

---

PATRICIA GÁNDARA  
GARY ORFIELD

Chapter One

*Introduction:*  
*Creating a 21st-century Vision of*  
*Access and Equity in Higher Education*

---

The United States is facing a severe crisis of opportunity for higher education compounded by inadequate financing, failure to address the educational needs of an exploding population of students of color, excessive reliance on flawed testing systems, inadequate investment in increasing space for a growing population, and major reversals of civil rights policies that have changed the face of selective colleges. As often happens, these problems have become critical in the most vivid form in the nation's largest state, California, the state that prided itself on the strongest system of public universities in the country: a three-tier system that became the model for many states and was supposed to guarantee access for all.

This book reports on the massive challenges facing California and the responses of both academics looking at the state's educational system as a whole and those within the policy system who are trying to keep it going in difficult times. The book reveals a system that simply is not up to the challenges it faces and presents a range of large and small ways in which it can become more responsive and more equitable. This volume began with

an extraordinary exchange between researchers and policy makers in Sacramento in the fall of 2003, and the resulting chapters and analyses raise issues that will be of interest to those concerned with higher education policy and with racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic equity across the nation.

During the last several decades a disquieting change has been occurring with respect to the United States' educational standing in the world. Once the unquestioned leader in availability and quality of public education, with the highest per capita level of education, the United States has fallen behind several other nations. Although among 55–65 year olds, it still ranks number one in college completion, among 25–34 year olds it has fallen behind Canada, several Northern European and Asian countries (OECD, 2006). The growing percentage of students from groups with high drop out rates threatens to make this pattern even worse. For example, in a new analysis of the Census Bureau's current population survey data, Swanson (2004) argues that the four-year graduation rate for Blacks and Latinos in the US is no more than about 50 percent. Moreover, while about 29 percent of Whites in the 25- to 29-year-old age cohort achieve at least a bachelor's degree, only 16 percent of Blacks and 11 percent of Latinos—who now comprise almost one-third of that population cohort—achieve this level of education. What has happened to U.S. higher education policy over the last half century that resulted in such extraordinary success and now such loss of status?

On the heels of World War II, the Congress saw the need to reintegrate hundreds of thousands of young men and women back into a changed economy and to reward them for service to the nation. Public Law 346, also known as the GI Bill, was passed by Congress in 1944 and opened the doors of higher education to many individuals who would otherwise not have been able to attend college. The GI Bill helped open what had been a very narrow path to college for lower income ex-servicemen, including African Americans and Latinos, and the nation footed the bill for tuition<sup>1</sup> as well as for the major capital investments that were required to radically increase capacity in institutions of higher education. It is widely acknowledged (Henry, 1975; Olson, 1974) that the huge investments in higher education created an educated citizenry that far outpaced other industrialized nations and fueled what would become during the 1950s an economy without rival; the United States became the unquestioned leader in research and technology. As a result, the American economy flourished in areas as diverse as agriculture and computer chip technology. Post-World War II education policies created what came to be known as the American Era.

Even in the face of such cultural and economic successes, the second half of the 20th century was not without serious social challenges. The civil

rights movement, the women's movement, and a new consciousness about the inequalities that existed in Western society blossomed in this period. In 1961, in response to the growing civil rights movement, President Kennedy created the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and issued Executive Order 10925, which referenced the term "affirmative action" to describe measures designed to achieve "nondiscrimination" (Eisaguirre, 1999). In 1964 the Civil Rights Act was passed, and Title VII of the Act affirmed the illegality of discrimination in hiring on the basis of race. Subsequent legislation and judicial opinions strengthened the role of affirmative action in redressing the wrongs of the past and helping to ensure greater fairness in the present with respect to hiring and access to higher education. Although affirmative action has never enjoyed either universal support or implementation, its greatest achievement may have been in fostering the debate about the nation's responsibility to redress a history of discrimination against some groups of Americans. While its effects have been muted by continuing controversy, it has also been the impetus for some gains for women and minorities. In fact, the gains for women have been highly significant; the gains for ethnic minorities somewhat less impressive, but nonetheless real. While women have continued to gain ground vis-à-vis men in higher education and today form the majority of all college students, ethnic minority progress stalled at the end of the 1970s and did not begin to rebound until the late 1980s. The subsequent decade saw substantial growth in college-going, but once again in the 2000s we are faced with backsliding and an impending crisis in access to *equitable* higher education options.

