AAHHE
American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education, Inc. www.aahhe.org

Raising the Bar for Hispanic Serving Institutions: An Analysis on Completion and Success Rates

Frances Contreras
EDS

Gilbert J. Contreras
Director Trio Programs
Cypress College

This Scholarly Paper was commissioned for the 9th Annual Conference of the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education, 2014.

Abstract

Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) in California have the potential to play a key role in raising Latino college completion rates. However, while HSIs provide access to higher education for Latinos, student success, persistence and completion rates remain low. This study utilized IPEDS and the California Community College Data Mart to examine student outcomes at two-year and four-year HSIs in California. Among the key findings, the majority of HSIs show lower college completion rates between Latino students and their peers despite promising persistence rates and college units earned. The findings suggest that traditional models of success may be less relevant for Latino students in predicting college success and four-year degree completion. Finally, this study introduces new approaches for HSIs to consider in their data collection, reporting and analytical processes to better serve Latino students and increase college success and completion.

Keywords: Retention, Success, Transfer, Persistence, Completion HSIs

Introduction

Latino students continue to experience low college attainment rates, with bachelor's degree attainment remaining largely flat over the past 25 years. The issue for Latino students is not one of access—there are plenty of open access institutions throughout the nation. The central issue and challenge for Latinos is academic success in college and degree completion. Many of the patterns in the K-12 system, such as under preparedness or high dropout rates, extend into the postsecondary experience for Latino college students. As a result, the Latino community remains in danger of becoming an expansive underclass with limited economic mobility and community sustainability options. This story however, is not predetermined and may still be rewritten with concerted effort, investment (personal and institutional), and strategic intervention. Hispanic serving institutions are a viable avenue for this strategic intervention. However, not all HSIs consider the concept of "Hispanic-serving" central to their institutional identity (Author, 2008; Hurtado & Ruiz 2012). The literature on Hispanic-serving institutions frames HSI status as largely accidental or due to state and regional Chicano/Latino demographic growth. This article addresses this phenomenon, particularly the capacity of HSIs to serve Latino students and the potential that exists for greater investment in this sector.

Background

The majority of Latino students who transition to college are likely to enroll in community colleges or public four-year institutions that are close to home. Latinos are fast becoming the largest minority group seeking postsecondary options (Fry & Taylor, 2013) but beyond accessing college, Latino students are not making sizable strides in postsecondary attainment. Academic preparation in the P-12 system remains at the forefront for explaining inequity in college attainment rates. Latinos are not prepared for college settings. The A-G

requirements for college admission, a set of high school classes that prepare students to be college-ready in California, are very low for Latino students. In fact, less than a third of all Latino students in 2009 took the appropriate classes to enroll in four-year institutions (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2014). Latino students are therefore less likely than their peers to be college-ready as a result of not taking this approved curriculum for college transition.

Another central issue is the fact that Latino students are more likely to enroll in college as part-time students, which lengthens their time to degree. LOOK FOR CURRENT DATA For example, "In October 2011 only 78% of Hispanic 18- to 24-year-old college students were enrolled full time. By comparison, 85% of similar whites were enrolled full time" (Fry & Taylor, 2013). Whites are also more likely than Latinos to be enrolled in a selective institution (Fry & Taylor, 2013; Bozick & Lauff, 2007) where time-to-degree rates are lower than non-selective institutions. These data also vary by institutional type. In California community colleges for example, less than half (46%) of the Latino students were enrolled in 12 units or greater.

The outcomes for Latinos attending HSIs remain a challenge with Latino students experiencing high attrition rates and low college completion rates in two-year and four-year HSIs. Raising Latino college transfer and completion rates at HSIs is critical for creating economically sustainable Latino communities. This article utilizes institutional data from IPEDS and the California Community Colleges Management Information System (Data Mart) to conduct an exploratory analysis assessing Latino student outcomes at HSIs by sector in California. Findings from this research will contribute to the literature on HSIs and Latino students.

If the states of California and Texas, that possess a substantial number of HSIs in their postsecondary sector, invested in Latino students in these institutions, and these institutions make concerted efforts to raise college success rates, a socioeconomic transformation among Latinos is possible. That is, investing strategically in HSIs to produce a greater number of degree completers might serve to transform the next generation of Latino families and the communities in which they live.

National Overview of Hispanic Serving Institutions

HSIs are federally recognized postsecondary institutions that possess at least 25% of Latino students enrolled full time. HSI status enables institutions to apply for distinct federal funding programs, such as Title V or the Developing HSI Program, as long as these institutions also serve Latino students that are economically disadvantaged.

Ed Excelencia, a non-profit organization that has examined the progress and development of this postsecondary sector, further expanded the definition and HSI classification to include "Emerging Hispanic Serving Institutions." Latinos make up 15-24% of full-time enrollment (FTE) at these colleges and universities (Ed Excelencia, 2010).

The majority of HSIs are located in California (n=127), Texas (n=68), and Puerto Rico (n=59). In 2012-13, there were 370 HSIs located in 16 states (including Puerto Rico). The top five locations that are home to the majority of HSIs include California, Texas, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Florida. Most HSIs are public two-year institutions (48%) compared to 20% public two year, 28% private four-year, and 4% that are private two-year institutions.

