American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education, Inc.

# Hispanic Serving Institutions:
# Patterns, Predictions, and Implications for Informing Policy Discussions

Vasti Torres
Indiana University

Desiree Zerquera
Indiana University

*This Scholarly Paper was commissioned for the 6th Annual Conference of the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education, 2011.*

**Hispanic Serving Institutions: Patterns, Predictions, and Implications for Informing Policy Discussions**

Latest US Census reports show that the Latino population continued its growth this past decade, increasing 9.7% in the percentage of Americans who self-identify as Latino/Hispanic (U.S. Census, 2011). Latinos now make up 16.3 % of the U.S. population, with growth over the past decade rising from 19.2 to 24.6 percent in New York and New Mexico to as high as144.5 and 147.9 percent in Alabama and South Carolina. In addition to this general population growth, previous census counts indicated that Latino children under the age of 5 made up approximately 19% of the total population of children a decade ago (U.S. Census Fact Sheet, 2000). This group of children will create the rising young adult population that will be of interest to educators and policy makers in the coming years. This unprecedented growth of the Latino population and children brings forth questions about the educational aspirations and success of this group which is projected to continue growing, and likely to take place in areas that are not seen as traditional Latino enclaves. This paper seeks to look at those areas in the U.S. which are predicted to see rapid growth in their adolescent Latino populations and assess the readiness of higher education institutions to receive this new population of students. In doing this we will identify *Potential* Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) located within these rapidly growing communities and which will likely be affected by this projected growth of young adult Latinos.

Considering the next set of HSIs is important because these institutions continue to play an important role in educating Latino college students. Hispanic Serving Institutions have 25% of their enrollment made up of Latino students and at least 50% of their students receive need-based assistance (Title V Program Statute, 2006). Within the continental U.S., HSIs tend to be concentrated in states with longstanding, large enclaves of Latino populations, like California,

Texas, Florida, Arizona, New Mexico, and New York. In spite of recent publications calling attention to *emerging HSIs* (Santiago, 2010), that is, institutions with enrollments approaching the 25% Latino threshold, most states and institutions continue to assume that this designation is not of interest to them. This work, conducted as part of the efforts of *Excelencia* in Education, found emerging HSIs in 20 states, including states with traditionally smaller Latino populations. Looking at emerging HSIs leads the way for considering the future of HSIs and speculating where the next concentration of Latino college students may emerge. As a result of having a smaller Latino population and a shorter history of acknowledging and addressing the needs of this group, these states and, in turn, the higher education institutions within them, may be less ready to serve the population growth of Latino adolescents that is likely to come to them in the future. While much research on Latinos has traditionally focused on states with longstanding Latino populations, more needs to be done in areas that are not seen as traditional enclaves of the Latino population.

This conceptual exploratory study uses population projections to examine *Potential* HSIs and makes an effort to assist with identifying ways that institutions can prepare for the future. The conceptual framework used to make these predictions is grounded in research focused on Latino college choice, attendance patterns, and the role of Hispanic Servings Institutions (HSI) in Latino college student postsecondary pathways. After presenting this literature, the research design will be described and illustrated. The results will focus on states identified as having the potential for rapid growth and institutions with the potential to become an HSI. The paper will conclude with discussion and implications for consideration by states and institutions.

## Literature Influencing the Conceptual Framework

College choice is a complex process, involving a multitude of factors and influences on students' enrollment decisions. Proximity to home and cost of attendance have consistently been a predominant factor in students' college choice process (Holland & Richards, 1965; Kinzie, Palmer, Hayek, Hossler, Jacob, & Cummings, 2004; Weiler, 1994). Additionally, models have been developed specifically to understand the college choice process for Latino students, whose decisions vary from those of their peers. In this next section, college choice is examined both generally and then applied specifically to Latino students' experiences.

**Proximity to Home**

Though proximity to home has consistently been considered within college choice models (e.g. Hossler and Gallagher, 1987; Perna, 2006), little empirical work has examined this topic, and findings on its role in students' college enrollment decisions remain somewhat inconclusive. For instance, in national studies of student enrollment decisions, Turley (2006; 2009) found proximity of a college to a students' home to be a major factor in students' decisions of where to enroll. Further, she and others have found the proximity of colleges and universities to increase the likelihood of an individual to apply to and enroll in those institutions, in particular four-year colleges (Long, 2004; Turley, 2009). However, in her study of college preferences of high school seniors in their senior year, Goble found both students and their parents to have a greater preference for institutions away from home (2010). Yet, these findings are not consistent across racial and ethnic groups.

