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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Latinas/os are the largest population of color enrolled in the U.S. and in California’s postsecondary educational system. In California, Latinas/os are the majority of K-12 public school students and they are the fastest growing segment of college-age students in the state. In the Bay Area Latina/o students have grown faster than any other racial and ethnic group, and in 2013 over a third of K-12 students were Latina/o. In keeping with this trend, Latina/o students more than doubled at Bay Area California State University campuses (CSUs) in the last decade.

The growing number of Latinas/os enrolled in four-year institutions is due to upward trends in their educational attainment in the nation and in the state. College enrollment rates are dramatically increasing, while high school dropout rates are declining. Although more students are seeking a college education, relatively few graduate. Latinas/os still experience a significant gap in degree attainment. Nationwide, 41% of all adults have earned an associate’s degree or higher. The figure for Latina/o adults is 21%. In California, 11% of Latinas/os have earned a bachelor’s degree compared to 30% for all adults.

We have a great opportunity in the Bay Area to improve postsecondary educational access and graduation rates for Latina/o students. As the number of Latinas/os pursuing postsecondary education increases, local colleges and universities will soon qualify to become Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), which opens up the opportunity for significant federal funding to support Latina/o students’ needs.

Using a wide range of data sources, a survey, and focus groups of students at SF State, this data report documents systemic issues that Latina/o students face when completing a baccalaureate degree at San Francisco State University (SF State). We worked with SF State’s administration, the Academic Institutional Research Office, faculty, and staff to understand students’ performance and engagement and the institutional environment at an emerging Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). Each chapter presents a review of the current research and literature surrounding Latinas/os, key indicators, and policy recommendations. Below is a summary of the results from each chapter.

Latina/o Students’ Demographics and Social and Cultural Background

In this chapter we explore students’ demographics profile and background characteristics with the purpose of understanding where students come from, not what they are capable in doing. Many Latina/o students differ from the traditional student in higher education. Often, school personnel view these differences as deficiencies and take a compensatory approach that ignores the strengths and knowledge that Latina/o students’ bring to the table. We want to understand their characteristics to design programs that meet their needs and build on their assets and skills.
Latina/o students at SF State have high educational aspirations and are enrolling full-time in school (96% of first-time freshmen and 86% of transfer students enroll full-time), but they confront particular challenges. On average they come to SF State with a high school GPA of 3.0 and a transfer GPA of 3.2, but two thirds need to hone their basic skills to succeed in college due to inadequate preparation in their high schools. Fifty-one percent of Latino students in our sample are the first person in their families to go to college, which means they are hardworking and leading-edge, but may be unaware of how best to succeed in college. Some Latino/a students and their families lack the information, language, or experience with postsecondary educational institutions to help them succeed in higher education. Moreover, there are few counselors in the schools they come from, and counselors have to deal with a wide range of issues in schools. It is customary for them to provide college preparation and college counseling to students who seek out information or to students who are in a college-track program. In addition, some students have been the victims of negative stereotypes, discrimination, police harassment, and violence in their high school and communities, which affects their confidence and behavior.

Latino students are also culturally different from traditional students. Their collective, respectful, and relational cultural values often seem in conflict with the individualistic, homogenizing, and competitive approach in higher education. These norms impart a strong social responsibility to Latina/o students, which can be leveraged to help Latinas/os complete their education and improve society. But they also bring a set of responsibilities that, if not understood by their teachers, can create stressors for students. A third of Latinas/os at SF State are helping to support their families (half of Latino male freshmen) and over a third are working off campus. They also work more hours than other students.

Given the importance of families, community, and connectedness for Latina/o students, it is critical for higher educational institutions to engage with Latino families and to build a sense of community for Latina/o students on campus. Latinas/os have a lower sense of trust of advisors and professors, and rely more on family, friends, and peers than on other groups for guidance and support. Consequently, institutional agents (faculty and staff) need to build trust to promote college success. Latina/o students need to feel validated. Faculty and staff need to create opportunities to explore and affirm Latina/o culture through Latina/o Studies courses, but also across the entire curriculum in all disciplines. Experiences that connect Latina/o students with one another and with faculty, such as cultural events or speakers’ series, can enhance Latina/o students’ sense of belonging. Moreover, faculty and staff need to reflect the experience and life of Latinas/os. Students need role models, and Latina/o faculty and staff could model for students how to navigate the college experience.
Barriers to Access, Admissions, and Enrollment at SF State

Postsecondary education is becoming increasingly salient in the lives of Latinas/os, but they are more likely to begin their higher education careers in the community college system immediately after graduation. Nationally, 55% of Latina/o students enroll in community colleges in comparison to 42% of African American, 40% of Asian American, and 36% of White students. Part of the reason for their choice is poor preparation. Fewer of them pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) or complete the A to G requirements. Latinos graduating from Bay Area public high schools have low rates of A to G completion (36.3% compared to the SFUSD’s overall rate of 56.2% among 2012–13 graduates), making a majority of them ineligible for four-year colleges. But well-prepared and high-SES Latinos go to community colleges as well. They rely heavily on friends and family for their college planning and decision making. And many Latinos do not even consider four-year selective colleges because of the complicated application/admissions process, especially first-generation college goers.

While a majority of the students view community college as a first step and intend to transfer to a four-year institution, far too few make it. Completing remedial courses quickly and taking the right courses that count for transfer are critical for transfer. But often the community colleges and four-year institutions do not have a clear articulation program in place to ensure a smooth transfer process for students. Furthermore, impacted majors and programs limit the number of transfer admissions, creating a further barrier to transfer.

At SF State, most Latina/o students enter the campus as first-time freshmen (FTF). Since 2011 they have been the largest racial group to enroll as FTF and the third largest group of transfers.

Examining applications and admissions at SF State, we see a dramatic increase in Latina/o applications for FTF and transfer, but compared to other students few are being admitted. Latinas/os and Asians were the only ethnic groups who applied at an increasing rate as FTF, but the increase in applications did not translate into a corresponding increase in admissions, especially between 2010 and 2013. In 2013, 50% of Latina/o FTF applicants were offered admission, compared to over 70% of White and Asian students. Moreover, the number of Latina/o students applying to transfer to SF State increased since 2009, but their admission rate has been lower than other students. In 2013 the campus admitted 66% of Asian transfer applicants, 52% of Whites, and 48% for Latinos. Latina/o admission rate, however, increased in 2014 for both FTF and transfer students, decreasing the racial/ethnic disparity in admission.

Providing information about available programs, the application process, and financial aid is fundamental for Latina/o access to higher education. Universities, however, need to communicate with students and their families in multiple languages. Instructions, websites, and materials directed at students should be provided in English and Spanish so that families can understand and help support their children. Also, university mentor and
outreach offices must be staffed with multilingual staff, particularly Spanish-speaking counselors and advisors.

Since Latina/o students approach peers and family member for information, four-year universities could provide support for students by creating mentoring and tutoring programs that supplement the limited resources available in the schools.

Partnerships between four-year universities, high schools, and communities colleges help to identify and improve curricular areas that would increase college readiness of Latina/o students; for example, the recently approved ethnic studies curricula by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) was a collaboration between the College of Ethnic Studies and SFUSD. Partnerships can help effectively develop programs and interventions that improve opportunities to transition to the four-year level, such as GANAS at CSU East Bay and the Transfer Articulation Bridge program (TAB) and Metro Academies at SF State. Finally, building collaboration with the Latina/o community could have an impact on awareness, preparation, and career choices for many potential students.

**Roadblocks to College Affordability: Latinas/os & Financial Aid**

The cost of education has dramatically increased nationwide. At SF State, the full-time tuition rose 103%, from $3,166 in year 2006–07 to $6,440 in year 2012–2013. This has been further compounded by the increasing gap between college costs and available financial aid. For example, the maximum Pell grant ($5,760) no longer covers the full cost of tuition at SF State. Overall, it covers only 24.2% of the cost of attendance at SF State. In contrast, California’s need-based grants (e.g., Cal Grants, State University Grant) have risen proportionately with tuition. However, even with this increase, most state need-based aid helps students close the gap on their tuition but does not come close to meeting the full cost of tuition, room and board, books, and transportation.

Additionally, although people were made aware of the increase in fees, the subsequent increase in state grant funding was not well communicated to students and their families. This exacerbated the perception that college was out of reach for low-income or working-class families across the state.

A serious roadblock to college affordability is the complicated process of applying for and receiving federal or state financial aid, which is time-sensitive and predominately Internet-based. In 2014, less than half of Latina/o students or their parents in the United States had knowledge of college prices and/or financial aid prior to entering college, and in 2013 and one quarter of Latina/o families still did not have access to the Internet. Additionally, many Latina/o students and their families face linguistic and cultural barriers that affect their ability to accurately complete the applications. Consequently many Latina/o students do not receive financial aid that they are qualified for, or they receive lower amounts than other applicants.
Unfortunately, dramatic increases in tuition at California public colleges and universities took place at the same time that new limits on federal and state financial aid were being implemented. A six-year lifetime limit has been placed on the federal Pell grant, even though nationally only 56.5% of all students and 48.7% of Latinos graduate within six years. Similarly, the State University Grant placed a limit of 150 units (6.25 years) for first-time freshman and 70 units (three years) for transfer students. Moreover, new restrictions were implemented for Cal Grants in 2012–13 that introduced tighter income guidelines, a reduction in grant aid for less than full-time, and the need to repay grants if enrollment dropped.

In order to close the gap between tuition and financial aid, Latina/o students often have to rely on loans and working more hours while attending college. Some reduce enrollment or drop out altogether. Of our survey respondents, Latina/o students reported working more hours than other racial and ethnic groups. Within the United States, Latino students have traditionally borrowed less and opted to work more. The numbers are not available by ethnicity, but in 2011–12, the number of college seniors who graduated with debt (42%) was lower at SF State than the CSU overall (47%), but the student average debt ($18,850) was higher than at the CSU ($16,648). These numbers do not cover all student loans since federal loan calculations only choose to include students who started as first-time students and received a bachelor’s degree. Loans taken out by transfer or continuing students who dropped out are not accounted for.

The CSU overall, and SF State specifically, must get a better understanding of how Latinas/os are accessing student loans so the university can maximize need-based aid and scholarships and can educate students on financial literacy and informed borrowing so that Latino students and other underrepresented populations do not incur unnecessary debt. SF State can improve access to financial support by employing the following practices:

1. Disaggregate financial aid data for admitted and enrolled students at SF State to determine potential equity gaps and identify specific roadblocks.
2. Provide access to bilingual, culturally competent financial aid advising.
3. Provide financial aid counseling at Bay Area community colleges to proactively promote transfer entitlement grant.
4. Identify roadblocks to enrollment created by the new business practices of relying on computer-based application systems.

The Campus Experience and Student Progress Towards a Degree

A number of factors impact students’ college degree attainment. SF State’s approach to developmental courses, barriers that students confront getting into classes, the availability and use of student services, activities, and resources, and the general campus environment affect student retention and completion.
Most students are completing their remediation in one year, but there are significant barriers for students who need to remediate in both math and English—54% of Latina/o students who were assigned to remediate in math and English completed both in their first year at SF State. Math is a serious challenge for Latina/o students—85% who needed math only completed remediation in one year, as compared to 94% of Latina/o students who needed English remediation only. Students are, however, assigned to remedial coursework based on the score of a single high-stakes standardized test. Scholars suggest that campuses use multiple measures to place students in gateway courses and that the priority be to get students into college-level courses. The tests and the courses also focus on a narrow set of skills that may have little relation to the student’s preferred area of study. A promising approach integrates remedial instruction within college-level courses, so students are not delayed in starting their area of study.

Impactions and restrictions in class offerings are having a serious effect on student’s enrollment in required courses for their major/minor. One of every five Latino men and 30% of Latina women responded they had not been able to get into a class in their major/minor because it was impacted. Fifty percent responded that they were not able to get into a class in their major/minor because the class was full at least once per semester, and a third were not able to get into a class at least once per semester because the class was canceled.

In general there is little engagement in campus activities. Students also do not seek help, even when they feel dissatisfied with their academic performance. They need to be able to engage with faculty who care about their academic success and have time to adequately support them. They need to participate in meaningful research and other academic activities, as well as have access to safe zones. These safe zones are necessary for building community, engaging with peers, and receiving mentoring and support that is critical for academic success. Most Latinos responded that a faculty member has taken an interest in their development and half have a staff member. Almost two-thirds feel faculty believe in their potential. But some appears not to be receiving the support they need—23% said no faculty member had taken an interest in their development and 10% did not think that faculty believe in their potential.

Research studies emphasize the importance of programs such as learning communities in providing academic and non-academic resources for students and improving their campus experience. These programs offer courses to enhance students’ basic skills, offer activities intended to acclimate students to the university, and provide a space for high levels of peer interaction and faculty-student engagement in and outside the classroom. But for the models to succeed with the Latina/o population, they cannot follow a compensatory approach which tries to “fix” or assimilate Latina/o students into the majority culture. They must validate the Latina/o experience and provide a relevant curriculum and activities to increase their sense of belonging on campus. There are several examples of successful learning communities at San Francisco State—Metro
Academies, the Transfer Articulation Bridge program (TAB), and the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)—and at CSU East Bay, GANAS.

In general student retention, graduation rates, and time to graduation has been improving at SF State, and the gaps in performance between racial and ethnic groups have been declining. But the outcomes for Latina/o students still lag behind those of other students, and they are below the average for the CSU system. For the 2009 cohort only 32% of Chicano/Mexican American and 40% of Other Latinos graduated in six years (system-wide, 44.6% of Latina/o students graduated in 6 years). However, Latina/o transfer students are doing better at SF State than the average for the CSU. For the 2009 cohort, 71% of Chicano/Mexican American and 74% of Other Latino transfers graduated four years after entering the campus, while system-wide it was 62.9% for the 2008 cohort.

**Campus Climate and Engagement**

The experiences of students of color in higher education are affected by a number of factors, one of which is campus climate. *Campus racial climate* captures the overall racial environment of a university—how members of the campus perceive the overall campus with respect to the treatment and affirmation of different racial groups. Most students on campus, particularly Latina/o students, agreed with the statement “SF State is strongly committed to diversity”—83% of White, 82% of Multiracial, 80% of Latina/o and Asian students, and 72% of African American students. However, one in ten African American students on campus disagreed with the statement.

Also critical for campus climate is the “nature of interactions among diverse groups.” On the one hand is having the opportunity to interact with people from other racial and ethnic groups, while in the other hand is whether that has improved people’s ability to interact. All groups, particularly Multiracial and White students agreed that SF State offers adequate opportunities to learn about other groups, with over two thirds of Asian, African American, and Latino/a students agreeing. Fewer students agreed with the statement their experience at SF State had improved their ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups. Latina/os have the highest rate of agreement, at 61%, while Multiracial and White students have the lowest rate of agreement. The differences in these results may indicate that students recognize opportunities to learn about diversity but not take part in activities that would contribute to cross-racial and cross-cultural interactions.

At SF State, the diversity composition of the student body is a major benefit to all students because it facilitates opportunities to interact. Students develop a sense of community as they are able to join student organizations that affirm their identities or participate in and witness cultural events that honor cultural diversity on campus.

Student racial experiences on campus can vary and can be influenced by the experience of overt discriminatory acts by faculty, staff, or other students or by covert messages,
such as racial microaggressions. Racial microaggressions can be psychologically harmful as they often put doubt in a student’s mind about whether she or he belongs in college or whether others perceive the student as having the intellectual and academic capacities to be successful in university.

At SF State, African American students reported higher incidences of bias and discrimination across the board, while Latinas/os appeared to be satisfied with the campus environment. Close to half of African Americans had witnessed discrimination while at SF State. Among Latina/os, Multiracial, and White students, close a third had witnessed discrimination at least once at SF State. Almost 20% of African American and 10% of Asian students reported feeling mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of their race or ethnicity. Ten percent of African Americans experienced discrimination from a faculty member at least once per semester, 9% experienced it at least once a year, and 11% had experienced discrimination once at SF State. Other groups also reported experiencing discrimination from a faculty member at least once while SF State: Asians (19%), Latinas/os (18%), and Multiracials (19%). Based on these findings, it is imperative that university administrators take seriously the training of faculty and staff who are able to support the academic and socio-emotional needs of all students, which includes regular, mandatory diversity trainings. Moreover, it is critical that SF State increase faculty, staff and administrators diversity on campus.

No more than about one third of students on campus agreed with the statement that “SF State has established procedures for addressing instances of harassment or discrimination.” Only 34% of Latina/o and African American students agreed there are procedures to address instances of discrimination on campus, as was also the case for 31% of Asian and 29% of Multiracial and White students on campus. This was then reflected in the percentage of students who reported cases of discrimination—close to 90% of students said they had never reported an incident of discrimination on campus. University administrators should ensure that students both know about reporting mechanisms available to them and have confidence that these mechanisms are effective at setting meaningful intervention in motion.

**Faculty and Leadership**

While we have seen rapid growth in the Latina/o student population at SF State, there has been limited growth in the number of Latina/o faculty, staff, and administrators. Latina/o faculty constitute only 8.7% of tenure-track faculty at SF State, with 63 Latina/o faculty members spread thinly and unevenly across five of six colleges. Latina/o administrators are also severely underrepresented, with only 5% of administrative positions. This means that only one out of 20 administrators is Latina/o while one out of every four students is Latina/o. And Latinas/os are only 15% of campus staff. The underrepresentation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff is damaging to the educational advancement of Latina/o students and to the strength and well-being of our campus at large.
In 2009, Latinas/os had the highest ratio of students to faculty of the same ethnicity as compared to other ethnic groups, with a ratio of 73 Latina/o students to one Latina/o faculty member. Since then the disparity has dramatically increased to 102 Latina/o students for every Latina/o faculty. This compares to a 37:1 ratio of students to faculty members overall and a 19:1 ratio of White students to White faculty.

We believe that one of the most important and central elements of our strategic plan for the future is to increase the representation of Latinas/os at the levels of tenure-track faculty. In particular, we lay out an emblematic target of a Latina/o student-faculty ratio that matches the total student-faculty ratio of 37:1. To reach this target, SF State would have to hire 113 additional Latina/o faculty members.

Based on a review of best practices, we call for precise and tangible measures and strategies when striving to reach a more equitable level of representation of Latinos. For example, the Academic Senate at CSU East Bay has articulated an institutional goal of greater diversity and has developed a rubric for assessing how well departments, units, and committees are doing in terms of faculty diversity. A department’s five-year plan, for example, will be rated as “exemplary,” “adequate/developing,” or “absent” in reference to how the plan integrates diversity. At SF State, we would like to see faculty HRTP committees adopt mechanisms similar to the diversity rubric developed at CSUEB to promote faculty diversity in a systematic way. We would like to see similar mechanisms integrated in the hiring processes for staff and administrators.

One of the challenges we have experienced at SF State is a lack of accessibility to systematically collected data and accurate gauges of diversity and representation. A genuine commitment to diversity at the institutional level requires that support and resources be earmarked specifically for the activities involved in building and maintaining a more diverse workforce at SF State. An administrative position and/or office that will be accountable for the systematic collection and assessment of data on Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff at SF State needs to be created.

We also advocate for the purposeful use of the Equity Scorecard process to solve the problem of inequitable educational outcomes by forming “evidence teams” of engaged individuals from across the campus in a coordinated effort to diversify the faculty. In a cycle of action inquiry, evidence teams would identify gaps in outcomes as well as supportive practices that address the gaps. We would then develop a precise, data-driven strategy to create institutional change with greater equity for underrepresented students and faculty.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Latinas/os became the largest population of color enrolled in the U.S. postsecondary educational system in 2010 (Fry, 2011). In California, Latinas/os are the majority (53.3%) of K-12 public school students and they are the fastest growing segment of college age and high school youth.¹ In the Bay Area Latina/o students have grown faster than any other racial and ethnic group and in 2013, over a third of K-12 students were Latina/o. In keeping with this trend, Latina/o students more than doubled at Bay Area California State University campuses (CSUs) in the last decade. The number of Latina/o students enrolled at San Francisco State and San Jose State doubled since 2003. The number of Latina/o students increased by 133% at CSU East Bay, 158% at Sonoma State, and by almost 300% at the Maritime Academy. At UC Berkeley, apart from international students, who grew by almost 300% between 2002 and 2013, Latinas/os were the fastest growing group of undergraduate students. They grew by 38%, while the campus only grew by 8% in the same period. If these patterns continue, Latinas/os could be close to half of the students at Bay Area four-year institutions by early 2020².

The growing number of Latinas/os enrolled in four-year institutions is due to upward trends in their educational attainment in the nation and in the state. College enrollment rates are increasing and high school dropout rates are declining. The Latina/o high school dropout rate declined dramatically from 32% in 2000 to 15% in 2012 (Lopez & Fry, 2013). And college-going rates for Latina/o high school graduates has increased significantly; by 2012, they enrolled in college at higher rates than Whites (Lopez & Fry, 2013). But there is still a gap between Whites and Latinas/os in high school graduation, and of those who graduate many need college preparation. In the Bay Area, the gap in high school graduation rates between Latina/o and White students persists at 20 percentage points, and twice as many whites as Latinas/os met the A to G requirements for University of California (UC) and CSU admission.³ Although college-going rates are increasing, Latinas/os still experience a significant gap in college degree attainment. Nationwide, “21% of Latino adults have earned a degree at some point in their lives in 2012, compared to 41% of all adults” (Santiago, 2013). In California, 11% of Latinas/os earned a bachelor’s degree compared to 30% for all adults (Campaign for College Opportunity, 2013).

Given that Latinas/os are the largest ethnic group in California and that only 11% have earned a bachelor’s degree, researchers are in agreement with sentiments shared in the Campaign for a College Opportunity report—California will not be able to maintain its

¹ Latinas/os were half of the growth in the Bay Area population between 2000 and 2010. US Census Bureau.
² Results obtained from the California State University system. Data at http://www.calstate.edu/as/stat_reports/2003–2004/FETH01.htm.
³ A to G requirements include 4 years of English, 3 years of mathematics, 2 years each of social studies, laboratory sciences, and foreign language as well as 1 year of a visual/performing art and an elective (California Department of Education, 2014).
economic growth without improving college graduation rates for Latinas/os (Campaign for College Opportunity, 2013). A bachelor’s degree is a prerequisite to almost all entry level positions today. People without college degrees suffer greater unemployment and lower lifetime earnings. Furthermore, when students graduate, there are clear net gains to the state and local communities beyond the payoff to the individual student. Since California has the largest college-age population in the nation, the ability to help those who reside in California obtain their college degree will have dramatic impacts locally, statewide, and for the national economy.

We have a great opportunity in the Bay Area to improve postsecondary educational access and graduation rates for Latina/o students. As the number of Latinas/os pursuing postsecondary education increases, local colleges and universities will soon qualify to become Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)4. This federal designation opens up the opportunity for significant federal funding to support Latina/o students’ needs. However, potential HSIs currently lack a process and a system of accountability to support educational achievement by Latina/o students beyond enrollment.

The Cesar E. Chavez Institute (CCI) established the Latino Educational Achievement Partnership (LEAP) to assist Bay Area institutions in going beyond just enrolling Latinas/os. The goal is to enable institutions to become “equity minded” by providing tools for evaluating institutional barriers to Latina/o success. LEAP examines barriers to college enrollment, persistence, and completion; identifies promising practices for improving services; and makes recommendations for increasing educational success and degree attainment. LEAP involves Bay Area postsecondary institutions in research, dialogue, and practice to yield institutional change that better serves Latina/o students.

This book identifies systemic issues that Latina/o students face to achieve a baccalaureate degree at San Francisco State University (SF State). These issues were identified by analyzing various datasets in relation to the following topics: Student Demographics; Access; College Affordability; Retention and Progress towards Degree; Campus Climate; and Campus Diversity and Leadership. LEAP researchers worked with SF State’s administration and the Academic Institutional Research Office, as well as faculty and staff to understand student performance, engagement, and the institutional environment at an emerging Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Each chapter presents a review of the current research and literature surrounding Latinas/os, key indicators of students experience and outcomes, and examples of promising practices or policy recommendations. As community members, educators, administrators, researchers, and many others come together to improve the success rates of Latina/o students, a common language is needed. This data book is a starting point for individuals to come together.

4 The Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) Division provides grant funding to institutions of higher education to assist with strengthening institutional programs, facilities, and services to expand the educational opportunities for Hispanic Americans and other underrepresented populations. The Department defines an HSI as an institution of higher education that has an enrollment of undergraduate full-time-equivalent students that is at least 25% Hispanic at the end of the award year immediately preceding the date of application.
1.1 Methodological Issues

The focus of this data book is on the outcomes of Latina/o students, but we present data for other racial and ethnic populations on campus for comparison purposes. When possible we present information for six major racial and ethnic groups: Latina/o; Asian, not Hispanic; White, not Hispanic; Black, not Hispanic; Arab/Middle Eastern/North African, non-Hispanic; and Multiracial, not Hispanic. But in many cases, the sample size was too small to generate reliable results; thus we concentrated on the largest groups—Asians, Latinas/os, and Whites. These ethnic categories were self-reported racial and ethnic identifications from our Student Life Survey or from administrative databases. The Multiracial category includes all of those who selected more than one race or ethnic group, except for Latinas/os, who were always assigned to the Latina/o group. In future work we plan to more fully study Asian, Latina/o, gender, and sexual orientation subgroups to learn about challenges and opportunities confronting these groups.

When possible, we tried to compare students at SF State with other students throughout the Bay Area and at other universities. For this analysis we considered the Bay Area as the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. And we compared results at SF State with those at other comparable four-year institutions in the Bay Area—UC Berkeley, San Jose State, CSU-East Bay, the Maritime Academy, and Sonoma State.

In analyzing barriers and assessing needs for students, we used quantitative and qualitative data. We used data from the Student Life Survey of undergraduate students conducted at SF State in the spring of 2014. Some 2,921 undergraduate students responded to the survey. We linked responses from the Student Life Survey to student records to obtain information on all courses taken by each student who took the survey up until the survey and a year after the survey. We use these data to examine students’ course completion patterns, GPA, and progress towards graduation, as well as student’s attitudes, experience preparation, and financial aid eligibility. In addition, we used the SF State Pulse surveys, NSSE Results for SF State, and other administrative data available at the Institutional Research Office (http://air.sfsu.edu/air/ir). We also used data

---

5 For the most part in this report, we aggregated Chicano, Mexican American, and Other Latinos to one group and refer to them as Latinas/os. In a few figures in chapter 5 we were able to disaggregate Mexican American/Chicano and Other Latinos.

