Targeted Universalism

Policy & Practice

by john a. powell, Stephen Menendian, Wendy Ake

This primer is published by the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at UC Berkeley

About the Authors

john a. powell is the Director of the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society and Professor of Law, African American, and Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

Stephen Menendian is the Assistant Director and Director of Research at the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society where he oversees the Institute's research initiatives and projects, including the Inclusiveness Index, fair housing policy and opportunity mapping project, and community engagement.

Wendy Ake directs the Haas Institute's Just Public Finance project. She also consults on the Institute's application of the targeted universalism policy framework and inclusive strategic philanthropy. Wendy's work explores exclusive economic structures and the potential of inclusive transformational economic systems.

Contents

There is a hunger for fresh approaches and urgent demand for novel policy methods that can break through our political gridlock, address the problems of our time and create new avenues for thriving individuals and communities. Targeted universalism is an approach that supports the needs of the particular while reminding us that we are all part of the same social fabric.

Introduction

THE WORLD IS BESET by a range of overwhelming challenges and intransigent problems that demand a policy response. Although political leaders may agree on the need for action, there is often disagreement over what constitutes an appropriate and legitimate response.[i] For example, the waves of refugee and migrant crises and the issue of widening economic inequality are two recent examples of crises in which policymakers are deeply divided on the best path forward.[1] The seemingly diminished capacity of government to address or forestall repeated waves of social crises across the globe is exacerbated by political polarization regarding what constitutes an appropriate or effective response.

Many policy disagreements are framed by familiar debates about the role of government and the nature or extent of the problem, as well as pragmatic concerns about how to structure or formulate policy for sustainable impact. More than differences of ideology or disagreement over facts, however, underlie these divides. Political polarization is fueled by a growing feeling of unfairness and the perception that policy is a zero-sum game. If one group benefits, or benefits disproportionately, then other groups may feel left behind or overlooked. The insistence that government and other public institutions remain neutral is eroded by a sense that the government is taking sides or has taken the wrong side.

In an era of political polarization and fiscal austerity, policy debates too readily become trapped in a binary of either universal responses or targeted solutions. Universal responses enjoy a degree of legitimacy in a diverse and pluralistic society, but they may also be viewed as unaffordable and overly ambitious, while also inadequate at helping those most in need. Therefore, the most marginalized people are often the most skeptical of ostensibly universal policies. Targeted policies may be more efficient and less costly, but by targeting a particular group, these approaches are often viewed as unfairly helping one group over another, seeding hostility and resentment.

Even well-intended policy interventions may inadvertently exacerbate inequality, but the absence of viable methods and workable policy frameworks ensures the perpetuation of "in-groups" and "out-groups." There is hunger for fresh approaches and policy methods that can break through our political gridlock, address the problems of our time, and create new avenues for thriving individuals and communities. Targeted universalism is an alternative to either universal or targeted strategies with the potential to bridge our most intransigent policy divides.

Targeted universalism means setting universal goals pursued by targeted processes to achieve those goals. Within a targeted universalism framework, universal goals are established for all groups concerned. The strategies developed to achieve those goals are targeted, based upon how different groups are situated within structures, culture, and across geographies to obtain the universal goal. Targeted universalism is goal oriented, and the processes are directed in service of the explicit, universal goal.

---

[i] Policy interventions follow three sequential steps: First, recognition of a social, economic, political, or environmental problem. In some cases, there is a lack of consensus that a problem exists. For example, despite the overwhelming scientific evidence, some political leaders deny that climate change is an environmental problem. Second, policymakers must decide that the problem requires and merits a policy response. Not every governmental entity has jurisdiction to address or respond to policy problems that arise within their jurisdiction. And, for prudential or ideological reasons, some political leaders may believe that the problem, such as it exists, does not merit governmental intervention. Third, policymakers must select an appropriate and effective policy response, and develop sufficient consensus to promulgate and implement it. Policy debates often involve disagreement at each step. Sometimes, however, policymakers debate the same issue at different steps, and thereby talk past each other. This report focuses on the third step, and assumes that there is consensus on the first and second steps, but disagreement at the third step. We acknowledge that this may not always be the case, and therefore the framework in this primer may not be able to help resolve every policy debate.

Targeted universalism is a platform to operationalize programs that move all groups toward the universal policy goal as well as a way of communicating and publicly marketing such programs in an inclusive, bridging manner. It is an approach that supports the needs of particular groups, even the politically powerful or those in the majority, while reminding everyone that we are all part of the same social and civic fabric. As such, targeted universalist policies are more resistant to the critique that government programs serve special interests, whoever that might be.

We urgently need aligned and coherent strategies that create belonging and promote bridging. Targeted universalism provides an approach for orchestrating these efforts. Targeted universalistic interventions undermine active or passive forces of structural exclusion and marginalization, and promote tangible experiences of belonging. Outgroups are moved from societal neglect to the center of societal care at the same time that more powerful or favored groups' needs are addressed.

The implementation strategies derived from a targeted universalism framework come in many forms. Some may be simple technical fixes or modest changes to existing programs. Others may be more sweeping changes or deeper structural reforms. Although the targeted universalism framework supports a wide range of policy interventions, the process for deriving implementation strategies unlocks the potential for transformative change. Such changes cannot arise without unraveling the narrow range of preconceived implementation possibilities held by many policymakers and reconstructing aspirations for an equitable society in which everyone can thrive. By emphasizing the universal goal as a way of justifying a diversity of implementation strategies, transformative change possibilities can be envisioned, pursued, and aligned.

This primer is offered in the spirit of sharpening and contributing to a large body of policy models. Targeted universalism is a platform that jettisons an overly formalistic, one-size-fits-all policy formula in favor of an approach that is more outcome-oriented. As such, targeted universalism opens up the possibilities for experimentalist, manifold pathway policy regimes. It is a framework that adds nuance that can complement and accommodate the best work within the domain of innovating policy change. This type of agenda requires deliberate strategizing, ground-truthing, and smart organizing. The growing community of powerful policy, advocacy, community-based organizations and others can meet the challenge. Indeed, they are already well on the way.

How to Use This Primer

Read it. This publication explains the framework of targeted universalism, discusses its advantages, and provides a process and step-by-step framework for deriving targeted universal strategies. Reading the document will provide a comprehensive understanding of targeted universalism mechanics and potential.

Apply it. This publication offers a workbook explanation of how to operationalize what is otherwise a seemingly abstract policy methodology. In our experience, targeted universalism is simple conceptually, but complex in application. Therefore, we encourage you to work with the process, consider how it may frame your current work, or attempt concrete applications of the strategy in your work. Please reach out to us to provide further support or clarification. We enjoy working with a large number of partners who implement and design targeted universalist strategies and will be happy to make connections to further this valuable work.

Contribute to its revision. This is a living document. The potential of targeted universalism is best realized in practice. We hope you will participate with us in documenting and collaborating in efforts to implement targeted universalism reforms. We would like to grow the community of people engaging with us to make its explanation and application clearer, more relevant, and more widely appreciated. We are interested in case studies, stories of success, implementation, and challenges with applying the concept and using this document. We are also interested in continuing to learn from you and others.

Did you find this primer relevant for thinking about and developing your work? Have you put it to use as a workbook? What needs to be expanded upon? Please let us know. We continue to refine this framework and appreciate learning from your experiences implementing the framework or challenges with the process. We plan to periodically update and reissue this primer. Your feedback and contributions will help it evolve and grow.

Categorizing Strategies

TARGETED UNIVERSALISM is an alternative framework to design policies and implementation strategies to achieve policy goals. Targeted universalism is sensitive to structural and cultural dynamics in ways that often elude both targeted and universal strategies. As such, it is also a way of communicating, a vernacular to build support for inclusive policies.

Despite what the term suggests, targeted universalism is more than a hybrid approach. It borrows the strengths and avoids the weaknesses of both targeted and universal approaches. Yet, it is also categorically distinct in both conception and execution. This distinction is important since a common misconception is that the targeted universalism framework is essentially "targeting within a universal" approach—i.e., pursuing targeted strategies that respond to the urgent needs of some people, and wrapping those strategies in a universal goal that holds wide appeal. But targeted universalism is more than that. It is an entirely distinctive platform for resolving problems that are often unaddressed or exacerbated by targeted or universal policies.

In contrast, targeted universalism programs are designed so that people, or groups, can achieve a universal policy goal, such as all people being adequately fed, producing housing for all those who need shelter, or having affordable health care for all. Targeted universalism is based on exploring the gaps that exist between individuals, groups, and places that can benefit from a policy or program and the aspiration-establishing goal. Targeted universalism policy formulations do more than close or bridge such gaps, but ultimately clarify and reveal the barriers or impediments to achieving the universal goal for different groups of people. The focus on gaps, while important, should be measured by reference to a universal goal, not just between groups.

To understand these differences, we must first better understand the difference between universal and targeted strategies, their nuances and subtleties and their advantages and flaws. Finally, we will turn to a discussion on how targeted universalism strategies exceed the potential of both universal policies and targeted policies while exploiting their benefits and avoiding their weaknesses.

CONCEPT 1
Universal Strategies

Universal policies are those that aspire to serve everyone without regard to group membership, status, or income. They often establish a goal or minimum protection for the general population. For example, national universal health care programs, such as single-payer systems, apply to everyone in the jurisdiction; there are no other qualifying standards that must be met, besides, possibly, citizenship in that jurisdiction. Similarly, the Fair Labor Standard Act's minimum wage policies provide a uniform floor of benefits irrespective of group membership, such as race, religion, or sexual orientation.[2]

Universal approaches have been developed and applied in a wide range of policy contexts to address critical social problems, from health care to unemployment insurance to education. Broad-based social programs, such as Social Security's unemployment insurance or old age benefits, are often referenced as the paradigmatic form of policy universalism. The assumption is everyone who meets certain work requirements is eligible for the program, and the program provides the same protections regardless of status or group membership (see Table 1). Similarly, free, universal public education is generally seen as an emblematic universal policy.

Universal policies have been defined as those that "guarantee a uniform floor of rights or benefits for all persons or, at least, offers guarantees of a set

Types of Universal Programs

Type of Policy	Components	Examples
Truly universal	They apply to everyone within a national jurisdiction. No cost or fee. No age or income baseline or minimum. No activity required.	Universal basic income
Broadly universal	A universal policy with some minimal exceptions, based upon activity.	Universal suffrage
Conditionally universal	A policy that applies conditionally, but not based on inherent characteristics.	Social Security's unemployment insurance and old age benefits; minimum wage: requires working

of rights or benefits to a broad group not defined according to identity axes."[3] Accordingly, universal policies generally apply to everyone, to all groups, within the policymaker's or administrator's jurisdiction. That does not mean, however, that all universal policies work the same way.

There are many gradations between universalistic policies. Some universal policies are truly universal, applying equally to everyone within a jurisdiction. Others are broadly universal, exempting or excluding some groups within a jurisdiction. And others are conditionally universal, depending on certain qualifying conditions or fees.

Universal suffrage, a basic principle of modern democracy, protects the right to vote irrespective of gender, race, or religion. Nonetheless, universal suffrage is generally restricted to adults attaining some age of majority, such as 18 or 21. In that respect, even this broadly universal policy excludes many people. Similarly, both free, universal public education and old age benefits, such as those provided by Social Security, depend on age qualifications, with the latter beginning at age 62. In addi-

tion, the benefit levels provided by Social Security's old age provisions depend upon the contributions made to the program, which in turn depend upon prior working life.

Even minimum wage laws, which ostensibly provide a uniform floor of benefits, typically exempt certain occupations (such as tipped employees) and sometimes minor workers. In this way, such laws are broadly or conditionally universal, but not necessarily truly universal.

Universal policies have many advantages. The appeal of the Universal Basic Income (UBI) is that it applies equally to everyone, irrespective of group status, but also of need, previous employment, or wealth.[4] Its universal scope means that there is less opportunity for a demagogic politician to rail against such a policy on the basis that it is a giveaway for special interests, or that the government is siding with one group against another. By providing the same benefit to everyone equally, a UBI is less likely to feed resentment within one segment of the population to another.

For these reasons, universal approaches are more

durable politically and judicially.[5] By providing protections to everyone, without respect to group membership within the class, universal approaches enjoy a broader and more resilient base of political support and are less likely to be viewed as benefiting a particular group. Moreover, as legal scholars have documented, universal approaches are less likely to be construed narrowly by courts and judges.[6]

Despite their scope, many universalistic policies have their genesis in problems that were disproportionately affecting specific groups or particular segments of the population. The aforementioned tactical advantages and the greater resilience of universalistic policy design has motivated policymakers to broaden policy responses to targeted problems. Consider, as two examples of this, the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and the adoption of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Both examples illustrate the particular advantage of a universalistic policy design frame.

The FMLA was a major legislative achievement of the Clinton administration.[7] The legislative effort began with recognition that new parents lacked federal employment protections if they wanted or needed to take time off of work to care for their infants. Evidence was gathered and presented that children and families benefited from having some baseline protections lacking in the United States, especially by comparison to other advanced nations. In its initial iteration, the legislation required employers to permit parents to take at least 12 weeks of leave without fear of termination or risk of dismissal. The final bill, however, was broadened and extended its protections not only to parents of children, but the care of older parents or spouses. Despite arising out of a pressing, and more narrowly framed policy problem, the FMLA was broadened to include benefits for people without children, and thus made into a broadly universal policy (see Table 1), serving the universal goal of employment stability despite urgent family caretaking needs.[ii]

Another example of a universalistic solution to a targeted problem was the multi-decade effort to curtail the racially discriminatory effects of the poll tax as a qualification for voting. This solution ultimately resulted in the Twenty-Fourth Amendment, which prohibited the use of a poll tax. Poll taxes were typically used by Southern states to make

it more difficult for the poor, but especially poor Black Americans, to vote. Before the adoption of the amendment, many anti-poll tax advocates had sought a federal anti-discrimination law that would have scrutinized the use of the poll tax when used to disenfranchise Black voters. By creating a blanket prohibition, rather than an antidiscrimination standard, as many of the anti-poll tax advocates initially sought, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment solved a problem disproportionately faced by a racial minority with a universal policy.[8] In this form, the constitutional amendment enjoyed broader support, including from white voters who were also impacted by such laws. Similarly, the National Voter Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act are both examples of voting legislation that is universal in scope, despite addressing problems confronted by particular communities and groups, including the issues arising from the 2000 presidential election.[9]

Universal approaches are not defined by the problems they are attempting to solve, but by their scope of coverage or application, and by how they establish or provide broadly uniform minimums or protections. Just like minimum wage laws, the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Twenty-Fourth Amendment, and the FMLA apply regardless of status or need. Moreover, the broader, universalistic policy frame made each of these laws more politically popular and durable.

