or ethnic groups, as well as other identity aspects, such as socio-economic status. Socio-economic status may be particularly important for examining law school decisions, because econometric analysis of experimental data show that perceptions about the cost of attendance and debt affect applicants' decisions to enroll in law school (e.g., Field, 2006).

While we aim to reveal disparities in law school admissions and enrollment among women of color compared to white women, we recognize that social identity, gender and race or ethnicity, cannot be reduced to one category or another. These categories "mutually construct one another" (Collins, 1998, p. 62). Existing literature, however, fails to explain women of color's law school access because of its focus on race or sex as "single, distinct factors" (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 2), which did not fully uncover the inequities that are "the outcome of intersections of different social locations, power relations and experiences" (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 2). Because their identities are based on both gender and race or ethnicity, minority women might not be accepted or enroll as often as white women or men of color even after controlling for LSAT scores and undergraduate GPA.

The intersectionality conceptual framework informs our methods (discussed further in the next section). Historically, studies that use critical race or intersectionality frameworks often use on qualitative or storytelling methods (e.g., Delgado, 1999; Parker & Lynn, 2002; Yosso, 2006). However, recent research supports the use of "quantitative intersectional analysis" (Covarrubias, 2011, p. 86). In his study of Chicanas and Chicanos, Covarrubias argues that analyses which focus on race or ethnicity alone "conceal within-group patterns that tell of the distinct impact of various forms of subordinations" (2011, p. 103). Covarrubias concludes that quantitative intersectional analysis is a promising approach to uncover within-group differences in educational opportunities. Other researchers also adapted the intersectionality approach into their quantitative studies to examine women of color college students (Brown, 2014; Espinosa, 2011; Ro & Loya, 2015). Based on Covarrubias' work, we posit that the intersectionality conceptual framework and quantitative intersectional analysis are well-suited to address our research questions.

Describe the research method that will be used (limit 1000 words):

- What are the research questions to be addressed?
- What is the proposed research methodology?
- What is the statistical model to be used?

Research Questions

Based on our review of the literature and intersectionality conceptual framework, we will address two research questions: (a) Were women of color (i.e., Black women, Latina women, Asian women) statistically less likely to be admitted to law schools after controlling for Law School Admission Test (LSAT) scores, undergraduate grade point average (GPA), and state residency? (b) Among admitted women of color, which law school characteristics (e.g., law school tuition, law school ranking) were related to the applicants' decisions to enroll at a law school?

Methods

We will use the Stata statistical package to estimate hierarchical generalized linear regression models (Hamilton, 2012) of data from twenty-five law schools. The dependent variable for the first question will be Admissions Decision (1 = admitted; 0 = not admitted). The dependent variable for the second research question will be Enrollment Decision, which is conditional on admission (1 = Enrolled; 0 = Did not enroll or deferred for another term).

Based on our conceptual framework, we will use interaction terms to conduct quantitative intersectional analysis at the student-level (level 1) models. For the first research question, we will use logistic estimation to regress Admissions Decision on independent variables for Sex (1 = female, 0 = male) and a vector of mutually-exclusive dichotomous race or ethnicity variables (1 = self-identified as Asian or Black or Hispanic). Although our review of the literature did not discuss underrepresentation of Asian women in law schools, we include Asian women so that we can have mutually-exclusive categories, with white women as a reference group. We will also generate interaction terms (e.g., West, Aiken, & Krull, 1996) to serve as key independent variables of interest by multiplying Sex and Asian; Sex and Black; Sex and Hispanic. Thus, we will test whether Asian women, Black women, and Hispanic women had lower odds of being admitted compared to white women at law school.

To address the second research question, we will include all the student-level variables that will be used to address the first research question. Additionally, we will add two new key independent variables of interest (level 2) that measure institutional characteristics (law school ranking and law school tuition data; both continuously measured) to estimate between-college effects of those measures. This model will explain whether students' enrollment at law schools vary across institutional characteristics, such as tuition or rank. Finally, we will look at the cross-level interaction model to

examine whether Black women, Hispanic women, Asian women who got admissions at law schools with higher rank or higher tuition were less likely to enroll than white women.

