MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: Kay Norton, President

SUBJECT: Report on recruiting and supporting diverse students

DATE: March 1, 2013

I am pleased to share with you the report on our enrollment planning team’s research into the question of how UNC must respond to the changing demographics of our nation. The specific question the research addressed was: How can UNC best deliver on its promise to serve a diverse population of students and how might becoming an HSI help UNC deliver on this promise?

The report includes extensive information about what it means to be an HSI, changing demographics, and the results of the team’s qualitative and quantitative research to answer the question above. I believe you will also find of interest the numerous quotes from responding institutions included in the research report. They offer candid insight on some of the day-to-day operational issues associated with seeking HSI status.

Based on the findings of this research, we do not believe it is appropriate for UNC to announce that it is seeking designation as an HSI at this time. Our time and energy are better invested in improving our efforts to recruit and support a diverse student body. Through this work we have developed further insight into specific action steps to move in this direction as a part of our core planning efforts. We will discuss these next steps with the Board at its fall retreat.
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This document describes the work conducted to examine the question “How can UNC best deliver on its promise to serve a diverse population of students and how might becoming an HSI help UNC deliver on this promise?” We begin by discussing UNC’s decision-making process, which is followed by information regarding the demographic imperative for doing this work and an explanation of the Hispanic Serving Institution designation. The remainder of the document describes the process we used to examine the question posed above, including the research methods and questions we deployed, the results of that research and recommendations for next steps.

**Overview of Our Decision-Making Process**

We have entered into a new era in higher education – an era that has less fiscal certainty, more competitors, and increasing demands for accountability of student learning outcomes. Because of this change, our decisions about how to use limited resources have greater import and risk as our operations are now primarily funded by student tuition. In response, we have adjusted the processes we use to assist us in making decisions in order to help us take the most informed course of action.

In this changing environment our decisions about strategic direction are now guided by our strategic framework and our nine core plans (see Appendix A). As we operationalize these core plans, we are engaging in critical thinking about which items to pursue in order to reach our stated goals. This critical thinking is guided by the flow chart in Figure 1 which was presented at the Board of Trustees meeting on November 18, 2011. The process guides us through the steps of 1) determining if the question warrants consideration, 2) identifying the group best suited to address the question’s further exploration 3) identifying the extent to which the question should be explored and, assuming exploration is warranted, 4) gathering and analyzing data, and 5) making recommendations regarding the next course of action.
Certainly not every strategic question that comes before us will undergo such an extensive analysis. This process is intended for questions that are directly related to UNC’s mission and will likely require significant human and financial resources. We agreed that it was important to consider the question of how to better serve a diverse population of students and how the HSI designation might support our efforts.

We are very cognizant that we are in the midst of significant demographic changes that will usher in a new era of diversity in our state and nation. We value and welcome these demographic changes that will lead higher education and UNC into a new era of addressing student access and success. We have been and will continue preparing for the implications of these fundamental changes that are just around the corner. We now turn to a brief discussion about the demographic imperative for change and the Hispanic Serving Institution designation.
Demographic Imperative for Change

Projections based on the 2010 Census suggest that the U.S. population will continue to grow significantly more diverse and older over the next half-century. By 2060, the Latino population, the total population of people who identify as a race or ethnicity other than white, and the 65-and-older population are all expected to more than double, according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s January 2012 projections. The projections show the white non-Hispanic population dropping from 63% to 43% of the total population by 2060, with the U.S. becoming a majority-minority nation for the first time in 2043. In 2056, the population age 65 and over is projected to outnumber the population under age 18 for the first time.

The changing demographics of the nation will be reflected in the college-going population as students become more diverse—in terms of race and ethnicity as well as age. Without question, the most dramatic change we will see in future students is greater racial and ethnic diversity—a shift resulting in part from increasingly diverse high school graduates. From a national perspective, the most recent projections from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) for public high school graduates indicate rapid growth in the Latino population with a commensurate decline in the white non-Hispanic population. To a lesser degree, the projections show the number of Asian/Pacific Islander high school graduates growing as the number of Black non-Hispanic graduates shrinks. The number of American Indian/Alaska Native graduates is projected to remain relatively stable. In the West, significant increases are projected for both Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander graduate numbers while others decline.

1 The federal government, universities and other entities often use Latinos (which include Latinos/Latinas) and Hispanics interchangeably. So we will also use these terms interchangeably based on the source.
Colorado’s public high school graduates will also be more diverse (Figure 2). The WICHE data show students of color accounting for 30% of the state’s public high school graduates in 2008-09, growing to 36% by 2016-17, and remaining at that level for the next decade. However, Colorado is also one of three Western states expected to see noticeable growth in the number of white non-Hispanic graduates by the end of the decade.

*Figure 2—Colorado public high school graduates by race/ethnicity (actual 1996-97 to 2008-09, projected 2009-10 to 2027-28)*

Demographic shifts of this nature expose disparities in and create a strain on existing services and resources as these systems were originally designed to serve majority populations. Without an intentional systemic and systematic transformation, demographic shifts, like those described above, could result in increasing numbers of individuals being underserved or denied access to services and

---

resources to be successful in college. Colleges and universities face this challenge as they set intentions to meet the needs and desires of emerging populations and must insure that one’s demography does not equal one’s destiny (Engel & O’Brien, 2007).