Universal policies are lauded for their tactical advantages, but they suffer a number of disadvantages as well. Universal policies are perceived—and not unjustifiably so—as entailing greater costs on account of greater benefits.[10] Where these benefits are not minimum legal protections, but involve treasury outlays or higher pay or benefits, those costs can be directly passed on to taxpayers or consumers. As noted before, some UBI proposals would provide identical payments to everyone, regardless of income.[11] Under a UBI, millionaires and billionaires would receive the same payments as the extreme poor. As such, universal policies are susceptible to the critique that they provide benefits to individuals or groups who do not need them, and therefore are inefficient or wasteful of collective resources such as government funds.

Perhaps the most trenchant cost critique of universal policies arose in the debates in recent years over universal pre-K. In his 2013 State of the Union address, President Barack Obama proposed a universal pre-K program. Debate over his proposal centered largely on the cost, which was estimated to be $12.3 billion each year.[12] The estimated cost inclined many commentators to suggest that a tar-

---

[ii] The FMLA could have been made more "universal" by extending its coverage to a broader range of kinship relationships, but the final bill was broadened from its originally targeted form.

geted program for low-income children would be a better policy approach.[13] However, the experience of the popular universal pre-K program instituted by the de Blasio administration in New York City illustrates the benefits, political and educational, of the universal approach.[14]

Another critique of universal approaches is that they exacerbate disparities and deepen inequality or injustice in society. This critique of universal policies is counterintuitive, but is well-supported by experience. Consider, for example, Massachusetts' 2006 statewide universal health care law.[15] The goal was to provide all of the state's citizens with access to health care through a mixture of subsidies and penalties. As a result of the program, 96 percent of the state's residents were able to obtain health insurance, above the national average of 84 percent.[16] This indicates that the policy was a significant achievement in that many more people were able to obtain health insurance. The problem was that the provision of health insurance did not translate into access to health care for individuals or groups with inadequate access to health care providers.[17]

For people who simply could not afford a doctor, the provision of insurance solved that problem. But for individuals residing in neighborhoods without or proximate to few or no health care providers, having health insurance did not solve the problem of lack of access to health care providers. For people in poor urban or rural communities with too few doctors or health care facilities, or who lacked a car or transportation to reach one, health insurance alone could not resolve that problem. Nor did it solve language barriers or other obstacles to securing access to a provider.

The result of the state's universal program was to exacerbate racial disparities in health coverage. A few years into the program, 78.9 percent of the state's Hispanic population was insured compared to 96 percent of the non-Hispanic white population.[18] It has further been demonstrated that Hispanic groups with limited English proficiency and Spanish-speaking groups did not advance toward the goal of universal coverage. The universal policy assumed that one strategy—making health insurance available—would both enable everyone to have insurance and would improve access to health care. However, for many groups, additional strategies were needed. Increasing the availability of primary care physicians in underserved areas was a barrier for some groups. Some groups faced a language barrier in enrolling in the program and in finding care providers. Simplifying the enrollment process, providing assistance in finding care providers, and helping to navigate the

health care system is necessary to help reach underserved populations.

Universal approaches can exacerbate disparities by addressing only one barrier to achieving the goal. This was perhaps most evident in the original implementation of the Social Security Act's various programs. Not only did the act exempt domestic and agricultural job classifications, occupations primarily filled by Black Americans and women, but it also provides benefits that scale to pay.[19] Consequently, in a discriminatory labor market, the benefits of the program were dramatically uneven.[20]

In a similar vein, consider job training programs that typically focus on the provision of technical skills and credentials. The presumption is that technical skills and credentials are what blocks potential employees from finding employment. Barriers to jobs include not only technical and vocational skills, but soft skills and social skills needed to interview and land the job, knowledge of job openings, and transportation to a job or access to a car. A job training program that treats everyone the same may also exacerbates disparities.

While the potential for universal approaches to exacerbate or deepen group-based disparities is perhaps their most problematic feature, there is a more fundamental flaw. Universal strategies in practice often function like targeted strategies. All universal policies assume a norm or a universal situation. For example, the Social Security Act was implicitly designed to make changes that would lift up the conditions of a white, able-bodied, working age man. People who were disabled were less likely to benefit from the program. And people who were no longer of working age could not benefit from the program either. At the core of any universal approach is an implicit universal norm, assuming that everyone it attempts to serve is similarly situated. Therefore, in the end, when the policy is implemented, it only serves some or a few people—that is, it proves to be a targeted program.

The Massachusetts universal health care policy reflects this deficiency. For some groups, the only thing that stood between them and health care was health insurance. Groups with limited English proficiency needed health insurance, assistance with the enrollment process, and access to quality health care providers in their communities. Groups with low income needed health insurance and a cost-reduction mechanism for medical care. The universal policy, with its singular strategy, moved some to the goal, but left others behind.

Universal health care plans hold great appeal for

many involved in social justice work. When implemented, the plans made solid measurable gains. However, there is an outstanding need for considering the underlying goal and the diverse array of barriers to that goal for specific groups within the general population.

Now that we have described universal policies in concept, as well as in their varying forms, presented a range of illustrative examples, and laid out their advantages and disadvantages, we turn to targeted policies for the same treatment.

Targeted Strategies

Targeted policies single out specific populations or make provisions for selected groups, generally, to the exclusion of others. Benefits or protections based on targeted policies depend on group membership or another categorical basis of eligibility, such as status or income. In this respect, they neither set nor pursue a universal strategy or goal, at least not explicitly.[21] Rather, the policy is tailored to the needs of the people it aims to serve or protect. This produces a binary program design, where members of the target groups benefit while members of other groups, no matter how well-off, do not receive the benefit or protection. This is often a source of claims of unfairness.

Like universal policies, targeted policies are ubiquitous and broadly familiar. Programs such as the Food Stamp Program (now redesigned as the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, or SNAP) epitomize targeted policies, providing food to low-income families who might be at risk of hunger or malnutrition. As we will discuss, each of these strategies may prove insufficient to achieve their policy goal, and not simply because of inadequate funding. Any program or policy with means-tested eligibility requirements or other income parameters are likely examples of targeted policies. For example, in contrast to a UBI, a negative income tax would provide benefits only to the lowest income brackets, and thus would condition benefits on income eligibility.

Targeted strategies may also provide public benefits to particular groups, such as veterans or people with disabilities. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the GI Bill, may be one of the most successful targeted policies in American history, providing subsidized education, loans, and health care to veterans returning from World War II.[22]

Targeted policies are prominent in civil rights legislation. Antidiscrimination norms are enacted because of the prevalence of discrimination on the basis of group membership. Additionally, many features of antidiscrimination law provide for special treatment for the targeted group. For example, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires not only equal treatment, but also special accommodations for persons with disabilities, including the provision of ADA accessible easements, entrances, and seating in public accommodations. The accommodation provisions are more than simple equal treatment mandates; they require affirmative accommodation by government, employers, or public businesses.[23]

Similarly, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 did not simply prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, but it specifically extended its protections to workers "over the age of 40."[24] This was set in recognition of a targeted problem. Namely, among others reasons, that "older workers find themselves disadvantaged in their efforts to retain employment, and especially to regain employment, when displaced from jobs."[25] Thus, by targeting workers over the age of 40 with special protections, the ADEA is a targeted policy.

Perhaps the most well-known and controversial class of targeted policies are affirmative action policies, which, in the contexts of employment, admissions, and government procurement, establish targets or soft goals for the hiring, contracting, enrollment, or promotion of underrepresented or historically disadvantaged groups. In a notable example, the University of California at Davis medical school set an enrollment quota of 16 seats for disadvantaged racial minorities in the early 1970s.[26] Other examples include specific set-asides, such as procurement or contract dollar targets, as enacted in the State of Ohio's Minority Business Enterprise Program.

While some may think that distributing access to college, jobs, or other limited resources cannot or should not be based on race, the distribution of such public or private goods based on grades or test scores results in an uneven distribution of such goods. Nonetheless, the assumption is that the latter such distributions are neutral, fair, or "meritorious," whereas programs such as affirmative action are not. Whether the selection criteria is based on race or some seemingly neutral merit criteria, the program is still "targeted."

Despite the association of targeted policies with protections for certain racial or other minorities, most targeted policies or approaches do not rely

Equity Imagery in the Context of Targeted Universalism

A common set of images used to illustrate the difference between formally equal treatment and supports that help individuals reach the "universal goal" are those that feature people behind a fence and trying to catch the view on the other side.

The fencing imagery is often framed as distinguishing between "equality," meaning strictly "equal treatment," and "equity" or fairness. In the '"equality" version of the image, people of different heights have equally sized boxes to help lift them in an aid to see above the fence. Each person is given an identically sized box to help them see over the fence—but only the taller person is able to see over the fence when they stand on the box. The same box doesn't help people of different heights see over the fence. In this way the visual metaphor demonstrates the idea that treating "different people" equally is not a solution. When we map this image onto the concept of targeted universalism it may be said that the universal strategy of distributing identical boxes to different people did not enable everyone to reach the goal. Targeted universalism does advocate for different people receiving different strategies or greater resources—in this case everyone could see over the fence if they had different sized boxes or more than one box. However, this image doesn't serve as the best metaphor for targeted universalism. From this analysis of the image we presume that the universal goal was to make it so that everyone could see over the fence.

A more careful analysis can point out the fact that the fundamental goal would be to remove the fence—and the goal would be to have everyone see and enjoy the baseball game. If the fence were gone, no one would need to stand on boxes—whether that's one or more boxes. This is definitely a more durable solution and doesn't require the perpetual distribution and production of boxes.

Removing the fence is universalistic—helping everyone to see the game— and does not single out a particular group based on height. This enables strategy design that solves the problem for the shortest people and the

Source: Family Futures (2014)

Sources: Variations of these images have been created by Craig Froehle, Angus Maguire, the Center for Story-Based Strategy and the Interaction Institute for Social Change.

tallest people. In so doing, figuring out how to take apart the fence does not focus on the "deficits" of individual people. Taking apart the fence is also a structural— rather than an individual—fix, is more durable, and benefits everyone.

Reading even more into this metaphor, we can appreciate the role of institutions, structures, and systems. One version of this image sometimes reconstructs the fence—see the final figure above. The wooden privacy fence has been replaced by a chain link fence. This is also a false solution—people can see the game but there is an enduring structural artifact that keeps people out of the facility. Certainly, in an image without a fence, we imagine that the team up for bat would usher the new game attendants to the bleachers and off the expanded field. Changing a literal structural barrier can make the existing rules of the game add people to the bleachers. There is a presumption in this figure that everyone wants to see a baseball game—an exceptionally long, and some may say boring, game. If more people were allowed into the game as spectators, then there is more potential for their desires to sway decisions. Maybe the publicly funded sports field can begin to host many different kinds of sports of interest to different people.

on group-based membership. Perhaps the most famous bundle of programs that embodied targeted approaches are the set of programs developed under the auspices of the so-called War on Poverty. These include the aforementioned Food Stamp Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which created the Community Action Program, Job Corps, and Volunteers in Service to America. The ESEA created a new channel for providing federal funding for primary and secondary education for underresourced communities and school districts. Although, in practice, nearly every school district received so-called Title I funds, the funds are ostensibly targeted at the most underresourced districts.[27]

As suggested by the resilience of universal policies, targeted programs are more vulnerable by comparison. In addition to the long-running attack on affirmative action as "reverse racism," the entire War on Poverty program came under sustained political assault in the 1970s, an attack which continued through the '80s and early '90s. In this environment, some wondered whether anti-poverty programs should be more narrowly targeted to apply only to "the truly disadvantaged."[28] Others wondered if the targeted nature of these programs made them particularly susceptible to political attack, some calling to mind the nineteenth century poorhouses and other policies that proved ultimately unsustainable for similar reasons.[29]

To some politicians and citizens, singling out a particular group to receive benefits, while excluding others, may seem unfair. An ethos of distributing resources equally is strongly held in our polity. But even when carefully justified, demagogic politicians can use the unequal distribution to claim that government is unfair, or taking sides. The refrain frequently leveled against social welfare programs, such Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or SNAP, is exactly that, and has been the operating logic underwriting decades of cutbacks in social welfare programs.

A weakness of targeted programs is their vulnerability to political challenge, particularly when the targeted group is an "outgroup" or perceived as undeserving.

If a targeted policy directs focus to these individuals, negative stereotypes and beliefs about those groups undermine support for an "underserving" out-group. Many of the most marginalized groups are also the least favored in the larger public imagination. Too often, the prevailing assumption is that the condition of that group lies with them rather than with society or the means by which benefits are distributed. For that reason, targeted programs for the elderly are more likely to be well-received and politically sustainable than targeted benefits for marginalized populations based on race or ethnicity. Means-tested programs are susceptible to the erosion of political will due to powerful and incorrect stereotypes as well as the averred unfairness of unequal benefit provision. Slashing social welfare programs, in particular, is a top policy objective and refrain of conservative politics.