6 For the purpose of this report and the focus on Latinas/os, for the most part we combined the Asian ethnic groups into one group and refer to them as Asians. Therefore, Asians include Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders/Native Hawaiians, Southeast Asians, and Filipinos. In a few figures in chapter 5 we were able to disaggregate Filipino, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders and Asian American students.

7 We did not include any results with fewer than 20 observations.

8 For information on the Student Life Survey see Appendix A and B.

9 For students who did not select a race/ethnic group, we used administrative records for the racial and ethnic group they had selected in their application to the campus and assigned them that racial and ethnic group.

10 For information on the methodology to generate our analysis of students’ completion of milestones towards graduation, see Appendix A.
from the California State System Institutional Data (https://csyou.calstate.edu/Pages/default.aspx), the California Department of Education (http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/), IPEDS Data Center (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/), the Consortium for Student Retention Data—CSRDE (http://csrde.ou.edu/web/index.html) and the former California Post-Secondary Commission (CPEC).

We conducted focus groups with undergraduate Latina/o students. Three focus groups were conducted with a total of 10 students who met and discussed their experiences for 60 to 75 minutes.  

11 Students varied with respect to gender, age, documentation status, transfer vs. non-transfer status at SF State, academic major, and use of academic support programs on campus. In the next few months we will conduct focus groups with more students, Latina/o faculty and staff. Moreover, what we learn and prioritize at the community forums to be held at SF State and in the community will also inform the findings and recommendations presented in this report. A final report with all policy recommendations will be released in May 2015.

---

11 For information on the focus groups see Appendix A
In general, Latinas/os differ from the traditional student in higher education. Often, faculty, staff, and administrators view these differences as deficiencies and take a compensatory approach that ignores Latina/o students’ “funds of knowledge” (Nuñez, et al., 2013). We want to understand their characteristics to design programs that meet their needs and build on their assets and skills. Therefore, in this volume we concentrate on the commonalities most often described in the literature for Latinas/os and their implications for higher education.

Latinas/os represent a number of national and ethnic origins, racial groups, languages, social classes, immigration statuses, and histories of integration. There is no homogeneous Latina/o experience. Nonetheless, while their pathway to college and their resources may vary, there is significant cultural affinity between Latina/o groups, and their experience in the United States unites them. In this chapter we concentrate on three critical aspects: The Latino/a Family; College Preparation and Assumptions about their Potential; and Student Characteristics.

2.1 The Latina/o Family

For Latinas/os the family is the most important social unit. They greatly value family relations and connectedness, *familialism* (Nuñez, et al., 2013; Ortiz & Santos, 2009; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Familialism involves a moral responsibility to help family members, a resource for information and guidance, and a close-knit network that brings families together for every occasion—holidays, birthdays, graduations, baptisms, and quinceañeras (Torres, 2010). The commitment to family goes beyond the nuclear family and includes extended family members and often *compueblanos*, people from the same village or communities of origin. Respect and trust—*confianza*—are key values of Latina/o culture precisely because of the importance of connectedness (Stanton-Salazar, 2001). In fact, for many Latina/o students their family is the major source of support in their education (Gandara, 1995; Ortiz & Santos, 2009; Torres & Hernandez, 2007).

For some Latina/o students their collective, respectful, and relational cultural values seem in conflict with the current individualistic, homogenizing, and competitive approach in higher education. Many feel a cultural shock (Gonzalez, 2002; Yosso, 2006). This is especially the case for first-generation Latina/o students, who often report an unfamiliar environment in college that makes them feel out of place and who seek “comfort zones”
on the campus to succeed (Nuñez, 2011). These comfort zones are difficult to find in an environment that often lacks role models who understand and affirm Latina/o culture, and in the absence of materials on Latinas/os throughout the curriculum. These deficits often foster a sense of isolation and affect the confidence of Latina/o students (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2002; Nuñez, 2011). In the following quote, a Latina/o student who was living at a majority Latina/o community before college speaks of her adjustment when she joined SF State:

I lived in mostly the majority Hispanic community. So I was mostly a majority in school. It’s very different to come here and be a minority—see myself out of my comfort zone and maybe keeping my language back a little. Or compared to home just the way things work. I feel more comfortable asking for help more at home and from those around you. There’s more staff that understands. And here maybe the staff is just different ethnicities, so it’s different. You have to find a different way of asking for help.

For Latinas/os, education goes beyond gaining knowledge and individual enrichment. It involves shaping a moral individual engaged with their family and community (Ortiz & Santos, 2009). These norms impart a strong social responsibility, which could be leverage to help Latinas/os complete their education and improve society. But they also bring a set of responsibilities that can create additional stressors for students. For example, some traditional households require that Latinas handle family caregiving and household responsibilities, and they are often expected to live at home while in college (Ortiz & Santos, 2009). Of the survey respondents, 44% of Latina/o freshman were living at home while going to SF State, and less than 40% reported living in on-campus housing (Figure 2.1). In contrast, 70% of White non-Hispanic freshmen reported living in on-campus housing. With regards to Latino males, in some households they are expected to work and help support the family (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2009). The results of our survey found that at SF State almost one of every three Latina/o freshmen help support their families—50% of Latino male freshmen—(Figure 2.2), as compared to less than one in five Asians and one in ten White freshmen.

In general, Latina/o parents and students have high educational aspirations, but often lack the information and experience to succeed in higher education. Latinas/os, Multiracial, and African American students at SF State have the highest educational aspirations of all racial and ethnic groups (Figure 2.3). More of them than Asians and Whites aspire to complete graduate studies. But Latina/o students and their families often lack the information, language, or experience with postsecondary educational institutions to succeed in higher education. This information and “know-how” is often described by academics as “cultural capital” or “the knowledge that schools value yet schools don’t teach,” and it is critical for academic success (McDonough, 1997, as quoted in Nuñez, et al., 2013, p. 47). This cultural capital is often relayed to students by their parents, but Latina/o undergraduates at SF State had the highest proportion of mothers without
college experience of all racial and ethnic groups on campus (Figure 2.4)—70% of the mothers of Latina/o undergraduates had no college degree and almost a third had less than a high school education. Furthermore, many Latina/o students are the first in their family to go to college. At SF State over half of Latinas/os were the first in their families to go to college, as compared to only one in four African Americans, one in three Asians, and one in ten White non-Hispanics (Figure 2.5). Additionally, because of the lack of college experience, many Latina/o parents may not understand the responsibilities that college students have or what is required in terms of time and focus, and they may not know how to help support their children’s efforts to succeed. Higher education institutions often engage with families during recruitment drives, but beyond that campus communication efforts are directed only at students. Moreover, campus communications are often not written in a language accessible to Latina/o families, making it difficult for Latina/o students to share relevant information with their families. Engaging with parents and providing them with relevant information about the campus and their children can help them better support their children.

In addition to cultural capital, students need financial capital to succeed in college. Almost a quarter of Latina/o undergraduates have a family income under $40,000 (Santiago, 2013). Latina/o children have some of the highest child poverty rates of all racial and ethnic groups. In the Bay Area more than one in four Latina/o children live in a household with income below the poverty line (Figure 2.6). As mentioned above, about a third of SF State Latina/o freshmen (50% of Latino males) were helping to support their families while in college (Figure 2.2). In our sample, a greater proportion of Latina/o freshman than any other freshmen group reported working off campus (Figure 2.7). Over a third of Latina/o freshmen were working, and of those who worked about a third worked more than 20 hours per week (11% of all Latina/o freshman in the survey). Latina/o sophomores in our sample worked even more than freshmen (Figure 2.8). The majority of Latina/o sophomores worked, as did the majority of White non-Hispanic and one in four Asian students. To accommodate this work schedule many students enrolled in college part-time. At SF State, however, Latinas/os have a low proportion of part-time enrollment (Figure 2.9). This means that Latina/o students are working more hours than other students and are still enrolled full-time in college. Moreover, 45% of them are commuting more than half an hour to come to campus and one of every six are commuting for more than an hour (Figure 2.10). This is a challenging scenario, particularly for freshman and sophomores who are still adapting to the campus life in an isolating environment. The following response reflects these realities:

*I know a lot of Latinos that commute all the time because we just can’t afford to live in San Francisco . . . I only have to work for that, for commuting. That’s basically why I need to work . . . And I know a lot of students that are working around this issue of making it more accessible to get to school.*

2.2 College Readiness and Assumptions about Students’ Potential
Researchers have found that high schools are a major component of students’ college preparation and success (Wolniak & Engberg, 2009). In general, Latinas/os come from high schools that have fewer resources to promote college enrollment than do other students (Perna & Titus, 2005). As a result, Latina/o students often have insufficient access to college preparatory courses (Contreras, 2011; Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Hernandez and Lopez, 2004; Justiz & Rendon, 1989). The limited access to these courses results in a lower A to G completion rate. Figure 2.11 shows A to G completion rates for White and Latina/o students who graduated from Bay Area high schools. The A to G completion of Latina/o males (12%) have remained more or less constant since 1989. Latinas/os and African Americans go to schools that have more teachers with emergency credentials, more dilapidated facilities, and more disciplinary problems than their counterparts (Wolniak & Engberg, 2009; Perna & Titus, 2005). Many of them score low in standardized test and high school exit exams. Less than a third of Bay Area Latina/o 10th graders scored above grade level in math, compared to 60 percent of Whites (Chavez et al., 2007). At SF State 37% of Latina/o freshman who responded to the Student Life Survey needed remediation in both English and math, and an additional 29% needed remediation either in math or English: 9% needed English remediation only and 20% needed math remediation only. Only about a third did not need any remediation when they first started at SF State (Figure 2.12).

Latina/o students also have less information about how to prepare for, apply for, and attend college than other racial and ethnic groups (McDonough, 1997). The American School Counselor Association recommends a student-to-counselor ratio of 250 students to one counselor (ASCA, 2011). In California the student-to-counselor ratio was 841 students for every counselor in 2012, and this ratio was on a downward trend (Figure 2.13). But in some Bay Area counties, the ratio is worse than the state average: Solano (1286:1), Santa Clara (1079:1), Napa (892:1), and Contra Costa (1135:1). Moreover, counselors have to deal with a wide range of issues in schools, including working with students with learning disabilities, dealing with bullying and disruptive behavior in the classroom, working with underperforming students, and preparing students for college. It is customary for them to provide college preparation and college counseling to students who seek out information or to students who are in a college track program (Marisco & Getch, 2009). Consequently, many Latina/o high school graduates have received limited support from counselors, and because many are the first in their family to go to college, even seemingly basic tasks in college can be very challenging (Nuñez, 2005).

Finally, the campus climate and students’ experiences with discrimination can have an impact on Latina/o student success in college. In particular, negative experiences and discrimination can erode their sense of efficacy and lead to worse academic performance. For example, if students perceive that they are being negatively stereotyped, this experience can affect their confidence and academic performance (Massey, et al., 2003; Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). Some students are more conscious of negative stereotypes than others. This consciousness has been called “stereotype threat” and it can
be exacerbated by feelings of inadequacy. At SF State, one in every six Latina/o students felt their high school or community college did not adequately prepare them to succeed in college (Figure 2.14). These feelings of inadequacy coupled with experiences of micro-aggressions, defined as subtle yet cumulative, regular acts of racism and stereotyping, are likely to make Latina/o students at SF State feel more isolated from their academic environment, affecting their confidence and sense of belonging (Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Nuñez, 2009a, 2009b; Solorzano & Villalpando, 1998; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solorzano, 2009).

2.3 STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The majority of students at SF State are females (57% of students), which holds true for every racial and ethnic group on campus. This is reflected in the greater representation of females in the Student Life Survey—67% of all respondents are female, with that number increasing to 70% for Latina/o respondents (Figure 2.15). With regards to sexual orientation (Figure 2.16), we find that the majority of students on campus are heterosexual, but a significant number of students are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ). One of every six Latina/o student on campus is LGBTQ, as are 20% of African American, Multiracial, and White students on campus.

In California most Latina/o students are of Mexican ancestry, but there is a high concentration of Central Americans (Nicaraguans and Salvadorians) in the San Francisco Bay Area. At SF State, the majority of Latina/o students are Chicanos/Mexicanos/Mexican Americans (Figure 2.17). But the proportion of Mexicans among the Latina/o undergraduates at SF State has been declining, from 64% in 2007 to 59% in 2012.

Although many believe that Latinas/os are for the most non-citizens, this is far from true. Eighty-six percent of Latina/o undergraduates in our sample reported that they were U.S. citizens (Figure 2.18). Additionally, the overwhelming majority of Latina/o undergraduates (90%) are California residents. Ten percent of Latina/o undergraduates qualify under AB 540.12

There is also a perception that Latinas/os are not fluent in English, but evidence from the literature showed that more than 80% of Latina/o school age children spoke English well (Santiago, 2013). They may not, however, have strong skills in advanced academic literacy in English, as seen by the proportion of Latinas/os who enrolled in English remediation classes (Figure 2.12). Others may be able to skip remediation but still struggle in higher-level courses that require proficiency in academic literacy. Many

---

12 In October 12, 2001, Governor Gray Davis signed into law Assembly Bill 540, which created a new exemption from the payment of non-resident tuition for certain non-resident students who have attended high school in California for three or more full academic years and received a high school diploma or its equivalent and passed the California High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE). They must be register at an accredited public institution of higher education in California. Students must not hold a valid non-immigrant visa (F, J, H, L, A, E, etc.).
Latina/o students start school as English language learners (ELLs) and are placed into English as a second language programs (ESL). But after a year or two of intensive in-class language support, students are reclassified and thereafter the explicit linguistic support they receive is limited. This makes it difficult for “former” language learners to develop advanced levels of academic literacy. Advanced academic literacy is the “kind of meaning-making that is . . . required for participation in many of the professional, technical, bureaucratic and social institutions in our world (Schleppergrell and Colombi, 2002: 1).” This advanced literacy involves the high-level cognitive functions of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The language used to hypothesize is very refined and complex, and it needs to be taught explicitly within instruction, together with the subject matter (Quijano, 2012). To acquire and become users of academic language and members of academia, students need significant exposure to this type of language. The Common Core aims to address this issue by providing intensive language support within content areas throughout K-12, with the goal of preparing students for advanced academic literacy at the postsecondary level.13 We at the higher education level need to look at what the Common Core is doing to keep building students’ advance academic language. This needs to be integrated across the curriculum and not just in a few writing courses.

We find that most Latinas/os at SF State are California residents, over half of them came to San Francisco State from the Bay Area—56% of Latina/o undergraduates in our sample reported in their application to San Francisco State that they were living in the Bay Area (Figure 2.19). Additionally, almost two-thirds of the students who came from other regions of the state, originate from Southern California.

### 2.4 Implications for Higher Education

Given the importance of families, community, and connectedness for Latina/o students, it is critical for institutions of higher education to engage with Latina/o families to build a sense of community within higher education for Latina/o students (Torrez & Hernandez, 2007; Yosso, 2006). Latinas/os have a lower sense of trust of advisors and professors, and therefore rely more on family, friends, and peers than do other groups (Perez & McDonough, 2008; Torres & Hernandez, 2007). Consequently, institutional agents (faculty and staff) need to build trust and community to promote college success. “First generation college going Latino students who develop and maintain supportive relationships both with their family of origin and with college personnel and peers experience smoother transitions to college than their counter parts who have weaker ties to their family members or members of their college communities” (Saunders & Serna, 2004, as quoted in Nuñez, et al., 2012, p. 35).

Latina/o students need to feel validated (Rendon, 1994; Rendon, Linares, & Munoz, 2011). Faculty and staff need to engage with Latina/o students and learn about their lives and experiences (Stanton-Salazar, 2001); they need to create opportunities to explore and

---

13 The Common Core State Standards (frequently known as just Common Core) are a set of K-12 educational standards in math and language arts. Forty-five states have adopted Common Core, including California. The Common Core focuses on developing the critical-thinking, problem-solving, and analytical skills students will need to be successful.
affirm Latina/o culture through Chicana/o and Latina/o Studies courses, and also across the entire curriculum in all disciplines. Experiences that connect them with other Latina/o students and faculty, and other cultural forms of engagement, can enhance Latina/o students’ sense of belonging (Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Nuñez, 2011). Moreover, faculty and staff need to reflect the experience and life of Latinas/os. Students need role models and Latina/o faculty could serve as role models in navigating the college experience (Torrez, 1999, 2003).

Below are examples of how students rely on a particular set of individuals on campus that they have developed relationship with.

*I have certain individuals that I feel comfortable going to, one of them being [Nicky Tresvina]. She has been my mentor since day one. She’s always telling me about workshops to go to, she’s always telling me about tutoring. I’ve been to CARP, the LAC, you know, Mr. [Head] is amazing at CARP. [Mendez], you know, with the TAB class. Nancy with financial aid.*

*. . . The Latina counselors or mentors that I do have, you know, we get it, we get each other. We know our histories, we know our jokes, our traditions, like our little sayings, we understand them. Whereas somebody else would probably be like, ‘well, can you clarify that, I don’t know what you mean’ . . . you know. So I guess you don’t have to further explain with those certain individuals . . . they just get it and you know, you feel at home. It’s like you come from home, you come to school and you have somebody that can be like . . . you.*

Taken together, the picture of Latina/o students painted by our work is as follows. The majority of Latina/o students at SF State attend school full-time, and a third of Latinas/os are helping to support their families (half of Latino male freshmen). Over a third are working off campus, and they work for more hours than other groups. Over half are the first person in their families to go to college, meaning that their parents do not have first-hand experience with higher education. And many of them need to hone their basic skills to succeed in college due to inadequate preparation in high school and community colleges. New approaches are emerging throughout the nation to meet the needs of a new and diverse student population. Specific examples of these promising approaches will be described throughout this report.
Figure 2.1. Proportion of students who live at home with their parents or on campus (by student level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home with Parents or Relatives</th>
<th>Campus Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The samples for Multiracial and African American students were too small to generate reliable results; 185 students did not respond to this question in the survey.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

- Latinas/os and Asians had the highest proportions of students living at home with their parents or relatives, especially in their freshman year. Over 60% of Asians and 44% of Latinas/os were living at home during their freshman year.

- Meanwhile the overwhelming majority (70%) of White students were living in on-campus housing in their first year, 43% in their second year, and about 17% by their junior year.

- About a third (30%) of freshman in campus housing were White, even though Whites were only 12% of the freshman on campus who responded to this question in the survey.

- Of all people living on campus who responded to the survey, 34% were White, 31% were Latina/o, and 17% were Asian.
**Figure 2.2. Proportion of students who help support their families while in college**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There is no statistically significant difference in support for sophomores, but the results for freshmen and juniors are significant.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

- One in three Latina/o freshman were helping to support their families during their first year in college, as were 25% of sophomores and almost 40% of juniors.

- Latinas/os help support their families significantly more than White students. Only 10% of Whites were helping to support their families, compared to 30% of Latinas/os and 23% of Asians.

- Over time, students are more engaged helping their families. By the junior year 38% of Latinas/os, 34% of Asians, 19% of White student were helping support their families.

- In general, about one of every four students of color at SF State helped support their families while in college, almost 50% more than White students.
Figure 2.3. Educational aspirations of SF State students

- Of the students in our sample, Latinas/os and African Americans have some of the highest educational aspirations of all racial and ethnic groups on campus.

- Seventy-five percent of Latina/o student in our sample said they wanted to pursue post-baccalaureate education. Half want to get a master’s degree and almost 30 percent want to pursue a PhD or a professional degree.

- Eighty percent of African American students want to pursue post-baccalaureate education—43% want an MA, and 37% a PhD or professional degree.

- Sixty-five percent of White non-Hispanics and 62% of Asian non-Hispanics said they want to pursue post-baccalaureate education.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 2.4. Highest level of mother’s education

Source: Student Life Survey 2014 and SFSU Student Records Spring 2013

- Latina/o undergraduate students in our sample had the highest proportion of mothers without a college experience: 70% of Latina mothers of SFSU students had no college degree.

- Almost a third of Latina mothers had less than a high school education.

- Half of White mothers of our undergraduate students had a BA or greater. Only 2% had less than a high school education.

- A third of African American mothers had a BA or greater and close to 60% had some college experience.

- One in six Asian mothers had less than a high school education and 33% had only a high school education. Almost half of Asian mothers had no college experience.

- Fathers of undergraduate students in the sample had similar education attainment and experience with postsecondary education as the mothers.
Figure 2.5. Proportion of students who are the first in their families to go to college

- Over half of Latina/o students enrolled at SF State who responded to our survey were the first in their families to go to college.

- The second largest group of first-generation students are Asians: 35% of them were the first person in their family to go to college.

- One in four African American students and about one in ten White and Multiracial students were the first in their family to go to college.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014 and SFSU Student Records Spring 2013
Figure 2.6. Child poverty (regions of 65,000 residents or more) 2007 and 2012 (by county)


Note: Child poverty is the estimated percentage of children ages 0–17 living in families with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level, by race/ethnicity (e.g., in 2012, 36.3% of African American children ages 0–17 in California lived in poverty). The Federal Poverty Level was $23,283 for a family of two adults and two children in 2012.

- Latina/o children have some of the highest child poverty rates. In 2012, 36% of African American children, 32% of Latina/o and American Indian/Alaska Native children were in a household with income below the poverty line. This is the case for one in four Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, one in six Multiracial children, 13% of Asian children, and 11% of White children.


- By 2012, over one in four Latina/o children living in the Bay Area were living in a poor family.
Figure 2.7. Work intensity for SF State freshmen, spring 2013

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: There was no statistically significant difference between the ethnic groups’ working intensity in their freshman year.

- About a third of Latinas/os, Asian, and White students were working off campus during their freshman year.

- About a quarter of the students who were working worked one day or less per week off campus.

- Over 40% of students working off campus worked 9 to 20 hours.

- Close to one of every three were working more than 20 hours off campus.

- A smaller proportion of Whites worked off campus; those who worked were employed one day or more per week (20% or more).
Figure 2.8. Work intensity for SF State sophomores, spring 2013

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: Differences across racial and ethnic groups were statistically significant in their sophomore year.

- The majority of Latina/o and White students in our sample were working during their sophomore year, as were over half of White non-Hispanic sophomores and one in three Asian students.

- Of White and Latina/o students who worked, the majority worked one day or more off campus. Over a third of them were working more than 20 hour per week off campus.

- Asian sophomores were working about as much as freshman.
For the most part students in our sample enrolled full-time at SF State in spring 2013; 11% of the sample were enrolled part-time. This is slightly lower than the overall campus enrollment in the fall semester, when 15% of undergraduate students were enrolled part-time.

Most (92%) ofLatinas/os undergraduate students in our sample were enrolled full-time this semester. Full-time enrollment was lower for seniors (82%) and juniors (94%) than it was for freshman (98%) and sophomores (99%).

Transfer students in our sample worked more than students who started at SF State as freshman. For the most part over 90% of students who started at SF State as freshmen and over 80% of Transfers were studying full time.
Almost half of Latinas/os commute more than an half an hour to come to campus.

Seventeen percent of Latina/o freshmen and 14% of Latina/o sophomores commute more than an hour to come to campus.

For African Americans sophomores have the longest commute—about 20% commute for more than an hours to come to campus.

In contrast, only 15% of White students commute more than an hour—only 7% of freshmen and 1% of sophomores commute more than an hour.
Figure 2.11 A to G completion rate in the Bay Area for Latino and White students, 1989–2009

Source: Authors calculations of the CPEC Student Data A to G. Data Generated on Sunday, October 26, 2014 at 5:14:33 PM at [http://www.cepec.ca.gov/StudentData/AtoGOptions.asp](http://www.cepec.ca.gov/StudentData/AtoGOptions.asp)

Note: The A to G completion rate is calculated by dividing the number of public high school students who successfully completed the A to G course requirements with a grade of C or higher in a given year by the number of freshmen four years earlier as reported by the schools. The numbers do not take into account students who move to another school.

- Less than 20% of Latina/o ninth graders at Bay Area schools completed the A to G course requirements by their high school graduation in 2009.

- Meanwhile, a third of the average students in the district completed the A to G course requirements in 2009.

- White women had the highest A to G completions rate (46%) and Latina/o men had the lowest A to G completion rate at only 12% of the cohort who graduated in 2009.

- The A to G completion rate of Latinas/os have remained more or less constant since 1989 at Bay Area schools.
Figure 2.12. Freshman remediation rates, SF State

Source: Student Life Survey 2014 and SFSU Student Records Spring 2013

Note: In 2012 a report by the Academic Institutional Research (AIR) office at SF State found that 38% of Latina/o first-time freshman needed remediation in English and 48% needed remediation in math (http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/20124remediation%20file%20summary_demos.pdf). An AIR research report on remediation for fall 2005 through 2009 cohorts of full-time first-time freshmen found lower remediation rates for Latinas/os—only about 20% needed English and over 20% needed math remediation (https://sites7.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/Remediation%20Study.pdf). They also found that 50% of those who were on remediation were still on campus after four years, as compared to close to 40% of those who did not need remediation. Six-year graduation rates are similar for both groups.

- Two-thirds of Latina/o students needed remediation, as compared to 48% of Asian and 31% of White students.

- Close to half of Latinas/os (46%) needed remediation in English and 57% needed remediation in math.

- A greater proportion of Asian students (50%) than Latinas/os needed remediation in English. But far fewer (33%) needed remediation in math than Latinas/os.

- Meanwhile only 6% of Whites need remediation in English and 29% needed remediation in math.
Figure 2.13. Ratio of students to counselors, 1998–2012 (by county)


Note: Ratio of public school students to full-time-equivalent (FTE) counselor. Smaller numbers indicate that students have greater access to support-service personnel.

- In 2012 California the student-to counselor ratio was 841 students per counselor.

- There are far fewer counselors in the Bay Area on average than in the rest of the state. Especially serious were the limitations in Solano, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties, in which Latinas/os were at least a third of the students enrolled in public schools.

- San Francisco has the lowest student-to-counselor ratios in the Bay Area: there were 370 students per counselor in the San Francisco School District, while Solano had the highest at 1,286 students per counselor. Solano County had only 50 counselors in 2012 for over 64,000 students in public schools.
Figure 2.14. Survey responses to “I feel my high school or community college adequately prepared me to succeed at San Francisco State.”