The majority of HSIs are also located in cities (52%) and suburbs (31%) (Santiago, 2014). Because proximity to family is a significant factor in the college choice processes of Latino students (Lopez-Turley, 2006; Author, 2011; Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012), many HSIs have developed due to their geographical location and Latino demographic growth that has occurred in several states. This institutional sector is therefore poised to expand alongside the unprecedented growth that the Latino population is experiencing across the nation.

Relevant Literature

Most of the research on HSIs has emphasized the potential of this sector to raise college access and completion rates for Latino students in states with a large proportion of Latino students (Santiago, 2006; Arciniega, 2012; Galdeano, et. al., 2012; Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012). Researchers acknowledge that Latinos attending HSIs have greater academic and financial needs (Nunez & Elizondo, 2012; Nuñez, Sparks, & Hernandez, 2011). Few studies have critically examined and challenged HSIs to raise the bar to better serve its critical mass of Latino students and improve their academic outcomes.

A study conducted on the academic outcomes of Latinos in select HSIs found that while Latino students have access to these institutions, these colleges were not producing equitable opportunities or outcomes for their Latino students (Author). That is, the Latino students within the HSIs examined had lower graduation rates in Math, Science, and Engineering majors at two and four-year institutions compared to their peers in these majors. In addition, after a careful review of institutional missions and marketing materials (e.g., websites, etc.) the HSIs examined possessed a "closeted-identity." That is, based on their overall student outcomes and their institutional profile (e.g., mission, strategic initiatives), the colleges did not appear to have

distinct effort to acknowledge their high Latino (and/or minority enrollment) or raise the success and completion rates of their critical mass of Latino students (Author).

Another study conducted across HSIs from both the mainland United States and Puerto Rico explored completion rates found that U.S. institutions that expend more financial resources on their students is likely to lead to higher college graduation rates (Nunez et. al., 2012). Nunez and colleagues further found that student persistence is lower for institutions with a student body largely from a lower socioeconomic status (Nunez et. al., 2012, p. 33). As a result, institutions must compensate for limits to financial resources experienced by many Latino students in HSIs. This research suggests that HSIs with large percentages of low-income students have the challenge of having adequate resources to invest in the student supports necessary to assist their students.

While HSIs have great potential to contribute to college attainment (Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012; Author), Latinos are often treated as commodities by campuses, where the HSI identity is utilized to seek federal funding opportunities. Yet, in many of these institutions, targeted efforts to raise Latino academic performance is unclear, and the students most likely to benefit from these student support grants are low-income White and Asian-American students. Many campuses utilize these grants for whole school improvement with minimal planning for raising Latino student achievement (Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012), transfer and four-year degree completion. The challenge therefore, is to modify existing postsecondary infrastructures to serve their critical masses of Latino, underrepresented and first-generation students.

A central challenge faced by many HSIs today is the fact that the majority of Hispanic Serving Institutions are community colleges that already possess multiple identities. Hurtado and Ruiz (2012) discuss how HSIs may possess multiple identities with competing interests that exist

within the institution. They describe how the institutional missions of HSIs were not developed with the intent to serve Latino students, but now that they possess this label, must begin to strategically plan how to serve this critical mass of students within these postsecondary institutions (Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012, p. 3).

Literature on the Role of Faculty and Staff

Faculty plays a key role in student experiences and success in higher education through the courses they teach, informal and formal mentoring, and through their research agendas (Hurtado & Ponjuan; Turner, et. al., 2008). Faculty of color, in particular, are more likely to serve as mentors to diverse undergraduate and graduate students by integrating students of color into their research projects and teams (Milem, 2003). The presence of diverse faculty serves as an indication of an institution's climate . For example, limited diversity suggests that the college climate is not progressive or open to multiple viewpoints, culturally competent, and committed to serving a diverse student body. Faculty of color in higher education are more likely to mentor students of color, engage diverse students in their research projects, and promote an equitable climate in college classrooms (Milem, 2003; Turner, Gonzalez & Wood, 2008; Turner, Gonzalez & Wong, 2011).

Persistence

Traditional persistence measures have focused on student progression in college beyond the first years of college (Tinto, 1998). Adelman (2004), using the NELS:88/00 study found that earning college credit, particularly 20 units or more, represents a "tipping point" that results in students obtaining their college degree. Swanson furthered this theoretical perspective in 2008, using the same longitudinal NELS 88/00 data set to explore the impact of dual enrollment programs. He introduced the concept of "academic momentum," defined as students who

progressed past the first two years of college. Swanson found that students with high academic achievement and college credits were likely to build academic momentum that ultimately resulted in college completion. These two studies however, were not specifically applied to Latino students or a particular institutional type (HSIs, etc.).

Completion

Research on college completion for Latinos (Author et. al., 2011; Santiago, 2010) have focused on the pathway to college, acknowledging the systemic issues that contribute to low academic preparation in P-12 settings and inhibit academic persistence and success. A central argument that has helped to explain low college completion, particularly among Latino community college students, is the overrepresentation of Latinos in developmental (remedial) education courses (Bailey, Cheong & Cho, 2010). Students fall into a cyclical trap of taking developmental courses repeatedly, which ultimately inhibit their exposure to the curriculum pertaining to their intended major. This process can take students up to two years, and can lead to fatigue and a loss of interest in higher education altogether.

