UC Riverside
UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

African American Male Access to the University of California: A Policy Discourse Analysis

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4fx1n6d3

Author

Brandon, Deborah Lynn

Publication Date

2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

African American Male Access to the University of California:
A Policy Discourse Analysis

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Education

by

Deborah L. Brandon

March 2018

Dissertation Committee:
        Dr. John Levin, Chairperson
        Dr. Carolyn Murray
        Dr. Margaret Nash

The Dissertation of Deborah L. Brandon is approved.

_____

_____

_____
John S. Levin, Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

iv

prepare for a professional future outside of sports disturbing. Lastly, I have been involved in public higher education all of my professional life, specifically working in the areas of access, admission, and outreach. After constantly observing the low number of African American males that are eligible for, gain admission to, and enroll in colleges and universities throughout the state of California, the issue of African American males' low participation in higher education has become even more personal to me. I take offense that, although the *California Master Plan for Higher Education* includes broad access as one of its main tenets, African American males are severely underrepresented on most college and university campuses. Why cannot the eligibility and admissions criteria for California's public universities be developed and implemented in a way that is genuinely inclusive? Why cannot the eligibility and admission criteria for California's public universities recognize society's negative perceptions of African American males within the K-12 education system and the world in which they live? And, why cannot the eligibility and admission criteria for California's public universities celebrate and embrace the uniqueness of all of its students? The presence of African American males on a university campus not only strengthens the university, it has a positive effect on its students and the future workforce. In addition, the inclusion of African American males at the university, at a more proportional or equitable rate, make it a more competitive system (due to its ability to recognize potential that the K-12 public system fails to recognize). It was with these thoughts in mind that I began this dissertation journey.

It is with gratitude that I recognize the many people who have traveled this journey with me. I first give thanks to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, without whose

proud. I am especially grateful to all of the African American males and their families, whose quest for a college education inspired me.

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother and my daughter. My mother, Linda A. Brandon, whose desire for me ever since I could remember was to for me to be a strong, educated African American woman who could hold her own and make a difference. My mother endured a lot, so that my brothers and I would have the opportunity to achieve the dream of a university education. My mother is the envy of many, because all three of her children received a college degree. My mother's pride is matched only by her commitment and dedication to the importance of family, and for this I am truly grateful and thankful. Morgan, my daughter, you inspired me, believed in me, and supported me throughout this process. Morgan, you came into this world early and the two of us would not be deterred by anything or anyone. Morgan, you are my pride and joy, and I have enjoyed watching you grow, and develop into a beautiful, strong, educated, loving, and caring young woman. Your admiration for me has humbled me, your expectations of me have helped shape me, and your love for me has grounded me. You are a mother's dream of a daughter, and I will always be thankful for you. The fact that you have also decided to pursue your Ph.D. to help shape and change the world makes me so proud, and grateful for many of the decisions I made in life. Lastly, you have brought into our family a wonderful man, your husband Dafu, who supports, encourages, and inspires much of the work that I do. This is for you.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

African American Males' Access to the University of California:
A Policy Discourse Analysis
by

Deborah L. Brandon

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program of Education
University of California, Riverside, March 2018
Dr. John Levin, Chairperson

Considered a historically renowned policy document, *Master Plan for Higher Education*

in California (*Master Plan*) transformed uncoordinated and competing colleges and

universities into a coordinated system, by providing each system (California Community

College, California State University, and University of California) with its own mission

and pool of students. *Master Plan* combined educational policy with access for students

for the first time in higher education. This policy document set forth guidelines for who

would be admitted to each system of higher education, with the University of California

(UC) responsible for enrolling the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates. Using

Master Plan as the guiding policy document, the UC established its eligibility and

admission policies. These policies have had a disparate effect on African American male

students, compared to other ethnicities/genders. Using a policy discourse analysis

methodology, I have explored the articulated goals of the UC's eligibility and admission

policies, and the discourses and positions they advance. In particular, I have considered

how these policy documents and discourses affect African American males' pursuit of a

UC education. I have argued that the dominant discourses of merit and prestige constrain

understanding of UC eligibility and admission policies, and potentially narrow the UC educational opportunities available to African American males. If *Master Plan,* and its premier public university system, the University of California, are to serve as instruments for creating and expanding opportunity, then the UC system, and its eligibility and admission policies, must be more than an amorphous and unreachable goal for *Master Plan* and the UC system, but should instead be made a reality. It is important to examine, analyze, and expand the definitions of merit, the construct of UC eligibility on the pathway to admission, and the overwhelming role of university prestige, as set forth in *Master Plan.* Lastly, I have argued that the interplay of access, definitions of merit, and prestige concerns in the UC system's eligibility and admission policies, utilizing *Master Plan* as the foundation for criterion, can serve as a gatekeeper, or block the opportunity path, of African American males' access to the University of California system.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Problem Statement

Despite the existence of California's historically renowned policy document, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* (*Master Plan*), that guaranteed that the University of California (UC) would select from the top 12.5% of the high school graduating class, African American males continued to lag behind their peers in attaining UC eligibility and gaining admission to the nine undergraduate campuses within the UC system. In 2015, African Americans were more likely to graduate from high school than they were a decade earlier, and California was home to the fifth largest African American population in the United States, yet their access to the University of California was still paltry (Valliani, 2015). Whereas both African American females and males had low eligibility and admissions rates, these rates were significantly lower for African American males. The word crisis has often been used to describe the current educational status of African American males in their quest to pursue a public postsecondary education, both nationally and in California (Harper, 2014). Crisis is a term also used to describe significant differences between African American male students and their White peers in educational outcomes, such as standardized test scores, grade point averages, high school graduation rates, eligibility and admission rates, and college enrollment (Lloyd, 2013). African American males have encountered barriers, including institutional inequality and discrimination, that have made educational equality, academic achievement, and university eligibility, admission, and enrollment, challenging (Benjamin, Henry, & McMahon, 2005). However, the scholarly literature on the intersection of African

1

American males' UC eligibility and admissibility, and the policy documents that guided these phenomena, is limited. This investigation addresses the question of whether the current low UC eligibility, admission rates, and consequent enrollment rates of African American males, in particular, are a partial result of UC's eligibility and admission policies—policies that are informed by *Master Plan*. Furthermore, not only are the policy documents understudied, but research specific to these documents, and their effects on African American male access to the UC system, is non-existent. This research is intended to fill this gap in the literature, and provide recommendations to ensure that African American males have a true opportunity to participate fully in the educational opportunities available at the nine undergraduate campuses of the UC system.

Purpose of the Research

The tenets of universal and broad access to higher education that form the basis of *Master Plan,* and its influence on the UC's eligibility and admission policies, have interested this researcher for three decades. The investigation of the intents, effects, and intersections of *Master Plan,* and related UC eligibility and admission policy documents and discourses, sheds light on the power those policies have wielded over a specific population-African American males-in higher education within California, especially regarding their ability to attain UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment.