Latino students prioritize proximity to home when making decisions on where to attend college (Cerna, Pérez, & Sáenz, 2006; Goble, 2010; Kim, 2004; Perez and McDonough, 2008; Perna & McDonough, 2008). This preference has been related to a strong family orientation attributed to Latinos (Perna & McDonough, 2008). Further, these preferences have also been tied

to values which make up Latino culture. *Familismo* is a cultural value, emphasizing loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity, requiring prioritization of family over individual interests (Vega, 1990). Further, Latina identity and sense of belonging have been found to be tied to closely to family connections (Espinoza, 2010). This often times conflicts with school demands, resulting in Latino students, Latinas in particular, being placed in a cultural bind (Sy & Romero, 2008), and having to choose between school or family obligations, which often times include spending time with family and staying close to home (Espinoza, 2001).

Latino parents tend to be more locally oriented, which has been associated with high rates of first-generation college status and lack of knowledge of US higher education structures (Turley, 2006). However, research has long documented the positive role Latina/o families and communities play in supporting student aspirations and encouraging student success, despite many Latina/o student first-generation status (Ceja, 2006; Gándara, 1995; Pérez & McDonough, 2008), including an increased likelihood in baccalaureate completion (Cerna, Pérez, & Sáenz, 2006). This finding highlights the importance of family within the Latino culture.

Proximity to home is also a factor when students consider how to pay for college. Beyond proximity, the cost of attendance has been a major factor in college choice. As cost of attendance includes more than just tuition, proximity to home is a factor considered in choice as it relates to students' financial concerns. In general, the likelihood of leaving home for college is higher for those whose parents' income is higher (Mulder & Clark, 2002). For Latinos, location and distance of the institution from home play a role in the importance of cost and affordability (Pérez, 2010). Cost of attending is a major concern for Latino students' choice of where to attend college, as they are more concerned than their non-Latino peers about how much financial aid they may get, and highly influenced by their family's income (Kim, 2004Proximity to family

curbs many financial concerns, and as cited previously, increases degree attainment for Latino students. Yet, oftentimes students, particularly those in urban areas, have multiple institutional enrollment options accessible to them. Like many students who are first-generation students and come from low-income backgrounds, the manner in which Latino students receive information regarding potential enrollment options is of particular concern. The considerations around college choice for this group of students are the focus of the next area of research literature.

**Chain Migration Theory**

Friends' suggestions have a significant impact on Latino students' choice (Kim, 2004), which research has consistently found untrue for other (general) groups of students. (Hossler et al., 1989). Research has applied chain migration theory to understand college choice decisions of Latinas/os (i.e. Pérez & McDonough, 2008; Person & Rosenbaum, 2006), and finding overwhelmingly, that family members, peers, and other social contacts serve as primary sources of information and influence on students' enrollment decisions. Latino students rely heavily on information channels created through siblings, peers, relatives, and high school contacts to plan for and consider higher education options (Pérez & McDonough, 2008). For example, in one study of Latino community college students, over 50% of students cited family or friends as a reason to choose a particular college, while less than 15 percent gave the same reason (Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). Latina/o students, especially first-generation college students, depend on chain migration contacts at the postsecondary institutions they were considering applying to or were going to matriculate since being alone or without family is hard for them to fathom. The negotiation limited the choices these students made, first by restricting their college choice set to institutions in-state and second, by limiting their options to institutions that were local to stay in close proximity to family (Perna & McDonough, 2008). At times, this proves to be a more

meaningful information source for Latino students, whereas Latino students at institutions within which there are smaller percentages of other Latinos, often encounter more barriers in obtain information about the college (Person & Rosenbaum, 2006) – fewer Latina/o faculty and staff, fewer social outlets, lack of specialized services and personnel. Collectively, these enrollment decisions by Latino students have helped create institutions with critical masses of Latino students, charged by researchers, policy makers, and federal agencies to support these students' educational aspirations.

## The Role of Hispanic Serving Institutions

The majority of HSIs are two-year institutions (Mercer & Stedman, 2008; Santiago, 2008), and tend to be generally less expensive than other institutions, located in large Latino communities, and be more accessible compared to other institutions (Santiago, 2007). Latino first-generation college students' perceptions of the racial/ethnic climate and financial aid availability affect their decisions on what institution to enroll in more so than for any other race/ethnicity (Cho, Hudley, Lee, Barry, & Kelly, 2008). Most Latino students enrolled at HSIs did not know their institution was an HSI (Santiago, 2007), yet over half of all Latinos in higher education are enrolled within one of these 265 institutions nationwide (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Many Latino students at HSIs chose their institution based on the "sticker price" of tuition and related costs (Cejda, Casparis, Rhodes, & Kelly, 2008; Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Cabrera, 2007; Santiago, 2007). Additional research has found that Latino students chose HSIs not only because of costs, but also proximity to home and family, welcoming campus environments, the support of family, perceived potential for employment opportunities, and an accessible campus as decisive factors in their college choice (Cejda, Casparis, Rhodes, & Kelly, 2008; Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Cabrera, 2007). In contrast, Latino graduates who did not attend HSIs were

more likely to prioritize financial aid, institutional prestige, and academic programs as critical factors influencing their college choices (Santiago, 2007).