We can see the distinction between popular support for strategies that target out-groups versus in-groups—particularly with corporations—when comparing federal social welfare spending versus corporate subsidies. For example, while $59 billion was spent on social welfare programs in 2014, $92 billion was spent on corporate subsidies.[30] Social welfare programs were publicly and consistently attacked, while corporate tax credits were largely left out of any public spending debate. Similarly, popular housing subsidies that primarily benefit the upper-middle class and affluent, including the mortgage interest deduction, may cost the treasury hundreds of billions of dollars per year.[31] In contrast, the federal government spends only a fraction of that amount (estimated at $46 billion per year) on affordable housing. Moreover, President Obama's 2017 budget estimated that it would cost only $1 billion more a year over 10 years to completely eliminate homelessness in the US.[32]

Popular support for social welfare programs has eroded by associating those programs with out-group stereotypes that run against the grain of popular societal values of independence, autonomy, and individual motivation. Such inaccurate and brutalizing stereotypes include poor people being cast as "lazy" and the racialized and gendered stereotype of the "welfare queen." Since the 1970s welfare support programs were attacked with a discourse tying racial stereotypes to such programs. This discourse ties the negative way people unconsciously feel about stereotyped groups to their decision to support or oppose a policy.[33]

Despite the perception that many targeted policies, especially those associated with the War on Poverty, have failed, targeted policies tend to be successful

in achieving their policy aims when fully implemented on a sustained basis. The tailored nature of the targeted policy means that it has a good chance at success. Targeting strategies for particular groups can produce measurable gains, as the GI Bill demonstrates. Consider, as another example, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The tax credit exclusively targets working families under a particular income level. Those families, representing nearly one out of every five tax filers in the US, received a tax credit averaging $2,194 in 2010.[34] This policy singles out a particular group and provides financial advantage to the group. The EITC has lifted approximately 4.7 million children above the poverty line.

Now that we have described and contrasted universal and targeted policies, we will turn to targeted universal approaches.

Targeted Universal Strategies

While they each have their advantages, universal and targeted policies are not only politically fraught, but have proved incapable of addressing, let alone solving, many of our most enduring social, economic, and environmental problems.[35] Having acknowledged this fact, many legal and political scholars have lamented the limits of prevailing policy design and policy imagination.[36] There is another way: targeted universalism. Targeted universalism is an alternative policy framework to design and implement policies that can achieve critical policy goals and bring us closer to our collective aspirations. Targeted universalism platforms are designed to enable everyone to enjoy the realization of a policy goal. The implementation strategies derived from this platform are designed to advance everyone to the universal goal.

Targeted universalism is sometimes incompletely understood as a platform that takes the best parts of targeted strategies and universal strategies—avoiding the problems and maintaining the advantages of each.[37] In that respect, targeted universalism might seem exactly like Theda Skocpol's call for "targeting within universalism." Indeed, it is very similar—the differences lie in very close inspection of targeted universalism—the insight we hope to provide here. Targeted universalism is categorically different, in both concept and execution.

First, targeted universalism is outcome-oriented, and the processes are directed in service of the explicit, universal goal.

Targeted universalism emphasizes goals, and recenters the policy debate toward a focus on outcomes.

Many policy efforts are designed to be either a targeted or universal strategy, but the goal is not an explicit part of the public debate or the way it is discussed in the public sphere—there is not an effort to consistently and coherently articulate what the strategy intends to accomplish. For example, in the context of health care, the Obama administration's overwhelming emphasis in promoting the Affordable Care Act (ACA) was the lack of insurance coverage for tens of millions of Americans. But, as the more recent debates over Medicare for all or single-payer as well as the experience of the Massachusetts health care law illustrate, health insurance is only one facet of the problem. Extending health insurance to millions of additional Americans has not come close to accomplishing the goal of universalizing access to health care. Extending insurance is an important but incomplete strategy to achieve the goal. From public debate around the ACA, it seems that policymakers either conflated health insurance with wellness and quality health care or were simply narrowly focused on a competitive market-based arrangement to provide health insurance to a larger number of people who were locked out of the market. In targeted universalism, a great deal of attention should be granted toward the identification of the universal goal.

Second, targeted universalism rejects a single or even a limited number of targeted implementation strategies toward a universal goal. Too often, policymakers develop a one-size-fits-all remedy to achieve policy goals, failing to understand that different communities and populations have different needs. Targeted universalism seeks the development of a range of implementation strategies. The implementation strategies are tailored to address both the structures that impede different groups and populations and to affirmatively develop structures that promote the desired outcome for different populations. The strategies are targeted, but the goal is always universal.

If the goal was trying to make health insurance available to all, then one could say that the Massachusetts experiment was successful. If the goal was to make sure everyone had access to a health care worker, it was not. Of course, the goal might

have been to provide health care to all communities and all people. Even then, providing access would not necessarily be adequate. This example illustrates two critical aspects of targeted universalism: First, it is important to be clear on what the universal goal is, and distinguish it from subsidiary or intermediate goals. Second, the "universal" in targeted universalism is not the implementation strategy or application. Targeted universalism does not aim to reach all people in the same way.

Targeted universalism rejects a blanket universal strategy, which is likely to be indifferent to the reality that different groups are situated differently relative to the institutions and resources of society. It also rejects the claim of formal equality that would treat all people the same as a way of ignoring difference—recall that universal strategies may not achieve universal goals. For this reason, targeted universalism is sometimes referred to as "Equity 2.0"—a framework to realize the full potential of pursuing equity. It embraces difference and disables any attempt to legitimize an inequitable status quo through treating everyone the same, with the same solutions, and the same attention. With an unwavering commitment to the universal goal, targeted universalism platforms require a diversity of strategies to advance all people toward it. It is not narrowly concerned with the disparities between groups.

Consider, for example, the series of popular images used to depict differences between equity and equality. In this primer we present various versions of these graphics accompanied by commentaries of the different visual metaphors. For example, a popular image and metaphor is a fence that obscures a ball game or natural sight that everyone might like to see (see p. 12). Taller individuals may be able to see over the fence, but shorter people or children may lack such a view. The fence takes everyone as they are and treats everyone equally, yet it has an unequal impact.

The general analysis suggested by this familiar equity imagery attempts to move us beyond a narrow conception of equality, but it is problematic in several respects. As our analysis reflects, such imagery suggests that the problem lies with the difference in height and not the structure in which height becomes a barrier. Further imagery has been developed to address this deficiency in part by, for example, removing the barrier instead of boosting an individual's height or replacing the barrier with a transparent barrier.

A different representation might illustrate three people of the same height, but one standing on a mound, one in a hole, and the other on flat land. In this depiction, it becomes clear that difference in outcomes is baked into the structure and is not due to particular characteristics of individuals. One could continue to play with this example, and several organizations have. The limitation with the approach of simply removing the barrier is that it suggests we can function without structures. Individuals are necessarily situated within structures and systems—malleable as those may be. Furthermore, structures are not neutral. In addition, the spectators should have a role in not just seeing the game but in constructing it.[iii]

We might achieve the goal of permitting everyone to view it by installing a stool or a bench at an appropriate distance, or provide viewer holes through the fence. Even then, however, some people, such as those with vision impairments, may not be able to see the view. In India, a group of blind students campaigned for a small model of the Taj Mahal so that they could apprehend the structure.[38]

Targeted universalism can address such barriers by making a structural change that removes a barrier and by providing shorter-term fixes and structural supports for people suffering under the barrier. Targeted universalism as Equity 2.0 moves beyond debates over equal treatment with a recognition of a shared goal or universal aspiration.

A shared goal instills a sense of shared aspiration and reinforces collective obligations. It counters forces that divide in- and out-groups. This is critical both at a strategic and conceptual level. It is strategic in that a shared goal of interest to all groups can diffuse potential discursive attacks, singling out particular groups and weakening the broader policy. It is also conceptually necessary given the flaws in both targeted and universalistic approaches.

The emphasis on a shared aspiration raises the expectations of all groups and does not set the goal based upon what more privileged groups already have. For example, many interventions in education focus on the performance gap—a disparity—between white students and their Latinx and Black counterparts. However, a shared goal would exceed the current performance of white students as well

---

iii This is one of the important distinctions between inclusion and belonging. Targeted universalism is an opportunity to put belonging "on the ground" in practice. In inclusion, the structure that similarly situates people is critical. In belonging, the structure is cocreated by the participants. This is one of the reasons the process for defining the universal goal must be taken seriously, rather than assumed.

Equity Imagery in the Context of Targeted Universalism

© 2014, Saskatoon Health Region

Sources: Elmina B. Sewall Foundation and Saskatoon Health Region Advancing Health Equity

In addition to the image of fences and baseball games, another image of people of different heights picking apples is used as a visual metaphor of the difference between equity and equality. In this image, people of various heights reach up to get an apple hanging from tree branches. These images imply that the everyone is trying to reach an apple.

The ability to reach the shared goal—getting to an apple—depends on the height and reach of the individuals. Thus, supports can be provided to help different individuals reach the universal goal.

The image suggests that the goal is to reach an apple—to pick it. However, the universal shared goal may actually be to provide food for people in the community in which the apple pickers live. In this case, the goal is not to reach the apple—but to harvest apples to share with others. It's important to those picking the apples that everyone eats. For everyone to eat, people in the image need to reach the branches, and other people—who are not in the image—just need all the apples harvested.

Concerning the shared goal here to feed people, it is meaningful to consider the "invisible" role of institutions, structures, and systems that may be at play in this image. Institutions guide the relationships between farmworkers and the people who control the land and create the structures that reify the terms of those relationships. If the apple pickers are working on a massive commercial farm and lack basic worker protections there are unique dynamics to harvesting apples, and the desire to feed their families may only make them focus on earning enough wages to purchase food. If the people picking apples are on a weekend leisure trip to a fruit farm then they may only gather enough for cider and baked apples for a treat at the week's family meals. All of the details in this image are relevant and reflect the kinds of fine-grained analysis and detail that would create the basis for designing targeted universal strategies on the ground.

rather than use white performance as a baseline. This goal may set a new standard of performance that all students have yet to benefit from.

In fact, this is one of targeted universalism's most important features. While the gap between groups is important, it is of limited insight or value. Relative equality between groups matters but is incomplete. One could close the gap between groups with none of them getting close toward the universal goal. Indeed, instead of achieving the universal goal, one could perversely reduce all groups to the lowest common condition of the most marginalized group, and the disparity between groups would vanish. Within targeted universalism, intergroup disparities should be used only as a diagnostic tool to assess relative performance, and not as a policy focus.

In the context of a shared aspiration and universal goal, we can investigate the ways different students are situated within the intersections of various systems that shape educational performance, including housing stability, food security, and transportation. In so doing, we might find that poor African American and white students, homeless students, and newly arrived immigrant students need affordable housing near the school and changes in enrollment criteria so they may be able to stay in the same school all year long. This will go a long way to helping their achievement of performance outcomes.

We might find that poor white students and poor Asian students need better transportation to get safely from their communities to the school. In this way, when we look for implementation strategies, we are not taking for granted groups of people identified in disparities data and groups on either side of "gaps" in disparities data. Rather, we see the disparities as a signal of a structural problem and move straight away to examining all the different structures that shape student outcomes.

Consider the brilliant work being done to disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline. These efforts reorganize the systems and change the structures perpetuating the problem of youth of color being swept up into the criminal justice system. This work is characterized by a set of powerful, targeted interventions, many of which have realized meaningful gains. Some interventions have centered on bringing practices of restorative justice into schools as a way to resolve what may otherwise be conflicts referred to police.

For example, see the "Restorative Practices" report detailing the implementation of restorative justice

in Alexandria City Public Schools.[39] There are many organizations advancing this strategy as a strategic intervention that interrupts what has come to be known as the "school-to-prison pipeline." The Advancement Project is one organization that has lifted up the potential power of restorative justice as a racial justice strategy—an intervention strategy that is a systemic approach to changing the criminal justice system.[40]

While students of color are the primary students facing the violence of the criminal justice system and its role in schools, there are other groups similarly situated with respect to the presence of police and the criminal justice system being combined with the education system: namely students with mental disabilities and abused/traumatized students. In this way, the strategy of restorative justice, teacher training, and changes in state and local policy disadvantage those students, and those students are the target of these interventions.

These targeted strategies serve a universal goal: all students should be educated in safe environments that nurture intellectual and emotional intelligence. Targeted strategies for youth of color to attain this goal include interventions to eradicate the school-to-prison pipeline, among many other strategies.

For other groups of students, such as students in affluent suburbs with high-performing schools, there may need to be an infusion of mentoring or counseling programs, additional expertise and training for teachers and principals to integrate empathy into their educational environments, and additional adult support for the learning environment. All groups can benefit and be supported by interventions to meet this universal goal.

While targeted universalism acknowledges different strategies needed for everyone to be able to benefit from reaching the goal, the platform also acknowledges and directs the prioritizing of different needs, different strategies, and a fair—rather than even—distribution of resources. Often these are the very real constraints that emerge on the ground as targeted universal strategies are designed and implemented..

Five Steps for Targeted Universalism

1. Establish a universal goal based upon a broadly shared recognition of a societal problem and collective aspirations.

2. Assess general population performance relative to the universal goal.

3. Identify groups and places that are performing differently with respect to the goal. Groups should be disaggregated.

4. Assess and understand the structures that support or impede each group or community from achieving the universal goal.

5. Develop and implement targeted strategies for each group to reach the universal goal.

Creating a Targeted Universalism Framework

CONCEPTUALLY INTUITIVE and appealing, targeted universalism is much more difficult to develop and implement. This section of the primer sets out a straightforward five-step process for developing targeted universalism policies. Subsequent sections of the primer will address more challenging elements set out within this framework in more detail, serving as a sort of troubleshooting guide.

Establish a universal goal based upon a broadly shared recognition of a societal problem and collective aspirations

Like all policy solutions, targeted universalism begins with recognition of a societal problem or a collective aspiration. The problem is sufficiently persistent and intransigent that it calls for a policy response and cannot be addressed alone by markets or private actors. The heart of this step is to establish a universal goal in relation to the societal problem. This may be a source of confusion, so let us be especially clear on this point.

As noted in the footnote in the Introduction to this report, in some cases there is a lack of political consensus that a social, economic, or environmental problem or need exists. Even where such consensus exists, however, there is sometimes a lack of consensus or disagreement that the problem or need warrants or merits a policy response.[41] For practical or ideological reasons, policymakers disagree that the government can help alleviate or address the problem. A targeted universalism platform cannot resolve policy disagreements in these respects.[iv] It can, however, forge a policy pathway forward where there is broad agreement that a problem exists and, furthermore, that the problem warrants a policy response, but there is disagreement or uncertainty about what to do.

Where there is broad consensus that a problem or need exists, and that a policy response is appropriate, a targeted universalism platform is the approach that has the best chance for creating a sustainable policy intervention to actually solve the problem or address the need. To do so, the first step is to clearly articulate the universal goal reflected by the collective aspiration or broad need.

