
The University of Georgia • College of Education
Center for Latino Achievement and Success in Education
(CLASE)

<http://www.coe.uga.edu/clase>

CLASE WORKING PAPER:
**LATINOS (NOT) IN HIGHER ED: A CULTURAL-
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON PERSISTING
GROUP BASED INEQUALITY**

**PEDRO PORTES, EDWARD DELGADO-
ROMERO, SPENCER SALAS**

2007



Running Head: LATINOS (NOT) IN HIGHER ED

Chapter in Sandhu, D.S., Hudson, J.B., & M. Taylor-Archer, (Eds.), Handbook of Diversity in Higher Education. Huntington, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Latinos (not) in Higher Education: A Cultural-historical Perspective

On Persisting Group Based Inequality:

Pedro Portes, The University of Georgia

Edward Delgado-Romero, The University of Georgia

Spencer Salas, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

16 October 2007

Latinos (not) in Higher Education and the Continuum of Group Based Inequality: A
Cultural-historical Perspective

Latino higher education is in a crisis. The youngest, largest and fastest growing U.S. minority group, Latinos account for only 18% of the undergraduate college population and are drastically underrepresented at the most prestigious colleges and universities. Among those age 25 and older, Latinos (12%) are less likely than African Americans (17.7%) or Whites (30.5%), to receive a bachelor's degree (National Council of La Raza, 2007). Moreover, U.S. Latinos are less likely than other populations to aspire to postsecondary education or to a Bachelor's or advanced degree; to enroll in postsecondary education; to enroll at a selective postsecondary institution; to maintain continuous postsecondary enrollment; to complete a postsecondary degree; or to earn a degree within four years (W. Swail, A. Cabrera, & C. Lee, 2004).

In this chapter, we argue that overcoming the numerous obstacles to equity for Latinos in postsecondary institutions and other educational settings that feed into higher education depends on wrestling with what Portes (1996) has described as “group based inequality” (GBI)—a socially produced cultural and historical phenomenon grounded in a historical tradition of inequities along a continuum of K-16. The group based inequality apparent in the statistical breakdown of Latino achievement in postsecondary education is exacerbated by the absence of conceptual and practical understandings of how to eradicate, or at minimum, diminish the achievement gap that prevents many children in the United States from even accessing higher education and other so-called equal opportunity structures essential to survival in today's post-industrial economies.

Furthermore, K-16 inequity continues past the undergraduate level into graduate education and the professoriate.

We review a series of recent, comprehensive quantitative descriptions of Latinos in post-secondary education that have pinpointed the public two-year college as a critical juncture in the educational trajectories of that population. We then extend our examination of the scope of the problem to focus on the scarcity of Latino/as in graduate school and in the academy. We move to a description of a cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap K-16. Focusing on the component of higher education, we conclude with recommendations for transforming professional preparation in higher education as an essential piece of a comprehensive, multilevel plan for eradicating the educational achievement gap of U.S. Latinos.

The Public Two-year College and Beyond

As a starting point for this review of Latinos (not) in higher education, we turn to the coda of Valdés' (2001) ethnographic study of four Latino adolescents in a Northern Californian middle school where she reveals what happened to the Latino youths after the 8th grade. Valdés recounts that by her sophomore year, Lilian had dropped out of high school, was the mother of two, and an employee in a fast food restaurant. Manolo graduated, lost his initial job as an electronics technician, and returned to his family-owned grocery store. Bernardo graduated without plans to continue his studies. The fourth, Elisa, was able to track herself out of ESL in high school and graduated. Seeking enrollment in local public two-year college, she was deemed ineligible for credit-bearing, college-level instruction and was routed to ESL coursework.

In a new U.S. economy, the social and economic intergenerational mobility of children like Lilian, Manolo, Bernardo, and Elisa—children that we call here “Latino Students Placed at Risk” or L-SPARS— is more than ever contingent on their attaining high levels of education and multiple professional credentials (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004; Gates, 2005; Pew Research Center, 2005; United States, 1996; 2002; White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, 1999). Until fairly recently, the decision to end one’s formal schooling with high school did not necessarily prevent that individual from participating actively in the U.S. workforce as a productive and taxpaying citizen. College was one of an array of options and it was not viewed as an indispensable precondition for economic success. The dinner-table refrain went, “School isn’t for everybody.” Things have changed. Not graduating from high school has been quantified as a one-million dollar mistake (earnings over the average lifetime); not graduating from college compounds the loss of individual lifetime earnings to the tune of two million dollars (Phipps, 1998; The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2004; Tierney, 2004).