For all our analyses, we will include multiple control variables. Two continuously coded variables will represent the most significant factors in law school admissions decisions: LSAT score and undergraduate GPA (e.g., Holmquist et al., 2014; Johnson, 2013; Olivas, 2005; Nussbaumer, 2006; Randall, 2006; Strickland, 2001). A third control variable will record whether the applicant was a resident of the state in which the law school is located (1 = in-state resident; 0 = not in-state resident). Fewer than 10% of cases were missing data, so we will account for missing data using listwise deletion.

Preliminary Findings

We conducted preliminary analyses on examining law school admissions among minority women. Logistic regression estimates show that after controlling for LSAT scores and GPAs, Black women and Hispanic women had lower odds of being admitted to law schools (odds ratios of 0.50 and 0.77, respectively) compared to white women. The estimated main effects and interaction effects were all statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. The interaction term for Asian women was not statistically significant ($p = 0.26$). We included institutional (fixed) effects in our preliminary analysis.

Our preliminary findings indicate that our approach to quantitative intersectional analysis is appropriate to addressing our research questions. These preliminary findings suggest further and more elaborated analyses to securitize law school admissions and enrollment among women of color. Additionally, our findings may be useful for future amicus briefs to courts that are considering affirmative action litigation about the continued need to consider race or ethnicity as one factor among many to achieve the educational benefits of diversity in university classrooms.

Statistical Models

For the first research question, we will use Stata to estimate a regression model following the general form of equation 1 below (e.g., Hamilton, 2012). In equation 1, β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , β_4 , and β_5 represent main effect parameter estimates, β_6 represents the estimated interaction effect for the key variable of interest. To illustrate, for individual student 'i', nested in law schools 'j', the log odds of the students' admission 'k' (k) in a law school relative to no admission (r) as the reference category can be expressed by the following function, the within institution model:

$$\log\left[\frac{\varphi_{ij}(k)}{\varphi_{ij}(r)}\right] = \beta_{0j}(k) + \beta_{1j}(k)*X_{SEX_{ij}} + \beta_{2j}(k)*X_{RACE_{ij}} + \beta_{3j}(k)*X_{LSAT_{ij}} + \beta_{4j}(k)*X_{UGPA_{ij}} + \beta_{5j}(k)*X_{RESIDENT_{ij}} + \beta_{6j}(k)*X_{SEX_{ij}}*X_{RACE_{ij}} \quad (1)$$

For the second research question, the log odds of the students' enrollment 'm' in law schools relative to no enrollment (r) as the reference category can be expressed by the following function, the within institution model:

Cross-level Interaction Model (Level 1):

$$\log\left[\frac{\varphi_{ij}(m)}{\varphi_{ij}(r)}\right] = \beta_{0j}(m) + \beta_{1j}(m)*X_{SEX_{ij}} + \beta_{2j}(m)*X_{RACE_{ij}} + \beta_{3j}(m)*X_{LSAT_{ij}} + \beta_{4j}(m)*X_{UGPA_{ij}} + \beta_{5j}(m)*X_{RESIDENT_{ij}} + \beta_{6j}(m)*X_{SEX_{ij}}*X_{RACE_{ij}} + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

where ϵ_{ij} represents the randomly distributed error term.

We allow both intercepts and slopes to vary across institutions as follows:

Cross-level Interaction Model (Level 2):

$$\beta_{0j}(m) = \gamma_{00}(m) + \gamma_{01}(m) * (X_{TUITION})_j + \gamma_{02}(m) * (X_{RANKING})_j + u_{0j} \quad (3)$$

$$\beta_{6j}(m) = \gamma_{10}(m) + \gamma_{11}(m) * (X_{TUITION})_j + \gamma_{12}(m) * (X_{RANKING})_j + u_{1j} \quad (4)$$

Where $\gamma_{11}(m)$ and $\gamma_{12}(m)$ represents the moderating effect of law school tuition and ranking, respectively, on the relationship between women of color and law school enrollment, u_{0j} represents random intercepts, and u_{1j} represents random slopes.

Note that in equations 1 and 2, RACE represents a vector of dichotomous variables (Asian, Black, and Hispanic).

Limitations

We acknowledge that we are using cross-sectional methods that do not support causal inferences. Yet, the proposed analytic plan is sufficient for addressing the research questions.