Unlike other specialty serving institutions, such as tribal colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Universities, for most institutions, the HSI status results from demographic shifts in their surrounding communities, as opposed to deliberate changes in mission (Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Laden, 2004; Flores, Horn, Crisp, 2006). Some have referred to this as an *acquired* (Malcom, Bensimon, & Davila, 2010) or *invisible* (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2006) identity, due to this often accidental or evolutionary state. Yet, more and more commonly, institutional efforts have emerged as institutions seek to become or solidify commitments to being HSIs (Santiago & Andrade, 2010). However, enrolling large numbers of Latino students is not sufficient to serve Latino students (Andrade, Santiago, & Brown, 2004). Successful HSIs are those which focus on student success through: improving student services to better support Latino students, developing a curriculum which better aligns with student interests, having leaders who are proactive in developing a commitment to Latino student success partnering with their surrounding communities, including high schools and other postsecondary institutions, and embracing diversity while enhancing campus climates for diverse populations (Andrade, Santiago, & Brown, 2004; Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2006; Santiago, 2008).

In summary, Latino students stay near home for college as a result of both cultural values and as a means of saving money. Further, their perceived postsecondary options are highly informed by social channels, resulting in Latinos chain-enrolling in institutions where they have friends and family members. These enrollment choices offer insights into how colleges and universities may emerge as HSIs. This literature on college choice by Latino students combined

with the literature on HSIs supports the assumptions that looking at geographic enclaves of Latinos will likely yield a college going pattern to nearby institutions.

## Research Design

This is an exploratory study to consider the future growth of the Latino college-going population. The design of this study began by considering states that presently do not have any HSIs and are projected to have a high school graduate population composed of or nearing 20% Latino students by 2020. The high school graduation projections selected was done by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE, 2008) and considered cohort survival ratio, which makes linear projections base on patterns seen in past data. This technique takes into account attendance patterns as well as birth rates. Using the projections of high school graduates for 2020, seven states were selected to consider for this study. While none of these states have a recognized HSI, two were identified as having emerging HSIs (Arkansas and Oregon). Table 1 illustrates the rapid growth predicted for the states under consideration.

_____

Insert Table 1 approximately here

_____

### Sample Development

Once the states were identified, the focus turned to current U.S. Census data (2009) to find enclaves of Latino residents. The decision was made to consider counties that presently have approximately 15% Latino population. Informed by chain migration theories and patterns of immigration (e.g. Durand & Malone, 2002; MacDonald & MacDonald, 1964), these decision were made based on the belief that present enclaves would likely attract more Latino immigrants to that region, and therefore presented a greater likelihood of amassing a critical number of

young Latinos, and consequently, Latino high school graduates. In total, 60 counties were identified across the seven states. Georgia and Oregon have the greatest number of enclave counties, with over 25 each, while Tennessee and Maryland have just two a piece, and South Carolina has only one such identified county. Arkansas and North Carolina also only have a few, with four counties identified for each of these states.

Once enclave counties were selected, higher education institutions within each county were identified, thus creating our sample of *Potential* HSIs. As stated previously, this decision was based on the literature surrounding Latino college choice, which finds that in large part, Latino students stay close to home and follow chain enrollment patterns when deciding where to go for college. The sampling process resulted in 36 institutions across the 60 enclave counties. As expected given its number of enclave counties, Oregon and Georgia had the greatest number of institutions – 14 each; Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee had only two a piece; and Maryland and South Carolina had just one institution each. Table 2 shows the number of enclave counties and institutions per state.

---

Insert Table 2 approximately here

---

**Describing Institutions and their Levels of Readiness to Serve Latino Students**

Once these institutions were identified, two analyses were conducted. In the first, 2009 data from the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) were used to describe the postsecondary options available within these counties. In the second stage, content analysis of institutional web sites was conducted to consider the level of *readiness* these institutions had to serve their growing Latino community. The initial results reported in this section will include all

institutions identified, but once the analysis of institutions was done using content of analysis, the for-profit institutions were deleted from the sample because they are ineligible for HSI status. Therefore analysis was restricted to non-profit institutions.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study include the inherent limitations provided by population projections estimates. While WICHE projections utilized a cohort survival ratio which accounts for various factors in its design, it is nonetheless a projection. Further, these projections are restricted to high school graduate estimates. Thus, because the college choice process may occur throughout an individual's lifetime, the framing of these predictions, and consequently our study, does not directly consider the number of students who delay entry into higher education. Though these states and enclaves are likely to grow in the size of their adult Latino populations as well, the perspective of this study focuses on those students who may enter higher education in 2020 as first time in college students.