Another important explanation for low Latino student completion rates is the fact that Latino students work a considerably greater number of hours than their peers while going to college (Author). The low socioeconomic backgrounds of Latino students, coupled with their debt averse approach to college (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008) has resulted in a large proportion of Latino students working greater than 20 hours a week (Author & Colleague). Working more than 20 hours a week influences the amount of time spent on studying, the ability to be engaged on their college campus, the likelihood of college departure, and lengthens the overall time to degree completion (Author).

The challenge with understanding college completion stems from the disconnect between the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection rates (four-year, six-year) and the actual Latino college completion rates. Since Latinos on average complete college in 9 years (Lee, et. l, 2011), a four-year and six-year completion rate is limited in depicting actual completion rates for Latino students. The education field has been unable to capture the full story of college completion when students are not followed for longer periods. At the same time, students should not be taking an average of 9 years to complete college. Longitudinal analysis of completion outcomes would help researchers and institutions to better understand actual Latino college completion rates.

Additional studies related to college completion have explored the role that college climate plays in student motivation, engagement, and persistence (Hurtado, 1994; Nora & Crisp, 2012). College climates play an important role in student success. Students elect to remain part of college cultures if the environment is seen as welcoming, supportive, and non-discriminatory. Students who are likely to complete college are also involved and engaged on college campuses or volunteer opportunities that colleges present in conjunction with communities or service learning coursework (Author).

Overview of HSIs in California

In 2014, Latinos will surpass Whites as the largest ethnic group in the state of California. California is home to the majority of HSIs in the country, and this list is growing dramatically. In 2012-13, there were 127 institutions in California classified as Hispanic Serving Institutions, an increase of 15 institutions from the previous year. Seventy-six percent of all HSIs in California (n=85) were community colleges. In addition, a total of 71 postsecondary institutions in California can be classified as "emerging HSIs" where Latinos represent between 15 and 24% of

the student population (Santiago, 2014). Thus, California has the largest number of emerging HSIs and is poised to have well over 200 in the next five years. The HSI sector in California is therefore rapidly changing and institutions are faced with larger proportions of minority college-goers which has altered institutional climates, challenges and opportunities.

To understand the outcomes for Latino students in select two- year and four-year public institutions, the authors analyzed 14 four-year HSIs from the CSU system throughout California and 42 community college HSIs in the greater Southern California region. The 14 CSU campuses provide a systemic perspective of outcomes at four-year HSIs, while the community colleges selected were chosen to assess outcomes in the greater Los Angeles region, the geographical area with the largest proportion of Hispanic Serving Institutions.

The central research questions include:

1. What are the educational outcomes (e.g., persistence rates, graduation rates) for Chicano/Latino students attending select Hispanic Serving Institutions in California public colleges and universities?
2. What does the data reveal about the state of HSIs and their record of serving Latino students?
3. What are limitations in the available data and what should HSIs be collecting and utilizing to assess their progress and record for serving Chicano/Latino students?

Study Design

This paper utilizes secondary data analysis to assess select student outcomes to better understand student success and completion rates at public HSIs in California. We examine Latino student outcomes at 56 HSIs largely from Southern California. Public colleges and

universities were selected, both two-year and four-year because the majority of Latinos who do transition to college are attending these public postsecondary institutions.

This study explored Latino student outcomes at 14 California State Universities (CSUs) and 42 community colleges (CCs) out of the 127 HSIs in the state. The 14 CSU campuses used to complete the first stage of their analysis represent all of the California State Universities that have designated HSI status out of 23 campuses in the system. The variables used to conduct the analysis of outcomes include IPEDS data on completions. In particular, the four-year and six-year college completion rates are utilized.

The second sector analyzed included 42 HSIs that are community colleges from Southern California. The regions included in this HSI analysis are Los Angeles, Orange County, the Inland Empire, and San Diego County. Forty-two out of forty-six institutions they examined from Southern California, or 91%, were HSIs. All of the community colleges from the Los Angeles and Inland Empire were HSIs, while six out of nine community colleges from Orange County, and seven out of eight from San Diego had HSI status. However, the three community colleges not yet designated as HSIs could be classified as emerging HSIs as they have 19.8% Coastline CC), 22.9% (Irvine Valley CC), and 23.4% (Saddleback CC) of their respective students that are Latino.

CSU Outcomes

The California State University is the four-year postsecondary sector with the majority of HSIs (n=14). In 2013, there were four UC campuses classified as HSIs. And for those students accessing four-year institutions from the community college system in the state, the majority of Latino students are transferring to CSU campuses. There is a great deal of inequity in access

rates for Latino community college students accessing University of California campuses (Malcom, 2013). The CSU system however, due to the number of campuses geographically accessible throughout California, lower tuition fees, and lenient admission requirements (compared to most UCs) has been a top choice for Latino students transitioning to college immediately after high school graduation and for the students transferring from community college to the four-year sector.

