

# Journal of Hispanic Higher Education

<http://jhh.sagepub.com/>

---

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

Vasti Torres and Desiree Zerquera

*Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 2012 11: 259 originally published online 23 April 2012

DOI: 10.1177/1538192712441371

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jhh.sagepub.com/content/11/3/259>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://jhh.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://jhh.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://jhh.sagepub.com/content/11/3/259.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jul 8, 2012

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Apr 23, 2012

[What is This?](#)

---

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

Journal of Hispanic Higher Education  
11(3) 259–278  
© The Author(s) 2012  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1538192712441371  
<http://jhh.sagepub.com>



Vasti Torres<sup>1</sup> and Desiree Zerquera<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

This article seeks to identify and assess the readiness of *Potential* Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)—institutions located within Latino communities projected to increase the number of Latino/a high school graduates. Institutions are described based on evaluation of institutional missions, planning documents, programs, and marketing strategies—resulting in three institutional categories: unaware, aware, and committed institutions.

## Resumen

Este artículo busca identificar y evaluar la preparación de posibles Instituciones de Servicio a Hispanos (HSIs)—instituciones localizadas dentro de comunidades Latinas que se anticipa incrementarán el número de estudiantes preparatorianos Latina/os. Instituciones se describen basadas en evaluación de misiones institucionales, documentos de planeación, programas, y estrategias de mercadotecnia—resultando en tres categorías institucionales: sin conocimiento, con conocimiento, e instituciones comprometidas.

## Keywords

Higher education, Hispanic-serving institutions, HSIs, Latina(o), policy

---

<sup>1</sup>Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Vasti Torres, Indiana University, 201 N. Rose Ave., Bloomington, IN 47401, USA  
Email: [vatorres@indiana.edu](mailto:vatorres@indiana.edu)

The latest U.S. Census reports show that the Latino population continued its growth this past decade, increasing 9.7% (U.S. Census, 2011). Latinos now make up 16.3% of the U.S. population, with growth over the past decade rising from 19.2% to 24.6% in New York and New Mexico to as high as 144.5 and 147.9% in Alabama and South Carolina. In addition to this general population growth, previous census counts indicated that Latino children under the age of 5 made up approximately 19% of the total population of children a decade ago (U.S. Census Fact Sheet, 2000). This group of children will create the rising young adult population that will be of interest to educators and policy makers in the coming years. This unprecedented growth of the Latino population—especially children—brings forth questions about the educational aspirations and success of this group, which is projected to continue growing in areas that are not seen as traditional Latino enclaves. This article seeks to look at those areas in the United States that are predicted to see rapid growth in their adolescent Latino populations and assess the readiness of higher education institutions to receive this new population of students. In doing this we will identify *Potential* Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) located within these rapidly growing communities and which will likely be affected by this projected growth of young adult Latinos.

Considering the next set of HSIs is important because these institutions continue to play an important role in educating Latino college students. Hispanic-Serving Institutions have 25% of their enrollment made up of Latino students and at least 50% of their students receive need-based assistance (Title V Program Statute, 2006). Within the continental United States, HSIs tend to be concentrated in states with longstanding, large enclaves of Latino populations, like California, Texas, Florida, Arizona, New Mexico, and New York. In spite of recent publications calling attention to *emerging HSIs* (Santiago & Andrade, 2010), that is, institutions with enrollments approaching the 25% Latino threshold, most states and institutions continue to assume that this designation is not of interest to them. This work, conducted as part of the efforts of *Excelencia in Education*, found emerging HSIs in 20 states, including states with traditionally smaller Latino populations. Looking at emerging HSIs leads the way for considering the future of HSIs and speculating where the next concentration of Latino college students may emerge. As a result of having a smaller Latino population and a shorter history of acknowledging and addressing the needs of this group, these states and, in turn, the higher education institutions within them, may be less ready to serve the population growth of Latino adolescents that is likely to come to them in the future. While much research on Latinos has traditionally focused on states with longstanding Latino populations, more needs to be done in areas that are not seen as traditional enclaves of the Latino population.

This conceptual exploratory study uses population projections to examine *Potential* HSIs and makes an effort to identify ways that institutions can prepare for the future. The conceptual framework used to make these predictions is grounded in research focused on Latino college choice, attendance patterns, and the role of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) in Latino college student postsecondary pathways. After presenting this literature, the research design will be described and illustrated. The

results will focus on states identified as having the potential for rapid growth and institutions with the potential to become an HSI. The article will conclude with discussion and implications for consideration by states and institutions.

