

High Stakes and Low Horizons: Changing the Odds for Latino Students

By Patricia Gándara

Patricia Gándara is professor of education and co-director of The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research focuses on educational equity and access for low income and ethnic minority students, language policy, and the education of Mexican origin youth. She is the author of numerous articles and several books, including The Latino Education Crisis, 2009, Harvard University Press, and editor of Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies, Teachers College Press, 2010.

As though a major earthquake had struck the U.S., demographic tremors are reverberating across the nation. This “demographic earthquake” is, of course, the rapidly changing youth population, especially the remarkable increase in Latino students. Away from the epicenter, some communities have not yet noticed its impact. But students of color now form a majority in the public schools in all major urban centers, the more immediately affected areas.

Some examples: Economic decline is imminent, studies show, unless Texas and California can improve educational outcomes for their youth. The federal government has stepped in to require the departments of education in Arizona and Massachusetts to improve the education of newcomer students. Southern and Midwestern communities admit they do not have teachers who can teach the changed student population.

In 1972—when most of today’s teachers and college faculty were moving through the

education system—almost 80 percent of K–12 students were of European background. About 15 percent were African Americans. Latinos and Asians were hardly a blip on the nation’s radar screen. In contrast, there will be no ethnic majority group among five to 19-year olds by 2025.¹ One quarter of all students will be Latino by 2020; half of all students in Texas and California now come from this group.²

The arrival of immigrant groups has historically benefited the U.S. Immigrants tend to be more youthful and healthier than the native population.³ They tend to be more optimistic about the future,⁴ and to apply this optimism to school and work.⁵ But the United States economy changed substantially since the great immigrant migration of the early 20th century. Then, barely six percent of all students completed high school. Today, the *minimum* education level needed for a secure job is a high school diploma with some postsecondary training.⁶ American high school dropout

rates remain among the highest in the developed world. But students lacking a high school diploma will likely spend time on welfare and settle for minimum wage jobs without benefits—jobs that cannot support a family.⁷ Up to half of Latino students face these prospects.⁸

A high secondary school dropout rate implies a low college completion rate. Only 12 percent of Latinos age 25 to 29 had earned a bachelor's degree by 2008. In contrast, nearly two-thirds of Asian Americans and almost 40 percent of whites in the same age group hold this degree. African Americans earn nearly twice as many bachelor's degrees (21 percent) as Latinos.

These statistics educe concern because of the growing Latino presence in the youth population. Recent reports predict an 11 percent decline in per capita income in California, and a five percent decline in Texas, between 2000 and 2020, if college degree production remains static.⁹ The reports project significant, though less severe, per capita income declines in other states with large percentages of Latino students, and in the nation as a whole. Such declines cannot be taken in stride. The California and Texas economies were built on 40 percent *increases* in per capita income between 1980 and 2000.

It will be difficult for these states—and the nation—to jumpstart the production of college degrees, especially among Latinos. In fact, the percentage of youth completing college degrees has been in a free fall since the publication of these projections. The U.S.—long the international leader in degree production among 25 to 34 year olds—today ranks between 7th

and 11th in the developed world.¹⁰ Analysts debate the accuracy of these rankings,¹¹ but all agree that the relative position of the U.S. has declined dramatically while other developed nations have shown a consistent rise in degree completion. This should not be too surprising since most other competitor nations provide tuition-free higher education, while costs to attend our colleges and universities continue to rise dramatically.¹²

This dangerous trend defies the typical pattern of intergenerational educational advancement. This will be the first generation of 25 to 34 year olds to have less education than its parents. Table 1 shows the growth in degree completion among major ethnic groups in the U.S. between 1975 and 2008. All except Latinos show incremental growth over time, especially Asians for whom we only have recent data. But Latinos show almost no growth over this period.

WHY ARE LATINOS FALLING BEHIND?

The most prominent explanations for this critical situation include immigration, language difference, and a culturally based devaluation of education.¹³ The recent waves of immigrants to the U.S. with low levels of education, some observers argue, reduce the Latino population's average educational level. Parents with low education levels, they add, are unable or unwilling to support their children academically. Reducing the immigrant stream, they conclude, will solve the underachievement problem as parents and children assimilate into mainstream America.