CSU Faculty

The faculty data for the CSU system show tenured Latino faculty representing only 8.8% while white faculty represented 68% in 2012. And 8.5% of Chicanos/Latinos are "probationary," defined by the CSU as the period prior to earning tenure at a CSU campus. Thus, the pipeline of assistant professors in the CSU system is also very limited and does not come close to parity (Author) or equity (Bensimon, 2005) in representation within the CSU system that helps to account for inequitable student outcomes (Bensimon, 2005). That is the leaders of and within institutions, particularly faculty who teach the next generation, remain far from understanding the first generation backgrounds, cultures, or lived experiences of the students they are expected to teach.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The staffing data for the CSU campuses are calculated to understand the representation across positions within each ethnic group This is misleading. Rather than understanding the representation of each group by category, the data collected for staff mask the true representation in professional or management positions compared to the different ethnic groups. Within the

Latino ethnic group, Latinos are more likely to occupy professional or technical or administrative support positions within CSU campuses (CSU Chancellor's Office, 2014). Conversely, Whites are more likely to hold faculty positions in the CSU system than any other ethnic group. For example, Whites constitute 42% of faculty in the CSU system in 2012 compared to 18% Latino, 20% Black, or 37% Asian American (CSU Chancellor's Office, 2014)

The graduation rate for CSU campuses illustrates lower graduation rates for Latinos in 12 of the 14 HSIs in the system compared to the overall six-year graduation rate (Table 2). Latinos had higher graduation rates that their White peers at CSU Bakersfield (42% compared to 38% for Whites). CSU Los Angeles had the same graduation rate between Latinos and Whites (33%). It is important to note that the overall six-year graduation rates are low for Latinos across the CSU system. In fact, in all but two campuses, the six-year graduation rates were below 50%.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

California Community College Context

An important aspect to understanding Hispanic serving community colleges in California relates to the campus leadership, faculty, and staff. An important question for this sector remains unanswered: Who are the individuals and groups "serving" Latino students and do they have cultural awareness of the linguistic, immigration, generational, and K-12 backgrounds and contexts that Latino students experience in the P-20 continuum? Latinos constitute 16% of administrators in community colleges despite the fact that over three quarters of the entire system are HSIs (76%) (CCC Chancellor's Office, 2014). This presents a challenge for institutions

particularly because few leaders may have a strong cultural understanding of the Latino community, and their specific history in the United States.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Community College Outcomes

The California community colleges are the primary entry point for Latinos transitioning to college in the state. Over 2.4 million students attend California community colleges, with Latinos constituting 41% in 2013 (CCC Chancellor's Office, 2013). Four outcome variables were utilized to assess student success and completion rates to provide a comprehensive overview of persistence, academic engagement, and overall success with transfer or degree completion. These variables are contained in the CSU chancellor's database, DataMart, which provides a publicly accessible database of select student and institutional outcomes for the 112 community colleges in California. The Scorecard Metric developed by the California Community College Chancellor's office (utilized for this analysis) includes the following student outcome variables:

1. Persistence Rate: Defined as a student who has been enrolled for three consecutive terms.
2. 30 Units Rate: Students who have earned 30 units.
3. Completion: Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR), which is a six-year cohort completion rate for students who either transferred to a four-year university or completed a two-year degree.

These measures are utilized to assess the overall performance of 42 community colleges from the Southern California region.

Persistence

Using the student scorecard metric measures from the Chancellor's Office enables the authors to conduct cross-institutional comparisons by race and ethnicity. For the purpose of this analysis, the authors selected two persistence measures: (a) the students who stayed enrolled consecutively for three terms (standard persistence) and (b) the 30-unit rate. The first measure of persistence is considered a "standard" measure because it has long been believed that students enrolled past the first year and into the second have reached a "momentum point."

The key data points utilized in this study include the persistence rate, students enrolling for three consecutive terms, and the 30-unit rate were used to explore student outcomes to better understand the progress made by Latino students and their progress at specific points in their higher education pathway.

Tables 4 and 5 illustrate an important story about persistence rates and the measure itself. The persistence rates for Latino students appears to be similar and in some cases higher than the overall rates for their peers across community colleges from the Los Angeles, Inland Empire, Orange County, and San Diego regions. In Los Angeles, the persistence rate for Latinos was higher than the overall rate in 9 out of the 20 colleges. Gaps in the rates were also smaller for this measure. A similar pattern is seen in the Inland Empire, with three out of nine colleges having high persistence rates for Latino students. Three out of six colleges in Orange County had high persistence rates for Latinos while three out of seven in San Diego County had higher Latino persistence rates compared to the overall rate of their respective colleges.

The thirty-unit rate tells a different story. The data convey declining persistence rates for Latinos. Latinos from Los Angles community colleges had higher 30-unit rates than the overall rate in only five colleges, one college in from the Inland Empire, none from Orange County, and one from San Diego County. It is important to note that the 30 unit rate is assessed because it is believed to be a strong predictor of student transfer (McCormick & Carroll, 1999; Prince & Jenkins, 2005).

However, Tables 6 and 7 show these persistence rates do not translate into degree completion. These findings are therefore contrary to existing theories on academic momentum as a result of persisting past the first year or with a certain number of college units. Latino students appear to be dropping out of college at very high rates after the first two years, and despite having investing in earning 30 units or greater. Thus, the authors question whether the current tools and theories for assessing student persistence are relevant to understanding Latino student success in the context of California community colleges.

INSERT TABLES 4 & 5 HERE

College Completion

The college completion measure the authors used to conduct their analysis of Southern California community college completion rates is derived from a six-year cohort analysis by the California Community College Data Mart Management Information System. The Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) is the six-year rate for community college students who either completed a two-year degree or transferred to a four-year institution. The problem with this measure is that it conflates two student outcomes: degree completion and transfer. While

both are measures of student success, they are not the same and should not be compiled into one variable for analysis. It is important to know how many students are completing their degrees from community colleges, and in what fields as well as how many students are transferring to four-year institutions. A more appropriate measure would be a longitudinal college completion rate that follows a student who transferred to understand their actual four-year degree completion rate. In addition, the two-year degree rate should be disaggregated to understand how long it takes a student to complete a community college degree and by field. And for those that completed their degrees, what pathways did they pursue following two-year degree completion (e.g., transfer, entry into the workforce, etc.).