In 1976 the United States reached a postwar peak in access to higher education for ethnic minority students. While about one-third of all students were going on to college after high school graduation, 22 percent of African American males and 23 percent of African American females in the 18- to 24-year-old cohort were enrolled in college. Similarly an all-time high of 21.4 percent of 18- to 24-year-old Latino males were enrolled in college in 1976, while a peak of 19.5 percent of Latina females had been reached the year prior, in 1975. These rapid gains were certainly related to affirmative action policies during the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, a waning of commitment to affirmative action toward the end of the 1970s and the Reagan-era aid cuts took their toll on college-going among Black and Latino students. The 1976 high in enrollments for students of color was not reached again for African American males and females until 1987 and 1986 respectively. Since that time there has been a slow but steady increase in college participation for African Americans, however most of the gains in college-going have been for women. In 1986 African American women overtook their male counterparts in college enrollment and by 2000, 63 percent of 18- to 24-year-old Black college-goers were female. Likewise, in 2000, 57 percent of Latino undergraduates were female. By comparison, in 1976 women accounted for 47 percent of

the undergraduate enrollments among White 18 to 24 year olds, but by 2000 they were 55 percent of all White undergraduates in that age cohort. Thus, women of all ethnicities have been the major beneficiaries of affirmative action policies, but White women have fared better than their sisters of color as a percent of total college-goers.

While all ethnic groups have seen some gains in college going over the last two or three decades, the gap in college participation for high school graduates ages 18 to 24 has widened among Whites, African Americans, and Hispanics. In 1999–2000, the college participation rate of 18- to 24-year-old White high school graduates was 46 percent, compared to 40 percent of African Americans and 34 percent of Hispanics (ACE, 2003). Of course, the colleges and universities that White and Asian students attended were generally different from those attended by Black and Latino students. Latinos, in particular, are much more likely than any other group to attend two-year colleges, where the probabilities of transferring and completing a four-year degree are variously cited as between about 3 and 8 percent for Black and Latino students (Gándara & Chávez, 2003).

In spite of the continuing gaps in access to college between White students and students of color, the mid-1990s saw an anti-affirmative action movement sweep the country. Proponents of the various initiatives and legal decisions that flowed from this movement contended that affirmative action was giving an “unfair” edge in college admissions to ethnic minorities, that the playing field had been leveled, and that since “anyone who wanted to work hard could go to college” there was no further need for affirmative action. The argument then follows that if low-income and ethnic minority students did not apply or go on to college it was because they either hadn’t worked hard enough to gain admission legitimately or they had insufficient interest in higher education to pursue it. In either case they did not “deserve” a break just because of the color of their skin.

Linking the issue of affirmative action to his previous success in pushing through an anti-immigrant initiative, California Governor Pete Wilson was quoted as saying, “It is wrong to reward illegal immigrants for violating our borders. . . . It is wrong to engage in reverse discrimination, giving preferences . . . not on the basis of merit but because of race and gender” (cited in Chávez, 1998, p. 52). Thus, Wilson was casting affirmative action not only as an unfair advantage for students of color—whose mean family income was *half* that of Whites and Asians applying to college, who came disproportionately from impoverished schools, and who as a result routinely had lower test scores—but part of a larger set of injustices against “the people who work hard to pay those taxes and . . . deserve a guarantee that their children will get an equal opportunity to compete for admission to this university” (cited in Chávez, 1998, p. 63). Oddly, the students that would be turned away with the demise of affirmative action would be just that, sons and daughters of people who worked hard and paid

taxes but rarely had the opportunity to compete for admission to the university because their schools did not prepare them for this opportunity. But, Governor Wilson was talking to quite a different constituency.