As noted in the discussion on the various forms of "universal" policies above, there are varying forms of universalism. Some "universal" policies touch everyone within a jurisdiction, as with some forms of UBI. Others, however, might only apply to people of working age, as is the case with other forms of UBI or universal suffrage, which exclude minors or the very young. Similarly, universal basic education is aimed at the young, while universal old age insurance is aimed at the old.

What is meant by "universal" must be worked out in relation to the problem or need. If the problem is hunger, then the universal goal might be that everyone is fed and has adequate nutrition. If the problem is homelessness, then the universal goal might be that everyone has shelter. If the problem is unsafe working conditions, then the universal goal might be that everyone has the benefit of minimum safety standards at work.

Recall that the FMLA developed a universal policy response to the problem of work instability for new parents, by extending protections for families without children who need time off to take care of family members, such as parents. The societal problem need not be universal or even broadly experienced to warrant the articulation of a universal goal that reflects a collective aspiration. For example, a policymaker might begin with the recognition of dispro-

---

iv There need not be complete consensus that a problem exists for a targeted universalism platform to proceed, but there does need to be a broadly shared recognition.

portionate levels of hunger in rural communities. If decision-makers and advocates join forces to create a targeted universal framework and craft a universal goal that would serve this population, the universal goal might be that "everyone has adequate nutrition." This is a universal goal in that it reflects collective aspirations and it is one that nearly all groups would accept, even urban populations that might not be suffering from hunger to the same degree—while serving those who might be—including the groups that were initially the focus of the policy.

Most legislation contains a statement of purpose, a section that describes the main purpose or a set of purposes, usually near the beginning of a bill. Less often, however, such statements articulate a collective aspiration in the form of a universal goal. For example, the first two purposes provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) were "[t]o preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery" and "to assist those most impacted by the recession."[42] The nation's primary legislative response to the Great Recession, ARRA was focused on pulling the economy out of the recession, but also explicitly attempted to help those most immediately impacted by the recession.

Some policy goals can be viewed as strategies to achieve other deeper and sometimes tacit goals. For example, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, aka "Obamacare," had as a statement of purpose "to improve access to and the delivery of health care services for all individuals, particularly low income, underserved, uninsured, minority, health disparity, and rural."[43] Providing health care services is a strategy to help people live a healthy life, rather than an end in and of itself. Refer back to our example of whether or not a policy of universalizing health insurance accomplishes the goal of providing access to health care, let alone this deeper goal. Had policymakers more carefully investigated the problem, they might have considered the full suite of strategies that could improve well-being and identify what health problems mean to people with day-to-day challenges. And, as we described, it would be clear that much more than health insurance is needed.

In general, however, the goal is either explicitly stated as part of the policy or implicit in the program. It is important to contextualize any strategy or policy as an effort to reach a particular goal. Universal health care works to realize the goal of accessing quality health care or living a healthy life. The SNAP program, a means-tested benefit, is an effort to realize the goal of obtaining food required for good health for all families, and avoiding hunger and malnutrition.

The articulation of the universal goal is the first step in a targeted universalism platform because it then serves as the basis for subsequent policy development. Without reference to the universal goal, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to assess progress and evaluate success.

Given that policymakers represent constituents and not others outside of their jurisdiction, it is not a defect of universal goal setting that the universal goal may have geographic or jurisdictional limits. We would not expect a municipal government to legislate on behalf of another government, just as a central government would not legislate on behalf of another nation's central government with respect to the problem of school funding or health care provision. By "universal," we mean universal insofar as it applies to a policymaker's jurisdiction.

Within a jurisdiction, the objective is then to get all groups to the goal, not just the most politically powerful or most marginalized within a society. In establishing the universal goal, no group is favored except insofar as the problem has landed on the policy agenda.[v] Ultimately, the goal—whether reflective a collective aspiration or a response to a societal problem—is one that requires broad consensus.

Assess general population performance relative to the universal goal

With a universal goal in place, the next step in operationalizing a targeted universalism framework is a general performance measure for the overall population within the policymaker's jurisdiction. Consistent with universalism, we must begin by understanding how well the overall population fares relative to the universal goal.

For example, we might assess the percentage of the population that fails proficiency on performance exams, lacks health insurance, or is inadequately nourished. If we take exam performance, health insurance, or hunger as a serious matter, then measuring the general population relative to this standard reveals the extent and scope of any social problem.

---

[v] As political scientists observe, politically powerful interest groups may be more successful than others in shaping the legislative agenda. A targeted universalism framework cannot solve this problem, either. However, once a universal policy goal has been established, then the targeted universalism platform will help ensure that no group is favored.

This baseline is necessary both to understand the nature of the problem as well as to provide a performance measure from which to evaluate and understand subgroup performance.

It is important to note, however, that the general performance measure does not become the baseline for a targeted universalism framework—we should never aspire to merely close gaps to move everyone toward the universal goal. Rather, the general performance measure provides a context for understanding the extent of the problem. The general performance measure simply allows us to understand the depth of scope of the problem to be addressed, and forms the foundation for the development of targeted strategies.

Identify groups and places that are performing differently with respect to the goal and disaggregate them

With the universal goal in mind, and the general performance measure relative to the universal goal available, the next step in a targeted universalism platform is to conduct a more granular assessment of how various subgroups perform relative to goal. A more detailed demographic and geographic analysis is necessary because the general population measure masks differential experiences of the problem relative to the universal goal.

Any social or economic problem is likely to have uneven effects across any general population. Some problems are experienced more intensely by rural or urban populations; racial, ethnic and religious minorities; women; LGBTQ persons; or, people with disabilities. For example, the opioid crisis has been most acute in rural communities.[44] Understanding how those effects are distributed is a prerequisite to crafting implementation strategies within targeted universalism platform. Without appreciating or fully recognizing that different groups perform differently with respect to the universal goal, we cannot understand why, let alone investigate, the causes of these outcomes. It is important when looking at this difference to understand this may say more about the structure and how opportunity is distributed than the nature of the group itself.

For example, if we find that 85 percent of the general population achieves the universal goal in relation to some problem, we might find that only 75 percent of men, or just 70 percent of rural men, or even just 65 percent of rural, white men achieve the universal goal. Such information is important to

assessing the nature of the problem and developing strategies to move rural men, in this example, toward the universal goal.

Defining constituent groups within the general population should be fact driven rather than based upon preconceived notions of group identity. When examining student performance, for example, we might need to examine different possible groupings of students or combinations of traits or characteristics to identify performance gaps that require further investigation.

Just as the universal goal must always be framed in terms of everyone, with no group favored, so too must the disparity data focus on the relationship to the goal or overall population, and *not* in relation to a dominant group. The purpose of this step is not to examine or identify disparities between one subgroup and another. Rather, the purpose is to identify distance from the universal goal.

Evaluating subgroup performance relative to the overall population might seem like a focus on disparities from a marginalized group relative to the dominant group, but it is not the same thing. An example can illustrate this subtle distinction. Suppose that a general performance evaluation conducted under Step 2 reveals that 73 percent of the overall population achieves the universal goal, whatever that might be. But suppose that the dominant group (however you might define that) within that population achieves the universal goal at a rate of 81 percent, and that a particularly marginalized group achieves the universal goal at a rate of 67 percent.

A disparity focus would emphasize the difference between the performance of the dominant group and the performance of the marginalized group, or the difference between 67 percent and 81 percent. However, the difference between the marginalized group and the general population performance was 67 percent to 73 percent. While a targeted universalism platform is concerned primarily with moving all groups to the universal goal, and therefore achieving a 100 percent achievement rate, it is secondarily focused on the general population and subgroups, not between the performance of marginalized group and dominant groups.

In fact, a targeted universalism framework deliberately shifts focus away from the performance of dominant groups. By focusing on how well dominant groups perform in relation to universal goals, we set the bar too low and slip back into targeted strategies. Only by focusing on the universal goal can we overcome this problem and the attendant

deficiencies of targeted strategies.

Why, then, conduct a general performance measure at all? The distance of subgroups from the general population measure serves as a diagnostic indicator and baseline measure that direct attention to conditions and structures that will be assessed in the next step. Many disparities are an effect of interlocking institutions, systems, markets, geographies, and structures. Performance disparities between groups relative to the universal goal are not always results of barriers to the universal goal. Often, the disparity in performance is not the result of an affirmative barrier so much as it is a dysfunction in the system. Only by understanding the general performance measure can we begin to understand the extent to which systems and structures are impeding or failing to serve subgroup populations.

In addition to different groups of people who experience different barriers to reaching the goal, many places or geographic locations must be assessed. Thus, in addition to examining the performance of various groups, we must also look at how certain places or communities fare relative to the universal goal. Residents from certain neighborhoods may be visibly disadvantaged in terms of employment, health outcomes, educational performance, or skills development. As noted above, the opioid crisis has particularly devastated rural communities. Without assessing performance or incidence of a problem geographically, it may be more difficult to identify or pinpoint underlying causes.

Furthermore, population subgroups may be spatially sorted. Thus, we need to assess how subgroups perform, not just as a block, but based upon their differential geographies. For example, Black children growing up in an affluent suburb may have different needs or confront different challenges than Black children growing up in a low-income urban neighborhood or inner-ring suburb that has suffered decades of disinvestment and poverty. To over generalize, children in the former may be more likely to suffer from microaggressions, exposure to racial epithets, or doubts of self-confidence, while children in the latter may simply lack resources, high-quality educational services, and have greater risk of physical violence. Particular places may also be identified as a constituent group by themselves. Geography matters.

Diverse forms of data should inform this assessment—for example, qualitative data that could include data from focus groups, surveys, and previous planning documents. Likert scale surveys could also be used to supplement qualitative feedback and aggregate quantitative data. This knowledge can also inform an assessment of the distance between a group and the goal. These may not be exact quantitative measures but may suggest further areas for inquiry or may constitute an assessment themselves.

STEP 4

Assess and understand the structures that support or impede each group or community from achieving the universal goal

This step is perhaps the most critical step within a targeted universal framework.

It is not sufficient to recognize varying performance outcomes among groups with respect to the universal goal. We must understand the structures that shape these outcomes for each group. This involves a deep investigation of the problem and the circumstances that confront each group or impede achievement of the universal goal. This step examines the systems and structures to see how they are performing in relationship to each group.

The analysis of the problem conducted at this step directly shapes and informs the strategies that will emerge in the final step. The previous two steps are primarily, but not exclusively, measurements. This step is more analytical and seeks to understand the nature of the problem at root.

To illustrate this step, however, consider the problem of accessing health care services. For many people, the cost of health care may be the main impediment to accessing health care services. But for people with disabilities, the hours, location, and easements may be additional barriers. For refugees or immigrants, there may also be a language barrier.

While the search for impediments is a critical part of this examination of structures, it should not be restricted to the identification of barriers. In some cases, it is a lack of supports, and not simply barriers, that forms the impediment. For example, lack of car ownership may impede progress toward the goal as much as a road block. Our assessment must extend beyond the search for barriers, and examine how structures are performing in relationship to how groups are situated within them. Our assessment must be driven by a proactive interest in monitoring and evaluating performance to achieve the universal goal, not simply trying to remove barriers or make a universal policy or system

Applying Targeted Universalism

Consider this example as a process for targeted universalism. First, set a universal goal—for example 100 percent proficiency in eighth grade math. Second, measure how the overall population fares relative to the universal goal. In this example we might discover that only 80 percent of eighth graders are proficient in eighth grade math. Third, measure the performance of population segments relative to the universal goal. So although 80 percent of all eighth graders are proficient, we might find that only 70 percent of Latinos are proficient. Fourth, understand how structures and other factors support or impede group progress toward the universal goal. For our Latino students, classroom instruction materials and lessons designed for English speakers may impede learning including math proficiency. Finally, implement targeted strategies so that each group can achieve the universal goal based upon their needs and circumstances. This may take the form of ESL-specific math tutoring for our Latino students while another group may require a completely different strategy to achieve the same universal goal.

Targeted universalism rejects a blanket universal, which may be indifferent to the reality that different groups are situated differently relative to the institution and resources.

Targeted universalism offers to organize these "smaller" and more practicable changes around long-term ambitious changes.

more neutral.

The assessment process must entail a mixed-methods analysis. It must encompass quantitative demographic analysis as well as qualitative sources. Drawing knowledge from a number of different sources and people is critical to this step. In that regard, it is essential that there is diverse representation throughout this process—affected groups, community organizing experts, policy groups, and decisionmakers—to make sure that the assessment is deeply informed by a broad base of knowledge.

In this phase of the process there is the opportunity that should not be missed—the opportunity to be influenced by a diverse set of experience, expertise, and knowledge. This requires that information generated during one phase of the process may inform or change the outcomes from another. These insights are important, and the process should be structured so that insights from one phase of the process can inform another. The process will be nonlinear, and insights will be gathered sporadically, so it is important to make sure this information is structured in a way that it is all gathered thoughtfully and systematically.

Drawing upon the insights of people themselves can be revealing. For example, if the goal is for residents of a jurisdiction to live in safe neighborhoods, for some groups a barrier may be the fear of police violence or lack of trust in police officers rather than just fear of criminal violence or property crimes, as might be the case for other groups. In our experience residents who do not feel safe in their neighborhoods conceptualize safety in the capacity for them to feel they belong in the local public park. In one community, when residents of color gathered in a park, white residents in or near the park expressed discomfort and police frequently appeared. This was described as a clear communication that residents of color did not "belong" in the park, that public space was not safe for them.

The analysis of the problem at this stage should shape and inform the strategies that are designed in the final phase. The first two steps involve quantitative data measurements. However, patterns in those measurements are often what inspire us to address a particular unfair disadvantage or an unfair gap. Targeted universalism asks that we not assume that the problem to address—the problem that a strategy will address—is a gap between groups. Rather, it asks that we think about problems as the gap between groups and the universal goal.

STEP 5

Develop and implement targeted strategies for each group to reach the universal goal

Throughout this report, we have been using the terms "general population," "subgroups," "targeted groups," and "universal goals" to draw crucial distinctions. Targeted strategies are associated with a particular group in mind, and they are generally designed to target that group or groups. The targeted universalism agenda is the ensemble of targeted strategies across all groups. Therefore, this step calls for the development and implementation of a range or set of strategies to advance all groups toward the universal goal.