## Literature Influencing the Conceptual Framework

College choice is a complex process, involving a multitude of factors and influences on students' enrollment decisions. Proximity to home and cost of attendance have consistently been a predominant factor in students' college choice process (Holland & Richards, 1965; Kinzie et al., 2004; Weiler, 1994). In addition, models have been developed specifically to understand the college choice process for Latino students, whose decisions vary from those of their peers. In this next section, college choice is examined both generally and then applied specifically to Latino students' experiences. These concepts shape a framework through which to consider where the next institutions will be called on to serve the growing Latino population.

## Proximity to Home

Though proximity to home has consistently been considered within college choice models (e.g., Hossler & Gallagher, 1987; Perna, 2006), little empirical work has examined this topic. Research findings on the role proximity plays in students' college enrollment decisions remain somewhat inconclusive. For instance, in national studies of student enrollment decisions, Turley (2006, 2009) found proximity of a college to a student's home to be a major factor in students' decisions of where to enroll. Furthermore, she and others have found the proximity of colleges and universities to increase the likelihood of an individual to apply and enroll in those institutions, in particular 4-year colleges (Long, 2004; Turley, 2009). However, in her study of college preferences of high school seniors in their senior year, Goble found both students and their parents to have a greater preference for institutions away from home (2010). Yet these findings are not consistent across racial and ethnic groups.

Latino students prioritize proximity to home when making decisions on where to attend college (Cerna, Pérez, & Sáenz, 2006; Goble, 2010; Kim, 2004; Perez & McDonough, 2008; Perna & McDonough, 2008). This preference has been related to a strong family orientation attributed to Latinos (Perna & McDonough, 2008). Furthermore, these preferences have also been tied to values that make up Latino culture. *Familismo* is a cultural value, emphasizing loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity, requiring prioritization of family over individual interests (Delgado-Romero, Galvan, Hunter & Torres, 2008; Vega, 1990). Furthermore, Latina identity and sense of belonging have been found to be tied closely to family connections (Espinoza, 2010). This often times conflicts with school demands, resulting in Latino students, Latinas in particular, being placed in a cultural bind (Sy & Romero, 2008) and having to choose between school or family obligations, which often times include spending time with family and staying close to home (Espinoza, 2001).

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

Proximity to home is also a factor when students consider how to pay for college. Beyond proximity, the cost of attendance has been a major factor in college choice. Because cost of attendance includes more than just tuition, proximity to home is a factor considered in the college choice as it relates to students' financial concerns. In general, the likelihood of leaving home for college is higher for those whose parents' income is higher (Mulder & Clark, 2002). For Latinos, location and distance of the institution from home play a role in the importance of cost and affordability (Pérez, 2010). Latino students are more concerned than their non-Latino peers about the costs of college attendance and are highly influenced by their family's income as well as how much financial aid they receive (Kim, 2004). Proximity to family curbs many financial concerns, and as cited previously, increases degree attainment for Latino students. Yet oftentimes students, particularly those in urban areas, have multiple institutional enrollment options accessible to them. Like many students who are first-generation students and come from low-income backgrounds, the manner in which Latino students receive information regarding potential enrollment options is of particular concern. This is the considerations around college choice that is the focus of the next area of research literature.

## **Chain Migration Theory**

Friends' suggestions have a significant impact on Latino students' choice (Kim, 2004), which research has consistently found untrue for other (general) groups of students (Hossler et al., 1999). Researchers have applied chain migration theory to the process of understanding college choice decisions of Latinas/os (Pérez & McDonough, 2008; Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). These studies overwhelmingly found that family members, peers, and other social contacts serve as primary sources of information and influence students' enrollment decisions. Latino students rely heavily on information channels created through siblings, peers, relatives, and high school contacts to plan for and consider higher education options (Pérez & McDonough, 2008). For example, in one study of Latino community college students, more than 50% of students cited family or friends as a reason to choose a particular college, while less than 15% of non-Latinos gave the same reason (Person & Rosenbaum, 2006). Latina/o students, especially first-generation in college students, depend on chain migration contacts at postsecondary institutions when they consider applying or matriculating because

being alone or without family is hard for them to fathom. The negotiation of family expectations limits the choices these students make, first by restricting their college choice to a set of institutions in-state and second, by limiting their options to institutions that are local in order to stay in close proximity to family (Perna & McDonough, 2008). At times, information from trusted others proves to be a more meaningful information source for Latino students (Torres, Reisser, LePeau, Davis, & Ruder, 2006). Latino students at institutions where there are smaller percentages of Latinos often encounter more barriers in obtaining information about the college (Person & Rosenbaum, 2006); this seems to be because of fewer Latina/o faculty and staff, fewer social outlets, and a lack of specialized services. Collectively, these enrollment decisions by Latino students have helped create institutions with critical masses of Latino students. When institutions reach this critical mass there is a need to support these students' educational aspirations.