Across all 42 institutions that were included in the Southern California data file,[1] Latinos had lower college completion rates than their White peers. And in only one institution's profile, West Los Angeles College, did Latinos exceed the college's overall completion rate, (42.1% compared to 39.3%), but still remained behind their White peers in transfer or degree completion. Thus, despite the fact that Latinos represent a sizable critical mass of the student body, their completion rates in the HSIs examined over a six-year period represents systemic failure. Having a large critical mass of students dropping out of college at alarming rates, when it is so difficult to transition students to college in the first place, is a central challenge for HSIs to address through targeted intervention, academic support and institutional investment.

INSERT TABLES 6 and 7 HERE

[1] Two of the Inland Empire Community Colleges did not have SPAR data contained in the MIS data file.

Discussion

The data reveal that graduation rates on average are poor for Latino students in both the CSU and CC systems in California. Completion rates are lower for Latinos than their White peers across the majority of CSU campuses and community across various regions in the state.

Social stratification is occurring in higher education in California, with the majority of Latinos, transitioning to the community college system. Even the students who are attending schools within high performing schools, and are high performing themselves, are opting for the two-year community colleges as the primary pathway to college (Gandara, 2010: Author, 2009; Malcom-Piqueax, 2013). Forty-six percent of Latinos who attended the top 10 percent of high schools in the state chose to enroll in community colleges immediately following high school graduation (Malcom-Piqueax, 2013). Segregation therefore is not only occurring in K-12 schools, the public higher education system in California has become increasingly stratified as well.

The CSUs play a critical role because for those students in California who do transfer, they are transferring to this system as the secondary pathway following community college enrollment. The following recommendations are intended as a starting point for campuses to consider as they work to better serve their Latinos students attending Hispanic Serving Institutions.

Recommendations

Improve Measures of Student Success

As a first step, campuses need to improve their measures of student success, which can be done in three ways:

1. **Rethink traditional measures of student success.** Measures that the DATA Mart MIS systems are utilizing as the scorecard metric do not represent what should be considered to be "success." A six-year community college completion rate, a six-year transfer rate, and a six-year time frame for measuring transitioning out of remedial tracks are far from optimal student outcomes for Latinos and all students. For example, students transitioning out of remedial math and remedial English are measured using six-year cohort rates. Six years on a remedial track is far too long to consider this success by any institution of system. Full time and part time students should take no more than two years to move beyond remedial tracks in community colleges.

2. **Conduct data collection and analysis beyond the standard Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection efforts, particularly for four-year institutions.** The Federal IPEDS data warehouse collects limited institutional data on student, staff, and faculty outcomes. HSIs that are committed to increasing college completion rates should expand these data points to monitor student and institutional progress toward better serving Latino students.
3. **Disaggregate underrepresented minority (URM) students.** Many institutions post Proposition 209 have opted to analyze their data by aggregating URM students together. This approach masks the inequities present across groups and fails to provide institutions with an accurate look at individual ethnic group progress and academic challenges.

Increase Latino Representation across Systems

Secondly, we recommend increasing Latino representation across academic systems by doing the following:

1. **Increase Latino faculty in HSIs.** Latino faculty play a critical role in Latino student retention and climate on college campuses. Latinos and faculty of color are more likely to mentor students of color, and provide direct research experiences. Latino faculty rates remain far below the percentages of White and Asian-American faculty across CSUs and CCs. States have historically sponsored "forgivable loan programs" or "grow-your-own" programs that have proven effective at diversifying applicant pools.
2. **Increase Latino administrators in HSIs.** Few Latinos are leading campuses within the CSU and community college system. This includes mid- to high-level managers. Increasing Latino administrators and leaders would help support the void in leaders that possess cultural awareness and direct experience in working with Latino communities.

Seek New Approaches for Latino Student Success

Based on these findings, we recommend seeking new approaches to Latino student success at both two-year and four-year sectors, including:

1. Accelerate time-to-degree completion. Standard time-to-degree rates completion is far too long for students. Transfer rates also represent unrealistic and long time frames. Students lose momentum and motivation after attending college for so many years. In order to accelerate time to degree, institutions need to rethink the way they administer financial aid. Investing in two-year students at higher financial rates would enable them to attend college for a greater number of units, work less hours, and reduce time to degree.

2. Place greater emphasis on part-time students. The majority of Latinos students are attending college part-time due to financial need. This lengthens the time to degree for students and increases the likelihood of dropping out from college. Changing work study options for the part-time working student would enable the state to tie financial aid to institutions and reduce the need for students to work in low-wage sectors.

Address Structural Challenges

The authors also recommend that learning institutions address structural challenges including:

1. **Rethink financial aid for community college and part-time, low-income students.** If the academic community is serious about accelerating time-to-degree, the way financial aid is calculated needs to shift and tie to jobs that pay for students' college tuition. This model would enable community college students to earn valuable industry experience and work less hours, ultimately enabling students to transition from part-time to full-time status.