Coupled with these demographic changes is the need to address disparities among prospective college students. In 2009 in Colorado, almost 20% of the 50,000 students who graduated from public high schools were Latino, but just under half of these students went to college. Varying income levels and K-12 educational opportunities contribute to such disparities. For example, in 2011 in Colorado, 8th grade composite math and reading scores measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress were 263 for both Hispanic students and Black non-Hispanic students, 290 for white students, and 299 for Asian/Pacific Islander students (Colorado scores for American Indian/Alaska Native students were not published because reporting standards were not met). Further, from 2006 to 2010, the Colorado median income for working-age adults (25-64) was $37,344, but the median was 32% less for Hispanic workers, 29% less for American Indian/Alaska Native workers, and 20% less for Black non-Hispanic workers.

In addition, it is no longer sufficient to think about prospective college students solely in terms of projected numbers of high school graduates. Our future students will also include a significant number of adults who are returning to college or attending for the first time. In fact, the WICHE projections show a national decline in the number of high school graduates for the first time in a decade. In the West, WICHE projects that the number of high school graduates peaked in 2010-11 and will drop to about 6% below the peak over the coming decade and a half. However, Colorado projections do not mirror this trend; the state is expected to have fewer high school graduates in 2013-14, but annual increases are projected for a decade thereafter.

In spite of the shrinking pool of high school graduates, the U.S. Department of Education projects a 15% increase in total enrollment at postsecondary degree-granting institutions from fall
2010 to fall 2021. The growth of students ages 18 to 24 enrolling in college will slow as the number of enrolling students ages 25 and older grows more rapidly, according to the projections. From 2010 to 2021, the number of students enrolling in college who are ages 25 to 34 is expected to increase 20% as the number of students age 35 and older grows 25% (Figure 3). Only a 10% increase in students ages 18 to 24 is expected over the same time, as compared to a 52% increase in this population from 1996 to 2010.

Figure 3—Actual and projected numbers for enrollment in all postsecondary degree-granting institutions, by age group.

---

Overview of the Hispanic Serving Institution Designation

The term Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) is broadly used to refer to institutions where at least 25% of students are Hispanic; however, there is not an “official” list of HSIs. Thus the HSI designation is frequently misunderstood because of the federal and non-federal definitions of the designation. On one hand, universities are labeled by national organizations as emerging HSIs or HSIs simply based on their percentage of Latino students. On the other hand, the federal government awards the designation when universities apply for and meet the criteria of being an HSI based on federal guidelines for HSI grant funding.

Federal HSI Designation

In the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, federal lawmakers recognized two concerning trends: (a) there was an increasing disparity between the numbers of college-going Hispanic students and non-Hispanic white students and (b) Hispanic-serving institutions generally received less state and local funding per student than other higher education institutions. To address these concerns, Congress authorized a grant program targeted specifically at developing Hispanic-serving institutions. The purpose of the program, as currently stated in federal law, is to:

1. expand educational opportunities for, and improve the academic attainment of, Hispanic students; and

2. expand and enhance the academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability of colleges and universities that are educating the majority of Hispanic college students and helping large numbers of Hispanic students and other low-income individuals complete postsecondary degrees.

In keeping with the concerns that prompted the program’s creation, eligibility criteria address both Hispanic student enrollment and institutional financial need. To be eligible to compete for federal HSI funding, an institution must have undergraduate enrollment that is at least 25% Hispanic.
students, must serve a significant number of low-income students, and must spend less per student than similar institutions spend.

The U.S. Department of Education administers the primary grant funding program for developing HSIs, commonly referred to as Title V funding. Total available funds, as well as how funds are divided between new and continuing projects, varies from year to year. For fiscal year 2011, funding for developing HSIs was approximately $104 million, a $13-million reduction from the previous year. Of the $104 million, $49 million was awarded for new projects. In addition, through the Department’s Title III program, $100 million was allocated to continue funding previously awarded multiyear grants to increase the number of Hispanic and low-income students earning degrees in STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) fields. The Department does not plan to consider new grant applications for STEM-related HSI funds until fiscal year 2016.

Although federal law sets the eligibility criteria for institutions to seek HSI funding, the federal government does not have a process for simply designating institutions as HSIs.