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: For Asian and for White non-Hispanics there is no statistically significant difference on their perceived level of preparation by student level. For Latinas/os, freshmen (87%) are statistically significantly more confident of their high school education than sophomores (73%), juniors (72%), and seniors (76%). Levels of confidence for Latina/o sophomores, juniors, and seniors have similar levels of confidence as other racial and ethnic groups. Latina/o freshman, however, feel more confident of their training than other groups.

- A slightly greater proportion of Latina/o students say they disagree with the statement that their high school or community college adequately prepared them to succeed at SF State than White and Asian students.

- One in six Latina/o undergraduate disagreed with the statement that their school adequately prepared them to succeed at SFSU, compared to 12% of Asians and 9% of Whites.

- White non-Hispanics are generally the most confident students about their preparation.

- Latina/o freshman were more confident with their high school preparation than sophomores—10% of Latina/o freshmen disagreed with the statement that their high school adequately prepared them for SF State, while 20% of Latina/o sophomores disagreed with the statement.
Figure 2.15. Gender distribution of SF State undergraduates (by race/ethnicity)

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: At SF State, 57% of all undergraduate students are female: 55% of Asian, 64% of African American, 61% of Latina/o, 60% of Multiracial, and 54% of White undergraduates at SF State in fall 2013 (http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/new_ethnic134.pdf).

- Females are overrepresented in our sample. Sixty-eight percent of students who responded to the Student Life Survey at San Francisco State were females, although females make up 57% of the undergraduate enrollment.

- Among African American, Latina/o, and Multiracial respondents, 70% were female. Among Asian and White students, two thirds were female.

- About 2% of the sample responded as transgender or other in the survey, specifying “gender fluid/neutral,” “gender queer,” “queer,” “prefer not to be either,” “questioning,” “transmasculine woman,” “two-spirit.”
Figure 2.16. Sexual orientation of SF State undergraduates (by race/ethnicity)

- The majority (83%) of students who responded to the Student Life Survey at San Francisco State were heterosexual.

- Close to 20% of African American, Multiracial, and White students who responded to the survey were LGBTQ.

- One of every six Latina/o students who responded to the survey were LGBTQ, as were 14% of Asian respondents.

- One of every six students who responded to the survey were LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) or other sexual orientation.

- For the “other” category, respondents specified “transmasculine woman,” “trans non gender conforming,” “Pansexual,” heteroflexible.”

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 2.17. Proportion of Latina/o students at SF State who are of Mexican/Chicana/o origin.

- The majority of Latina/o students who responded to our survey at SF State are of Mexican origin.

- But the proportion of Latinas/os from other regions or national origins have been increasing over time. While almost two thirds of Latinas/os at SF State were of Mexican ancestry in 2009, by 2013 the percentage had dropped to just below 60%.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
The majority (86%) of Latina/o undergraduates were U.S. citizens.

A greater proportion of Asians were non-citizens—one of every four Asian students on campus.

The overwhelming majority of White (95%), Multiracial (94%), and African American students (92%) were U.S. citizens.

Most Latina/o undergraduates (90%) were California residents.

Nine percent of Latina/o students are AB 540.

Asian undergraduates had the smallest proportion of California residents, but they were still overwhelmingly (88%) California residents.

One in ten (11%) of Asian undergraduates were foreign international students and 1% were AB54.

Source: Student Records 2014.
• The majority (56%) of SF State Latina/o undergraduates originated in the Bay Area while 43% originated from other areas in California: 29% came from Southern California and 14% from the rest of the state.

• For the most part (75%) Asian students came from the Bay Area. About 16% originated from the rest of California and 7% came from outside the United States.

• White students are the most geographically dispersed: 42% came from a Bay Area county, 28% came from Southern California, and 24% came from other regions in the state. This data indicates that Whites are more willing to travel to attend university.

• Looking at geography by student level, the proportion of students who were living in the Bay Area at the time of their application increased with time on campus, which may indicate that local students may be better able to succeed on campus than their counterparts from other regions of the state.
3 Barriers to Access, Admission, and Enrollment

by Umadevi Senguttuvan and Eurania Lopez

Postsecondary education is becoming increasingly salient in the lives of Latinas/os. A greater number of Latinas/os are applying to and enrolling in colleges across the nation every year. In fact, in fall 2012 more Latina/o high school graduates enrolled in college than their White counterparts (67% vs. 65%; Fry & Taylor, 2013). The landscape of Latina/o college enrollment, however, is different from that of Whites. For example, only 56% of Latinas/os are enrolled in a four-year college, compared to 72% of Whites (Fry & Taylor, 2013). Latinas/os are also less likely than Whites to enroll in a selective college or be enrolled full time (Bozick & Lauff, 2007). Scholars suggest that these differences may partially explain the gap in degree attainment between Latinas/os and Whites (Fry, 2004), making it crucial to understand the discrepancy in their enrollment choices and the barriers Latinas/os face.

3.1 Community Colleges vs. Four-Year Universities

Latina/o students are more likely to begin their higher education careers in the community college system and are less likely to enroll directly in a four-year institution immediately after high school graduation (Kurlaender, 2006). Nationally, 55% of Latina/o students enroll in community colleges in comparison to 42% of African American, 40% of Asian American, and 36% of White students (Cook & Cordova, 2007). The community college being the preferred attendance choice is particularly evident in California, the state with the largest Latina/o population and where an estimated 80% of college-going Latina/o students enroll in the community college system (CPEC, 2007). Qualities such as open access, affordability, proximity to home, skills training, and schedule flexibility make them an attractive first step for many Latinas/os (Bozick & Lauff, 2007; Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). While community colleges remain the first choice for many high school graduates, it becomes the only choice for many Latina/o students. These students experience barriers to enrolling in four-year institutions because of their low levels of college readiness and lack of information.

3.1.1 College Readiness and Enrollment Choice

Much attention has been paid to the poor preparation received by Latina/o high school graduates, which makes them ineligible or under prepared for four-year colleges. For example, in California a college admission requirement is to pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), which assesses the achievement of ninth and tenth grade content standards for English language arts and mathematics. The Human Resources Research Organization estimated that of the class of 2015, 68.8% of Latina/o
students passed both parts of the CAHSEE exam by May 2013, compared to 85.3% of White students and 89% of Asian students (Wise, 2013). Additionally, to be considered for admission to the University of California and California State University college systems, students should complete A to G requirements, which include four years of English, three years of mathematics, two years each of social studies, laboratory sciences, and foreign language as well as one year of a visual/performing art and an elective (California Department of Education, 2014). While a letter grade of D counts for high school graduation, the A to G courses require a letter grade of C or above for college admission. Latinas/os graduating from Bay Area public high schools have low rates of A to G completion (36.3% compared to the SFUSD overall rate of 56.2% among 2012–13 graduates), making a majority of them ineligible for four-year colleges. In contrast, nonselective institutions (i.e., two-year colleges and vocational/technical institutes) require only that students have a high school diploma or equivalent for admission. State colleges and universities consider high school diploma, college preparatory curriculum, and a combination of grade-point average and test scores for admission. Based on these requirements Latinas/os are considered underprepared or not as college-ready compared to Whites and Asians. This discrepancy in college readiness has roots in the scarce resources of the California education system. Reports indicate that many high schools provide insufficient college preparatory courses, have few qualified teachers to teach the preparatory courses, and a low number of school counselors to help students on their path to college. Furthermore, schools with a high concentration of Latina/o and African American students are more likely to have limited resources, resulting in racial disparities in the levels of college preparation (Oakes et al., 2006).

3.1.2 Cultural Enclave and Enrollment Choices

It is not only underprepared Latinas/os or those facing financial constraints that go to nonselective institutions, but well prepared and high-SES Latinas/os go to community colleges as well (Kurlaender, 2006; Perna, 2000). National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) data showed that more well-prepared Latinas/os go to nonselective institutions compared to Whites (60% vs. 52%; Fry, 2004). Examining the reasons for the low number of Latinas/os in selective institutions makes clear that it is not just a problem of admission; rather many Latinas/os simply do not apply to selective institutions (Fry, 2004).

Studies show that compared to other racial groups Latinas/os are less likely to undertake a comprehensive college selection process (Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs, & Rhee, 1997). Instead, they rely heavily on friends and family for their college planning and decision-making (Perez & McDonough, 2008; Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). The college application process proves to be arduous for most. It can be especially daunting for first generation college goers, as is the case in many Latina/o families. In such cases, extended family members and friends may function as the easiest access to information and may even help with the application/admissions process. Many Latinas/os do not even consider
four-year selective colleges because of the complicated application/admissions process. Instead, they prefer to apply to and enroll at feeder colleges where they already have friends and family enrolled (Perez & McDonough, 2008; Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). This reliance on social ties for college decisions limits their options and results in their enrollment at community and junior colleges with their enclave. While friends and family may boost sense of support, and provide quick and easy access to information, they may lack crucial information themselves. Continued dependence on social contacts alone for assistance may isolate the student from the larger college environment and the resources available.

### 3.2 Barriers to Transfer

While a majority of the students view community college as a first step and intend to transfer to a four-year institution, data indicates that community colleges have a low transfer rate (CPEC, 2007, Horn & Lew, 2007). For example, while 80% of the students enrolling in community colleges intend to transfer to a four-year college, only 15% do so within five years (Horn & Skomsvo1d, 2011; Shapiro et al., 2013). The picture is bleaker for Latinas/os compared to Whites, less than 25% of Latina/o students who begin at a community college successfully transfer to a four-year college, compared to a 36% of their White peers (Fry, 2004). Several barriers exist at both the community college and the four-year institution levels that make transfer difficult.

Scholars posit that the first year at a community college is very critical to successful transfer (Driscoll, 2007; Hagedorn et al., 2008). Completing remedial courses quickly and taking the right courses that count for transfer are linked to student persistence and advancement. In fact, transferability of community college credits is cited to be the greatest barrier to transfer (Serban et al., 2008). Often the community colleges and four-year institutions do not have a clear articulation program in place to ensure a smooth transfer process for students. Of the students transferring from community colleges only about half of them receive full credits for their transfer courses, requiring them to spend more time, money, and energy at the four-year institution, resources that they may not have (Doyle, 2006). Furthermore, impacted majors and programs limit the number of transfer admissions, creating further barrier to transfer (Cohen, 2003).

### 3.3 Mechanics of Enrollment

Access to a college education begins with academic preparation, but it takes much more to turn a college education into a reality. Latina/o students (first-time freshman as well as transfer students) who have a lack of knowledge of the college-going culture are often unsure of what happens after their application is complete, and they are often unaware of how to finance their college education, how to register for their classes, or how to make housing arrangements. For example, of the students who apply to and are admitted to four-year colleges many do not enroll because they failed to complete a financial aid application (Nagaoka, Roderick, & Coca, 2009). It is crucial that higher educational
institutions reach out to Latina/o students and their families and provide them with a road map to college enrollment to make an easier transition into the college system. Also, the way schools and organizations reach out and establish relationships with Latina/o families determines the involvement of parents in their children’s education (Delgado-Gaitan, 2007).

In sum, low college readiness, lack of information about institutional choices, poor articulation programs between community colleges and four-year institutions, and complicated college application/admission systems in general appear to create barriers for Latina/o students’ access to postsecondary education.

3.4 APPLICATIONS, ADMISSIONS, AND ENROLLMENT AT SF STATE

Latinas/os are the fastest growing racial/ethnic group of students at SF State, increasing from 22% of undergraduates in 2009 to 27% in 2013 (Figure 3.1). In fact, they are the largest racial/ethnic group to enroll as first time freshmen (FTF)—35% of first-time freshmen enrolling at SF State in the fall 2013 were Latinas/os, as compared to 21% White and 32% Asian (Figure 3.2). However, Asians and Whites surpass Latinas/os in transfer enrollment—Latinas/os are 25% of transfers enrolled in 2013, as compared to 28.5% Whites and 33.5% Asians (Figure 3.3).

To better understand Latinas/os access to SF State, we examined the number of applications, admissions, and enrollment between the years of 2009 and 2014. Data showed that the rate of admission decreased from 2009 to 2010 across all racial/ethnic groups. Although the number of Latina/o students was growing on campus, first-time freshman admission rates declined dramatically and was lower than that of White and Asian students (Figure 3.4). The disparity was particularly high between 2010 and 2013. For example, in 2013 only 50% of Latina/o applicants were admitted to SF State compared to a 71% of Asian and White applicants. Latina/o admission rate increased in 2014 to 63%, but continue to lag behind the admission rates of Asian (74%) and White (75%) students.

Examining trends (Figure 3.5) between 2009 and 2014 revealed that Latinas/os showed the highest growth in the number of applications (58%), admissions (51%), and enrollment (42%). Asian students also presented with a 21% growth in application numbers, 18% growth in admission, and 2% growth in enrollment. In contrast, White students showed a decline in applications, admissions, and enrollment. With the increase in Latina/o admission rate in 2014, the gap between the growth in applications and admissions that was present between 2010 and 2013 has been narrowed.

Transfer students present with similar patterns. Admission rates declined for all racial/ethnic groups from 2009 to 2010 (Figure 3.6). While numbers have improved since 2010, the rate of admission continues to be lower than what it was in 2009. Latinas/os had the highest transfer admission rate in 2009 at 82%, but experienced a huge drop to
49\% in 2010. They lagged behind White and Asian students since and in 2013 had the lowest admission rate (48\%) across all racial/ethnic groups. However, in 2014 Latina/o admission rates improved markedly- 60\% of Latina/o, 63\% of Asian and 62\% of White transfer applicants were offered admission in 2014.

Examining transfer student trends (Figure 3.7) between 2009 and 2014 revealed that Latinas/os showed the highest growth in the number of applications (114\%) and admissions (58\%) followed by Asian students with 69\% growth in application and 42\% growth in admission. White students showed a 11\% increase in applications but a 13\% decline in admissions.

Without an analysis of applications, we cannot assess the reasons for the patterns of admission we observed. It is possible that the recession attracted a new group of students with less preparation or that changes in admissions policy at SF State had a disproportionate effect on Latina/o students, a growing share of applicants to the campus. Nevertheless, the Latina/o admission rates of 2014 are a step in the right direction to decrease the racial/ethnic disparity in Latina/o access to higher education.

3.5 Recommendations to Increase Access

Colleges and universities must create community outreach programs to encourage students from pre-kindergarten to the university level to envision attending college. More exposure from colleges and universities in local schools and communities can help strengthen the college-going culture and provide avenues for information.

Partnering with well-established institutions that have a track record working with Latina/o communities can further this effort. One example of strong partnership and a media campaign is the joint effort of Univision, local nonprofit organizations, and the California State University campuses.\(^{14}\) This multimedia education initiative aims to increase Latina/o students’ high school completion, college readiness, and graduation. The initiative raises awareness about the importance of postsecondary education and provides concrete tools and resources to help students achieve their academic goals. The importance of the initiative is how it outlines the steps to get into college, makes resources available, and provides staff that is Latina/o, bicultural, and bilingual.

To enhance SF State’s outreach efforts in recruiting more Latina/o students, the campus needs to hold college information sessions designed for Latina/o youth and their families at high schools, community centers, and other nonprofit organizations. Having publicity material available in both English and Spanish is very important, but most important is having the presence of bilingual/bicultural staff available to students and their families.

SF State should create a well-staffed pathway from the Bay Area feeder community colleges, expanding successful programs such as the dual admission program and

\(^{14}\) For information on this initiative visit http://corporate.univision.com/corporate/community-relations/educacion/
providing support with admissions and financial aid applications, all with bicultural and bilingual materials and staff.

The campus should create a Latina/o cultural center that could house bilingual and bicultural academic advisors, Latina/o outreach staff, and Latina/o student groups. Currently SF State does not have a designated location for Latina/o students and their families. Currently there is no location where Latina/o families can obtain information about all the services and programs available on campus. The establishment of such a space can make the campus inviting for prospective Latina/o students.

Increasing the overall number of Latina/o faculty, advisors, and administrators is necessary and very important at SF State. Showing an institution that reflects the student population can create a feeling of community and inclusiveness.

SF State, as a public institution of higher learning, should strengthen its relationship with professional Latina/o networks to create and expand opportunities for students. Working with local Latina/o networks can lead to mentorship and professional internships for students, as well as scholarships and funding sources to support future Latina/o students.

In summary, it is important to show the Latina/o communities that colleges and universities value and respect their culture and support the vision of making higher education accessible to all. They must create an environment not only where students feel welcome but also where they receive the support needed to succeed. To continue moving forward, SF State must make an administrative, financial, and deliberate commitment to the success of Latina/o students.
Latinas/os are the only ethnic group, except for Multiracial students, whose proportion of undergraduate students at SF State increased between 2009 and 2013. It grew from 22% to 27% of all undergraduates students at SF State.

The proportion of White non-Hispanics at SF State declined from 36% of undergraduates to 27%, almost at parity with Latina/o students on campus.

The proportion of Asian students on campus remains more or less constant, declining only slightly in this period from 35% of undergraduates to 33%.

The proportion of African American and Native American undergraduates at SF State also declined between 2009 and 2013.
Of first-time freshmen students, Latinas/os increased in number, whereas White students declined in number across 2007 to 2013.

Up until 2009, White students comprised the majority of the student body at 35.5%, followed by Asian students and Latina/o students at 29%.

Starting in 2011, Latinas/os surpassed both Whites and Asian students and became the largest racial group of first-time freshman enrolled at SF State.

Of the first-time freshmen enrolled in 2013, Latinas/os made up 34.9%, Asians made up 31.7%, and Whites made up 21.4% of the students.
The number of Asian and Latina/o students who transferred to SF State has been increasing over the years, while Whites show a declining pattern.

In 2013, Asian students ranked as the biggest racial/ethnic group among transfer students followed by Whites and Latinas/os.
The overall rate of admission declined across all racial/ethnic groups after 2009. The numbers appear to have improved in 2014.

Latina/o students experienced a stronger decline in admission rates from 2009 to 2010 compared to White and Asian students.

Between the years of 2010 and 2013, Latina/o and African American/Black students experienced greater disparity in admission rate. For example, 71% of the White and Asian applicants were offered admission in 2013, compared to a 50% of Latina/o and 42% of Black applicants.

Latina/o admission rate increased in 2014 to 63%, but continue to lag behind Asian (74%) and White (75%) students’ admission rates.

African American/Black applicants continue to have the lowest rate of admission. Only 49% of the applicants were offered admission in 2014.


Note: Statistics on the Multiracial category started in 2010.
Between 2009 and 2014, there was an overall growth in the number of first-time freshman applications received at SF State; Latinas/os had the highest growth rate at 58% followed by Asians at 21%.

Latina/o students also show the highest growth rate in the number of admissions at 51%, followed by Asian students at 18%.

The enrollment rate of first-time freshman at SF State declined 7% from 2009 to 2014, whereas Latinas/os showed a 42% growth in enrollment.

With the increase in Latina/o admission rate in 2014, the gap between the growth in applications and admissions has been narrowed.

White students showed a decline in the number of applications, admissions, and enrollments from 2009 to 2014.
Figure 3.6 Transfer students rate of admission (% by race/ethnicity)

The rate of transfer admission shows fluctuation between 2009 and 2014. It was highest in 2009 and declined across all racial/ethnic groups in 2010. While numbers have improved since 2010, the rate of admission continues to be lower than what it was in 2009.

Asian students had the lowest rate of decline from 2009 to 2010.

In the past five years, Asian students had the highest rate of transfer admission, 63% of the transfer applicants were offered admission in 2014.

Latinas/os had the highest transfer admission rate in 2009 at 82%; they experienced a huge drop, however, to 49% in 2010. They had the lowest rate of admission across all racial/ethnic groups at 48% in 2013.

The racial/ethnic disparity in transfer admission decreased for Latina/o students in 2014, 60% of Latina/o, 63% of Asian and 62% of White transfer applicants were offered admission.

African American/Black applicants have one of the lowest rates of transfer admission. Of those who applied to transfer, 49% were offered admission in 2014.
Between 2009 and 2014, there was an overall increase in the number of transfer applications received and number of admissions offered at SF State.

Latinas/o students showed the highest growth in applications at 114% followed by Asian students at 69%.

Latina/o students also had the highest growth in admissions (58%) followed by Asian students (42%).

While the rate of growth in admission is not on par with the rate of growth in application for Latina/o transfer students, the admission rates of 2014 is a step in the right direction to decrease the racial/ethnic disparity in Latina/o access to higher education.

Source: SF State Academic Institutional Research Office & Data Book, 2009
4 ROADBLOCKS TO COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY: LATINAS/OS & FINANCIAL AID

BY NANCY JODAITIS

Universities and policy makers in California and across the nation are seeking to increase college graduation rates to meet the demands of a workforce that will support economic growth for our state and our nation. However, student barriers to college affordability have emerged as a critical issue that must be addressed, especially as tuition costs have soared in the past decade. The College Board indicates, “The confusion and complexity parents and students face preparing for college financially and academically create a perilous cost.”(College Board Policy and Advocacy Center, 2010, p. 20). The ever-rising cost of a college education, combined with the complexity families face in accessing financial aid, is preventing many academically prepared students, especially Latina/o students, from successfully entering and graduating from college.

Nationally, and within California, two major problems have affected the ability of Latina/o students across educational systems, to obtain the help necessary to make college affordable: (a) the increasing gap between college costs and available financial aid, which has accelerated since the academic year 2006–07; and (b) the complicated application process to apply for and receive federal or state financial aid, which is time-sensitive and predominately Internet-based and can be hard to navigate for many Latina/o students and their families. These two factors disproportionately affect Latina/o communities and have compounded the equity gaps Latina/o students face in obtaining college degrees. This chapter begins with a focus on roadblocks to college affordability, including tuition that has skyrocketed juxtaposed with limits on financial aid. Next we look at the specific financial aid challenges Latina/o students confront in applying for and receiving financial aid. The chapter concludes with specific practices that will increase the ability of Latina/o students to successfully obtain all financial aid for which they are eligible.

California colleges and universities must be prepared to address the challenges Latina/os face in accessing financial aid because Latina/os are the largest percentage of Californians between the ages of 18 and 24 and they constitute over fifty-three percent (53%) of California’s current K-12 student body (PPIC, 2014). Furthermore, with twenty-three campuses, the CSU serves over 437,000 students, and Latina/os currently make up 35% of the CSU undergraduate student body. San Francisco State University, one of the largest CSUs in Northern California, serves over 30,000 students, and Latina/os made up over 27% of the undergraduate class in fall 2013. Now that Latina/os make up more than one-quarter of the student population, SF State is poised to become a Hispanic-Serving Institution. It is vital that we develop a better institutional understanding of the roadblocks Latina/o students and their families face when accessing and paying for a college education. By using a Latina/o lens to discuss financial aid, I am building upon Excelencia in Education’s model to significantly “increase its educational attainment goals with a tactical plan that intentionally includes Latina/os” (Santiago, 2013, p. 4). Within
California and across the nation, Latina/os represent a growing majority of students who do not meet the traditional student profile since many work and live off-campus, take more than four years to complete their degree, and are the first in their family to attend college. All of these factors dramatically affect their ability to go to college and receive state and federal financial aid. In order to meet the workforce and economic needs of the state, we must develop a model that will intentionally help Latina/o students and their families address the difficulty they face in paying for college.

4.1 Who Shoulders the High Cost of College?

Nationwide, college tuitions have increased dramatically in the past six years. The cost of tuition at public four-year institutions in the United States increased by 25.1% since 2008–09 (National College Access Network, 2012). As the economic recession took effect across the nation, support for public education in many states was significantly reduced (Johnson, Mejia, Ezekiel, & Zeiger, 2013). Unfortunately, California was one of the states that were hardest hit. The unprecedented declines in state funding that the UCs and CSUs faced is directly tied to California policymakers reducing state fiscal support for public colleges and universities (Figure 4.1). For the most part, these institutional gaps in funding were passed on to the students and their families, by doubling fees at California public universities within six years. In a six-year span, SF State full-time tuition rose 103%: from $3,166 per year in 2006–07 to $6,440 per year in 2012–13 (Figure 4.2). The high cost of obtaining a college degree at public universities in California has prevented too many college-ready students from entering college. Unfortunately, Latina/o students are disproportionately affected, due to their high percentage of college age youth in California and the fact that many Latina/o students are first-generation and/or low-income students.

4.2 Need-Based Financial Aid

4.2.1 Federal Aid

Increases in federal grants were intended to mitigate these rising tuition costs, but have not kept up with the costs of attending a four-year university. As the Education Trust pointed out, thirty years ago the maximum Pell award covered about three fourths of the cost of attending a public four-year institution, but now it covers only about one third of a student’s tuition, room and board, books, and transportation (Lynch, Engle, & Cruz, 2011). At SF State in 2013–14, the maximum Pell grant covered only one quarter (24.2%) of the cost of attendance (Figure 4.3). This is a dramatic change from the historic role the Pell grant played in offering low-income students the financial support necessary to be able to attend college. This gap between the cost of college and available federal financial aid can prevent many students from pursuing their college education, especially if they want to go away to school.
Furthermore, for the first time in history at SF State, during the 2012–13 academic year the maximum amount of the Pell grant no longer covered the full cost of tuition. While tuition at SF State more than doubled (103%) within six years, the Pell grant increased only 42% (Figure 4.3). This gap has created a severe financial burden for students and their families. Too often students close this gap by working more hours, taking out loans, reducing enrollment, or choosing not to attend college.

4.2.2 State Need-Based Aid

California has one of the largest entitlement programs for higher education in the nation, including financial aid for its residents and limited categories of non-citizens that completed high school here. The three main grants available at California public four-year universities are Cal Grants A & B, State University Grant (CSU), and University Grant (UC). In contrast to the federal need-based grants such as the Pell, which was outpaced by skyrocketing tuition, California’s need-based grants have risen proportionately with the tuition hikes in the last six years. However, even with this increase, the State University Grant or the Cal Grant A does not cover the full cost of tuition; only the Cal Grant B covers full tuition at the CSU (Figure 4.4). Most state need-based aid helps students close the gap in their tuition, but doesn’t come close to meeting the full cost of tuition or room and board, books, and transportation. Additionally, at a time when the awareness was high about the increase in fees, the subsequent increase in state grant funding was not well communicated to students and their families. This exacerbated the perception that college was out of reach for low-income or working-class families across the state.