Undergraduate Degree Completion and the Role of Selective Pathways

Notwithstanding the largest increase in high school completion rates, Latinos continue to trail Whites and African-Americans in attending college (ACE, 2006). Furthermore, with costs of four-year universities on the rise, the public two-year college has emerged as the first “port of entry” for first-generation college attendees and U.S. Latinos in particular (see, e.g., Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004; Fry, 2002, 2004, 2005). The Pew Hispanic Center has repeatedly pointed to the ambiguity of the two-year college where Latinos who do graduate from high school and move on to attend postsecondary

institutions are disproportionately represented (Fry, 2002, 2004, 2005; W. S. Swail, A. F. Cabrera, & C. Lee, 2004).

In his research for the Pew Hispanic Center, Fry (2004) has argued the “role of selective pathways” to explain the gap (104%) between non-Latino Whites and Latinos who complete an undergraduate degree by the age of 26. That is, the vast majority of Latino college students do not attend the same kinds of institutions as do non-Latino White undergraduates. Tuition is less expensive at community colleges and many less selective public four-year colleges and course schedules at two-year colleges normally accommodate students who must work full time as they continue their studies—as is the case for many Latinos (Fry, 2002, 2004, 2005). In addition community colleges are often located in the communities where Latinos live, thus avoiding the issue of having to move away from home.

In spite of the public two-year college curb appeal for Latinos and other first-generation college goers, the preponderance of remedial coursework in such institutions—such as the kind for which Valdés’ (2001) Elisa was identified—has been hypothesized as potentially problematic. In their national survey of community colleges, Jenkins and Boswell (2002) reported that in the fall semester of 2000, public two-year colleges were more likely than any other U.S. postsecondary institution to provide remediation in the form of one or more reading, writing, or mathematics courses. Likewise, once in public two-year college remediation, students remained for longer average periods of time compared to freshmen in remedial coursework in private two and four-year institutions, and public four-year institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003).

Merisotis and Phipps (2000) argue that the prevalence of remediation at the public two-year college is not solely a function of the “under-preparedness” of public two-year college students. Rather, students tested for remediation are that much more likely to be identified as needing it. Consequently, one of the potential reasons that so many U.S. two-year college students are in remedial coursework is simply because procedures for identifying students for such coursework exist (Merisotis & Phipps, 2000).

In a similar vein, Fry (2004) has proposed that the undergraduate degree gap might be substantially narrowed if Latinos attended the same sorts of institutions that their White counterparts did--four-year institutions and not two-year colleges. Citing data from a U.S. Department of Education survey that tracked a sample of some 25,000 youth over a period of 12 years, Fry maintained that approximately half of the Latinos enrolled in college were prepared to succeed at the four-year college level—however minimally. Yet, “The best prepared Hispanics fare worse than white youth of equal preparation. Similarly, the least prepared Hispanics fare worse than their least prepared white peers” (p. vi). In a word, for Fry, the predicament of Latinos in higher education is an issue of selectivity: “Hispanic undergraduates disproportionately enroll on campuses that have low bachelor’s degree completion rates, i.e., their pathways through post secondary education start on low trajectories Selectivity matters because college selectivity and college completion go hand-in-hand” (p. vi).

Latinos in Higher Education

Logically the achievement gap that begins in pre-kindergarten has a significant impact throughout the U.S. educational system, persisting to the highest levels. That is to say that Latinos are under-represented as university students, graduate students, alumni,

staff, faculty and administrators. Proportionately meager representation in the higher education system may result in a lack of ability to influence the policies and practices at the gateway to virtually every profession in the U.S. Concretely, as a result of under-representation Latino/a students, staff and faculty may feel marginalized, discriminated against (Verdugo, 2003), tokenized (Niemann, 1999) or pressured to sever cultural ties (Delgado-Romero, et al., 2003). Often these factors result in burnout (Howard-Hamilton & Delgado-Romero, 2002), under-performance or a failure to achieve goals (e.g., graduation, promotion or tenure). Latino/a students, staff and faculty may foreclose majors/career options based on either an acceptance of stereotyped negative beliefs or the lack of role models. The manifestation of the achievement gap at the level of higher education is rooted in historical factors dating back to the 1800's (see MacDonald & Garcia, 2003).

