

Running Head: TRANSFER EQUITY FOR “MINORITIZED” STUDENTS

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students:
A Critical Policy Analysis of Seven States

Presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education
November, 2009

Work in Progress:
Please Do Not Circulate or Cite without Permission of the Authors

Alicia C. Dowd, Megan Chase, Loni Bordoloi Pazich, Estela Mara Bensimon

Loni Bordoloi Pazich is a research associate and Megan Chase a doctoral student at the Center for Urban Education, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA. Estela Mara Bensimon is Professor and Co-Director, Center for Urban Education and Alicia C. Dowd is Associate Professor and Co-Director, Center for Urban Education. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Megan Chase, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, 702 WPH, 3470 Trousdale Parkway, Los Angeles, CA 90089. Phone 213 740-5202. E-mail: megan.chase@usc.edu

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to thank Brianne Davila, Linda Taing Shieh, and Maria Malagón for valuable assistance with this research.

Abstract

Using Qualitative Document Analysis (QDA), data from policy documents and accountability instruments governing “vertical” transfer from two-year (community and technical colleges) to four-year institutions in seven purposefully sampled states (CA, FL, TX, MI, MN, WA, and WI) were collected and analyzed from the perspective of critical race theory (CRT). Consistent with prior studies, the findings indicate that transfer policy in these states is primarily concerned with the efficient transfer of credits rather than bringing about racial-ethnic equity in transfer outcomes. Although transfer policy is largely “color blind,” accountability practices tying student progression through non-degree credit coursework and incorporating technical colleges into transfer policy offer potential for improving transfer equity.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions—what is sometimes called “vertical transfer” to distinguish from transfer among four-year colleges or “reverse transfer” where individuals with bachelor’s degrees enroll in community colleges—is regarded as an important means of providing access to the baccalaureate. However, national data show that students of color experience lower rates of transfer than their white peers (Bailey, Jenkins, & Leinbach, 2005). According to Bailey et al. (2005), a higher percentage of white students (32%) transfer to four-year institutions than blacks (16%) or Hispanics (24%). Wassmer, Moore, and Shulock (2004) (2004) came to a similar conclusion, finding that community colleges with higher percentages of Hispanic or African American students have lower 6-year transfer rates. Furthermore, Wassmer et al. (2004) found that community colleges with higher transfer rates tend to enroll younger students, students with better academic preparation, higher socioeconomic status, and students with a focus on academic curriculum.

Arbona and Nora (2007) argue that community colleges, despite having large minority enrollments, “have not served as the gateway to a bachelor’s degree for large numbers of lower-income and ethnic minority populations” (p. 248). As an example, according to the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study, approximately 25% of Hispanic students who attended a community college initially planned to transfer. Yet, after six years, only 6% had earned a bachelor’s degree (Hoachlander, Sidora, & Horn, 2003). While policy makers, higher education organizations, and academic researchers have all given considerable attention to transfer issues in recent years, none have analyzed how race and ethnicity are addressed in state transfer policies.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

To some extent, this lack of attention to race and ethnicity can be understood as a consequence of the anti-affirmative action movement. As affirmative action policies in California, Michigan, Washington and other states were struck down or attacked in highly visible public contests, the viability of legislation with explicit reference to the educational outcomes of specific racial-ethnic groups became questionable. Researchers and policy analysts sought class-based or geographic alternatives to increasing racial-ethnic diversity in four-year institutions, particularly selective public universities (Bowen, Kurzweil, & Tobin, 2005; Kahlenberg, 2004; Tienda & Niu, 2004). In the transfer policy arena, legislation attended not to equity concerns but to the efficiency of transfer, such as in the technical efficiency of the transfer of credits between sectors (Roksa & Keith, 2008) or the economic efficiency of getting students to start in the lower cost community college sector, for example by offering transfer scholarships (Long, 2005) or instituting guaranteed transfer policies (Dowd, Bensimon, Bordoloi, & Watford, 2007). The efficiency aspects of transfer took on greater political ramifications as the rising costs of college pushed more middle-class families to consider enrolling in community colleges (Anderson, Alfonso, & Sun, 2006).

In this context, it is perhaps not surprising that equity in the use of transfer as a route to the baccalaureate has been examined more extensively in the research literature by socioeconomic class (Dougherty & Kienzl, 2006; Dowd, Cheslock, & Melguizo, 2008; Dowd & Melguizo, 2008; Melguizo & Dowd, 2009) than by race and ethnicity. This racial-ethnic ‘blind spot’ has been noted in research that calls attention to the large and disproportionate number of Latinos enrolled in community colleges, particularly in states with large Latino populations and large community college systems, such as California and Florida, and their relatively limited

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

opportunities for transfer (Bensimon & Dowd, in press; Brent D. Cejda, Casparis, Rhodes, & Kelly, 2008; González, Stone, & Jovel, 2003).

In this study we frame community college to four-year college transfer as an important educational outcome on the way to a baccalaureate degree. Transfer is viewed as a matter of educational opportunity and of outcome equity, where equity invokes a standard for higher education accountability to ensure that transfer resources are used not just to provide access but also to promote equal transfer outcomes among income and racial-ethnic groups (Bensimon, 2007; Dowd, 2003, 2008). Promoting transfer equity in legislation and higher education policy requires taking account of differential uses of transfer pathways among racial-ethnic groups. This study illuminates the transfer policy debate, and policy analysis more generally, by demonstrating how racial-ethnic inequities in transfer may be created through the lack of explicit attention to race and ethnicity in transfer policy. Using qualitative discourse analysis, we analyzed transfer legislation and postsecondary accountability instruments, focusing on these as the most influential and visible components of state transfer policy (Dougherty, Reid, & Neinhusser, 2007; Wellman, 2002). Analyzing documents from seven states purposefully sampled to provide a range of demographic and higher education contexts, we addressed the following research questions:

1. In what ways, if any, do transfer legislation and postsecondary accountability systems represent race and ethnicity?
2. How do legislation and postsecondary accountability systems assess institutional effectiveness and hold institutions accountable for enabling vertical transfer for historically “minoritized” groups?

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Our objective was to understand how transfer legislation and postsecondary accountability accounts for historic inequities in baccalaureate attainment by racial and ethnic group who represent “involuntary minorities” (Ogbu, 1990) because their presence in the United States came about as a consequence of enslavement (African Americans), conquest (American Indians, Mexican Americans), and colonization (Puerto Ricans and Native Hawaiians) (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005). Hence, the term “minoritized” populations is used intentionally to represent more accurately the historical and legal circumstances that resulted in the creation of “minority” populations. The prevalence of educational inequality is the legacy of exclusionary practices (e.g., forbidding the teaching of reading to slaves), legal segregation, mandatory instruction in English, and inferior schools and resources (Gloria Ladson-Billings, 2006). The overrepresentation of African Americans, Latinas and Latinos, and American Indians in two-year community and technical colleges is not simply a matter of college or career choices. Based on indicators of educational quality and funding equity, minoritized students attend the poorest quality, most segregated, and underfunded public schools (Ladson-Billings, 2006), which lack the college preparation and information resources routinely available in predominantly white schools (Oakes, 1989).

It is due to this pattern of unequal educational opportunity that the two-year college sector is the only point of entry into higher education for large numbers of students from minoritized populations. Unequal educational opportunity also results in the overrepresentation of students from minoritized groups in non-degree credit college basic skills courses. In California traditional college-age Latina and Latino students (as well as African Americans) entering community colleges may find that, in order to enroll in a college-level English or

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Mathematics course, they first have to complete as many as three non-credit courses, with the total number depending on their scores on a placement exam.

CRT makes it possible to show the ways in which the erasure of race and racial history limits the power of educational policy to address inequity, even when it purports to. For example, Gloria Ladson Billings suggests that instead of defining racial disparities as the “achievement gap” between blacks and whites, the focus should be on the historical, economic, sociopolitical, and moral decisions and policies that have created an education debt. The redefinition of “achievement gap” as an “education debt” owed minoritized populations is not merely a semantic conceit, it places the responsibility for redress on society.

Conceptual Framework

This study examines how state transfer policies address the urgent need to increase transfer access and successful transfer outcomes among racial and ethnic groups for whom the community college serves as the main point of entry into higher education. Are transfer policies formulated to achieve equity, which, as in our prior scholarship, we define as parity in educational outcomes across racial-ethnic groups (Bensimon, 1999; E.M. Bensimon, 2005; E. M. Bensimon, 2005; Bensimon, Hao, & Bustillos, 2006; Bensimon, Harris III, & Rueda, 2007; Bensimon, Polkinghorne, Bauman, & Vallejo, 2004; Dowd, 2003, 2008)? Critical race theory (CRT) posits that racism is endemic and ingrained in political, legal, educational, and other institutions (Ladson - Billings, 1998; Matsuda, Lawrence III, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Solorzano, 1998). As part of a broader goal of ending all forms of oppression, CRT challenges claims of neutrality, objectivity, meritocracy, and equal opportunity in policy instruments that are made despite evidence to the contrary (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009; Ladson - Billings, 1998; Matsuda, et al., 1993; Solorzano, 1998). By challenging implicit assumptions, those who

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

adopt critical race theory in their work aim to transform institutions and not merely make adjustments to existing structures (Matsuda, et al., 1993).

CRT originated in the 1980s to contest the lack of attention to race in judicial decisions and legal scholarship. Its use has since been extended to the social sciences. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) initially called for educational researchers to apply CRT in their work. Since then, CRT has been used to study not just the impact of judicial decisions on higher education (Morfin, Perez, Parker, Lynn, & Arrona, 2006; Villenas, Deyhle, & Parker, 1999), but also education policy (Aleman, 2007; Brady, Eatman, & Parker, 2000; Iverson, 2007; Young, 1999), and the racialized experiences and identity development of students and scholars (Banning, 1999; Gonzalez, 1998; Pizarro, 1998; Solorzano, 1998; Villalpando, 2000).

Traditional rationalist and positivist approaches to policy analyses are what critical race theorist refer to as “color-blind.” By assuming a racial-ethnic norm or that race and ethnicity are not relevant in educational policy, they camouflage the differential impact of policy on students of color and white students (Iverson, 2007; Parker, 2003; Rivas, Pérez, Alvarez, & Solorzano, 2007; Young, 1999). Conventional analyses treat the policy process “principally as a process of problem solving” (Iverson, 2007, p. 589) and fail to take a critical stance on, among other things, the differential impact of “solutions” on white students and students of color. Young (1999) demonstrates the limitations of the traditional rationalist approach to policy analysis in her bi-theoretical study of the failure of a parental involvement policy. The rationalist approach did not reveal, as the CRT approach did, how the inequitable distribution of power and knowledge of parents at the school was implicated in the policy failure.