The purpose of this investigation was to identify and explain the criteria which contributed to the development of the UC eligibility requirements and admission policies, through the lenses, or frameworks, of Critical Race Theory and Institutional Theory, from within the context of the tenets, and in light of the broad and universal access of *Master*

Plan. This investigation also sought to explain the implications of policy decisions for African American male students', in terms of true and proportionate access to, and enrollment in, the UC system. It was assumed that admission policies were, and are, guided by the principles of *Master Plan*. Therefore, it was necessary to determine the veracity of this assumption, as well as the extent to which the admission policies of the UC system align with these principles. The implementation of, and effects of, this alignment were also a part of this investigation. Although it has been acknowledged that *Master Plan* has facilitated the access and enrollment of African Americans in California's institutions of higher education, there has been little clarification as to the intersection of mission, merit, and prestige in the development of eligibility and admission policies that negatively affect African American males. The determination of which factors are important, in terms of developing eligibility and admission policies that are genuinely inclusive of African American males, has been elusive.

To make this determination, it was necessary to ascertain how the individuals charged with admission policy development had defined the concepts of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and university prestige in their creation and implementation of admission policies. In addition, it was important to identify and explain what guided, and continues to guide, university policy development, including internal and external politics, institutional norms, organizational structures, and governing bodies. By examining the documents, coupled with records explicating these individuals' interpretations of institutional principles and values, it became possible to

gain insight into the political, cultural, and institutional pressures underlying, or driving, eligibility and admission policy development at the UC.

The focus on the UC system was critical because the UC system was designated by *Master Plan* as "the primary state-supported academic agency for research;" it was the designated public university system responsible for conferring all advanced and professional degrees including MAs, PhDs., JDs, and MDs (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, pp. 37, 43). Moreover, all nine of the UC undergraduate campuses had repeatedly been ranked among the best global and domestic universities by *U.S. News and World Report* (2014), with two campuses, Berkeley and UCLA, ranking in the top 25. Finally, the UC system was one of the most selective and prestigious public university systems in the nation.

Introduction

In 1959, five years after the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the California State Legislature passed a resolution to commission the preparation of a master plan for the "development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education" in California to meet the state's needs for the following ten years (California Student Aid Commission, 2009, p. 95). The plan included community colleges, state colleges, the University of California campuses, and other institutions of higher education in the state. The resulting document, *Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975* (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960), then known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, was ratified by the Regents of the UC and the State Board of Education, then signed by Governor Patrick Brown on

April 27, 1960. *Master Plan* was designed to address the growing enrollment in the

state's public higher education institutions, the state's financial outlook, and the concern

that competition and duplication between the state colleges and UC campuses would cost

the taxpayers millions of dollars (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). The governance

and coordination of the state's tripartite system were also key components of *Master*

Plan. This policy document transformed higher education in the state of California, and it

was seen, both nationally and internationally, as the model for ensuring ordered and

planned growth of public higher education (Douglass, 2000). The development of *Master*

Plan, according to Kerr (2001),

> was a treaty and it was a process. It was also a vision. It was a vision that within a single overall system of higher education there would be greatly expanded opportunity for all youth, greatly extended provisions for the training of "polytechnic" skills in an evolving economy with a more highly skilled labor force, and the highest level of advanced professional training and basic research. (p. 186)

Master Plan is the framework for California's tripartite system of public education that

provided for differentiation in mission, eligibility, and admission criteria and included

California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University System (CSU),

and the University of California (UC). Under *Master Plan*, the top 12.5% of high school

graduates were entitled to enroll in UC schools. "[The] UC was considered the public

academic research institution of the state, and it alone was initially permitted to offer

graduate education through the doctorate as well as professional education including law,

medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine" (The Master Plan Survey Team, pp. 19-20,

1960). According to *Master Plan*, CSUs recruited their students from the top 33.33% of

high school graduates. Their campuses were not to develop doctoral programs, except in

collaboration with the UC system. High school graduates who did not qualify for admission to either the UC or the CSU systems would be eligible for admission to CCCs located throughout the state. The mission of the junior colleges was to provide academic and vocational instruction for the first two years of undergraduate education, remedial education, adult non-credit instruction, and workforce training (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960).

In 1960, college was not seen as the natural next step for individuals who finished high school, and "access to higher education was unequal, whether measured by income or by racial and ethnic background" (Baum, Kurose, & McPherson, 2013, p. 19). Yet Clark Kerr, then president of the UC, facilitated the development of *Master Plan*, which promised broad and universal access to all students, and aimed to put a publicly funded college experience within the financial and geographic reach of every high school student in the state (Douglass, 2000).

The expansion of opportunity envisioned by Kerr stands in sharp contrast to the present-day status of African Americans, with respect to UC eligibility and admission. In the Fall 2013 semester, according to the California Department of Education (CDE), 31% of African Americans completed the California high school courses required for enrollment eligibility at a UC campus. In contrast, 68% of Asians, 49% of Whites, and 32% of Latinos completed these courses ("Enrollment by Ethnicity," n.d.). That same semester, 46% of the African American applicants were admitted to a UC campus, as compared to 64% of the White and 57% of the Latino applicants ("Enrollment by Ethnicity," n.d.). Overall, 3.7% of the students enrolled at UC campus were African

American, whereas 31% were Asian, 33% White, and 18% Latino ("UCOP University of California Office of the President," 2009b).

Although *Master Plan* has served as a guide for the UC in its development of eligibility and admission policies, its influence on the access of African American males to the UC has often been overlooked. Instead, the literature and research have focused on how low college attendance rates, poor academic preparation, low scores on standardized admission tests, various "school to prison pipeline" theories involving California's K-12 educational systems, and the overall "crisis" of the African American male have affected access (Allen, Jayakumar, & Frank, 2009; Harper, 2006; Harper et al., 2009). The literature has not addressed the impact that *Master Plan* has had on eligibility and admission to UC campuses, or the challenges the UC system has faced in working to ensure that *Master Plan*'s tenets are integral components of its eligibility and admission policies. This gap in the literature needed to be filled to clarify understanding of why and how higher education policies have continued to advance and support the educational stratification that begins in K-12. It would also help in understanding how the intersections of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and university prestige affect UC eligibility and admission.

This investigation sought to advance understanding of how *Master Plan*, as a policy document, has influenced the access of African American males to the University of California. It also looked at the significance of *Master Plan* extending beyond its stated goals, as well as its unintended consequences. Given that *Master Plan* is fifty-seven years old, and that the enrollment demands, ethnic and racial demographics, and

economic and social needs of the state of California have changed, I specifically

examined the effects of *Master Plan* on the relationship between UC eligibility and

admission policies and African American males' access to the UC system. Focusing on

Master Plan as a prominent policy document, that serves as a backdrop for UC eligibility

and admission policies, may help policymakers better understand how California might

develop university eligibility and admission policies that are inclusive of African

American males. At the administrative level, this investigation sought to determine which

interpretations of the university mission(s), and its (their) role(s) within *Master Plan,*

were used in the development of the UC system's eligibility and admission policies, as

well as what role the definitions of merit and access have played in the development of

those policies. The investigation examined policymakers' philosophical understanding of

the intersection of *Master Plan* and university prestige, and the effects of that

understanding on UC's eligibility and admission policies. After examining the role of

prestige in UC's eligibility and admission policies, I examined how merit and access are

defined over time, considering the principal tenets of *Master Plan*: broad and universal

access. The results of that analysis should help to fill the gap in the discourse related to

access and equity of outcomes in UC eligibility and admission policies.