To move all groups toward the universal goal, the cliché "one size fits all" does not apply, and, in fact, is the chief impediment. While a strategy may be frequently raised in association with a problem, a targeted universalism platform resists the reduction of implementation strategies to a single approach. A targeted universalism policy requires a multiplicity of implementation strategies to advance all groups to the universal goal. Implementation strategies will vary in form and content, as well as the kinds of resources that are required, as will be described in greater detail in the next parts.

While the universal goal may be one to which most or all groups aspire, some groups have more acute needs and more extreme circumstances. In cases where their resources are limited to fund or otherwise support particular interventions, it may not make sense to evenly distribute those resources simply because the universal goal has not been reached by every group. Groups further off from obtaining stable housing—and groups in extreme distress—should be the recipients of greater support. Clarifying that the goal is universal in aspiration does not require artificially restrictive supports by way of maintaining a formally equal resource distribution.

Recall the assessment of barriers and supports

conducted for the problem of health care services described in the previous section. This analysis can produce quite a number of targeted strategies— changing the location and hours of service delivery, providing public finance to finance health care services, and/or providing translators and system navigators. We may think or even discuss these ideas before we know to "look" for the measure of distance. The collective experience and knowledge at the table may point to these issues. After this, we may need to turn to look for data that could confirm or modify these issues.

It is in this phase of the targeted universalism platform that the importance of local knowledge and qualitative insights becomes fully manifest. Identifying how different groups are situated or performing relative to the goal can be and is usually assessed by data. However, it's important for the process to also be influenced by the experiences and tacit knowledge of people who are at a distance from the goal. While the "distance" step may seem more analytical, the importance of having broad participation in earlier phases will ensure the targeted strategies are able to provide immediate and long-term relief.

Because so many people and groups of people are often left out of spheres of authority and decision making where policy is created, there must be a deliberate and institutional process to articulate what the universal goal is and for prioritizing the targeted strategies that may be derived. This is not to say that people who are traditionally represented in positions of authority and those vested with decision-making power should be excluded—it is to say that particular groups are already well represented in those positions.

In order to benefit from the knowledge of people traditionally excluded we have to make a great and intentional effort to involve people from those groups. This may mean that decision makers will have to fundamentally change their deliberative process. This is also to say that this participation must exceed the traditional notions of "community participation" or "engagement." People need to be included need to share power and exert influence by their participation. Their insights and knowledge should meaningfully shift the course of action and conversation.

Implementation strategies derived in this step of the targeted universalism framework are not only outcome oriented, but they must be evaluated for success. A single dose intervention—even administered through a panoply of implementation strategies—is unlikely to advance all groups toward the universal goal. Rather, what is needed is a sustainable process that evaluates progress toward the universal goal, and recalibrates or recommends amendments to the implementation strategies over time.

Equity Imagery in the Context of Targeted Universalism

This series of images serves as a third visual metaphor of targeted universalism. In the images we see similar themes: a fence obscuring the view of two people trying to see the Taj Mahal, then they get a bench to stand on to see over the fence. The same principle for the fence and tree —removing the fence is a more durable fix.

However, this image reflects another dimension of consideration. Making one structural change to remove the fence can be more durable than installing a bench to stand on. However, there are multiple ways to "see" the Taj Mahal. This example draws from a story of a young blind man who was given a model of the Taj Mahal so it may enable him to apprehend the structure. This makes the articulation of the universal goal even more thoughtful and rigorous. The goal isn't to see the Taj Mahal—if by seeing we mean the way a majority of people's visual system is integrated with their central nervous system. Instead the goal could be described as making sure everyone can appreciate and appraise the structure. This example highlights the importance of making sure there is a diverse audience that participates in deciding what the universal goal is and making sure that the audience shares decision-making power.

In the bottom image, a young boy holds a physical model of the Taj Mahal, surrounded by young men with posters urging people to "Vote for the Taj" as part of an election process in 2000 to select the "world's seven wonders." A song written for the occasion of the voting process was released in six of the many different languages spoken in India and came to be known as the Taj Anthem. These events were public demonstrations that encouraged voting for the Taj, as is the example of the young man holding the model. The model does not only allow him an avenue to "see" the Taj Mahal—it may afford him additional information that could shape his decision to share or dissent from holding national pride in the Taj or "voting for it."

Source: Haas Institute

This image and example illustrates how including many people in the process of defining a universal goal is important, with a deliberate, intentional effort to involve people who are ordinarily left out of decision-making. This participation is not simply an advisory role where these groups or individuals provide insight—rather the participants must be granted authority and influence.

Targeting within a Targeted Universalism Framework

THE PREVIOUS SECTION of this primer outlined and described the steps by which a targeted universalism policy or program might be designed. Going through the work and moving all groups to the universal goal, will likely require a multiplicity and range of implementation strategies. Moreover, the universal goal reflects a collective aspiration, not simply the needs or demands of marginalized groups or those further off from the goal.

The different needs, situatedness, and circumstances particular people confront does not resolve the question of how targeting occurs within a targeted universalism framework. This section is meant to clarify this crucial ambiguity. The targeted universalism framework seeks to support all people while also being sensitive and responsive to the extreme suffering some people experience.

To begin, a targeted universalism process does not assume which groups are most marginalized or further off from the universal goal, but conducts an assessment in each case to determine this. In one situation or policy context, group A may be the most marginal. In another situation, it may be group B. The implementation strategies derived through the targeted universalism framework is inherently sensitive to these differences, without assuming who is most marginalized in any context or what they require to achieve the universal goal.

Relatedly, while groups A and B may change places in terms of the most marginal depending on the situation or policy context, they may both be significantly marginalized relative to a more favored group, group C, or much better off than another marginalized group, group D, in a different context. Universalistic policies that are insensitive to group positionality within deep social and economic structures have a tendency to benefit dominant groups, exacerbating intergroup inequalities. In contrast, targeted efforts that focus on the most marginalized, without accounting for the needs of others, may make the targeted groups slightly or even significantly better off, but may be less politically sustainable.

Moreover, a targeted universalism process does not presuppose how groups are defined either in terms of the assessment process or in developing implementation strategies. To underscore this, it rejects an essentialism that fixes a group in terms of situatedness, stratification and marginality, but also in terms of identity, which we regard as dynamic rather than static.[45] In one context, a particular identity, such as a racial or ethnic identity, may be most salient both to the groups involved but also to explaining or understanding inter-group inequality. In another context, a religious or cultural identity may be more salient.

When groups are targeted through the targeted universalism framework, however, the group targeted isn't a group with a single group identity, or even people who can be described with a number of different identities. In fact, the group of people who are benefited by a particular targeted strategy is more diverse than a single group. This is especially the case when a targeted strategy makes significant durable structural change. The targeted group can include people who have very different identities—either racial, religious, sexuality, gender, national origin, and other markers that can describe group identity. In this way targeted universalism moves beyond the identification of groups of people as categorically different—for example, Hispanic or Latino people, African American, and non-white Hispanic groups. These distinctions are inherited from a long history of racial formation in the United States and is a structural formation that solutions to belonging should exceed. Much of what we think of as a difference between groups and identity is a difference between situatedness in structures.[46]

In the end, a targeted universalism platform differs from a targeted policy approach in that no group is

ignored. The goal is to get all groups to the explicitly articulated universal goal. So while there may be different implementation strategies developed for different groups, the framework supports the belonging of all groups, from the most dominant to the most marginalized.

This sensitivity, however, does not mean that targeted universalism implementation strategies must or even have a tendency to target groups. In fact, this is one of the most persistently misunderstood areas of targeted universalism. In general, targeted implementation strategies derived from a targeted universalism framework focus on structural change—in systems, structures, and institutions rather than people or groups as such.[47] In this regard, targeted universalism is sensitive to all groups rather than targeting everyone.

For example, instead of a targeted strategy that seeks to increase the enrollment of Black students into a university's undergraduate student body, a targeted universalism strategy might seek to change the admissions criteria that disadvantage Black students in the admissions process. It could do this by de-emphasizing one criterion in favor of another, or reforming the committees that set or review applications. The Texas Ten Percent Plan is a good example of a statewide policy that promotes undergraduate student body diversity in spite of underlying patterns of interdistrict racial segregation.[48] This policy automatically guarantees admissions to the University of Texas (UT) to every high school senior in the state graduating in the top 10 percent of their high school class.[49] In so doing, it changed the admissions criteria that UT considered. Even better, one implementation strategy derived from a targeted universalism framework might seek to reform primary and secondary education policies that disadvantage students of color in the university admissions process.

This is not a trivial point. The goal is to have structures and systems that advance all the groups to the universal goal. If an implementation strategy gets Black men to the goal but not Black women, it suggests that the strategy is not adequately serving Black women. For example, African American students represent 31 percent of school-related arrests. Black girls are 15 percent of the enrolled student population—37 percent of arrested students and 28 percent of girls who are referred to law enforcement. While Black girls and boys may share many of the same structural disadvantages, there are also gender differences that they do not share. Thus, a blanket strategy targeted to Black children may be inadequate to address the disparate gender

dynamics, let alone additional dimensions of difference such as learning disabilities or special needs. Additional strategies are needed, as well as greater attention to the systems and structures themselves.

We acknowledge that the driving force behind support for targeted universalism approaches may be to address incredibly unjust gaps in identity group outcomes—for example, college graduation rates by race or wealth inequalities by race and/or gender. But further in the process, when analyzing structural problems and barriers, strategic interventions that redesign institutional arrangements will affect many groups simultaneously. Although the primary target is the institutional arrangement or structures, in another sense, "targeted" groups are composed of individuals who are facing the same barriers and who are similarly situated relative to systems, structures, and culture.

This is where coalition building can form. Other targeted strategies may benefit and serve a less diverse group of individuals—perhaps students who are almost entirely students of color. The idea is that targeted universalism allows for greater potential for building political and community power. It also enables a practicable movement that exceeds the erasure of difference through an appeal to "shared interests" in making all students safer and the way this can neglect the need for deliberate leadership and participation on creating, designing and implementing targeted strategies.

People on the policy side of targeted universalism correctly say that targeted universalism reflects that "we are all connected." And advocates and grassroots activists often focus on the ways different groups have radically different day-to-day experiences. Both of these are true, and targeted universalism bridges these two realities in a meaningful way that has the potential to build grounded applications of the very unique experiences of people who exist in a mixed state of multiple identities which makes their experiences quite exceptional relative to other people who face different relationships to similar systems, structures, and institutions.

This is an important part of targeted universalism. By going through the full process of articulating a universal goal and designing targeted universalism implementation strategies—not a single, one-size-fits-all implementation strategy—it becomes clear that many more people have a stake in these changes than the least well-off. In this way, broader coalition building can be realized and greater political will created. Ultimately, the practice and habit of thinking in broader coalitions can foment

Differences in Targeted, Universal & Targeted Universalism Approaches

Targeted policies

Single out a specific group. They do not set a universal goal, their goal is set for particular groups. For example: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has resource and income parameters that qualify one for program participation. SNAP is a program targeted toward households that meet specific income and resource conditions. Many means-tested programs fall into the category of targeted programs. The entire welfare system is a package of programs targeted to those meeting specific conditions. One may or may not qualify for targeted programs.

Universal policies

Aspire to serve everyone. They set a goal for the general population. Universal policies intend to apply to everyone, to all groups. For example, universal health care policies are intended to apply to all groups; there are no qualifying standards that must be met.

Targeted universal policies

Aspire to serve everyone by enabling different strategies based on the needs of different groups. Targeted universal policies appeal to everyone and set a goal for the general population: everyone stands to benefit by reaching the universal goal. At the same time everyone benefits from reaching the goal, different groups need different supports. Some groups also need more help because groups are situated differently with respect to the goal. Some are closer, some are further, and different groups must take different paths to get there.

greater common concern for groups that are traditionally othered.

We must again emphasize that setting a universal goal is a process that must be thoughtful and intentionally involve people who are traditionally excluded in decision-making and their "participation" should be accompanied by sharing decision-making power and acknowledgement of their expert knowledge. It's different than what participation usually looks like where information is usually extracted from impacted groups without vesting any authority or meaningful influence in a process. The universal goal setting is such a process, one that has to be designed carefully and very differently than existing policy or decision-making processes. The universal goal may seem ambitious—more ambitious than one group or one policy can work toward realizing. However, articulating that ambitious goal and designing a specific implementation strategy to achieve that goal should be explicit.

There may not be immediate expressions of common concern and empathy between groups in this

coalition. It may be necessary and appropriate for some coalition groups to take a greater lead than others—providing a directive and more vocal role in implementing and organizing changes. The coalition may exist simply out of intergroup concerns. However, the long-term goal of sustaining the coalition over time, of working together for immediate and longer-term changes that are included in the targeted universalism platform, can lead to greater affinity and concern across groups. Ultimately, building common concern is a long-term project and the necessary condition for transformative changes.

And as transformative changes continue to pile up, greater conditions for this shared concern for different groups of people can build. For example, we must also consider what groups need to effectively participate to both articulate their aspirations and help identify dysfunctions within systems or structures that impeded progress toward the universal goal. How we take cognizance of group needs and aspirations is a critical part of establishing the universal goal. Working in the vein of targeted universalism promises to operationalize what is often an

Targeting Structures

Now, what systems, structures, and institutions are involved in employment and access to employment? We know that the cost of public transportation is high and the costs go up with the distance traveled. We also realize that people working in lower paying jobs have to live in segregated communities farther from the job centers. This means that the very idea of getting to a job every day eats away at income.

If a person working in a low paying industry wants to get job training for higher paid employment opportunities, local community colleges can be hard to get to, especially if you're attending those classes after work hours. Applications policies can signal markers of difference that decrease the likelihood that you will receive a callback or a job interview. Different people with different markers of difference face these barriers. And solutions, like affordable housing in higher job growth centers of the region, ban the box strategies, low-cost or free job training, and more, can require structural and institutional change, and each strategy will serve a greater and greater number of people.