The work of Young (1999) and others demonstrates how using CRT in policy analysis is especially important in a highly stratified society like the United States because otherwise the

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

impact of status differentials such as race and class remain hidden. For scholars concerned with exposing and ameliorating the ways in which educational policy and practice subordinate racial and ethnic minority groups, CRT provides a theoretical lens to formulate research questions, interpret data, and propose changes to policies, practices, and institutions (Aleman, 2007; Parker, 2003) (Alemàn, 2007; Parker, 2003; Solórzano, 1998). CRT is useful because it provides a lens that helps us see the ways in which everyday policies and practices, such as those having to do with transfer, perpetuate racial inequity (Harper, et al., 2009).

Three tenets of CRT are particularly relevant to the analysis of transfer policies.

First, CRT emphasizes, *to counter institutionalized racial discrimination focus on reforming the policies, structures, practices, and allocation of resources that result in or reinforce racial inequity (Chesler & Crawfoot, 1989), rather than on eliminating the discriminatory or racist views of individuals (Matsuda, et al., 1993)*. Transfer policies can be enacted without conscious discriminatory intent, yet still produce results with inequitable, negative effects on students of color. From this view, persistent and systematically unequal participation and outcomes among racial-ethnic groups in transfer courses, preparatory programs, transfer, and successful bachelor’s degree completion after transfer provide evidence that transfer policies and practices are discriminatory. This tenet motivates our analysis of transfer policies. Demonstrating how to critically evaluate policies in terms of their potential for discriminatory impact provides the basis for redesigning policies in a more equitable manner.

Second, *take a skeptical stance toward claims of objectivity, neutrality, inclusiveness, universality, color blindness, and equal opportunity (Matsuda, et al., 1993)*. For example, a policy labeled “Guaranteed Transfer” conveys a right to transfer for students who meet certain requirements. However, by asking “who benefits” from a CRT perspective, seemingly neutral

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

eligibility criteria are observed to disadvantage racial and ethnic minorities. The discriminatory aspects of such a policy emerge by questioning the inclusivity of a valuable benefit, such as a guarantee of transfer. Observing that students who do not enter postsecondary education prepared to complete degree-credit courses, and the substantial overrepresentation of students of color in non-degree (i.e. remedial or basic skills) courses (for further discussion, see Dowd, 2008) reveals that straightforward, “meritocratic” curriculum requirements might exclude more students of color than they include (Dowd, et al., 2007). Similarly, the concentration of minoritized students in technical degrees and institutions (Bragg, 2002; Bailey, Leinbach, Scott, Alfonso, Kienzl, & Kennedy, 2003) has implications for the design of transfer policies. Though the purpose of technical programs is to prepare students for the workforce, when there is a systematic racial-ethnic stratification of students in different postsecondary sectors, then policies that restrict the access of students in technical programs to transfer and bachelor’s degrees are not neutral.

Third, *insist on a contextual and historical perspective (Matsuda, et al., 1993) of educational policy*. A critical perspective on transfer policy takes into account the factors that contribute to direct enrollment in the four-year college sector, such as income, occupation, and parental degree attainment at the bachelor’s, professional, and doctoral level, and the historical monopoly that whites held on educational opportunities that led to high status, high income professions. For example, the importance placed on “legacy” students in elite college admissions illustrates the intergenerational value of college completion and the disadvantage faced by today’s generation of minoritized groups due to the institutionalized exclusion of earlier generations of members of their family from college. From this perspective, it is not a matter of

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

individual choice, but of historical exclusion, that minoritized groups are heavily concentrated in non-degree credit courses and technical programs.

In addition, while many students exercise choice when enrolling in community colleges, many others do not. There is a “geography of access” that provides a broad postsecondary choice set, including flagship universities, to students of economic means who have high mobility and a much more limited choice set, possibly comprised solely of community colleges, to low-income urban and rural students, many of whom are students of color. Decisions about the physical location of different types of institutions and the amount of funds allocated to historically black colleges and urban campuses have been driven over the years by political lobbying, institutional competitions, and conflict among racial groups (Olivas, 2005).

Literature Review

Scholarship on transfer barriers tends to focus on student, institutional, and cultural characteristics (D. L. Banks, 1994; B. D. Cejda, 1998; Brent D. Cejda, 2004; Deil-Amin, 2003; Garcia, Gonzalez, & Grimes, 2004; Harris, 1998; Jones, 1992; Lanaan, 1996; Perin, 2005; Shaw, 2001). Less attention has been paid to the state policies that govern transfer as a pathway to the baccalaureate. Studies and reports on state transfer policies conducted to date are predominantly of two types; (a) descriptive studies that characterize, catalog, or identify state and national trends; or (b) studies on the effectiveness of transfer policy in increasing transfer rates. While these studies are important in understanding the state transfer policy landscape, they do not consider the intent and impact of transfer policies in relation to the history of community colleges as the dominant pathway to the baccalaureate for racial and ethnic groups who have been least well served by the public educational system. As noted above, the majority of these studies are concerned with the general purposes of transfer policies and their effectiveness in

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

achieving rational outcomes, e.g., efficiency, reducing the cost of higher education, and meeting workforce needs.

Descriptive Transfer Policy Studies

Descriptive transfer policy studies published to date have used a rational traditionalist approach to capture the contours of state transfer policy. In the mid 1980s, states increased involvement in transfer and articulation because policymakers believed that states with transfer policy would perform better than those without (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985). Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) analyzed state-level articulation and categorized all 50 states into four patterns of transfer and articulation policy: (a) formal and legally based policies, (b) state system level policies that refer more to transfer guidelines than articulation, (c) voluntary agreements between institutions, and (d) agreements for technical or vocational courses. At the time of their report, eight states met the first pattern of policy, but the number grew quickly to thirteen by 1989 ((Bender, 1990; Ignash & Townsend, 2001). Bender (1990) conducted state case reports of successful transfer and articulation at the state and regional level in California, Florida, New Jersey, and Texas. He found that each sampled state had a policy statement on credit transfer. He concluded that successful articulation is a result of invested leadership in articulation issues and cross campus faculty relationships. Using interview data and document analysis, Knoell (1990) compared state articulation and transfer policy in 1965 and 1987, and found that transfer and articulation policies had shifted from informal agreements between institutions, to more formal policies created by the state legislature or state boards of higher education. Dougherty, Reid, and Nienhusser (2007) examine state policy affecting access to and success in community colleges for minority and low-income students in Florida, New Mexico, Texas, North Carolina,

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

and Virginia, but it does not focus specifically on transfer, and it does not use critical race theory as its conceptual framework.

One study provides information on the impact of state legislature on transfer policy. Keith (1996) examined legislative histories of 48 states to explore the extent to which the type of state governance authority may affect the establishment of articulation policies. He found that the structure of community college governance and legislation varies by state. He concluded that states that incorporate their community colleges under state higher education boards are more likely to create articulation policies than in states where they are separate (Keith, 1996, p. 89). Dougherty and Reid (2007) add that state transfer policies vary in their “source, scope, and authoritativeness” (p. 19), and the stronger transfer policies are products of statutory action and pertain to all sectors of higher education in the state.

More recent transfer policy studies attempt to provide analyses for all 50 states to identify general trends across the nation (Roksa & Keith, 2008). The Education Commission of the States (ECS, 2001) surveyed legislation pertaining to transfer, statewide articulation agreements, transfer data reporting systems, transfer incentives, statewide articulation guides, common general education curriculum and common course numbering system in all 50 states. ECS (2001) found large disparities between state policies and recommended that states design a more comprehensive strategy (ECS, 2001). Ignash and Townsend (2001) aimed to identify trends in state transfer policy by surveying 43 state’s State Higher Education Officers and directors of community college state agencies, and like ECS (2001), found a high degree of variability between the states.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

The Effectiveness of State Transfer Policy

Other studies examine the effectiveness of state transfer policy, where “effectiveness” is defined as increasing the number of transfer students. Researchers provide mixed results on the relationship between transfer policy and transfer rates (Anderson, Sun, & Alfonso, 2006) (Anderson, et al. 2006). According to Roksa (2009), the strongest assessment of the effectiveness of articulation policies would result from comparing longitudinal data on transfer before and after policy implementation. However, this is generally not possible, as data collection methods were developed after states mandated transfer policies, and even if data systems had been in place, they are not uniform, making cross state comparisons difficult.

Studies conducted by Banks (1994), Higgins and Katsinas (1999), and Goldhaber, Gross, and DeBurgomaster (2008) found that institutions with formalized statewide articulation policies have higher transfer rates. Banks (1994) and Higgins and Katsinas (1999) examined community college transfer rates in 15 states, whereas Goldhaber et al. (2008) considered whether states with legislated transfer policies have more students enrolling in community colleges and successfully transferring. Goldhaber et al. (2008) discovered an association between stronger policies, increased student aspirations to transfer and transfer rates. They also found that common general education requirements and common core courses were not always associated with higher transfer rates. More interestingly, Goldhaber et al. (2008) found an association between transfer and articulation policies and students “warming up” to earning a bachelor’s degree. This suggests that in states with transfer policies, students who enter two-year institutions without transfer goals were more likely to change their goal to transfer compared to students in states without such policies.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Other researchers argue that state transfer policies are not effective in increasing the number of transfer students (Anderson, Sun, et al., 2006; Roksa & Keith, 2008; Wellman, 2002). Wellman (2002) found that the difference between high and low performing transfer states is less associated with academic policies and more correlated with how state higher education governance is structured. Similarly, Anderson et al. (2006) found no relationship between academic transfer policies and transfer rates. The researchers found that community college students in states with articulation and transfer policies do not experience increased probability of transfer when holding constant student demographic, socio-economic, educational, and enrollment characteristics.

Roksa and Keith (2008) argue that facilitating transfer was never the intended goal of state policies. The researchers posit that an examination of these policies reveal that the goal is to “facilitate students’ transitions across state higher education institutions by preventing the loss of credits,” not necessarily to increase the number of transfer students (p. 237). The researchers reviewed the language of all state statutes and found that articulation policies were designed to preserve credits when students transfer, not to increase or entice students to transfer. Roksa and Keith (2008) do acknowledge that the establishment of state policy could indirectly affect transfer rates.

This review illustrates that the extant research on transfer policy provides a valuable overview of the policy landscape, while also drawing attention to a lack of consensus regarding the effectiveness of transfer policies. However, despite a burgeoning policy literature on transfer and community colleges, there is a noticeable and surprising dearth of critical studies of transfer policies (or higher education policies in general). While these policy audits enable comparisons across states, or within selected states over time, most do not attempt to critically evaluate

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

transfer policy with an eye towards meeting the needs of students of color, despite the fact that for many of these students, the community college represents the only pathway to higher education.

Few studies take into account education’s history of exclusionary practices, which have resulted in segregated schooling and inferior opportunities for racial and ethnic minority students to become college prepared. In addition, research delving into the “effectiveness” of state transfer policy fails to evaluate them from the standpoint of which student populations benefit from such policies. As will be explored in the following section, this study has been designed to begin to fill this gap in our knowledge and to help us understand the extent to which the needs of racial and ethnic minorities are considered in formulating transfer legislation and accountability.