In addition, no contact was made with these institutions; therefore, it is probable that some of these institutions may be in planning phases which would not be represented on the web site content and thus not captured by our analysis of institutional readiness. In some cases the institution's web site was underdeveloped and may not be an accurate reflection of what is actually happening on the campus.

As a final comment, it should be noted that the results of this study is focused on educated hypothesis, therefore results should not be treated with the certainty that comes with data from the present, but more so this study should serve as a way to consider potential implications for institutions and states within a rapidly changing context.

## Results

The analysis provided is a snapshot of where institutions are today and what steps they are taking to prepare or address for the changing demographics in immediate area.

### Description of Institutions in Enclave Counties

Among the 36 institutions in the seven states, public two-year colleges made up the majority (11) of these institutions, with only three public and five private four-year institutions existing within the counties across these seven states. Additionally, there were 15 private for-profit colleges (See Table 3).

---

Insert Table 3 approximately here

---

These institutions had a mean enrollment of Latino students of just under 8% (as a percentage of all full-time equivalent undergraduates). While well over half of these institutions had Latino student enrollments well under 10% of their total undergraduate population, two institutions (both for-profit) had over 20% undergraduate Latino population. Additionally, these institutions had a mean enrollment of Black/African American students of nearly 15% (as a percentage of all full-time equivalent undergraduates), with three institutions (all for-profit) meeting enrollment eligibility requirements to be a predominantly Black Institution (PBI) having over 40% Black student enrollment. Among this diverse range of institutions, the retention rate for full-time students varied from 64% for institutions in Arkansas to 76.5% for Tennessee institutions, while the graduation rate for all students ranged from 14% in Maryland to 79.5% in Tennessee (See Table 4).

Insert Table 4 approximately here

**Exploration of Institutional Readiness to Serve Latino Students**

Of these 36 institutions, we considered the level of readiness of the 19 non-for-profit colleges and universities within the enclave counties. For-profit institutions were deliberately excluded because although Latinos enroll in these institutions in high numbers, they are not eligible for HSI Title V funds. Though considered in the collective analysis of this study, they are not considered as a part of the institutional readiness analysis.

Using institutions' web sites, content analyses were conducted. Informed in part by criteria used within HSI literature (e.g. Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2008; Santiago, 2008), the content analysis focused on eight primary institutional aspects:

- Institutional mission
- Emphasis on local community
- Approach to diversity issues
- Institutional plans posted on web site
- Marketing strategies for enrollment
- Student support program, especially for students of color and Latinos
- Stated approach to serving the local community
- Any additional mention of Latino/a in the web site

As a result of considering these aspects, we derived three categories which captured the institutional approaches, policies, and practices for each institution, and provide a sense of institutional readiness. Each institution was then given an "institutional readiness" label: unaware, aware, and committed. These categories are summarized briefly in Table 5 below.

Insert Table 5 approximately here

---

**Unaware.** The majority of institutions fell within a group we considered to be "unaware." These institutions had little, or in most cases, no mention of diversity. When mentioned, it was discussed in generic or broad terms and not specifically addressed in terms of race or ethnicity. For instance, one institution's only mention of diversity was discussed briefly in terms of a "multiplicity of perspectives." Further, there was no evidence of programs to serve underrepresented students, or outreach strategies to recruit students either, particularly not for Latinos. Additionally, and one of the most defining characteristics of these institutions was that there was little to no demonstration of an awareness of the changing demographics in their region. These institutions exist within the context of a county which is at least 15% Latino, yet displayed no indication or acknowledgement of this significant population nearby. This was a distinguishing trait among the nine institutions in this group, the majority of which were community colleges.

In one such example, a technical college in northeast Georgia – a county with a Latino population of just under 30% - mentioned Latinos only through a scholarship website which provided links to external websites for scholarships, including a few from sources such as the Hispanic Scholarship Fund. Additionally, in fulfillment of a mission "to meet the workforce development needs of the area," the institution highlights its literacy programs for "immigrant parents" to "prepare students to continue their education, and create a better quality of life." This might suggest an early awareness of a predominantly immigrant population, however whether or not this population they refer to is Latino is not directly addressed.