The Cal Grant is an entitlement grant for California high school graduates to support their pursuit of higher education at a California university or college. Students must meet the income guidelines, residency requirements, and minimum GPA and complete the application on time to be awarded this grant. The problem is that a significant portion of low-income and middle-class students are not aware of and are not receiving these grants. In fact, the Institute on College Access & Success (TICAS, 2013, p. 8) reports that the two most common myths about the Cal Grant program are that “it serves all of the neediest students in California and sufficiently addresses college costs.” In 2010–11, Cal grants were awarded to only 36% of the first-time freshman at SF State. So almost two thirds (64%) of first-time freshman who enrolled did not receive it. The income and asset ceiling would preclude a percentage of these entering students from receiving the grant. Yet far too many students who meet the requirements do not accurately apply for or claim their Cal Grant awards because of the complicated application and awarding process. Many low-income and first-generation students who didn’t receive the grant weren’t able to enter college or had to take out loans in order to be able to pay for college.

The State University Grant is available at the CSU to all low-income California residents and certain categories of non-residents who apply for financial aid by the March 2 priority deadline and meet income guidelines equivalent to the Pell grant. In 2010–11, 38% percent of undergraduate students received a State University Grant, which covers only the state portion of
tuition, leaving a $900 gap between the grant and the cost of their classes. Fortunately, the majority of low-income students who receive the State University Grant or the Cal Grant B could also be awarded a federal Pell grant if they meet the FAFSA requirements.\textsuperscript{15} The maximum amounts of federal Pell and state grants combined would cover over half (53\%) of the full cost of attendance—the full cost of tuition, books, and transportation, but not food, housing, or personal expenses.

\section*{4.3 New Limits on Federal and State Financial Aid}

Unfortunately, dramatic increases in tuition at California public colleges and universities took place at the same time that new limits on federal and state financial aid were being implemented. The Higher Education Act of 2011 placed a six-year lifetime limit on the federal Pell grant. This limit was imposed even though nationally only 56.5\% of students entering college obtain their bachelor’s degree within six years (National College Access Network, 2012). For Latinas/os, the percentage is even lower: only 48.7\% graduate within six years (Figure 4.5). The Pell grant lifetime limits are creating new roadblocks to college affordability, since only about half of students at public universities are able to obtain their degree within these time frames.

Shortly after the federal limits were put into place, the CSU followed suit by placing limits on the State University grant, with a maximum 150 units for first-time freshman and 70 units for transfer students. These limits translate into 6.25 years for first-time freshman and just under three years for transfer students. Student progress towards these limits is closely monitored and the financial aid system blocks any Pell or State University Grants once a student reaches the maximum.

Within the CSU, access to the State University Grant was further limited through a stricter adherence to the March 2 priority deadline. Prior to 2012–13, students who met the income eligibility guidelines for the State University Grant, but missed the priority deadline, could still be awarded aid, until the funds ran out. After 2012–13, students are no longer guaranteed access to these funds, even if they met the income guidelines. Many CSUs began to restrict access to the State University Grant if students applied after March 2. At SF State, specifically, students can be considered for a spring-only State University Grant if there are funds available. This new limit disproportionally affects students who are unaware of the priority deadlines, such as transfer students and those with additional barriers to successfully applying for financial aid such as Latinas/os, African Americans, and first-generation and low-income students.

Historically, the Cal Grant was limited to four years of full-time attendance for high school seniors and one to two years for transfer students. But new restrictions were implemented for Cal Grants in 2012–13 that introduced tighter income guidelines, a reduction in grant aid for less than full-time, and the need to repay grants if enrollment dropped. Prior to that date, students were awarded a grant for half-time or full-time enrollment, mirroring how students were charged tuition at the four-year universities. Beginning in fall 2012, Cal Grants were prorated based on units taken, even though the model for charging tuition at the CSU had not changed. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{15} This would not include undocumented AB 540 or nonresident students.
students who were enrolled in nine units continued to be charged full-time tuition but received only nine units’ worth of their Cal Grant. Additionally if a student reduces their unit load, they are required to pay back a portion of their Cal Grant. Apart from the financial pressure, this can also cause a potential roadblock for future enrollment if students are unaware of or unable to meet this financial obligation.

4.4 **NEW TYPES OF STATE FINANCIAL AID IN CALIFORNIA**

California is one of eleven states in the nation that now offers state-based financial aid to undocumented students who meet the requirements for AB 540. The California Dream Act, passed in 2011, offers students at the CSU who meet these criteria the opportunity to apply for Cal Grants, EOP grants, and State University Grants as well as institutional scholarships. This need-based aid is applied for through the California Dream Application, which mirrors the FAFSA application but is administered by the California Student Aid Commission. This is a great opportunity for undocumented California high school graduates, but unfortunately, lack of knowledge about the online application process, fear of how the information will be used, and lack of training within financial aid offices has prevented a large number of students from accurately applying for or claiming this aid. Nevertheless, at San Francisco State, and within the CSU, the number of undocumented students has grown dramatically since the implementation of the Dream Act, and the majority of these students are Latina/o.

The Middle Class Scholarship is another form of state financial aid that became available for higher-income California residents and AB 540 students during the 2014–15 academic year. Student households that have an income up to $150,000, but do not have their tuition covered by another source, can be awarded a small amount of tuition relief on a sliding scale (up to $748 per year). This state scholarship is administered through the California Student Aid Commission and can be used at UCs and CSUs. Middle-income families also need help paying college expenses, since the income threshold for need-based aid precludes most middle-class families from receiving need-based aid. Yet offering non-need-based aid when need-based aid is simultaneously being limited is a troubling trend that is taking place across the nation (Jackson, 2013).

4.5 **LATINA/O FAMILIES ACCESSING FINANCIAL AID**

As tuitions have risen dramatically and the new limits for financial aid are implemented, all low-income and first-generation families are struggling to keep up with the costs of obtaining a college degree. This is especially true for Latina/o families, who often lack awareness about the availability of financial aid and face additional challenges in successfully navigating the

---

16 AB 540 requirements include attending three years of primary or secondary school in California; graduating from a California high school or obtaining a GED; and turning in an affidavit to a public school in California.
application process and claiming the federal and state aid for which they are eligible. The inability of these families to meet the costs of higher education, or their belief that they are unable to meet the costs, has a direct correlation with college access, student retention, and degree attainment (Lee & Rawls, 2010). Each year within California, tens of thousands of academically qualified high school graduates decided not to explore university programs because they were completely unaware of the aid available to them (The Education Trust–West, 2013, 2014). Unless helping Latina/o students successfully apply for and receive financial aid becomes a priority, California will limit its future economic stability.

Lack of knowledge about the application process continues to be a big part of the problem for Latina/o families. In 2014, less than half of Latina/o students or their parents in the United States had knowledge of college prices and/or financial aid prior to entering college (College Board Policy and Advocacy Center B4, p. 2). In addition, many Latina/o students and their parents face linguistic and cultural barriers when using the FAFSA or Dream application that prevents their awareness of specific requirements. The current process from application to disbursement is almost exclusively online, and in 2013, one quarter of Latina/o families still did not have access to the Internet (Lopez, Gonzales-Barrera, & Patton, 2013). And many Latina/o families who can access the Internet are not comfortable submitting sensitive financial information online, which can create a delicate situation between the student and parent in completing the necessary forms in a timely fashion (Lee, et al., 2011). In a focus group, a SF State Latina/o student described her family’s experience of applying for financial aid:

They’ve been really confused for filling out the loan information. And the FAFSA in general is hard to fill out. I didn’t understand some of it. And my parents didn’t either because my parents have never done it before. So they were like, “I don’t know what to do.” And was just like, “I don’t know what to do either.” It’s been difficult, but we got through it.

Others do not complete the application successfully. In reviewing initial applicants to the FAFSA from 2010, three quarters of all applications submitted were initially missing a signature, among other problems, resulting in an incomplete application (Cochrane, LaManque, & Szabo-Kubitza, 2010). And many Latina/o families who overcame these barriers in applying got lost in the maze of income verification or could not successfully claim their awards at the university they planned to attend (The Institute on College Access & Success, 2013). Unless we are able to address these barriers, Latina/o students will continue to miss out on the financial assistance necessary to enter and succeed in college. Another Latina/o focus group participant stated:

Well my mom says she can put it on a credit card kind of thing. I didn’t want to come into university without being able to pay for it because I really don’t want to take out loans . . . I’m not really sure how we’re going to pay for it.
Another Latina/o student related similar concerns:

Okay, well like with this same thing I was supposed to receive the Cal Grant, but I had to resubmit my parents’ tax information. So when that went through I was disqualified. And so during all of that I was trying to figure out if I should continue with this semester or I was considering dropping out because I can’t afford it on my own. So they couldn’t give me a straight answer of when I’d receive the Cal Grant or if I’d receive it at all. And so I ended up sticking it out with my classes, but now I’m not. I’m going to have to pay my mom back forever.

Unfortunately, these barriers dramatically reduce the ability of Latina/o students to receive all federal and state financial aid for which they are eligible. Latina/o undergraduates received lower amounts of total financial aid in 2008 than all undergraduate students ($7,925 vs. $9,114; see Figure 4.6). This is true even though on average, the median Latina/o income was less than other applicants (Santiago, 2013). This trend continued in 2011, when Hispanic and African-American families had a significantly lower median household income than Asian and White students. However, Cal Grant amounts awarded are smaller for African American, Latina/o, Native American, and Pacific Islander students. In fact, “across the state, underrepresented minority students receive grants that are on average just three quarters of the size of white students’ grants” (The Institute on College Access & Success, 2013, p. 6).

The importance of accessing financial aid for the vast majority of Latina/o students in California is directly tied to their ability to enter and succeed in higher education (College Board Policy and Advocacy Center, 2010; Lee, et al., 2011, 2013; Santiago, 2013; The Institute on College Access & Success). When Latina/o students have problems successfully applying for and receiving adequate grant funding, they’re faced with a financial gap between available aid and educational expenses. In order to close it, students have to choose between pursuing privates scholarships, working more hours while attending college, an overreliance on student loans, reducing enrollment, or dropping out altogether (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Cochrane, LaManque, & Szabo-Kubit, 2010; Leisenring, 2011). Each of these choices adversely affects student success and degree completion.

Only a small number of students successfully pursue scholarship funding to bridge the financial gap. Too many scholarship dollars go unclaimed due to a lack of familiarity about how to become a competitive scholarship applicant, identify scholarships, prepare a strong personal statement, and obtain letters of reference. Students who are able to successfully apply report less financial pressure, greater academic success, and the ability to focus on school/career development instead of taking out loans or working so many hours to bridge the financial gap.

As tuitions at public universities continue to climb, the percentage of students working part-time or more while attending college continues to rise. Across California, students work a lot more today than before tuitions rose so dramatically at the CSUs and UCs. For many Latina/o students, the shared roles in meeting household expenses often requires many to work while they are pursuing a college degree. On a national level, 43% of Latina/o students work full-time; one third (33%) work part-time, and only one quarter of Latina/o students (24%) did not work at all
(Santiago, 2013). At SF State in 2011, 40% of Latina/o students polled were working more due to the economic recession and high cost of tuition (SF State Pulse Survey, 2011). Underrepresented minority students surveyed at another CSU campus showed that three quarters of this student population now worked while in college (Leisenring, 2011). On average, these students were working 24 hours a week, but 40% were working more than 25 hours a week. Of the students who participated in our survey, a third of Latinas/os (half of Latina/o male freshmen) were helping to support their families and over a third were working off campus (See Figures 2.7 and 2.8). These students also worked more hours than other racial and ethnic groups. As one Latina/o student reported:

No, but I always tried to stay working because that usually pays for my food expenses, my gas and my books. And then the financial aid pays for actual really expensive stuff.

Another SF State Latina/o student shared:

If it wasn’t for financial aid, I wouldn’t be able to come to school. It’s too much. And that’s me working two jobs sometimes. But having to help out at home and paying all your personal finances, it’s really difficult and I understand how frustrating it can be.

Working over 15 to 20 hours a week has a detrimental effect on academic progress and degree completion (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008; Leisenring, 2011). Nationally, 71% of students who dropped out did so because they needed to work to make money (College Board Policy and Advocacy Center, 2010). Two thirds (68.9%) of SF State Latina/o students indicated that financial pressure to work was the greatest circumstance slowing down their academic progress (SF State Pulse Survey, 2011).

Taking out student loans to bridge the financial gap has risen so dramatically that in 2010 student loan debt exceeded credit card debt for the first time ever (Lynch, Engle, & Cruz, 2011). With students taking out so many loans, it’s a clear indication that college is becoming less accessible (Johnson et. al, 2013). Furthermore, three quarters of college students and their parents are concerned that higher loan limits are more than they could realistically repay (College Board Policy and Advocacy Center, 2010). Students with FAFSA eligibility who cannot meet the full cost of education are offered federal student loans. Beginning in 2014–15, in California, students who are eligible through the California Dream Act will also be offered state student loans. These loans are often what make it possible for students with financial need to cover their living expenses and meet the full cost of attendance. Student loans have also been the only option for families whose income is too high for need-based aid. However, a 2014 national study revealed that low-income students, who met the income eligibility for Pell grants, were more likely to take out student loans and even had a higher average debt than other students (The Institute on College Access & Success, 2014).

The Institute for College Access & Success (2012) estimated that 66% of college seniors who graduated in 2011 had a student loan debt, with a national average of $26,600. Within the CSU,
47% of college seniors graduated with debt in 2011-12, and the average amount owed was $16,648 (CSU Institutional Financial Report). At SF State during the same period, the number of college seniors who graduated with debt was lower than the CSU overall (42%), but the student average debt ($18,850) was higher. TICAS points out that these numbers do not cover all student loans since federal loan calculations only choose to include students who started as first-time students and received a bachelor’s degree. Loans taken out by transfer or continuing students or students who dropped out are not accounted for. So the averages are actually higher than currently reported (Reed & Cochrane, 2012). Furthermore, students who incur debt but do not graduate are much likelier to default on their loans or incur penalties during repayment.

Within the United States, Latina/o students have traditionally borrowed less and opted to work more (Cunningham, & Santiago, 2008). In the past, many Latina/o students and their families had an aversion to borrowing due to fear of debt. One SF State Latina/o student shared:

_ I do qualify for loans, but I’ve always been scared to take loans just because I don’t want to be in that. It’s just a personal thing for me, so I’ve never taken out loans_

Other students chose not to borrow because the potential financial gains from obtaining a college degree were not clear cut enough to warrant the potential debt. But as the need for a college degree to ensure economic mobility has increased, while tuition has continued to rise, it has become more culturally acceptable, and often a financial necessity, for Latina/o students and their families to take on more student loans. As a system the CSU overall, and SF State specifically, must get a better understanding of how Latinas/os are accessing student loans so the university can maximize need-based aid and scholarships and can educate students on financial literacy and informed borrowing so that Latina/o students and other underrepresented populations do not incur unnecessary debt. Furthermore, as loan counseling has transitioned into an online tutorial, many students are not receiving the necessary support they need to be fiscally prepared to take on high levels of debt and successfully repay it without incurring unnecessary interest or penalties. This is important because students who have financial need but choose not to borrow are more likely to not complete their degree (Reed & Cochrane, 2012). Ultimately, despite increasing debt, a college degree is a good investment for the vast majority of students (Johnson et al., 2013).

Latina/o students and their families confront an additional difficulty in paying for college since the methodology of calculating federal and state financial need no longer reflects the reality of the majority of Latina/o students (Santiago, 2013). As Excelencia in Education points out, financial aid policy continues to be based on a traditional student model, even though this model pertains to a decreasing percentage of the student population. According to the traditional student model, a student enrolls full-time in the fall after completing high school, arrives college ready, earns a degree within four years, and lives and works on campus. In the twenty-first century, many current and potential college students, especially Latina/o and underrepresented students, are nontraditional in their approach to accessing higher education. These students often need college prep courses, may start their academic career at the community college, live and work off-campus, attend more than one institution, and decide where to attend based on costs and location (Santiago, 2013). Furthermore, federal law mandates that financial information for
parents must be included in the methodology to determine financial need, even if the parent is no longer financially contributing to their children’s education, or claiming them on their taxes. This can be detrimental for Latina/o students if they continue working to help their families meet their financial responsibilities. Because the federal and state applications do not take into account the shared roles Latina/o families use in confronting economic realities, it is vital that the methodology used to ascertain financial need is updated to better serve the profile of today’s Latina/o students.

4.6 DISAGGREGATING FINANCIAL AID DATA AT SF STATE

Currently, SF State does not conduct institutional analysis on financial aid based on race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Prior to 2014–15, SF State did not even document or record financial aid data based on race or ethnicity. In order to better understand how financial aid is supporting recruitment and retention at our university, SF State must conduct an analysis of how financial aid is being accessed. An analysis of the application, income verification, awarding, and disbursement of students receiving financial aid based on socioeconomic and racial breakdowns would be invaluable in identifying potential roadblocks Latina/o and other underrepresented students face in accessing federal and state financial aid at our university. While the Student Life Survey undertaken in spring 2013 increased our understanding of how Latinas/os access financial aid at SF State, it was limited in scope as it aimed to ensure that access to financial aid services is equitable for all students. The university must take an institutional approach in disaggregating financial aid data to determine that all students have access to the financial aid they are eligible for in order to complete their degree.

4.7 BEST PRACTICES OR INTERVENTIONS

SF State can be a leader in helping Latinas/os meet the costs of a college education with three main strategies: (1) Identifying the specific roadblocks Latina/o students at SF State face in accessing financial aid; (2) Developing culturally competent financial aid strategies and materials to increase the ability of Latina/o students to receive all financial aid for which they are eligible; and (3) Using financial aid in the recruitment and retention strategy to specifically close the equity gap for Latinas/os in obtaining their undergraduate or graduate degrees.

1. Identify the specific roadblocks Latina/o students at SF State face in accessing financial aid.
   - Disaggregate financial aid data for admitted and enrolled students to determine potential equity gaps
   - Incorporate the financial aid application into the admission process to maximize identification of students eligible for financial aid and ensure important deadlines are met
   - Promote knowledge of specific steps from application to receipt of grant

2. Develop culturally competent financial aid strategies and educational materials to increase the ability of Latina/o students to receive all financial aid for which they are eligible
• Demystify financial aid eligibility for Latina/o students and their families
• Provide access to bilingual, culturally competent financial aid advising. Increase outreach to prospective and current Latina/o students and their families through targeted emails, phone calls, and social media
• Provide financial aid counseling at Bay Area community colleges to proactively promote transfer entitlement grant and prepare students for dramatic changes between two-year and four-year universities.

3. Use financial aid as a recruitment and retention strategy to close the equity gap for Latinas/os in obtaining their undergraduate or graduate degrees.

• Identify roadblocks to enrollment created by the new business practices of relying on computer-based application systems
• Promote financial literacy to address rising school costs and reduce student debt
• Create institutional support for college work-study and scholarships for Latina/o students
• Develop a scholarship class/workshop series to strengthen the ability of students to successfully apply for and receive scholarships

California public universities play a vital role in preparing students to meet our state’s workforce needs. Although college tuition is currently at its highest rate in Californian history, the price is not nearly as high as the price California’s communities will have to pay if we do not produce a workforce capable of meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century. The benefits of helping all students, especially Latina/o students, in meeting the cost of higher education extend well beyond the direct pay-off to the student; they include substantial gains to the state, such as increased financial revenue and lower expenditures statewide (Johnson et al., 2013). The Campaign for College Opportunity and PPIC report that “For every dollar California invests in students who go to college, the state will get a net return on investment of $4.50 in the form of increased taxes on graduate earnings and savings on social services and incarceration” (Johnson et al., 2013). However, in order to assure the next generation will be able to obtain their educational goals, we must address how students are going to pay for college. Too many Latina/o students who are academically prepared cannot ultimately go to college or attend full-time because the costs are too high. This loss of academic potential is not a cost our state and local communities can afford to pay. California alone requires one million new bachelor’s degrees by 2025 if we want to stay competitive economically and be able to provide support for our state’s infrastructure.
Figure 4.1. Decline of relative spending on higher education from the general fund to UC and CSU, 1980–81 to 2013–14

- California was one of the states hardest hit by the 2008 recession, due to our policymakers’ decisions to reduce state fiscal support for public colleges and universities.

- General fund spending for the University of California (UC) was reduced from $24,045 in 1980–81 to $10,879 in 2013–14.

- General fund spending for the California State University (CSU) was reduced from $16,000 in 1980–81 to $6,417 in 2013–14.
Figure 4.2. Increase in SF State tuition, 2006–07 to 2013–14

- SF State tuition increased by about $300 per year between 2006–07 and 2008–09.
- SF State tuition increased by almost $1,000 in one year in 2009–10, followed by a $500 increase in 2010–11.
- In a six-year span, SF State full-time tuition rose 103%: from $3,166 per year in 2006–07 to $6,440 per year in 2012–13.

Source: SF State Bursar & SF State Academic Institutional Research
Figure 4.3. Maximum Pell Grant compared to SF State cost of attendance & full-time tuition, 1984–85 vs. 2013–14

- The maximum Pell grant was $1,900 in 1984–85 and grew to $5,760 in 2013–14.
- In 1984–85, the maximum Pell grant award ($1,900) covered 72% of the cost of attendance ($2,533) at SF State.
- In 2013–14, the maximum Pell grant award ($5,760) covered 24.2% of the cost of attendance ($23,826) at SF State.
- Thirty years ago, the maximum Pell award was equivalent to about three fourths of the cost of attending a public four-year institution. Now it covers only about one third.
- For the first time in history at SF State, during the 2013–14 academic year the maximum Pell grant ($5,760) no longer covered the full cost of tuition ($6,440). In all the previous years, students would always have their tuition covered if they received the maximum Pell grant.

Note: These numbers have not been adjusted for inflation.

Figure 4.4. California need-based grants compared to SF State full-time tuition, 2013–14

- Full-time students with a Cal Grant A or a State University Grant receive $5,472 to cover state tuition and still have to pay the local fees of $998 per year.

- Full-time students who receive a Cal Grant B receive $5,472 to cover state tuition, plus an additional $1,473 access grant, totaling $6,945. This covers full-time tuition with about $505 left over for books per year.

- The Cal Grant B is the only grant given by the state that covers the full tuition at SF State, with a modest amount toward the cost of books.

- This ratio is the same with all other CSUs, although the amount per year of local fees varies.

- Cal Grants and the State University Grant at the CSU have risen proportionately with the state tuition fee, which is set by the Chancellor’s office and is currently $5,472.

Source: California Student Aid Commission, SF State Bursar & SF State Office of Student Financial Aid
Figure 4.5. Six-year graduation rates for bachelor’s degree

Source for all Students: National: National College Access Network (2012); SF State Academic Institutional Research, California State University Graduation Rates
Source for Latina/o students: National: National College Access Network (2012); SF State
California State University Graduation Rates

Nationally

- 54.3% of all students entering college obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.
- 48.7% of Latina/o students entering college obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.

Within the CSU

- 52.4% of all students entering in 2004 obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.
- 40% of all Latina/o students entering college obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.

San Francisco State University

- 45.5% for students who entered in 2007 obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.
- 44.5% of all Latina/o students entering in 2007 obtained their bachelor’s degree within six years.

On a national average, Latina/o undergraduates had a lower Estimated Family Contribution than all undergraduate students ($9,966 vs. $13,524).

A student’s Estimated Family Contribution (EFC) is calculated to determine eligibility for grants, loans, and work-study. The lower the EFC, the higher the grant award.

Latina/o undergraduates received lower amounts of total financial aid in 2008 than all other racial/ethnic groups of undergraduate students ($7,925 vs. $9,114).
President Obama has made college completion a priority of his administration. Furthermore, a number of national funders (e.g., the Gates Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Lumina Foundation) are prioritizing awards to increase degree attainment. Improving Latina/o college completion is critical to meeting these national goals. More Latinas/os are seeking a college education now than ever before (Fry, 2011), but college completion rates still remain low. Nationally, only half of Latina/o students who started their bachelor’s degree in 2006 completed it in six years, compared to 65% of Whites (Rodriguez & Calderon, 2015).

In this chapter we examine the campus experience for students at SF State and study Latina/o students’ college retention and completion. We use the results from our survey to look at student engagement on campus and at students’ views about student services, programs, and organizations. We use administrative records to examine four- and six-year graduation rates. We also use first- and second-year milestones that we constructed to examine the critical first- and second-year experience of SF State students who responded to our survey. We conclude this chapter with some policy recommendations.

5.1 The Impact of Campus Practices and Institutional Factors on Student Success

Student persistence is believed to be influenced by student preparation and personal characteristics, external forces, and institutional factors (Tinto, 1993). The Cesar E. Chavez Institute’s Latino Educational Achievement Partnership (LEAP) takes personal student characteristics as given. These characteristics provide an idea of student needs, and in the Student Life Survey we concentrated on the programs and activities that meet these students’ needs.

While affordability is a serious obstacle for students in continuing their education, other aspects of the university experience also impact student retention. Institutional practices, the campus environment, and the level of student involvement in campus activities affect student outcomes (Bean, 1982; Austin, 1993). The campus has administrative control over the number of courses offered every semester, the developmental courses available, and how they approach students who need additional support. Because of budget cuts, student services programs have suffered significantly, limiting access to tutors, financial aid advisors, and student mentors on many campuses (Bohn, Reyes, and Johnson, 2013). Campus organizations and activities not only

---

To complete their college degree in six years students are expected to complete at least 12 units per semester. Hence, to meet the first-year milestones, students need to complete 24 units by the end of the first year, maintain a 2.0 GPA, and complete remedial courses with a C or better. For the second-year milestones, students need to complete 48 units, maintain a 2.0 GPA, and select a major by the end of their sophomore year.
supplement academic preparation but also connect students to campus. Engaged students are believe to be more likely to stay and complete their education.

Using our survey data, we examine the campus’s approach to developmental courses; course availability and enrollment challenges; student services and resources; activities and organizations; mentoring and support; and the general campus environment.