References cited (no word limit):

- American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Profession. (2017). A current glance at women in the law. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/marketing/women/current_glance_statistics_january2017.authcheckdam.pdf
- American Bar Association. (2008). Goal III: Eliminate Bias and Enhance Diversity. Retrieved from: https://www.americanbar.org/about_the_aba/aba-mission-goals.html
- Bowman, C. G., Roberts, D., & Rubinowitz, L. S. (2006). Race and gender in the Law Review. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 100(1), 27-70.
- Brown, N. E. (2014). Political participation of women of color: An intersectional analysis. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 35(4), 315-348.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race, and nation. *Hypatia*, 13(3), 62-82.
- Covarrubias, A. (2011). Quantitative intersectionality: A critical race analysis of the Chicana/o educational pipeline. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 10(2), 86-105.

- Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (2014). The structural and political dimensions of intersectional oppression. In P. R. Grzanka (Ed.), *Intersectionality: A Foundations and Frontiers Reader* (pp. 17-22). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Dark, O. C., (1996). Incorporating issues of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and disability into law school teaching. *Williamette Law Review*, 32, 541-576.
- Delgado, R. (1999). *When inequality ends: Stories about race and resistance*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Deo, M. E., Woodruff, M., & Vue, R. (2010). Paint by numbers: How the race and gender of law school faculty affect the first-year curriculum. *Chicana/o-Latina/o Law Review*, 29, 1-42.
- Espinosa, L. (2011). Pipelines and pathways: Women of color in undergraduate STEM majors and the college experiences that contribute to persistence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(2), 209-241.
- Fernandez, F., & Garces, L. M. (2015). Affirmative action and challenges to diversity in higher education. In H. L. Gates (Ed.), *Oxford African American Studies Center*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Field, E. (2006). Educational debt burden and career choice: Evidence from a financial aid experiment at NYU law school (NBER Working Paper No. 12282). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9fad/4fa8795777f098d68a744f40609a01fb33e6.pdf>
- Fisher v. University of Texas, 570 U.S._(2013).
- Fisher v. University of Texas, 579 U.S._(2016).
- Flanagan, W. S. (2017, October 26). Students examine Harvard's affirmative action case. *The Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2017/10/26/affirmative-action-student-event/>
- Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
- Hankivsky, O. (2014). Intersectionality 101. Vancouver, Canada: The Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy, Simon Fraser University. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Olena_Hankivsky/publication/279293665_Intersectionality_101/links/56c35bda08ae602342508c7f/Intersectionality-101.pdf
- Hamilton, L. C. (2012). *Statistics with Stata (version 12)*. Belmont, CA: Cengage.
- Holmquist, K., Shultz, M., Zedeck, S., & Oppenheimer, D. (2014). Measuring merit: The Schultz-Zedeck research on law school admissions. *Journal of Legal Education*, 63(4), 565-584.
- Jayakumar, U. M., & Garces, L. M. (with Fernandez, F.) (Eds.). (2015). *Affirmative action and racial equity: Considering the Fisher case to forge the path ahead*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, A. M. Jr. (2013). Knots in the pipeline for prospective lawyers of color: The LSAT is not the problem and affirmative action is not the answer. *Stanford Law and Policy Review*, 24(2), 379-424.
- Nance, J. P., & Madsen, P. E. (2014). An empirical analysis of diversity in the legal profession. *Connecticut Law Review*, 47(2), 271-320.
- Nussbaumer, J. (2006). Misuse of the law school admissions test, racial discrimination, and the de facto quota system for restricting African-American access to the legal profession. *St. John's Law Review*, 80, 167-181.
- Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.
- Randall, V. R. (2006). The misuse of the LSAT: Discrimination against Blacks and other minorities in law school admissions. *St. John's Law Review*, 80, 107-151.
- Redfield, S. E. (2009). *Diversity realized: Putting the walk with the talk for diversity in the legal profession*. Lake Mary, FL: Vandeplas Publishing.
- Reynoso, C., & Amron, C. (2002). Diversity in legal education: A broader view, a deeper commitment. *Journal of Legal Education*, 52, 491-505.
- Ro, H. K., & Loya, K. I. (2015). The effect of gender and race intersectionality on student learning outcomes in engineering. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(3), 359-396.
- Sander, R., & Taylor Jr, S. (2012). *Mismatch: How affirmative action hurts students it's intended to help, and why universities won't admit it*. New York: Basic Books.