The structure that is producing higher levels of unemployment is a spatial mismatch between residence and job growth or availability. Targeting the group to solve this problem, such as by providing transportation for that group, is a transactional change that creates a pathway to the universal goal for the targeted group. It has limited impact as the structure that generates the problem is left unaltered. Although we might first turn our attention to the harms a particular group of people experiences, we risk minimizing the efficacy and duration of a change if we target the "group of people" rather than the "group of structures" that created the problem they experience.

abstract goal to create alignment and coherence. Investing in the long-term goal of creating a world in which everyone belongs cannot be approached with individual fragmented efforts.

Step 4 in implementation of a targeted universal framework requires an assessment and understanding of structural barriers or system relationships that explain outcomes for different people facing different barriers. Step 5 requires the development of strategies that can help all groups realize the universal goal as one of affirmative inclusion. However, the targeting mechanism should focus on those structures that are inflicting great harm or failing to sustain groups in their pursuit of the universal goal. In fact, the targeted universal framework suggests that there are profound differences in the way people are treated, the advantages or disadvantages they face, and even the physical health and life span influenced by these circumstances—targeted universalism is not color-blind; it is not blind to these vast differences.

Attending to group outcomes rather than groups may seem to be a semantic detail; however, it is essential to understanding why the goal is described as universal—a term that is frequently used to describe color-blind approaches or policies that do not respond to the unique ways people are situated. Focusing on group outcomes and structures—rather than groups themselves—also enables a flexible and comprehensive analysis that serves to improve outcomes for groups who suffer in different ways and experience different harms.

Those individuals belonging to groups outside of the targeted group within any strategy devised through the targeted universalism process are not neglected. If a change strategy for a particular group, a targeted strategy, is advanced within the aspiration to reach a goal with universal appeal, those groups who do not necessarily benefit are not left out. The universal goal will be understood to apply to the targeted group while also being held out as a goal for other groups. In this way, while other groups may not be explicitly mentioned as a targeted strategy is advocated, universally appealing language will signal the outstanding work that remains to be done. It might be more accurate to say that all groups are targeted within targeted universalism, except that they are targeted differently.

Dedication to advancing targeted strategies in a language that holds promise for all groups can invite other groups to complement the change agenda, or highlight targeted strategies that other re-

sources could "pick up" in the cause of all groups reaching the goal. Targeted universalism can build coherence and alignment within long-term systemic change agendas to create belonging.

When targeting a structure rather than merely focusing on a group or members of a group, targeted universal policies unlock transformative change potential that is often masked by either universal or targeted policies, even if well-intended or designed.

Although targeted policies may sometimes contain structural or prophylactic measures, such as the ADA, a myopic focus on groups or members of those groups will inevitably elide the deeper forces that shape group outcomes in some respect. Targeted universalism does not suffer this deficiency.

Targeted universalism policy can create transactional or transformative change.

Transactional changes reform or eliminate a single barrier within a structure to enable more people to achieve the universal goal.

Many transactional changes address effects of oppressive structures. These are necessary changes.

Transformative changes are changes in the structures and systems that shape group outcomes. These are more durable and may be sufficient changes.

Transactional versus Transformative Change

TARGETED UNIVERSALISM policies encompass both transactional policy changes and transformative policy changes. Transactional changes reform or eliminate a single barrier within a structure to free groups to achieve the universal goal. Transactional change largely works within an existing set of institutional and structural arrangements. Transformative changes restructure the system itself rather than reform some relationship within the existing structure. To differentiate these types of change is not to diminish the value and urgency of either.

Transactional changes, for example, have provided vast improvements in the material living conditions for people who struggle the most—in particular people of color and the extremely poor. For example, removing unnecessary licensure requirements or criminal background checks that have a disparate impact can help people move toward the universal goal of securing income, food, or shelter. To achieve the full potential of targeted universalism, however, we have to understand the way urgent needs and aspirations may not be adequately served by the existing system.

At the extreme, the system itself may function to help some and deny others a more fulsome range of life opportunities. Moreover, a system can mutate and evolve over time, either as a result of policy interventions or as a result of decentralized decision-making. Either way, there may be a need for transformative change. We note that there is not an inherent tension between transactional and transformational interventions. But when possible, these efforts should be aligned.

Transformative changes are more fundamental changes in the structures and systems that shape group outcomes. Transformative changes can be more durable over time and have greater effects as the causes of problems are alleviated—not just their effects. This is the logic behind targeted universalism's focus on structures. Most critically,

transactional changes should be aligned within the larger ambitions of transformative changes and the universal goals they aspire to realize.

In some circumstances, policies and strategies developed through a targeted universalism framework may be simple, transactional interventions that move groups to the universal goal. For example, the Baltimore City Health Department helped launch a special program to provide eyeglasses to primary and secondary schoolchildren after a screening program discovered that as many as 15,000 students in their school system needed glasses.[50] This program institutionalized a screening service and provided eyeglasses at no cost, providing 1,000 free eyeglasses in the first 10 months. The service targeted individuals through a screening process based upon a recognition that some students were unable to reach the universal goal of receiving an adequate education without them, but it is an example of a targeted universalism strategy.

This intervention responded to individuals that were lacking a more basic capacity needed to participate in traditional classroom learning, but did not fundamentally change classroom structure, curricular or resources. The move was "smaller scale" in that it was not necessarily leading to radical transformation of structures that shape learning outcomes. However, the intervention resulted in regular practice of eye screening, which changed institutional practice. However, if the universal goal is to obtain adequate education, then we know that after eye care needs are met, there are a host of other barriers that need to be addressed. Targeted universalism provides direction for taking care of urgent needs that are obvious but not recognized. And it provides for a long-term agenda for a series of needs that change over time.

Consider the problem that exists in some schools— that of creating proficiency in mathematics as one feature of a broader problem with many students

obtaining quality education. If one problem for non-native English speakers is English language learning, then the transactional fix is to either provide supplemental English instruction or language-appropriate supports. Transactional interventions that achieve universal goals should be pursued where appropriate. But one should not overfocus on transactional change when the need is for transformational. The transactional is often more immediate and easier but may not deliver the desired outcome. But when done right, many transactional changes can support transformational change. But there are times that transactional changes undermine needed transformational change. Targeted universalism encodes and derives immediate changes and their placement within longer-term efforts for durable change.

In the case above, it's very possible that problems associated with that particular group of students—that of less comprehension of the language of instruction—would be evident without going through the process of creating a targeted universalism platform. So what is the value of the effort if it's largely understood? One possible answer is that a targeted universalism platform would seek solutions that impact entire systems rather than address symptoms. To bypass the longer and more arduous process set out limits the longer-term benefits of targeted universalism. It may be that a problem finds a short-term solution through exploring other types of strategies or policy. However, the longer-term and complementary set of strategies is left unexplored, the opportunity for maintaining and creating broad coalitions is missed, and identifying a prioritized set of changes beyond that of the most immediate change is neglected. And, importantly, as the targeted universal analysis is quite deep, it may be that the strategy to address urgent effects is not going to be up to the task of countering structural effects—even in the short term.

Both transformative and transactional changes are necessary. Coordinating the timeline and preliminary work to implement a set of strategies is necessary and helps to realize what is immediately possible in a larger vision of great change. This coordination helps to not feel overwhelmed with the profound changes we need. We may hold great vision for the world, and it can seem overwhelming to have that vision and work toward it. Seeing the changes over which we may have control can seem to fall short of the large changes we seek.

However, looking at how we can coordinate this work is encouraging and can shed light on the utility and necessity of what may seem like small

Austin Parks and Recreation Department Urban Infill Park Initiative Implementation Plan

In 2019, the Austin City Council passed a resolution that set a goal for all residents to live within half to a quarter mile of a park. The city wanted to "become the most family friendly city in the country" and this aspiration was integrated into the city's four citywide strategic priorities. Prior to this resolution the Parks and Recreation Department had already done work that created the basis for the department to do its part to implement one of the city's overall strategic priorities and the longer-term metagoal for the city to become family friendly. The department was also the primary force to implement the resolution for all residents—a finer scale universal goal.

In 2003, the department had already created a gap analysis map that measured the services the department provided within a half to one mile of residences. The city had already done a key part of the analysis of different needs across the city. The department had also secured funding—a portion of which could be used to implement targeted strategies of the resolution. A $20 million infill and acquisition bond package was approved by voters in 2006. This is a key step in preparing for the creation of parks because acquiring land, a structural barrier that may be necessary, could constitute a large portion of the costs for implementing targeted strategies.

The department created maps of undeveloped parkland, school parks, city-owned land that may be used for the creation of parks, and then identified acquisition areas based upon the half to one-quarter mile goal. Between 2010 and 2014 the department acquired over 800 acres of parkland and developed 20 new parks on undeveloped parkland, newly acquired parkland, existing city-owned land, schools, and school parks.

changes. For example, creating women-only swim sessions at the public pool may be a small reorganization of public resources. However, this creates opportunities for women of various faiths who prefer these conditions on religious grounds, and for others, to practice a skill that can save their lives and the lives of others. Ultimately, changing the institutional practice of giving unique access to specific people otherwise deprived of resources can be an instructive example for community members who are not aware of this access problem. It is also instructive for those who feel that those groups of people are undeserving of resources—it is a clear demonstration that official public institutions recognize the legitimacy of fairer access.

Targeted universalism offers to organize these "smaller" and more practicable changes around long-term ambitious changes. The universal goal a particular coalition is working on may be very narrow, very specific. But the goal of universal goals—the goal of goals—can be organized around the following goals:

• Reclaim government so it serves the people.
• Build places for public debate, influence, and service—building the capacity for people to exercise collective agency.
• Change the economy so it serves people, not corporations or only the elite.

These three metagoals can orient and align an infinite array of targeted universal agendas. They can be thought of as framing or providing the landscape on which we look for systemic and transformational change through targeted universalism.

There is one final caveat. Recognizing that there are many factors that contribute to a problem, one might suppose that all the factors must be addressed at once. This is often referred to as a comprehensive approach. But this assumption is mistaken. Instead, it is often possible to identify strategic leverage points that will reverberate through the system without reconstructing the entire system. While this may be possible, it is important to understand that components of the system may be interrelated in a nonlinear way.[51]

Universal Goals and Limited Resources

A **TARGETED UNIVERSAL** agenda will generate multiple strategies and policies. As discussed earlier, some of these strategies may serve many people, including those experiencing greater suffering. Indeed, while the focus should be on the most marginal groups, strategies can address the condition of that group, but move even larger and more diverse groups toward the universal goal. Often the reason we turn to policy for changes is care, concern, or outrage for suffering and injustice. Some strategies may promise benefits to people who are disadvantaged by systems and structures, but who are not facing existential threats. With a long list of strategies and policies generated within the targeted universalism approach, it is likely that decisions will have to be made about how to allocate resources, what to prioritize, or what to pursue. Despite the likelihood of generating more strategies than a single group or agency could implement, generating the full set is a necessary and critical part of targeted universalism. Urgency and relief of suffering often promote the selection of a limited array of strategies to implement.

This too is a reason to pursue structural reforms which are more durable and can be a more efficient use of limited resources. Often structural changes that can serve a wide array of people are better insulated from the political backlash and resentment that feeds group-targeting. Transformative changes are more likely to redound to the benefit of all groups compared to transactional reforms that remove barriers for a single or few groups. It's often the case that successful implementation of "smaller scale" transactional changes or smaller scale demonstrations of big change strategies can generate greater financial and political support down the line.

Prioritizing structural change—transformational change—can be a more efficient use of limited resources. It can also direct attention, and limited financial resources, to strategies that address the greater and more urgent needs, as well as to those strategies that promote more durable changes or provide greater relief.

The superior tailoring means that resources directed into targeted universal programs have a better chance at producing tangible gains than those that are delimited only to group membership, without respect to need or situation. In addition, by redounding to the benefit of all people impeded by the structural barrier or lack of resources, targeted universalism policies are infused with positive externalities that redound to the broader public.

There are times when the analysis of identifying strategies will reveal surprising unexpected outcomes. In a notable example we have worked on, a room full of education experts were joined together to address high student turnover in a local elementary school. The analysis was not limited to the classroom or school and included sources of information from the impacted communities. Because of this, it was clear that the problem was a lack of affordable housing throughout the city. The problem laid outside of the local school and even outside of its local geographic area. While the strategy pointed to housing solutions, there wasn't a member of the group who had any control or networks in the local housing system. Though incredibly productive, this analysis did not lead to immediately moving on to implementing a strategy. In fact, they had to back up, establish a plan to create strategic networks, and learn more about the housing system from an expanded team. The question of resources and capacity is not only limited to financial resources or to the staff capacity at any particular group.

The practical limits of "on the ground" action can make the process of transactional and transformation change complex and impossible to predetermine. While there are real limits, there is also a need to question a premature focus on limits to address a problem. Often the resources available are greater or more flexible than imagined—or expanding resources may become part of "next steps" for a change effort. Rethinking and working outside of a scarcity of resources frame is an important aspect of targeted universalism—despite the fact that it can be a very real factor at the initial stages.

Building the Table for a Targeted Universal Framework

THE QUESTION OF targeted universalism accounts for the way particular groups and people traditionally excluded from decision-making must be included in the process of designing, implementing, and leading targeted universalism. Participation should look different than focus groups and coffee-table conversations with "the most impacted communities." If limited to this, "participation" can turn into an extractive relationship in which information is gathered and then used by the decision-making group. Meaningful and influential structural elements for meaningful and influential participation of directly impacted people should be instrumental in developing, implementing, and documenting the function of targeted universalism. This participation should hold great power and decision-making capacity. The structural changes that would enable meaningful community participation may be providing for local groups better resources for their participation and opportunities to identify the goal and determine the prioritization of strategies.

The process should integrate full participation, from the beginning, of the following:

- Those most affected by the problem, with a deliberate and coordinated attempt to include people traditionally excluded in such a way to respect those individuals' decision-making power and agency.
- Those benefiting from change strategies.
- Those implementing the intervention/project.
- Those documenting the implementation process.
- Those with a strong or expert understanding of the problem or issue.