**Other Sources of the HSI designation**

There are two nonprofit organizations—Excelencia in Education and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)—that annually publish lists of HSIs and “emerging” HSIs based on data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Both organizations publish lists of HSIs and emerging HSIs on their websites. The lists include accredited 2- and 4-year public and private, nonprofit degree-granting institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico. They identify an institution as an HSI if at least 25% of enrolled undergraduate full-time equivalent students are Hispanic students (this aligns with the enrollment requirement for federal funding eligibility but does not address the financial criteria). Institutions with 15 to 24.9% full-time equivalent students who are Hispanic are identified as emerging HSIs.
For 2011-12, using the *Excelencia* and HACU criteria, there were 356 HSIs nationwide. Two hundred and eighty-six (81.3%) of these institutions are public 2-year institutions, including Aims Community College, Otero Junior College, Pueblo Community College and Trinidad State Junior College. The remaining 70 institutions (19.7%) were 4-year institutions, which included Adams State College, Colorado State University Pueblo and Colorado Heights University. Of the 250 emerging HSIs listed, six were in Colorado and with the exception of Metropolitan State College of Denver and Remington College Colorado Springs Campus, all are 2-year institutions — Community College of Aurora, Community College of Denver, Lamar Community College and Morgan Community College.

In summary, universities are given the HSI or emerging HSI designation by either HACU or *Excelencia* solely based on percentage of Latino students or by the federal government after meeting additional financial need criteria. As with any federal grant funded program, HSI funding through Title V ebbs and flows as a result of the current political context, and obtaining funding must be based on meeting the HSI criteria designation and the grant RFP guidelines when funding cycles are active. Across the country and within Colorado the vast majority of colleges with the non-federal designation of an HSI or emerging HSI are 2-year colleges.

In this next section we describe how we engaged in an in-depth examination of the research question – “How can UNC best deliver on its promise to serve a diverse population of students and how might becoming an HSI help UNC deliver on this promise?”
Research Process

Per our decision-making process described previously, once it was determined that we needed to explore the use of an HSI designation as a tool to enhance student diversity, it became the responsibility of the enrollment planning team\(^5\) to begin a more in-depth examination of the question. The enrollment planning team is charged with working with the campus community to establish UNC’s strategic enrollment principles, set meaningful enrollment targets, create actions steps to realize targets and assess the effectiveness of these efforts.

Methodology Used

Significant university strategic decisions must be informed by analytics – quantitative and qualitative data – that are unbiased and follow rigorous guidelines for conducting empirically based research. Utilizing this process ensures that we address any important strategic topic by holding assumptions or biases we might have in abeyance and approaching the question at hand from an “intellectually clean slate.” Put simply, deploying research to investigate important questions helps us differentiate between perceptions and facts. To do anything else would be to place university resources at risk.

The methodology we used to examine the research question followed the standards used to guide research. We worked over a number of months (Table 1) to thoughtfully review the literature; develop research questions, data collection methodologies and statistical analyses to be used; and make recommendations based on our findings.

---

\(^5\) UNC’s enrollment plan is developed by a team of individuals with direct university-wide responsibility to recruit, enroll and support students. Current membership of the enrollment planning team includes: Linda Black, Dean, Graduate School; Anita Fleming-Rife, Special Assistant to the President for Equity and Diversity; Tobias Guzmán, AVP for Enrollment Management and Student Access; Michelle Quinn (co-chair), CFO and SVP; Gloria Reynolds, Special Assistant to the President, Katrina Rodriguez, AVP for Student Engagement and Dean of Students; Tom Smith, AVP for Undergraduate Studies; Jeanette VanGelder, CIO; Robbyn Wacker (co-chair), Provost and SVP; and Jeanie York, Executive Director for Extended Studies.
Table 1. Research Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Oct – Dec ’11</th>
<th>Jan ’12</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan ’13</th>
<th>Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOT Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed research questions and interview questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established research methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed sampling criteria and selection criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained Internal Review Board Approval to begin data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Grad Student interviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email invitations to participate in study sent to Provosts (3xs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected Qualitative Interview Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected Quantitative Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzed data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed Results and Developed Action Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Written &amp; Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

We identified broad research topics and corresponding research questions to investigate how universities determined to pursue the federal HSI designation. First, we wanted to learn more about macro-level considerations such as the demographic characteristics of HSI institutions and state demographic variables related to our sample universities’ overall planning process and enrollment strategies. We were also interested in learning about the meso-level—university level—decision-making processes and operational questions related to recruitment, student support, funding, academic programming and creating a welcoming climate. Tables 2 through 4 list the questions we used to guide the qualitative and quantitative data collection. Some of the questions listed below (marked with an *) were not answered because the data were not available from secondary sources or from the respondents’ universities.

Table 2. Questions to assess the national demographic context

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Are there HSI institutions among UNC peers that UNC aspires to be like? What are they doing to succeed in serving diverse students and what could we learn from them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>What is the demographic context of HSI institutions? How does regional/national changing demographics factor into the HSI decision? What was the philosophical reason for pursuing HSI – e.g., gain more resources to better support La/o population served by the institution or to attract more La/o?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Are there universities with a high percent of Latino/a students that do not have an HSI designation? If yes, why have they not sought HSI designation and to what do they attribute their success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>How many universities have or are seeking HSI status? Over the last 10 years, has there been an increase or decrease? How long pursuing? What stage? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Given the demographic changes and the efforts being made to increase the number of college ready students, what is the pool of prospective UNC students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>How did other institutions go about meeting the criteria? Did they increase in overall enrollment or did they keep enrollment constant with an increase in Latino/a students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>How do the inputs (e.g., student enrollment characteristics) for other HSI universities differ from our inputs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. University-level Questions