2. **Revisit the organizational structure of the community college system.** The California Community College State Chancellor's Office is likely constrained by being part of the state legislative process—the state mandates allocations and approves the budget for the community college system, as seen in the case of the K-12 budget. The CSU and UC systems are independent from this infrastructure and still receive state funding. The current system creates reactive leadership and inhibits innovation.

Limitations

Because this work is descriptive in nature and the systemic data remain limited, it is difficult to fully understand the complexities of student and institutional outcomes at HSIs. The recommendations provided are intended to start a conversation on the unique role that HSIs play and have the opportunity to play for Latino students in California. However, individual level student data, rather than aggregate student data would greatly improve our ability to understand the barriers to college completion. For example, developmental course enrollment at the community college and CSU levels are only provided at the institutional level and these data are incomplete. That is, not all institutions are providing this data to the DataMart system. Several missing values, and variables altogether, influence the quality of the analyses that can be conducted. This article is intended to serve as a descriptive starting point.

Conclusion

The outcomes for Latino students in California's CSU and community college systems represent a serious challenge for the state. While Latino students have relatively comparable persistence rates to their peers, these rates are still unacceptable. In addition, the persistence rates do not translate into college completion rates. Thus, the traditional approach to assessing persistence for students and Latinos in particular, is obsolete. Latino students are more likely to be attending part-time, work more than 20 hours per week, stop in and out of college, and have far longer time-to-degree averages than the recorded six-year rate. The 30-unit rate and first year retention rate therefore may not be the best predictors of college completion.

Due to the changing nature of today's college student, the measures utilized to determine student success need altering. They are not the most appropriate measures nor should be acceptable measures of systemic "success." The persistence rates are too narrow and do not appear to be the best predictor of college success for Latinos, the remedial course taking data for community college students are incomplete and therefore do not allow for critical review and analysis at a systemic level, and the six-year cohort analyses for transfer and two-year degree completion is also an unacceptable window. Six years to transfer is far from what one would consider a successful outcome. Minimally, there needs to be several data points reported, such as the two-year transfer rate, two year degree completion rate, three year transfer and completion rates, to better understand how difficult it is for our students to reach the intended milestones and develop tangible strategies for reducing the time-to degree and transfer.

Thus, it is critical to modify these measures and utilize data to enact formative change in student academic support and financial aid distribution. Further, it is imperative for the CSU and CC systems reduce the time-to-degree to increase the number of Latinos completing college. If academic performance and college completion rates are not altered, California is poised to consist of a sizable Latino underclass (Author 2009;2011). While HSIs represent one sector that may raise college completion rates, these institutions in California are serving the majority of Latino college goers. They are the postsecondary institutions with the ability to transform the outcomes for the next generation of Latinos. That is, if postsecondary systems and individual institutions invest wisely in altering how Latinos are served in CSU and CC HSIs, California could also be a transformed state in the process—a state with a highly educated workforce prepared for economic flexibility, sustainability, and the demands of the future.

References

Adelman, C. (2004). *Principal indicators of student academic histories in postsecondary education, 1972-2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved 12/7/10 from: http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/prinindicat/prinindicat.pdf

Bailey, T., Jeong, D. W., & Cho, S. W. (2010). Referral, Enrollment, and completion in developmental education sequences in community colleges. *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 255-270.

Bozick, Robert, and Erich Lauff. 2007. *Education longitudinal study of 2002 (ELS:2002): A first look at the initial postsecondary experiences of the high school sophomore class of 2002.* NCES 2008-308. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Chan, R., (2013). "College readiness and remediation in higher education: A policy brief of California community colleges among Hispanic/Latino undergraduate students in American society." Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, January 21, 2013.

Contreras, F. E., Malcom, L. E., & Bensimon, E. M. (2008). Hispanic-serving institutions: Closeted identity and the production of equitable outcomes for Latino/a students. In Gasman, M., Baez, B., & Turner, C. (Eds.) *Understanding minority-serving institutions: Interdisciplinary perspective.* New York: State University of New York, 71–90.

Contreras, F. (2011). *Achieving equity for Latino students.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cunningham, A., & Santiago, D. (2008). Student Aversion to Borrowing: Who Borrows, Who Doesn't? Report Prepared by the Institute for Higher Education Policy and Excelencia in Education. Washington, D.C.

Gandara, P. & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hurtado, S. (1994). The institutional climate for talented Latino students. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(1), 1994.

Hurtado, S. & Ruiz, A. (2012). Realizing the potential of Hispanic-serving institutions: Multiple dimensions of institutional diversity for advancing Hispanic higher education. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lopez-Turley, R., (2006). When parents want children to stay home for college. *Research in Higher Education,* 47(7), 823–846.

Malcom, L., (2013). Addressing Latino outcomes at California's Hispanic serving institutions. Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California.

McCormick, A. C. & Carroll, C. D. (1999). Credit production and progress toward the bachelor's degree: An analysis of postsecondary transcripts for beginning students at 4-year institutions. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Milem, J. F. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nuñez, A. M., Sparks, P. J., & Hernandez, E. A. (2011). Latino access to community colleges and Hispanic-Serving Institutions: A national study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 10*(1), 18–40.

Nuñez, A. M., & Bowers, A. J. (2011). Exploring what leads high school students to enroll in Hispanic-Serving Institutions: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(6), 1286–1313.

