"Discrimin-admissions" (3 words)

At a time of ethnic diversity, both American and British higher education systems seem unfair as they discriminate against minority groups. The 2018 US Census Bureau's chart compares school enrolment by ethnic origin while The Economist and Afua Hirsch's testimony in The Guardian denounce ethnic discrimination at Harvard and Oxford. The Daily Free Press broadens the scope by highlighting the social pressure to enrol in elite colleges, corroborated by Granlund's satirical cartoon. How does such a discrimination affect college applicants and educational values ? (77 words)

Discrimination at Harvard is a long-standing practice, from racial quotas against Jews in the 1920s to Asian-Americans today, The Economist states. Hirsch relates her own experience as a Black student at Oxford where white teachers did not encourage her to thrive. Despite a more diversified population in US colleges between 2007 and 2017 according to the Census chart, white students still outnumber minorities by far. Both Varner and The Economist underline that the quotas imposed by Affirmative action are playing against minorities today to turn it into "Affirmative dissatisfaction". To keep tabs on its applicants sneakily, Harvard boasts about its "holistic" admissions policy by including non-academic criteria like a personality test, more subjective, that discriminates against Asian-Americans, although they outperform white students academically. The high-school SATs also overlook knowledge, Varner explains, as managing practical tips are more relevant to succeed; hence the economists' quandary to define fairness properly, The Economist observes. (148 words)

Cheating in the admissions process is condemned as a scourge. The cartoon demonstrates bribery as part and parcel of the process, which Varner examplifies with the recent scandal of celebrities who paid staggering amounts to get their children into elite colleges or as the Pinocchio student shows in the cartoon: parents resort to expensive private tuitions which rig SATs results and benefit a rich minority. The Economist goes further, explaining how a Harvard lawyer tries to juggle statistics including race and family wealth to keep afloat: (racial) quotas, easily assessed, testify that minorities are not discriminated against whereas other more qualitative and subjective factors, like wealth and legacy preferences (family connections), hold sway and are much needed for the college's reputation. Besides, Varner emphasizes that wealthy parents are crucial donors, meaning any attack against Harvard is wishful thinking: Students For Fair Admissions'

lawsuit proved inconclusive. In Britain, Hirsch argues that top universities should be blamed for not encouraging diversity because of social hierarchy. Although OFFA strongly advises minority groups' acceptance, a more homogeneous background is better praised as colleges wish to live up to their reputation. Hirsch herself was the victim of people's ingrained beliefs that a Black student was supposed to attend Oxford Brookes, not Oxford College. (209 words)

Debunking the myth of elite colleges should be a priority (docs 2&3). Social pressure fuels parents' assumption that less prestigious colleges are not worthy of their children. It is a Catch-22 (doc.2): however skilled minority students are, institutions make them feel awkward among whites and heightens their emotional stress, which eventually leads to drop-outs. Consequently, elite colleges should consider students' merit democratically, as MIT does successfully (doc.1). (66 words)

(498 words)