We hypothesize that some of the reasons that Latinos struggle in higher education are overt problems such as unequal preparation, racism, prejudice, discrimination, and hostile working environments. However determining the exact nature and scope of the problem is a daunting task for several reasons. First, despite the abundant statistics regarding the numbers of Latinos in higher education, getting an accurate count is a problem given the highly politicized nature of the data. That is, most institutions want to appear that they are diverse and therefore may use flexible criteria in counting who is Latino/a. Delgado-Romero and colleagues (2007) described dimensions of Latino/a identity and how the use of different dimensions (e.g., cultural commitment versus Latino surname) may have implications for hiring, retention and promotion. Their concern was that the use of vague pan-ethnic terms such as "Hispanic" (Diaz McConnell & Delgado-

Romero, 2004) would perpetuate and obscure group based inequity. In particular, given that Mexican-Americans represent a historical and numerical majority of U.S. Latinos, one would expect Mexican-Americans to represent the largest number of Latinos in higher education. However, current practices make this information difficult to get and many are concerned that Mexican-Americans are in fact discriminated against in higher education (Delgado-Romero, et al, 2003).

Available data (ACE, 2006) indicate that Latinos trail Whites in the percentage of college-aged people and as we mentioned before, that the number of Latinos (18-24) who enrolled in higher education did not increase at a significant rate relative to the fastly growing overall Latino population. In addition to enrollment, Latinos have documented problems with retention and graduation from post-secondary institutions (Castellanos & Jones, 2003; Hurtado & Kamimura, 2003), although Latinos have shown the most growth in achieving associates degrees (ACE, 2006). Data on college completion rates in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001) for individuals between 25- 29 years was 9.7% for Latinos (compared to 29.6% for Whites). This number was a dramatic increase from 1974 where the rate for Latinos was 5.7%.

In terms of faculty from 1993-2003 Latinos experienced the largest rate of increase in faculty with an increase of 66.3%. This increase is due mostly to the success of Latinas, although they are still outnumbered by Latino men in the academy. Latinas at the Associate Professor level (a level at which tenure is usually conferred) rose 68.5%, while Latinos at the Full Professor level rose 43.7%. The number of Latinos in administrative positions almost doubled, with Latinas again leading the charge. Finally

Latinos experienced the fastest rate of growth at the presidential level of all minorities, with a 79.6% increase from 1995-2005.

A concrete example of the situation for Latinos is the case of the field of psychology, one of the most popular undergraduate majors in the U.S. Statistics (NCES, 2001; 2007) indicate that the majority of psychology degrees indicates that most were awarded to Whites (72% of Bachelor's and master's degrees and 77% of doctoral degrees), while Latinos received 10% of bachelor's degrees and 5% of both master's and doctoral degrees, Latinos were most likely to be found in health service provider subfields of psychology (clinical and counseling) and Latinos were most likely of all racial/ethnic groups to have earned a Psy.D. (doctor of psychology – a degree based on the professional school model) degree versus the traditional Ph.D. degree (Leong, et al., 2003). The American Psychological Association (APA) has noted this under-representation with particular concern about the doctoral level (APA, 2003), which is the gateway to becoming a psychologist. It should be noted that within the Latino group the percentage of doctorates in psychology is relatively high (17% - NCES, 2007). However, the professional representation in APA of Latinos is very small (Kite et al., 2001) as indicated by a study indicating that 2.1% of the membership of APA is Latino, Latinos fare better within the governance of APA where they comprise 4.8% of the leadership (APA Research Office, 2002). It is estimated that in 2001 Latinos composed 3% of graduate Psychology faculty, up from 1% in 1981-82 (Leong, et al., 2003).