| a. | What are the academic and SES demographics of the students who apply, enroll and graduate to HSIs? Enroll? Graduate? * |
| b. | How did an HSI designation change the mix of academic prepared Latino/a students?* |
| c. | How does becoming an HSI affect overall student perceptions of the institution? How does it relate to the institution’s overall goal of being a welcoming place for a diverse student body? |
| d. | Are there specialized HSI focus areas (e.g., STEM; business, education, health care) that might benefit UNC and focused partnerships we could leverage (e.g., community colleges, school districts?) |
| e. | What recruiting strategies are effective for HSIs? How would recruiting need to change and what resources would it require? Is there a niche population UNC could attract by being an HSI? (e.g., high-achieving Latino/a students who don’t want to go far from home). Are there recruiting opportunities for UNC with specialized “feeder” institutions? (e.g., building bridges to new Denver high schools that target high achieving Latino/a students)? |
| f. | What are the fiscal, infrastructure and staffing implications of the enrollment growth/composition shift required to be an HSI? How would UNC need to adjust its student and academic support services to ensure student success outcomes? |
| g. | How much federal or private grant funding have HSIs received as a result of seeking HSI? What have been historic patterns of federal and private funding? How can they and how do HSIs use the funding? |
| h. | If HSI federal or private funding is reduced, how sustainable would HSI efforts be? Could you sustain your HSI status without federal or private funding? |
| i. | Fiscal implications for expenses (e.g., student support, scholarships, etc.?) |
| j. | What effect did the HSI status have on their net revenue? What was the overall economic effect? |

Table 4. Organizational/Unit level logistical questions

| a. | How do organizations manage the planning and decision processes and implementation of becoming an HSI? Organizationally, who were the key champions of pursing an HSI? |
| b. | What are the steps/processes for institutions that became HSIs and what were the critical elements of their processes? How relevant are they to UNC? |
| c. | What formal and informal process and structures are in place to support being HSIs; and support serving a diverse population of students; |
| d. | Did they intentionally address faculty and staff demographics and cultural competencies needed in supporting student success? |
| e. | Where do UNC’s demographics and organizational structure stand in relation to HSI criteria and support? |
| f. | What are the community characteristics of HSI universities? Diversity? Partnerships? Community characteristics for student success (include capacity for co-curricular partnerships; jobs for students; welcoming environment)? |
Selection of the Sample and Key Informants

We identified 15 institutions that met the following criteria for inclusion in the sample. These institutions were doctoral granting or research intensive institutions of similar size (7,000 to 20,000) to UNC and that had a Latino population of at least 10%. The sample was further distinguished by their consideration or attainment of HSI status (i.e., emerging or designated) using the HACU/Excelencia definition.

The Provosts at all 15 institutions were contacted a minimum of three times to invite their participation in this study. Of the 15 Provosts contacted, seven did not respond to the invitation to participate or to follow-up recruitment emails, four responded but declined to participate, one agreed to participate but did not respond to subsequent attempts to schedule an interview, and three from the original sample participated, yielding a 20% participation rate. Consistent with the snowball sampling technique, a fourth participant was engaged upon the recommendation of another participant, bringing the total number of participants to four, a 25% participation rate.

All participants were initially invited to participate by UNC’s Provost and provided the informed consent and possible interview questions prior to scheduling an interview. Recruitment, selection and training of the graduate assistants commenced in the fall 2012 term. The research team was trained in consensual qualitative research (CQR) as described by Hill, Thompson, and Williams (1997) and later refined by Hill, Knox, Thompson, Williams, Hess, and Ladany (2005). The consensus process is an integral part of the CQR method (Hill et al., 1997) which “relies on mutual respect, equal involvement, and shared power” (p. 523). We sought a common understanding of the data and promoted the right of all research team members to voice differing views. All interviews were conducted by one individual with GRAs present at three of the four sessions. Members of the research team met four times to analyze the interviews and discuss clarifications, disagreements and feelings related to the data. The research team met to review and refine the codes until consensual meaning was derived, overarching themes determined and representative quotations identified.
Results

State and University Demographic Context

As we discussed earlier, state demographics are important context when considering the current and potential pool of diverse college-bound students. To better understand the context in which our respondent universities are operating, we looked at California demographic data because all of our respondents were located at universities in California. According to WICHE data, overall public high school graduation numbers in California are expected to drop precipitously (by 27%) between the years 2008-09 and 2019-20. Hispanic public high school graduates are the only ethnic/race group projected to grow during this timeframe (19%).

In comparison, as described earlier, the number of Colorado public high school graduates peaked in 2010-11 and is expected to decline through 2014. By 2024-25 the numbers are projected to increase by 20% over the 2008 data. In the same time period, the numbers of white non-Hispanic high school graduates will increase only slightly (32,000 to 36,000); and Hispanic high school graduates will increase from 9,400 to 12,300 with a peak of 14,000 in 2019-20. The number of Black high school graduates will also increase (2,600 to 3,500), as will Asian students, from 1,700 to 3,400. The number of Native American high school graduates is projected to range between 400-500 during the same period.