Prince, D. & Jenkins, D. (2005). Building pathways to success for low-skill adult students: Lessons for community college policy and practice from a longitudinal student tracking study (CCRC Brief No. 25). New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.

Swanson, J. (2008). *An analysis of the impact of high school dual enrollment course participation on post-secondary academic success, persistence and degree completion.* Iowa City, IA: Institute for Research and Policy Acceleration at the Belin-Blank Center for Gifted Education, University of Iowa. Retrieved from: http://www.nacep.org/confdownloads/swanson_executive_summary.pdf

Tinto, V. (1998). Colleges as communities: Taking research on student persistence seriously. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(2).

Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1,* 139 –168. doi:10.1037/a0012837

Table 1

CSU Headcount of Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status and Ethnicity, Fall 2012

Tenure Status	Total	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Latino	White
Tenured	7,239	3.9 (n=280)	.01 (n=42)	15.6 (n=1,132)	8.8 (n=634)	68.0 (n=4,913)
Probationary	2,118	3.8 (n=81)	.01 (n=15)	22.6 (n=478)	8.5 (n=181)	57.0 (n=1,208)
Temporary	1,991	3.1 (n=62)	.005 (n=10)	7.3 (n=146)	8.2 (n=163)	75.4 (n=1,504)
Total	11,348	3.7 (n=423)	.006 (n=67)	15.5 (n=1,756)	8.6 (n=978)	67.2 (n=7,625)

Table 2

Six-Year Graduation Rate by Race/Ethnicity

Institution	Percent Chicano/Latino	Overall 6-Year Grad Rate	American-Indian/ Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Latino	White
CSU-Bakersfield	45.8	39	50	43	16	42	38
CSU-Channel Islands	29.8	51	0	62	25	46	55
CSU-Dominguez Hills	49.0	28	50	24	22	31	46
CSU-Fresno	38.1	48	65	46	34	43	56
CSU-Fullerton	33.9	51	50	55	41	45	56
CSU-Long Beach	33.1	57	54	60	50	51	61
CSU-Los Angeles	55.3	37	71	51	26	33	33
CSU-Monterey Bay	36.0	37	17	48	15	34	40
CSU-Northridge	37.3	48	54	50	32	44	58
CSU-Poly Pomona	34.3	57	25	56	54	43	55
CSU-San Bernardino	49.3	44	31	51	37	42	49

CSU-San Marcos	30.9	45	29	50	50	40	45
CSU-Stanislaus	39.9	49	60	54	29	46	49
San Diego State University	27.1	66	60	65	63	61	68

Table 3

Faculty in Community Colleges, Fall 2013

		Fall 2013 Employee	Fall 2013 Employee
Academic, Tenured/Tenure Track	**Total**	16,142	20.13%
African-American		913	5.66%
American Indian/Alaskan Native		141	0.87%
Asian		1,407	8.72%
Hispanic		2,233	13.83%
Multiethnicity		141	0.87%
Pacific Islander		96	0.59%
Unknown		794	4.92%
White Non-Hispanic		10,417	64.53%

Table 4: Community College Persistence Outcomes, Los Angeles & Inland Empire, 2012

Institution	Percent Chicano/ Latino	Persistence Rate			30-Unit Rate		
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT							
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**	**Latino**	**White**	**Overall**
Antelope Valley College	38.3	I	I	I	62.3	65.9	62.6
Cerritos College	60.9	69.9	69.3	68.5	65.0	70.1	65.0
Citrus College	56.2	68.9	70.7	68.6	62.9	68.4	65.1
College of the Canyons	39.0	62.3	55.1	57.2	66.5	68.8	68.2
East Lost Angeles College	64.3	65.1	66.7	64.4	65.1	60.6	66.0
El Camino College	44.1	67.5	67.8	66.5	63.3	69.6	66.4
Glendale Community College	25.7	67.5	77.0	73.0	60.2	80.7	74.6
Long Beach City College	48.9	71.9	74.8	73.7	64.6	76.2	68.7
Los Angeles City College	43.3	65.1	66.7	59.1	56.9	73.7	61.6
Los Angeles Harbor College	54.8	54.7	54.3	54.3	66.0	65.9	64.2
Los Angeles Mission College	71.8	57.1	47.4	57.3	57.6	57.9	57.3
Los Angeles Pierce College	42.6	65.7	63.7	63.0	63.4	75.3	69.9
Los Angeles Southwest College	32.9	44.7	33.3	44.1	54.8	100	50.2
Los Angeles Trade-Tech College	54.0	58.5	57.5	58.5	58.9	70.0	57.1
Los Angeles Valley College	44.9	52.0	64.5	56.0	56.2	70.5	62.5
Moorpark College	26.6	67.6	70.3	68.0	67.8	75.5	73.6
Pasadena City College	40.1	70.6	68.9	72.1	64.5	72.4	72.2
Rio Hondo College	77.3	71.1	70.5	68.0	61.7	69.0	63.4
Santa Monica College	34.3	63.8	65.4	64.4	63.6	73.8	68.6
West Los Angeles College	38.4	56.3	50.9	50.5	67.1	56.1	58.6
INLAND EMPIRE							
Chaffey College	54.6	56.4	64.1	57.8	57.0	66.9	61.9
Crafton Hills College	40.9	69.1	65.8	66.4	64.6	64.8	64.7
Moreno Valley College	52.1	I	I	I	I	I	I
Mt. San Antonio College	54.8	71.5	74.5	72.4	62.6	68.9	67.6
Mt. San Jacinto College	39.6	59.9	66.0	65.0	55.1	63.3	60.4
Norco College	51.4	I	I	I	I	I	I
Riverside City College	50.6	67.5	68.3	67.1	61.8	66.4	63.6
San Bernardino Valley College	61.2	67.7	65.2	63.4	59.5	64.0	58.5
Victor Valley College	44.3	57.6	60.8	58.7	58.6	63.3	60.4