Research Methods

This study was conducted by using qualitative document analysis (QDA), “an integrated method, procedure, and technique for locating, identifying, retrieving and analyzing documents for their relevance, significance and meaning” (Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, & Schneider, 2008, p. 128). Data were collected from “documents,” which are broadly defined in QDA methods as “any symbolic representation that can be recorded and retrieved for description and analysis” (Altheide, et al., 2008, p. 127), but which in this study refers to written state-level postsecondary legislation and policies. Consistent with QDA standards for trustworthiness, replicability, and transferability, the methods for this study involved systematic document retrieval, “developing a protocol for more systematic analysis,” and “constant comparisons to clarify themes, frames, and discourse” (Altheide, et al., 2008, p. 128). QDA methodology is consistent with a CRT analysis because QDA investigates documents both for their explicit content and their use, function, and impact (Prior, 2008; Zimmerman & Pollner, 1971). Sensitivity to both these aspects of document

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

analysis is important to this study, because we are as interested in what documents “say” as what documents “do” (Prior, 2008) in regard to constructing transfer equity for underrepresented racial-ethnic minority groups.

Sampling and Data Collection

Seven Purposefully Sampled States To conduct an in-depth analysis of the representation of race and ethnicity in transfer policy we examined documents pertaining to transfer policy, postsecondary education structures, and higher education accountability in seven states (CA, FL, MI, MN, TX, WA, WI) purposefully sampled as information-rich cases offering a significant amount of variation (Patton, 1990).

The seven states offer variation, first, in terms of the racial-ethnic composition of the population. As shown in Table 1, California and Texas are the only sampled states where the majority of the population is no longer white (42.6% and 47.8%). In both of these states, the Hispanic population, as designated in the U.S. Census Bureau’s data, is more than a third of the total population. Florida and Michigan both have large African American populations of approximately 14%, and Florida also has a large Hispanic population (20.5%). Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin represent states with large white populations; however, recent research indicates that these states, too, are experiencing dramatic growth of the Latino population (Fry, 2006).

Second, the states vary in terms of the way postsecondary education is structured and the extent to which they rely on two-year systems, whether of community colleges or technical colleges, to provide access to the baccalaureate. As shown in Table 2, all seven states have two-tiered research and comprehensive universities, but three of them do not have a technical college system. California has the largest community college sector, with 110 colleges. The number of

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

community colleges in the other states ranges between 4 (WA) and 50 (TX). Minnesota and Washington have similar governing systems, where the community colleges and technical colleges are organized under a single coordinating body. In contrast, Wisconsin’s two-year liberal arts colleges are organized under the University of Wisconsin and are separate from the Wisconsin Technical College System.

Finally, we selected states where minoritized populations are highly concentrated in two-year colleges, as Latinos are in community colleges in California, Florida, and Texas, and African Americans are in technical colleges in Wisconsin and Texas. Transfer pathways from technical colleges are of critical importance for students of color. For example, 98.1% of all racial minorities enrolled in two-year colleges in Wisconsin attend a technical college (Wisconsin Technical College System, 2008). Other states have similar statistics, such as Texas where almost 60% of students enrolled in technical colleges are racial minorities.

Data Collection Data collection proceeded in several steps, resulting in a database from which we drew for the purposes of this analysis. First we developed a policy review protocol that, as previously identified by Wellman (2002), distinguished between postsecondary structures and academic policies that shape or impact the transfer function. In regard to postsecondary structures, we further delineated the following categories: legislation, accountability reporting, management information system capacity, public two-year college mission(s), and incentives and rewards for students to transfer. Relevant to academic policies, we delineated the categories of cooperative/articulation agreements, guaranteed transfer agreements, statewide articulation guides, common core curricula, and common course numbering, which “influence the internal business of alignment between students, programs, and courses within and across institutions” (Wellman, 2002, p. 38). The comprehensiveness of these categories, which essentially cover the

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

entire content domain of transfer policy and provide a holistic picture of each state’s activity in this policy arena (Education Commission of the States, 2001), enabled us to categorize the data we subsequently collected through on-line searches of state government web sites, accountability instruments, and policy audits (listed in Appendix A) in a carefully delineated manner.

As shown in Table 3, a data collection prompt was then associated with each category. Each prompt, tailored to the type of information typical of each category of information, questioned to what extent race or ethnicity was explicitly or implicitly recognized. The prompt for each category of legislation also focused on collecting any information available in the documents concerning the historical background, which would provide context for assessing to what extent the legislation represents a commitment to meeting the needs of underserved populations. In the category of accountability reporting, the focus was on determining if transfer data were disaggregated by race and ethnicity and if institutional performance benchmarks were required or expected for underserved populations.

Table 2, which lists the entire series of data collection prompts, demonstrates how we operationalized CRT tenets in our data collection process by questioning assumptions of inclusivity and neutrality, asking “who benefits” from eligibility, reporting, or dissemination policies as written, and attempting to establish the historical context of policy adoption. We hypothesized that for the most part transfer policies are “color blind,” meaning that they do not typically include explicit references to racial-ethnic groups. Therefore, we also looked for terms with racialized meanings, such as “minorities,” “disadvantaged,” “diversity,” “underrepresented,” “disadvantaged,” “at risk,” etc.

Between January and March 2009, the data were collected first by one researcher and then independently reviewed by a second researcher who compared the source document and the

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

collected data for accuracy and completeness. Information was also collected or cross-checked using existing policy audits (Education Commission of the States, 2001; Dougherty & Reid, 2007; Townsend & Ignash, 2000; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2005), taking care to note where information in those sources was outdated.

In this paper, we report our analysis of the subset of these data pertaining to the first two structural categories of transfer legislation and accountability reporting. We have selected this focus because these categories offered a wealth of information and, as noted above, due to their public visibility, legislation and accountability policies are key repositories of information about transfer (Dougherty & Reid, 2007, Wellman, 2002).

Data Sources Following Dougherty and Reid (2007), we took a broad view of what constitutes higher education policy, including both legislative actions, accountability requirements, and “guiding policies” (Robertson & Frier, 1996). In determining which of the admittedly vast cache of legislative documents to include in our analysis, we used a nested sampling strategy. We first obtained written texts concerning transfer reflecting authoritative actions by the state legislature (which we refer to as “legislative transfer statutes”). When those documents did not include any reference to racial-ethnic groups or terms such as “minorities,” or “disadvantaged” students, we broadened the data collection to include policies issued by statewide higher education coordinating boards or agencies (which we refer to as “higher education policies”). We took this approach because we did not want to reach the conclusion that states do not take account of race and ethnicity in higher education policy without casting a broad net. In those cases where no web-based evidence of legislative action on transfer existed (as was the case in one state we studied), similarly we turned to policies put forward by coordinating boards.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

In determining which aspects of postsecondary accountability policies to include, we limited the search initially to two-year public system requirements and data collection instruments. We defined **transfer-related indicators** as any indicators appearing in statewide accountability instruments pertaining to transfer students, satisfying at least one of the three following criteria:

- (i) ***transfer preparation or readiness***: any indicators pertaining to completion of transferrable courses, transfer curriculum or core curriculum by any and all students (e.g. attainment of transfer-ready status);
- (ii) ***transfer-out to four-year institutions***: any indicator pertaining to numbers or percentages of students transferring from two- to four-year institutions (e.g. transfer rates);
- (iii) Success of transfer students at receiving four-year institution (or ***success post-transfer***): any indicator pertaining to success experienced by transfer students at receiving university, including grade point average, retention, graduation, or baccalaureate attainment (e.g. baccalaureate holders who transferred from two-year institutions, associate degree transfers who earn 2.5+ GPA after one year at receiving university);

Next, we collated all indicators that, while not necessarily directly related to transfer students, could be expected to impact transfer or baccalaureate attainment. Based on what is measured or monitored, wherever appropriate, the indicators were put in at least one of the following three categories. These are collectively referred to as **transfer-impacting indicators**.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

- (i) **Basic skills:** any indicator pertaining to the success, improvement, retention, or completion for underprepared students or students in basic skills/developmental education (e.g. successful developmental education course completion, entry into college-level coursework; transfer outcomes for students who started in basic skills);
- (ii) **Retention:** any indicator pertaining to the retention, persistence or credit attainment thresholds of prepared or underprepared students (e.g. persistence of prepared and underprepared students, persistence of first-time undergraduates, students who earn at least 30 credits);
- (iii) **Two-year degree completion:** any indicator pertaining to certificate or degree completion or attainment or graduation from two-year institutions (e.g. certificate/degree attainment in high-demand fields, associate degree attainment within four years among black males who complete 18 credits);

Finally, and again to cast a broad net, we reviewed accountability indicators that were not related to transfer and sought to incorporate any pertaining to race/ethnicity (including as expressed in the terms of underrepresented, underserved, or minority students). In addition, all of the surveyed states’ accountability instruments or related policy documents put forward by state higher education coordinating boards or agencies were examined to see if any numerical goals, targets, or benchmarks were indicated using transfer-related or transfer-impacting measures, as defined above.

Analysis

After locating the appropriate documents for our analysis and collecting the data by the categories of the document review protocol, we examined each piece of legislation or policy for the presence or absence of references to race or ethnicity, either in explicit racial-ethnic terms or

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

in terms often associated with ethnic-ethnic groups with minority status. This analysis was conducted to answer our first research question, “In what ways, if any, do transfer legislation and postsecondary accountability systems represent race and ethnicity?”

The second research question asks “How do legislation and postsecondary accountability systems assess institutional effectiveness and hold institutions accountable for enabling vertical transfer for historically minoritized groups?” We first categorized legislation and accountability indicators in our data as transfer-related or transfer-impacting, as defined above. We interpreted *transfer-related* indicators as having less potential to improve equity because, as Roksa and Keith (2008) have found, they are intended primarily to ensure the efficient use of higher education resources rather than to improve transfer for underrepresented groups. In assigning this meaning, we note that technical efficiency is also necessary for achieving equitable student outcomes; however, efficiency rationales typically obscure equity issues rather than address them (Dowd, 2002).

In analyzing legislation and the *transfer-impacting* indicators, as defined above, we interpreted provisions that were inclusive of students in technical colleges and that measured progress from the pre-collegiate to the transfer curriculum as having the greatest potential to improve transfer equity. We constrained this interpretation on the condition that the legislation directed and accountability systems acted on data disaggregated by race and ethnicity. We assigned this meaning to provisions with these characteristics to account for the overrepresentation of minoritized groups in the pre-transfer (non-degree credit) curriculum. This interpretation follows the tenet of critical race theory to account for the historical context of enrollment patterns, which reflect the intergenerational legacy of the legal, institutionalized discrimination that excluded minoritized groups from postsecondary education. Transfer

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

legislation and accountability that does not include indicators of student progress in the non-degree credit curriculum will, by design, be exclusive of minoritized students due to their poor access to the degree-credit curriculum.