In spite of the mostly optimistic data presented above, there is cause for concern about these numbers. A critical view of Latino faculty research reflects inequity in the sense that Latinos are over-represented in social sciences and under-represented in the

sciences; over-represented in Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and 2 year colleges and under-represented at four year colleges; over-represented in the ranks of lecturers and adjunct faculty and under-represented in full-professorships, deanships and presidencies (Delgado-Romero, et al, 2003). A concrete manifestation of the achievement gap is the gap between the tenure rate for Whites (73%) and Latino/as (64%) (ACE, 2002), meaning that Latino/a faculty, especially Latinas, are tenured much less than their White counterparts. Haro and Lara (2003) point out that if research data regarding Latino/a administrators are disaggregated by institutional type a sobering picture emerges where Latino/as are virtually absent from the most prestigious and influential institutions in the U.S. Taking this point a bit further Delgado-Romero and colleagues (2003) took a look at data that heralded the dramatic increase of Latinos as presidents of universities and found that these numbers were inflated by the decision to include data from the Puerto Rican university system.

A critical look at the research data paints a picture of the Latino population being saturated at the lowest levels of prestige and pay in academia and virtually absent from the highest levels of decision-making, influence and wealth. Indications are that this picture is not likely to change any time soon (Haro & Lara, 2003). Given the inertia inherent in an achievement gap that has persisted throughout the educational system it should not be surprising that there are few candidates in the so-called “pipeline” for the future.

A Cultural-historical Approach to Closing the Achievement Gap

The condition of Latinos in higher education that Fry (2002, 2004, 2005) has described for the Pew Latino Center and, more generally, group based inequality, is

largely about literacy differences produced (paradoxically) through schooling. Latinos and their children are blending into U.S. society; by a second or third generation, they are resoundingly English dominant if not completely monolingual (A. Portes & Hao, 1998; A. Portes & Schauffler, 1994). However, while some have been absorbed by suburbs of Fairfax, Virginia or Gwinnett County, Georgia others have been absorbed by urban poverty (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004; DePalma, 2005).

Closing the gap requires a heightened collective awareness of what decades of imposed poverty does to cultural patterns of adaptation. Reducing that gap calls for a developmental appreciation of how certain aspects of socialization vary by group and how such socialization influences teaching and learning. Exactly, our understandings of Latinos in higher education are informed by cultural-historical theories of human development emphasizing the notion that women and men's higher mental functions are socially produced and cognition is the consequence of the "mind in society" (Vygotsky, 1978). To that end, schools and the higher education structures that inform them not only need to improve, but also become redirected and less fragmented in transforming the whole pre-kindergarten–post secondary system.

Reproaching K–12 educators reflects part of the problem that is largely socio-historical in origin signals a misunderstanding of the bounds of inequality in present society. That is to say, the thoroughly documented achievement gap of Latinos in higher education is configured inter-generationally. As a result, a time lag exists between the time new generations of students are socialized in new ways and the time their children can perform at grade level or above in the next generation. Consequently, a

developmental framework aimed to disarm the ways class and power disadvantage Latinos' development each generation (relative to other children) is urgently needed.

Readying students from underrepresented groups ready for college and for middle-class professions (such as the professoriate) insists on the transcendence of short-term solutions. Namely, a long term strategy for increasing Latinos' postsecondary enrollment, retention, graduation rates, promotion and career advancement needs deliberate individual and contextual supports woven in the lives of children such as those that Valdés (2001) and others have poignantly described (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Valdés, 1996; Valenzuela, 1999). Although the current focus on Latinos (as students and faculty) in the public two-year college, for example, has brought much needed attention to the issues surrounding Latinos in tertiary education, we argue that achieving comparable distributions and proportional achievement outcomes for Latino students placed at risk entails systematic intergenerational overcompensation strategies spanning the educational lives of those students.

Overcompensation and Higher Education

Overcompensation is required to redress the detrimental influences resulting from the effects of cumulative, intergenerational socio-economic disadvantages; and, limited school resources, norms, and damaging organizational features present in the inferior schooling experiences designed for Latino students placed at risk. Precisely, the overcompensation needed to change the number of Latinos entering and completing higher education needs to start at an early age and involve culturally mediated activities with high intensity and continuity of experience in and out of schools.