It has been argued that in the United States, education opens the doors to upward

social and economic advancement, while enlarging the cultural, social, economic, and

human capital of both individuals and communities (Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt,

2005). President Obama stated, "In a global economy where the most valuable skill you

can sell is your knowledge, a good education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity—

it is a prerequisite" (State of the Union Address, 2009). In addition, recent research has suggested that the supply of workers with bachelor's degrees in the California workforce is decreasing, due to large demographic changes resulting from increasing representation of ethnic and racial groups with historically low rates of college attainment, in combination with retirements (Reed, 2008; Johnson & Sengupta, 2009). The Public Policy Institute of California estimates that, by the year 2025, California will have one and a half million fewer adults with bachelor's degrees than are needed in the workforce (Bohn, 2014). Therefore, increased access to higher education will be a necessity, not only from the point of view of individual job seekers, but also for the health of the state's economy.

Several scholars have characterized higher education as a public good with widespread social benefits, through which individual participation yields positive outcomes for the larger society, including reduction in crime and poverty and increased civic engagement (Kezar et al., 2005). Higher education was characterized as "an umbrella public sphere sheltering projects that pertain to the public good (singular) and more narrowly defined public goods (plural). Most public functions are associated with the university's roles in knowledge, learning, and discourse" (Marginson, 2012, p. 13).

Other scholars and policy makers have argued that public colleges and universities were designed to extend higher education to all citizens as a part of the social contract between public higher education and the citizens it serves (Duderstadt & Womack, 2003). Public higher education has served as the catalyst for major social and political transformations, such as: the "Civil Rights Movement, 1960s-1970s student

power and grass-roots democracy, 1970s feminism, gay liberation, anti-nuclear protests, pro-ecology movements, and the 1990s-2000s protests against global injustice, corporate power, and violations of national sovereignty" (Marginson, 2012, p. 13).

Increasing demands for public higher education are attributable to the demands of the labor force. Factory jobs are becoming scarce, the cultural expectations for women have expanded, and society has increasingly recognized an obligation to ensure postsecondary educational opportunities for African American students (Baum et al., 2013). The earnings of four-year graduates outpaced inflation over the two decades from 1990 to 2010, whereas earnings declined for other groups according to Oreopoulous and Petronijevis (2013). The 2010 United States Census Bureau reported that the average yearly earnings of a man who had completed high school were $30,723, compared to $55,655 for a man who completed a bachelor's degree—an 81% increase in income as well as higher standard of living (United States Census Bureau, 2011).

Whereas the literature is varied, in terms of questioning the purpose and value of a college education, it is clear that a college degree has economic value for both the individual and society:

> Traditionally higher education's public role and contribution to the public good has included educating citizens for democratic engagement, supporting local and regional communities, preserving knowledge and making it available to the community, working in concert with other social institutions such as government or health-care agencies to foster their missions, advancing knowledge through research, developing the arts and humanities, broadening access to ensure a diverse democracy, developing the intellectual talents of students, and creating leaders for various areas of the public sector. (Kezar, 2004, p. 430)

As a public university system, the UC is accountable to all of California's population for its policies. Accountability is important with respect to African American male access to higher educational systems, participation in its intellectual environment, and the social and economic mobility ladder that is attached to a university degree.

Since the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education* overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal" and outlawed racial discrimination in the nation's schools,

> The educational progress of African Americans has been a song played in several keys . . . [although] the major chords correspond to the dramatic improvement in African American educational access and attainment . . . [T]he minor chords strike a less harmonious sound, as African Americans continue a substantial and persistent lag behind Whites and Asian Americans in college enrollment, academic performance, and degree attainment. For African Americans, the centuries-old struggle for access to and success in higher education is emblematic of a larger fight for personhood and equality. (Allen et al., 2009, p. 1)

In 1960, *Master Plan*'s development provided California the prospect of educating unprecedented numbers of students and expanding the educational opportunities that the state provided for its citizens. According to the UC Regents, *Master Plan* created a system that combined quality with broad and universal access for students (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). *Master Plan* "established a broad framework for higher education that encouraged each of the three public segments [CCC, CSU, and UC] to concentrate on creating its own distinctive kind of excellence within its specified responsibilities" (UCOP University of California Office of the President, para. 3).

The promise of broad and universal access, as it related to access for African American males at public four-year colleges and universities in California, has not been

fulfilled. The underrepresentation of African Americans in higher education has remained a stubborn and relentless problem in the state, and throughout the nation (Allen et al., 2002).

Access in Higher Education

In 1868, the state law establishing the University of California directed the Regents to "so apportion the representation of students, when necessary that all portions of the State shall enjoy equal privileges therein" ("Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools Response to the 2003-04 Eligibility and Admissions Study Group," 2005, p. 2). In 2004, the UC Regents reaffirmed their commitment to inclusivity when they declared that "the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California" (Regents of the University of California, 2004, p. 3). The Regents of the University of California acknowledge that, as a public university, in a highly ethnically and economically diverse state, California needed educated individuals to support an educated workforce. "While California is home to the nation's fifth largest African American population, and though African Americans are more likely to graduate from high school and college than they were a decade ago, there are persistent opportunity gaps in college access within the state" (Valliani, 2015, p. 3). The 2015 *Campaign for College Opportunity* report asserted that, even though the number of African Americans enrolled in a college or university in California was 33% higher than it was in 2004 (from 127,000 in 2004 to 150,000 in 2013), the growth had been concentrated at for-profit

universities and CCCs. According to the report, which compared the four major racial/ethnic groups in California, African Americans had the largest opportunity gap (Valliani, 2015, p. 3).

A major policy for public higher education (and the foremost access-related policy) was the Morrill Act of 1890, which sanctioned legal participation of African Americans in the land-grant system, mandating equitable distribution of funds to maintain separate educational institutions for African Americans (Neyland, 1990). Although the intent appeared to be positive, what evolved was a "separate, but equal" policy that signaled the beginning of the educational disparities characteristics of a racially segregated society (Harper & Harris, 2012). A major outcome of the Morrill Act of 1890 was the establishment of colleges for African Americans, yet many African Americans still preferred to attend predominantly White institutions (Neyland, 1990).