These individuals and institutions should be present for all steps of the process:

- Design
- Implementation
- Assessment

An evaluation component that measures impact of the policy should also be integrated early on. It is not necessary, however, to build a complete table before developing a targeted universalism agenda. If a group—for example, a philanthropic organization, a school, or local government department—wants to design its internal practices to execute a targeted universal agenda, it will require dedicated attention to this end. The analysis may be shorter or longer depending on the scope and scale of the problem at hand—and implementing the strategies may be easier or harder depending on existing relationships and the power of groups involved. But, in any case, dedicated time and attention needs to be set aside for this purpose. Creating a comprehensive targeted universal agenda can involve a great investment of time and financial resources. It is a critical process to create transformational change, transactional change that furthers transformation, and valuable coalition building work that can sustain change and additional complementary changes that can unfold after the implementation of a priority effort.

Planning for this type of emergent understanding depends upon who is at the table during the process. The process must have respect for different types of knowledge and understand that these different types of knowledge are critical for a change agenda to be sustainable and useful. Consider a problem in the arena of public health—for example, high rates of asthma. Health practitioners, public health academics, and physicians have knowledge critical to understanding a problem in public health. Additionally, other groups have knowledge that is critical to bring to the table—for example, those with asthma-related emergency room visits. This may include the elderly, youth, Black communities, and the poor. These individuals, their advocate groups, and local organizers bring valuable information, knowledge, and analysis to the table. If only the former groups are included in the process to create a targeted universal agenda, the challenges and in-

Power Sharing and Building among Groups Using a Targeted Universalism Approach

Sometimes groups rightfully critique the practices of local government, quasi public private/planning agencies, or other local institutions. The city may be making "another agreement with a developer" that too closely resembles a previous agreement that gave tax breaks to the developer of a new sports stadium with the promise of new jobs. Very little of the promised jobs and other promised economic benefits came about. "And now, here we go again." A community group may spend resources and energy to "organize against" the project. This is sometimes the contours of local activist or community organizations.

Targeted universalism can help groups get more serious about taking power, not just making "wins" that represent concessions from the powerful decisionmakers. Power can be diffused and shared. Targeted universalism can provide the means to accomplish this power sharing and power building among community groups.

Many social justice advocates target attention on particular groups. In some respects this makes sense. Many groups are marginalized and barred from accessing the benefits of experiencing societal belonging and the benefits that entails. As we discuss in this document, prioritizing resources and strategies is permitted and logical within the targeted universal framework. Groups targeted by social justice advocates do receive resources, more resources, to reach a goal, and usually need more strategies to reach the goal.

It may not be obvious why setting a goal that will benefit all groups is useful when it is obvious that some groups are in greater need, suffering, and deserve urgent attention. However, as we suggest in the Targeted Strategies section of this primer, there are many benefits to completing the targeted universal process to more effectively advocate for marginalized groups. These strategies promise more sustainable solutions, new alliances, and effective and meaningful communication strategy, and can reveal new areas for change. Of incredible importance is the framework's potential to build power for change rather than limiting practices to resisting decisions and analyzing the problems of our profoundly unfair world.

Social justice and advocacy organizations' reorganization has taken place in a Pacific Northwest city and is a good example in this respect. There was a chasm between social justice groups and the regional planning community that was making poor decisions that would further marginalize or maintain current structures that did the same. Their work had been focused on highlight-

ing disparities between different groups in the region, groups of people and clusters of cities and neighborhoods. They produced analyses of why these policies were unfair and packed public hearings expressing objection to the regional plan that was produced.

After thinking of their work through the lens of targeted universalism, their language of making change shifted away from disparities. They expressed their aspirations as a vision that would benefit all groups and would benefit currently marginalized groups as well. Their vision expressed goals that the region's 40-year plan should include:

- **Vibrant Communities.** People live and work in vibrant communities where they can choose to walk for pleasure and meet their everyday needs.

- **Economic Prosperity.** Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.

- **Safe and Reliable Transportation.** People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.

- **Environmental Leadership.** The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.

- **Clean Air and Water.** Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water, and healthy ecosystems.

- **Equity.** The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

These goals establish a vision for the 40-year plan and shift away from the usually formulaic data analysis and route treatment of regional development. These goals place priority on considering different groups of regional residents and locations so that all residents and places in the region realize the goal over the course of a 40-year plan.

Because of this pivot from disparities focus to one of shared vision and shared distance from a goal, social justice advocates were brought into the planning process and able to shift the 40-year planning document and continue to make changes to shorter term development plans and development practices. These relationships promise to let social justice advocates make decisions regarding ensuring real community benefit through development and influencing or dictating the future dispensation of public dollars and municipal revenue. This is a powerful position groups can leverage along with

terventions may be limited to biomedical solutions. These strategies may include greater access and abundance for inhalers and other medically necessary equipment and greater access to health clinics and primary care and health insurance. It is obvious that these are valuable strategies. The other groups will supplement that knowledge with complementary insights. Perhaps knowledge and information from other people will ensure considerations of factors that influence asthma outside of the clinic—for example, community organizing efforts to influence corporate environmental impacts or the location of residential housing, affordable housing, and transportation. Knowledge from across a diverse array of parties holds the greatest potential for thorough analysis and meaningful development of the change we urgently need.

The process of generating a targeted universal agenda depends upon thoughtful attention to how and in what atmosphere a targeted universal agenda will be derived. This means that a great deal of preparatory attention must be given to planning for the process itself. Key actors, specific individuals, thoughtful timing, and more must be charted from the inception of the effort.

This planning may evolve and change as the targeted universal design is underway, but it should be designed prior to beginning. This important preparation may delay the start of the process. It may require developing more trust with strategic partners or deepening relationships with the served communities and groups. However, it is critical to creating a robust and sustainable platform.

When we talk here about the value of maximizing the inclusion of many types of information, knowledge, and perspectives, we mean to suggest something deeper than many community participation strategies entail. There are many types of community participation and many strategies to make sure it is meaningful and influential.

These insights can focus the long-term agendas and sustain coalitions beyond the timeline of transactional changes. It can shape the future and ambition of long-term relationships and the formation of networks necessary for long-term structural change. Even if there is a "win" for a selected priority area or strategy there can be a long-view agenda for change, and this long view can expand and shift power dynamics within those networks.

Conclusion: Equity 2.0

Targeted universalism is not only a policy strategy to get beyond the fight over universal versus targeted policy approaches, but it also serves as a way to overcome a narrow focus on equal treatment. With an unrelenting focus on outcomes-as-effect that trace back to structures-as-cause, targeted universalism radically reconceives the debates over equity and the narrow fights over equalizing expenditures.

JUMPING INTO CREATING change strategies based exclusively upon the presence of a disparity is inadequate and is a disservice to the people one intends to benefit. In different ways, universal and targeted strategies may promote and create a false understanding of equity. The false interpretation of equity in the universal approach assumes that different groups, different people, are situated in the same or in equivalent ways. In the targeted approach, there is an implicit assumption that only the targeted group needs support. Both of these assumptions are false.

Our focus and analysis is drawn to structures that enforce the marginality of different people. In the course of working with targeted universalism there is often discussion of "targeted groups." This language is not technically correct—the structures are targeted, not people. If we are going to use the language of "targeted groups," we should understand those groups to be people who are disadvantaged by particular structures—although disadvantaged in different ways, some people who are disadvantaged experience extreme harm and suffering and others are disadvantaged in less severe ways. This does not mean to suggest that "targeted groups" are similarly situated. In his classic book, *A Theory of Justice,* John Rawls concluded that policymakers must take account of the most marginalized, a notion encoded in his "difference principal." Coming from a different direction, targeted universalism accomplishes the same end. Whereas the difference principle requires that policies "benefit the least

well-off" in society, targeted universalism ensures that all groups—and people—achieve the universal goal. But it permits a variety and diversity of implementation strategies to accomplish that end, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.

We do suggest that targeted universalism rejects the notion that identity groups are intrinsically different. We do suggest that targeted universalism responds to and attends to the empirical fact that there are persistent patterns of identities that experience similar disadvantage. These different patterns can involve different dimensions of othering and marginality—for example disparities data shows clear differences in the value of housing between predominantly white and Black neighborhoods, and differences between referrals to the police between white and Black students and between Black female and Black male students.

We see a concerted effort to shift the goal from equality to equity. This language represents an important insight. However, the importance of using this different language is muted if our practices and strategies pursue a hollowed understanding of equity. To this end, it is helpful to think of equity along with belonging. When a hollow version of equity leads to equal treatment, we must challenge this with the question of belonging. Equity must also be approached with an expectation that the condition of the favored group is not the goal. To be sure, outcomes for a group that experiences less structural oppression are more favorable. However, it is often the case that everyone can aspire to better

outcomes—and if groups that are further off can benefit from structural changes, then often groups facing lesser harms will also benefit from those changes. Closing a disparity between different groups of people is not necessarily the goal. Outcomes, not treatment, is the touchstone. In many cases, we strive for something higher for everyone.

Educational equity battles provide a helpful analogy. In the 1970s, the US Supreme Court held that unequal per-pupil funding formulas across school districts did not violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Part of the basis for this ruling was that educational provision, under the US Constitution, was not a fundamental right.

Advocates protesting unequal funding formulas targeted their efforts at state constitutions, many of which required that states provide a minimum level of educational provision. These efforts are collectively referred to as "equity" litigation, as they moved beyond a focus on whether school funding was equal or should be equalized toward achieving a minimum level of educational service as required by state constitutions. Thus, the focus was not on whether districts, under those states, provide equal funding, but whether the state was providing enough resources to offer an "adequate" education, for example. Providing an adequate education cannot be measured in terms of per-pupil expenditure, and the amount of spending required to provide that education might vary from district to district.

Targeted universalism provides an analogous approach. The goal is not, and should never be, equalization of resources, but achieving the universal goal. In some cases, this will require unequal resource expenditures. This might happen, for example, because of a greater proportion of disadvantaged students or English language learners. Providing equal—or even greater—provision to students who have additional needs is insufficient to help them achieve the universal goal.

In the framework of targeted universalism, targeted strategies support a goal that is appealing to everyone: it is a universal goal. We recognize that there are strategic and ethical arguments that may place an urgent priority to implement targeted strategies that benefit groups "further off" from the goal-- those groups facing greater harm and suffering.

Creating a targeted universal framework demands an investment in human and financial resources. We acknowledge and promote the understanding that some groups need more help, and strategies tailored for that group. Furthermore, we know that after creating a targeted universal framework, it is likely that only some targeted strategies will be selected for implementation.

Most meaningfully, targeted universalism is both a way to operationalize belonging and create agendas for aligned transactional and transformative changes. Targeted universalism acknowledges that structural changes that benefit those experiencing greater harms likely hold benefits for many more people. In this way, promoting the implementation of a targeted strategy in the context and language of shared concerns resonates with a broad base of support. Popular support is lined up when an appeal is made to fulfill a goal to which all groups aspire. These universal goals also resonate with collectively shared values and beliefs. A particular strategy that will help one group meet the goal will garner greater popular support within the meaningful frame of collective aspirations and beliefs.

Relatedly, wrapping a targeted strategy with the language of shared aspirations and values operationalizes the fact that the challenges faced by the most marginalized among us can impede progress for everyone. This recognition is a powerful force that can dissolve barriers between in- and out-groups. One group's interest is entangled with the condition and interests of another group. Through the practice of targeted universalism, the sentiment that "we should all belong" is built.

Targeted universal frameworks manifest the understanding that we are collectively better off when all groups advance towards a shared goal. We can only advance there together if we accommodate each other's difference. In this way, we create belonging in thoughtful reflections of group differences in the spirit of care and mutual concern. Difference is not the root of othering. Rather, othering results from the consideration of difference in the spirit of concentrating privilege and/or power. Targeted universalism's transformative change agenda embraces and values difference: it is a productive use of difference toward a more fair and inclusive society.■

Endnotes

[1] Noam Scheiber, "2016 Hopefuls and Wealthy Are Aligned on Inequality," The New York Times, March 29, 2015, https://goo.gl/uwUdem.

[2] Although some minimum wage statutes do provide occupational and age-based exemptions, among others.

[3] Samuel R. Bagenstos, "Universalism and Civil Rights (with Notes on Voting Rights After Shelby)," Yale Law Journal 123, no. 8 (Jun 1, 2014), 2842. https://www.yalelawjournal.org/essay/universalism-and-civil-rights-with-notes-on-voting-rights-after-shelby.

[4] Zachary Quintero. "An Overview of Universal Basic Income: Discussion on the Benefits of a Single System Welfare Standard." (2014). https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1114&context=urc.

[5] Bagenstos, "Universalism and Civil Rights," 2848.

[6] Bagenstos, "Universalism and Civil Rights," 2849-51. Approaches that rely on anti-discrimination norms are also more difficult to enforce because they generally are predicated on fault-based paradigms in the United States. These paradigms require that a plaintiff establish a discriminatory motive. In contrast, universal approaches rely less on discerning the intent of the defendant and more on establishing a set of objectively provable facts.

[7] "Family and Medical Leave Act," Wage and Hour Division (WHD), U.S. Department of Labor, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.dol.gov/whd/fmla.

[8] Bagenstos, "Universalism and Civil Rights," 2843-4.

[9] Ibid. According to most scholars, anti-discrimination approaches, while universalist to the extent that they often treat members of all groups equally, are not generally understood as universalist. By "calling attention to the identity status," anti-discrimination laws have a different dynamic, perception, and understanding than approaches that do not require any reference to an identity group. Anti-discrimination provisions, while universalist in scope, are generally regarded as targeted sets of protections, as the debate over the poll tax illustrates. In this regard, distinguishing universal approaches from non-universal approaches can be difficult, and there is no broad consensus on this point.

[10] Theda Skocpol, "Targeting Within Universalism: Politically Viable Policies to Combat Poverty in the United States," in The Urban Underclass, by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), 411-436.

[11] John O'Farrell, "A no-strings basic income? If it works for the royal family, it can work for us all," The Guardian, January 7, 2016, accessed December 11, 2017, https://goo.gl/yFfMVy.

[12] Sarah Trumble and Lanae Erickson, "Making Pre-K Matter: Instilling a Mobility Mentality" (Washington, D.C.: Third Way, October 1, 2014); For another critique, including on cost, see: David J. Armor and Sonia Sousa, "The Dubious Promise of Universal Preschool," National Affairs 38, no. Winter 2019, accessed February 28, 2019, https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-dubious-promise-of-universal-preschool.