5.1.1 Student Preparation and Developmental Education

As a nation we are requiring of this generation more college preparatory and advanced courses than any previous generation in U.S. history (Zusman, 2005). But there is significant variation in the availability of such courses and the quality of students’ preparation. Due to poor high school preparation, many Latina/o students begin their college career behind their peers, and they are thus required to enroll in remedial courses. 19

There is a great deal of variation in remedial instruction. Currently no UC campuses offer remedial courses, and a small number of CSUs offer remedial courses during the summer (Long, 2012, as cited in Chang, 2013). Students who do not complete remediation courses on time are subject to disenrollment and are redirected to community colleges (Chang, 2013). Some studies have found that remedial courses have a positive effect on student preparation and can improve student persistence towards graduation (Bettinger & Long, 2009; Boatman & Long, 2010), while others find the opposite result (Martorell & McFarlin, 2011). For some students remedial courses become a dead-end in their education (Scott-Clayton & Rodriguez, 2012). Not surprisingly, studies have shown that the more remediation students are required to take, the harder it is for them to complete their college education (Charles A. Dana Center et al., 2012). A long sequence of courses is harder for students to complete and tends to decrease students’ persistence. It is critical for students to complete remedial coursework quickly and effectively (Charles A. Dana Center et al., 2012).

At SF State, entering freshmen who are not proficient in math or who are “at risk” in English will need to start the remediation process before their first term. All students are given the opportunity to enroll in a summer refresher course, offered both online and on campus. Upon completion of the summer refresher course students can retake the placement test, which could result in students testing out of remediation. Students who do score below a certain level on the placement test are required to complete remedial courses prior to enrolling in regular math and/or English courses. They have one year to complete remediation before being disenrolled and redirected to a community college, where they must complete remediation before being eligible to enroll again at a CSU campus.

---

19 Students take a placement test to determine whether they are academically prepared for postsecondary education. Depending on their scores, students are required to take remedial courses that teach students what the campus determines to be the necessary skills to complete the gateway courses in English and math.
The overwhelming majority (66%) of SF State’s Latina/o first-time freshman were required to enroll in remedial courses for English and/or math. Most students completed their remediation in one year, but the completion rates decreased with increased need for remediation (Figure 5.1)—94% of Latina/o freshmen who required only English remediation and 85% of those who required remediation only in math completed their remediation in one year, as compared to 54% of Latina/o students who were required to enroll in both English and math remediation. After one year, 21% of Latino students were still required to complete some remediation.

Figures 5.2 and 5.3 show first- and second-year milestones for a cross section of the students in our sample that needed remediation when they started at SF State as compared to those who did not need remediation. Students who needed remediation, particularly students who needed remediation in more than one subject area, were more likely to fall behind than their counterparts. While 80% of Latinas/os who did not need remediation completed the first-year milestones, only 10% of students who needed remediation in both English and math completed the first-year milestones. They remained behind in the second year—37% of Latina/o students who needed both English and math remediation completed the second year milestones. Less than half (48%) completed 48 units two years after starting at SF State. For students who needed remediation in only one subject, either math or English, math remediation appears to have had a longer-lasting effect on students than English remediation (Figure 5.3). Only about half (52%) of the students who needed math remediation completed the second year milestones, compared to 86% of Latina/o students who enrolled in English remediation only. For many students math becomes the gatekeeper to student success (Fike & Fike, 2012).

Although Latina/o students who responded to this study completed English remediation for the most part successfully and did not persistently fall behind, some students may struggle with advanced English courses in the junior or senior year, when courses require a higher level of academic literacy and writing. In a future study we will look at the completion of English requirements to explore the effect of advanced academic literacy on student performance.

5.1.2. Course Availability and Enrollment Management

Course availability, campus policies about course registration, and impactions can make it hard for students to get into classes and complete their degree. A consequence of budget cuts and reductions in hiring, the dwindling availability of courses is a serious problem. New student enrollment continues to increase, but faculty hiring has not kept pace. This has resulted in significant competition for few classes offered; increased student-teacher ratios; unpredictable

---

20 For Latinas/os in our sample at SF State, 37% required both math and English remediation, 9% required English only, 20% required math only, and 34% required no remediation.

21 Campus impaction (otherwise known as campus-wide impaction) means that a campus has exhausted existing enrollment capacity in terms of the instructional resources and physical capacity of the campus. Because the campus receives more eligible applicants during the initial admission application filing period than can be accommodated, the campus must therefore restrict enrollment at the campus for a specific enrollment category (e.g., first-time freshmen or transfers). Major impaction means that the number of applications from fully eligible students to a designated major during the initial filing period far exceeds the number of spaces available in that major. The majors then impose additional requirements for admission. For a list of impacted majors and the rules about impact on each major at SF State go to http://www.sfsu.edu/future/apply/impacted.html.
schedules; and increases in the number of efforts by faculty to designate the majors in their departments as impacted so as to restrict the number of students who can enroll in their course offerings. The following statements reflect the situation in the College of Science and Engineering, where many majors have been declared formally impacted.

I have a couple friends who are biology majors. One of them actually ended up dropping out from campus because he was just so frustrated. They’re so impacted, the programs. So getting in classes, it’s crazy, so he had to go back to City College.

I feel like for some reason, the fear of graduating on time, sometimes it just feels like a joke because you know, it’s not going to happen, especially when you’re in an impacted major. You have to take all these classes and you just can’t get through. I am a junior right now . . . well I’m a sophomore officially but I’m third year at San Francisco State. And I’m barely taking Introductory Biology, when biology is my major. And that’s how it is for mostly everyone because if you were not lucky enough to know that you need to take it when you’re a freshman, when you’re a sophomore, it’s impossible to take it because all these people have priority. There’s a wait list, there’s so much and . . . no, I tried for two semesters and I didn’t get in . . . So I was in between what am I going to do so . . . I’m going to end up taking no science classes this semester because I can’t get into any of the classes.

Our survey further corroborates these experiences (Figure 5.4). Twenty-three percent of Latinos and 30% of Latinas say they wanted to pursue a major, but were not able to because the major was impacted. Students are expected to select their major by their sophomore year—36% of Latina/o sophomores responded that they were not able to get into a major because it was impacted (Figure 5.5). But this is also an issue for freshmen, juniors, and seniors—among Latinas/os, a third of the freshmen, 28% of the juniors, and 21% of the seniors could not declare their desired major because it was impacted.

In addition to difficulty in gaining access to particular majors, students reported difficulty in gaining access to classes in their major because they were full or canceled. Fifty percent of Latina/o students responded that they were not able to get into a class in their major or minor because the class was full at least once per semester, and a third were not able to get into a class at least once per semester because the class was canceled (Figure 5.6). This becomes even more of an issue for students as they progress in their degree—Figure 5.7 shows that the following percentages of Latina/o respondents were not able to get into a class in their major/minor at least once per semester because the class was full: 35% of freshmen, 64% of sophomores; 56% of juniors, and almost half of seniors. It appears that limited class availability, and work schedules, force students to take classes at night, when student services are closed (Figure 5.6). For example, 29% of Latina/o students are taking evening classes every semester. Thus, reduced class access appears not only to be delaying time to graduation and students’ debt by extending the number of semesters tuition must be paid, but it also limits students’ access to campus resources that could improve their academic performance, social support, and financial aid (e.g., tutoring, counseling, and student services).
5.1.3 The Campus Experience

Students who are engaged academically, socially, and personally in their university are more likely to maintain a high GPA and persist towards graduation (Arbona & Nora; 2007; Tinto, 1993; Yazedjian et al., 2009). For Latina/o students, there is evidence that engagement in out-of-class activities improves outcomes (Nora, 1987; Otero et al., 2007). Others, however, have found a negative effect of student involvement in certain social activities on GPA and/or graduation rates (Baker, 2008; Cole, 2008; Museus, Nichos, & Lambert, 2008). For example, at a selective four-year institution, Baker (2008) found that Latinos who participate in political organizations during their first year have a higher GPA in their second year than their counterparts, while students who participate in co-ethnic groups or intramural sports have a lower GPA by their sophomore year. The paper, however, did not control for campus environment. The following quote, however, explains the positive effect of cultural programs on SF State Latina/o students’ sense of belonging:

*Having cultural events, like I know sometimes in front of the student center . . . and they bring in Mayan music. So just exposing our cultures and all the different cultures, to make a statement like, “hey we are here, we should be valued and appreciated, because we’re part of this community.”*

5.1.3.1 Campus Activities and Organizations

In the SF Student Pulse Survey for fall of 2013 (SF Student Pulse Survey, 2013) 31.5% of students (29.5% of Latinos/as) were involved in some extracurricular activity at SF State. But we do not know what specific types of activities they are participating in. In our survey, 27% of Latina/o students said they participated in seminars, conferences, and workshops every semester; 17% participated in cultural events on campus; 20% participated in social events such as dances and gatherings; and 14% went to campus athletic games or sponsored events every semester (Figure 5.8).

Certain critical activities have been identified as high-impact activities: conducting research with faculty members, study abroad, and community service learning. Latina/o students reported participating in high-impact academic activities on campus at similarly low rates as other students. Similar to other students, only 4% of Latina/o students participated in study abroad programs and 9% worked with faculty members at least once per semester (Figure 5.9). Latina/o students were more engaged in community service learning (CSL) than other activities; 38% of Latino students have engaged in CSL at some point while at SF State.

---

22 They define extracurricular activities as campus recreation, student organizations, student government, residential life, and fraternity/sorority.

23 Service learning is a method of teaching that combines classroom instruction with meaningful community service. This form of learning emphasizes critical thinking and personal reflection while encouraging a heightened sense of community, civic engagement, and personal responsibility.
In addition to participating in activities, finding a Latina/o community on campus has been found to serve as a protective force that better enables students to cope with the college environment, to feel they belong, and to thus increase their desire to remain (Hernandez, 2000). As shown in Figure 5.10, 37% of Latinos became members of a student organization (only 7% joined a fraternity or sorority, the same percentage as Asians and Whites). With the help of Mario Flores, Director of Project Connect, and the Latinos Unidos Coalition, new Latina/o fraternities, sororities, and professional organizations are being created on campus to facilitate increased student engagement.

5.1.3.2 Student Services and Resources

Some student services are utilized more than others by SF State students. For example, 30% of Latina/o students used Student Health Services at least once per semester and 22% visited the Student Involvement and Career Center (Figure 5.11). Those who used the student services were generally satisfied with the service they received. In our focus groups students were very satisfied with Student Health Services. Below are some examples of comments about services on campus.

I would use CARP (Campus Academic Resource Program) for my papers over there. They’re really good. You bring in your draft and they really sit down and point things out. And it’s great that it’s our sessions, you know, because sometimes in thirty minutes, you don’t get much done. But in an hour, I felt like, “okay this is really great.”

The health center. And they helped me right away. So that was convenient. I didn’t have to wait very long either. I feel like they’re equipped to handle me.

I enjoy the library. I was doing a research paper the other day, and I really, really liked it. It was just books forever. I love books. I love reading, and I walked into the library. I had never been on the third floor before, and I walked in there, and it was like, “oh my goodness this is amazing” because there’s books on every subject there. And I thought it was really cool. I will definitely be using it more often.

As we mentioned in prior chapters, there is evidence that Latina/o students are less likely than students of other ethnic groups to seek help and are more likely to rely on friends and family members for support. Consistent with these findings, Figure 5.12 shows that most students failed to seek tutoring when they felt dissatisfied with their academic performance. However, Latinas/os were more likely to meet with a tutor than Asian or White students. The low percentage of students seeking tutoring or advising even when they were dissatisfied with their academic performance may be a reflection of their reduced confidence to perform well (i.e., self-efficacy). Figure 5.13 shows students’ level of confidence in their academic performance: 38% of Latinas/os reported that at least once per semester they felt dissatisfied with their academic performance, 28% felt that other students had more of an advantage, and 13% felt unable to meet SF State’s standards at least once per semester. Nonetheless, there appear to be some models at
SF State that are successful in building bridges to student services for Latina/o students, and thus increasing their confidence/self-efficacy. Below is an example of a course connected to the Transfer Articulation Bridge (TAB) program to help students from San Francisco City College and Skyline College learn about resources on campus:

*I took the TAB class, which is a transfer articulation bridge class taught by Paul Mendez. That was my first point of connection with this university. From there—that class is amazing. He talks about financial aid, scholarships, major, minors. It’s kind of like an introductory course to “this is what State is going to be like.” Being exposed to that and building those connections from there really took me a long way.*

5.1.3.3 Mentoring and Support

The relationships students develop on campus also contribute to student retention. Individuals who support students, such as role models, mentors, parents, and peers, contribute in meaningful ways to Latina/o students’ persistence (Arana et al., 2011; Arellano & Padilla, 1996). Formal mentoring experiences, such as students working with professors, are positively correlated with better grades for Latinas/os in college (Bordes, Sand, Arredondo, Robinson-Kurpius, & Rayle, 2006; Fisher, 2007). Figure 5.14 shows student engagement with staff and faculty on campus. Half (51%) of Latina/o students agreed with the statement that a staff member had taken an interest in their professional, academic, and personal development, and 62% of Latinas/os agreed with the statement that a faculty member had taken an interest in their development. Moreover, 62% of Latina/o students think that faculty believed in their potential. However, 23% of Latinas/os disagreed with the statement that faculty had taken an interest in their development, 10% do not feel that faculty believe in their potential and 28% neither agree nor disagree. Thus despite reports of high interest among staff and faculty in student development, more time may need to be spent directly with students, or a greater awareness of what these students find helpful may be needed. For example, students may not have access to staff and faculty who signal a sense of belonging and authentic belief in their potential due to low numbers of Latinas/os in these roles at SF State. In fact, Latina/o students have a preference for mentors who share their cultural background, as explained in the following quotes from focus groups that were part of this study:

*I didn’t want to be biased, but I did want to choose a mentor that I could identify with, so my mentor is from Tijuana. And basically our relationship is based on culture identity and trying to find and conserve my roots. So basically our meetings go upon trying to figure where I come from, what values I have lived upon and how to maybe pick out what I really want from them and what I really believed in from them. So my mentor and I discuss about . . . we basically tried to have our meetings in Spanish just in order for me to try to keep connecting with myself and keep using my language . . . having those older people who are really connected, or have found a connection within themselves and in their roots it’s really helpful.*
Well when I... I keep going back to this internship. But the process in which they select you, because it’s really tough to get it. They accept only ten students. And out of those ten students, they ask you to pick three mentors. So I picked two other amazing scientists and I picked just because she was a Latina and she was the only Latina that I saw... And yeah, I did pick her for those reasons, but I always seek finding something that I could have in common with my mentors... she’s helped me before, you know. I understand that culture of family comes first and just because the Latino culture. And I feel that’s really nice to have someone that understands that part. Or whenever I have some issue with my dad that doesn’t understand what I’m doing or he would get mad because I would spend a lot of time in the lab, she would understand that because she knows that Latino parents are a little bit different. She would understand all these things that go on at home, that no other teacher, I think, would understand or no other mentor would understand. So that’s nice to have.

5.1.3.4 Non-Academic Support and Learning Communities

Being successful in postsecondary education requires more than the ability to satisfactorily complete college-level courses. For many students, especially Latina/o students who are the first in their families to go to college, they need to learn to navigate a new bureaucratic, social, and cultural system (Menchur Karp, 2011). They need non-academic support to enhance their learning, note-taking, test-taking, paper writing, and time management and get the “know-how” to succeed in college (Menchur Karp, 2011).

Research studies emphasize the importance of programs, such as learning communities, in providing academic and non-academic resources for students and improving their campus experience (Menchur Karp, 2011). These programs offer courses to enhance students’ basic skills, offer activities intended to acclimate students to the university, and provide a space for high levels of peer interaction and faculty student engagement in and outside the classroom (Schnell & Doekott, 2002; Schrader & Brown, 2008). Menchur Karp (2011) describes four mechanisms that appear to encourage students’ success:

- Helping students create social relations with professors, staff, and peers that make students feel they belong in higher education and that provide information and resources.
- Enhancing students’ commitment and clarifying their aspirations to make their goals more achievable.
- Enhancing skills and college know-how, so they are better able to navigate the system.
- Making college life possible by helping students stay in college.

But for the models to succeed with the Latina/o population, they cannot follow a compensatory approach which tries to “fix” or assimilate Latina/o students into the majority culture (Hernandez, 2000; Padilla, Treviño, Gonzalez, & Treviño, 1997). For learning communities to promote success for Latina/o students they must validate the Latina/o experience and provide a relevant curriculum and activities to increase their sense of belonging on campus. There are
several examples of successful learning community at San Francisco State—The Metro Academies, Transfer Articulation Bridge Program (TAB), and the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)—and at CSU-East Bay, GANAS. These programs work to build students’ learning skills, as well as provide non-academic support to students. In our sample, one of every four Latina/o students and one of every three African American students participated in learning communities during their first year (Figure 5.15). Below is a description of the impact of the Metro Academies:

I was part of this organization on campus called Metro . . . And at the time, I didn’t know what to major in and I was completely lost and it was refreshing . . . It was having that community and going to the same class with the same people and we would get together and have study groups, and most of us were minorities. We all struggling . . . And even though I graduated from Metro already, I still keep in contact with those people . . . And I think having that support of knowing that there’s someone that you can call or contact if you just are lost—it was really important.

I think being part of the Metro program was really something that we would keep talking about it over and over. It was all these classes and we would talk about racial discrimination and all of these issues. And I guess for some reason, talking about it really helps and just seeing it, but really realizing that something is changing along the way. And I feel, because I’ve been surrounded by minorities all the time, it doesn’t feel like I’m an outsider or anything like that. However, yeah, when I do go to science classes and there aren’t a lot of minorities or things like that, it’s still a little bit threatening, but because you know that you have that support and you know that there’s . . . you have your brothers, sisters, whatever, you don’t feel alone I guess.

I get help from the Metro program, and I guess that’s been really nice because when I don’t know what I’m doing I can always go ask someone there, and they always know where to direct me and what to do. And that’s been really, really helpful . . . It’s just like someone always there that you can ask for anything—like for academic support or when it comes to picking your classes, and they can help you with that. And they helped us with that in the beginning of the year. That was really nice because I looked at the book of all the classes, and I was so overwhelmed. I was like I don’t know where to start.

Figure 5.16 tries to capture effects of learning communities on student outcomes by looking at the first- and second-year milestones. During the first year, students who participated in learning communities were less likely to meet first-year milestones, consistent with the fact that students in these programs are often less academically prepared; 30% of Latina/o students who participated in a learning community completed the first-year milestones as compared to 51% of Latina/o students who did not participate in a learning community (a 21 percentage point
difference). However, student outcomes improved significantly in the second year: 48% of Latina/o students who participated in a learning community completed the second-year milestones (up from 30% the first year). The gap between those who participated (48%) and those who didn’t (58%) also narrowed in the second year.

5.1.3.5 Academic Offering and Content

Students also need to see their experiences validated on campus to increase their sense of belonging, and thus their academic success. They need to see themselves represented in the faculty and staff, and they need to learn about themselves in the curriculum. There were a number of student responses in the focus groups that addressed the importance of learning about the Latina/o experience and how this impacts students’ perceptions at SF State. The College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State is a gem in this respect, but the Latina/o experience needs to be integrated in the curriculum throughout all disciplines. Here is an example of the types of responses we gathered in the focus groups:

*But being here at State and taking Latino [Studies] courses has exposed me to a lot of things. It’s like, “no, I’m not just going to stay quiet,” like I need to voice my opinion, you know, make myself count because nobody else is going to. So I think that has been a major component of the classes here, you know, the fact that we have this building and we have the Latino [Studies] department and Black Studies, you know, Asian American [Studies] and all those. So I think that’s great.*

*I think it’s a very empowering that we’re the only college with a College of Ethnic Studies. That’s empowering in itself. I’ve looked for Latino studies at so many CSUs, and this is the only one. This is the best one that I could find because the rest are Chicano/Chicana studies specifically. That’s very supportive.*

Latina/o students are everywhere on campus. They need to learn about themselves in the curriculum throughout the campus. Figure 5.17 shows undergraduate students’ choice of college. Latina/o students concentrate in three colleges: the College of Liberal and Creative Arts (27%), the College of Health and Social Science (29%) and the College of Science and Engineering (22%). The remaining 22% were in the College of Business (12%), Interdisciplinary Studies (8%), Ethnic Studies (2%), and Education (1%).

As far as majors (Figure 5.18), the top five majors for Latina/o students are: biology, criminal justice, sociology, psychology, and health education. One in ten Latina/o students have not declared a major, a proportion higher than Asian and White non-Hispanics. To determine whether Latina/o students’ experience varies across disciplines we would have to examine completion rates for Latina/o students in different majors. There are currently no data available to conduct this analysis.

---

24 The first year milestones include completing 24 units, maintaining a 2.0 GPA, and completing remediation.
25 Many students double major or minor in Ethnic Studies, but these calculations only capture the “primary” major and exclude the second major and minor.
26 7.1% of Latino students are biology majors. The table on top 20 majors breaks out biology by concentration. They are parsed out into biology (concentration in physiology), biology (concentration in CMB), and biology (i.e., general biology). The concentrations are all part of the biology major.
5.2 Retention and Graduation

5.2.1 First and Second Year Retention

Student retention, graduation rates, and time-to-degree have been improving at SF State, and the gaps in performance between racial and ethnic groups have been declining. For example, in examining one-year and two-year continuation rates for first-time freshman (Figures 5.19 and 5.20, respectively) we observe significant improvements in outcomes, particularly for Latina/o students. For Chicanas/os and Mexican Americans, 69% of the 2007 cohort remained at SF State for a second year, and this number increased to 77% for the 2012 cohort.

Next, we examined the completion of milestones for the average Latina/o student in our sample and we found that only 44% of Latina/o students completed their first-year milestones and 57% completed the second-year milestones (Figure 5.21). This is significantly less than White students: 69% and 68% of whom completed the first- and second-year milestones, respectively. With so many Latinos/as having to complete remediation, the first year is challenging for many of them. But there is significant improvement by the second year. Figure 5.22 examines GPA and units completed, and illustrates that the greater challenge for Latina/o students in attaining milestones is the lower number of units they are completing, not the GPA. Over 80% of Latinas/os who responded to our survey maintained a GPA above 2.0, but only 65% of them completed 48 units by their second year. Meanwhile, 79% of White students and 74% of Asian students earned 48 units by their second year.

Latina/o transfer students do well at SF State, and the outcomes for them are also improving. More transfer students are continuing to a second year at SF State—88% of Chicanos/Mexican Americans and 84% of Other Latinos (Figure 5.23). In fact, student outcomes are very similar across all racial and ethnic groups for transfer students. There is no statistically significant difference across racial and ethnic groups with respect to GPA and units completed in the first and third years after entering SF State (Figure 5.24).

5.2.2 Graduation

Finally, we examined graduation rates and found significant improvement in graduation rates between the 2005 cohort and the 2009 cohort of students at SF State, but graduation rates still remained notably low. Four-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen are improving, particularly for Chicano/Mexican American students they increased by 60%, from 10% to 16% (Figure 5.25). However, four-year graduation rates are very low at SF State. Only one 15% of Chicano/Mexican Americans and 16% of Other Latinos who started on the campus in 2009 graduated in four years. Even the six-year graduation rates are generally low—32% of Chicano/Mexican American and 40% of Other Latinos graduated in six years (Figure 5.26). These graduation rates are lower than the average for the CSU: on average 44.6% of Latina/o students in the 2008 cohort graduate in 6 years (Campaign for College Opportunity, 2013).
Transfer students also experienced an increase in graduation rates. Two-year graduation rates improved for Chicanos/Mexican American and Other Latinos, from 26% for the cohort who started in 2007 to 36% for the cohort that started in 2011 (Figure 5.27). These graduation rates are better than the average for the CSU: 22.9% of Latina/o transfers graduate two years after transferring to the CSU (Campaign for College Opportunity, 2013). Four-year graduation rates did not increase as much as the two-year graduation rates, but by the 2009 cohort, 71% of Chicano/Mexican American and 74% of other Latinos graduated within four years of enrolling at the campus (Figure 5.28). The average four-year graduation rate for Latinas/os at the CSU was 62.9% for the 2008 cohort (Campaign for College Opportunity, 2013). There is no gap between Latina/o transfer students and other students in terms of graduation rates, as is also the case for many other outcomes.

5.3 Implications for Higher Education

Our survey and focus groups point to institutional challenges in the areas of enrollment, remediation, and student service provision that may have an impact on Latina/o student retention at SF State.

Remediation is a particular challenge for students who need to remediate in multiple subjects and students who remediate in math. At SF State students are assigned to remedial coursework based on the score of a single high-stakes standardized test. There are, however, some questions about the predictive validity of these tests and whether students could have passed gateway math and English courses even when obtaining a low score on the test (Scott-Clayton, 2012). Moreover, although the test is so important for student placement, students are often “unaware of their importance and consequently do not take the time to prepare or apply the necessary focus the exam demands” (Charles A. Dana Center et al., 2012, p. 4). Scholars suggest that campuses use multiple measures to place students in gateway courses and that the priority be to get students into college-level courses. The tests and the courses also focus on a narrow set of skills that may have little relation to the student’s preferred area of study. For example, college algebra may not be needed for nursing or photography, while is critical for economics and engineering. Likewise, English writing and reading skills may vary by discipline, but we use a one-size-fit-all for remedial education. Scholars are also testing different approaches to remediation; some promising approaches are integrating remedial instruction within college-level courses, so students are not delayed from starting their area of study (Jenkins & Cho, 2012).

There are serious enrollment barriers at SF State. Courses are being rationed, and students are suffering the consequences. Unfortunately, many students may decide to leave SF State if they are unable to pursue their intended major due to impactions and class rationing. Moreover, time to graduation will not decrease unless students are able to access the classes they need for graduation. Most of the complaints we heard from students were in the science fields, but cancellation of classes and long waiting lists are prevalent throughout campus. It is critical that more faculty be hired, and it is our recommendation that a majority of these faculty show evidence of being able to effectively work with Latina/o students.
Students are relating to peers, staff, and faculty, but they are not engaged on campus. It is clear that in spite of the many demands on their time, faculty is succeeding in making most students feel they can succeed. But some students are falling behind. For Latina/o students to succeed, they need a culturally relevant educational environment. This means that they need more time to engage with faculty who care about their academic success and have time to adequately support them. They need to participate in meaningful research and other high impact academic activities, student organizations as well as have access to “safe zones.” These safe zones are necessary for building community, engaging with peers, and receiving mentoring and support that is critical for academic success (Cerezo et al., 2013).