Table 5: Orange County Community Colleges, Persistence Rates, Orange County & San Diego County, 2012

Institution	Percent Chicano/ Latino	Persistence Rate			30 Unit Rate		
ORANGE COUNTY							
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**	**Latino**	**White**	**Overall**
Cypress College	39.8	70.5	73.9	71.6	62.5	70.0	69.2
Fullerton College	48.0	68.6	69.2	68.3	67.2	70.2	68.5
Golden West College	27.3	75.9	75.6	75.7	66.1	72.4	72.2
Orange Coast College	29.4	78.8	76.3	79.2	70.9	75.2	75.5
Santa Ana College	51.3	69.5	78.6	72.8	65.3	76.3	70.4
Santiago Canyon College	43.5	62.3	55.1	57.2	68.9	73.4	71.4
SAN DIEGO							
Cuyamaca College	31.4	64.0	70.3	68.1	62.6	68.3	67.1
Grossmont College	29.4	66.9	70.3	69.8	62.4	69.8	67.2
Miracosta College	29.7	60.3	61.2	61.9	60.0	69.2	67.7
Palomar College	35.3	59.7	65.2	63.2	57.6	68.2	64.6
San Diego City College	48.7	53.9	40.3	50.0	53.4	44.3	49.4
San Diego Mesa College	30.5	64.4	62.7	61.8	57.9	61.9	59.4
Southwestern College	54.8	73.6	70.6	72.2	64.3	65.0	64.4

Table 6: Community Colleges Success & Completion Rates, Los Angeles & Inland Empire 2006-12

Institution	Percent Chicano/ Latino	Completion Rate (SPAR) within 6 years		
LOS ANGELES				
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**
Antelope Valley College	38.3	42.3	50.1	46.0
Cerritos College	60.9	35.2	45.7	39.9
Citrus College	56.2	38.7	51.4	44.4
College of the Canyons	39.0	43.9	59.4	56.3
East Lost Angeles College	64.3	35.2	48.5	41.9
El Camino College	44.1	33.3	56.0	45.3
Glendale Community College	25.7	37.7	63.7	52.3
Long Beach City College	48.9	37.9	53.2	43.4
Los Angeles City College	43.3	29.9	47.7	37.1
Los Angeles Harbor College	54.8	38.9	54.9	44.6
Los Angeles Mission College	71.8	32.3	44.7	34.8
Los Angeles Pierce College	42.6	39.7	59.8	52.5
Los Angeles Southwest College	32.9	42.1	66.7	35.4
Los Angeles Trade-Tech College	54.0	30.6	55.0	32.8
Los Angeles Valley College	44.9	35.6	46.9	42.0
Moorpark College	26.6	51.5	65.9	63.8

Pasadena City College	40.1	36.8	61.1	55.0
Rio Hondo College	77.3	34.7	45.7	39.9
Santa Monica College	34.3	36.6	64.5	51.4
West Los Angeles College	38.4	42.1	43.9	39.3
INLAND EMPIRE				
Institution	**Percent Chicano/ Latino**	**Completion Rate (SPAR) within 6 years**		
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**
Chaffey College	54.6	37.9	49.7	45.6
Crafton Hills College	40.9	38.2	44.8	42.1
Moreno Valley College	52.1	I	I	I
Mt. San Antonio College	54.8	38.4	49.4	48.6
Mt. San Jacinto College	39.6	36.9	44.4	41.7
Norco College	51.4	I	I	I
Riverside City College	50.6	34.9	43.0	40.2
San Bernardino Valley College	61.2	32.0	35.6	35.6
Victor Valley College	44.3	32.3	43.3	38.6

Table 7: Community Colleges Completion Rates, Orange & San Diego Counties, 2006-12

Institution	**Percent Chicano/ Latino**	**Completion Rate (SPAR) within 6 years**		
ORANGE COUNTY				
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**
Cypress College	39.8	37.0	47.3	48.0
Fullerton College	48.0	42.2	50.6	49.0
Golden West College	27.3	38.1	50.7	51.5
Orange Coast College	29.4	50.6	59.7	59.0
Santa Ana College	51.3	41.3	57.4	49.0
Santiago Canyon College	43.5	47.1	58.7	57.1
SAN DIEGO				
Institution	**Percent Chicano/ Latino**	**Completion Rate (SPAR) within 6 years**		
		Latino	**White**	**Overall**
Cuyamaca College	31.4	40.9	50.1	48.4
Grossmont College	29.4	45.4	52.3	50.4
Miracosta College	29.7	41.6	59.7	55.1
Palomar College	35.3	43.5	55.1	52.2
San Diego City College	48.7	56.1	70.3	62.1
San Diego Mesa College	30.5	51.0	65.4	62.0
Southwestern College	54.8	41.4	47.7	43.1