**Aware.** Six institutions, considered "aware" colleges, demonstrated a developed recognition of a growing Latino population and were distinguished from the previous category

because these institutions had an indication of early attentiveness to the needs of the surrounding Latino community. This was noted in strategic plans, program descriptions, and campus newsletters. While most had a strong emphasis on serving their surrounding communities, these institutions often lacked a clear definition of how they defined and approached that service. Similarly, though most mentioned or even highlighted diversity, its approach to diversity was celebratory at best in some cases, and pejorative at worst in the case of others.

For instance, at one public, four-year college, located just outside of Atlanta, Georgia, its mission statement emphasizes diversity explicitly, with a "core commitment [to]… excellence in a learning environment dedicated to serving a diverse student body." This institution also highlights the presence of a Latino based student organization whose mission is "to celebrate Latino/a culture." These comments suggest a celebratory approach to diversity. Though they emphasize serving their region in their mission statement, they do not emphasize how to integrate the region onto their campus, or more specifically, how to recruit and support Latino students on campus. Further, this institution is one of a few institutions where we found the presence of academic programs with special curricula focused on serving the regional Latino population. For example, the program description for this institution's social work program states the following:

> In addition to the core content shared with all accredited social work programs, the [bachelor of social work program] offers preparation for social work in [the region] with the emerging Latino population and with the historic Appalachian population…The cultural competence training related to learning Spanish and the cultural immersion experience in Mexico provide enhanced skills for social work practice in [the region].

This might reflect a pejorative approach by the institution to serving the community. Though training of culturally sensitive social workers brings a clear benefit to the residents of the region, the institution did not demonstrate anywhere elsewhere their efforts to integrate the community's residents onto their campus as students. Though such a program may provide validation for current students from Mexican and Spanish-Speaking backgrounds, there was no mention of support programs specifically for Latino students to help their academic success.

Similarly, at a private, liberal arts university in Oregon, academic programs offer comparable emphases. As noted by the institution's president, "Spanish language competency and cultural sensitivity is built into the health care curriculum we teach [here]. Our goal is to help our students become well-rounded health professionals who can treat the whole patient and the whole community." Similar to the previous example mentioned above, the emphasis here is for students to be prepared to serve the community, but not for the institution to uniquely serve their Latino students.

**Committed.** A smaller proportion of institutions demonstrated not only a clear awareness of shifting demographics in their surrounding region, but efforts to identify and serve the needs of the surrounding Latino community. These five institutions defined diversity through their mission statement, vision, and goals in a way which was clear and direct. While several offered academic programs with curricula specifically oriented towards serving the Latino population, similar to those described above, they were accompanied by campus efforts as well. These institutions demonstrated a commitment to enhancing the climate for diversity for students on their campus, with supportive programs to aid with transition and navigation of college, and by providing community outreach programs and continuing education courses specifically for Latinos in the region.

A prime example of such an institution is seen in one of Arkansas' community colleges, located in a rural, primarily agricultural region in the southwest area of the state. This institution not only acknowledges a changing demographic in the surrounding community, but has an espoused commitment to that community, with accompanying current and planned activities to serve the community. In the institution's strategic plans, the institution includes a goal of a "sharp increase" in the college's Latino enrollment. However, this goal does not stand alone it is accompanied by supporting strategies to meet these enrollment goals, including the translation of the institution's website into Spanish. Further, the campus' president is quite involved in these efforts, and has committed to learning Spanish so that he may not only attend community cultural events, but interact with Latino community members in Spanish. This echoes previous work on HSIs which emphasize the critical role of campus leaders in developing effecting HSIs. It further highlight's an institutional commitment to the Latino community, starting with the campus president.

Another community college, located in North Carolina, also demonstrates a clear commitment to meeting their goals of better serving Latino students on their campuses. In their plans, they not only clearly define diversity, but mention the development of specific support services – a diversity center as well as marketing efforts aimed at connecting to the Latino community through attending community events, and even the development of an advisory team of minority business and community leaders.

## Discussion and Implications

This exploratory study sought to identify areas where *Potential* HSIs may emerge in the next ten years, and yielded findings that indicate the majority of institutions are not considering

the growth of Latinos in their communities, and even fewer are preparing for this enrollment growth.

The majority of institutions in these enclave regions were community colleges, underscoring the continued importance of community colleges in educating Latino/a students. Because community colleges are driven by missions to serve their local communities, it understandable that the majority of HSIs are community colleges. These findings emphasize the significant role these institutions play in educating the nation's Latino populations. In this study the use of chain enrollment theory and proximity to institutions held the sample of institutions, but these theories may also provide insight into why so many Latino students attend community colleges. The use of these theories to make sampling decisions led to identification of more community colleges than other types of institutions among the enclave counties. This fact should be considered when explaining the enrollment of Latinos at community colleges.