Student services need to be better integrated into the classroom environment. While university personnel state that students are provided with great resources, our survey finds that student fail to use them. Learning communities, like the Transfer Articulation Bridge (TAB) and Metro Academies are successful because they bring university resources to the classroom. Students do not need to “sink or swim” and are able to develop relationships of trust with university staff and instructors.

We also advocate for the purposeful use of the “Equity Scorecard.” This process, pioneered by researchers at the University of Southern California, forms “evidence teams” of engaged individuals from across the campus. These teams work together to address institutional barriers, policies or practices that contribute to inequitable educational outcomes. Teams identify gaps in student outcomes, as well as evidence-based institutional practices to reduce the gaps. In this way a precise, data-driven strategy to create institutional change for greater equity for underrepresented students and faculty can be developed.
Figure 5.1. Remediation completion rates—single subject and multiple subjects

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: We worked only with students who were first-time freshmen; 292 observations had missing remediation data, 103 had missing information about completed English remediation, and 121 had missing information about completed math remediation. There is no statistically significant difference between the three groups in the completion of math remediation. Figure 2.12 shows the proportion of students who needed remediation: 37% of Latina/o students and 24% of Asians needed remediation in multiple subjects.

Note: These figures were calculated using student records for the sample of students who responded to our survey. We had students’ placement test results and observed course-taking patterns to determine whether a student completed with a grade of C or better the required remediation series within the first year. There are two studies of remediation completed by the AIR office. They are available at http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/20124remediation%20file%20summary_demos.pdf and https://sites7.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/Remediation%20Study.pdf.

- About 20% of Latinas/os and 16% of Asians did not complete the required remediation in their first year at SF State.
- The biggest disadvantage is among students who needed remediation in multiple subjects: 46% of Latinas/os and 40% of Asians did not complete them within the first year.
Figure 5.2. Completion of first- and second-year milestones based on remediation status—multiple-subject remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed Both Math and English Remediation</th>
<th>Did not need Remediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Milestones Y1</td>
<td>Completed Milestone YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed units in YR1</td>
<td>Completed 24 units in YR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Milestones Y1</td>
<td>Completed Milestone YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed units in YR1</td>
<td>Completed 24 units in YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Milestones Y1</td>
<td>Completed Milestone YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed units in YR1</td>
<td>Completed 48 units in YR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Milestones Y1</td>
<td>Completed Milestone YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed units in YR1</td>
<td>Completed 48 units in YR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: The difference between White and Asian students is not statistically significant in most categories.

Note: Over a third of Latina/o students (35%) needed remediation in both English and math; 23% of Asian students and 10% of Whites needed remediation in both subjects.

- There is significant variation in the educational progress of students who needed remediation in both English and math and students who did not need remediation.

- Students who did not need remediation generally completed first- and second-year milestones successfully: over 90% completed 24 units in year 1 and over 78% completed 48 units in year 2.

- Latinas/os are below Asian and White students in almost all outcomes.

- Students who need remediation in multiple subjects are at a serious educational disadvantage, particularly Latina/o students. Only 10% of Latina/o students who needed remediation in multiple subjects completed the first-year milestones. Only about a third of them completed 24 units in the first year and less than 50% completed 48 units in the second year.
Figure 5.3. Completion of first- and second-year milestones based on remediation status—single-subject remediation

- Math remediation appears to have a more deleterious effect on students than does English remediation during the first two years at SF State.

- Only about half of the students who needed math remediation completed the second year milestones, except for Whites, of whom 61% of the students who needed math remediation completed the second year milestones.

- For the most part English remediation affects the first-year milestones. By the second year most students have completed their milestones: 81% of Asians who needed English remediation completed the second-year milestones, as did 71% of Latinas/os and 65% of White students.

- For students who needed English remediation, their milestones approach those of students with no need for remediation by the second year.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Students of color are significantly more affected by impaction than White students on campus. Only 15% of White males and 21% of White females were not able to pursue a major because of impaction.

The group suffering most from impaction appears to be African Americans: 39% of African American men and 29% of African American women say they have not been able to pursue a major because the major was impacted.

For Latinas/os, 23% of Latinos and 30% of Latinas say they could not pursue a major because the major was impacted.

All the top six majors for Latina/o students (see Figure 5.18)—criminal justice, sociology, psychology, health education, kinesiology, and biology—are impacted majors.
Figure 5.5. Survey responses to “Did you want to pursue a particular major, but were not able to because it was impacted?” (by student level)

- Impaction is an issue for students at all levels, particularly in the sophomore year, when students are choosing a major. Forty-six percent of Asian sophomores and 36% of Latina/o and White sophomores in our sample responded that they were not able to pursue a major because the major was impacted.

- Impaction affects students of color more than White students on campus at all levels. For example, while over 30% of Asian and Latina/o freshmen have been affected, 22% of White freshman were affected.

- Impaction persists as a problem for students in their junior and senior years: 28% of Latina/o and 29% of Asian juniors were not able to declare a major because it was impacted. And even in the senior year, 30% of Asians and 21% of Latinas/os were not able to pursue a major because it was impacted.
Figure 5.6. Percentages of students who reported that at least once per semester they had not been able to get into a class in their major/minor because the class was full or not offered/cancelled, or they were taking classes at a time when campus services were closed.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: Female students of every ethnicity are having a harder time getting into classes in their major/minor every semester because classes are full: 63% of Asian females, 53% of Latinas, and 48% of White females are not able to get into a class for their major/minor because the class was full.

- Impaction is a problem in terms of being able to pursue a particular degree, but students are also struggling to get into required courses for the major/minor every semester.

- At least once per semester, over half of the students on campus were unable to get into a required course for their major/minor because the class was full: 61% of Asians, 50% of Latinas/os, and 47% of White students.

- Moreover, 34% of Asians, 32% of Latinos, and 28% of White students are not able to get into a class in their major because the class was cancelled.

- A significant number of students are having to take courses at times when campus services are closed: 29% of Latinas/os, 25% of Whites, and 23% of Asian students took classes at night.
Figure 5.7. Percentages of students who said that at least once per semester they had not been able to get into a class in their major/minor because the class was full (by student level)

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: The percentage of students who said that at least once per semester they have not been able to get into a class in their major because the class was full was 61% for Asians, 50% for Latinos, and 47% for White students.

• The problems students are confronting getting into classes is an issue throughout their tenure at SF State.

• Even at the level of freshmen, when students are acculturating to the campus and deciding majors, over a third of White and Latino freshmen and 46% of Asian students were not able to get in a class for their major/minor because the class was full.

• Sophomores in general confront the biggest problems. And again, students have to decide their majors by the sophomore year, but over 60% of sophomores are struggling to get into classes for their major/minor every semester.

• For junior and seniors, over half are struggling to get into required courses every semester, affecting their chances of graduating in four years.
There is also limited student engagement in campus-wide activities.

Latinas/os are one of the most engaged groups of students on campus every semester: 17% participate in cultural events each semester, 20% participate in campus social events, and 14% attend sports events. Although this data is encouraging, the vast majority of Latinas/os are not engaged in campus activities.

On the other hand, Asian students tend to be the least engaged in campus activities: 12% participate in cultural events, 11% percent participate in social events, and 9% participate in sports and athletic events every semester.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 5.9. Participation in high-impact academic activities on campus

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: There are no statistically significant differences across racial and ethnic groups in any of these outcomes.

- Less than 10% of Latina/o students are engaged in research with a faculty member every semester.
- The overwhelming majority of students at SF State have never worked with a faculty member in research while at SF State—close to 70% of all undergraduates.
- Very few students participate in study abroad. Only about 5% of undergraduate students in our sample participated in study abroad.
- More students participate in community service learning (CSL) at SF State than other academic activities on campus: 38% of Latinas/os, 35% of Asians, and 28% of White students in the sample participated in CSL.
- They are also going to seminars and academic events on campus -- 27% of Latina/o students participate in seminars and conferences every semester.
There is significantly more participation by SF State undergraduate students in student organizations other than in fraternities and sororities, although the number of Latina/o fraternities and sororities is increasing on campus.

Over a third (37%) of Asian, Latina/o, and White students became a member of a student organization while at SF State.

Far fewer students become members of fraternities or sororities. Only about 7% of SF State students who responded to our survey were members of a fraternity or a sorority during their enrollment at the university.
Figure 5.11. Use of student services

- One of every five Latina/o students and one in four Asian students visited the Career Center at least once per semester.

- Almost one in three Latina/o students visited the Health Care Center on campus at least once per semester.

- Relatively few students visited the Counseling and Psychological Center at least once per semester.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Although there are significant differences in outcomes and levels of confidence, there is no significant statistical difference between groups in whether they seek advice from an advisor when they are feeling they are not doing well.

In fact Asians, who have some of the lowest levels of confidence, were the least likely to seek the support of an academic advisor. One of every five Asian students never sought the advice of an academic advisor even though they felt they were not performing well. This is the case for one of every six Latinas/os.

However a slightly higher proportion of Latinas/os sought tutoring when they felt they were not doing well: 20% sought the help of a tutor when they felt they were not satisfied with their performance once a semester. But the majority (51%) of Latina/o students did not visit a tutor even when they were not doing well.
Asian and Latina/o students are less satisfied with their academic performance at SF State than White students: 41% of Asian students and 38% of Latinas/os were dissatisfied with their academic performance once per semester, as compared to 30% of White students. Also, fewer are confident about their performance. Only 12% of Asians and Latinas/os have never felt dissatisfied with academic performance, as compared to 18% of Whites.

Even if dissatisfied with their academic performance, fewer students are not meeting university standards. Close to half of Asian and Latina/o students on campus have never been unable to meet university’s standards. Only 14% of Asian and 13% of Latinas/os reported that they feel unable to meet San Francisco state standards once per semester.

Asian and Latina/o students feel more at a disadvantage as compared to other students than White students—30% of Asian and 38% of Latinas/os feel other students had more of an advantage than them at least once per semester. Only about a third of them have never felt disadvantage as compared to other students, while over half of White students have never felt disadvantage.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Most students agreed with the statement “At least one faculty member has taken an interest in my development.” This is especially true for White and Latina/o students.

Moreover, most students agreed with the statement “Faculty members believe in my potential to succeed academically.” This is especially true for White and Latina/o students. One in 10 Latina/o students disagreed that faculty believed in their potential to succeed.

Latinas/os appeared to be getting more support from staff: 51% of Latina/o students agreed with the statement “At least one staff (e.g., financial advisor) member has taken an interest in my development (academic, professional, and/or personal),” compared to 47% of Asian students and 42% of White students.
Figure 5.15. Participation in learning communities, first-year students

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: In the Student Life Survey we asked undergraduate students whether they participated in learning communities or student success program such as Metro Academies, Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Step to College, Guardian Scholars, Reentry Student Program, or others. The highest proportion of students indicated they participated in EOP.

- One of every four Latina/o students in our sample participated in a learning community during their first year at SF State.

- A third of African American students interviewed participated in a learning community during their first year at SF State.

- One of every six Asian undergraduate students we interviewed participated in a learning community during their first year at SF State.

- Only 5% of White non-Hispanic students participated in a learning community in their first year at SF State.
Figure 5.16. Completion of first- and second-year milestones for students in learning communities

Note: The difference in milestones between Asian students who participated in learning communities and those who did not was not statistically significant. The same was true for Whites. The difference was statistically significant for Latinas/os.

- For Latina/o students there was a significant difference between the educational progress of students who participated in learning communities and those who did not, particularly in the first year after entering SF State. This is to be expected since students who join these programs were more disadvantaged.

- There is a difference of 21 percentage points between Latina/o students who participated in learning communities and those who did not in terms of first-year milestone completion. By the second-year milestone, the difference was 10 percentage points.

- While only 30% of the Latinas/os who participated in a learning community completed the milestones in their first year, 48% completed the second-year milestone.

- But even Latinas/os who did not participate in learning communities in the first year made less progress on average than Whites and Asians. Only about half of Latina/o students who did not participate in learning community (51%) completed the first-year milestone and 58% completed the second-year milestone.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014 and the administrative data
Figure 5.17. Undergraduate choice of college at SF State

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: These numbers capture the primary major of students. Many students double major or do minors. This figure does not count double majors and minors.

- For all racial and ethnic groups, except for Asian students, the majority of students were in the College of Liberal and Creative Arts or in the College of Health and Social Sciences: 61% of Whites and 56% of Latinas/os were pursuing a major in one of these two colleges.

- The majority (53%) of Asian students were in Science and Engineering (27%) or Business (25%).

- About one in four (22%) Latina/o students on campus (and White non-Hispanics) were enrolled in a major in Science and Engineering.

- Business is an important college for Asian students, but only 12% of Latina/o and White students are pursuing a major in Business.

- Latinas/os have the highest proportion (10%) of students majoring in Ethnic Studies and Interdisciplinary Studies.
### Figure 5.18. Top 20 majors at SF State, 2009 cohort (by race/ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latinos</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>Business Accounting</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Studies BA</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>Psychology BA</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>Kinesiology BS (Exercise &amp; Movement Sciences)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology BA</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Kinesiology BS (Exercise &amp; Movement Sciences)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>Undeclared Interest (Nursing)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology BA</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Broadcast and Electronic Communication Arts BA</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>Biology—Physiology</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education BS</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>Communication Studies BA</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology BS (Exercise &amp; Movement Sciences)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>Sociology BA</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>Business Marketing</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology—Physiology</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>Business Marketing</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>Business Finance</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Interest (Nursing)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Cinema BA</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Health Education BS</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Marketing</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>Liberal Studies BA</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast and Electronic Communication Arts BA</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Drama BA</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science BA</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>English BA (Creative Writing)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies BA</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Political Science BA</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Biology—Cell &amp; Molecular</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Sociology BA</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema BA</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>History BA</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Studies BA</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology—Cell &amp; Molecular</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>English BA (Literature)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>Biology—Microbiology</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Health Education BS</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Liberal Studies BA</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies BA</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Studies BA</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Communication Studies BA</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism BA (Print and Online Journalism)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Biology—Physiology</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Nursing BS</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Accounting</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Undeclared Interest (Nursing)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

- More Latinas/os than students from other racial and ethnic groups in the analysis were undeclared majors: 7.8% of Latinas/os, compared to 4.5% of Asians and 4.4% of Whites. Students whose major remains undeclared for a long period of time typically have lower graduation rates than other students.

- The top five majors for Latina/o students are criminal justice, sociology, psychology, health education, and kinesiology.

- For White non-Hispanics the top five majors are psychology, kinesiology, broadcast and electronic communications, communication studies, and sociology.

- For Asian students the top five declared majors are business accounting, kinesiology, biology, business marketing, and business finance.
**Figure 5.19. First-time full-time freshmen one-year continuation rates**


Note: Continuation rates represent the proportion of a student cohort still enrolled at the same university as undergraduates for a specific year after matriculation.

- On average, continuation rates are increasing for all students at SF State.

- For Chicano/Mexican American first-time freshman, 69% of the cohort who started in 2007 continued into their second year. This increased to 77% of first-time freshmen in 2012.

- Other Latinas/os also increased their continuation rates. While 73% continued into their second year at SF State in 2007, 84% continued to their second year in 2012.

- The highest continuation rate is among Asian and Filipino freshmen—almost 90% of them continued to their second year in 2012.
Two-year continuation rates are also increasing at SF State for all racial and ethnic groups, except for other Latinas/os, who experienced some fluctuations throughout the six years we examined and ended up at a 67% continuation rate.

Chicanos/Mexican Americans increased their two-year continuation rate from 60% of students continuing to their third years in 2006 to 67% in 2011.

Asians and Filipinos had the highest two-year continuation rate of all racial and ethnic groups examined.

Although up from 2006, Whites have the lowest continuation rate for 2011. Only 65% persisted to their third year at SF State.
Figure 5.21. First-time freshmen completion rates for first- and second-year milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>First-Year Milestones</th>
<th>Second-Year Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: We define first-year milestones as completing 24 units, maintaining a GPA of 2.0 or above, and completing remediation. The second-year milestone includes completing 48 units, maintaining a 2.0 GPA, and declaring a major.

Note: The survey data is retrospective for the cross section of students who were enrolled at SF State in the spring of 2014.

- Of all the students who responded to the Student Life Survey, Latinas/os and African Americans had the highest proportion of students who did not complete their first-year milestones.

- Forty-four percent of Latinos and 31% of African Americans who were at SF State in 2014 completed their first-year milestones.

- The majority of Asian (57%) and White students (68%) completed their first-year milestones.

- However, the majority of students of all racial and ethnic groups completed second-year milestones.

- Forty-three percent of Latinas/os and African Americans did not complete the second year milestones.
Figure 5.22. GPA and units completed by first-time freshmen during their first and second years at SF State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completed 24 units</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 1YR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed 48 units</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain 2.0 or</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 1st YR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain a 2.0 or</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better 2nd YR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>math remediation</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English remediation</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: All differences across racial and ethnic groups are statistically significant, except maintaining a 2.0 GPA in the second year. For the most part 95% of students were maintaining a GPA above 2.0 in the second year.

Note: The survey data is retrospective for the cross section of students who were enrolled at SF State in the spring of 2014.

- Most students in our sample maintained a GPA above 2.0 in their first and second years. Eighty-two percent of Latinas/os maintained a GPA above 2.0 in their first year, one of the lowest groups, and 96% in the second year.

- More Latinas/os than Whites and Asians did not complete 24 units in the first year or 48 units in the second year.

- About 20% of Latinas/os did not complete their remediation in the first year in SF State.
For transfer students there is more variation across cohorts in their continuation rates. We speculate that sample sizes are too small for reliable results.

Over the five-year span, between 82% and 89% of Chicano/Mexican American transfer students returned for the second year after transferring to SF State.

Other Latinas/os may have experienced a slight decline in their continuation rates. While 87% of the 2008 transfer cohort returned for their second year at SF State, 84% of the 2012 cohort returned the second year.

Asian and Filipino transfers had the highest first-year continuation rate. Almost 90% of them returned to SF State for the second year.
Figure 5.24. Transfer student milestone completion: GPA and units taken during year 1 and year 3 after entering SF State

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

Note: There are no statistically significant differences across racial and ethnic groups. The only significant difference is on maintaining a GPA above 2.0 on the third year after transferring.

Note: The survey data is retrospective for the cross-section of students who were enrolled at SF State in the spring of 2014.

- Just as for freshmen, transfer students who were at SF State in the spring of 2014 maintained a GPA above 2.0 in their first and third years after transferring to SF State.

- Over 90% of all racial and ethnic groups analyzed maintained a GPA above 2.0 one year and three years after transferring to SF State.

- Transfer students have a more difficult time completing 24 units in the first year after transferring to SF State and completing 72 units within three years after transferring.
Few students at SF State graduate in four years. The highest graduation rate was for Whites and only 23% of them graduated in four years.

One in six Latina/o students graduated in four years.

Only one in ten Filipinos and African Americans graduate in four years.

System-wide data for the cohorts that started in 2008 indicate that the four-year graduation rate for Latinas/os was 10.3%. It was 7.8% for African Americans, 12.2% for Asians, and 23% for White students.
Figure 5.26. Six-year graduation rates for first-time full-time freshman

- Most students at SF State did not graduate six years after starting at SF State.
- Only among Asian students did a majority (57%) graduate within six years of starting at SF State.
- Six-year graduation rates have increased for Chicanos/Mexican Americans, Other Latinos and African Americans at SF State. In the 2002 cohort, 32% of Chicanos/Mexican Americans, 40% of Other Latinos, and 28% of African American students graduated within six years after starting at SF State. Five years later, in the 2007 cohort, 46% of Chicanos/Mexicans, 43% of Other Latinos, and 42% of African Americans graduated within six years of starting at SF State.
- System-wide, the six-year graduation rates were 44.6% for Latinas/os, 53% for Asians, 58.4% for Whites, and 34.7% for African Americans.
Graduation rates two years after transferring to SF State have been increasing over time for all groups.

Most transfer students do not graduate within two years after transfer. The group with the highest graduation rate was Whites: 42% of them graduated two years within transferring to SF State.

Latina/o transfer students graduating two years after transferring increased from 26% for the cohort who transferred in 2007 to 35% for Other Latinas/os and 36% for Chicanos/Mexican Americans for the 2011 cohort.
Four-year graduation rates for transfer students have been increasing for all racial and ethnic groups at SF State.

Most transfer students graduate four years after transferring to SF State. The group with the highest graduation rate was Asians: 75% of the 2009 cohort graduated within four years of transferring to SF State.

Latina/o transfers have similar four-year graduation rates as White non-Hispanics: 74% of White students completed their degree four years after transferring to SF State, as is the case for 74% of Other Latina/o and 71% of Chicano/Mexican American transfer students.

The lowest four-year graduation rate is for African Americans.

Source: Author calculations from AIR Reports on Retention and Graduation at SF State (https://sites7.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.air/files/Graduation%20Retention%202014%20CCC2.pdf).
6 CAMPUS CLIMATE AND MENTAL HEALTH

BY ALISON CEREZO

The focus of this chapter is to examine the experiences of SF State students in relation to the overarching theme of campus racial climate. Data from the student survey as well a series of focus groups are used to examine students’ perceptions of campus diversity, experiences with bias and discrimination on campus, and, finally, students’ sense of belonging at SF State as well as experiences with loneliness and depression. The chapter ends with a discussion on practice and policy recommendations based on the data collected.

6.1 CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

The experiences of students of color in higher education are impacted by a number of factors, one of which is campus climate. Campus racial climate is a concept used to describe the overall racial environment of a university; how members of the campus perceive the overall campus with respect to the treatment and affirmation of different racial groups. Several theoretical models of campus racial climate have been developed in the higher education research literature. Of particular note is the model developed by Hurtado and colleagues, who proposed that campus racial climate is influenced by the (a) historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of groups, (b) numerical representation of diverse people, (c) nature of interactions among diverse groups, and (d) individual perceptions of campus climate.

As noted by Hurtado et al. (1996), “individual perceptions of campus climate” is a key factor in the overall climate of the university. It should be noted that perceptions of campus racial climate might be experienced quite differently amongst certain ethnic and racial groups since these differences are rooted in how the campus has treated particular groups over the years, which transfers to current climate perceptions. In the next section, a snapshot of students’ perceptions of the campus racial climate at SF State is presented using survey data as well as focus group data.

The first section of data explores students’ perceptions of SF State as it relates to the university’s commitment to diversity (Figure 6.1). Most students on campus agreed with the statement “SF State is strongly committed to diversity”—83% of White, 82% of Multiracial, 80% of Latina/o and Asian students, and 72% of African American students. However, one in ten African American students on campus disagreed with the statement “SF State is strongly committed to diversity.” Latinas/os are very supportive of the statement and only 4% disagreed that “SF State is strongly committed to diversity.”

Another important factor in Hurtado et al.’s (1996) model of campus racial climate is the “nature of interactions among diverse groups.” On the one hand is the opportunity to interact with people from other racial and ethnic groups, while on the other hand is whether that has improved people’s ability to interact. In other words, has this opportunity improved how well people are able to interact with those of other backgrounds. Figure 6.2 examines whether students feel “SF
State offers adequate opportunities to learn about other groups and cultures.” All groups, particularly Multiracial and White students agreed with this statement, as did over two thirds of Asian, African American, and Latino/a students. Figure 6.3 displays the results of a related statement, “SF State has improved my ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups.” Latina/os had the highest rate of agreement at 61%, while Multiracial and White students had the lowest rate of agreement. In addition, 13% of African Americans disagreed with the statement. Over 30% of White and Multiracial students neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that “SF State has improved my ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups.” The differences in these results may indicate that students recognize opportunities to learn about diversity but do not take part in activities that would contribute to cross-racial and cross-cultural interactions.

At SF State, the diversity composition of the student body is a major benefit to all students because it facilitates opportunities for cross-racial engagement. Students of color greatly benefit from a racially diverse campus and in fact “come to enjoy cognitive, psychosocial, and interpersonal gains that are useful during and after college” (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). In the focus groups, a Latina/o undergraduate described the benefits of campus racial diversity at SF State:

> And I feel like even us . . . we’re very privileged to be at a very diverse school . . . I think that’s one of the ways that it empowers [us] . . . At least for me, as an undocumented student, I appreciate that.

This student’s perspective demonstrates the benefits of campus diversity with respect to facilitating students’ sense of belonging on campus as students of color. A diverse student body at SF State is critical to students, but more important is that they are able to develop a sense of community as they are able to join student organizations that affirm their identities or as they participate in and witness cultural events that honor cultural diversity on campus. The following quote expresses this sentiment:

> Having cultural events, like I know sometimes in front of the student center . . . and they bring in Mayan music. So, just exposing our cultures and all the different cultures, to make a statement like, “hey, we are here—we should be valued and appreciated, because we’re part of this community.”

It has been documented in the research literature that many students of color form “counterspaces” comprised of supportive peers where they are able to gain validation and critical skills to navigate the campus climate (Cerezo et al., 2013). Counterspaces are physical or social spaces that symbolize opportunities for individuals from historically marginalized communities to receive cultural validation (Yosso et al., 2009)—a key ingredient of a positive campus racial climate.
As discussed by Hurtado et al., the “historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of groups” is an important factor to consider in campus racial climate. SF State has a historical legacy of resistance on issues of race and ethnicity. The Third World Strike of the 1960s closed the campus and was the catalyst for the creation of the College of Ethnic Studies, which launched the movement for ethnic studies in the nation and the world. In the next section, data on students’ experiences with bias and discrimination at SF State is examined.

6.2 Students’ Experience of Bias and Discrimination

The ways students understand their racial experiences on campus can vary and can be influenced by the experience of overt discriminatory acts by faculty, staff, or other students, to covert messages, such as racial microaggressions, which involve “incessant, subtle, yet stunning racial assaults” (Yosso et al., 2009). Racial microaggressions can be psychologically harmful as they often put doubt in a student’s mind about whether she or he belongs in college or whether others perceive the student as having the intellectual and academic capacities to be successful in university.

Overall, survey results suggested key differences between racial and ethnic groups at SF State. Most notably, African American students reported higher incidences of bias and discrimination across the board, while Latinos appeared to be satisfied with the campus environment.