Portes (2005) has described a lifespan-developmental model for children from cultures placed at-risk that consists of organizing action at four levels: (1) better preschool preparation; (2) elementary school supports, (3) life skills for adolescent; and (4) Higher education transformation.

INSERT FIGURE (Pedro Portes, 2005)

For the purpose of this chapter, we limit our discussion to a summary of Portes' final component—the transformation in the professional preparation of educators and other college students in higher education.

Transforming Teacher Education in U.S. Universities

We believe that a more level playing field can begin to be established—a playing field that potentially liberates Latino children and families from many of the constraints now imposed by poverty and group based inequality. At the same time, such a system might enable the society in which we live to become more ethical through a system of educational practices powerful enough—in not to eradicate inequality—to reproduce far much less of it in U.S. society.

Unfortunately, at present and amidst a teacher shortage, the average career teacher's career lasts between six to eight years. Yet, the careful selection of teachers who have the vocation to teach for and with Latinos K-16 is essential but improbable as with other single-issue approaches to closing the gap. What is more likely is certainly more feasible is helping educators develop a professional identity that is aimed toward educating all children equitably. However, such a professional identity requires structural and organizational support for Latinos K-16 from a developmental perspective.

Rather than isolated required courses (e.g., philosophy and foundations of education, educational psychology course, and methods courses), the integration should also be based on the relations among learning, instruction, development, and equity as essential to excellence in education with real world fieldwork for all college students.

1. In higher education, faculty must develop leadership with a clear strategy to help public schools close the gap and have equity or excellence at the top of their mission statement. School superintendents might also help ensure focused collaborations are sustained as urgent priorities. They must be among the first to form a variety of community partnerships (Seeley, 1985).
2. Educators, as well as others, may sponsor a Latino Student Placed at Risk (L-SPAR) as part of their service, obtaining extra pay and/or tax credits. Private employers and the justice court system may also find ways to help provide staff assistance for LSPARs in and after school.
3. College students and volunteers who mentor LSPARs also receive tuition and other tax credits.
4. States, businesses, and universities may offer LSPARs at-grade-level (free) tuition for college.
5. In school, class-size reduction /itinerant teachers are institutionalized as part of educational reorganization. Elementary schools are targeted first, followed by secondary schools in a systemic fashion.
6. Finally, a needs assessment is carried out to help prioritize program elements.
Some of the needed changes in counselor and teacher education are:

- a. Human development theory and research focused on the achievement gap problem;
- b. Impact analysis, along with political and economic analysis of related programs; and
- c. Program evaluation tools to be included for process evaluation/feedback to change agents.

Accordingly, a new cadre of educators represents one of a series of key links to serve a new generation of Latinos in U.S. higher education and out of it in four years—with diplomas in hand.

Indeed, we need to transform the ways educators are prepared, and then colleges of education can play a pivotal role. The needed transformations are not even on the horizon, but rather exist in bits and pieces in some programs. The disciplines that underlie key professions remain divided, under-prepared, underpaid, and are consequently disempowered. We have advanced knowledge in improving the early education of students placed at risk (Ramey et al., 2000) and how to transform teaching across student populations (Tharp et al., 2000), yet much of it is not applied. We know affective relationships must be firmly established with young Students Placed at Risk before academic leaning thrives (Comer, 1990), yet we often fail to design learning environments so this may happen. We know how leadership in instruction can drive achievement (Leithwood, et al, 2004) and need to share it with all educators. We have an emerging technology that is promising in assisting educators with experiences and videos of effective lesson studies across cultures (Stigler, Gallimore & Hiebert, 2002) that has yet to be disseminated where most teachers are to be prepared. We need colleges and

communities to volunteer services to help LSPARs and a different federal approach to assist them.

Beyond teacher education, we must also take a critical look at the higher education system itself. We need to begin to look at system that is replicating inequity with the successes (high Latino enrollment) and failures (low graduation and transfer rates to 4 year colleges) of the community college system. We need to demand a rigorous and accurate (e.g., disaggregated by ethnicity, degree and type of institution) accounting of the status of Latinos as undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty, staff, administrators and alumni. Furthermore, an examination of the structures and procedures that perpetuate inequity in the recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure and career advancement of Latinos and others is needed as part of the general knowledge base.