It should also be noted that two of the five committed institutions were community colleges. However, five of the eleven community colleges within these enclave regions demonstrated little to no awareness of their surrounding Latino community or its needs. This contributes to calls for continued support of these institutions to help them increase student success on their campuses.

As the size of the high school age Latino population grows, it will become increasingly important that higher education partner with K-12 districts. The lack of awareness at the postsecondary level reflects a disconnect between primary and secondary schools and their local higher education institutions. Given that these projections are based on birthrates and immigration/emigration patterns from past years, we know that elementary schools in these counties are increasingly enrolling Latino students. The unawareness on part of postsecondary

institutions suggests that these demographic changes and the implications they have for education in their regions are not being communicated clearly. Higher education institutions must partner with surrounding K-12 districts and acknowledge these children as potential future college students. Because of the historically high dropout rate among Latino/a high school students, it is important that higher education institutions work with elementary through high schools to empower this new population to succeed educationally. As institutions recognize this new population it will be important that they partner with multiple institutions such as schools, community organizations, and other civic groups that organize the Latino population in their area in order to build pathways for information to increase access, and develop means of becoming informed about this population's needs.

Funding for these institutions should consider that the need to restructure in order to develop and implement programs to better serve Latino students. As state policy makers manage challenges from the struggling economy, they must consider the increased challenges these institutions face amidst these population changes. Therefore funding agencies should consider ways to support and encourage institutions to develop new programs and services for this population. Further, state and federal policy makers must consider the implications at the micro and macro level on financial aid to support Latino students' in their educational pursuits. Private and for-profit institutions made up a large proportion of the postsecondary options accessible within these growing Latino enclaves. As Latinos enroll in for-profit institutions in large numbers, and many come from low-income backgrounds, consideration of how states and the nation may have to deal with financial aid allocation is imperative to meet students' financial needs and support their educational pursuits. Private institutions, oftentimes are more expensive than their public counterparts and make up more than a quarter of all HSIs in the US, as well as

five of the 19 institutions of focus in this study. These campuses must consider the ways they provide financial support to Latinos, who tend to be less informed about the financial aid process and resources available to them (Brown, Santiago, & Lopez, 2003; Zalaquett, 2006).

Further, some campuses were extension campuses of other institutions, created to reach a region in the state underserved by higher education. While some of these branch campuses could not be captured by this study (not represented in IPEDS, or don't have a unique website), those that were included helped highlight state efforts to increase access to higher education. States might consider these enclaves as potential sites for extension centers, branch campuses, or even new institutions. This exploratory conceptual study brings to light future enrollment trends that should be considered within these states.

Though becoming an HSI is a phenomenon which often happens to an institution as a result of circumstance (Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Flores, Horn, & Crisp, 2006), these findings also support a small body of work (e.g. Santiago & Andrade, 2010) which has pointed to the efforts of some institutions to explicitly become HSIs. While some work has suggested the reasons why institutions may maintain an invisible HSI identity (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2006), echoing calls by others (i.e. Flores, Horn, & Crisp, 2006), that more research is needed on the institutional incentives to become an HSI, as well as what activities might constitute those efforts. Campus practices that have been found to make a difference for HSIs include institutional leaders that are not complacent, academic support for students, community outreach, and the use of data to make decisions (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2006; Santiago, 2008). These practices require that potential HSIs not only acknowledge the growing population of Latinos in their service regions, but that they enter a committed level of awareness in order to be prepared.

Innovative practices exemplified within the committed institutions here include proactive institutional leaders, working with the community to support students and lead the institution to better serve this population. Additionally, promising academic programs which emphasize cultural competency were also highlighted, though they raised concerns when not coupled with support programs for Latino students on campus. Still, these provide insights to how institutions are managing their rapidly changing context. Innovation will be critical for these institutions which have traditionally not had to consider a Latino population. Much research focused on HSIs and Latino student success is concentrated in regions such as California, Texas, and Florida, areas with traditionally longstanding Latino populations. This study points to an increased need for more work focused on these regions with growing Latino populations. As these populations are emerging within new contexts, these institutions provide a prime opportunity for not only investigation, but partnerships to help them better serve their current and potential future Latino student populations.

Though institutions may commit to serving the growing Latino population within their region, they need the support of their community and state to reach their full potential. Challenges involved in serving this population cannot be overcome without supportive structures to help promote these practices and a culture of commitment to this population.

## References

Brown, S.E., Santiago, D., & Lopez, E. (2003). Latinos in higher education: Today and tomorrow. *The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35(2), 40-47.

Cho, S., Hudley, C., Lee, S., Barry, L., & Kelly, M. (2008). Roles of gender, race, and SES in the college choice process among first-gneration and nonfirst-generation students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(2), 95-107.