To synthesize our results, we wrote a summary of the collected evidence for each state in response to the following prompts: “What evidence do we have that these policies promote or undermine equity? Who benefits from these policies? What assumptions are made of transfer students? What evidence is there of race consciousness in the rhetoric or expressed values? And what sensitivity is evidenced to the needs of minority students?” We then conducted a cross-case analysis, summarizing our findings with excerpts from the documents analyzed in order to retain the original context of the data, and tallying the results according to our interpretive categories.

Limitations

The existence of policies targeted at improving transfer equity for minoritized groups are not very likely to be sufficient to bring about transfer equity, for example in the absence of political will, directed resources, and educational leadership at the campus and system levels. Therefore, it is relevant to question if it really matters whether state legislation or policies take account of differences among racial-ethnic groups in postsecondary education. This analysis cannot determine the extent to which the statutes and policies analyzed had an impact on transfer participation or outcomes for minoritized students. However, we view these policy instruments as valuable levers for attention to racial-ethnic inequities, acting as one component that can bring pressure to bear on systems to address such inequities.

In addition, an analysis of accountability requirements for four-year colleges and universities in these states could yield an additional dimension to our findings, particularly in the area of post-transfer success.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Our findings are not generalizable to other states; however, they demonstrate common modes of representation of race and ethnicity in transfer policy and a range of variation in the ways that states account for the history of institutionalized discrimination in postsecondary education in the United States.

Descriptive Results

Our results indicate that only Michigan, among the states in the sample, did not have transfer legislation and accountability policies relevant to evaluating the effectiveness of public two-year institutions in promoting transfer to the four-year sector.

Legislation

The content of transfer legislation in these states was characteristic of transfer policies documented in prior fifty-state studies. As summarized in Table 4, statutes establishing a core curriculum, common course numbering, program articulation among sectors, dual enrollment, and formal structures to disseminate information to students about transfer procedures existed in these six states. By far, California had the most activity in legislating transfer, counting for 22 of the 43 statutes we coded for transfer content. The number of transfer statutes in the other six states ranged between two (MN) and six (FL). (Appendix A provides the legislative code number and a description of the content for each statute we coded as pertaining to transfer.)

Postsecondary Accountability

Postsecondary accountability goals and indicators relevant to transfer were established in formal planning documents and accountability instruments in six of the seven states sampled in this study. As shown in Table 5, these were articulated in the following plans or systems in each state: Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) in California, the Long-Range Program Plan in Florida, the Texas Higher Education Accountability System, the

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Minnesota Measures: Report on Higher Education Performance, the Higher Education Accountability Report in Washington, and Investing in Wisconsin’s Future: UW System’s Growth Agenda Accountability Report. Wisconsin’s Growth Agenda does not pertain to the Wisconsin Technical Colleges. The technical colleges are in a separate system that does not have a public accountability plan. As noted above, Michigan does not have an accountability plan.

Transfer-related indicators (transfer readiness, transfer out, and post-transfer success) and transfer-impacting indicators (basic skills, persistence, and degree completion) existed in the majority of the sampled states with accountability plans, with the exception of basic skills course completion and transfer readiness indicators, which were found in only two and three states. Among the transfer-related indicators, transfer out and post-transfer success were more common than transfer readiness. Transfer out was an indicator in California, Florida, Texas, and Washington, and post-transfer success was an indicator in California, Florida and Wisconsin. Only California and Washington had indicators to monitor transfer readiness.

Among the transfer-impacting indicators, persistence and degree completion indicators existed in four states (with Florida and Minnesota being the exceptions for persistence, and California and Wisconsin the exceptions for degree completion). Indicators to monitor student progress in the non-degree credit curriculum were found in three states. California, Florida, and Texas monitor students’ successful completion of non-degree credit courses in English, English as a Second Language, and Mathematics. The types of indicators in each state are summarized in Table 5.

Representations of Race and Ethnicity

Legislation In the six states with transfer policies, only one, California, referred to race or ethnicity, or used terms typically associated with minoritized groups, in its transfer legislation

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

and accountability indicators. These references occurred in 14 of the 22 legislative statutes coded as pertaining to transfer using a variety of terms including “underrepresented” (3 times), “disadvantaged” (2), “underrepresented minorities” (2) or minorities (1), “diversity”(2), “ethnicity”(1) and “race”(1). Explicit reference to African American, Chicano/Latino, and American Indian students occurred once in our data. Race was mentioned or alluded to in the following contexts: access to transfer pathways, dissemination of transfer information, development of transfer centers, development and maintenance of articulation agreements and transfer plans, monitoring of transfer data, and evaluation of transfer policies. (See Appendix B for the specific language of statutes coded as referring to race or ethnicity.)

Transfer has been a critical component of higher education policy in California since 1960, when the California Master Plan for Higher Education was passed. The plan created the three segments of the state higher education system: the University of California (UC), the California State University (CSU), and the California community colleges. The community college was designed as the main entry point for students to higher education (Master Plan for Higher Education, 1960).

The California legislature describes student transfer agreements as “significant in achieving the goal of student diversity within their segments, and in ensuring that all students, particularly those currently underrepresented in higher education, have access to a university education” (Cal. Ed. Code 66736). California legislation also states, “all policies and procedures shall give preference and emphasis toward enhancing the transfer of students from economically disadvantaged families and students from traditionally underrepresented minorities” (Cal. Ed. Code 66736). In addition, it emphasizes the dissemination of information about the core

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

curriculum to schools and community colleges with high ethnic minority enrollments (Cal. Ed. Code 66721).

California established transfer centers at community colleges to provide counseling services and disseminate information. The provision of services to minoritized groups is explicit, as the legislation states,

The governing board of each community college district shall recognize transfer as one of its primary missions, and shall place priority emphasis on the preparation and transfer of underrepresented students, including African-American, Chicano/Latino, American Indian, disabled, low-income and other students historically and currently underrepresented in the transfer process (Cal. Admin. Code tit. 5, § 51027).

California legislation also emphasizes that in the development of articulation agreements minoritized groups should be included. One statute mandates that each major/discipline department at the UC and the CSU campuses develop articulation agreements with specific community colleges, with the criteria for college selection directing the inclusion of community colleges with large percentages of “ethnic minorities” (Cal. Ed. Code 66740).

Legislative documents also set out expectations for monitoring the progress of minoritized students in transfer. California requires each segment of higher education to provide “statistical reports on transfer patterns” with data disaggregated by ethnicity (Cal. Ed. Code 66742). In addition, under Title 5, California Community Colleges are required to “promote student success for all students, regardless of race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances”; in addition, monitoring is directed, as the statute states that, “the governing board of each community college district shall maintain a student equity plan” and conduct “campus-based research as to the extent of student equity” (Cal. Admin. Code tit. 5, § 54220).

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Notably, the legislation prescribes that planning and monitoring be tied to specific targets for “increasing the transfer applications of underrepresented students among transfer students”:

Each community college district governing board shall direct the development and adoption of a transfer center plan describing the activities of the transfer center and the services to be provided to students. Plans shall identify target student populations and shall establish target increases in the number of applicants to baccalaureate institutions from these populations, including specific targets for increasing the transfer applications of underrepresented students among transfer students (Cal. Admin. Code tit. 5, § 54220).

California legislation also mandates evaluation of transfer services (Cal. Ed. Code 66740). This statute establishes that a committee be convened to evaluate transfer access and performance. This committee is to be charged with examining “the extent to which transfer program activities have been directed at students who have been historically underrepresented in the University of California and the California State University.” The legislation states that a “failure to implement reform or to improve the transfer rate of historically underrepresented groups significantly shall precipitate legislative hearings to determine the reasons why any one or all of these goals have not been met.”

Accountability Indicators Despite references of some type to race and ethnicity (including words associated with minoritized groups, such as “underrepresented”) and occasional strong language directing attention to racial-ethnic groups in legislation, California does not require that accountability indicators related to transfer be monitored or reported by race or ethnicity. In fact, due to the use of a composite indicator in California’s Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges, which establishes a standard report for each of the 110 community colleges where transfer is aggregated with other outcomes, transfer is not monitored

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

as a specific outcome. The outcomes comprising the “student progress and achievement rate” include earning an AA or AS as one of five possible outcomes achieved within six years. The reporting format makes it impossible to differentiate between students who earned a certificate or an associate’s degree, or who became “transfer directed” or “transfer prepared” by accumulating the appropriate credits in transfer coursework, from those who transfer.

In the other states sampling, transfer-related and transfer-directed accountability indicators are not typically tracked by race and ethnicity. No state requires that transfer-related indicators (transfer preparation, transfer out, and post-transfer success) be monitored or reported by race and ethnicity. No state requires that all transfer-impacting indicators be monitored or reported by race and ethnicity. Monitoring by race and ethnicity is expected on particular transfer-impacting indicators in three states. Texas and Minnesota require disaggregated racial-ethnic data on the transfer-impacting indicator of degree completion for associate’s degrees and certificates, while Wisconsin requires that retention be tracked for white students and an aggregated group of “students of color” separately. No state requires disaggregation of basic skills or ESL course completion data.

The absence of racial-ethnic indicators for transfer can be contextualized by comparison to the use of race and ethnicity in monitoring accountability indicators not related to transfer or in targets set in planning and goal-setting documents. In four of the six states with accountability plans, accountability indicators for postsecondary participation, service area representation, enrollment status or intensity are disaggregated by race and ethnicity. In Wisconsin, these indicators take the form of system-wide targets set by The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents in the areas of access, enrollment, retention, and graduation for “students of color.” In Texas, the accountability indicators are aligned with goals articulated in the long-range plan.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Florida has also established a goal for increasing associate’s degree completion among African American males. (It should be noted, however, that the Florida Department of Education has proposed eliminating this measure from its planning document.)

Interpretive Results and Discussion

Representations of Race and Ethnicity

With the exception of California, transfer policy in these states is largely, although not entirely “color blind.” Outside California, race and ethnicity is explicitly referred to in planning documents in ways that demonstrate concern with providing access to postsecondary education to communities (service areas) with minoritized populations and with increasing the enrollment of African American, Latina and Latino, Native American, and other groups. In addition, race and ethnicity receive explicit attention in the transfer-impacting accountability indicators of persistence and degree completion. Transfer itself is not monitored or reported by race and ethnicity in any state in our sample.

In almost half of the legislative statutes concerning transfer, California legislation incorporates references to minoritized students, either through specific reference to racial-ethnic groups or using words associated with underserved students. A gap exists between the racial-ethnic consciousness of the legislation and the community college accountability system, the ARCC, which does not require monitoring or reporting of transfer-impacting or transfer-related indicators by race and ethnicity. In addition, a gap exists between the acknowledgement in legislation of the state’s responsibility to ensure transfer as an outcome for minoritized groups—which follows from the explicit stratification of access to different postsecondary sectors established in the California Master Plan—and lack of acknowledgement of that responsibility in the accountability system, which relies on indicators of transfer preparedness rather than of

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

transfer itself. To some extent this is due to the difficulties of determining who “counts” as a transfer student and tracking transfer across postsecondary sectors (Dowd, 2008).