The reality of the impact of affirmative action on admission to the University of California, of course, is substantially different from the rhetoric. While affirmative action was a concept designed to redress both formal and informal policies that had denied access to jobs and education for people of color and women, during its relatively brief 30+ years' existence, some gains were made, but these were far fewer than many people had hoped for or than its opponents contended. Enrollments for students of color in the University of California, if anything, were slower to show progress than those nationwide and were profoundly affected by the demise of affirmative action in that state. In 1995, just prior to the passage of Proposition 209 banning affirmative action in the state, African Americans comprised 4.3 percent of the freshmen entering the University of California while they were 7.5 percent of the graduating seniors from California's public high schools. In that same year Chicano (Mexican-origin) students were just 11.1 percent of the University's freshman admits, while they comprised about 26 percent of the high school graduating seniors. *Before* the demise of affirmative action, Blacks and Chicanos combined were admitted and enrolled in the University of California at a rate less than half of their representation in the high school graduate population. A number of observers were writing at the time that the under-representation of students of color had reached crisis proportions. *After* the implementation of Proposition 209,<sup>2</sup> there was an immediate plummeting of enrollment of these groups—from 4.3 percent to 2.9 percent for Blacks and from 11.1 percent to 8.8 percent for Chicanos in 1998. By 2003 (the most recent year for which confirmed enrollment data are available), freshman enrollments for Blacks had still not returned to pre-Proposition 209 levels, with a representation of only 3.2 percent of the freshman class, and Chicanos had barely returned to those earlier levels with 11.2 percent of the freshman enrollment. In the interim, however, the pool of Chicano/Latino high school graduates had grown by about 3 percentage points, resulting in a net decline in representation at the University of California. What in 1995 appeared to be a crisis in access, in 2003–2004 had become considerably worse.

Admissions policies are only one impediment to access to higher education. In California, another major impediment is the lack of investment in building capacity within its higher education institutions. In the ten year period between 2003 and 2013, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) estimated that an additional 741,000 students, representing an increase of 34 percent, would seek enrollment in a system already bulging at the seams (CPEC, 2004). Estimates are that by 2010 the community colleges alone will have a shortfall of 315,000 seats to meet projected enrollments, and by 2013 the University of California will need to add 50,000 more

spaces. To simply cover the operations costs of these increases will cost an additional \$3.1 billion without any outlay for capital expenditures. Only one UC campus has been added to the system in the last 40 years, Merced, which opened in fall of 2005 with fewer than 1,000 students—hardly sufficient to absorb the burgeoning demand.

In the absence of massive new expansion of the system, policy makers have focused on achieving greater efficiencies—reducing the average time to graduation, sending more students abroad to study, sharing campuses across systems, relying to a greater extent on private colleges, and expanding the use of distance technologies—to help meet the demand. But these strategies alone will not relieve the pressure on the system or on the most selective campuses. Increasing competition for access to the University of California will mean that more and more students will have to be diverted to less selective—and less expensive—alternatives. With an average high school GPA of 3.8 and SAT scores in the 1200 range already (and over 4.0 and 1300 at the flagship campuses of Berkeley and UCLA), students admitted to the University of California will have to be increasingly competitive, well beyond the range of the great majority of *high achieving* Black, Latino, and Native American high school graduates. Lack of capacity will play a significant role in increasing pressure to divert students of color away from the most selective institutions and into the poorly funded two-year college sector where their chances of actually completing a degree are reduced significantly.

Another critical part of the crisis in access to higher education is the chronic under-representation of faculty of color. A growing literature finds a relationship between faculty diversity and perceived campus climate for students of color. Black and Latino students point to increased opportunities for mentorship with faculty of color, important role models in academe, and a greater understanding of their social and educational circumstances. Yet, in spite of an expanding pipeline, there has been little to no progress in hiring and retaining Black and Latino faculty within the university. In 1989, African Americans were 2.1 percent of the university ladder-rank faculty and in 2004 they were 2.5 percent of the faculty. Chicano/Latinos (a large portion of whom are Latino and *not* Chicano, unlike the great majority of Hispanics in the state) were 3.6 percent of the faculty in 1989 and only 4.9 percent in 2004, in spite of about a 10 percentage point increase in this population group over that 15-year period. Little serious attention has been applied to this problem by the university, although the university in large part is responsible for developing the pool of potential faculty that it contends it cannot find.