Table 1. BA Degree Completion, 25–29 Year Olds, by Ethnicity, 1975–2008¹

Ethnicity	1975	1985	1995	2005	2008
White	24%	24%	29%	34%	37%
Asian American	NA	NA	43	60	58
African American	11	12	15	18	20
Latino	9	11	9	11	12

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2008/section3/table.asp?tableID=907>.

¹ Rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The “immigrant status explains underachievement” argument, however, is weak. Latino “immigrant students” (usually children of immigrants),¹⁴ note several studies, often receive higher grades, demonstrate greater motivation, and aspire to higher educational levels than their native-born, English-speaking Latino peers. Moreover, recent studies show that academic attainment appears to deteriorate in successor generations.¹⁵ We’ve already alluded to one explanation for these results: Latino children of immigrants, like most other immigrants, are more hopeful about their future. They witness their parents’ struggles to provide them with opportunities, and they remain closely tied to traditional culture. More eager to please their parents than students raised in American culture, they have not yet been socialized into a counter-culture produced by multiple generations of poverty and lack of opportunity.¹⁶

Viewing a lack of English as the principal barrier for Latino students is equally questionable. Middle class immigrants with weak English skills often outperform native-born English-speaking Latinos. An inability to speak English does, indeed, impede achievement in English-only classrooms, but this inability is neither the principal impediment nor need it be a barrier at all. English learners taught in strong dual language programs show academic outcomes comparable to monolingual English speaking peers. “Almost all evaluations of students at the end of elementary school and in middle and high school,” notes one study, “show that the educational outcomes of bilingually educated students, especially those in late-exit and two-way programs, were at least comparable to their comparison peers [which included English-only students as well as English learners in other types of instructional programs].”¹⁷ As for the third argument—that Latinos do not value education—Latino parents, especially immigrant parents, have been shown to have *higher* aspirations for their children’s education than other groups.¹⁸

The more likely explanations for Latino underachievement are relative poverty, low

parental education levels, limited experience with the education system, and concentration in the most segregated, isolated, and lowest performing urban schools. These factors challenge even the most motivated students.

Poverty has the strongest effect on Latino youth performance. Nearly one in three Latino children (31 percent) lives in poverty in the United States; the overall proportion is about 19 percent.¹⁹ Poverty ravages the prospects of children by creating health problems, unstable living conditions, and neighborhoods that provide too few supports for education and that offer risky temptations. There is no more clear relationship in the social science literature than the negative effects of poverty on educational outcomes. The more parents earn, the higher the average test scores of their offspring at all levels of education.²⁰ Income also determines who goes to college. A student in the lowest academic quintile, but the highest family income quintile, has the same chance to go to college as a student in the highest academic quintile, but the lowest income quintile.²¹

The poor schooling and harsh living conditions keeping most Latinos out of the highest academic quintile affect their performance in merit scholarship competitions. Moreover, poverty helps to explain why Latinos fail to enroll in or to complete college. About 52 percent of Latino college dropouts, notes a recent national survey, cited financial problems as the key reason for leaving.²² Many more students never matriculated because they believed they could not afford college.

Scholarship also demonstrates the importance of social and cultural capital that can aid social mobility. But Latino families have little of this capital. Sociologist James Coleman defined productive relationships between schools and parents as “intergenerational closure”—a key to ensuring positive academic outcomes.²³ But poverty and lack of resources, he lamented, interrupts close parent-school connections. The personal connections and the belief systems of middle class and non-minority parents often

enable them to obtain needed resources for their children.²⁴ These children are more likely to be assigned to the best schools, teachers, and college-prep classes. The children of less powerful and knowledgeable parents are more likely to be assigned to schools, classes, and teachers that cannot provide the same resources.