Similar misalignment between legislative or planning goals and accountability is observed in Texas and Washington. Although Texas legislation does not mention students of color, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) created the “Closing the Gaps” plan. This plan sets targets set increasing minority participation, success, and excellence rates in higher education among black, Hispanic, and white students (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2000). However, while the plan has set targets for Black and Hispanic baccalaureate achievement, there are no goals for Black or Hispanic transfer within the document or Texas transfer legislation. Washington demonstrates a similar misalignment. Legislation in Washington directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to “make recommendations to increase minority participation, and monitor and report on the progress of minority participation in higher education,” yet none of the HECB data is disaggregated by race and ethnicity (WA. Revised Code 28B.76.290).

Excluding race and ethnicity in transfer legislation suggests that students of color are not a state priority in terms of baccalaureate attainment. Including race and ethnicity in transfer legislation does not by itself create increased transfer outcomes for students of color. For example, California includes race and ethnicity in state transfer legislation, yet continues to have low transfer rates for students of color (Dowd, Bensimon, Watford, & Malcolm, 2002). When race and ethnicity are included in transfer legislation and low transfer rates for students of color ensue, it suggests a misalignment between legislation and accountability.

Representing students of color in transfer legislation demonstrates a commitment to closing the baccalaureate achievement gap and also provides the leaders of higher education

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

coordinating boards and institutions with strategic directions and numerical goals for students of color. Accountability indicators and numerical goals which are disaggregated by race/ethnicity in the surveyed states tend to fall under the domains of access (e.g. enrollment, service area representation) or degree completion (e.g. degree attainment, graduation rates). There is little to no monitoring or goal-setting of success outcomes, including transfer, for students of color. The manner in which goals are articulated (or not articulated) matters because explicitly articulated goals have the potential direct attention and resources at the system- and institution-level towards transfer and/or students of color.

California, Wisconsin, Washington, and Florida are states that tie some kind of benefit to transfer for those with associate degrees, and these four states notably do not monitor associate degree completion by race/ethnicity. Florida statutorily guarantees admission to public in-state four-year institutions for associate degree holders from Florida community colleges. Associate degree holders from the UW Colleges are guaranteed waiver of general education requirements upon transfer into UW four-year institutions. California and Washington offer priority transfer admissions for associate degree holders to their in-state public four-year institutions for associate degree holders from their respective community colleges.

Efficiency and Equity

Consistent with the results of prior studies, the findings indicate that in the states sampled transfer policy includes provisions with the potential to create more efficient structures for the vertical transfer of credits from the two-year to the four-year sector. A number of these efficiency features offer potential to improve transfer equity for minoritized groups. All the sampled states except for Wisconsin have developed a core curriculum, which is defined as a general education curriculum offered at two- and four-year institutions guaranteed to transfer

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

with or without the associate degree (Arnold, 2003). Although states adopt core curricula to save money (by decreasing the number of classes that students have to repeat) and increase technical efficiency, the adoption of a core curriculum has the potential for a positive impact on equity because such policies can reduce confusion over what courses transfer. By calling on educational administrators and faculty to organize working groups to develop a core curriculum, these policies have the potential to integrate systems and institutions of higher education. This is significant because, due to differences in status and prestige, faculty in different sectors typically function quite separately, responding to different professional incentives and responsibilities. This can generate distrust and perceptions of disrespect between two-year college and four-year college faculties (Gabbard, et al., 2006), which creates barriers to creating efficient transfer pathways and to motivating attention to the unequal participation in transfer among racial-ethnic groups. By aligning policies with efforts focused on using the core curricula to promote equity, the potential exists to reduce the confusion students face when navigating transfer, which can be considerable for minoritized students who lack access to institutional agents who can direct them to the effective uses of transfer resources (Bensimon & Dowd, in press).

Four states (FL, WA, MN, WI) incorporate technical degrees and credits within their transfer legislation. This is significant from an equity perspective because of the overrepresentation of minoritized groups in the two-year sector, particularly technical colleges. A lack of transfer policies for technical degrees or credits represents a truncated pathway to the baccalaureate for technical students. Florida statute states, “Graduates of a Florida community college associate in science degree (technical degree) program with an agreement that is documented and maintained by the Articulation Coordinating Committee shall be granted admission to a public postsecondary institution in the program designated to articulate with their

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

degree” (FL. Statute 6A-10.024). Similarly, Washington legislation states that transfer policies need to address the “applicability of technical courses toward baccalaureate degrees” (WA. Revised Code 28B.76.2401). Minnesota legislation states “All vocational and technical credits earned for a diploma or certificate shall be applicable toward any available degree in the same program” (Minnesota Session Laws 136F.32). Finally, Wisconsin statute 36.44 states, “The technical college system board, in agreement with the board may designate courses other than those covered ... as transferable for collegiate credit between the 2 systems.” Because minoritized students are heavily represented in technical colleges, a lack of technical degree transfer pathways perpetuates and contributes to the baccalaureate achievement gap.

Transfer Impacting Accountability

The use of detailed transfer-impacting accountability indicators for student progress in basic skills courses occurs in three states, all of which have large populations of Latinas and Latinos (CA, FL, TX). This also offers promise to improve transfer equity due to the concentration of Latinos in basic skills courses in community colleges. California’s ARCC system includes a completion indicator and an improvement indicator for basic skills and ESL courses. For example, the report shows that in 2008-2009 Allan Hancock College had a 63.3% successful course completion rate in all basic skills courses, including ESL. Completion is defined as anyone who was retained to the end of the course with a final course grade of A, B, C, or CR. That same year Allan Hancock College’s improvement rates for Basic Skills courses was 53.7% and for ESL 17.2%. The improvement indicator assesses the percentage of students who progress from one level to the next higher level within three years of completing the first basic skills or ESL course. The indicators used in the other states are the 1) percentage of students exiting college preparatory program who enter college-level courses leading to the AA, AS or

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

other postsecondary programs (FL, TX), 2) percentage of students who started out in college preparatory courses who transfer to the State University System and earn a 2.5 GPA the first year after transfer (FL); 3) number of students enrolled in college preparatory courses (FL, TX); 4) test core improvement after having taken courses in Adult Basic Education or ESL.

The use of transfer readiness indicators rather than transfer indicators is ambiguous in regard to the potential for positive effects on transfer equity. Only California and Washington have indicators to monitor the performance of community colleges based on student completion of transfer requirements. In California students who completed transfer-level English and Mathematics transfer eligible courses are identified as having reached the status of “transfer directed” and students who have completed 60 transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher as “transfer prepared.”

However, as already mentioned above, these two measures of transfer readiness are combined with other measures to make up the Student Achievement and Progress composite indicator. Moreover, the composite score is reported as an aggregate of five years of data. For example, Allan Hancock College’s “student progress achievement rate” for 2003/04 to 2008/09 was 49.9% but it is impossible to determine how many of the students that are included in this figure reached “transfer directed” or “transfer prepared” or any of the other three educational outcomes that constitute the indicator. Washington’s transfer ready indicator includes the number of students who complete 45 units in the core curriculum and earn at least a 2.0 GPA. Neither California nor Washington reports this indicator by race and ethnicity. The potential for positive impacts on transfer equity would improve substantially if indicators of transfer preparedness were combined with indicators of transfer and that all indicators were monitored by racial-ethnic group.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Accountability instruments manifest their level of attention to issues known to affect students of color through their chosen indicators. Students of color tend to be overrepresented in developmental education due to poor prior schooling experiences, and are underrepresented in retention, transfer, and associate and bachelor’s degree attainment. The lack of monitoring of race or ethnicity in basic skills in all the surveyed states is a problem that disproportionately affects students of color. Placement in developmental education is a serious impediment to entering college-level transferrable courses and subsequently transferring out to four-year institutions. The general lack of monitoring of persistence or retention at two-year institutions by race or ethnicity is problematic for this same reason.

Conclusion

None of the states sampled for our study have an accountability system that could truly be considered “comprehensive” in terms of (a) monitoring of the transfer pathway (readiness, transfer-out and success post-transfer) and (b) monitoring of issues that impede transfer (basic skills, retention, associate degree completion). Among the surveyed states, California, Florida and Washington have the three types of indicators to monitor the transfer pathway, and at least two of the three issues (basic skills, retention, associate’s degree completion) that can be expected to impact transfer. Without comprehensive accountability instruments that examine transfer preparation, retention, degree completion, transfer-out and success post-transfer for prepared and underprepared students, by race/ethnicity, it will be difficult to know to what extent two-year institutions in these states are enabling transfer and baccalaureate attainment for their students.

As the findings of this study indicate, the need for more intentional and comprehensive state policies to facilitate transfer for minoritized students is needed. However, the legislation

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

and higher education policies in these states provide a resource for drawing a composite for equity-enhancing transfer policy.

Comprehensive transfer policy designed to enhance equity would be characterized by the following: (1) a public commitment to access and transfer for minoritized students; (2) numerical benchmarks or goals pertaining to transfer and other outcomes for minoritized students; (3) accountability indicators for two-year institutions that include basic skills completion and transfer, disaggregated by race/ethnicity; (4) cooperative/articulation agreements not dependent on associate degree completion, and with provisions for technical/vocational coursework; (5) common course curriculum and (6) common course numbering system to make the transfer process clearer.