For example, although academia is considered a system based solely on merit, there are distinct obstacles that Latino¹ faculty face that their White colleagues do not. As this chapter was written during Hispanic Heritage Month, two of the authors (Pedro and Edward) received numerous requests for service from the university community (as two of the very few Latino faculty on campus). Yet, in terms of promotion and tenure, such service often carries little weight and is not widely perceived as a tenure-eligible candidates' "legitimate" use of their limited time in many institutions. Consequently, the unique world of the Latino faculty and administrators needs to be addressed and the success of this group (and those in the pipeline) must be considered within a historical and increasingly complex context.

¹ African American and other ethnic faculty may face different issues depending on context,

In order to establish equity in educational outcomes at the school level, a critical mass of educators must come together and lead change for and with Latinos K-16. This is unlikely as long as higher education remains the same. In closing this chapter, we offer several general recommendations:

- We must strive to transform not only teacher education but also the education of all professionals in ways that informs them and brings them closer through service experiences to how the achievement gap is structured and can be diminished. We must have college professors (personnel) who understand the gap (equity - excellence connection) and Group Based Inequality as both a scientific and social problem in which we all play a part and can play a more direct part. A common knowledge base (to which we are referring to in this paper (p.13-15) can be a new goal for undergraduate education that connects with our roles in moving toward greater equity.
- While multicultural education has played an important role in education so far, it is not sufficient to close the gap (Portes & Salas, in preparation). It is time that a more proactive approach and comprehensive approach be infused in all higher education that includes a knowledge base concerning the reproduction of group-based inequality.
- The ethical dimensions and socio-economic costs of failing to integrate a practical, cost-effective social justice direction in higher education need to become a distinct standard in the evaluation of all higher education programs.

- A current limitation in higher education lies in the insulation universities provide the professoriate in addressing social inequity. This often prevents them from encouraging and rewarding their students from helping transfer some of the social capital from universities to struggling students in P-12 who are under-represented. Higher education needs to ensure all students, not only a small group of education, health and law students assist the less advantaged.
- Higher education must lead toward excellence through equity not only by example but also by facilitating social changes along with technological and other advances in weaving a just world where there is progressive reductions in group based inequality and child poverty. We propose one way to do this is to involve every student fortunate enough to have access to higher education in a brief 1-2 semester educational mentoring practicum with a P-12 LSPAR along with the knowledge base on how we can eradicate this preventable inter-cultural, social dis-ease.

Advocacy for Latinos in higher education is not just about getting more Latinos in higher education and professions as a particular end. Rather, higher education is one vital component of part a seamless plan in transforming society toward equity and excellence. We see today from our cultural historical lens how the means provided by affirmative action did open a window from which a movement occurred in the marketplace that corrected some of the gross under-representation produced by centuries of segregation. While critics focused on abuses associated with reverse discrimination and ethnic middle

class student taking advantage of such apertures, in Bowen, W. G., & Bok's (1998) analysis it is clear that access to higher education was limited much too soon.

The reversal of affirmative action may not only have been premature as indicated by the above analysis but also somewhat hypocritical. Since that time, two other developments have exacerbated group-based inequality for historically disparaged, caste-like social groups. First, college costs have soared. Second, higher standards in public education have essentially required students to take Advance Placement courses and perform considerable service to compete for top schools. To top this double bind in which students subject to group based inequality must compete against, we observe that the more advantaged students with more support and higher grades obtain subsidies in the form of tuition waivers and scholarships as much if not more than those in need. Privilege is therefore compounded.

The deficit view regarding ethnic and language learners by many entrenched in privileged positions in higher education is often telling of a deficit in a broader sense of what constitutes human or cultural development. Even with limited access to the top institutions of higher learning, many Latinos continue to enrich and cross-fertilize the areas in which they endeavor, regardless of their social strata, race, or nationality of origin. For example, at Princeton, a Dominican Black male genius is allowed to thrive yet hundreds of other above average Latino seniors who are here to stay without proper documents are barred from higher education lest their low wage parents can pay out of state tuition. Such anti-immigrant policies that deny educational opportunity to the children of exploited workers ruptures a pipeline of talent and successful models and illustrates how group-based discrepancies are mediated and sustained by design.