Many parents of Latino students fit this description, and consequently are the least likely to question school decisions, no matter their personal aspirations. Most parents—lacking knowledge of how schools work—do not question counselors who say their children are “not college material” and assign them to a curriculum that presages an unproductive future. Latino students are often tracked away from college preparatory classes because their parents don’t know the consequences of course placements or how to change them. Table 2 shows how significantly the level of education of Latino parents differs from other groups.

Segregation is traditionally cast as a Black/White issue, but Latino students are more likely to attend segregated schools than are African American students.²⁵ In large western cities, more than 60 percent of Latinos are in hyper-segregated schools, defined as 90 to 100 percent minority; 47 percent of Black students attend such schools.²⁶ Racial and ethnic segregation of both African American and Latino students is also associated with high socio-economic segregation.²⁷ And, as noted earlier, concentrated poverty is associated with variables ranging from less optimal physical development to familial mobility—one of the greatest risk factors for Latino students.²⁸

Isolating Latino students in segregated schools—overwhelmingly the case for these students—reinforces ethnic, economic, and linguistic segregation. Only 5,000 schools in the United States, notes a 2005 study, educated fully 70 percent of all English learners.²⁹ The difficulties involved in learning English under such circumstances affect how students, even those classified as “fluent” in English, perform on critical tests. Thus, many of these students, if they go to college, will be mistakenly placed in English as Second Language (ESL) classes that often do not focus on teaching rigorous academic English.³⁰ As a result, the students may never master the academic language of the classroom or graduate from college.

Low income, segregated, minority high schools also lack adequate counseling services. Many studies document the lack of college counseling skills among most high school counselors.³¹ But this absence is acute in schools that expect few students to go to college—at least colleges where admission depends on serious counseling. Community college students *rarely* receive any counseling about this important decision and begin college without knowledge of the requisites for success, including study skills.³² A high rate of student withdrawal from community college without a certificate, degree, or transfer capability—especially in the first semester—is the unfortunate consequence.³³

Latinos are more likely than others to attend college part time and to work long hours, a significant factor in dropout. So while Latinos “go to college” at similar rates as other students,³⁴ only 20.5 percent (age 16 to 24) were enrolled in

Table 2. Education Level of Parents of K–12 Students, by Ethnicity, 2001

Ethnicity	Less than High School	High School or Higher	Bachelor’s Degree or Higher
White	4.3%	95.7%	39.0%
Black	12.3	87.7	16.4
Latino	39.4	60.6	10.9

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics, *The Condition of Education 2003*. Supplemental Tables, 2-1.

college in 2009—a lower rate than for all youths (28.2 percent), whites (30.4 percent), Blacks (24.6 percent) and Asians (44.4 percent).³⁵

High percentages of Latinos report that they drop out of school for “having to support a family.”³⁶ It is not clear if this stems from a cultural imperative or if they experience greater economic need than other low-income groups (because of larger family size, births at younger ages, or family members who are unable to work or to receive social benefits) or both. But Latinos with financial aid counseling are more likely to attend college, so targeted advice while in college may help stem dropping out.³⁷ Yet, the community college student to counselor ratio can be as high as 2,000:1; it’s even higher in the evenings when many part-time students attend.³⁸

CHOICES THAT LIMIT OPPORTUNITY

Too many talented Latino students choose to attend less selective colleges where their chances of completion are reduced dramatically. Latinos “at all levels of preparation,” a 2004 study notes, “show a greater propensity to enroll in ‘open-door’ institutions than their white peers.”³⁹ The open door into college thus is also an open door out of the institution.

Contrary to the “mismatch hypothesis”—that minority students will fare worse in highly selective and demanding colleges because of poor preparation—the evidence shows that attending a more selective college with rigorous standards *increases* the chances of graduation.⁴⁰ Yet, “shooting low” continues. Why? Most Latino students don’t know anyone who has ever attended a selective school. They may also feel family pressure to stay close to home. The costs can seem prohibitive. But the failure to receive good counseling about selective colleges and about financial aid also contribute significantly to a “shoot low” decision.