References

- Aleman, E. (2007). Situating Texaz school finance policy in a CRT framework: How "substantially equal" yields racial inequity. . *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 525-558.
- Altheide, D., Coyle, M., DeVriese, K., & Schneider, C. (2008). Emergent qualitative document analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Anderson, G. M., Alfonso, M., & Sun, J. C. (2006). Rethinking cooling out at public community colleges: An examination of fiscal and demographic trends in higher education and the rise of statewide articulation agreements. *Teachers College Record*, 108(3), 422-451.
- Anderson, G. M., Sun, J. C., & Alfonso, M. (2006). Effectiveness of statewide articulation agreements on the probability of transfer: A preliminary policy analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 29(3), 261-291.
- Arbona, C., & Nora, A. (2007). The influence of academic and environmental factors on Hispanic college degree attainment. *Review of Higher Education*, 30(3), 247-269.
- Bailey, T., Jenkins, D., & Leinbach, T. (2005). Community college low-income and minority student completion study: Descriptives statistics from the 1992 high school cohort Retrieved February 27, 2006, from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/>
- Banks, D. L. (1994). Effects of environmental conditions on student-transfer activity. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 18, 245-259.
- Banks, D. L. (1994). Effects on environmental conditions on student-transfer activity. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 18, 245-259.
- Banning, M. (1999). Race, class, gender, and classroom discourse. . In S. Villenas, D. Deyle & L. Parker (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 155-180). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Bartlett, L., & Brayboy, J. M. B. (2005). **Race and Schooling: Theories and Ethnographies**
The Urban Review, 37(5), 361-374.
- Bender, L. W. (1990). *Spotlight on the transfer function: A national study of state policies and practices*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1999). *The interschool partnership on faculty performance and compensation*. Los Angeles: The James Irvine Foundation.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2005). Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational learning perspective. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Organizational learning in higher education* (Vol. 131). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2005). *Equality as a fact, equality as a result: A matter of institutional accountability* (Commissioned Paper). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The underestimated significance of practitioner knowledge in the scholarship of student success. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(4), 441-469.
- Bensimon, E. M., & Dowd, A. C. (in press). Dimensions of the 'transfer choice' gap: Experiences of Latina and Latino students who navigated transfer pathways. *Harvard Educational Review*.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

- Bensimon, E. M., Hao, L., & Bustillos, L. T. (2006). Measuring the state of equity in public higher education. In P. Gandara, G. Orfield & C. L. Horn (Eds.), *Expanding opportunity in higher education: Leveraging promise* (pp. 143-165). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bensimon, E. M., Harris III, F., & Rueda, R. (2007). The meditational means of enacting equity-mindedness among community college practitioners. *Diversity Research*, 7(1,2), 14-15.
- Bensimon, E. M., Polkinghorne, D. E., Bauman, G. L., & Vallejo, E. (2004). Doing research that makes a difference. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(1), 104-126.
- Bowen, W. G., Kurzweil, M. A., & Tobin, E. M. (2005). *Equity and excellence in American higher education*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Brady, K., Eatman, T., & Parker, L. (2000). To have or not to have? A preliminary analysis of higher education funding disparities in the post-Ayers v. Fordice era. *Journal of Education Finance*, 25, 297-323.
- Cejda, B. D. (1998). The effect of academic factors on transfer student persistence and graduation: A community college to liberal arts case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(7), 675-687.
- Cejda, B. D. (2004). Nontraditional students as transfers. In B. Jacobs, B. Lauren, M. Miller & D. Nadler (Eds.), *The college transfer student in America: the forgotten student*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.
- Cejda, B. D., Casparis, C. A., Rhodes, J. H., & Kelly, S.-N. (2008). The role of social capital in the educational decisions of Hispanic students attending Hispanic-serving community colleges. *Enrollment Management Journal*, 2(1), 32-59.
- Chesler, M. A., & Crawford, J. (1989). An organizational analysis of racism in higher education. *ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education*, 436-469.
- Deil-Amin, R. (2003). The social prerequisites of success: Can college structure reduce the need for social know-how? *Annuals*, 586, 120-143.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Kienzl, G. S. (2006). It's not enough to get through the open door: Inequalities by social background in transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges. *Teachers College Record*, 108(3), 452-487.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Reid, M. (2007). *Fifty states of “Achieving the Dream”*: State policies to enhance access to and success in community college across the United States. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Dougherty, K. J., Reid, M., & Neinhusser, H. K. (2007). *State policies to achieve the dream in five states: An audit of state policies to aid student access to and success in community colleges in the first five achieving the dream states*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Dowd, A. C. (2002). Uniting old adversaries: Teaming efficiency and equity for social justice. *The Academic Workplace*, 13, 1, 3, 6-7, 15.
- Dowd, A. C. (2003). From access to outcome equity: Revitalizing the democratic mission of the community college. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586(March), 92-119.
- Dowd, A. C. (2008). The community college as gateway and gatekeeper: Moving beyond the access “saga” to outcome equity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 77(4), 407-419.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

- Dowd, A. C., Bensimon, E. M., Bordoloi, L., & Watford, T. (2007). Does "2+2" still equal four? Examining the "new math" of transfer access from community colleges to the baccalaureate. *Presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education*.
- Dowd, A. C., Bensimon, E. M., Watford, T., & Malcolm, L. E. (2002). Does "2+2" still equal four? Examining the "new math" of transfer access from community colleges to the baccalaureate. *Presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education*.
- Dowd, A. C., Cheslock, J., & Melguizo, T. (2008). Transfer access from community colleges and the distribution of elite higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 1-31.
- Dowd, A. C., & Melguizo, T. (2008). Socioeconomic stratification of community college transfer access in the 1980s and 1990s. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(4), 377-400.
- ECS (2001). *Transfer and articulation policies*. Denver, CO: ECS.
- Fry, R. (2006). *The changing landscape of American public education: New students, new schools*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gabbard, G., Singleton, S., Macias, E., Dee, J., Bensimon, E. M., Dowd, A. C., et al. (2006). Practices supporting transfer of low-income community college transfer students to selective institutions: Case study findings Retrieved May 5, 2008, from www.jackkentcookefoundation.org [links: Grants and RFPs/Community College Transfer Initiative/CCTI Research Report/Section IV]
- Garcia, V., Gonzalez, L., & Grimes, G. A. (2004). How cultural studies help Latino students transfer to universities. *The Community College Enterprise*, 10(2), 61-77.
- Goldhaber, D., Gross, B., & DeBurgomaster, S. (2008). *Community colleges and higher education: How do state transfer and articulation policies impact student pathways?* : University of Washington.
- Gonzalez, F. E. (1998). Formations of Mexicananess: Trenzadas de identidades multiples Growing up Mexicana: Braids of multiple identities. *Qualitative studies in education*, 11(1), 81-102.
- González, K. P., Stone, C., & Jovel, J. E. (2003). Examining the role of social capital in access to college for Latinas: Toward a college opportunity framework. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2(1), 146-170.
- Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and Equity for African American Students in Higher Education: A Critical Race Historical Analysis of Policy Efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 289-414.
- Harris, B. W. (1998). Looking inward: building a culture for student success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(4), 401-418.
- Higgins, C. S., & Katsinas, S. G. (1999). The relationship between environmental conditions and transfer rates of selected rural community colleges: A pilot study. *Community College Review*, 27(2), 1-23.
- Hoachlander, G., Sidora, A., & Horn, L. (2003). *Community college students: Goals, academic preparation, and outcomes* (Postsecondary Education Descriptive Analysis Reports No. 2003-164). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ignash, J. M., & Townsend, B. (2001). Statewide transfer and articulation policies: Current practices and emerging issues. In B. K. Townsend & S. B. Twombly (Eds.), *Community Colleges policy in the future context* (pp. 173-192). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 586-611.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

- Jones, J. C. (1992). Moving on: A cooperative study of student transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(1), 124-140.
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (2004). *America's untapped resource: low-income students in higher education*. New York, NY: Century Foundation Press.
- Keith, B. (1996). The context of educational opportunity: States and the legislative organization of community college systems. *American Journal of Education*, 105, 67-101.
- Kintzer, F., & Wattenbarger, J. L. (1985). *The articulation/transfer phenomenon: Patterns and directions*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Knoell, D. (1990). *Transfer, articulation and collaboration: 25 years later*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Ladson - Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Lanaan, F. S. (1996). Making the transition, understanding the adjustment process of community college transfer students. *Community College Review*, 23(4), 69-84.
- Long, B. T. (2005). *State financial aid policies to enhance articulation and transfer* Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
- Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence III, C. R., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Melguizo, T., & Dowd, A. C. (2009). Baccalaureate success of transfers and rising four-year college juniors. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 55-89.
- Morfin, O. J., Perez, V. H., Parker, L., Lynn, M., & Arrona, J. (2006). Hiding the politically oblivious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education. *Educational Policy*, 20, 249-270.
- Oakes, J. (1989). What educational indicators? The case for assessing school context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 181-199.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1990). Minority education in comparative perspective. *Journal of Negro Education*, 59(1), 45-57.
- Olivas, M. A. (2005). Higher education as "place": Location, race, and college attendance policies. *Review of Higher Education*, 28(2), 169-189.
- Parker, L. (2003). Critical race theory and its implications for methodology and policy analysis in higher education desegregation. In G. R. Lopez & L. Parker (Eds.), *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology and epistemology* (pp. 145-180). New York: Peter Lang.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Perin, D. (2005). Institutional Decision making for increasing academic preparedness in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 129, 27-38.
- Pizarro, M. (1998). Chicana/o power! Epistemology and methodology for social justice and empowerment in Chicana/o educational communities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 57-80.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

- Prior, L. (2008). Emergent methods. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 111-126). New York: Guilford Press.
- Rivas, M. A., Pérez, J., Alvarez, C. R., & Solorzano, D. G. (2007). *An examination of Latina/o transfer students in California's postsecondary institutions* (No. 16). Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center.
- Roksa, J. (2009). Building bridges for student success: Are higher education articulation policies effective? *Teachers College Record*, 111(10), 2444-2478.
- Roksa, J., & Keith, B. (2008). Credits, time, and attainment: Articulation policies and success after transfer. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 30(3), 236-254.
- Shaw, K. (2001). Culture and ideology in keeping transfer commitment: Three community colleges. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(1), 91-114.
- Solorzano, R. W. (1998). Pedagogy Versus Politics. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 25(4), 81-85.
- Tienda, M., & Niu, S. (2004). Capitalizing on Segregation, Pretending Neutrality: College Admissions and the Texas Top 10% Law. Unpublished Research Report. Princeton University
- Villalpando, O. (2000). *Self-segregation or self-preservation? A critical race theory and Latina/o critical theory analysis of a study of Chicana/o college students*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Villenas, S., Deyhle, D., & Parker, L. (1999). Critical race theory and praxis: Chicano(a)/Latino(a), and Navajo struggles for dignity, educational equity, and social justice. In S. Villenas, D. Deyhle & L. Parker (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 155-180). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Wassmer, R., Moore, C., & Shulock, N. (2004). Effect of racial/ethnic composition on transfer rates in community colleges: Implications for policy practice. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 651-672.
- Wellman, J. V. (2002). *State policy and community college-baccalaureate transfer*: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education and the Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Young, M. D. (1999). Multifocal educational policy research: Toward a method for enhancing traditional educational policy studies. *American Educational Researcher*, 36(4), 677-714.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & Pollner, M. (1971). The everyday world as a phenomenon. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Understanding everyday life* (pp. 80-103). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Table 1 Racial-Ethnic Composition of the Population in the States Sampled

Population by Race/Ethnicity								
	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Other	
California	42.6%	6.0%	36.1%	0.5%	12.1%	0.3%	0.3%	
Florida	60.7%	14.8%	20.5%	0.2%	2.2%	0.1%	0.3%	
Michigan	77.5%	13.9%	4.0%	0.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	
Minnesota	85.6%	4.3%	4.0%	1.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.1%	
Texas	47.8%	11.3%	35.9%	0.3%	3.3%	0.1%	0.2%	
Washington	75.8%	3.3%	9.5%	1.2%	6.5%	0.4%	0.2%	
Wisconsin	85.2%	5.8%	4.9%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.1%	
Total Population	36,418,499	18,182,321	10,045,697	5,181,962	23,845,989	6,453,083	5,598,453	

Source: American Community Survey 2006-2008 3-Year Estimates, B03002

Notes: The 2006-2008 data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Table 2 Design of Public Higher Education Systems in Seven States

	Research universities	Comprehensive universities	Community Colleges	Technical Colleges
CA	10	23	110	0
FL	6	5	28	0
TX ¹	6	26	50 ²	4
MI	4	11	30 ³	0
MN	1	11	40	7 ⁴
WA	2	4	29	5 ⁵
WI	2	11	13	16

Source: State postsecondary web sites (CA: <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/>; FL: <http://www.flbog.org>, <http://www.fldoe.org/cc/>; TX: <http://www.txhighereddata.org>; MI: <http://www.mea.org/> ; MN: <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/campuses.php>, <http://www.mnscu.edu/>; WA: <http://www.hecb.wa.gov/>; WI: <http://www.wtcsystem.edu/>, <http://www.uwsa.edu/>)

¹ In addition, Texas has 3 public two-year, upper division universities/centers, 9 public health-related institutions, and 3 public two-year, lower-division state colleges.