The original idea behind the 1954 K-12 school desegregation was the provision of an education equivalent to that of White students for African American students (Halpern, 1995;Kluger, 1976). African American students would acquire access to educational resources, networks, and opportunities, which were unavailable in their segregated schools. Proponents of desegregation did not consider the effects of altering the culture, climate, or instructional setting of the African American educational experience which, according to Halpern (1995), already embodied equity, efficiency, community, security, and liberty. Whereas segregated educational systems provided an encouraging environment, within the social and political era of their time, supporters believed that desegregated schools would also provide new intellectual opportunities

(Brown & Dancy, 2008). They assumed that the desegregation of K-12 schools, school systems, and postsecondary institutions could be the catalyst for African American upward social mobility (Brown & Dancy, 2008). Although school desegregation, in theory, promoted equal opportunity in education, Brown & Dancy, (2008) argued that this concept "failed to provide meaningful guidance for efficient student outcomes" (p. 18). According to these authors, equity proponents fought to ensure equality for political reasons, while efficiency proponents focused on costs and benefits (Brown & Dancy, 2008). The quest to achieve educational equality through desegregation persisted until a series of legal cases were filed by African American students who sought admission to predominately White institutions (Brown, 1999). A series of higher education integration cases would serve as the foundation for *Brown v. Board of Education* (Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1954).

In *Brown v. Board of Education*, the United States Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation, including the operation of separate but equal facilities in public education, would no longer be legal (Brown, 2001). This landmark case established the legal and social standard for open access within school settings. More specifically, the *Brown v. Board of Education* case rejected the system of apartheid in public education and called for greater educational opportunities and access for African Americans. Brown contended that, "[t]he mandate to desegregate did not reach higher education until one decade after the Brown court case, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964," (2001, p. 49). Subsequently, the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling was applied to higher education in the settlement of Florida v. Board of Control (1956).

President Kennedy first introduced the term 'affirmative action' in a civil rights speech, and President Johnson made it happen with the signing of Executive Order 11246, which required "federal contractors to increase the number of minority employees as an 'affirmative step toward remedying years of exclusion for minority workers' and take affirmative action to ensure that equal opportunity is provided in all aspects of their employment" ("Executive Order 11246," n.d.). The affirmative action policies of the mid-1960s dramatically increased educational opportunities for African Americans (Bowen & Bok, 1998). In addition, race-based college admission policies "led to striking gains in the representation of minorities in the most lucrative and influential occupations" (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 10). Between 1973 and 1977, a marked increase in college enrollment numbers for African Americans occurred.

The Landscape for African American Males in K-12

The current, low levels of eligibility and admission at public universities for African American males stems from several sources. First, the poor academic performance of African American males in K-12 had influenced college/university eligibility and admissions, and it channeled this population onto paths that did not lead to postsecondary education. The academic performance of African American men was one result of the multiple challenges they encountered in society (Irving & Hudley, 2005). Their academic experience was substantially divergent from that of White males. For example, racism in the form of racial microaggressions (small, subtle racial slights) had a direct effect on how African American males encountered, navigated, and engaged in educational institutions (Ingram, 2013). They received subtle negative stereotypical

messages regarding their intellectual abilities, behaviors, and life expectations from teachers, peers, and the media (Davis, 2014). Many scholars also argue that teachers' perceptions and attitudes have shaped the experiences of African American males in schools, most often causing a negative effect on these students' educational achievements (Howard, 2008; Milner, 2007Reynold, 2010). A study conducted by Rong (1996) demonstrated that teachers' perceptions of their students' social behaviors were a result of complex interactions between the students' and teachers' races and genders. His study showed that female teachers perceived female students more positively than males, regardless of the teacher's race, and that White female teachers perceived White female and male students more positively than African American male students (Rong, 1996). White female teachers approached African American males in the educational setting from a deficit-thinking model, a model that blames African American males for their poor academic performance regardless of their educational environment, which had a negative effect on the African American males' academic potential in the eyes of their teachers (Howard, 2013a).

Additionally, several studies have shown that teachers' low expectations for African American males were based on perceptions of students' current performance, rather than their potential (Ferguson, 2000; Kober, 2001; Trent et al., 2003). The negative effects of teachers' attitudes were magnified by the lack of diversity among K-12 teachers, 90% of whom were White (National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force, 2004). The overwhelming majority of these educators were also female (National Education Association, 2004).

Secondly, the conceptualization of academic achievement and merit by university eligibility and admission policy makers placed African American males in a difficult position, as they tended to lack the types of academic credentials that universities required. High school counselors were far more likely to impose negative expectations upon African American males seeking to attend college than on their White counterparts (Ogbu, 2003; Reid & Moor, 2008; Robinson, Stempel, & McCree, 2005. A study by Lewis, Simon, Uzzell, Horwitz, and Casserly (2010) noted that most African American boys were educated in urban schools, which had higher levels of unqualified, inexperienced, and uncertified teachers, higher teacher turnover rates, and frequently operated with insufficient resources and outdated facilities.

The media was, and is, another negative influence on the educational experiences of African American males, too often depicting them as gangsters, criminals, and drug dealers (Harper, 2013). Positive depictions of African American males were usually restricted to entertainers and athletes (Harper, 2013. Most media images portrayed African American males as morally deficient and intellectually inferior, argued Wood and Hilton (2013).

African American male students have continued to academically lag behind their White peers. Since the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 introduced accountability through standards, the academic achievement gap between African American and White students has remained large (Booker-Baker, 2005). This "falling behind" not only affected educational and employment opportunities, but also had a negative impact on the mortality of African American children, especially African American males (Noguera,

2003). Several scholars identified a "School to Prison Pipeline" as an additional set of limitations on the ambitions of African American students, particularly males (Darensbourg, Perez, & Blake, 2010; Morrison & Epps, 2002). The "School to Prison Pipeline," as defined by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), is a collection of "policies and practices that push … our most at-risk children out of classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems" ("School-to-Prison Pipeline," 2011, p. 1). Sixty-one percent of African American males scored below basic levels on their math achievement examination (Bottoms & Carpenter, 2003). African American males were more likely to be suspended or referred to special education and had fewer educational and social support systems than their White counterparts (Brown-Wright & Tyler, 2010). Urban African American males also had fewer academic opportunities than their rural and suburban counterparts (Davis & Jordan, 1994). Fifty-two percent of the African American males that left high school prematurely had prison records by their 30's (Ashton, 2011). Poverty further compressed the academic options for African American males; the community in which a student lives has a tremendous impact on that student's success (Ensminger, Lamkin, & Jacobson, 1996). Predictably, living in a middle-class neighborhood benefitted students, but proportionally few African American students had the opportunity to do so both nationally and in California (Ensminger et al., 1996). African American students have been "adultified," and stereotyped as disorderly criminals (Muhammad, Smith, & Duncan, 2008).

One result of the No Child Left Behind legislation was that African American children were more often disciplined by expulsion from the school or classroom, which

had direct and harmful impact on their academic success (Fenning & Rose, 2007A similar report by Darensbourg et al. (2010) highlighted that African American males were overrepresented in expulsion discipline and special education, and that such treatment may have served as a socializing pathway for routing them into the criminal justice system.