As a senior in high school, I asked a classmate why she chose to attend a prestigious eastern college instead of a good nearby college. I surmised that she must have had family near the distant college. I thought I was a relatively

informed student who was heading to a selective institution. But I did not know what an Ivy League college was or why I should attend one. My parents hadn’t completed high school, so how could they advise me?

Most Latino students, however well prepared for college, are equally vague about the relative benefits of a state four-year college versus a community college, for example. But these students make different choices when someone, such as a counselor in a college outreach program, explains these benefits. In one study, moderate- to high-risk students—those from low income backgrounds with associated risk factors—who participated in college outreach programs increased their odds of enrolling in a four-year college nearly twofold.⁴¹ But, by one estimate, no more than five to ten percent of students that could benefit from these programs have the opportunity to participate.⁴²

Even armed with the requisite knowledge, Latinos are least likely to take on college loans. Fragile family finances make the prospect of debt unattractive, especially when these families lack knowledge of the benefits of a college education. And their instincts reflect reality. College costs have grown more rapidly for low-income families than for middle-income families. Welcome augmentations to the Pell Grants program in 2010 did not close the wide gaps between college costs and the ability of low-income students to meet these costs.⁴³ Financial aid counseling, however, can increase the number of low-income students attending college.⁴⁴ Low-income students suffer from “sticker shock,” and often simply decide not to go if they lack information about how to pay for it.⁴⁵ But too few knowledgeable counselors are available to low-income Latino students. That’s why outreach programs are so critical.

SYSTEMIC REALITIES THAT LIMIT OPPORTUNITY

Latino students, we’ve noted, are likely to attend high poverty schools offering poor

preparation for postsecondary education. A high percentage of these students—96 percent in a study of southern California community colleges—therefore need academic remediation once at college.⁴⁶ Assignments to developmental or remedial education can involve years of non-credit courses before students accrue any college credit. Meanwhile, they exhaust their financial aid, assume more out-of-school responsibilities, and lose momentum. “The more levels of developmental courses a student must take,” one researcher notes, “the less likely that student is to ever complete college English or math.”⁴⁷

Fewer than half of students at only one level below college-level work at entrance will complete their sequence. The proportion drops to one-third for students who must master three levels of developmental courses. Only 8.5 percent of students referred to developmental education, notes a 2007 study, completed any credential within four years.⁴⁸ Weak K–12 schooling makes completing college within a reasonable timeframe nearly impossible. The problems of developmental education and the need to strengthen this system have received much recent attention, but we still know little about moving students through the remedial system in a reasonable time span.

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES?

Faculty members want their students to meet high goals and rightly oppose curricular “short cuts.” But few students will graduate if they must retrace every missed step of the K–12 curriculum before they can attempt college work. Faculty serving developmental education students must find ways to accelerate their remedial education and to introduce college-level courses as soon as possible.

Some colleges are attempting to meet this challenge. The Academy for College Excellence (formerly the Digital Bridge Academy) at Cabrillo College in California, focuses on underrepresented, underprepared second language learners, mostly Latino. Capitalizing on student

interest in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) areas with significant employment opportunities—including technology, nursing, and lab technicians—the academy offers a full time one semester, 15-credit integrated college preparation program. The program focuses on behavioral and management skills, intensive English, and exposes students to exciting and motivating activities. Some credits are transferable to California State University. The program only accepts students who read at the ninth grade level or above, though their English score may be lower. It enrolls students in regular community college credit courses by second semester. Evaluations suggest a promising model, but, to date, no other community college has adopted it.

Valencia Community College (Florida) is experimenting with learning communities. Developmental education students take courses in cohorts to help build a support system. By second semester they may co-enroll in developmental and college credit courses. Some colleges pair developmental and college credit courses to scaffold instruction while allowing students to work toward transfer or a degree. But we still need systematic evidence of the effectiveness of campus-by-campus efforts.

Learning communities, where students receive sustained support from peers and dedicated faculty, appear to increase retention. Signaling a need for remediation while students are still in high school, which some studies have recommended, *may* support greater success in college, but this probably depends on the type of academic support offered. Many high schools attended by low income Latinos are not equipped to provide the pre-college remediation they need. And hearing they are “not college material” can lead students to foreclose options, absent viable, attractive, and timely ways to remediate their academic deficits.