When we examine the racial and ethnic composition within public high school graduates we find that there is a shift projected to occur over the next 10 years. White non-Hispanic graduate percent will drop from 70.1% to 64.2%; over this same period of time, Hispanic students will comprise a greater percent of graduates, growing from 20% to 26% (WICHE, 2013).

In both California and Colorado (Tables 5 and 6), students of color continue to lag behind in the percentage of students graduating from high school who attend college. In Colorado, both Hispanic students and Native American students have the lowest percentage of high school graduates of all
racial and ethnic groups (<50%) attending college. The same pattern holds true in California with the addition of Black high school graduates.

Table 5. College Attendance of Colorado High School Graduates (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
<th>In-State – College Type Public (%/n)</th>
<th>In-State- Any College Type (%/n)</th>
<th>Community College (%/n)</th>
<th>College Anywhere (%/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>56.2% (990)</td>
<td>65.5% (1,153)</td>
<td>12.3% (217)</td>
<td>78.2% (1,377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>40.0% (1,112)</td>
<td>52.6% (1,463)</td>
<td>16.6% (462)</td>
<td>65.8% (1,829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9,899</td>
<td>33.8% (3,341)</td>
<td>43.0% (4,257)</td>
<td>15.8% (1,567)</td>
<td>48.7% (4,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>30.1% (151)</td>
<td>40.0% (201)</td>
<td>12.7% (64)</td>
<td>48.2% (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>34,505</td>
<td>49.2% (16,966)</td>
<td>58.9% (20,334)</td>
<td>14.7% (5,066)</td>
<td>72.8% (25,118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>13.4% (98)</td>
<td>13.8% (101)</td>
<td>11.9% (87)</td>
<td>13.8% (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50,182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. College Attendance of California High School Graduates (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
<th>In-State – College Type Public</th>
<th>In-State-Any College Type</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>College Anywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42,714</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12,624</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>25,987</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>157,094</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>136,234</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>377,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Sample University Demographics

Our respondents’ universities were geographically located in areas (city and county) with high percentages of Hispanics (Table 7). The percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in our sample universities ranged from 20.3% to 30.0% (Table 8). Table 8 shows the rate of growth in Hispanic student enrollment in our respondents’ universities from 2008 to 2012. The data show that growth was incremental and occurred over multiple years. UNC has also had a similar pattern of growth in Latino students.

Table 7. Hispanic Demographics of Respondents’ Communities and States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Community Characteristics (% Hispanic)</th>
<th>Number Hispanic HS Graduates in the State (2009)</th>
<th>% Hispanic HS grads – State (Projected 2014-15)*</th>
<th>State Demographics (% Hispanic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>36% (city) 28.5% (county)</td>
<td>9,899</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>21% (1.0 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - A</td>
<td>40.7% (city) 23.3% (county)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University – B</td>
<td>66.7% (city) 32% (county)</td>
<td>157,094</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>38% (14.0 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - C</td>
<td>36.6% (city) 32% (county)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - D</td>
<td>16.7% (city) 15% (county)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: WICHE (2013); Pew (2013)

Table 8. Rate of Growth in Hispanic Student Enrollment (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent University</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interview Results**

The next section describes the qualitative results of the interviews conducted with university officials regarding their experience with pursuing the HSI federal designation.

*Question 1: What prompted our respondent’s university to seek an HSI designation?*

All participants voiced their institution’s decision to seek the federal HSI designation as being aligned with the institution’s public mission, purpose and promise as well with as their current academic, demographic and strategic realities.

“Well, it was just the right thing to do for [institution’s name]; the numbers were already close, it fit with our mission of promoting diversity in terms of students, faculty and staff.” Institution D

“Well, we had an emerging Hispanic population…We are serving a fairly large Hispanic population, at least as far as, a four year university in [State]… first of all, obviously it’s always just to provide better service.” Institution C

“Our change, I was saying a little bit before your call, our striving towards the Hispanic Serving designation is not so much that we decided that we need a Hispanic Serving designation so let’s get there, but we’re going to this place already, so let’s get recognized for it. Institution C

“Well, we serve… our local region has, um, low-income, first generation college students, and a large mix of the students are Hispanics or Latinos. And, it was only a matter of time before we started to see that we were going to grow in number. … so we needed to look at not only how to, uh, not only recruit them here, but also retain them. And that’s when we started looking at the Hispanic Serving Institution status or designation” Institution B

*Question 2: What were the implications of being an HSI on enrollment diversity, particularly for Latino or Hispanic students? Did the respondent’s university use the process/status to grow enrollment, to increase diversity, or to recruit new students?*

All respondents interviewed noted their universities did not change their recruitment strategies as they pursued an HSI status nor was the pursuit of the HSI designation linked to any enrollment growth or used to recruit Latino students. One or two respondents noted that they had recruitment materials, recruiters and websites in multiple languages as well as staff who were bilingual Spanish (as well as other languages, e.g., Vietnamese, Filipino).
**Question 3: What were the operational considerations identified as critical in support of becoming an HSI?**

**Preparation and Planning**

All participants indicated that preparation and planning were central to their success in seeking an HSI designation. Specifically they noted that their institutions engaged in an evaluation of: (a) current services to student, faculty and staff, (b) demographic representativeness of Hispanic individuals (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) within their institutions, and (c) internal and external perceptions related to becoming an HSI.