It is not simply empty rhetoric to worry out loud about the future of the state of California—and other states as they more closely parallel the demographics of that state—with respect to its economic viability. A number of studies have called attention to this looming economic crisis, as well as to the benefits associated with addressing it proactively. A recent RAND study,

based on several simulations of government investments in education along with costs of social services, concluded that whether the goal was to bring Blacks and Latinos to parity with Whites and Asians in high school completion, college-going, or college degrees, meeting any of those goals always results in a net public financial benefit (Vernez, Krop, & Rydell, 1999).

The estimated public benefits of increasing the education of Blacks and Latinos exceed the estimated costs of providing this education, regardless of the specific educational goal considered, in both California and the rest of the nation. For instance, the public benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 for the “full equalization” (same educational outcomes for all ethnic groups) implies that “every \$1 spent on equalizing education would save, over the long term, about \$1.90 in 1997 dollars in California. The . . . ratio is even more favorable for the rest of the nation, where every \$1 spent . . . would save \$2.60” (Vernez et al., 1999, p. 73).

Moreover, the RAND investigators compute that “the costs of closing the educational attainment gap may be recouped within a decade or so—and thus well within the lifetime of most of those called upon to make the investment—provides a strong argument that indeed the investment is in the taxpayers’ self-interest as well” (Vernez et al., 1999, p. 79). On the other hand, in California, where nearly half the student population is Latino, “failure to close the education gap . . . will result in a large share of future (and larger) cohorts being unprepared to compete in a labor market that increasingly requires at least some postsecondary education” (Vernez et al., 1999, p. 78). In fact, without such investments, we are creating a future that few people would knowingly want to bequeath to their children.

Acknowledging this crisis, in October of 2003, the University of California, Davis and The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University joined forces to host a conference on the crisis in higher education access in California and the nation. Intending to take a more positive stance, the conference was entitled “Expanding Opportunity in Higher Education,” and the focus was on solutions as much as on documenting the existing problems. The immediate focus on California is particularly appropriate given the size of the state—it educates one of every nine students in the country—and its checkered political record with respect to civil rights and educational inequities. A dozen papers were commissioned from the foremost scholars in the country and the most key policy makers in the state were invited to comment on the state of higher education access from their perspectives. What resulted was an unprecedented conversation between policy makers—heads of legislative committees and legislative watch dogs, heads of higher education institutions and agencies—and scholars who have dedicated their careers to understanding the dynamics of education access. The conference yielded two major sets of papers: one that recounted the depth of the challenges that California and the nation face, which was published in the May 2005 issue of the journal

*Educational Policy*, and the second set, focusing on responses to these challenges, which appears in this volume.

We were warned by several of the conference speakers that we must treat the problem of access to higher education as a systemic issue affecting the entire pathway from preschool to college. Winston Doby, vice president of the University of California, warned that the solutions lay in statewide policy and not in adjustments to admissions policies in single institutions. Doby, citing Glenn Loury, noted that “selection rituals are political acts with moral overtones.” We think this is a particularly apt description of the system by which some are selected for elite institutions and others not. As we attempt to understand the selection system in place it is critical to remember that “merit” is a social construction that reflects a political process. Who is merit worthy is decided by officials, and those who make the decisions are, for the most part, from the same group who benefited most by the existing system. It is difficult to find the motivation to change something that doesn’t appear to be broken from one’s own perspective. But, Doby’s invoking of the moral dimension suggests that statewide policy cannot be made solely from the perspective of the traditional beneficiaries of those policies. In order to meet the test of fairness—the moral dimension—all perspectives must be considered, and we need to care as much about the perspective of those who have traditionally failed to gain access as those for whom admission to university is viewed as a birthright. It occurs to us that included in this moral dimension is the problem of social policy in a country that purports to value its children but provides no real support for them or their families. For millions of low-income children who attend the nation’s lowest performing schools, there is no social or educational safety net. It is hard to get to college when you go to school hungry and without adequate housing or medical care every day. This, too, must be a consideration as we weigh the policies that will shape the fates of our youth. Neither in the conference that generated it, nor in this volume, could we undertake to study all the social ills that lead to such disparate outcomes for young people. But we must, at the least, consider that the problem is systemic in the most profound sense, and so we begin part 1 of this book with a set of chapters that examines the contribution of K-12 institutions to the deep inequities that exist in the opportunity sorting machine that is the higher education system in the United States.