Summer bridge programs exposing students to the demands of college first hand can be especially effective for Latino students. Well-organized programs on the college campus

allow students to receive targeted remediation before starting the academic year. Early preparation for core classes increases grades and self-confidence in the critical first semester.⁴⁹ These programs also allow first-time students to cultivate friendships that help demystify the college experience and combat loneliness that drives many Latinos back home. First Year Experience (FYE) programs combine elements of summer bridge experiences, learning communities, and targeted counseling and remediation. These programs, though often effective, are relatively costly and therefore only serve limited numbers of students.⁵⁰

The Puente program (“bridge” in Spanish) largely serves Latino students. This program, implemented at half of California’s 112 community colleges, has successfully increased the transfer rate for Latino students. The program provides community mentors, a developmental English class that simultaneously remediates and accelerates students, incorporating Latino literature and a honed writing curriculum, and increases counseling for them.⁵¹ But, like FYE, Puente serves relatively small numbers of students. The per-student cost places these programs on the chopping block when colleges must make cuts. Researchers must learn how to scale up these programs at a manageable cost.

Providing small, structured groups of students with an “expert” leader who focuses study and mutual social and academic support is a consistent predictor of academic success.⁵² Uri Treisman, who taught at UC Berkeley in the 1980s, found that successful Asian math students usually formed study groups. Creating similar groups for African American and Latino students, he obtained similar results. Some observers categorize these groups as “learning communities,” but that term can apply to many activities, sometimes effective and sometimes not. Treisman’s small structured groups allowed students to cultivate strong relationships and to focus on specific curriculum content. Led by a graduate student or expert peer, they functioned as tutorial sessions as well as support groups. The

leader also had to know how to marry challenging accelerated lessons with remedial work that strengthened student skills. At the University of Michigan, Claude Steele successfully based his 21st Century Program on this model, one of several similar replications.⁵³

Campus climate is also critically important. Latino students must feel they *belong* on campus; providing an inviting climate for diversity helps achieve this. Diversity courses and academic support groups targeting Latinos can increase a sense of belonging. So can classes and extracurricular activities that break negative stereotypes and invite Latino participation.⁵⁴ I offer a course that allows undergraduates to explore the reasons there are such disparities in representation of Black and Latino students on campus. The class is always oversubscribed and minority students often cry at the acknowledgement of the hurdles they have overcome, while non-minority students walk away with many stereotypes shattered.

WHAT CAN FACULTY DO?

Let’s begin first with what faculty *cannot* do. They cannot change the socio-economic circumstances of their Latino students. Nor can they change deficits in their preparation for college. They cannot change decisions made about which college to attend or whether to attend college at all. But faculty can do many things.

Faculty members can emulate the best aspects of college access programs. They can serve as informal counselors and formal mentors, incorporate reading materials relating to Latino experiences, and encourage students to collaborate and support each other inside and outside of class.

Faculty participation in middle and high school outreach programs can deepen the pool of college-eligible Latino students. They can also advocate for these programs. Many Latino-serving high schools lack knowledgeable counselors, so many young Latinos receive information about college only from outreach and college access programs. Yet, in times of

fiscal stress, such as now, the mantra becomes “keep the cuts away from the classroom” by cutting ancillary services that seem superfluous to the core mission. But little is more core than helping young Latinos make good decisions about college. The consistent cuts to these programs seriously erode the chances that we can change the low college completion rates of Latino students.

Many Latino college students never see a counselor before deciding to drop out. Faculty teaching first year students should understand the high stakes played out in their classrooms. They should help students connect to each other and encourage them to express doubts and concerns. At the risk of reinforcing stereotypes, Latino students come from a relationship dependent culture. Relationships are critically important for Latino students. Believing that even one teacher really cares about them can make the difference between staying and leaving.