As we closed this chapter in early 2008, we received emails from activist Students for Latino Empowerment on Campus pleading for us to write to our congresspersons for the Dream Act on behalf of the latter while Newt Gingrich organizes anti-immigrant legislation over the internet on You Tube. On our own campuses, few students seem to make the connection between the relationship between low-cost immigrant labor and global competition especially as this relates to industries in the New South (Schunk & Woodward, 2000; Kochnar, 2005; Murphy et al, 2001). Nor do they understand that historically, this source of cheap labor has been a staple of the U.S economy and remains part of its overall international policy (Portes, A. 2007).

Higher education is not simply about gaining a trade or the means to make a living. It is much more and in the new millennium, we believe, the stakes and opportunities are higher than ever. We also know more than before perhaps and there is evidence that education remains the most cost-effective means to improve the lot of humankind. A cultural historical approach considers activity/action/experience as essential in reversing inequity at two levels: (1) Students Placed at Risked in under-represented groups; and (2), the future dominant majority—currently the privileged middle class/college student population. The latter category is considerably more malleable than the current decision makers who are part and parcel of the GBI problem. It is this malleability that is intergenerational or “historical” in our analysis of Latinos in higher education. While changes are already occurring in modest fashion, looking at the data, it is troubling that the pace of praxis is so slow given the demographic shift at hand. The condition of Latinos (not) in higher education is one index of the degree of and commitment to progress toward greater equity and excellence in U.S. society. As such,

access to a knowledge base and praxis for closing this and other achievement gaps k-16 is a contemporary and future imperative.

References

- American Council on Education. (2006). *Minorities in Higher Education: Twenty-Second Annual Status Report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association (2003). Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58, 377-402.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D., (1998). *The shape of the river: long- term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press.
- Castellanos, J. & Jones, L. (2003). Latino/a undergraduate experience in American higher education. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 1-13). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Chapa, J., & De La Rosa, B. (2004). Latino population growth, socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, and implications for educational attainment. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(2), 130-149.
- Comer, J. P. (1990). Recreating our school communities for youth: the Comer School Development Program. *Partnership: A Journal for Leaders in Education*, 15(1).
- Council of Economic Advisors. (2000). *Educational attainment and success in the new economy: An analysis of challenges for improving Hispanic student's achievement*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President.
- Delgado-Romero, E.A. (2004). *No Parece: The privilege and prejudice inherent in being a light skinned Latino with no accent*. In S.K. Anderson & V.A. Middleton (Eds.), *Explorations in oppression, diversity and privilege* (pp. 119-126). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Delgado-Romero, E.A., Flores, L., Gloria, A., Arredondo, P. & Castellanos, J. (2003). The Majority in the Minority: Developmental career challenges for Latino and Latina psychology faculty. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 257-283). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Manlove, A., Manlove J. & Hernandez, C. A., (2007). Issues in the recruitment and retention of Latino/a Faculty. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6, 1-18.
- DePalma, A. (2005, 26 May). 15 years on the bottom rung. *The New York Times*, p. A1.
- Diaz McConnell, E., & Delgado-Romero, E. A. (2004). Panethnic options and Latinos: Reality or methodological construction? *Sociological Focus*, 4, 297-312.
- Fry, R. (2002). *Latinos in higher education: Many enroll, too few graduate*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Fry, R. (2005). *Recent changes in the entry of Hispanic and White youth into college*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gates, B. (2005). *National education summit on high schools*. Retrieved 2 May, 2005, from