Figure 6.4 illustrates students’ perceptions about the degree of racial tension on campus. The majority of students disagreed with the statement that “SF State has a lot of racial tension,” but it was lowest for African American (50%) and Asian students (56%). One of every six African Americans and one of every ten Asian students agreed with the statement that “SF State has a lot of racial tension.” On the other hand, over two thirds of Latino/a, Multiracial, and White students disagreed with the statement that “SF State has a lot of racial tension.”

Moving away from a general perception of racial tension on campus, students also reported experiences with discrimination and mistreatment by various constituents at SF State, as well as experiences of witnessing discrimination. Figure 6.5 reflects students’ responses to a question about witnessing discrimination on campus. One in eight African American and one in ten Asian students who responded to the survey say they witnessed discrimination on campus at least once per semester. Close to half of African Americans reported witnessing discrimination at least once while at SF State. Among Latina/os, Multiracial, and White students, close a third of them reported being witness to discrimination at least once at SF State.

Figures 6.6 and 6.7 deal with discrimination, mistreatment, or being placed at a disadvantage because of a student’s race and ethnicity. Figure 6.6 shows whether students agree with the statement “I believe that I have been mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of my race or ethnicity.” Twenty percent of African American and 10% of Asian students reported feeling mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of their race or ethnicity. This is corroborated by the responses to the question about how often the student has “Experienced discrimination yourself from a faculty member, including instructors
and teaching assistants” (Figure 6.7). African American students experienced significant discrimination at SF State—10% experienced discrimination from a faculty member at least once per semester; 9% experienced it at least once a year, and 11% experienced it once at SF State. The responses of other students experiencing discrimination from a faculty member at least once while SF State were Asian (19%), Latina/o (18%), and Multiracial (19%).

Figure 6.8 examines discrimination from staff and university personnel, and Figure 6.9 describes students’ experience with discrimination with other students. One in six African American students experienced discrimination from a staff member at least once per year. Twenty-seven percent of African Americans and 20% of Multiracial students experienced discrimination from staff while at SF State. That is the case for only 12% of Latina/o and Asian students.

Students experienced the most discrimination from other students. One in six African American students (16%) reported discrimination from other students as occurring at least once per semester. Nearly half (45%) of African American students reported some incidence of discrimination from other students at SF State. One in four Latino students experienced discrimination from other students on campus.

Focus group data also revealed negative experiences related to race among Latina/o undergraduates. A junior Latino student describes the covert messages he received when enrolled in a Latin American class that was comprised of mostly Latina/o students:

I take a Latin American studies class, and you get this tension between—because the class before us is a mathematics class. And you get kind of a snub . . . they would stay in the class a lot longer . . . but it was kind of like we were “second class.” It was really insulting in certain regards. And there was not a lot of communication between them and us—almost like we spoke different languages, or we were less and they were more—something like that. So it was actually very disrespectful.

Historically, negative perceptions of campus racial climate for students of color have been associated with lower academic achievement and persistence (Hurtado et al., 1996). It is therefore critical that issues rooted in negative perceptions of campus racial climate be addressed to improve the retention and time to graduation rates of students of color at SF State. In the next section, data is examined to understand students’ reporting behaviors of mistreatment related to race and ethnicity.

6.3 Reporting Instances of Bias and Discrimination

The data show significant experience of discrimination at SF State, particularly for African American students and some Asian students. In the next set of tables, data is presented on student reports of (a) their knowledge of campus procedures for reporting incidents of bias (Figure 6.10), and (b) frequency of reporting discriminatory incidents on campus (Figure 6.11). A third or less
of students on campus agreement with the statement “SF State has established procedures for addressing instances of harassment or discrimination.” Only 34% of Latina/o and African American students agreed with the statement that there are procedures to address instances of discrimination on campus, as was also the case for 31% of Asian and 29% of Multiracial and White students on campus. This was then reflected in the percent of students who report cases of discrimination—close to 90% of students say they have never reported an incident of discrimination on campus. Only 6% of African American, 7% of Asian, and 4% of Latina/o students reported acts of discrimination, even though many of them reported witnessing and/or experiencing discrimination on campus.

6.4 Sense of Belonging, Loneliness, and Depression

The research literature supports a well-founded relation between campus racial climate and self-esteem (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003), and a sense of belonging (Nuñez, 2009) among students of color. In a study by Nuñez (2009), the author found that experiencing a hostile campus climate was a stronger predictor of a sense of belonging for Latina/o undergraduates than having a faculty member take an interest in them. Exploring students’ sense of belonging as well as their psychological well-being is an important task since such factors impact students’ academic success.

Figure 6.12 shows students’ sense of how well they “fit” on campus. Only about half of SF State students agreed with the statement “I feel that I really fit on this campus.” Latina/o students had the highest sense of belonging of all students we surveyed—55% of Latina/o students reported experiencing a sense of belonging at SF State, followed most closely by 49% of African American and White students. Over 20% of African American students disagreed with the statement that they “really fit on this campus,” as did 18% of White, 15% of Multiracial, and 13% of Latina/o and Asian students.

Figures 6.13 and 6.14 show student mental health status at SF State. From prior chapters we know that most students are not seeking mental health services on campus (Figure 5.11). In Figures 6.13 and 6.14 we see that most students experienced high rates of loneliness and depression. Close to 80% of students on campus reported feeling lonely at least once while at SF State. The highest rates of loneliness was experienced by Multiracial students. Almost 50% of Multiracial students said they felt lonely on campus at least once per semester, followed most closely by White (44%) and African American (40%) students. Moreover, 45% of Multiracial students reported experiencing depression at least once per semester. And almost one in three White (37%), African American (34%), Asian (32%), and Latina/o (31%) students experienced depression at least once per semester.

Focus groups were carried out in an effort to bring context to students’ experiences of sense of belonging and consequent loneliness and depression. An SF State second-year Latina describes sense of belonging as it relates to gender and race in the sciences:
It’s really easy to get discouraged when you’re in science, especially because you don’t see a lot of Latino scientists. You don’t see a lot of women in science and as you think, “well maybe there’s something wrong with me.”

Although the data presented in this section is brief, it provides a starting point for better understanding students’ sense of belonging as well as a glimpse into their mental health. Further exploring these factors in connection to academic success, retention, and time to degree completion is imperative for providing a more positive and supportive learning environment for all SF State students.

6.5 Recommendations

The goal of this chapter was to review SF State student data as they relate to the overarching theme of campus racial climate. In this preliminary analysis, data were examined in three major areas: (a) perceptions of the university’s commitment to diversity and opportunities for cross-racial interactions, (b) experiences with witnessing and/or experiencing harassment and discrimination in addition to reporting such incidents to campus authorities, and (c) feelings of sense of belonging as well as frequency of bouts of loneliness and depression. In summary, the data suggest that SF State generally provides students with a positive campus climate as it relates to racial and ethnic identity. However, differences in perception of SF State’s climate exist between racial and ethnic groups, with African American students reporting the lowest ratings of confidence in the university’s commitment to diversity as well as the most frequent rates of witnessed and experienced harassment and discrimination. These differences are critical to consider as they hint to the varied needs of students of color, which should be considered in the development and augmentation of campus services.

Two major advantages already present at SF State that contribute to positive campus racial climate are (a) the sheer number of diverse students on campus, which allows for the formation of cultural and advocacy organizations, and (b) the existence of academic departments as well as academic support programs that provide academic and socio-emotional support to students of color at SF State.

Although SF State has attained a number of key factors needed to achieve and maintain a positive campus racial climate, the university has a “ways to go.” As evidenced by the student surveys and focus groups, many students struggle with incidents of bias and discrimination from various constituents, such as other students, faculty, and staff. In the academic realm, about 2 in 10 African American students and 1 in 10 Asian students report feeling mistreated or placed at a disadvantage because of their race or ethnicity. Thus, a substantial proportion of students are left feeling unwelcome or pushed out of the classroom at the hands of SF State faculty—the individuals who are supposed to be contributing to students’ academic and personal growth. Based on these findings, it is imperative that university administrators take seriously the training
of faculty and staff who are able to support the academic and socio-emotional needs of all students, which includes regular, mandatory diversity trainings.

Another important finding was the discrepancy between students’ witnessing or experiencing harassment or discrimination and their frequency of reporting these incidents to campus authorities. University administrators should ensure that students both know about reporting mechanisms available to them and have confidence that these mechanisms are effective at setting meaningful intervention in motion. As a first step, administrators should carry out an assessment of students’ knowledge of campus authorities and supports so that any identified shortcomings may be addressed. Second, administrators should engage in a campus-wide advertising campaign that makes clear that racial bias and discrimination is unacceptable at SF State and that lays out steps students can take when facing such challenges.

The last area of focus in this chapter was students’ sense of belonging as well as the frequency with which they faced loneliness and/or depression. Given the presence of these experiences across all racial and ethnic groups, it is imperative that investments be made in ensuring adequate staff resources to provide counseling services that support students in need as well as to educate the campus to best support students of color. This chapter provided a snapshot of students’ mental health. A useful next step would be to carry out a campus-wide survey to assess students’ mental health needs, so the campus can (1) be prepared to intervene with clinical support when needed and (2) engage the student body in wellness programming that prevents the development of serious mental health issues.
One of every ten African American students disagreed that SF State is strongly committed to diversity as compared to only 4% of Asian students and 4% of Latina/o students. This difference is important to note because it reveals that among the students of color sampled, African American students were two to three times more likely to disagree that SF State is strongly committed to diversity than other students of color.

White non-Hispanics and Multiracial students were the most in agreement with the statement.

Latinos were also very supportive of the statement that SF State is strongly committed to diversity. Only 4% of them disagreed with the statement.

A number of students neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement: 11% to 15% of all students.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.2. Survey responses to “SF State offers students adequate opportunities to learn about other groups and cultures.”

- Multiracial students were most likely to agree that SF State offers students adequate opportunities to learn about other groups and cultures at 79%, followed most closely by White students (71%).

- These findings are interesting to consider since in a related item, Multiracial and White students scored lowest in agreement to the survey item, “my experience at SF State has improved my ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups.”

- Thus, students may recognize opportunities to learn about diversity but not take part in activities that would contribute to cross-racial and cross-cultural interactions.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.3. Survey responses to “My experience at SF State has improved my ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups.”

- Latina/o students have the highest level of agreement (61%) with the statement that SF State has improved their ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups, followed by 60% of African American students and 58% of Asian students.

- However, at the opposite end, African American students were most likely to disagree (13%) that SF State has improved their ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups, compared to only 7% of Latina/o students and 8% of Asian students.

- These differences, especially among African American students, hints at the potential of intragroup differences in students’ experiences with increasing their cross-racial and cross-cultural interaction skills.
Figure 6.4. Survey responses to “SF State has a lot of racial tension.”

- African American students (16%) scored the highest rates of agreement to the perception of “a lot of racial tension at SF State” as compared to 10% of Asian students and much lower scores among Latina/o (6%), White (6%) and Multiracial students (5%).

- Only half (50%) of African American students disagree that SF State has a lot of racial tension as compared to Asian (56%), Latina/o (67%), Multiracial (68%), and White (69%) students.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.5. Survey responses to “Please indicate how often you have witnessed discrimination at San Francisco State.”

- A substantial proportion of students across all racial and ethnic groups in the sample reported witnessing an incident of discrimination at SF State.
- One in 10 African American and Asian students who responded to the survey said they witnessed discrimination on campus at least once per semester.
- About half of African American and Asian students have never been witness to discrimination on campus.
- Even among Latina/os, Multiracial, and White students, close a third of them have been witness to discrimination at least once at SF State.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.6. Survey responses to “I believe that I have been mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of my race or ethnicity.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Refused to respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Life Survey 2014

- Eighty percent of White students disagreed with the statement that they have experienced faculty maltreatment related to race and ethnicity, whereas 69% of Asian students and 63% of African American students disagreed with this statement.

- Almost 20% of African American students report feeling mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of their race or ethnicity.

- African American students scored almost twice as high on experiences of mistreatment by a professor related to race or ethnicity as Asian (10%), Multiracial (9%), Latina/o (7%), and White (6%) students.
Figure 6.7. Survey responses to “Please indicate how often you have experienced discrimination yourself from a faculty member, including instructors and teaching assistants.”

Similar to the prior chart, African American students have experienced significant discrimination at SF State: 10% experienced discrimination from a faculty member at least once per semester, 9% experienced it at least once a year, and 11% have only experienced it once at SF State.

Asian (19%), Latina/o (18%), and Multiracial (19%) students have experienced discrimination at least once while SF State.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.8. Survey responses to “Please indicate how often you have experienced discrimination yourself from staff/personnel, including resident assistant, academic advisor, campus police or custodian/maintenance workers at San Francisco State.”

- African American and Multiracial students reported the highest frequency of discrimination from staff/personnel; 16% of African American and 8% of Multiracial students reported discrimination occurring approximately once a year.

- White and Latina/o students reported the least frequent experience of discrimination from staff/personnel: 90% of White students and 85% of Latina/o students reported never experiencing discrimination from staff/personnel.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
Figure 6.9. Survey responses to “Please indicate how often you have experienced discrimination yourself from other students at San Francisco State.”

- African American students generally reported the highest incidence of discrimination (45%) from other students at SF State as compared to all other student groups sampled.

- One in six African American students (16%) reported incidence of discrimination from other students as occurring at least once per semester. This was over two times more frequent than Asian students (7%) and nearly three times more frequent than Latina/o (6%), Multiracial (6%), and White (6%) students.

- One of every four Latina/o, Multiracial, and White students experience discrimination from other students at least once while at SF State.
Figure 6.10. Survey responses to “SF State has established procedures for addressing instances of harassment or discrimination.”

- Similar rates of disagreement were present between all racial and ethnic groups sampled with respect to the existence of campus procedures to address harassment or discrimination. The range for disagreement was 8% to 9% for all students.

- The greatest range of differences between groups was the rating of *neither agree nor disagree*, with Multiracial students scoring lowest on this survey item at 22% and Asian students scoring highest on this survey item at 36%.

- Thus, about 2 out of 10 Multiracial students and nearly 4 out of 10 of Asian students sampled demonstrated lack of clarity with respect to knowing whether SF State had established procedures for addressing harassment or discrimination on campus.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
The data suggest a discrepancy between the number of students who witnessed and/or experienced harassment or discrimination at SF State as compared to the frequency with which they reported incidences of harassment or discrimination.

Only 6% of African American, 7% of Asian, and 4% of Latina/o students reported acts of discrimination, even though many of them reported witnessing and/or experiencing discrimination on campus.
Figure 6.12. Survey responses to “I feel that I really fit on this campus.”

- Latina/o students had the highest sense of belonging of all students in our sample: 55% of Latina/o students reported experiencing a sense of belonging at SF State, followed most closely by African American students at 49%.

- Latina/o students scored 6% to 10% higher than all other racial and ethnic groups sampled with respect to sense of belonging at SF State.

- On the opposite end of the spectrum, 22% of African American students reported not experiencing a sense of belonging, most closely followed by 18% of White students.

- Forty percent of Asian students reported moderate ratings of sense of belonging (neither agree nor disagree), followed most closely by 34% of Multiracial and 33% of White students.

Source: Student Life Survey 2014
A significant number of students reported feeling lonely. Close to 80% of students on campus felt lonely at least once while at SF State.

The highest rates of loneliness were experienced by Multiracial students. Almost 50% of Multiracial students said they felt lonely on campus at least once per semester, followed most closely by Whites (44%) and African Americans (40%).

The lowest rates of loneliness were experienced by Asian students: 24% indicated they had never experienced loneliness while at SF State, followed by Latina/o students at 23%.
There are significant levels of depression among SF State students. Over two thirds of SF State students who responded to our survey said they had experienced depression while at SF State.

Almost half (45%) of Multiracial students reported experiencing depression at least once per semester. Approximately one in three White (37%), African American (34%), Asian (32%), and Latina/o (31%) students experienced depression at least once per semester.

At 33% African Americans had the highest proportion of students who reported never experiencing depression while at SF State. Asian and Latina/o students had the next highest proportion, 28%.
As the number of Latina/o students on the SF State campus increases, there is a growing need for Latina/o role models and mentors. In this chapter we examine the level of Latina/o representation among the faculty, staff, and administration at San Francisco State University, the consequences of underrepresentation, and recommendations for increasing diversity on campus.

7.1 Latina/o Representation in the SF State Labor Force

Latina/o faculty constitute only 8.7% of tenure track faculty at SF State, with 63 Latina/o faculty members spread thinly and unevenly across five of six colleges (Figure 7.1). Concentrations of Latina/o faculty range from 0% in the College of Business to 23% in the College of Ethnic Studies. If we take the College of Ethnic Studies out of the analysis, the representation of Latina/o faculty drops to a mere 7.7% average across the remaining colleges and units. Latinas/os are also underrepresented among staff and administrators, accounting for 15% of staff and 5% of administrators (Figures 7.2 and 7.3).

The growth in the Latina/o student population is not been match by a comparable increase in Latina/o faculty, staff and administrators. Over the five years studied, while the proportion of Latina/o students at SF State grew by 37%, from 19% in 2008 to 26% in 2012, the number of Latina/o faculty declined on campus. Over the same time period, the proportion of Latina/o staff has increased from 13% in 2009 to 15% in 2012 (Figure 7.2) while the increase in Latina/o administrators moved from 4% in 2009 to only 5% in 2012 (Figure 7.3). The underrepresentation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff is more pronounced at SF State than the CSU system-wide averages.

Recent studies on faculty and leadership in higher education show that the underrepresentation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff is damaging to the educational advancement of Latina/o students. Researchers have studied the multifaceted benefits to increasing the number of Latina/o faculty and administrators, arguing that Latina/o faculty serve as role models for Latina/o college students (Gutierrez, Castaneda, & Katsinas, 2002), play an essential role in increasing academic achievement (Berlak & Moyenda, 2001; Hagedorn, Chi, Cepeda, & McLain, 2007), and assist in recruiting students of color into college (Alger & Carrasco, 1997; Antonio, 2000). A number of studies highlight the vital pedagogical and scholarly innovations of Latina/o faculty that help the academy to be more responsive to changing demographics and to the institution’s own stated tenets of social justice and the goal of preparing all students to live in a multicultural society (Antonio, 2000; García, 2000; Nevarez & Borunda, 2004; Umbach, 2006; Urrieta & Méndez Benavidez, 2007; Cole & Barber, 2003). Latina/o administrators and staff are equally important to Latina/o student success and play a key role as mentors for Latina/o faculty to enter the
administrative pathway (King & Gomez, 2008; Sedlacek & Fuertes, 1993). In the coming years, as a large cohort of administrators move into retirement in California’s institutions of higher education, there will be openings for faculty members to move into administrative positions, but the current underrepresentation of Latina/o faculty and administrators foreshadows a continued lack of representation and growth at all levels in the future. Research shows that having a good representation of Latina/o faculty and administrators is beneficial not only to Latina/o students and students of color but also to the overall student population and institution (Gutierrez et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2009). As the proportion of Latina/o students at SF State continues to grow, so does the need to understand exactly where we stand as an institution in terms of the diversity of our faculty, administration, and staff and our commitment to increase Latina/o representation at all levels.

7.2 Student-to-Faculty Ratios

One of the most striking data points for Latinas/os at SF State is the ratio of students to faculty of the same ethnicity. In 2012, there were 102 Latina/o students for every one Latina/o tenured or tenure-track faculty member, making Latina/o faculty the most underrepresented among all ethnic groups in proportion to students of the same ethnicity. The Latina/o ratio of 102 Latina/o students to one Latina/o faculty (102:1) compares to a ratio of 7:1 for American Indians, 42:1 for African Americans, 50:1 for Asians and 19:1 for Whites (Figure 7.4). In 2009, the ratio of Latina/o students to Latina/o faculty was already the highest of all groups at 73:1, but since 2009 the ratio has seen dramatic growth, rising to 85:1 in 2010, 93:1 in 2011, and reaching 102:1 in 2012. No other group has experienced a significant rise in the student-to-faculty ratio over the same time period.

7.3 Faculty Diversity by College

Another notable data point is the 0% figure, which marks the fact that the College of Business does not have a single Latina/o tenure-track faculty member. The Colleges of Liberal and Creative Arts and Science and Engineering are doing only slightly better, with 8% and 6% Latina/o faculty, respectively. The College of Health and Social Sciences and the School of Education have 13% and 16% Latina/o faculty. The only college to approximate parity with the proportion of Latina/o students at SF State is the College of Ethnic Studies, with 23% Latina/o faculty (Figure 7.5).

7.4 Ratio of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty to Lecturers/Temporary Faculty

The faculty data thus far has counted only tenured or tenure-track (T/TT) faculty. When widening the analysis to include all faculty at SF State, including lecturers, we find that Latina/o
faculty have the lowest rate of T/TT faculty of all groups, with only 37% of Latina/o faculty being tenured or tenure-track. The 37% figure for Latinas/os compares to 41% for African American, 42% for Whites, and 61% for American Indians.

Since 2009, Latina/o tenured or tenure-track faculty have suffered a steady decline in percentage, from 53% in 2009, to 47% in 2010, 44% in 2011, and 37% in 2012 (Figure 7.6).

7.5 DIVERSIFYING THE CAMPUS LEADERSHIP

We believe that one of the most important priorities of our campus in the near future is to increase the representation of Latinas/os, at all levels throughout campus, but especially at the levels of tenure-track faculty. We lay out an emblematic target of a Latina/o student-faculty ratio that matches the total student-faculty ratio of 37:1. To reach this target, SF State would have to hire 113 additional Latina/o faculty members.

One of the common themes in the literature on faculty and leadership in higher education is a call for precise measures and tangible strategies when striving to reach a more equitable level of representation among Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff. Even when there is agreement to push for change, it is still challenging to come to agreement about what constitutes the best strategies and practices for promoting diversity and equity. Institutions across California and across the country have launched an array of equity initiatives, some of which hold great potential for diversifying campus leadership and increasing the representation of Latina/o faculty, staff, and administrators. Here I will highlight how Latina/o representation in the higher education workforce could be increased through equity and diversity initiatives such as the Equity Scorecard process, Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) status, and formal institutional recognition of diversity goals.

In the thick of a crisis with Ethnic Studies at CSU Long Beach, CSU Chancellor White suggested that units should not automatically value what they have been asked to measure but rather “measure what you value.” One of the scholars that best models the idea of measuring what you value is Estela Bensimon through the process and data tool she calls the “Equity Scorecard.” Bensimon describes the Equity Scorecard as a process designed to solve the problem of inequitable educational outcomes by forming “evidence teams” of engaged individuals from different departments and divisions on a campus. Evidence team members become experts on what their campus is doing and what it could do better to improve the success of students from underrepresented groups. The process involves what Bensimon refers to as “a cycle of action inquiry, which includes: the identification of racial and ethnic gaps in educational outcomes, inquiry into instructional and academic support practices, purposeful changes in practices and policies based on the results of systematic inquiry, and evaluation of the implemented changes.” (Bensimon & Malcolm, 2012, p. 18) Bensimon advocates for a precise, data-driven strategy to create institutional change with greater equity for underrepresented students and faculty.

We could use the Equity Scorecard process or a similarly specific process to gather precise data about Latina/o underrepresentation in the SF State workforce, to identify intervention points in
hiring, retention, and promotion processes, and to create actionable objectives and effective measures to evaluate results.

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) developed a similar set of recommendations to promote racial and ethnic diversity in college faculty. The AFT process also begins with an in-depth, data-driven look at what is happening on the diversity front on a campus. Once the data is systematically collected and analyzed, the AFT recommends that the faculty union initiate a discussion with all union members and campus leaders to create a plan of action that includes the incorporation of diversity activities and goals into the collective bargaining contract. (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

A number of studies refer to the need to create “institutional agents.” Bensimon & Dowd (2012) warn that “institutional agents don’t just happen by accident—an institution must create them.” Ricardo Stanton-Salazar developed the sociological concept of the institutional agent defined as “individuals who possess resources—both intellectual and social—and use those resources on behalf of students. They belong to multiple social networks, hold a position of authority, and use their substantial human, social, and cultural capital to advocate and provide resources for historically underrepresented students” (Stanton-Salazar, 2010).

Many actual and potential institutional agents are employed at SF State, but their potential is dampened by the lack of a specifically stated and sanctioned institutional goal to increase Latina/o representation of faculty, staff, and administration. Some campuses have recognized through official channels the need to increase the diversity of their labor force, and the goal of hiring more Latinas/os is made more tangible as a result. For example, the Academic Senate at CSU East Bay has articulated an institutional goal of greater diversity and has developed a rubric for assessing how well departments, units, and committees are doing in terms of faculty diversity. They define faculty diversity as “variation within a faculty population of such characteristics as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, cultural background, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic class.” Their rubric identifies three elements as central to building and maintaining a diverse faculty: (1) Recruit and retain excellent faculty that reflects the institution’s student body and community; (2) Ensure fairness for all in hiring and promotion processes that remain aware of underrepresented minorities and women in the candidate pools; and (3) Maintain awareness that a diverse campus community enriches the educational and scholarly environment by bringing varied interests, experiences, and perspectives to the teaching, learning, and creative activities that constitute the core mission of the institution (CSUEB Diversity Rubric, 2014). A department’s five-year plan, for example, will be rated as “exemplary,” “adequate/developing,” or “absent” in reference to how the plan integrates diversity. The rubric offers one example of how a specific institutional commitment to diversity might be operationalized and implemented in the decentralized everyday operations of an institution. At SF State, we would like to see faculty Hiring, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (HRTP) committees adopt mechanisms similar to the diversity rubric developed at CSUEB to promote faculty diversity in a systematic way. We’d like to see similar mechanisms integrated in the hiring processes for staff and administrators.

One of the challenges we’ve experienced at SF State is a lack of accessibility to systematically
collected data and accurate gauges of diversity and representation. A related challenge is finding the time and energy to devote to a systematic and evaluative analysis of diversity on top of the demands of our workload as faculty and staff. Given these challenges, we feel that a genuine commitment to diversity at the institutional level requires that support and resources be earmarked specifically for the activities involved in building and maintaining a more diverse workforce at SF State. It is a challenge to fund changes that promote diversity, but there are examples of campuses that have increased allocations of institutional support for diversity through organized initiatives, including Diablo Valley Community College through their Equity Score Card Process, and CSU Long Beach through the interconnected programs and initiatives of their HSI Development Grant. Now that SF State has a student body that is more than 25% Latina/o, we would like to apply for an HSI Development Grant the moment our institution becomes eligible. We would like to become a model for other emerging HSIs to exemplify best practices that truly better serve Latinas/os and other underserved populations.