### **The Role of Hispanic-Serving Institutions**

The majority of HSIs are 2-year institutions (Mercer & Stedman, 2008; Santiago, 2008) and tend to be generally less expensive than other institutions, located in large Latino communities, and are more accessible when compared to other institutions (Santiago, 2007). Latino first-generation in college students' perceptions of the racial/ethnic climate and financial aid availability affect their decisions about what institution to enroll in more so than for any other race/ethnicity (Cho, Hudley, Lee, Barry, & Kelly, 2008). Most Latino students enrolled at HSIs do not know their institution is an HSI (Santiago, 2007), yet more than half of all Latinos in higher education are enrolled within one of these 265 institutions nationwide (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Many Latino students at HSIs choose their institution based on characteristics mentioned previously, such as the "sticker price" of tuition and related costs, proximity to home and family, welcoming campus environments, the support of family, perceived potential for employment opportunities, and an accessible campus (Cejda, Casparis, Rhodes, & Kelly, 2008; Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Cabrera, 2007; Santiago, 2007). In contrast, Latino college graduates who did not attend HSIs are more likely to prioritize financial aid, institutional prestige, and academic programs as critical factors influencing their college choices (Santiago, 2007).

Unlike other specialty serving institutions, such as Tribal Colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Universities, for many institutions the HSI status results from demographic shifts in their surrounding communities, as opposed to establishment under or development of deliberately targeted mission (Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Flores, Horn, Crisp, 2006; Laden, 2004; O'Brien & Zudak, 1998). In this regard, these institutions are within a group of recently federally recognized minority serving institutions (MSIs)—Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs), Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs), and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions—which similarly achieve designation based on the racial/ethnic composition of their student body. HSIs are unique among this group because they serve the majority of a

particular ethnic group of students in higher education—that is, the majority of Latinos in college and university campuses across the United States attend an HSI, which is not true among other MSIs (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Much remains to be explored regarding the growth and development of these types of institutions (Johnson, Conrad, & Perna, 2006; Laanan & Starobin, 2004), including HSIs.

Some have referred to the HSI status as an *acquired* (Malcom, Bensimon, & Davila, 2010) or *invisible* identity (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2008), due to this often accidental or evolutionary change in student demographics. More and more commonly, institutional efforts have emerged as institutions seek to become or solidify commitments to being HSIs (Santiago & Andrade, 2010). However, enrolling large numbers of Latino students is not sufficient to truly serve Latino students (Santiago, Andrade, & Brown, 2004). Recent work has started examining promising practices at HSIs and identified some factors that are indicative of a commitment to serving Latino students. These successful HSIs are those that focus on student success through improving student services to better support Latino students, developing a curriculum that better aligns with student interests, having leaders who are proactive in developing a commitment to Latino student success, partnering with their surrounding communities including high schools and other postsecondary institutions, and embracing diversity while enhancing campus climates for diverse populations (Andrade, Santiago, & Brown, 2004; Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Contreras et al., 2008; Santiago, 2008).

In summary, Latino students stay near their home for college as a result of both cultural values and as a means of saving money. Furthermore, their perceived postsecondary options are highly informed by social channels, resulting in Latinos chain-enrolling in institutions where they have friends and family members. These enrollment choices offer insights into how colleges and universities may emerge as HSIs. This literature on college choice by Latino students combined with the literature on HSIs supports the assumptions that looking at geographic enclaves of Latinos will likely yield a college-going pattern to nearby institutions. Consequently, as these enclaves grow and the demographic characteristics of regions shift, higher education institutions should be adapting to better serve their regions through policies and practices that engage their Latino populations. This study seeks to set the foundation for this type of proactive thinking about the growing Latino enclaves in the United States.