This first section begins with a chapter by Oakes, Mendoza, and Silver, entitled “California Opportunity Indicators: Informing and Monitoring California’s Progress Toward Equitable College Access,” in which the authors, all principal researchers with the University of California’s All Campus Consortium on Research for Diversity (UC ACCORD), lay out their system of indicators to monitor the opportunity structure in different high schools in California. Consistent with the view that the college admission process takes place in a highly politicized space, the UC ACCORD team provides a profile of the



indicators for all the schools in each senate and assembly district in the state. Legislators are always interested, and sometimes shocked, at how the schools in their districts perform with respect to preparing students for college. The Indicators Report is a prime example of scholarship that pays attention to the social and political context in which it is conducted, using data to raise the visibility of a problem in legislators' own backyards. This is a model that could be easily adapted in other states and even enhanced in states with better data collection systems than California's.

Fitzgerald follows with chapter 3, which looks at the impact of financial aid on college access, entitled "Lowering Barriers to College Access: Opportunities for More Effective Coordination of State and Federal Student Aid Policies." Recent shifts from need-based to merit-based financial aid and billions of dollars in shortfalls in Pell grant funds have exacerbated an already acute situation for low-income students and large tuition increases have compounded these problems. As Fitzgerald points out, money matters, and many low-income students who are well-prepared for college do not go because of inadequate financial aid. California, through its Cal Grant entitlement program, has one of the most generous financial aid programs in the country, yet the complexity of the process, lack of timely information for families to plan for college, and uncoordinated efforts at the state and national level mean that many students who could benefit from these funds do not know how to access them. The authors contend that better coordination of federal and state policies, tying financial aid to intervention programs in the schools, and more effective utilization of resources can mitigate access barriers and increase enrollment opportunities for low- and moderate-income students in California and across the nation.

A thorny issue in the politics of admission in California higher education has been the awarding of an extra grade point for Advanced Placement courses taken and passed. In other words, a student who receives a B in AP English is given grade points equivalent to an A. The policy was adopted as another way to distinguish among highly qualified students in a highly competitive admissions process. Chapter 4, entitled "The Role of Advanced Placement and Honors Courses in College Admissions," by Geiser and Santelices, looks at the predictive power of simply taking and passing AP courses for grades in college. The authors find no significant relationship between AP course-taking and college GPA and therefore argue that providing extra grade points for taking the courses (but not necessarily passing or even taking the AP test) is not justified as a factor in admissions. And, since they are a source of inequity because schools that serve low-income students are less likely to offer these courses, such a policy would help to equalize opportunity for low-income students. The authors note that students who take AP courses also receive university course credit and holistic reviews of applications consider the degree to which students have challenged themselves with demanding

coursework, so incentives remain for students to take these courses where they are offered even in the absence of extra grade point credit.

Charles Ratliff rounds out the first section of the volume with a perspective from inside the California Legislature on how the state—and other states—might address the inequities that result in such uneven chances for young people from different socio-economic backgrounds to gain access to higher education. Ratliff argues that there are no silver bullets that will equalize opportunity for all of California's students, but that educators can tackle many of the technical aspects of the education system that prevent it from functioning as well as it might. Working in the day-to-day environment of the legislature, Ratliff offers solutions that are politically “doable” and that hopefully move the system closer to the larger goal of equity. Included in his suggestions are using market forces to better distribute highly qualified teachers across both low-income and middle-class schools, reducing restrictions on the way that public education funds are spent, providing better trained administrators that can more successfully address the diversity in their schools, and giving the states' students the opportunity to become fluent in more than one language. These are the very real problems that are debated daily on the floors of the legislature, and while seemingly commonsensical, they have defied easy solutions. To the extent that their resolution would result in much better prepared students, it would appear that these strategies can advance equity in access to higher education; whether it is enough to create fundamental change in access is an empirical question.