Ceja, M. (2006). Understanding the role of parents and siblings as information sources in the college choice process of Chicana students. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(1), 87-104.

Cejda, B.D., Casparis, C.A., Rhodes, J.H., & Kelly, S. N. (2008). The role of social capital in the educational decisions of Hispanic students attending Hispanic-serving community colleges. *Enrollment Management Journal, 2*(1), 32-59.

Cerna, O. S., Pérez, P. A., & Sáenz, V. B. (2006). *Exploring the aspirations and attributes of Latina/o college degree attainers.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Anaheim, CA.

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 M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Turner (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Understanding Minority Serving Institutions*. New York: SUNY Press.

Espinoza, R. (2010). The good daughter dilemma: Latinas managing family and school demands. *Journal of Hispanic higher Education, 9*(4), 317-330.

Espinoza, R. (2001). *The good daughter dilemma: How Latina doctoral students balance family*

*obligations with school demands*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Flores, S. M., Horn, C. L., & Crisp, G. (2006). Community colleges, public policy, and Latino student opportunity. In C. L. Horn, S. M. Flores, & G. Orfield (Eds.) *Latino educational opportunity: New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 71-80). San Francisco, CA: Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Gándara, P. (1995). *Over the ivy walls: The educational mobility of low-income Chicanos*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Holland, J. L., & Richards, J. M. (1965). A factor analysis of student "explanation" of their choice of a college. *American College Testing Research Reports*, 8, 23.

Hossler, D. and Gallagher K. S. (1987). Studying Student College Choice: A Three-Phase Model and the Implications for Policymakers. *College and University*. 62(3): 207-21.

Hurtado, S., Saenz, V., Santos, J., & Cabrera, N. (2007). *Advancing higher education: A portrait of Latina/o college freshmen at four-year institutions: 1975-2006.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Inman, W. E., & Mayes, L. (1999). The importance of being first: Unique characteristics of first generation community college students. *Community College Review, 26* (4), 3-22.

Kim, D. (2004). The effect of financial aid on students' college choice: Differences by racial groups. *Research in Higher Education, 45,* 43–70.

Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S., & Cummings, H. (2004). Fifty years of college choice: Social, political and institutional influences on the decision-making process. *New Agenda Series,* 5. Lumina Foundation for Education: Indianapolis.

Laden, B.V. (2004). Hispanic-serving institutions: What are they? Where are they? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28,* 181-198.

Long, B.T. (2004) How have college decisions changed over time? An application of the conditional logistic model. *Journal of Econometrics* 121:271-296.

Malcom, L. E., Bensimon, E.M., Davila, B. (2010, Winter). (Re)constructing Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Moving beyond numbers toward student success. *Education Policy and Practice Perspectives, 6*(Winter). Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.

MacDonald, J.S., & MacDonald, L.D. (1964). Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation, and social networks. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, *42*, 82-97.

Massey, D., Durand, J., & Malone, N.J. (2002). *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an era of economic integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mercer, C. J., & Stedman, J. B. (2008). Minority-serving institutions: Selected institutional and student characteristics. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. S. V. Turner (Eds.), Understanding minority-serving institutions (pp. 28-42). Albany: State University of New York Press

Mulder, C. H., & Clark, W. A. V. (2002). Leaving home for college and gaining independence. *Environment and Planning A 34*,981–999.

Pérez, P.A. & McDonough, P.M. (2008). Understanding Latina and Latino college choice: A social capital and chain migration analysis. *Journal of Hispanic Higher education, 7*(3), 249-265.

Pérez, P. A. (2010). College choice process of Latino undocumented students: Implications for recruitment and retention. *Journal of College Admission*, Winter.

Perna, L. (2006). Studying College Access and Choice: A Proposed Conceptual Model. *Higher Education,* 99-157.

Perna, P. A., & McDonough, P. M. (2008). Understanding Latino and Latino college choice: A

social capital and chain migration analysis. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 7* (3), 249-265.

Person, A. E. and Rosenbaum, J. E. (2006), Chain enrollment and college enclaves: Benefits and drawbacks of Latino college students' enrollment decisions. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2006: 51–60.

Santiago, D. A., & Andrade, S.J. (2010). *Emerging Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs): Serving Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.

Santiago, D. A. (2008). *Modeling Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs): Campus practices that work for Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.

Santiago, D. A. (2007). *Choosing Hispanic-serving institutions: A closer look at Latino students' college choices.* Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education. Title V Program Statute, 2006. http://www2.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/title5legislation.pdf Accessed March 1, 2011.

Turley, R.N.L. (2009). College proximity: Mapping access to opportunity. *Sociology of Education, 82*(2), 126-146.