## Research Design

This is an exploratory study to consider the future growth of the Latino college-going population. The design of this study began by considering states that presently do not have any HSIs and are projected to have a high school graduate population composed of, or nearing, 20% Latino students by 2020. The high school graduation projections selected were done by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE, 2008) and considered cohort survival ratio, which makes linear projections

**Table 1.** Projections of Latino High School Graduates by States With Major Increases

State	Latino high school graduates in 2000 (1999-2000) as percentage of all graduates	Predicted Latino high school graduates in 2020 (2019-2020) as percentage of all graduates
Arkansas	1.86	21.65
Georgia	1.73	21.54
Maryland	3.11	18.56
North Carolina	1.71	23.95
Oregon	5.36	25.75
South Carolina	0.97	17.59
Tennessee	0.96	17.53
Average across these states	2.24	20.94
Average across United States	11.12	24.2

based on patterns seen in past data. This technique takes into account attendance patterns as well as birth rates. Using the projections of high school graduates for 2020, seven states were selected to consider for this study. While none of these states have a recognized HSI, two were identified as having emerging HSIs (Arkansas and Oregon). Table 1 illustrates the rapid growth predicted for the states under consideration.

## Sample Development

Once the states were identified, the focus turned to identifying current enclaves of Latinos within those states. U.S. Census data (2010) were used to find enclaves of Latinos in counties that presently have 15% or more of the population identifying as Latino. Informed by chain migration and proximity theories as well as patterns of immigration (MacDonald & MacDonald, 1964; Massey, Durand, & Malone, 2002), the decision was made to identify institutions on the belief that present enclaves would likely attract more Latino immigrants to that region and therefore present a greater likelihood of amassing a critical number of young Latinos and, consequently, Latino high school graduates. It should be noted that the structures of counties serve as a starting point for identifying future enclaves. There are limitations with using counties for this type of research. More is provided about these limitations in the description of the authors' selection of *Potential* HSIs. In total, 60 counties were identified across the seven states. Georgia and Oregon have the greatest number of enclave counties, with more than 25 each, while Tennessee and Maryland have just 2 each, and South Carolina has only 1 such identified county. Arkansas and North Carolina also only have a few, with four counties identified for each of these states.

Once enclave counties were selected, higher education institutions within each county were identified, thus creating our sample of *Potential* HSIs. As stated

**Table 2.** Number of Enclave Counties and Institutions, by State

	Total number of enclave counties	Number of institutions in state enclave counties
Arkansas	4	2
Georgia	25	14
Maryland	2	1
North Carolina	4	2
Oregon	22	14
South Carolina	1	1
Tennessee	2	2
Total	60	36

previously, this decision was based on the literature surrounding Latino college choice, which finds that in large part, Latino students stay close to home and follow chain enrollment patterns when deciding where to go for college. The sampling process resulted in 36 institutions across the 60 enclave counties, with 11 counties not having any higher education institutions located within their geographic boundaries. At the point the analysis of web sites were conducted, the for-profit institutions were deleted from the sample because they are ineligible for HSI status. The description of institutions in the selected counties does include the for-profit as a way to illustrate the current state of higher education in these counties. As expected, given the number of enclave counties, Oregon and Georgia had the greatest number of institutions—14 each; Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee had only 2 each; and Maryland and South Carolina had just 1 institution each. Table 2 shows the number of enclave counties and institutions per state.

### **Describing Institutions and Their Levels of Readiness to Serve Latino Students**

Once these institutions were identified, two analyses were conducted. In the first, 2009 data from the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) were used to describe the postsecondary options available within these counties. The description of institutions in the selected counties includes for-profit institutions as a way to illustrate the current state of higher education in these counties.

In the second stage, content analysis of institutional web sites was conducted to consider the level of *readiness* these institutions had to serve their growing Latino community. As stated earlier, during this stage of the analysis for-profit institutions were deleted from the sample because they are ineligible for HSI status. Several research decisions should be explicitly explained at this point. First, level of readiness was informed by characteristics identified by research on HSIs (Santiago, Andrade, &

Brown, 2004; Contreras et al., 2008; Santiago, 2008), which center on mission, community focus, diversity, marketing, planning, and support programs. Second, web sites served as the primary source of information about institutions. Though this approach has limitations, it should be noted that a strong Internet presence is a growing basic expectation of colleges and universities and a vital component of their marketing and service provision efforts (Black, 2001; Kiecker, 2004). Web sites serve as an information source for many students, and web content is emphasized as a vital tool in the recruitment of potential students (Black, 2001), with students using the Internet more and more as a way to gather information when exploring their college options (Kiecker, 2004). It is less risky and a more accessible option for students to “surf” the college web site than it is to go on campus. Therefore an informed assumption was made that institutions who wanted to attract Latino/a college students would put their most pertinent information on the web site and thus illustrate their desire and readiness to serve this population of students. While there are some inherent limitations to this approach, it does use the same information that would be available to potential students.