Institutional structures within schools also hindered college/university access for African American males. For example, it was well known that African American males did not perform well on standardized tests when compared to their White counterparts (Darling-Hammond, 2007The discrepancy in standardized test scores between African American and White students may be caused by "stereotype threat—a situational threat – a threat in the air – that, in general form, can affect the members of any group about whom a negative stereotype exists" (Steele, 1997, p. 614). However, colleges and universities continue to rely heavily on standardized tests for admission purposes, despite the differences in test performance and research suggesting that standardized tests are weak measures of academic success for students of color (Hoffman & Lowitzki, 2005).

Finally, the stratification of United States society, according to economic status, race, and gender, has led to the positioning of African American males at or near the bottom of our social hierarchy (Crimmins, Hayward, & Seeman, 2004), and this positioning reinforces this situation. The literature argues that academic and social stratification are embedded within issues of access and equity. The equality of opportunity for all students to attend public colleges and universities, without regard to their backgrounds or preparation, is a foundational principle of higher education

policymaking, and financial mechanisms have been developed to implement this principle (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001). However, the policies that terminated academic programs, eliminated remedial education, and promoted honors colleges within state public higher educational systems have contributed to increased stratification of programs and students within the state system, as well as within particular campuses of that system (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001). This has increased the natural tension between the twin principles of access and differentiation in the design of public systems (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001). Barrow claimed that states "the strategy of selective excellence is designed to rationalize the American system of higher education by further differentiating the missions of individual institutions" (1996, p. 447). The research by Gade (1993) supported the notion that students make choices about their educational opportunities based on their educational, social, and academic needs and expectations. If such options were not provided, access was a hollow promise. In addition, Ackoff (1994) placed access and equity in the context of higher education and social stratification. He argued that institutions of higher education fell into three strata: "the elite, the middle, and the bottom" (p. 73). In general, the costs of applying to and attending college, the quality of the students admitted by these colleges/universities, and the quality of the jobs graduates were able to take were highly correlated; hence, differential admission and enrollment practices were likely to preserve and/or reinforce social stratification, which was often incompatible with the university's mission.

Although much of the literature addressed access in traditional ways (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001; Noguera, 2003), this perspective was limiting because it failed to address

poor K-12 academic preparation at schools serving students of lower socioeconomic status. However, the literature did show that the educational experiences, and the academic expectations of parents, as well as school and peer influences, were key elements in addressing access.

Environmental factors, coupled with unwritten norms, set the tone for a culture of success or failure within K-12 schools and subsequent access to a four-year university education. Structural racist practices, according to Wald and Losen (2003), subjected African American males to policies and practices that increased their likelihood of fulfilling low expectations of academic achievement, and that some students would be trapped in the "School to Prison Pipeline." Students who were suspended or expelled were more likely to disengage from their studies and drop out (Wald & Losen, 2003). Three factors contributed to the systemic racial disparity in the school system: (a) criminalization of African American males, (b) race and class privilege, and (c) zero tolerance policies (Wald & Losen, 2003).

The criminalization of African American males is not new, nor is it a concept that can be viewed as insignificant in the discussion of the equity and access of African American males in postsecondary education (Oliver, 2003).Whether accurate or not, the negative stereotype of African American males, that of not being academically inclined, can be psychologically damaging, and it may result in both academic underperformance and detachment from the educational process, thereby obstructing their access to postsecondary educational opportunities (Steele, 1997).

Research indicated that race and class privilege were present throughout the organizational structure of United States schools (Paulsen & St. John, 2002). Socioeconomic status was a key dividing line in the United States. A person's socioeconomic status often defined access to resources, and had a bearing on the perceived costs versus benefits of college attendance, argued Paulsen and St. John (2002). They noted that minority students from low income households were much more cost conscious, increasing the likelihood that they would choose an educational path that would not significantly change their socioeconomic status (Paulsen & St. John, 2002). Minority students often assumed they had no, or less, access to higher education, due to a lack of knowledge, tools, and/or financial resources that aided other students in accurately evaluating their college eligibility and helped them make informed choices in the application and enrollment process (Pearson & Wyche, 2009).

Several scholars examined student academic expectations and the impact that these expectations had on educational attainment. Numerous studies identified links between students' academic expectations and the expectations of their parents, as well as the family's socioeconomic status, level of education, and the amount of college savings (Alexander, Bozick, Entwisle, Dauber, & Kerr, 2005). Other studies examined the connection between student educational expectations and individual perceptions of their neighborhood, school, and teachers, as well as the level of academic expectations that teachers had for their students (Mello, 2005Rong, 1996).

A study conducted in 2013 found that, of students in public schools at that time, African American males in grades K-12 were more likely than any other population to

have repeated a grade, been suspended, or been expelled, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013This negative reinforcement of African American males within the educational system will influence their level of academic achievement, postsecondary educational preparedness, and access to higher education (Fenning & Rose, 2007).

Several studies found that African American parents tended to have lower academic expectations for male students (Rowan-Kenyon, Bell, & Perna, 2008; Wood, Kaplan & McLoyd, 2007Because parental expectations had also been shown to predict students' personal expectations (Trusty, 2002these lowered, gendered, parental expectations contributed to the expression of lowered academic expectations by African American males. If, as a result of lower parental expectations and school-related factors, these students displayed lower levels of academic achievement throughout grade school, parental expectations for postsecondary studies would likely be further decreased (Wood et al., 2007).

Over the last decade, there has been much discussion and debate about the accessibility of United States institutions of higher education. In September 2006, the Spellings Commission conducted a national discussion of the current state of affairs in higher education, and they noted that there were several critical issues, such as affordability, accountability, and quality, that needed to be addressed. In addition to the findings of the Spellings Commission, the literature consistently noted that increased tuition costs, combined with financial aid offerings, increasingly competitive admission standards, secondary school inequities, misalignment between high school preparation

and postsecondary expectations, and limited information regarding funding
opportunities, all contributed to the decline in accessibility (Hodge, Harrison, Burden, &
Dixon, 2008). In postsecondary systems as varied as those found across the United States,
the manner in which commitment to access has been operationalized is largely defined by
state politics (Tierney & Hagedorn, 2002). "The social constriction of college access is
closely tied to technical challenges, which include (a) a college going culture, (b)
rigorous academic curriculum, (c) high quality teaching, (d) intensive academic and
college-going support, and (e) a multicultural college-going identity among high school
students" (Oakes, Roger, Lipton, & Morrell, 2002, pp. 108-109). All of the
aforementioned factors are contrary to the typical African American male experience.
Many African American males have surrendered to the collective pressures that keep
them out of higher education: racism, stereotypes, poor academic preparation, low
academic achievement, absentee fathers, negative peer influences, drugs and alcohol, and
policy decisions that affect access (Steel, 1997; Ogbu, 1997; Osborne & Walker, 2006),
some of which are the focus of the present investigation.

Black Males in Postsecondary Education

African American men enroll in colleges and universities with the goal of social
and economic mobility (Bush & Bush, 2010). In 2002, African American men accounted
for 4.3% of the total enrollment at four-year postsecondary institutions in the United
States, a figure that was nearly the same as it was in 1976 (Harper, 2012a). The 2012
"Digest of Education Statistics" reported that African American males accounted for
5.18% of the total postsecondary enrollment and 5.43% of the general undergraduate

population compared to 43% for White males (Snyder & Zillow, 2012). Moreover, among the total number of African American men enrolled in undergraduate education, 41% were enrolled in public community colleges and 24% in public four-year colleges/universities (Wood, 2013). Table 1 shows the breakdown, by race, of male enrollment in the various sectors.