Savage, C. (2017, August 1). Justice dept. to take on affirmative action in college admissions. The New York Times. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/01/us/politics/trump-affirmative-action-universities.html>

Strickland, R. (2001). Creating opportunity: Admissions in U.S. legal education. *Journal of Legal Education*, 51, 418-422.

Taylor, A. N. (2015). Diversity as a law school survival strategy. *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 59, 321-384.

West, S. G., Aiken, L. S., & Krull, J. L. (1996). Experimental personality designs: Analyzing categorical by continuous variable interactions. *Journal of Personality*, 64(1), 1-48.

Yosso, T. (2006). *Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/o educational pipeline*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Project Description - Appendix

There are no files attached.

Datasets

List the datasets that will be used and explain why they best serve this research (limit 500 words)

This project uses multi-institutional data that were collected by a research project on the Scale and Effects of Admissions Preferences in Higher Education (Project SEAPHE). Project SEAPHE investigators created the dataset by submitting Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to public law schools that were subject to state-level public records requirements. The Project received admissions data from 25 public law schools with varying levels of prestige and selectivity as measured by law school rankings. The data were cleaned (LSAT scores are comparable and outlying values removed) and de-identified and are publicly available. Project SEAPHE has traditionally focused on empirically challenging race-conscious admissions processes in U.S. higher education (e.g., Sander & Taylor, 2012). However, we are using the publicly available data to take a quantitative intersectional approach to examining admission and enrollment of women of color in U.S. law schools.

The dataset records information on a large number of applications (N = 60,548) for admission to law school for the 2006 fall semester. Conditional on admission, the dataset also contains information on a large number of admitted applicants and their decisions about whether to enroll in law school (N = 15,063). Asian women submitted 2,979 applications in the dataset; Black women submitted 2,857 applications in the dataset; Hispanic women submitted 1,725 applications in the dataset. For admission decisions, 627 were for Asian women, 496 were for Black women, and 345 were for Hispanic women. As previously mentioned, the dataset includes variables for undergraduate GPA (continuously coded on a 4-point scale) and LSAT scores (continuously coded from 120-180), which are established in the literature as the most important factors in law school admissions. The dataset also includes a variable that records whether applicants sought admission as in-state residents.

The Principal Investigator has collected contextual data on 2006 law school rankings from U.S. News and World Report. Additionally, the principal investigator has gathered data on 2006 law school tuition rates from publications by the American Bar Association. The contextual data will be cleaned, saved as separate Stata files, and merged into the Project SEAPHE data file to address the second research question.

We acknowledge several limitations to the dataset. First, it does not include variables for other aspects of the admissions process, such as letters of recommendation. However, the study will include the most important quantitative measures in the admissions process, LSAT scores and undergraduate GPA (Holmquist et al., 2014). Second, despite the strength of our multi-institutional analysis of 25 law schools, the analyses cannot account for the fact that applicants in the dataset may have applied to or enrolled at institutions that are not included in the dataset. Third, the data are from applications for fall 2006 admission. Although these data are older, prior literature suggests that it may be necessary to analyze data from before the Great Recession, when the number of white students entering law school decreased due to changing perceptions about the labor market and debt aversion (e.g., Taylor, 2015).

Statement of use of restricted datasets (limit 250 words):

Applicants should provide a statement indicating whether the proposed research will require use of restricted datasets. If restricted datasets will be used, the plan for acquiring the appropriate license should be described.

If restricted datasets will not be used, leave this text box blank and click *Save and Continue*.

Timeline and Deliverables

Timeline:

Provide a timeline of key project activities.

Project period: March 1, 2018 through February 28, 2019

Data Merging and Analysis Phase (March 1, 2018 – May 31, 2018)

- Merge contextual data into Project SEAPHE dataset
- Calculate descriptive statistics
- Logistic estimation analysis

- Conduct additional post-hoc analysis tests or sensitivity analysis (as needed)
- Prepare tables of descriptive statistics and regression estimation results
- Prepare and submit conference presentation proposals
- Receive progress report forms on June 1, 2018
- Submit first progress report by July 1, 2018

Manuscript Preparation Phase (June 1, 2018 – September 30, 2018)

- Focus on writing two manuscripts (one for a higher education journal with a high impact factor; a second for a law review-type journal)
- Receive progress report forms by October 1, 2018
- Submit second progress report by November 1, 2018

Presentation and Dissemination Phase (October 1, 2018 – February 28, 2019)

- Attend and present at the 2018 AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium
- Prepare conference presentations or present at conferences
- Incorporate feedback from conference discussants to finalize manuscripts
- Submit manuscripts for review in scholarly journals
- Submit final report by April 30, 2019

Deliverables:

List deliverables such as research reports, books, and presentations that will be developed from this research initiative.