(a) Evaluation of Current Services

“…we were going to (get) some level of assessment in terms of what we were currently doing that we thought we were doing well, and what were some of the areas that we thought we needed to improve or work on” Institution B

“…get a very clear diagnosis of your outreach and improvement strategies as far as what’s working and what isn’t…” Institution C

Make sure that if you have a student affairs area, you ask them to do some brainstorming for you too about what services would make the campus more attractive for Hispanic students or to retain, you know, just so all of your areas-like kind of you know how when you do enrollment, they tell you it takes the whole campus to do enrollment and you get everybody together form all these different areas. It’s the same for a process like this.” Institution A

(b) Faculty and Staff Composition

“…Yeah, yeah that’s huge, I mean the students repeatedly talk about how important it is to be able to at least (have) some faculty and staff that they can identify with directly.” Institution D

I think the other the other element we’ve been talking about with other institutions is looking at the representation of faculty and staff in terms of how diverse are we, in general, but in particular, you know how might we more accurately represent the community in which we sit demographically. Institution B
(c) Internal and External Perceptions

“because we , we’re surrounded by a conservative area, in terms of people who may or may not understand what an HSI designation is, it’s not becoming a Hispanic or Latino institution where everyone has to be Latino.” Institution B

“So there was like a cartoon in in the newspaper about us turning the university into a Latino university. And it had like, a little, I can’t remember the cartoon, but it had like two separate fountains, like a Latino fountain.” Institution B

“I think the main negative which we’re trying to figure out how to address is um many people when they hear, well we’re working on you know the HSI designation we hear, well does that mean you don’t care about people from x or y or z ethnicity ... not so much saying you shouldn’t do the HSI I think but more does that mean you’re ignoring us?” Institution C

Campus Involvement

In addition to preparation and planning activities, respondents were clear about the need to involve a number of key individuals from across their campuses. Participants identified the critical nature of involving a broad representation of key individuals and leaders from within the university (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) and one participant’s institution involved community (parents, civic, business and community members). Meaningful and intentional involvement in the design, communication, and execution of the strategic plan encouraged a diversity of perspectives, accuracy and authenticity of the process, continued energy and enthusiasm, and public accountability during all phases of the process. While all participants noted a need for representative voices on working teams, clear lines of leadership and responsibility were necessary.

“in the first phase was we developed what we called an education phase. And that consisted of not only educating our internal campus community but also the external campus community through a variety of presentations, creating of brochures, explaining the designation, the benefits of the designation, and um, what we needed in order to obtain it, and I think it started to sort of facilitate the process for the next phase. And that took a year, um, and the appointment became representatives across the campus, we also recruited people from key areas from the external campus community, and composed that committee… We had two student reps all the way through, first through the third phase.” Institution B
“The co-chair, the acting director of the educational partnerships center which I mentioned, that includes basically faculty, staff, and one student. And the staff range from those providing direct student services, counselors, and the director of the retention services, the director of learning support services, director of ethnic resource center … so a pretty diverse mix of um stake holders.” Institution B

“It becomes a little overwhelming, and they’re like, oh you have to submit this data, so you need a team of folks to look at the technical aspect of the application submittal, but then you need another team that’s gonna become your grant-writing team for the first grant. Because once you’re eligible to apply, then you could, you get a response back right away in terms of your status, so then you’re ready to go in terms of competing for HSI grants. So we did it two-fold for the third phase: apply, receive designation, and then get busy with the grant.” Institution B

“There is a need for high faculty involvement; we have multiple task forces taking place to consider student preparation, curriculum, and retention issues.” Institution B

“Teams of faculty, staff, students, administrators are CRTICAL…must have thinkers, movers and skeptics.” Institution C

“Actually, our vice chancellor, the second in command…published five goals that she wanted to achieve for 2015 and they were tied to retention rates, international students, dependable budgets, which we haven’t quite succeeded on, and achieving the HSI designation…so that really set the tone” Institution C

“making sure that you’ve got the broad groups, you know getting together and working on this that are you cross cutting, you know the faculty, the students who work directly with the students with the staff who work directly with students and indirectly with students and um the students to help start catalyzing and bringing along a campus.” Institution C

A Multiyear Process

Seeking the HSI designation was described by participants as a multiyear, multi-phased process guided by a team of interested and dedicated individuals. The decision to seek or continue to seek the HSI designation was consistently based on the institution’s enrollment percentages relative to the HSI standards (three of the four institutions had ≥ 20% Hispanic enrollment at the initiation of the process); followed closely by the institution’s readiness to serve and retain Hispanic students. One participant noted her institution decided not to pursue the HSI designation (19% Hispanic enrollment) and sought the Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISI) designation.
Participants whose institutions sought an HSI designation articulated that their institutions set short- and long-term goals, established meaningful benchmarks within a timeframe, and consistently communicated their progress at regular intervals. Generally, participants described four phases of this process:

(a) Initiation Phase: a period of evaluation and internal feasibility relative to the HSI requirements which led to a decision/announcement from a president or chancellor to pursue an HSI designation. Accompanying the announcement, requisite resources (personnel, finances, enrollment) within the institution were identified (see the Prominence domain for a full description);

(b) Education Phase: the purpose, intent and goals of HSIs were communicated in a variety of formats (e.g., small groups, website, printed materials and community conversations). This phase continued throughout the process, with formal and informal communications;

(c) Evaluation of Readiness Phase: institutional assessment of current curricula, programs, support services (academic, cultural, linguistic, familial), institutional data and reporting, and financial aid relative to projected need;

(d) Preparation and Submission of HSI application materials.

“There was a whole plan of action in place in terms of getting there. When we became HSI in 2009 we had been working probably 3 years back when we started. And we designed the strategy basically in three phases… in the first phase we developed what we called an education phase… and that took a year; … basically explaining to folks what it is to be a Hispanic Serving Institution, which is basically allowing the opportunity to compete for federal grants that places the institution in a better place financially; it provides research for students, it provides research for faculty, dollars for programmatic initiatives… Then the second semester was crafting a plan of action in terms of, in terms of strategy. ‘You know, how we’re going to educate them?’ we did campus forums, we did, individual presentations at key places in the campus also went outside in the external community, so that took a year.” Institution B

“…the second phase consisted of outreach, recruitment, and retention. …a three-tier, approach… some level of assessment in terms of what we were currently doing that we thought we were doing well, and what were some of the areas that we thought we needed to improve or work on to make it through that phase, and be prepared to apply to the federal government, which that became the third phase. …” Institution B
“Then the third year, we were prepared because we could see the numbers escalate for the strategy that we had implemented. When we became eligible, which is the 25th percent mark, then created a third committee, and this third committee was also another committee that we turned over, and it was mainly ... a lot of faculty that had a lot of research experience, and then folks from key areas, like from the grant-writing support program, ...we had folks from there, and what they looked at is the process of submitting the application, because the application’s pretty thick, it’s a thick document...It becomes a little overwhelming, and they’re like, oh you have to submit this data, so you need a team of folks to look at the technical aspect of the application submittal, but then you need another team that’s gonna become your grant-writing team for the first grant. Because once you’re eligible to apply, then you could, you get a response back right away in terms of your status, so then you’re ready to go in terms of competing for HSI grants. So we did it two-fold for the third phase: apply, receive designation, and then get busy with the grant. Institution B

Academic Considerations

Respondents were also working to address curricular changes they thought were needed.

“...we hired an associate vice president for diversity and inclusion. And he, along with several other people created a strategic plan for the campus and one of the things that we have on there because we’re an HSI, we have academic programs that we’re proposing like Chicano Studies, and also looking at the hiring practices, looking at an increase of faculty of color.” Institution B

“bolstering the kind of academic offerings, ... for example in an inter-department of Latin American Latina studies, that’s analogues to the Spanish for heritage speakers but for students who are not in the major in these fields simply having an offering there provides or makes the overall academic climate more welcoming and supportive so they can you know go back and survive their chemistry homework” Institution C

“...thinking about a survey of the high school students, the community college students, what is it that they want to get out of a four year institution? What program should you be building some that would attract them, attract them to you as a distinct program specifically meeting the needs. You know, here, nursing is one of our huge programs. ... it’s like, seventy percent Filipino. Many many Filipino students want go into nursing. So we know that, that for Filipino students, this is the college of choice for nursing.” Institution A

“We actually, from the one I know off the top of my head is the nursing, that when they created their curriculum, they give I think like 6 points, it’s like a pointing system of sort, I think it’s like 24 points, and when you’re admitted they give credit of 6 points to the students who are bilingual, and can speak Spanish.” Institution B

“I’ve been thinking about is we really need to incorporate bilingual into our front-line service staff. A bilingual (person) will be a plus. To hire people that are bilingual, because we are an HSI, we have a lot of the parents that come with the students and we are always looking for someone that can translate. So I think an investment for us would be to have our quality control reps, is what we call them to be, bilingual.” Institution B
“We call it Soar, S-O-A-R … it’s a referral system that we have implemented for all students, but with the intention of making sure that we, do outreach to Latino families, low-income, first-generation college students, and we do some orientations in Spanish.”

Institution C

Question 4: What were the financial implications?

As mentioned previously, none of the respondents indicated that there was an increase in enrollment and tuition revenue linked to the effort to pursue the HSI designation. The HSI designation allows universities to be eligible to apply for Federal funds under Title V and one respondent indicated that there was a need to manage his university’s expectations around HSI because “there’s no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.” None of the respondents we interviewed indicated they received Title V funding. One respondent noted that their university was able to include its HSI status in a grant from the Mexican government, which they believed had a positive impact on their getting the grant.