Here’s the challenge: College program directors and administrators who participate in my studies on college access and success repeat one comment: “The problem [of increasing success for minority students] is not the students. It’s the faculty!” “The faculty doesn’t believe these students can do it. They don’t want to change anything about their curriculum or instruction to accommodate these students.” Now, these directors are probably not talking about you. But, please ask your colleagues to rethink what and how they teach Latino students—the future of our communities. Curriculum and instruction must engage these students and help build self-confidence. It’s likely someone has told these students they aren’t “college material.” Underprepared students are not under-intelligent. Investigate innovative programs that build their skills and help them set and meet high goals. Then adopt at least one program!

Finally, inspire and help young Latinos to enter the teaching profession—the entry profession for many generations of immigrants. Many immigrant communities built their own teaching forces that responded to their needs,

thereby building their middle classes. The nation desperately needs Latino teachers. Every teacher can aim to replace himself or herself with a young person who will create the same miracles on a daily basis that you do.

NOTES

¹ <http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/summarytables.html>.

² Pew Hispanic Center, 2005.

³ Tienda and Mitchell, 2006.

⁴ Pew Hispanic Center, 2009.

⁵ Rumbaut, 1995.

⁶ Lemann, 1999.

⁷ Carnavale et al., 2010.

⁸ Orfield et al., 2004.

⁹ Kelly, 2005; National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2005a and b.

¹⁰ OECD, 2009.

¹¹ Kelly, 2010; “Are International Rankings Unfair...,” 2009.

¹² Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 2001.

¹³ See Gándara and Contreras, 2009, 1-14 for a full discussion.

¹⁴ The majority of what are often called “immigrant children” are, in fact, the children of immigrants. In 2008, about three million children under 18 were born outside of the United States—about 11 percent of the combined first and second generation (children of immigrants) under 18. The overwhelming majority of these youth are already U.S. citizens. See *Child Trends Databank*, data based on U.S. Census.

¹⁵ The Pew Hispanic Center found lower graduation rates for third- than for second-generation students (Pew Hispanic Center, 2009). A multigenerational, longitudinal study of Latinos in the U.S. reports a similar finding (Telles and Ortiz, 2008).

¹⁶ Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Rumbaut, 1995; and Kao and Tienda, 1995.

¹⁷ Genesee et al., 2006, 205.

¹⁸ A recent national poll found that 94 percent of Hispanics expected their children to go to college. http://surveys.ap.org/data%5CNORC%5CAP-Univision%20Topline_posting.pdf.

¹⁹ Childstats, 2008.

²⁰ Lemann, 1999.

²¹ Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 2001.

²² AP/Univision Poll of Hispanic Attitudes toward Education, 2010. http://surveys.ap.org/data%5CNORC%5CAP-Univision%20Topline_posting.pdf.

²³ Coleman, 1988.

²⁴ Lareau, 1987.

²⁵ In 2005–06, approximately 78 percent of Latinos attended predominantly (50 to 100 percent) minority schools, while about 73 percent of Black students attended similarly segregated schools (Orfield and Frankenburg, 2008).

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Orfield and Lee, 2005.

²⁸ Rothstein, 2004; Ream, 2004.

²⁹ Cosentino de Cohen, 2005.

³⁰ Bunch et al., 2010.

³¹ See, for example, McDonough, 1997, and Venezia, et al. 2003.

³² Venezia et al, 2003.

³³ Driscoll, 2007.

³⁴ Fry, 2004.

³⁵ Pew Research Center, 2009.

³⁶ Fry, 2004.

³⁷ Horn and Chen, 1998.

³⁸ Hagedorn et al., 2008.

³⁹ Fry, 2004.

⁴⁰ Alon and Tienda, 2005. See also Bowen and Bok, 1998.

⁴¹ Horn and Chen, 1998; Terenzini et al., 2001.

⁴² Adelman, 2000.

⁴³ The net cost of a year at a public university for families in the lowest earnings quintile increased from 39 percent of median income in 1999–2000 to 55 percent in 2008. The same cost at community colleges for these families increased from 40 percent in 1999–2000 to 49 percent in 2008. Students from middle- and upper-income families also receive larger institutional grants.