Table 1

Percentage of Men by Race Enrolled in Postsecondary Education by Sector

Race	Public Four-Year	Private Not for Profit Four-Year	Public Two- Year	Private for Profit
African American	**24.1**	**10.9**	**41.0**	**15.9**
American Indian or Alaska Native	26.0	6.1	36.9	21.6
Asian	38.1	12.6	34.0	6.7
Latino	25.3	7.1	46.6	12.9
White	32.8	13.3	37.3	8.7
Other	28.8	13.9	39.9	9.9
Total	30.4	11.7	39.2	10.8

Note. From National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (2012a). NPSAS institution sector (with multiple) by race/ethnicity (with multiple) for gender (male). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Whereas more than two and a half million Black men were enrolled in college and universities, in 2012, a hundred and fifty-five thousand were enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013).

Definitions of Merit in Undergraduate Admission Policies

The purpose of a college education shapes the understanding of merit in undergraduate admission policies. Historically it was thought "that a college education could serve two purposes: occupational /positional preparation and personal/social

development" (Veysey, 1965). This "utility-based perspective emphasizes occupational preparation and sought to recognize individual merit (Veysey, 1965). College, by this definition, is intended to move students beyond an education grounded in practice, to one that includes academic or theoretical concerns.

The liberal development viewpoint places less emphasis on the individual in economic terms, and it focuses instead on the student as a citizen. Accordingly, a college education delivers civic training, and provides a curriculum requiring all students to complete a range of courses designed to broaden their minds and their understanding of how historical events shape current problems (Veysey, 1965).

The literature, as related to meritocracy in the development of undergraduate admission policies, clearly showed that the definition of merit was central to this development as a political and economic concept. More importantly, the definition of merit demonstrated who had power in the larger society, since those who defined merit were those who possessed more of it; those with greater resources—cultural, economic, and social—were generally able to ensure that the educational system deemed their own children more meritorious (Karabel, 2005). The academic meaning of merit in the early 1900s measured one's mastery of a traditional curriculum, including Latin and Greek (Karabel, 2005). By the 1920s, in the context of a national movement to restrict immigration, this definition then evolved into equating merit with "the ideal man," of "sturdy character, sound body, and proper social background" (Karabel, 2005). In the late 1950s, Cold War and Sputnik sparked concerns of "talent loss," and research showed a pivotal shift to the gifted student—those with high scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test

and high grades (Karabel, 2005). In the wake of the Civil Rights social unrest, and the upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s, the definition of merit again changed to include values such as diversity and inclusion. More importantly, the definition and meaning of merit have continually shifted in response to fluctuating power relations among groups, as well as changes in the broader society (Karabel, 2005).

Conversely, Contreras (2005) notes that, although merit was commonly perceived as an individual attribute, there were external factors beyond the students' control that determined their achievement levels. Comeaux and Watford (2006) conclude that current definitions of merit lacked sensitivity to the context of applicants' achievements. If policymakers were to come to understand this point, they might develop policies that would better permit universities to grant access to a broader range of students, while minimizing institutional racism (Comeaux & Watford, 2006).

The policymakers responsible for defining merit, according to Coleman (1988),

> have a duty to (a) do so in a way that aligns with the unique educational mission of the college or university, both in principle and practice, (b) establish non-discriminatory definitions of merit, (c) establish comprehensive definitions of merit recognizing a range of important criteria that should be considered in admission decisions, including testing, and (d) articulate the definitions of merit in clear and understandable ways. (p. 96)

More importantly, Coleman stated, if other factors entered into an admission decision—such as leadership or the ability to overcome obstacles—then the policy makers responsible for eligibility and admission policy development ought to define merit as including not only the more traditional academic criteria, such as test scores or grade point averages, but also these other factors (1988). This latter category of additional

factors demonstrated what traits a higher education community might value. If these are valued, then they should be included in the definition of merit. In addition, as Coleman (1988) clearly stated, "a student's value to the academic community should be determined not only by an assessment of his or her credentials in isolation, but also by that student's potential contribution to the larger community of learning." There should be no "second-class citizenship" when the qualifications and qualities of students are shown to meet particular educational objectives of the higher education institution (p. 110).

Merit has historically been defined by past performance (Banks, 2001However, the basis of merit must shift from past performance alone to a combination of past achievement and potential benefit to society, argues Banks (2001Moreover, according to Banks (2001), the historical, individualist rationale did not place emphasis on the potential of the individual with respect to expected future performance and, therefore, was an unproductive approach to framing merit in terms of economic efficiency. In a study of UC admission standards, Contreras (2005) defined merit as an "ever-rising" and "moving target" equity standard that influenced how higher education organizations operationalize equity (p. 385). Accordingly, merit has been depicted both as a reward for past performance (achievement) and student potential (Contreras, 2005). She also argues that merit took the shape of a rising curve, where the competitive background characteristics defined by the applicant pools continue to elevate admission standards far beyond the baseline of UC eligibility requirements (Contreras, 2005). Merit could also be defined in relation to definitions of equity in admission criteria and the resources

available to applicants in their high schools (such as college prep courses or honors and AP course offerings), and by recognizing that educational experiences affect students' competitiveness (Contreras, 2005).

Finally, the literature highlighted that there is tension between two perspectives on admission. The student-centric perspective defines college as both reward and opportunity for students of high ability (Kilgore, 2009). The organization-centric perspective is based on competition between colleges in the overall system of higher education, and admission to elite colleges is further based on the ability of particular students to meet the more stringent needs of particular college organizations (Kilgore, 2009). The tension between these two perspectives creates a policy dilemma, facing institutions of higher education that has not been adequately explored in the literature (Kilgore, 2009).

That fact that educational attainment differs dramatically by race/ethnicity, as well as by gender, is well documented (Bowen, Chingos, & McPherson, 2009). In the patterns of educational attainment, the large disparities in educational outcomes which are related to race/ethnicity and gender constitute an "opportunity gap" (Bowen et al., 2009). This opportunity gap can be explained, to some degree, by social conditions that lead to deeply rooted differences in academic achievement, often stemming from where, geographically and socioeconomically a student attends K-12 school. The opportunity gap aligns with equity and access issues (Bowen et al., 2009). Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor spoke to the absence of equity in United States higher education:

The diffusion of knowledge and opportunity…must be accessible to all individuals regardless of race or ethnicity…. Effective participation by members of all racial and ethnic groups in the civic life of our Nation is essential if the dream of one Nation, indivisible, is to be realized. (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, p. 332)

Despite these sentiments, race remains a significant factor in creating inequity within the United States, and educational attainment, or lack of it, is a consequence of this inequity (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Social Context

Two highly regarded studies by Solórzano determined, from a cohort of 100 African American kindergarten classes, that only a small number of these students ultimately achieved UC/CSU eligibility, a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, or a doctorate/professional degree (Solórzano, 1995). As an update of this research (Allen et al., 2009) utilized simulation, resuming at the ninth-grade level. These researchers projected the outcome, by following the same trends outlined in Solórzano's research, and determined the following: For a cohort of 100 African American ninth grade students, 53 will graduate from high school. From those graduates, only thirteen will complete the course requirements to be eligible for UC or CSU. Thirty-one of the students will attend college in California, twenty-three at CCCs, five at CSUs, two at UCs, and one at a private university. Eleven of the students attending CCCs will receive an associate's degree, with four of those graduates transferring to a CSU, and one transferring to a UC. Of the nine students enrolled at a CSU, six will earn bachelor's degrees; of the three attending UCs, two will earn bachelor's degrees. From the original

cohort of 100, five will earn a master's degree from either a UC or CSU, and one will earn a Ph.D./professional degree.