“…in terms of financial aid…we’ve applied to agencies that we could say we are an HSI in and it favors us to apply. For instance we received a grant from the Mexican government I think it was, for the 85/40 students, you know the students that don’t have legal status? And we were awarded a small grant, I think it was $50,000, and it was favorable that we noted on there because we’re an HSI we would like to help these students, so things like that, but nothing has changed in terms of process, if that is what you were asking. We just monitor what we do. And if there’s an area that we see that needs to be modified, we pay attention to it.” Institution B

In summary, respondents indicated that pursuing the HSI designation was not a driver for increased enrollment of Hispanic students, nor was there an increase in operating budgets linked to an HSI status either through increased tuition revenues or Title V grant dollars. One financial implication noted by respondents was the increase in financial investments related to time, faculty and staff hires, and operational resources all used toward making their universities a welcoming environment for all diverse students, including Latinos. One campus hired an associate vice president for diversity and inclusion while others invested in efforts to diversify faculty; assessing, evaluating and considering new student services; adding academic offerings; engaging in outreach to Latino families and low-income and first-generation college students; and considering the need to incorporate bilingual front-
line staff. The respondents were consistent in their view that adding support services, academic advising and other changes were to be universal in their support of all students. Results also indicated that there was a multiyear investment in a strategic planning process that involved a great number of teams of faculty, staff and administrators.

**Conclusions**

There is clear evidence that pursuing an HSI designation does not increase enrollments of Latino students specifically or increase student diversity in general. What we found from the respondents we interviewed was that the likelihood of meeting the federal benchmarks for HSIs prompted them to seek the designation. Moreover, there was a tremendous amount of preplanning work done by the respondents’ universities at least three years prior to seeking the HSI designation to address campus climate, academic and student support services, staffing needs and engaging a broad group of the campus community done.

We believe that the projected demographic changes will indeed occur in Colorado in the coming years, just as it has in California over the last 10 years. This coming demographic change and our continued increase in the percentage of Latino students at UNC means that we will likely meet the federal requirements for an HSI designation within the next decade – just as our respondents did. However, instead of declaring that an HSI designation is our intention, we recommend that over the next three years we focus instead on the systemic fundamental work needed to be a welcoming and diverse campus.

**Recommendations**

Using the results of the research to guide our next steps, we will bring to the BOT retreat in the Fall specific recommendations and action steps that will address the foundational work needed to be a welcoming place for a diverse student body. Below are the areas we identified that will be embedded into one or more of the appropriate nine core plans and support plans.
Incorporated into our Equity and Diversity Plan and Academic Portfolio plan will be the work to address issues around climate. Climate relates to the psychological climate that includes perceptions of racial/ethnic tension, discrimination and prejudicial attitudes; structural diversity that includes diverse student enrollment and faculty/staff; and behavioral dimensions that includes social interactions across racial/ethnic groups and within the classroom (Hurtado, et al., 1999).

Incorporated into our Enrollment Plan and Academic Portfolio will be the development of active and robust pipelines for diverse and adult students to enroll at UNC from community colleges within the state. In addition, we will invest in building relationships with underrepresented elementary and junior high school students to prepare their students for enrollment at UNC. We will also continue our work to actively recruit all underrepresented students.

Incorporated into our Integrated Student Support Services plan will be an assessment of our academic support services designed to assist all students to be successful at UNC.
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University-wide Planning

The Strategic Framework is the foundation for all of UNC's planning work. As illustrated by the Venn diagram (on right), our vision is to provide students with opportunities for transformative education by focusing on the intersections among academics, research and community.

UNC’s approach to planning is entrepreneurial, multiyear, and based in systems thinking. Our planning process includes multiyear direction setting and priority setting; annual identification and implementation of action steps; and evaluation of both the planning process and its outcomes.

Entrepreneurial
At UNC, we have defined planning as an ongoing, iterative process of taking control of our own future in order to fulfill UNC’s mission and our shared vision for the University.

Multiyear
We have two types of multiyear plans: core plans and support plans. Core plans articulate aspirations and action steps for the nine areas that comprise the core mission and function of the University. Building on the directions and priorities in the core plans, support plans articulate aspirations and action steps for major University-wide support efforts.

Systems-based
To facilitate a systems approach, all of our planning work considers the following eight key system elements:

- **UNC Mission & Identity**
- **Cost of Attendance**
- **Cost-saving Innovations**
- **Other Operating Costs**
- **External Funding**
- **Capital**
- **Compensation**
- **Reserves Strategy**

While these eight elements are not of equal importance, each has a bearing on our ability to fulfill the vision articulated by the Strategic Framework. In the diagram on the right, a plan’s color indicates only the Key System Element with which the plan is primarily associated; there is significant overlap among the plans and elements.

ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION
We operationalize the multiyear plans through UNC’s annual action plans and budgets that address:

- Student recruitment and success
- Pricing and discounting
- Staffing
- Capital projects
- Information management and technology
- Marketing and communication
- Fundraising
- Operations of campus units