⁴⁴ Horn and Chen, 1998.

⁴⁵ Fitzgerald, 2006; Advisory Committee..., 2001.

⁴⁶ Hagedorn, nd.

⁴⁷ Bailey, 2009.

⁴⁸ *Achieving Success*, July, 2007.

⁴⁹ Gándara and Bial, 2001.

⁵⁰ Mosqueda. 2010.

⁵¹ Laden, 2000; Rendon, 2002.

⁵² See, for example, Gándara, 1999.

⁵³ Ibid., 128 describes the 21st Century Program.

⁵⁴ Hurtado and Pojuan, 2005.

REFERENCES

Achieving Success. The State Policy Newsletter of Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count. Boston, Mass.: Jobs for the Future, July 2007. www.achievingthedream.org.

Adelman, C. "Participation in Outreach Programs Prior to High School Graduation: Socioeconomic Status by Race." Paper presented at the ConnectED Conference, San Diego, Calif.: January 10, 2000.

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance. *Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2001. http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/acsfa/access_denied.pdf.

Alon, S. and M. Tienda. "Assessing the Mismatch Hypothesis: Differences in College Graduation Rates by Institutional Selectivity," *Sociology of Education*, 78 (2005), 294-315.

"Are International Rankings Unfair to the U.S.?" *eCampus News*, November, 2009. <http://www.ecampusnews.com/top-news/are-international-rankings-unfair-to-u-s-colleges/>.

Bailey, T. *Rethinking Developmental Education: CCRC Brief.* New York: Community College Research Center. Teachers College, Columbia University, 2009.

Bowen, W.S. and D. Bok. *The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Bunch, G., A. Endris, D. Panayotova, M. Romero, and L. Llosa. *Language Testing and Placement for Language Minority Students in California's Community Colleges: Mapping the Terrain.* Santa Cruz, Calif.: University of California, Santa Cruz, 2010.

Carnavale, A., N. Smith, and J. Strohl. *Help Wanted. Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2018.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University

- Center on Education and the Workforce, 2010. <http://cew.georgetown.edu/jobs2018>.
- Child Trends Databank. http://www.childtrendsdata-bank.org/sites/default/files/110_Fig01.jpg.
- Childstats.gov. *America's Children in Brief: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2010: Economic Circumstances*. <http://www.childstats.gov/americanchildren/eco.asp>.
- Coleman, J.S. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (1988), 95-120.
- Cosentino de Cohen, C., N. Deterding, and B. Clewell. *Whose Left Behind? Immigrant Children in High and Low LEP Schools*. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute, 2005.
- Driscoll, A.K. *Beyond Access: How the First Semester Matters for Community College Students' Aspirations and Persistence*. Berkeley, Calif.: Policy Analysis for California Education, University of California, Berkeley, 2007. Policy Report 7-2.
- Fitzgerald, B. "Lowering Barriers to College Access: Opportunities for More Effective Coordination of State and Federal Student Aid Policies." In P. Gándara and G. Orfield, eds., *Expanding Opportunity in Higher Education*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Fry, R. *Latino Youth Finishing College: The Role of Selective Pathways*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, 2004. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/30.pdf>.
- Gándara, P. *Priming the Pump: Strategies for Increasing the Achievement of Underrepresented Minority Undergraduates*. New York: The College Board, 1999.
- _____. and D. Bial. *Paving the Way to Postsecondary Education: K-12 Interventions for Underrepresented Youth*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 2001. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001205.pdf>.
- _____. and F. Contreras. *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Genesee, F., K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, and D. Christian. *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Hagedorn, L. "Achievement Gaps in Developmental Studies in Mathematics: A View of Community College Students." Powerpoint presentation of TRUUCS study data. Florida University, n.d.
- _____, S. Cypers, and J. Lester. "Looking in the Rear View Mirror: Factors Affecting Transfer for Urban Community College Students," *Journal of Research and Practice*, 32 (2008), 643-664.
- Horn, L. and X. Chen. *Toward Resiliency: At-Risk Students Who Make It to College*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1998. <http://www.ed.gov/PDFDocs/resiliency.pdf>.
- Hurtado, S. and L. Pojuan. "Latino Educational Outcomes and the Campus Climate," *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4 (2005), 235-251.
- Kao, G. and M. Tienda. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth," *Social Science Quarterly*, 76 (1995), 1-19.
- Kelly, P. *As America Becomes More Diverse: The Impact of State Higher Education Inequality*. Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 2005.
- _____. *Closing the College Attainment Gap between the U.S. and Most Educated Countries, and the Contributions to be Made by the State*. Boulder, Colo.: NCHEMS, 2010.
- Laden, B.V. "The Puente Project: Socializing and Mentoring Latino Community College Students," *Academic Quarterly Exchange*, 2 (2000), 90-99. Eric# EJ677361.
- Lareau, A. "Social Class Differences in Family-School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital," *Sociology of Education*, 60 (2) (1987), 73-85.
- Lemann, N. *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux, 1999.
- McDonough, P. *Choosing Colleges: How Social Class and Schools Structure Opportunity*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Mosqueda, C. "The Effect of a First-Year Experience Program on Transfer Readiness and the Transfer Process of Community College Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2010.
- National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. *Measuring Up: 2008*. <http://measuringup2008.highereducation.org/print/NCPPEMUNationalRpt.pdf>.
- _____. *Projected Drop in Income for California Most Severe in U.S.; Educational Level of State Workforce also Expected to Decline*. Policy Supplement 2005a. http://www.highereducation.org/reports/pa_decline/states/CA.pdf.