- <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/MediaCenter/Speeches/BillgSpeeches/BGSpeechNGA-050226.htm>
- Haro, R. & Lara, J. F. (2003). Latinos and administrative positions in American higher education. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 153-168). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. & Delgado-Romero, E. (2002). *The Relationship among workload, burnout and stress of full-time faculty and administrators who are people of color*. (Invited Paper - Available from NASPA, 1875 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 418, Washington, DC 20009-5728).
- Hurtado, S. & Kamimura, M. (2003). Latina/o retention in four-year institutions. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 139-150). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Jenkins, D., & Boswell, K. (2002). *State policies on community college remedial education*. Denver: Education Commission of the States Center for Community College Policy.
- Kite, M. E., Russo, N. F., Brehm, S. S., Fouad, N. A., Hall, C. C., Hyde, J. S., & Keita, G. P. (2001). Women psychologists in academe: Mixed progress, unwarranted complacency. *American Psychologist*, 56, 1080-1098.
- Kochnar, R. (2005). Latino Labor Report, 2004: More Jobs for New Immigrants but at Lower Wages. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., et al. (2004) *Learning leadership project: How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leong, F.T. L., Kohout, J., Smith, J. & Wicherski, M. (2003). A profile of ethnic minority psychology: A pipeline perspective. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew & F.T. L. Leong (Eds.) *Handbook of Racial and Ethnic Minority Psychology* (pp. 76-99). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.
- MacDonald, V-M. & Garcia, T. (2003). Historical perspectives on Latino access to higher education, 1848-1990. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 15-43). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Merisotis, J., & Phipps, R. (2000). Remedial education in colleges in universities: What's really going on. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 67-85.
- Murphy, A., Blanchard, C., & Hill, J. (2001) *Latino workers in the contemporary South*: Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *Remedial education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in fall 2000*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences.
- The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2004). *The educational pipeline: Big investment, big returns*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Minorities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Council of La Raza. (2007). *Hispanic education in the United States*. Washington DC: Author.
- Niemann, Y. F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 20, 11-34.
- Pew Research Center. (2005). *Hispanics: A people in motion*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Phipps, R. (1998). *College remediation: What it is, what it costs, what's at stake*. Washington, DC: the Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Portes, A., & Schauffler, R. (1994). Language and the second generation: Bilingualism yesterday and today. *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 640-661.
- Portes, A. (1996). *The new second generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A., & Hao, L. (1998). E Pluribus Unum: Bilingualism and loss of language in the second generation. *Sociology of Education*, 71(4), 269-294.
- Portes, A. (2007). Migration, development, and segmented assimilation: A conceptual review of the evidence. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 610, No. 1, 73-97.
- Portes, P. (1996). Ethnicity and culture in educational psychology. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *The handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 331-357). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Portes, P. (2005). *Dismantling educational inequality: A cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Portes, P., & Salas, S. (in press). The dream deferred: Why multicultural education fails to close the achievement gap-A cultural historical analysis. *Cultura y Educacion*
- Ramey, C. T., Yeates, K. O., Research Office. (2002). *Race/ethnicity of APA members and APA governance members: Analyses of APA governance survey*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schunk, Donald and Doug Woodward. (February 2000). *A profile of the diversified South Carolina economy*, Columbia, SC: Center for Governance.
- Seeley, D. (1985). *Education through partnership*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute on Public Policy Research.
- Stigler, J. W., Gallimore, R., & Hiebert, J. (2000). Using video surveys to compare classrooms and teaching across cultures: Examples and lessons from the TIMSS Video Studies. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 87-100.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Swail, W., Cabrera, A., & Lee, C. (2004). *Latino youth and the pathway to college*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2004). *The educational pipeline: Big investment, big returns*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S. S., & Yamauchi, L.A. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion and harmony*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Tierney, W. G. (2004). *The changing landscape of higher education: The future of college admission*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis University of Southern California.
- United States. President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. (1996). *Our nation on the fault line: Hispanic American education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- United States. President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. (2000). *Creating the will: Hispanics achieving educational excellence. A report to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and the nation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- United States President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. (2002). *The road to a college diploma: The complex reality of raising educational achievement for Hispanics in the United States. An interim report*. Washington, DC: White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans.
- Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools : An ethnographic portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Verdugo, R. R. (2003). Discrimination and merit in higher education. In L. Jones & J. Castellanos (Eds.) *The majority in the minority: Retaining Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in the 21st century* (pp. 241-254). Sterling, VA: Stylus Books.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.