## Limitations

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

Furthermore, the sample of institutions selected for this exploration was restricted to those located directly within the counties identified as enclaves for Latinos within these states. It should be acknowledged that institutional service regions are not bound by county lines of where they are located, nor is proximity to a student’s home restricted to within-county higher education options either. However, defining the service region for all institutions located near Latino enclaves proved to be a complicated process and beyond what we hoped to accomplish with this study. Though this presents a major limitation to exploring the options Latino students may consider within these areas, restraining the exploration in this manner was justified by the conceptual framework of this study. Because research decisions were based on proximity and chain enrollment, considering only the institutions within the same counties where students live was considered to be most consistent with the immediate option students are likely to confront when they interact within their communities, schools, work, and daily lives.

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

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

## **Results**

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

### **Description of Institutions in Enclave Counties**

Among the 36 institutions in the seven states, public 2-year colleges made up the majority (11) of these institutions, with only three public and five private 4-year institutions existing within the counties across these seven states. In addition, there were 15 private for-profit colleges (see Table 3).

As a group, these institutions have a mean enrollment of Latino students under 8% (as a percentage of all full-time equivalent undergraduates). While well over half of these institutions have Latino student enrollments well under 10% of their total undergraduate population, two institutions (both for-profit) have more than 20% undergraduate Latino populations. In addition, these institutions have a mean enrollment of Black/African American students of nearly 15% (as a percentage of all full-time equivalent undergraduates), while three institutions (all for-profit) meet enrollment eligibility requirements to be a Predominantly Black Institution (PBI) by having more than 40% Black student enrollments. Among this diverse range of institutions, the retention rate for full-time students varies from 64% for institutions in Arkansas to 76.5% for Tennessee institutions, while the graduation rate for all students ranges from 14% in Maryland to 79.5% in Tennessee (see Table 4).

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

Of these 36 institutions, we considered the level of readiness of the 19 not-for-profit private and public colleges and universities within the enclave counties. As mentioned previously, for-profit institutions were deliberately excluded because although Latinos enroll in these institutions in high numbers, they are not eligible for HSI Title V funds.

**Table 3.** Enclave County Institutions, by Institutional Sector

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

**Table 4.** Student Success Measures, Aggregated Across Institutions Within Each State

	Full-time retention rate, mean across institutions for which data is available	Part-time retention rate	Transfer- out rate	Graduation rate, total cohort
Arkansas	64.00	50.50	9.00	22.00
Georgia	72.50	63.89	5.45	44.91
Maryland	67.00	44.00	32.00	14.00
North Carolina	65.50	39.50	9.00	22.50
Oregon	66.83	61.63	10.33	51.45
South Carolina	100.00		15.00	35.00
Tennessee	76.50	75.50	0.50	79.50

Though considered in the collective analysis of this study, they are not considered as a part of the institutional readiness analysis.

Using institutions' web sites, content analyses were conducted. Informed in part by criteria used within HSI literature (e.g., Santiago, Andrade, & Brown, 2004; Contreras et al., 2008; Santiago, 2008), the content analysis focused on eight primary institutional aspects, derived from this body of literature:

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

**Table 5.** Institutional Readiness Categories

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

Evaluating institutional readiness required researcher judgment, therefore previous research, cited above, was used to identify the characteristics of successful HSIs. For example, an HSI that is serving Latino students well would have student services to support Latino students, develop curricular offerings that align with student interests, have leaders who are proactive in developing a commitment to Latino student success by partnering with their surrounding communities, and embrace diversity by enhancing campus climates (Santiago, Andrade, & Brown, 2004; Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Contreras et al., 2008; Santiago, 2008). As a result of considering these characteristics, we derived three categories that captured the institutional approaches, policies, and practices for each institution, and provided a sense of institutional readiness. Each institution was then given an “institutional readiness” label: unaware, aware, and committed. These categories are summarized briefly in Table 5 above.

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

In one such example, a technical college in a northeast Georgia county with a Latino population of just under 30%, Latinos were only mentioned through a scholarship web site, which provided links to external web sites for funding opportunities, including a few from sources such as the Hispanic Scholarship Fund. In addition, in fulfillment of a mission “to meet the workforce development needs of the area,” the institution highlights its literacy programs for “immigrant parents” to “prepare students to continue their education, and create a better quality of life.” This might suggest an early awareness of a predominantly immigrant population; however, whether or not this population they refer to is Latino is not directly addressed; nor is the educational philosophy behind this type of program offering.