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

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011, March). Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010 Census Brief. Accessed March 25, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010, June). County characteristics resident population estimates file. *Population Division.* Accessed November, 2011.

U.S. Census http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/ Accessed February 23, 2011

U.S. Census Fact Sheet, 2000. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFIteratedFacts?_event=&geo_id=01000US&_geoContext=01000US&_street=&_county=&_cityTown=&_state=&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&ActiveGeoDiv=&_useEV=&pctxt=fph&pgsl=010&_submenuId=factsheet_2&ds_name=DEC_2000_SAFF&_ci_nbr=400&qr_name=DEC_2000_SAFF_R1010&reg=DEC_2000_SAFF_R1010%3A400&_keyword=&_industry=

Vega, W. A. (1990). Hispanic families in the 1980s: A decade of research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 1015-1024.

Weiler, W. C. (1994). Transition from consideration of a college to the decision to apply. *Research in Higher Education,* 35, 631–646.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (2008). *Knocking at the college door projections of high school graduates by state and race/ethnicity 1992-2022*. Boulder, CO: WICHE.

Zalaquett, C.P. (2006). Study of successful Latina/o students. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Eudcation, 5*(35), 35-47.

Table 1: Projections of Latino High School Graduates by States with Major Increases

| State | Latino High School Graduates in 2000 (1999-2000) as percentage of all graduates | Predicted Latino High School Graduates in 2020 (2019-2020) as percentage of all graduates |
|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 1.86 | 21.65 |
| Georgia | 1.73 | 21.54 |
| Maryland | 3.11 | 18.56 |
| North Carolina | 1.71 | 23.95 |
| Oregon | 5.36 | 25.75 |
| South Carolina | .97 | 17.59 |
| Tennessee | .96 | 17.53 |
| *Average Across These States* | *2.24* | *20.94* |
| *Average Across U.S.* | *11.12* | *24.2* |

Table 2: Number of enclave counties and institutions, by state.

| | Total Number of Enclave Counties | Number of Institutions in State Enclave Counties |
|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 4 | 2 |
| Georgia | 25 | 14 |
| Maryland | 2 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 2 |
| Oregon | 22 | 14 |
| South Carolina | 1 | 1 |
| Tennessee | 2 | 2 |
| *Total* | *60* | *36* |

Table 3: Enclave county institutions, by institutional sector.

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Public, 4-year or above | 3 | 8.25 |
| Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above | 5 | 13.9 |
| Public, 2-year | 11 | 30.6 |
| For-profit (total) | 15 | 47.25 |
| Private for-profit, 4-year or above | 3 | 8.25 |
| Private for-profit, 2-year | 6 | 16.7 |
| Private for-profit, less-than 2-year | 8 | 22.2 |
| Total | 36 | 100.0 |

Table 4: Student Success measures, aggregated across institutions within each state.

| | Full-Time Retention Rate, Mean Across Institutions for Which Data is Available | Part-Time Retention Rate | Transfer-Out Rate | Graduation Rate, Total Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 64.00 | 50.50 | 9.00 | 22.00 |
| Georgia | 72.50 | 63.89 | 5.45 | 44.91 |
| Maryland | 67.00 | 44.00 | 32.00 | 14.00 |
| North Carolina | 65.50 | 39.50 | 9.00 | 22.50 |
| Oregon | 66.83 | 61.63 | 10.33 | 51.45 |
| South Carolina | 100.00 | | 15.00 | 35.00 |
| Tennessee | 76.50 | 75.50 | 0.50 | 79.50 |

Table 5: Institutional readiness categories

| Institutional Readiness | Number of Institutions in Enclave Counties |
|---|---|
| **Unaware:**<br>• Little to no mention of diversity<br>• Where diversity discussed, treated in broad or generic terms<br>• Lack of support programs for students of color<br>• Little discussion of institutional context (i.e. regional demographics and needs) | **8 Institutions:**<br>• 3 Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above<br>• 5 Public, 2-year |
| **Aware:**<br>• Mentioning of growing Latino community in surrounding region<br>• Institutional approach to diversity is celebratory at best, pejorative at worst<br>• Emphasize serving community, but service often times lacks clear definition<br>• Indication of early attentiveness to the needs of the surrounding Latino community | **6 Institutions:**<br>• 1 Public 4-year or above<br>• 1 Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above<br>• 4 Public, 2-year |
| **Committed:**<br>• Aware of shifting demographics in surrounding region<br>• Efforts to identify and serve the needs of Latino community in region<br>• Emphasize creating a supportive climate for Latino students, i.e. programs, diversity support<br>• Institutional definition of diversity is clear and channeling | **5 Institutions:**<br>• 2 Public 4-year or above<br>• 1 Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above<br>• 2 Public, 2-year |