- _____. *Educational Level of Texas' Workforce Projected to Decline. Income of Residents Would Drop as a Result*. Policy Supplement, 2005b. http://www.highereducation.org/reports/pa_decline/states/TX.pdf.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Highlights from Education at a Glance 2009* (Paris: OECD, 2009). <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/35/11/43619343.pdf>.
- Orfield, G., D. Losen, J. Wald, and C. Swanson. *Losing our Future. How Minority Youth are Being Left Behind by the Graduation Rate Crisis*. A joint release by The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, The Urban Institute, Advocates for Children of New York, and The Civil Society Institute, 2004. www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.
- _____, and E. Frankenburg. *The Last Have Become First: Rural and Small Town America Lead the Way on Desegregation*. Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, 2008. www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.
- _____, and C. Lee. *Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, 2005. www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.
- Pew Hispanic Center. *Hispanics: A People in Motion*. Washington D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, 2005. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/40.pdf>.
- _____. *Between Two Worlds. How Young Latinos Come of Age in America*. Washington D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, 2009. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/117.pdf>.
- Ream, R. *Uprooting Children: Mobility, Social Capital, and Mexican American Underachievement*. New York: LBF Scholarly Publishing, 2004.
- Rendon, L. "Community College Puente: A Validating Model of Education," *Educational Policy*, 16 (2002), 642-67.
- Rothstein, R. *Class and Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.
- Rumbaut, R. "The New Californians: Comparative Research Findings on the Educational Progress of Immigrant Children." In R. Rumbaut and W. Cornelius (eds.), *California's Immigrant Children: Theory, Research, and Implications for Educational Policy*. La Jolla, Calif.: Center for U.S. Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1995.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., and M. Suárez-Orozco. *Transformations: Migration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation among Latino Adolescents*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Telles, E., and V. Ortiz. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 2008.
- Terenzini, P., A. Cabrera, and E. Bernal. *Swimming Against the Tide: The Poor in American Higher Education*. Research Report No. 2001-1. New York: The College Board, 2001.
- Tienda, M., and F. Mitchell. *Multiple Origins, Uncertain Destinies: Hispanics and the American Future*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2006.
- Venezia, A., M. Kirst, and A. Antonio. *Betraying the College Dream: How Disconnected K-12 and Post-secondary Systems Undermine Student Aspirations*. Palo Alto, Calif.: The Bridge Project, Stanford University, 2003.