These numbers starkly contrasted with statistics for White students. The projected numbers for White students indicated that 86% of White students will graduate from high school and 25% will graduate from either a UC or CSU campus, with 11% earning a master's degree and 1.4% a Ph.D./professional degree (Allen et al., 2009). These wide disparities in educational outcomes, across ethnic groups, underline the systemic unequal access to, enrollment in, and completion of higher education for African Americans, a persistent inequity that has significant economic and social consequences in today's global society.

More than any other population in the United States, African American males have consistently been characterized in a negative light as "troubled, defiant, uneducated, and lazy" (Ogbu, 1997). In addition, Ogbu (1997), argues that "African American males have been ostracized, belittled, and undervalued, while being attacked at their core, experiencing ongoing psychological emasculation and the lack of physical safety" (p. 17). More African American males were incarcerated and dropping out of high school, and fewer were attending college (Hefner, 2004). African American males were incarcerated at a rate of 4,367 per 100,000, compared to 922 Latinos, 488 non-Latino Whites, and 34 Asians. ("Prison Census Data," as of June 30, 2013). African American males are the group most likely to be negatively stereotyped, most likely to drop out of K-12 schools, most likely to be harshly punished, and most likely to be labeled as trouble makers, according to Harper (2009). African American males have long encountered

numerous barriers, such as institutional inequality and discrimination that make

attaining educational equality, academic success, and university eligibility, admission,

and enrollment challenging (Benjamin et al., 2005).

Given these ongoing inequities, it is unsurprising that fifty-three years after the

end of legal segregation, many young African American males still do not pursue a

postsecondary education. Decades of educational inequality and systematic

discrimination have created what is now termed the "The African American Male

Educational Crisis," a phrase used to describe significant differences between African

American male students and their White peers in educational outcomes, as indicated by

standardized test scores, grade point averages, high school graduation rates, eligibility

and admission rates, and college enrollments (Flores, 2007; Nettles, Millett, Ready,

Saunders, Williams, & Williams, 2004).

In the United States, race continues to be an important factor in determining

access to higher education (Bell, 1992). In addition, racial inequity has hindered access to

higher education for several populations and is a pervasive and permanent element of the

United States' social, political, and cultural life. Racism is the standard way that United

States' society conducts business; Racism pervades the common, everyday experience of

most people of color in this country and, therefore, it proves difficult to cure or address

(Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

The present investigation located public colleges and universities in California as

inherently political institutions. Scholars have argued that, over the past four decades,

public universities have become increasingly selective, therefore considerable attention

32

has turned to the factors employed in determining admission criteria (Bowen et al., 2009). Pusser stated that the definition of merit, the legality of certain demographic criteria (e.g., gender, ethnicity, or race), and the value of other criteria utilized in the admission process, have evolved over time and been challenged within institutions, legislatures, and courts. From a pluralist perspective, the outcome reflects the views of a political majority as expressed through ballot initiatives, and by appointments to governing boards by governors and legislators (Pusser, Kempner, Marginson, & Ordorika, 2012).

In 2015, the rationale for a selective admission process was rarely challenged, and the higher educational community had come to accept selective admission as normal (Pusser, 2004).

Whereas the construct of selective admission is relatively new, society had embraced the notion that a selective college or university was a prestigious one. The need for selective admission in public universities was taken for granted (Lemann, 2000). This assumption was a biased view, given that there were new, well resourced, and highly effective public universities that provided extensive educational options. Moreover, with respect to college access, several scholars noted that the limited capacity of highly selective public universities had created admission openings that were increasingly tilted in favor of those in higher income brackets (Astin & Oseguera, 2004).

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this investigation were:

1. What understandings of the university's mission and role within *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* have been used in the development of the University of California (UC) eligibility and admission policies?

This question addresses the policymakers' philosophical understandings of the intersection of *Master Plan* and university prestige in California's eligibility and admission policies.

2. What roles do the definitions of merit and access play in the development of eligibility and admission policies?

After looking at the role of prestige in UC's eligibility and admission policies, I investigated how merit and access were historically defined to ensure the tenets of *Master Plan*, specifically regarding broad and universal access, were addressed. This question frames my contribution to the academic discourse on access and equity of outcomes in UC eligibility and admission policies. After reviewing the tenets of *Master Plan* with UC eligibility and admission policies, I saw the constructs of race and gender, related to African American males, as essential to this research because they challenged frameworks that viewed such constructs as obsolete.

The subordinate questions that guided my investigation were:

1. What goals are articulated by the University of California for eligibility and admission policies?

2. What dominant and alternate discourses produced these policy stances?

3. What access positions do these discourses make possible?

34

4. What access positions do these discourses promote through eligibility and admission policies?

After examining the role of prestige in the University of California's eligibility and admission policies, I investigated how merit and access have been defined over time to ensure that the principles of broad and universal access have been addressed. This question framed my contribution to the academic discourse on access and equity of outcomes in UC eligibility and admission policies related to African American males.

Analysis Method

This investigation used the qualitative analysis method. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), the qualitative approach "offers the opportunity for a researcher to address specific problems and questions, and an understanding, ascertain some meanings and put forward an interpretation. The role of *Master Plan* in UC eligibility and admission policy development, viewed through the lens of an inductive method, such as the qualitative approach, provides a broader degree of focus on the interactions, and the meanings attached to these interactions, by evaluating organizational structure and institutional norms. Finally, qualitative research ensures that "[a]s the researcher you do not simply work out where to find data which already exists in a collaborative state. Instead you work out how best you can generate data from your chosen data sources" (Mason, 2002, p. 52). This approach allowed me to determine the meanings that individuals and governing bodies had attributed to the institutional mandates, policies, and values of the UC.