One theme that runs through most of the chapters in part 1 of the volume is the necessity to start preparing young people earlier for postsecondary options. The various authors note that low-income and ethnic minority parents have inadequate information with which to plan financially for their children's education and insufficient knowledge of the coursework and other requirements for college admission. Many critics of the existing system argue that postsecondary options need to be presented to students while they are still in elementary school, so that they have developed a disposition to higher education and are better prepared to take the classes they will need for college admission when they begin secondary school. Given that the typical California high school has about one counselor for every 850 students, and elementary schools are not likely to have any, there are far too few school personnel assigned to help students examine their postsecondary options or begin to prepare for them. The dearth of counseling available for low-income and students of color, who often have no other sources of information, must be addressed. Currently, one of the primary ways in which students receive this kind of information and support is through honors and AP courses. However, as Geiser and Santelices (this volume) point out, the likelihood of the students who most need this support receiving it in those contexts is very small. Another way is through special college preparation programs, but these have

never reached large numbers of eligible students and they too have been defunded to a large extent in California as a result of recent budget crises.

Part 2 of this volume focuses on potential interventions at the postsecondary level. We open with a chapter by Estela Bensimon and her colleagues, entitled "Measuring the State of Equity in Public Higher Education," in which they present an educational equity indicators system for higher education. Similar to the Oakes and colleagues' High School Indicators project, Bensimon et al. attempt to provide a framework for institutions of higher education to evaluate their own effectiveness with respect to diversifying their campuses *and* ensuring positive outcomes for their students of color. A critical component of this work is the focus not just on attracting students to the campus but on the experience they have there and the record of the institution with respect to retaining and graduating them. A forthcoming publication authored by Deborah Santiago provides a cogent critique of many Hispanic serving institutions that proudly wave the banner of diversity based on their enrollments, but pay little attention to graduation rates of the Latino students they attract, or to their educational experience at the campus. Bensimon's work, like that of Oakes and her colleagues, has far reaching applicability in California and beyond.

In chapter 7, entitled "Reaping the Benefits of *Grutter*: College Admissions and Racial/Ethnic Diversity," Catherine Horn and Patricia Marin remind us of the evidence for the critical importance of diversity in higher education and the opportunity that the recent Supreme Court decisions allowing affirmative action in higher education represent for continuing the battle for diversity. They also present the evidence on race-neutral admissions strategies that have been used to replace affirmative action in situations where it has been banned, such as in California, but that may also augment affirmative action. They provide a cautiously optimistic view that such things as percent plans and alternative admissions strategies can be important complements to affirmative action, but reiterate that nothing else comes close to providing the same yield as affirmative action. They urge states that can still implement affirmative action strategies to do so vigorously. At the October 2003 conference the chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, Carol Liu, was asked if overturning Proposition 209 and the ban on affirmative action was a possibility from the point of view of the California legislature. Her reply: "Anything is possible in California!" It strikes us that if such a thing were to come to pass, it would need to rely heavily on the kind of evidence presented in the chapter by Horn and Marin.

Stephen Handel and his colleagues follow in the next chapter (8), entitled "The Effectiveness of the Transfer Path for Educationally Disadvantaged Students: California as a Case Study in the Development of a Dual Admissions Program." The chapter provides a discussion of the rise and fall of the highly touted but ill-fated Dual Admissions Program (DAP). A core diversity strategy of the former President of the University of California, Richard

Atkinson, the DAP was intended to increase diversity by ensuring students from low-income schools who were close to achieving eligibility for the university that they would have a reserved place at a UC campus upon completing their first two years of general education requirements. The critical innovation of the DAP, in addition to the written guarantee, was the attention that students were to receive from UC counselors and the very personal recruitment strategy that included a series of personal communications with these students. Unfortunately, cuts to the higher education budget and a new strategy introduced by the governor to move fully eligible students into the community colleges with the same guarantee undermined the DAP program and placed it on indefinite hold. However, Handel, Heisel, and Hoblitzell write about the lessons learned in building and implementing the program, including the need for better incentives to attract students to such a program. As observers of this program, we have also wondered at the lack of attention to providing a supportive peer group for these DAP students at the community college. The research shows that most first-in-the-family college students need to have peers who share their backgrounds and support their aspirations. Creating a cohort of students within the community college who share the same classes and many of the same college experiences on the way to transferring to the four-year university would almost certainly help to ensure the success of such a program.