*Aware.* Six institutions were considered “aware” colleges, demonstrating a developed recognition of a growing Latino population that distinguished them from the previous category of institutions. These institutions had an indication of early attentiveness to the needs of the surrounding Latino community. This was noted in strategic plans, program descriptions, and campus newsletters. While most had a strong emphasis on serving their surrounding communities, these institutions often lacked a clear definition of how they defined and approached that service. Similarly, though most of these institutions mentioned or even highlighted diversity, the approach of these six was celebratory at best in some cases, and pejorative at worst in the case of others.

For instance, at one public, 4-year college, located just outside of Atlanta, Georgia, its mission statement emphasizes diversity explicitly, with a “core commitment [to] . . . excellence in a learning environment dedicated to serving a diverse student body.” This institution also highlights the presence of a Latino-based student organization whose mission is “to celebrate Latino/a culture.” These comments suggest a celebratory approach to diversity. Though they emphasize serving their region in their mission statement, they do not emphasize how to integrate the region onto their campus, or more specifically, how to recruit and support Latino students on campus. Furthermore, this institution is one of a few institutions where we found the presence of academic programs with special curricula focused on serving the regional Latino population. For example, the program description for this institution’s social work program states the following:

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

The intent of these statements is unclear; therefore it could reflect a pejorative approach by the institution to serving the community. Though training of culturally sensitive social workers brings a clear benefit to the residents of the region, the institution did not demonstrate anywhere else their efforts to integrate the community's residents onto their campus as students. Though such a program may provide validation for current students from Mexican and Spanish-speaking backgrounds, there was no mention of support programs specifically for Latino students to help their academic success.

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

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

A prime example of such an institution is seen in one of Arkansas' community colleges, located in a rural, primarily agricultural region in the southwest area of the state. This institution not only acknowledges a changing demographic in the surrounding community but also has an espoused commitment to that community, with accompanying current and planned activities to serve the community. In the institution's strategic plans, the institution includes a goal of a "sharp increase" in the college's Latino enrollment. However, this goal does not stand alone; it is accompanied by supporting strategies to meet these enrollment goals, including the translation of the institution's web site into Spanish. Furthermore, the campus' president is quite involved in these efforts and has committed to learning Spanish so that he may not only attend community

cultural events but also interact with Latino community members in Spanish. This echoes previous work on HSIs, which emphasize the critical role of campus leaders in developing effecting HSIs. It further highlights an institutional commitment to the Latino community, which in the case of this institution, starts with the campus president.

Another community college, located in North Carolina, also demonstrates a clear commitment to meeting their goals of better serving Latino students on their campus. In the institution's plans, it not only clearly defines diversity, but mentions the development of specific support services to serve students. These include a diversity center, marketing efforts aimed at connecting to the Latino community, and the development of an advisory team of minority business and community leaders.

## Discussion and Implications

This exploratory study sought to identify areas where *Potential* HSIs may emerge in the next 10 years, and yields findings that indicate the majority of institutions are not considering the growth of Latinos in their communities, and even fewer are preparing for this enrollment growth.

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

It should also be noted that community colleges were found at both of ends of the continuum of readiness. Two of the five committed institutions were community colleges. However, 5 of the 11 community colleges within these enclave regions demonstrated little to no awareness of their surrounding Latino community or its needs. This contributes to calls for continued support of these institutions to help them increase student success on their campuses.

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

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

Funding for these institutions should consider the need to restructure, develop, and implement programs to better serve Latino students. As state policy makers manage economic challenges, they must consider the increased challenges these institutions face amidst these population changes. Thus funding agencies should consider ways to support and encourage institutions to develop new programs and services for this population. Furthermore, state and federal policy makers must consider the implications at the micro and macro level on financial aid to support Latino students' in their educational pursuits. Private and for-profit institutions make up a large proportion of the postsecondary options accessible within these growing Latino enclaves. As Latinos enroll in for-profit institutions in large numbers, and many from low-income backgrounds, consideration of how states and the nation may have to deal with financial aid allocation is imperative to meet students' financial needs and support their educational pursuits. Private institutions oftentimes are more expensive than their public counterparts and make up more than a quarter of all HSIs in the United States, as well as five of the 19 institutions of focus in this study. These campuses must consider the ways they provide financial support to Latinos, who tend to be less informed about the financial aid process and resources available to them (Brown, Santiago, & Lopez, 2003; Zalaquett, 2006).