² Texas has 50 community college districts with multiple community colleges

³ Count includes one public two-year tribal college

⁴ Technical colleges in Minnesota are part of the Minnesota State Colleges and University system. The state incorporates the technical colleges with the community colleges. To determine the number of technical colleges, we added the number of two-year colleges with “technical college” in their name. Other two-year colleges designated “community colleges”, “college”, or “community and technical college” were totaled in the Community Colleges column. Minnesota has 47 public two-year colleges.

⁵ Technical colleges in Washington are organized under the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. To determine the number of technical colleges, we added the number of two-year colleges with “technical college” in their name. Other two-year colleges designated as “community colleges”, “college”, or “community and technical college” were totaled in the Community College column. Washington has 34 public two-year colleges.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Table 3 Data Collection Protocol Summary

Structures	Data Collection Prompt
Legislation (and Historical Background)	In what ways does legislation signal a commitment to meeting the needs of students by race and ethnicity?
Accountability Reporting	Are transfer data outcomes disaggregated by race/ethnicity? Are benchmarks or performance goals set by race and ethnicity?
Information System Capacity	Is the data collected disaggregated by race/ethnicity? Is the data used to develop benchmarks or performance goals by race and ethnicity?
Mission of 2-year Colleges	In what ways does the mission signal a commitment to meeting the needs of racial and ethnic groups?
Incentives and Rewards for Students to Transfer	In what ways are criteria for the distribution of transfer incentives and rewards race-conscious? (E.g., not using criteria that will disproportionately disadvantage minoritized racial and ethnic groups).
Academic Policies	Data Collection Prompt
Cooperative/ Articulation Agreements	In what ways do articulation agreements allow students to move from technical/vocational coursework to general education/liberal arts coursework? How is credit transfer of technical/vocational/developmental courses treated?
Guaranteed Transfer Agreements	In what ways do guaranteed transfer programs impact students by race and ethnicity?
Statewide Articulation Guide	How are statewide articulation guides disseminated? What languages are used? Are counselors available to explain articulation guides to students in minority serving institutions?
Common Core Curriculum	Does the common core curriculum include coursework available in the technical/vocational college systems?
Common Course Numbering	Does the common course numbering include coursework available in the technical/vocational college systems?

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Table 4 Summary of Transfer and Selected Postsecondary Education Legislation

State/ # of Transfer Statutes ⁶	Content of Legislation Relevant Statutes
CA/ 22	Core Curriculum, publishing and dissemination of core curriculum, articulation for lower division major coursework, establishment of transfer counseling centers, new programs (e.g. outreach) to encourage transfer, transfer data reporting, advisory committee on transfer, creation of educational plans for transfer, monitoring transfer, admission for transfer students at public and private institutions Cal. Ed. Code 66720-25.3, 66730-66744, California Code of Regulations, Title V.
FL/ 6	Core curriculum, common course numbering system, AA degree as the primary transfer degree (2+2), transfer of technical degrees (AS) and credits, dual enrollment, alignment of exit requirements of one system and admission requirements of another, encourage institutions to include private institutions in articulation discussion, articulation with high schools FL. Statute 6A-10.024, 1007.01, 22, 23-25
TX 3	Core curriculum, articulation for lower division major coursework, develop seamless system of higher education TX. Ed. Code 61.822, 61.823, 61.831
MN 2	Core curriculum (Minnesota Transfer Curriculum), transferability of vocational/technical credits Minnesota Session Laws 136F.32, Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, n.d.
MI/ none	Not applicable
WA/ 8	Core curriculum, collaboration between segments of higher education to ensure increases in transfer, adoption of policies that ensure transfer of credits (transfer AA and major pre-requisites), dual enrollment, articulation with high schools WA. Revised Code 28B.45.014, 28B.76.240, 28B.76.2401, 28B.76.250, 28B.76.260, 28B.76.290, 28B.76.330
WI/ 2	Wisconsin Technical College System and the University of Wisconsin shall collaborate to increase transfer WI. Statute 36.31, 36.11

⁶ State statutes were included if they included the term “transfer” within the statute.

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Table 5 Accountability Plans and Goal-Setting in Sampled States

State/Plan/Office	Transfer Accountability Indicators	
	Transfer-related -(transfer readiness, transfer out, and post-transfer success)	Transfer-impacting- (basic skills, persistence, and degree completion)
CA: “Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges” (ARCC) by the California Community Colleges’ Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer readiness • Transfer out • Post-transfer success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic skills • Persistence
FL: “Long-Range Program Plan” by the Florida Department of Education (DOE) Community College Programs (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer out • Post-transfer success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic skills • Degree completion
TX: “Texas Higher Education Accountability System” by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic skills • Persistence • Degree completion
MN: “Minnesota Measures: Report on Higher Education Performance” by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education (MOHE) (2009)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree completion
WA: “Higher Education Accountability Report” by the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer out • Post-transfer success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistence • Degree completion
WI: “Investing in Wisconsin’s Future: UW System’s Growth Agenda Accountability Report” by the University of Wisconsin System Administration (2009)*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-transfer success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistence

Source: Documents indicated for each state, obtained from government web sites in sampled states

*Does not include public accountability reporting for Wisconsin Technical College System, which is separate from the University of Wisconsin system.

^Alexandra Djurovich, personal communication, 10/22/2009

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix A Websites Utilized for Data Collection of Legislative Documents

Websites for Data Collection
California
California Code of Regulations, Title V. http://government.westlaw.com/linkedslice/default.asp?SP=CCR-1000 California Education Code §9.2-66720-22.5. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=66001-67000&file=66720-66722.5 California Education Code §9.2-66725-25.3 http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=66001-67000&file=66725-66725.3 California Education Code §9.2-6673-66744. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=66001-67000&file=66730-66744 California Senate Bill 121. (1991). http://www.cpec.ca.gov/Billtrack/1991_SB121.asp
Florida
Florida Statute 6A-10.024. (2005). https://www.flrules.org/gateway/RuleNo.asp?id=6A-10.024 Florida Statute 1007.01, 22, 23-25. (2005). http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=Ch1007/ch1007.htm
Michigan
Michigan Association of Registrars and Admissions Officers. http://www.aacrao.org/pro_development/transfer.cfm
Minnesota
Minnesota Session Laws 136F.32 (2005). https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=136F&view=chapter#stat.136F.32 Minnesota Statutes, MN. §6-135A.031 (2009). https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/statutes/?id=135A.031 Minnesota Transfer Curriculum. http://www.mntransfer.org/transfer/policies/t_lpa.php
Texas
Texas Education Code, § 61.822 (1997). http://law.onecle.com/texas/education/61.822.00.html Texas Education Code, § 61.823 (2001). http://law.onecle.com/texas/education/61.823.00.html Texas Education Code, § 61.831 (2001). http://law.onecle.com/texas/education/61.831.00.html

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix A Continued

Washington
Washington Revised Code §28B.45.014 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.45.014
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.240 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.240
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.2401 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.2401
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.250 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.250
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.260 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.260
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.290 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.290
Washington Revised Code §28B.76.330 (2004). http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.76.330
Wisconsin
Wisconsin Statutes 36.11 & 36.31. (1993). http://nxt.legis.state.wi.us/nxt/gateway.dll/?f=templates&fn=default.htm

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix B Transfer-Related Accountability Indicators

State Transfer-Related Accountability Indicators		
California		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>Institution-level:</i></u> Achievement rate (i.e. attainment of students’ stated goals, including successful transfer, “transfer directed” status, and “transfer prepared” status).</p> <p><u><i>System-level:</i></u> Number of community college (cc) students who transfer to 4-year institutions (UC, CSU, private, out-of-state), percent of first-time students with a minimum of 12 units earned who attempted transfer-level Math or English during cc enrollment who transferred to 4-year institution (i.e. “transfer rate”) (CCCCO, 2009).</p>	No
Basic skills Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>Institution-level:</i></u> Successful course completion rate for basic skills courses, improvement rates for credit ESL/basic skills courses, college preparation progress and achievement rate.</p> <p><u><i>System-level:</i></u> Number of students exhibiting basic skills improvement (CCCCO, 2009).</p>	No
Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>Institution-level:</i></u> Percent of students who earned at least 30 credits, persistence rate, college preparation progress and achievement rate (CCCCO, 2009).</p>	No
AA and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>System-level:</i></u> Number and percent of CSU and UC baccalaureate students who attended a CA CC.</p>	
Florida		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>System-level:</i></u> Percent of associate’s degree (AA) degree graduates who transfer to State University System within 2 years (FL DOE, 2009).</p>	No
Basic skills Indicator(s)	<p><u><i>System-level:</i></u> Percent of students exiting college-prep program who enter college-level work associated with AA, or other postsecondary programs, percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5+ GPA after 1 year at receiving institution, number of students receiving college prep instruction (FL DOE, 2009).</p>	No
Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	No	N/A

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix B Continued

AA and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Number of black male/ESL students/economically disadvantaged students who complete 18 credits, number and percent of students who graduate with AA degree within 4 years (recommended deletion); number and percent of AA students who complete 18 credits, percent of whom graduate in 4years, percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5+ GPA after 1 year at receiving institution (FL DOE, 2009).	Yes-only one
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who earns 2.5+ GPA after one year at receiving institution.	No
Minnesota		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> percent of transfer from CC within three years.	Yes
Basic skills Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	No	N/A
AA and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	No	No
Texas		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	<i>System- and Institution-level:</i> Number of transfer students to 4-year institutions, number of transfer students who completed core curriculum.	No
Basic skills Indicator(s)	<i>System- and institutional-level:</i> Number and percent prepared and under-prepared students who successfully complete a college-level course in math, reading and writing, number of percent of underprepared students who satisfy Texas Success Initiative, number and percent of underprepared and prepared students returning in fall.	No