Chapter 9, entitled “A Strengthened Community College Role in Teacher Preparation: Improving Outcomes for California’s Minority Students,” by Nancy Shulock and Colleen Moore, considers an expanded role for the community colleges in providing a more diverse teaching pool for the K-12 schools and simultaneously providing incentives for diverse students to stay in the higher education pipeline. These authors tackle two deep problems in higher education: the critical shortage of teacher candidates who come from the same communities as the students most at risk in our public schools—low-income and ethnic minority students—and the difficulty that community colleges experience in retaining and transferring students of color to four-year colleges. The teacher candidate problem is part of a vicious cycle in education. Most students of color who go to college in California first attend community colleges. Yet, community colleges have a weak record of transferring students of color to four-year universities where they can earn the bachelor’s degree, a prerequisite to becoming a teacher. And, many have noted that the absence of faculty of color, important role models, reduces the likelihood that young minority students would see teaching as a viable career for themselves.

In fact, the community college student population is potentially the richest source of diverse teacher candidates, if the colleges were more successful in transferring these students to four-year colleges. Thus, Shulock and Moore propose that by starting the pathway to teacher education in the community colleges, it is possible to identify and support potential teacher candidates of

color, create a clear pathway to the teaching credential, and help to provide more teachers who look like the students they teach. The early pathway model has particular value in states like California that rely heavily on their public two-year colleges for postsecondary education, but could be widely adapted to stimulate the pool of teachers of color and increase the holding power of postsecondary institutions.

In chapter 10, entitled “The Educational Pipeline and the Future Professoriate: Who Will Teach California’s and the Nation’s Latino and African American College Students?,” Jorge Chapa presents data on the state of faculty diversity, a nagging and too often overlooked problem in academe. He argues that the faculty diversity problem has two aspects: the need to provide opportunities for more diverse faculty and the need to place college faculty in classrooms with diverse students who understand and can support these students’ educational aspirations. Chapa concedes that the solution to the latter problem may not be the same as the solution to the former. In other words, while attempting to diversify the faculty, he argues that institutions must also be paying attention to the pedagogical skills of the White faculty who will for some time be the majority of college teachers. Creating culturally sensitive faculty who will be successful teachers of Black and Latino students must, according to Chapa, be one of the goals of faculty hiring and reward systems, and he offers examples of how this might happen.

UC President Dynes, in his opening statement at the beginning of the October 2003 conference, noted another important reason to pay keen attention to the issue of faculty diversity. He used the example of scientific discovery and noted how bringing diverse perspectives to the investigation of problems was most likely to result in real scientific breakthroughs. The quality of the research produced by the university, he contended, would be strengthened by diversifying the people in it. The U.S. Supreme Court concluded that there was compelling evidence for this proposition in its 2003 *Grutter* decision upholding the legality of affirmative action. Yet, as Chapa points out, significant progress in creating more diverse faculty in highly selective institutions remains a difficult challenge. The pipeline to the research doctorate for Blacks and Latinos dwindles to a trickle in the latter stages, and individuals who are first in their family to go to college do not often think of the academic life as an appropriate or even desirable choice. Much of the problem lies in the culture of the university and the paradoxically conservative self-replicating nature of the professoriate. It is a fact that faculty produce faculty. Especially in the case of professors of color, it is common to hear that they decided to pursue an academic career because one professor in college told them they were PhD material, helped them get into graduate school, or invited them into their laboratory or onto a research project. Unfortunately, this is less likely to occur with students of color than with middle-class White students who more closely resemble the existing faculty. This

social reproduction must be interrupted, and faculty must be educated in their role as creators of a more diverse new generation of college professors.

In chapter 11, entitled “Access in California Higher Education: The Promise and the Performance,” Bruce Hamlett, former college professor and current chief of staff for Assembly Higher Education in the California legislature, summarizes the state of higher education in California and reflects on the lessons shared in the foregoing chapters. He finds that a well-intended financial aid system in California has been under-funded and does not meet the needs of California’s low-income students, that the state’s heavy reliance on its under-funded community college system cannot deliver on the promise of a college education for all the state’s students. He argues that policy needs to be rethought with respect to what the community colleges can realistically do given their constrained resources, and he seriously questions the wisdom of the 20th-century policy—a cornerstone of the California 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education—of channeling two-thirds of the state’s students into community colleges where they are unlikely to attain the education necessary to compete in a 21st century economy. He also notes that legislation that would create a guaranteed transfer process for some students could only work if it addressed the weaknesses identified in the earlier DAP policy.