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

Though becoming an HSI is a phenomenon that often happens to an institution as a result of circumstance (Benitez & DeAro, 2004; Flores et al., 2006), these findings also support a small body of work (e.g., Santiago & Andrade, 2010), which has pointed to the efforts of some institutions to explicitly become HSIs. There is also some research investigating why institutions may maintain an invisible HSI identity, such as a negative antidiversity backlash and loss of prestige (Contreras et al., 2008). With this study we echo the calls by others (i.e., Flores et al., 2006) for more research on the

institutional incentives to becoming an HSI as well as working to identify activities that might constitute those efforts. Campus practices that have been found to make a difference for HSIs include institutional leaders that are not complacent, academic support for students, community outreach, and the use of data to make decisions (Contreras et al., 2008; Santiago, 2008). These practices require that potential HSIs not only acknowledge the growing population of Latinos in their service regions but also that they enter a committed level of awareness to be prepared.

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

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

### **Authors' Note**

This article was a commissioned paper by AAHHE.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **References**

- Benitez, M., & DeAro, J. (2004). Realizing student success at Hispanic-serving institutions. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2004*(127), 35-48.
- Black, J. (2001). Students in the dot-com world. In J. Black (Ed.), *The strategic enrollment management revolution* (pp. 259-286). Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

- Brown, S. E., Santiago, D., & Lopez, E. (2003). Latinos in higher education: Today and tomorrow. *Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35(2), 40-47.
- Ceja, M. (2006). Understanding the role of parents and siblings as information sources in the college choice process of Chicana students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 87-104.
- Cejda, B. D., Casparis, C. A., Rhodes, J. H., & Kelly, S. N. (2008). The role of social capital in the educational decisions of Hispanic students attending Hispanic-serving community colleges. *Enrollment Management Journal*, 2(1), 32-59.
- Cerna, O. S., Pérez, P. A., & Sáenz, V. B. (2006, November). *Exploring the aspirations and attributes of Latina/o college degree attainers*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Anaheim, CA.
- Cho, S., Hudley, C., Lee, S., Barry, L., & Kelly, M. (2008). Roles of gender, race, and SES in the college choice process among first-generation and non-first-generation students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(2), 95-107.
- Contreras, F. E., Malcom, L. E., & Bensimon, E. M. (2008). Hispanic-serving institutions: Closed identity and the production of equitable outcomes for Latino/a students. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Turner (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary approaches to understanding minority serving institutions* (pp. 71-90). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Galvan, N., Hunter, M. R., & Torres, V. (2008). Latina/o Americans. In G. McAuliffe (Ed.), *Culturally alert counseling: A comprehensive introduction* (pp. 323-283). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Espinoza, R. (2001). *The good daughter dilemma: How Latina doctoral students balance family obligations with school demands* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Espinoza, R. (2010). The good daughter dilemma: Latinas managing family and school demands. *Journal of Hispanic higher Education*, 9, 317-330.
- Flores, S. M., Horn, C. L., & Crisp, G. (2006). Community colleges, public policy, and Latino student opportunity. In C. L. Horn, S. M. Flores, & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Latino educational opportunity: New directions for community colleges* (pp. 71-80). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Gándara, P. (1995). *Over the ivy walls: The educational mobility of low-income Chicanos*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Goble, L. (2010, August). *Should I stay or should I go? The role of college proximity for college success*. Paper presented at American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. Atlanta, GA.
- Holland, J. L., & Richards, J. M. (1965). A factor analysis of student "explanation" of their choice of a college. *American College Testing Research Reports*, 8, 23.
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. (1987). Studying student college choice: A three-phase model and the implications for policymakers. *College and University*, 62, 207-221.
- Hossler, D., Schmit, J., & Vesper, N. (1999). *Going to college how social economic and educational factors influence the decisions students make*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hurtado, S., Saenz, V., Santos, J., & Cabrera, N. (2007). *Advancing higher education: A portrait of Latina/o college freshmen at four-year institutions: 1975-2006*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