[13] Trumble and Erickson, "Making Pre-K Matter: Instilling a Mobility Mentality"; Armor and Sousa, "The Dubious Promise of Universal Preschool."

[14] Christina Veiga, "New York City Gets a Gold Medal for Pre-K Quality and Access, New Report Finds," Chalkbeat, January 23, 2019, https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ny/2019/01/23/new-york-city-gets-a-gold-medal-for-pre-k-quality-and-access-new-report-finds/.

[15] So-called "Romneycare." The Affordable Care Act was, in part, modeled on the Massachusetts program. See Michael Costa and David Spackman, "An Act Providing Access to Affordable, Quality, Accountable Health Care" (Boston: Greenberg Traurig, LLP, 2006).

[16] Sharon Long, "What is the Evidence on Health Reform in Massachusetts and how might the Lessons from Massachusetts Apply to National Health Reform?" Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2010). https://goo.gl/8d2ijZ; James Maxwell et al., "Massachusetts' Health Care Reform Increased Access to Care for Hispanics, but Disparities Remain," Health Affairs 30, no. 8 (Aug 1, 2011), 1451-1460. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0347. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21821562; Benjamin D. Sommers, Sharon K. Long and Katherine Baicker, "Changes in Mortality After Massachusetts Health Care Reform: A Quasi-Experimental Study," Annals of Internal Medicine 160,

no. 9 (May 6, 2014), 585. doi:10.7326/M13-2275. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24798521; Massachusetts Health Care Reform: Six Years Later (Menlo Park: Kaiser Family Foundation, 2012).

[17] Bobby Milstein, Jack Homer, and Gary Hirsch, "Are Coverage and Quality Enough? A Dynamic Systems Approach to Health Policy," American Journal of Public Health, October 27, 2009.

[18] Maxwell et al., "Massachusetts' Health Care Reform Increased," 1451.

[19] See Ira Katznelson, When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006).

[20] But, as earlier noted, the Social Security program was not truly universal in the first place (See Table 1). But even where programs are ostensibly designed to be universal, they are based upon inaccurate assumptions. In complex systems, where there are multiple reinforcing constraints and dynamic relationships, policy interventions may produce inequitable outcomes.

[21] Although, there may be an implicit recognition of extreme need or historical disadvantage.

[22] Suzanne Mettler, "How the G.I. Bill Built the Middle Class and Enhanced Democracy" (Cambridge, MA: Scholars Strategy Network, January 2012).

[23] Such an approach could also be the product of a targeted universalism analysis, since it seeks to get everyone to the universal goal of access.

[24] "The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967," U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1967, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm.

[25] Ibid.

[26] "Affirmative Action," United States Department of Labor, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.dol.gov/general/topic/hiring/affirmativeact. The challenge to UC Davis' enrollment quota resulted in the Bakke case brought to the Supreme Court in 1978 where the court ruled 5-4 that UC Davis had set up an unconstitutional quota system. In what he called a "grand compromise," Justice Lewis Powell ruled that while the program was unconstitutional that a "diversity rationale" could

be used, in 2which race could be one of other factors to achieve diverse student bodies.

27 Goodwin Liu, "How the Federal Government Makes Rich States Richer," Funding Gaps 2006 (Jan 8, 2013), 1-16. doi:10.1503/cmaj.109-4372.

28 The Truly Disadvantaged was a book authored by William Julius Wilson in 1987. It was influential in changing the debate about the causes of concentrated poverty in cities and provided new insights for public policy solutions. Although published almost 30 years ago, its arguments are held up by thinkers as relevant to current policy debate. For an interview with William Julius Wilson, see Wilmot Allen, "Urban Poverty in America: The Truly Disadvantaged Revisited," The Huffington Post, August 25, 2014, accessed December 11, 2017, https://goo.gl/FaaX8w.

29 Skocpol, "Targeting Within Universalism."

30 Mike P. Sinn, "Government Spends More on Corporate Welfare Subsidies than Social Welfare Programs," Think by Numbers, accessed December 11, 2017, https://goo.gl/E9xeTE. A study of similar patterns in 2002; see Chris Edwards and Tad DeHaven, Corporate Welfare Update (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2002). https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/tbb-0205-7.pdf.

31 Robert Collinson, Ingrid Gould Ellen, Jens Ludwig, "Low-Income Housing Policy," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 21071 (Apr 2015). https://www.nber.org/papers/w21071

32 Matthew Desmond, "How Homeownership Became the Engine of American Inequality," The New York Times, May 9, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/09/magazine/how-homeownership-became-the-engine-of-american-inequality.html.

33 Note that under the Carter administration new technology enabled data to be gathered on "welfare fraud." This technology and data changed administrative practices and created a disciplinary regime associating criminality and fraud with welfare and its recipients.

33 2010 Earned Income Credit (EIC) Table, 2010.

35 Bagenstos, "Universalism and Civil Rights," 2841.

36 Skocpol, "Targeting Within Universalism."

37 It's useful to note that in previous work we

have described targeted universalism as a combination of the strengths of targeted and universal policies—while avoiding the weaknesses of each approach. However, as the framework has evolved alongside the effort to create structural belonging, it has become clear that the potential of targeted universalism exceeds either of those traditional policy approaches. Targeted universalism is a means to operationalize belonging.

38 Mihika Basu, "IIT-Bombay Tech Will Help Blind See Taj Mahal," DNA India, July 25, 2010, https://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai/report-iit-bombay-tech-will-help-blind-see-taj-mahal-1414189.

39 "Restorative Practices," Alexandria City Public Schools, 2019, http://www.acps.k12.va.us/site/default.aspx?PageID=2140.

40 "Restorative Justice Now: A Community Review of Alexandria City Public Schools' Implementation of Restorative Justice" (Washington, D.C.: Tenants and Workers United; Alexandria United Teens; The Alexandria Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Advancement Project, June 2016), https://advancementproject.org/resources/restorative-justice-now/.

41 For a useful example, consider conservative columnist David French's rejoinder to a monologue from Tucker Carlson, in which French expressed skepticism about the role of government in solving a cluster of social problems: "It is a simple fact, that when people make bad choices, there are a cascade of negative effects that follow. The extraordinarily difficult challenge of public policy is considering how to mitigate the effects of those mistakes and providing pathways to overcoming bad decisions. And nothing about that is easy." https://www.nationalreview.com/2019/01/the-right-should-reject-tucker-carlsons-victimhood-populism/

42 "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009," 123 Stat. 115 § 3 (2009), https://www.ntia.doc.gov/page/2011/american-recovery-and-reinvestment-act-2009.

43 "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009," 123 Stat. 115 § 5001 (2009), https://www.ntia.doc.gov/page/2011/american-recovery-and-reinvestment-act-2009.

44 Katherine M. Keyes et al., "Understanding the Rural–Urban Differences in Nonmedical Prescription Opioid Use and Abuse in the United States," American Journal of

Public Health 104, no. 2 (December 12, 2013): e52–59, https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301709.

45 There are studies to suggest that our identities are largely a result of our circumstance and not essential or independent. See: Anthony W. Marx, Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

46 See: Iris Marion Young and Danielle S. Allen, Justice and the Politics of Difference, Paperback Reissue (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2011).

47 There is, however, a complex relationship between structures and identity that is beyond the scope of this primer. Suffice to say, what is perceived as identity is often the result of different positionality within structures. That means that the distinction between targeted structures and targeting people may be, in some larger sense, a false dichotomy.

48 http://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/amicus_brief_fisher_v_texas_social_and_organizational_psychologists_0.pdf

49 Not technically a 10% plan, since the plan was subsequently capped at 75% of UT's undergraduate body. In practice, it functions as a top 8 or 8.5% plan.

50 Students who had difficulty reading were more likely to be identified as having a learning disability or behavior problem. "Vision for Baltimore," Baltimore City Health Department, August 17, 2016, https://health.baltimorecity.gov/VisionForBaltimore; Katie Pearce, "Vision for Baltimore Celebrates 1,000 Free Pairs of Glasses for City Students," The Hub, Johns Hopkins University, March 8, 2017, https://hub.jhu.edu/2017/03/08/vision-for-baltimore-1000-glasses/.

51 This insight is derived from a complex systems theory. Stephen Menendian and Caitlin Watt, "Systems Thinking and Race" (Columbus, OH: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, The Ohio State University, December 2008).

52 San Antonio Independent School District V. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 959 (1973).

Further Reading and Resources

- Allen, Willmont. "Urban Poverty in America: The Truly Disadvantaged Revisited." The Huffington Post, August 25, 2014, https://goo.gl/FaaX8w.

- Bagenstos, Samuel R. "Universalism and Civil Rights (with Notes on Voting Rights After Shelby)." Yale Law Journal 123 (8): 2838-2876. https://goo.gl/5tYL48.

- Better, Even, Halley Potter, "Lessons from New York City's Universal Pre-K Expansion: How a focus on diversity could make it," The Century Foundation, Issue Brief (May 13, 2015): https://tcf.org/content/report/lessons-from-new-york-citys-universal-prek-expansion/

- City of Austin Urban Parks Workgroup. 2011 Urban Parks Workgroup Report Recommendations. Austin: Central Austin CDC.

- Costa, Michael and David Spackman. 2006. "An Act Providing Access to Affordable, Quality, Accountable Health Care." Boston: Greenberg Traurig, LLP.

- Edwards, Chris and Tad DeHaven. 2002. Corporate Welfare Update. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute. https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/tbb-0205-7.pdf.

- Kaiser Family Foundation, "Massachusetts Health Care Reform: Six Years Later." (2012)

- Katznelson, Ira. "When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America." New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.

- Liu, Goodwin. "How the Federal Government Makes Rich States Richer." Funding Gaps 2006: 1-16, 109-4372 (2013): doi:10.1503/cmaj.

- Long, Sharon. "What is the Evidence on Health Reform in Massachusetts and how might the Lessons from Massachusetts Apply to National Health Reform?" Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, (2010): https://goo.gl/8d2ijZ.

- Manship, Karen, Linda Jacobson, and Bruce Fuller, "Achieving Fair Access to Early Education: Fewer children, regional gaps across California," Berkeley Early Childhood Think Tank & American Institutes for Research and Designing options for California's Young Children (July 2018): https://news.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/UC-AIR-Pre-K-Scarcity-Report.pdf

- Maxwell, James, Dharma E. Cortes, Karen L. Schneider, Anna Graves, and Brian Rosman. "Massachusetts' Health Care Reform Increased Access to Care for Hispanics, but Disparities Remain." Health Affairs 30 (8): 1451-1460 (2011): doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0347.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21821562.

- Milstein, Bobby, Jack Homer, and Gary Hirsch. "Are Coverage and Quality Enough? A Dynamic Systems Approach to Health Policy." American Journal of Public Health, 1-21, (October 27, 2009)

- O'Farrell, John. "A no-strings basic income? If it works for the royal family, it can work for us all." The Guardian, (January 7, 2016): https://goo.gl/yFfMVy.

- powell, john a., Connie Cagampang Heller, Fayza Bundalli, "Systems Thinking and Race: Workshop Summary," The California Endowment (June 2011): http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/Powell_Systems_Thinking_Structural_Race_Overview.pdf

- powell, john a., "Deepening our understanding of structural marginalization, "Poverty and Race 22, no. 5 (September/October 2013):3-13.

- powell, john a. and Wendy Ake "Creating Structural Changes: The role of targeted universalism." In The Hidden Rules of Race: Barriers to an inclusive economy, by Andrea Flynn, Dorian T. Warren, Felicia J. Wong, Susan R. Holmberg. In Cambridge Studies in Stratification Economics: Economies and Social Identity, 166-95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- powell, john a., Stephen Menendian, Jason Reece, "The Importance of Targeted Universalism" Poverty Race and Research Action Council, (March/April 2009).

- powell, john a., "Post-racialism or targeted universalism?" Denver University Law Review 86, 785-806. https://www.law.du.edu/documents/denver-university-law-review/powell.pdf

- powell, john a., "Poverty and Race Through a Belongingness Lens," Policy Matters and Northwest Area Foundation, 1:5(March 2012) https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/PolicyMatters_powell_V4.pdf

- Reece, Jason, Christ Rogers, Matthew Martin, Stephen Menendian, Caitlin Watt, "Targeted universalism and the jobs bill: helping communities in crisis through targeted investments," Prepared for the Congressional Black Caucasus (March 2010): http://www.kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/reports/2010/03_2010_TargetedUniversalismJobsBill.pdf

- Scheiber, Noam. "2016 Hopefuls and Wealthy Are Aligned on Inequality." The New York Times, (March 29, 2015): https://goo.gl/uwUdem.

- Sinn, Mike P. "Government Spends More on Corporate Welfare Subsidies than Social Welfare Programs." Think by Numbers, (December 11, 2017): https://goo.gl/E9xeTE.

- Skocpol, Theda. "Targeting Within Universalism: Politically Viable Policies to Combat Poverty in the United States." In The Urban Underclass, by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.

- Sommers, Benjamin D., Sharon K. Long, and Katherine Baicker. 2014. "Changes in Mortality After Massachusetts Health Care Reform: A Quasi-Experimental Study." Annals of Internal Medicine (160:9, 585): doi:10.7326/M13-2275. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24798521.

- United States Department of Labor, "Family and Medical Leave Act." Wage and Hour Division (WHD).: https://www.dol.gov/whd/fmla.

- United States Department of Labor, "Earned Income Credit (EIC) Table, 2010," Affirmative Action (2010): https://www.dol.gov/general/topic/hiring/affirmativeact

- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity, "The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967," (1967): https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm.

For more materials on targeted universalism, including an animated video, a set of curricula for teaching, and a podcast episode with john a. powell, please visit haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/targeteduniversalism.

This primer on targeted universalism is offered to contribute to a large body of models of strategy and policy. Targeted universalism is an approach that supports the needs of the particular while reminding us that we are all part of the same social fabric.

Targeted universalism rejects a blanket universal, which is likely to be indifferent to the reality that different groups are situated differently relative to the institutions and resources of society, and rejects the claim of formal equality that would treat all people the same as a way of denying difference.

haas institute
FOR A FAIR AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETY

@haasinstitute