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix B Continued

Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	<i>System- and institution level:</i> Number and percent of underprepared and prepared students returning in fall (not disaggregated by race/ethnicity), percent of first-time undergraduates who persist after one and two years (disaggregated for African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and white students) (TX HECB, 2008).	Some
AA and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	<i>System- and institution-level:</i> Graduation and persistence rates for first-time, full-time, credential-seeking students. number of degrees and certificates.	Yes
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Washington		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Number of students who are transfer-ready (completed at 45 units of core curriculum with 2.0+ GPA), percent transfer rate (% of students transferring to 4-year institution within 3 years of initial enrollment, among those expressing transfer intent and earning at least 15 credits).	No
Basic skills Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Improved at least one competency level on test after taking ABE or ESL.	No
Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Percent still enrolled (for students counted in transfer rate measure, percent not transferring to a four-year institution and still enrolled at the two-year institution).	No
AA and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	<i>System- level:</i> Number of students who complete AA degrees.	No
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Wisconsin		Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity?
Transfer-out Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Basic skills Indicator(s)	No	N/A

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix B Continued

Persistence and/or Attainment Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Persistence rates of new freshman.	Yes-only by white students and students of color as a group
Associate degree and/or graduation completion Indicator(s)	No	N/A
Success of transfer students at 4-year institution Indicator(s)	<i>System-level:</i> Combined 5 th year graduation and 6 th year retention for University of Wisconsin Colleges transfers to 4-year institutions	No

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix C Transfer and Selected Postsecondary Education Legislation in Seven States

State Legislation/Policy Pertaining to Transfer and/or Students of Color	
California	Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?
Cal. Ed. Code 66720,21.5-25.3: Requires the Board of Governors (BOG) of the California Community Colleges, the UC Regents, and CSU Trustees to jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses for the purpose of transfer. This section also outlines the transfer degree path (e.g. transfer admission agreement) and requirements.	No
Cal. Ed. Code 66721: Requires the BOG of the California Community Colleges , the UC Regents, and the Trustees of the CSU to publish the curriculum to public schools and each community college in the state, “with an emphasis on the communication of that information to each school or college having a high proportion of students who are members of one or more ethnic minorities.”	Yes
Cal. Ed. Code 66730-32: "student transfer agreement programs constitute a significant role in achieving the goal of student diversity... and ensuring all students particularly, those that are currently underrepresented in higher education, have access to a higher education."	Yes
Cal. Ed. Code 66734-36: "All policies and procedures shall give preference and emphasis toward enhancing the transfer of students from economically disadvantaged...underrepresented minorities."	Yes
Cal. Ed. Code 66737-38: Holds the governing board of each public postsecondary education segment accountable for the development and implementation of formal statewide articulation agreements and transfer agreement programs.	No
Cal. Ed. Code 66739.5: States the intent of the legislature as ensuring that community college students who wish to earn the baccalaureate degree at CSU are provided with a clear and effective path to his degree.	No
Cal. Ed. Code 66740-42: Requires each department, school, and major in UC and CSU to develop, in conjunction with community college faculty in appropriate and associated departments, “discipline-specific articulation agreements and transfer agreements for those majors that have lower division prerequisites." Requires “the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the President of the University of California shall begin the process of setting priorities to determine which community colleges will receive first attention for the development of agreements. Criteria for priority determination shall include, but not be limited to, the	Yes
percentage and number of students from economically disadvantaged families and underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities” Cal. Ed. Code 66743-44: “The California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested to convene an intersegmental advisory committee on transfer access and performance for the purposes of presenting biennial reports to the Governor and the Legislature on the status of transfer policies and programs....as well as the extent to which transfer program activities have been directed at students who have been historically underrepresented in the University of California and the California State University”	Yes

Appendix C Continued

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div. 5, 1.2-9: “A system wide lower-division transfer pattern by major shall be established for each high-priority major. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University, shall develop procedures for establishing system wide lower-division transfer patterns by major. The procedures shall include extensive participation of faculty members in the major. The procedures shall encourage the development of system wide lower-division transfer patterns by major that are consistent with, but not necessarily identical to, the recommended lower-division course-taking patterns of CSU first-time freshmen”	No
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div. 5, 1.3-5: Legislation lists requirements for undergraduate admissions to the CSU as a transfer students.	No
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div. 6, 1.8-§ 55080: Legislation addresses long term educational plans for the community college. “Each plan shall contain the educational objectives of the community college or district and the future plans for transfer programs, career technical programs, noncredit courses and programs, and remedial and developmental programs.”	No
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div. 6, 2.1- § 51027: “The governing board of each community college district shall recognize transfer as one of its primary missions, and shall place priority emphasis on the preparation and transfer of underrepresented students, including African-American, Chicano/Latino, American Indian, disabled, low-income and other students historically and currently underrepresented in the transfer process. Each community college district governing board shall direct the development and adoption of a transfer center plan describing the activities of the transfer center and the services to be provided to students, incorporating the provisions established in the standards outlined below. Plans shall identify target student populations and shall establish target increases in the number of applicants baccalaureate institutions from these populations, including specific targets for increasing the transfer applications of underrepresented students among transfer students. Plans shall be developed in consultation with baccalaureate college and university personnel as available”.	Yes
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div. 6, 5.4: “In order to promote student success for all students, regardless of race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances, the governing board of each community college district shall maintain a student equity plan which includes for each college in the district” to develop “Campus-based research as to the extent of student equity”.	Yes
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Div 7.5, 2.12- § 71770: Legislation lists requirements for undergraduate admissions to private institutions as a transfer student.	No
Florida	Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?
Florida State Board of Education 6A-10.024(4): "The Associate in Arts degree is the basic transfer degree of the community colleges. It is the primary basis for admission of transfer students from community colleges to upper division study in a state university. Every associate in arts graduate of a Florida community college shall be granted admission to an upper division program...Admission to the student’s preferred public postsecondary institution or program is not guaranteed."	No
Florida Statutes Section 1007.01: The state legislature requires attention to articulation so that “The alignment between the exit requirements of one system and the admissions requirements of another system into which students typically transfer”.	No

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix C Continued

Florida Statutes Section 1007.22: The state legislature requires “The levels of postsecondary education to collaborate in further developing and providing articulated programs in which students can proceed toward their educational objectives as rapidly as their circumstances permit”.	No
Florida Statutes Section 1007.23-25: The state legislature has mandated strong articulation between 2- and 4-year colleges; a common course numbering to enhance inter-institutional transfer; and the establishment of a list of common prerequisite courses as required components for all its degree programs	No
Michigan	Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?
No legislation pertaining to transfer. In 1973-74, the Michigan Association of Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRAO), a private professional organization, adopted an articulation agreement by which participating institutions generally (but not always) waive general education requirements for those students who earn AA degrees at 2-year institutions. All the public universities, except for UM-Ann Arbor, participate in the MACRAO agreement.	No
Minnesota	
Minnesota Session Law Ch. 356, Art. 2, sec. 8: All Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) and the University of Minnesota (U of M) is mandated to implement the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum (MNTC). MNTC is comprised of general education courses reflecting competencies adopted by the public higher education entities in Minnesota. The bill also mandates that an internet resource exist that displays and describes general education at two-year institutions and transfer to Minnesota universities.	No
Minnesota Session Law Ch. 136F.32: Students who have earned a certificate in a vocational or technical field may earn a degree in the same field if they complete general education and other degree requirements.	No
Texas	Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?
Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 61.822: If a student successfully completes the core curriculum at an institution of higher education, that block of courses may be transferred to any other institution of higher education and must be substituted for the receiving institution’s core curriculum.	No
Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 61.831: It is the purpose of the statutory subchapter on transfer of credit to develop a seamless system of higher education with respect to student transfers between institutions of higher education, including student transfers from public junior colleges to general academic teaching institutions.	No
Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 61.823: If a student successfully completes a field of study curriculum developed by the board, that block of courses may be transferred to a general academic teaching institution and must be substituted for that institution’s lower division requirements for the degree program for the field of study into which the student transfers, and the student shall receive full academic credit toward the degree program for the block of courses transferred.	No

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix C Continued

<p>Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted "Closing the Gaps by 2015" in October 2000 with strong support of the state's educational, business, and political communities. The plan, which is directed at closing educational gaps within Texas, as well as between Texas and other states, has four goals: to close the gaps in student participation, success, excellence, and research. More specifically, Texas is charged with meeting specific bachelor’s degree targets for African American and Hispanic students by 2015 (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2000).</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Washington</p>	<p>Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?</p>
<p>WASH. REV. CODE ANN. § 28B.76.240: The board shall, in cooperation with the state institutions of higher education and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, establish and maintain a statewide transfer of credit policy and agreement.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>WASH. REV. CODE ANN § 28B.76.2401: The statewide transfer of credit policy and agreement shall be designed to facilitate the transfer of students and evaluation of transcripts to better serve persons seeking information about courses and programs, to aid in academic planning, and to improve the review and evaluation of academic programs in state institutions of higher education.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.45.014: Requires higher education branch campuses to collaborate with the community and technical colleges in their region to develop articulation agreements to ensure that branch campuses serve as innovative models of a two plus two educational system. Areas of collaboration include joint development of curricula and degree programs.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.45.080: “The higher education coordinating board shall adopt performance measures to ensure a collaborative partnership between the community and technical colleges and the branch campuses. The partnership shall be one in which the community and technical colleges prepare students for transfer to the upper-division programs of the branch campuses and the branch campuses work with community and technical colleges to enable students to transfer and obtain degrees efficiently.”</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.76.250: Requires the higher education coordinating board to convene work groups to develop transfer associate degrees that will satisfy lower-division requirements at public 4-year institutions of higher education for specific academic majors. Each transfer associate degree developed under this section must enable a student to complete the lower-division courses or competencies for general education requirements and preparation for the major that a direct-entry student would typically complete in the freshman and sophomore years for that academic major. Completion of a transfer associate degree does not guarantee a student admission into an institution of higher education.</p>	<p>No</p>

Transfer Equity for “Minoritized” Students

Appendix C Continued

Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.76.260: Requires the higher education coordinating board to create a statewide system of course equivalency for public institutions of higher education, so that courses from one institution can be transferred and applied toward academic majors and degrees in the same manner as equivalent courses at the receiving institution.	No
Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.76.290: directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to “make recommendations to increase minority participation, and monitor and report on the progress of minority participation in higher education.”	No
Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28B.76.330: directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to “work with the state board of education, the superintendent of public instruction, the state board for community and technical colleges, the workforce training and education coordinating board, two and four-year institutions of higher education, and school districts to improve coordination, articulation, and transitions among the state's systems of education..”	No
Wisconsin	Is Race/Ethnicity Represented?
WI. Stat. 36.31: legislature directs the WTCS and UWS Boards to broaden collegiate transfer offerings in the technical college districts.	No
WI. Stat. 36.11: Refers to transfer of credit policy within the University of Wisconsin system and with the Technical Colleges	No