- Johnson, J. N., Conrad, C. F., & Perna, L. W. (2006). Minority serving institutions of higher education: Building on and extending lines of inquiry for the advancement of the public good. In C. F. Conrad & R. C. Serlin (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook for research in education: Engaging ideas and enriching inquiry* (pp. 263-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kiecker, P. (2004). College choice: A consumer decision-making model. In R. Whiteside (Ed.), *Student marketing for college and universities* (pp. 119-132). Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.
- Kim, D. (2004). The effect of financial aid on students' college choice: Differences by racial groups. *Research in Higher Education, 45*, 43-70.
- Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S., & Cummings, H. (2004). *Fifty years of college choice: Social, political and institutional influences on the decision-making process* (New Agenda Series, 5). Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education.
- Laanan, F. S., & Starobin, S. S. (2004). Defining Asian American and Islander-serving institutions. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2004*(127), 49-59.
- Laden, B. V. (2004). Hispanic-serving institutions: What are they? Where are they? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*, 181-198.
- Long, B. T. (2004). How have college decisions changed over time? An application of the conditional logistic model. *Journal of Econometrics, 121*, 271-296.
- MacDonald, J. S., & MacDonald, L. D. (1964). Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation, and social networks. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 42*, 82-97.
- Malcom, L. E., Bensimon, E. M., Davila, B. (2010, Winter). *(Re)constructing Hispanic-serving institutions: Moving beyond numbers toward student success* (Education Policy and Practice Perspectives, 6). Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.
- Massey, D., Durand, J., & Malone, N.J. (2002). *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an era of economic integration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Mercer, C. J., & Stedman, J. B. (2008). Minority-serving institutions: Selected institutional and student characteristics. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. S. V. Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority-serving institutions* (pp. 28-42). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mulder, C. H., & Clark, W. A. V. (2002). Leaving home for college and gaining independence. *Environment and Planning A, 34*, 981-999.
- O'Brien, C. T., & Zudak, C. (1998). Minority-serving institutions: An overview. In J. P. Merisotis & C. T. O'Brien (Eds.), *Minority-serving situations: Distinct purposes, common goals* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pérez, P. A. (2010, Winter). College choice process of Latino undocumented students: Implications for recruitment and retention. *Journal of College Admission, 206*, 21-25.
- Pérez, P. A., & McDonough, P. M. (2008). Understanding Latina and Latino college choice: A social capital and chain migration analysis. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 7*, 249-265.
- Perna, L. (2006). Studying college access and choice: A proposed conceptual model. *Higher Education, XXI*, 99-157.
- Perna, P. A., & McDonough, P. M. (2008). Understanding Latino and Latino college choice: A social capital and chain migration analysis. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 7*, 249-265.
- Person, A. E., & Rosenbaum, J. E. (2006). Chain enrollment and college enclaves: Benefits and drawbacks of Latino college students' enrollment decisions. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 133*, 51-60.

- Santiago, D. A. (2007). *Choosing Hispanic-serving institutions: A closer look at Latino students' college choices*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Santiago, D. A. (2008). *Modeling Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs): Campus practices that work for Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Santiago, D.A., Andrade, S. J., & Brown, S. E. (2004). *Latino student success at Hispanic-serving institutions findings from a demonstration project*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Santiago, D. A., & Andrade, S. J. (2010). *Emerging Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs): Serving Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Sy, S. R., & Romero, J. (2008). Family responsibilities among Latina college students from immigrant families. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 7, 212-227.
- Title V Program Statute, 2006. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/dueshsi/title5legislation.pdf>
- Torres, V. (2006). A mixed method study testing data-model fit of a retention model for Latino students at urban universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 299-318.
- Torres, V., Reiser, A., LePeau, L., Davis, L., & Ruder, J. (2006). A Model of First-Generation Latino/a College Students' Approach to Seeking Academic Information. *NACADA Journal*, 26(2), 65-70.
- Turley, R. N. L. (2006). When parents want children to stay home for college. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 823-846.
- Turley, R. N. L. (2009). College proximity: Mapping access to opportunity. *Sociology of Education*, 82(2), 126-146.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Fact Sheet, 2000*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Retrieved from <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011, May). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010 Census Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- Vega, W. A. (1990). Hispanic families in the 1980s: A decade of research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 1015-1024.
- Weiler, W. C. (1994). Transition from consideration of a college to the decision to apply. *Research in Higher Education*, 35, 631-646.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (2008). *Knocking at the college door projections of high school graduates by state and race/ethnicity 1992-2022*. Boulder, CO: WICHE.
- Zalaquett, C.P. (2006). Study of successful Latina/o students. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 5(35), 35-47.

## Bios

**Vasti Torres** is a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and Director of the Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University. She has researched issues of Latino/a identity and student success.

**Desiree Zerquera** is a doctoral candidate at Indiana University and is Co-Chair of the AAHHE Graduate Student Fellows program.