Based on the particular configuration of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff on the SF State campus, and on the work of Bensimon, Stanton-Salazar, and others who promote the creation of institutional agents and diversity, we make the following recommendations:

1. Create an administrative position and/or office that will be accountable for the systematic collection of data on Latina/o faculty, administrators, and staff at SF State;
2. Systematically gauge and assess where Latinas/os are underrepresented;
3. Fold into the recruitment and hiring process accurate gauges of a prospective faculty or staff member’s experience teaching and working with Latina/o students so that this valuable experience is counted as one of the candidate’s qualifications;
4. Allocate administrative support to focus on the pursuit of a Title V HSI Institutional Development Grant and other HSI-related funding opportunities at SF State;
5. Develop and implement the systematic use of mechanisms to promote workforce diversity such as a Diversity Rubric to assess efforts in hiring committees and program reviews;
6. Reward and highlight faculty and administrators who act as institutional agents; provide release time and compensation for this activity;
7. Channel institutional agents onto search committees;
8. Articulate a clear institutional commitment to diversity, and revise our mission and strategic plan to reflect our commitment to mirroring the diversity of our student body and community in our campus labor force;
9. Create and/or strengthen proactive partnerships with coalition partners to educate the public about the value of diversity of faculty, administrators, and staff;
10. Educate hiring committees about the institutional diversity mission and plan, and establish protocols for the search and hiring process and mechanisms of enforcement, with the goal of reaching parity with the student body and community.
Figure 7.1. Number of SF State tenured and tenure-track faculty (by race/ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author calculations from the HR Summary to Dean, 2013

Note: The total number of faculty is the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty with known ethnicity. We excluded 51 (7%) of the 778 faculty members whose ethnicity was not identified in 2012; 51 (6%) of 793 in 2011; 47 (6%) of 811 in 2010; and 45 (5%) of 871 faculty members in 2009.

- Latina/o faculty constitutes 8.7% of tenure-track faculty at SF State.
- Over the last four years the number of Latina/o faculty dropped, from 69 to 63.
- Latinas/os comprise 8.7% of faculty and 26% of the student body.
- The number of Latina/o students is growing while the number of Latina/o faculty remains stagnant.
Figure 7.2. Ethnic distribution of SF State staff

Source: Author’s calculations using the HR Summary to Dean, 2013

Note: These are the percentages for the staff members with known ethnicity. We excluded 130 staff members (8%) of the 1542 staff members whose ethnicity was not identified in 2012.

- Latinas/os represent 15% of the staff at SF State
- Over the four years studied, the proportion of Latina/o staff members grew by two percentage points, from 13% to 15%.
Figure 7.3. Ethnic distribution of SF State administrators

Source: Author calculations using the HR Summary to Dean, 2013

Note: These are the percentages for the administrators with known ethnicity. We excluded 6 administrators (4%) of the 137 administrators whose ethnicity was not identified in 2012.

- Latinas/os are severely underrepresented in administration, with a 5% share of administrative positions.

- From 2011 to 2012, the proportion of Latina/o administrators declined by 29% (two percentage points).

- One in 20 administrators is Latina/o while one in four students is Latina/o.
Figure 7.4. Ratio of students to tenured/tenure-track faculty of same ethnicity

- There are 102 Latina/o students for every one Latina/o tenured or tenure-track faculty member.
- Latina/o faculty is the most underrepresented among all ethnic groups in proportion to students of the same ethnicity.
- The imbalance of Latina/o students to Latina/o faculty is increasing rapidly, growing from 73:1 in 2009 to 102:1 in 2012.
- No other group has experienced a significant rise in the student-to-faculty ratio over the same time period.
- The 102:1 Latina/o student-to-faculty ratio compares to an overall student-to-faculty ratio at SF State of 37:1.
Figure 7.5. Ethnic distribution of tenured/tenure-track faculty (by college)

![Ethnic distribution chart]

Source: Author calculations from the HR Summary to Dean, 2013

Note: These are the percentages for tenured/tenure-track faculty with known ethnicity. We excluded 45 faculty members (7%) of the 778 faculty members in 2009 whose ethnicity was not identified in 2012. There were 114 faculty members in the College of Business, 281 faculty members in the College of Liberal and Creative Arts, 54 in the College of Education, 43 in the College of Ethnic Studies, 113 in the College of Health and Social Sciences, and 156 in the College of Science and Engineering.

- Representation of Latina/o faculty ranges widely across the colleges, from 0% in the College of Business to 23% in the College of Ethnic Studies.

- Ten of the 63 Latina/o faculty members are concentrated in the College of Ethnic Studies.

- Excluding the College of Ethnic Studies, the proportion of Latina/o faculty at SF State drops to 7.7%.

- Latinas/os are most severely underrepresented in the three largest colleges: Business with 0%, Science and Engineering with 6%, and Liberal and Creative Arts with 8%. 
Figure 7.6. Percentage of SF State tenured/tenure-track faculty (by race/ethnicity)

![Graph showing percentage of total faculty who is tenured/tenure track from 2009 to 2012 by race/ethnicity.]

Source: Author calculations using the HR Summary to Dean, 2013

Note: The percentage of tenure-track is the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty over the total number of faculty members (temporary lecturers plus tenured/tenure track).

- Latina/o faculty has the lowest rate of T/TT faculty of all groups, with 37% of Latina/o faculty being tenured or tenure-track.

- The percentage of Latina/o faculty that is tenured or tenure-track has steadily declined from 53% in 2009 to 37% in 2012.
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10 Appendix A: Student Life Survey and Student Focus Groups

Funding from the San Francisco Foundation, awarded to Belinda I. Reyes, Principal Investigator, supported this research. Data presented in this report were collected through multiple avenues including student surveys, focus group discussions, student academic data from the institution, and data trends from institutional reports.

10.1 Survey

Participants for the survey were recruited through flyers, class announcements, and emails. All undergraduate students at SF State who began no earlier than fall 2007 were sent an email describing the study and were provided a link to the online survey. The students were informed that the purpose of the study was to improve programs at SF State and create opportunities for all students. The survey included questions about their experiences with campus programs, activities and services; challenges getting into classes; the level of mentoring and support they were receiving; diversity and issues of discrimination on campus; and college affordability. The majority of the questions were standard questions used in past SF State surveys, NSSE, and campus climate survey instruments. The students were assured of confidentiality and of the voluntary nature of the study—they could stop the survey at any time or skip any question they did not want to respond to. Weekly reminder emails about the study were also sent to the students for a total of five weeks from March 2014 to May 2014. The online survey was administered through Qualtrics and took about 10 minutes to complete. Students had to be at least 18 years of age to participate in the study. As compensation, students who took the survey were entered into a raffle with the opportunity to win one of forty awards for $25 on their OneCard. OneCard could be used for various services around the campus (e.g., printing, dining). The complete survey and descriptive information can be found in Appendix B. To compare Latina/o students with students from other racial/ethnic backgrounds, a series of chi-square tests (for count/categorical data) and ANOVAs (for continuous data) were employed.

10.2 Academic Data

Students who participated in the survey also gave permission for researchers to access their academic data. The Office of Academic Institutional Research, which distributed the survey, collected the responses and merged survey data with academic records. They then stripped all identifying information (student ID numbers, email address, name, and address) and sent only the raw data file to the researchers. Data was collected on several variables, including units attempted, units completed, grade point average (GPA), and remediation requirement and status.

Researchers used academic data such as GPA and units completed to compute various milestones. Separate milestones were created for students entering SF State as first-time
freshman (FTF) and as transfers. First-time freshmen students were considered as successfully meeting their first year milestone if they met all 3 criteria: (a) completed at least 24 units by the end of their first year, (b) maintained a GPA of 2.0 or above, and (c) satisfied their English and math remediation requirement (either did not need remediation or needed and completed remediation) by the end of their first year. Their second year milestone included (a) completing at least 48 units by the end of their second year, (b) maintaining a GPA of 2.0 or above, and (c) a successful declaration of major. For students who started at SF State as first-time freshmen in our sample only 37 school records were not used due to inconsistencies within the institutional data.

To successfully meet their milestones, transfer students were required to maintain a GPA of 2.0 or above, complete at least 24 units at SF State in their first year and at least 48 units at SF State in their second year. For this subgroup of students, 40 school records were not used due to inconsistencies within the institutional data. The students will be followed for another academic year, and data on retention, units completed, and GPA for that year, as well as other data, will be collected.

10.3 Focus Groups

The focus group discussions were conducted with Latina/o undergraduates at SF State in fall 2014. The focus groups aimed to understand the experiences of Latina/o students, specifically their access to and use of campus services, and their perceptions of campus climate related to their cultural identities. Participation in focus groups was open to undergraduate students who self-identified as Latina/o, were at least 18 years of age, and were enrolled at SF State at the time of data collection. Students were recruited via email announcements to several academic programs and departments as well as via faculty announcements in classes. Students who expressed interest in the focus group were invited to participate in small groups. Three focus groups were conducted, with each group consisting of between two and four students (total of 10 students) who met and discussed their experiences for 60 to 75 minutes. Students varied with respect to gender, age, documentation status, and transfer vs. non-transfer status at SF State, academic major, and use of academic support programs on campus. Each student relied on financial aid to some degree to pay for college and most students worked to help pay for college. Signed informed consent was obtained from all participants before the start of the focus group. Professor Cerezo, an experienced group facilitator, led all the focus groups using a series of predetermined open-ended questions (e.g., how do you perceive the campus with respect to respect and affirmation of students of color, and particularly Latina/o students?) and follow-up questions specific to participant response (e.g., Does having Latina/o faculty and staff at SF State matter to you? How come?). Participants were compensated with $10 gift cards for their time at the end of the group.

Focus groups were audiotaped and transcribed by an outside professional transcription company. Transcriptions were then analyzed by researchers, including graduate student researchers, for thematic statements made by the participants. Student quotes provided in this book have
sometimes been slightly edited for readability by removing filler words such as *you know* and *like*.

The main themes that emerged from the focus groups were (a) financial well-being, (b) experiences with the financial aid office at SFSU, (c) experiences with academic resources at SFSU, (d) academic readiness upon initiating studies at SFSU, (e) sense of belonging on campus as Latina/o students, and (f) relationships with staff and faculty at SF State, including mentoring relationships. At least two researchers independently examined each theme and discussed their findings. Participant quotes that captured student experiences have been interspersed in the report. Focus groups will resume in spring 2015, with interviews with Latina/o students, faculty, and staff.
# Appendix B: Student Life Survey

## 11.1 Comparison of SF State Undergraduate Student Population and Survey Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Data</th>
<th>SFSU Data Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Freshman (FTF)</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Load</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/Arab</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td><strong>2921</strong></td>
<td><strong>26059</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 Campus Climate Survey

Note: The Don't know/Decline to state responses were omitted for the descriptive statistics

Q1. What is your current major?

Q2. How many times have you switched majors?  \( N = 2894, M = 1.37, SD = .54 \)
   - None (1)
   - 1-2 (2)
   - 3 or more (3)
   - Don't know/Decline to state (4)

Q3. Did you want to pursue a particular major, but were not able to because it was impacted?
   - Yes  \( n = 788, \% = 27 \)
   - No  \( n = 2129, \% = 72.9 \)

Q4. Which of the following best describes where you are living while attending SF State?
   - Residence hall or other campus housing  \( n = 477, \% = 16.3 \)
   - At home with parents or relatives  \( n = 1046, \% = 35.8 \)
   - On your own-not with family (i.e. house or apartment)  \( n = 1259, \% = 44.3 \)
   - Public Housing  \( n = 67, \% = 2.3 \)
   - None of the above  \( n = 32, \% = 1.1 \)

   Q4a. If you selected none of the above for your place of residence, where do you live?

Q5 How long is your commute to campus?  \( N = 2856, M = 1.57, SD = .75 \)
   - Less than 30 minutes (1)
   - 30 minutes to one hour (2)
   - More than one hour (3)
   - Don't know/Decline to state (4)

Q6. What is the highest level of education you expect to complete in your lifetime?  \( N = 2660, M = 1.94, SD = .75 \)
   - Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.) (1)
   - Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.) (2)
   - Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.) (3)
   - Don't know/Decline to state (4)
Q7. Describe the highest level of education completed by your parents or caregivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Mother/Female Caregiver (1)</th>
<th>Father/Male Caregiver (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less High School</td>
<td>N = 2729, M = 2.78, SD = 1.25</td>
<td>N = 2627, M = 2.75, SD = 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Decline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. How do you identify in terms of your sexual identity?

- Heterosexual
  - n = 2369, % = 81.1
- Lesbian or Gay
  - n = 139, % = 4.8
- Asexual
  - n = 28, % = 1.0
- Bisexual
  - n = 132, % = 4.5
- Queer
  - n = 55, % = 1.9
- Unsure or questioning
  - n = 69, % = 2.4
- Other
  - n = 78, % = 2.7

Q9. What is your gender?

- Male
  - n = 874, % = 30
- Female
  - n = 1922, % = 66
- Transgender Female to Male
  - n = 6, % = 0.2
- Transgender Male to Female
  - n = 2, % = 0.1
- Other
  - n = 23, % = 0.8
- Decline to state
Q10. When you complete a form that allows you to identify yourself as a member of racial, ethnic, or cultural group, which group or groups do you select? (You can choose more than one group)

- American Indian
  - n = 67,  % = 2.3
- Arab/Middle Eastern/North African
  - n = 86,  % = 2.9
- Black/African-American
  - n = 202,  % = 6.9
- Mexican/Chicano
  - n = 589,  % = 20.2
- Central American
  - n = 142,  % = 4.9
- Other Latino
  - n = 149,  % = 5.1
- Filipino
  - n = 294,  % = 10.1
- Pacific Islander
  - n = 87,  % = 3.0
- East Asian
  - n = 358,  % = 12.3
- South East Asian
  - n = 217,  % = 7.4
- South Asian
  - n = 120,  % = 4.1
- White
  - n = 1010,  % = 34.6
- Decline to state

Q11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement; I feel my high school or community college adequately prepared me to succeed at San Francisco State?

\[ N = 2836, M = 2.28, SD = 1.04 \]

- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)
Q12. Since entering SF State, how often:
   Very Often (several times/semester) – 1
   Often (once/semester) – 2
   Occasionally (once/year) – 3
   Rarely (once @ SF State) – 4
   Never – 5
   Decline to state – 6

| I. Have you participated in seminars, conferences | $N = 2825, M = 3.58, SD = 1.27$ |
| II. Have you participated in cultural events on campus, such as culturally-focused concerts, exhibits or literary events | $N = 2814, M = 4.06, SD = 1.20$ |
| III. Have you participated at social events on campus, such as student dances or gatherings | $N = 2804, M = 4.05, SD = 1.23$ |
| IV. Have you attended campus athletic games or events | $N = 2781, M = 4.33, SD = 1.15$ |
| V. Have you not been able to get into a class you needed for your major/minor because it was full | $N = 2781, M = 2.72, SD = 1.52$ |
| VI. Have you not been able to take a class you needed for your major/minor because it was not offered or cancelled | $N = 2772, M = 3.48, SD = 1.50$ |
| VII. Have you taken classes at times of the day when a campus service office you needed was closed | $N = 2714, M = 3.59, SD = 1.42$ |
Q13. Have you participated in the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a learning community or student success program such as Metro, EOP, Step to College, Guardian Scholars, Re-entry student program or other</td>
<td>$n = 435$,</td>
<td>$n = 2141$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% =16.9</td>
<td>% = 83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in study abroad</td>
<td>$n = 127$,</td>
<td>$n = 2551$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% =4.7</td>
<td>% = 95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Freshmen or Transfer Orientation</td>
<td>$n = 2440$,</td>
<td>$n = 224$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% =91.6</td>
<td>% = 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became a member of a student organization</td>
<td>$n = 985$,</td>
<td>$n = 1669$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% =37.1</td>
<td>% = 62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined a fraternity/sorority</td>
<td>$n = 171$,</td>
<td>$n = 2499$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% = 6.4</td>
<td>% = 93.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14. Since entering SF State, how often have you:

Very Often (several times/semester) – 1
Often (once/semester) – 2
Occasionally (once/year) – 3
Rarely (once @ SF State) – 4
Never – 5
Decline to state – 6

I. Worked with a faculty member on a research project \( N = 2693, M = 4.38, SD = 1.10 \)

II. Met with an academic advisor \( N = 2699, M = 2.90, SD = 1.29 \)

III. Participated in tutoring services \( N = 2688, M = 4.08, SD = 1.29 \)

IV. Received career services at the Student Involvement and Career Center (SICC) \( N = 2684, M = 4.65, SD = 0.81 \)

V. Received Financial Aid advising from a financial aid counselor. \( N = 2684, M = 4.07, SD = 1.25 \)

VI. Used student health services on campus. \( N = 2694, M = 3.54, SD = 1.48 \)

VII. Used services provided by Counseling and Psychological Services. \( N = 2689, M = 4.62, SD = 0.95 \)

VIII. Attended a meeting or event sponsored by a student organization (i.e. professional, career, political, or religious student organization) \( N = 2691, M = 3.79, SD = 1.43 \)

IX. Attended a meeting or event sponsored by a culturally-based student organization (i.e. Asian, Latino, Black, Jewish, Arab, LGBT, etc.) \( N = 2686, M = 4.27, SD = 1.21 \)

X. Engaged in community service-learning \( N = 2652, M = 4.28, SD = 1.21 \)

XI. Taken an ethnic studies course through the College of Ethnic Studies \( N = 2659, M = 4.00, SD = 1.26 \)
Q15. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Strongly Agree – 1
Agree – 2
Neither Agree nor Disagree – 3
Disagree – 4
Strongly Disagree – 5
Don’t know/no response – 6

I. At least one staff (e.g., financial aid advisor) member has taken an interest in my development (academic, professional, and/or personal)  
   \[ N = 2500, M = 2.87, SD = 1.30 \]

II. At least one faculty member has taken an interest in my development (academic, professional, and/or personal)  
   \[ N = 2533, M = 2.48, SD = 1.22 \]

III. Faculty members believe in my potential to succeed academically  
    \[ N = 2481, M = 2.31, SD = 0.96 \]

IV. Students at SF State are friendly  
    \[ N = 2601, M = 2.23, SD = 0.83 \]

V. I feel I really fit in to this campus  
   \[ N = 2566, M = 2.59, SD = 1.02 \]

VI. SF State is strongly committed to diversity  
   \[ N = 2566, M = 2.59, SD = 1.02 \]

VII. SF State accurately reflects the diversity of its student body in publications and marketing materials (e.g., brochures, website)  
    \[ N = 2368, M = 2.22, SD = 0.89 \]

VIII. SF State promotes the appreciation of cultural differences  
    \[ N = 2523, M = 1.89, SD = 0.80 \]

IX. SF State has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity  
    \[ N = 2245, M = 2.51, SD = 0.97 \]

X. SF State has a lot of racial tension  
   \[ N = 2388, M = 3.85, SD = 0.95 \]

XI. SF State has established procedures for addressing instances of harassment or discrimination  
    \[ N = 1848, M = 2.60, SD = 0.89 \]
Q16. Below are statements of opinions about student life at San Francisco State. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following

Strongly Agree – 1
Agree – 2
Neither Agree nor Disagree – 3
Disagree – 4
Strongly Disagree – 5
Don’t know/no response – 6

I. "Incidents of discrimination and prejudice at SF State are caused by a very small number of people and do not reflect the beliefs and attitudes of the majority." $N = 2104, M = 2.13, SD = .89$

II. "My experience at SF State has improved my ability to interact comfortably with people of other racial/ethnic and cultural groups." $N = 2370, M = 2.35, SD = .92$

III. "Students on this campus spend too much time emphasizing their differences with students of other racial or ethnic groups rather than exploring values and goals they have in common." $N = 2186, M = 3.08, SD = 1.00$

IV. "SF State offers students adequate opportunities to learn about other groups and cultures." $N = 2291, M = 1.33, SD = .59$

V. "I believe that I have been mistreated or placed at a disadvantage by a professor because of my race or ethnicity." $N = 2338, M = 4.02, SD = 1.01$
Q17. Imagine that you heard the following statements made by someone on campus. Please indicate to what extent you find the following scenarios offensive.

Extremely Offensive – 1
Somewhat Offensive – 2
Offensive – 3
Not at all Offensive – 4
Don’t know – 5

I. A professor comments that Black students have more difficulty learning than other (i.e., non-Black) students at SF State
   \[ N = 2290, M = 1.82, SD = 0.99 \]

II. An administrator comments that there are too many foreign students on campus
   \[ N = 2310, M = 1.93, SD = 1.02 \]

III. A classmate comments on another group of students who are speaking to each other in their heritage (i.e., non-English) language: "They are in America now--they should speak English."
   \[ N = 2351, M = 1.77, SD = 0.97 \]

IV. A professor states in class: "I wish that all my students would work as hard as Asian students do in completing their class assignments."
   \[ N = 2439, M = 1.70, SD = 0.96 \]

V. A professor comments, "many Latin Americans think it's a good thing to be macho."
   \[ N = 2148, M = 2.29, SD = 1.10 \]
Q18. Please indicate how often you have witnessed or experienced discrimination at San Francisco State.

Very Often (several times/semester) – 1
Often (once/semester) – 2
Occasionally (once/year) – 3
Rarely (once @ SF State) – 4
Never – 5
Decline to state – 6

I. Witnessed discrimination
   \[ N = 2338, \ M = 4.26, \ SD = 1.07 \]

II. Experienced discrimination yourself from other students
    \[ N = 2350, \ M = 4.43, \ SD = 1.01 \]

III. Experienced discrimination yourself from a faculty member, including instructors and teaching assistants
     \[ N = 2340, \ M = 4.68, \ SD = 0.78 \]

IV. Experienced discrimination yourself from staff/personnel, including resident assistant, academic advisor, campus police, and custodians/maintenance workers
    \[ N = 2337, \ M = 4.76, \ SD = 0.71 \]

V. Reported an incident of discrimination to a campus authority
   \[ N = 2335, \ M = 4.92, \ SD = 0.40 \]
Q19. During the past year at San Francisco State, how often did you feel...
Very Often (several times/semester) – 1
Often (once/semester) – 2
Occasionally (once/year) – 3
Rarely (once @ SF State) – 4
Never – 5
Decline to state – 6

I. Depressed?  
   \[N = 2374, M = 3.22, SD = 1.47]\n
II. Lonely?  
   \[N = 2388, M = 3.03, SD = 1.46]\n
III. Dissatisfied with your academic performance?  
   \[N = 2411, M = 3.00, SD = 1.28]\n
IV. Unable to meet SF State academic standards?  
   \[N = 2633, M = 4.15, SD = 1.15]\n
V. That most other students at SF State had more advantages than you?  
   \[N = 2633, M = 3.62, SD = 1.43]\n
Q20. Did you apply for financial aid this academic year?  
○ No, did not apply  
   \[n = 689, \% = 28.1]\n
○ Yes, I did apply  
   \[n = 1765, \% = 71.9]\n
Q20a. Which type of aid did you receive? (mark all that apply)  
○ Pell Grant  
   \[n = 1007, \% = 34.5]\n
○ Cal Grant  
   \[n = 899, \% = 30.8]\n
○ Other grants or scholarships (i.e., awards that do not require repayment)  
   \[n = 408, \% = 14]\n
○ Loans (i.e., federal loans, institutional loans, or loans from private sources like banks)  
   \[n = 947, \% = 32.4]\n
○ Work Study  
   \[n = 273, \% = 9.3]\n
○ Tuition assistance from current or former employer (including Veterans Administration)  
   \[n = 22, \% = 0.8]\n
○ Other, Please Specify: ____________________  
   \[n = 55, \% = 1.9]\n
○ Income too high to receive need-based aid  
   \[n = 132, \% = 4.5]\n
○ Ran out of financial aid  
   \[n = 120, \% = 4.1\]
Q21. Are you working outside the campus while you are attending SF State?
☐ Yes \hspace{1cm} n = 1287, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 52.7
☐ No \hspace{1cm} n = 1157, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 39.6

Q22. How many hours do you work outside of the campus in a typical week?
\[ N = 2446, \hspace{0.5cm} M = 1.29, \hspace{0.5cm} SD = 1.34 \]

☐ I am not working outside of campus. (0)
☐ Eight hours or less per week. (1)
☐ More than 8 hours but less than 20 hours per week. (2)
☐ More than half time but less than 40 hours per week. (3)
☐ Full-time or more per week. (4)

Q23. Do you help support your family while you are in college?
☐ Yes \hspace{1cm} n = 693, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 28.4
☐ No \hspace{1cm} n = 1751, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 71.6

Q24. Since you first enrolled at SF State, have you ever stopped taking classes for one semester or longer?
☐ Yes \hspace{1cm} n = 155, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 6.3
☐ No \hspace{1cm} n = 2298, \hspace{0.5cm} % = 78.7
Q25. If you stopped going to school for a semester or longer, how important were the following factors in your decision to stop taking classes?

Most Important – 1
Very Important – 2
Somewhat Important – 3
Not Important – 4
Decline to State – 5

I. Changed my career plans
   \( n = 128, M = 3.00, SD = 1.08 \)

II. Wasn't doing as well academically as I expected
   \( n = 132, M = 2.96, SD = 1.14 \)

III. Was bored with my coursework
     \( n = 127, M = 3.33, SD = 0.91 \)

IV. Was placed on academic probation
    \( n = 128, M = 3.15, SD = 1.17 \)

V. Had family responsibilities
    \( n = 129, M = 2.30, SD = 1.25 \)

VI. Was tired of being a student
    \( n = 130, M = 3.11, SD = 1.05 \)

VII. Had medical issues
     \( n = 132, M = 2.75, SD = 1.32 \)

VIII. Had a good job offer
      \( n = 126, M = 3.14, SD = 1.09 \)

IX. Had money problems and could no longer afford to attend college
    \( n = 130, M = 2.57, SD = 1.28 \)

X. Could not afford or find adequate housing
    \( n = 129, M = 3.02, SD = 1.17 \)

XI. Had a better offer at another campus or college
    \( n = 128, M = 3.45, SD = 1.03 \)

Q26. Do you have any additional thoughts or comments you would like to share?