- Three research (progress) reports to Association for Institutional Research
- Presentation of findings at the AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium in Scottsdale, Arizona
- Conference proposals (and presentations, if proposals are accepted) at national annual meetings by groups such as the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Education Law Association, and American Educational Research Association
- Manuscripts submitted for review to a leading higher education journal (Potential targets in order of preference: Journal of Higher Education, Review of Higher Education, Educational Policy) and a law review journal or journal focusing on legal issues (Potential targets in order of preference: Stanford Law Review, Stanford Law and Policy Review; Journal of Legal Education)

Disseminate results:

Describe how you will disseminate the results of this research.

(Note: Costs of travel to meetings should be calculated on the budget page.)

We will submit one manuscript to a leading higher education journal and one manuscript to a law journal. We also plan to present at national conferences such as the Association for the Study of Higher Education, American Educational Research Association, and Education Law Association. We will also present working papers to the Higher Education program's brown bag lunch series at University of Houston (invitations are extended to students and faculty in the Hobby School of Public Affairs and the Institute for Higher Education Law & Governance at the Law Center). Finally, we will collaborate with the Director of Communications at the University of Houston's College of Education to announce the award and research findings through social media and websites (and likely with the Houston Chronicle, which is ranked as being one of the nation's top 15 newspapers by circulation).

IRB Statement

Statement of Institutional Review Board approval or exemption (limit 250 words):

As part of the proposal, a statement outlining a plan for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval is required. The statement should outline the applicant's timeline and plan for submitting the proposal to an IRB or explain why IRB approval is not necessary. Final IRB action is not necessary prior to submitting the application.

Institutional Review Board approval is not necessary for secondary analysis of publicly available, de-identified data.

Biographical Sketch(es)

Biographical sketch (limit 750 words):

Frank Fernandez is Assistant Professor of Higher Education at University of Houston. He earned a Ph.D. in Higher Education from The Pennsylvania State University, and his dissertation on Latina/o graduate education received the 2018 first-place award in the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education's (AAHHE's) outstanding dissertation competition. He is affiliated with the Center for Mexican American Studies at University of Houston and is a fellow with the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida.

Fernandez's research focuses on policy and law issues in higher education, particularly in relation to underrepresented students and graduate education. His work is published or forthcoming in education and law journals including, Educational Policy, Penn State Law Review, and Belmont Law Review. Additionally, he co-edited Affirmative Action and Racial Equity: Considering the Fisher Case to Forge the Path Ahead (Routledge, 2015). He also co-edited The Century of Science: The Global Triumph of the Research University (Emerald, 2017), which received the 2017 award for significant research by the Association for the Study of Higher Education's (ASHE) Council on International Higher Education. He is a co-authoring a book on legal issues related to free speech in higher education (NASPA, under contract).

Fernandez has a strong background in quantitative methods. In addition to coursework, he has received additional training through the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Statistical Institute on Casual Inference, which was co-hosted by the National Science Foundation in May 2015. He has worked with datasets from the National Center for Education Statistics, National Science Foundation, Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, and other forms of institutional data.

Biographical sketch (limit 750 words):

Hyun Kyoung Ro is an assistant professor in Higher Education and Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University (BGSU). She earned her Ph.D. degree in Higher Education and minored in Educational Psychology at Pennsylvania State University in 2011. She uses advanced quantitative methodologies, such as hierarchical linear modeling, propensity score matching, and testing interaction effects. She has been leading author on articles that were published in leading higher education journals, such as *The Review of Higher Education* and *Research in Higher Education*.

Ro is increasingly researching topics related to graduate education. She is lead author on a recently-published article that examined engineering students' aspirations to attend graduate school (published in *Journal of Engineering Education*). Her broader research agenda focuses on examining student access and outcomes and how relationships vary by different student characteristics. Relevant to this project, she has advanced intersectionality theory in higher education research (published in *The Review of Higher Education*).