Hamlett also finds that a sound accountability system for higher education is lacking and that some of the indicators that Bensimon and her colleagues suggest ought to be included as accountability benchmarks to help ensure better graduation outcomes for the state’s colleges and universities. Finally, Hamlett admonishes that “we know that higher education is the engine that drives the state’s economy. We also know that existing state policies are not supportive of an expansive, effective higher education system. If the policies are not soon revised, the state’s economy will not be competitive internationally.” And so, Hamlett ends where we began, with a system in crisis, under-funded and unprepared for the escalating numbers of students—increasingly from communities of color who have not fared well in this system and with admissions policies that exacerbate an increasing social divide between Whites and Asians on the one hand and Blacks and Latinos on the other.

The serious conversations that occurred among academics and policy makers during the Sacramento conference and through these chapters show that although both groups saw a crisis of considerable dimensions, it was seen differently according to where the speaker was in the educational and political structure. Importantly, however, policy makers repeatedly asked for the help of academics in thinking through ways to address the crisis, and academics were eager to find ways to craft real policy from the findings of their studies. While the policy makers necessarily focused more on the day-to-day political battles that must be won to move any progressive idea forward, the academics often called for more comprehensive changes. In real-

ity, however, the sweeping changes that all acknowledged needed to occur would ultimately have to meet the test of political viability in an era of constrained resources, and from big ideas smaller pieces of legislation would have to be fashioned until and unless there are major changes in public opinion and politics.

We hope that the thoughtful analyses presented in these chapters, paired with solid strategies for equalizing access to *quality* higher education can result in significant change before it is too late. But there is little time to spare. Californians already face shrinking educational opportunity as the state fails to keep up with its exploding population and the increasingly urgent need for college education. The new majority of non-White youth in California has little chance to share the great opportunities available at the top of the state's educational pyramid. The golden days of California's growth and prosperity are not likely to persist long without investing in an education system to meet the needs of a new century and a vastly different population. Once hailed as a document of resounding vision, California's Master Plan for Higher Education was undeniably the driving force behind the enormous expansion of the state's economy. But, that time is past and a new vision is required. We hope that the chapters that follow will contribute to creating that new vision and that it might be a lighthouse for the nation.

## NOTES

1. The GI Bill provided for up to 48 months of "full school costs, including tuition, fees, books, and supplies . . . paid directly by the Veteran's Administration, up to a maximum of \$500 per school year, plus a monthly subsistence allowance between \$50 and \$75" (Henry, 1975, p. 57).

2. While Proposition 209 was passed in November 1996, it did not go into effect until 1997, and therefore the first freshman class to be selected for admission did not enroll until Fall of 1998.

## REFERENCES

- American Council on Education. (2003). *Minorities in higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2004). *Student access, institutional capacity, and public higher education enrollment demand, 2003–2013*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2005). *An update of the commission's community college enrollment demand projections by region*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

- Chávez, L. (1998). *The color bind: California's battle to end affirmative action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Eisaguirre, L. (1999). *Affirmative action*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Gándara, P., & Chávez, L. (2003). Putting the cart before the horse: Latinos and higher education. In D. López & A. Jiménez (Eds.), *Latinos and Public Policy in California, An Agenda for Opportunity* (pp. 87–120). Berkeley, CA: California Policy Research Center, University of California.
- Henry, D. (1975). *Challenges past, challenges present: An analysis of American higher education since 1930*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2004). *Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003*. Retrieved on December 6, 2004, from <http://www.OECD.org>
- Olson, K. (1974). *The GI bill, the veterans, and the colleges*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- Swanson, C. (2004). Sketching a portrait of public high school graduation: Who graduates? Who doesn't? In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Dropouts in America: Confronting the Graduation Rate Crisis* (pp. 13–40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Vernez, G., Krop, R., & Rydell, C. P. (1999). *Closing the education gap: Benefits and costs*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.