Budget

- [FernandezRoBudget20171130R](#)

Funding History**Funding history (limit 250 words):**

A statement of prior, current, and pending funding for the proposed research from all sources is required. The statement should also include a history of all prior funding from AIR to any of the PIs for any activity. Funding from other sources will not disqualify the application but may be considered in the funding decision.

Neither investigator has received funding from AIR. We do not have any prior, current, or outstanding proposals related to this research project.

Dissertation Advisor Letter of Support

There are no files attached.

How Did You Hear About This Grant Opportunity?

Check all that apply:

- American Educational Research Association (AERA)
- Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE)
- Other (please list below)

postcard mailed to my apartment



Research Grant Proposal Budget Form



Name: Frank Fernandez

Personnel - Salary

Principal Investigator \$

Second Principal Investigator \$

Third Principal Investigator \$

Graduate Research Assistant \$

Travel

2018 AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium: Principal Investigator \$

2018 AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium: Second Principal Investigator \$

2018 AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium: Third Principal Investigator \$

2018 AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium: Graduate Research Assistant* \$

Other research related travel: \$

(Note: Other planned travel should be listed in the "Timelines and Deliverables" section)

Other research expenses

Please provide a breakdown of expenses below and add the total value in the box to the right. Allowable expenses include: materials, such as software, books, supplies, etc.; consultant services, such as transcription, analysis, external researchers, etc.; and costs for publishing articles in journals. The purchase of computer hardware, overhead or indirect costs, and living expenses are not allowable. If you have questions about specific expenditures, please contact AIR. \$

TOTAL REQUESTED – Maximum Allowable is \$50,000 \$

**Note: The AccessLex Institute believes graduate student professional development and mentoring opportunities are important aspects of the Research Grant Program. Therefore, Research Grant recipients are strongly encouraged to designate funds for graduate student travel for the AccessLex Institute Legal Education Research Symposium Presentation.*

To: Tinsley Smith

From: Frank Fernandez and Hyun Kyoung Ro

Subject: Response to Reviewers' Feedback for "Examining Gender and Race Intersectionality" Proposal

Date: February 5, 2018

We appreciate the reviewers' thoughtful feedback. We plan to address all three points. The feedback is repeated below in black text, followed by our responses in blue text.

- The dataset only contains public law schools so it is important make that clear, possibly even in the title.
 - We are revising the project title to: *Examining Gender and Race Intersectionality in Public Law School Admissions and Enrollment – A Multi Institutional Analysis*.
- Clarify the degree to which the 25 public law schools in the dataset are representative of the racial and gender diversity of all law schools and public law schools.
 - Based on the previous comment and revised title (our explicit focus on public law schools), we will focus on addressing representativeness compared to public law schools.
 - We will add a sub-section to the data and methods section that compares descriptive statistics of the project dataset to admitted applicants to public U.S. law schools.
 - Law school enrollment data for 2006 are available through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) fall enrollment survey, "Major field of study, race/ethnicity, gender, attendance status, and level of student: Fall 2006." For example, the variable **efciplev** will be used to identify law students (716 = Law [first professional], all students; 736 = Law [first professional], full time students; 756 = Law [first professional], part time students). Additionally, variables such as **efrace04** and **efrace10** will be used to identify Black and Latina Women, respectively.
 - Additionally, we will contact the Law School Admission Council (LSAC) to request data on the number of women of color who applied and were admitted to U.S. public law schools. The 2006 LSAC data that are publicly available online are national aggregate statistics calculated by race/ethnicity¹ or by gender/sex.² Based on our theoretical framework, we will seek to present statistics that examine the intersection of gender and race (i.e., admissions for women of color to public U.S. law schools).
- The focus of this study is on the underrepresentation of some students of color but in fact in many graduate programs women of color are more represented than men of color (according to IPEDS 9% of law grads are African American women compared to just 5% African American men).
 - In all manuscripts resulting from the project, we will be sure to acknowledge that Black and Latino males are also underrepresented in law schools. We chose to study underrepresented women of color based on prior literature on law school admissions and our theoretical framework. We will encourage future research that examines admissions for minority males.

¹ <https://www.lsac.org/lisacresources/data/ethnicity-sex-admits/archive-2>

² <https://www.lsac.org/lisacresources/data/ethnicity-sex-admits/archive-3>