In my investigation, I utilized policy document analysis, which is a research method that incorporates how documents are interpreted to give voice and meaning to a topic. I chose policy document analysis as a qualitative research method because "documents are unobtrusive and non-reactive," therefore unaffected by the research process" (Bowen, 2009, p. 31). Policy document analysis addressed "the concerns related to reflexivity (or the lack of it) inherent in other qualitative research methods" (Bowen, 2009, p. 31). "Reflexivity, which requires an awareness of the researcher's contribution to the creation of meanings attached to social interactions, as well as acknowledgement of the possibility of the investigator's influence on the research, is usually a non-issue in using documents for research" (Bowen, 2009, p. 31). More importantly, policy documents are stable, available for repeated review, and uncover events that occurred before the research began (Bowen, 2009). They provided the broad coverage that was necessary in my investigation, giving an overview of a long-time span, many events, and many settings.

I focused on three specific functions of the documents examined in my investigation. First, I used the documents as data sources in the context of the research. These documents provided background information, as well as historical insight, on the roots of specific issues, contextualizing the political, social, and economic background of the phenomena studied. Second, these documents provided a means of tracking change and development. Many of the changes and updates of *Master Plan* were reflected in updates of UC eligibility and admission policies. Third, the documents contained information that suggested further questions to pursue in my research.

Data Collection

This investigation included two strands of data collection. The first was the historical, recorded compilation of UC eligibility and admission policies, from sources such as documents from the UC's Office of the President, meeting minutes from the UC Committee on Educational Policy, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) (the faculty body that determined UC eligibility and admission policies), and *Master Plan* itself. This information was supplemented by other historical documents, including UC Regents' meeting minutes, public records, and policy papers that addressed the development of eligibility and admission policies at the UC.

This investigation reviewed the contents of *Master Plan* and *Master Plan Renewed*, as well as other UC eligibility and admission policy documents, to look for information and/or themes related to the UC system's definitions of merit and broad access. Correlations and relationships between the stated intentions, and the actual eligibility and admission policies of the policymakers, were examined for evidence of the content's stated purposes, and to determine whether these policies were merely political, related to university mission and prestige, or strategic in nature.

Finally, the investigation examined the past development of undergraduate UC eligibility and admission policies in accord with *Master Plan,* and past studies on the eligibility, admissibility, and enrollment of African American males in the UC system, in an effort to shed light on current eligibility and admission policies.

Document and Content Analysis. Document and content analysis can provide information that may not be accessible by other methods. Content analysis is a

component of document analysis, and it is a systematic research method for a standardized analysis of textual information that allows the researcher to make inferences about that information (Krippendorff, 1980; Weber, 1990). In conducting such an analysis, the researcher classifies key ideas through some form of written communication, such as a policy document through key ideas via written communication, such as a policy document. According to Smith (2000) "content analysis is a technique used to extract information from a body of material by systematically identifying specified characteristics of the material with disinterest" (p. 314).

Content analysis offered several benefits for the present investigation. First, it allowed for an unobtrusive review and analysis of the admission policy documents and discourses, and their potential relationship to African American males' access to the university. Second, content analysis considered the effects of several variables (economic, political, and cultural) and characteristics (credibility and likability) of message content (Smith, 2000).

Document analysis for my investigation examined pivotal points in the life of UC eligibility and admission policies, and their relationships to *Master Plan*. The questions I sought to answer, in examining these documents, included (a) What was the intent of the policy document and policymakers?; (b) Did the documents define merit, and if so, how?; (c) Did the documents affect admission and eligibility policies and practices, and if so, how is this effect on admission and eligibility policies significant?; (d) Was there a preference for specific criteria, such as test scores, GPA, AP and honors classes?; and (e)

What was the nature of any reference/s to the eligibility of underrepresented students and the consideration they would receive in the admission process?

Interviews. In addition to analyzing these documents, I conducted in-person and phone interviews seeking additional insights to guide my document and content analysis. According to Jones (1985), research interviews "are social interactions between two people in which one, the interviewer, initiates and varyingly controls the exchange with the other, the respondent, for purpose of obtaining information" (p. 138). "The interviews can reveal the individuals' innermost thoughts, frames of reference, reactions to situations, and cultural conventions" (Smith, 2000, p. 313). Moreover, language often displays more about people than they want to disclose or even realize about themselves, which can help guide the researcher's questions, according to Smith (2000). Interviewing was used in a limited capacity, as a supplement to document analysis. Those interviewed included a UC admissions director, a UC system-wide undergraduate admissions director, members of campus-wide admission boards, and a member of the UC system-wide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). These experts provided useful information, and confirmed or disconfirmed my observations, after I analyzed the policy discourses and documents.

Theoretical Framework. The theoretical frameworks that guided my investigation were Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Institutional Theory. Both of these frameworks illuminate the connection between external values and meanings, norms and belief systems, and organizational structures and resource allocation.

Critical Race Theory. A CRT framework examines the role that race and racism, as tied to power, play in formulating meanings and assumptions about the world we live in (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). In addition, CRT draws on the interdisciplinary foundations of law, ethnic and women's studies, and sociology (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The use of this framework permitted an understanding of the intersection of race, politics, and higher education institutions as they related to the eligibility criteria and admission policies in California. This framework was also used to determine whether these policies affected African American males' access to, and enrollment in, UC's public universities, and to what extent they were affected.

A CRT framework, which emerged from legal studies, is "the study and transformation of the relationship among race, racism, and power" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT has shown that, in the United States, race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity (Hacker, 2010The main tenets and themes of CRT, as outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001), support the concept that racial inequity hinders access and affects all aspects of society's social, political, and cultural perspectives. The first tenet stated that "racism is pervasive and a permanent part of American society; it is ordinary, not aberrational—"normal science" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p.7). This tenet linked African American males' access to, and enrollment in, UC's to the phenomenon of race in the United States. As discussed earlier, despite these students' strong aspirations to attend college, their inadequate preparation, attendance at low performing schools, and the unavailability of AP and honors courses at those schools, have negative effects on their UC eligibility and admissibility. Because these factors differentially affect African

Americans, and have a greater negative effect on them, an analysis of race cannot be absent from the examination of the eligibility and admissibility of African Americans (e.g., specifically African American males), in California's public universities.

The second tenet, sometimes labeled "interest convergence" or "material determinism," (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 11) suggest that African American males' limited access to UC was due to the material interests of White elites, and the psychological interests of White working-class people, as these groups form significant segments of society, and neither group has much incentive to eradicate racism (Bell, 1980; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). This tenet implies that White elites will endure or encourage racial advances for African Americans, only when such advances also promote White self-interest (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT challenges the claims of objectivity, neutrality, colorblindness, and merit. The questioning of these claims could provide the impetus for policymakers to reevaluate the predictive value of standardized tests, grade point averages, course enrollment, and co-curricular activities in the determination of eligibility and admission policies. Often, admission and eligibility policy developers define merit exclusively by reference to factors that reflect their own life experiences and preparation for college. Moreover, according to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), the CRT approach supports "naming one's own reality" or "voice" to counter accepted narratives and "reveal inherent fictions and irony" (p. 14).

A third tenet of CRT, the "social construction" thesis, holds that race, or races, are the product of social thought and relations" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 7). "They are not objective, or fixed; they correspond to no biological or genetic reality, but rather,

41

races are categories that society invents, manipulates, and retires when convenient"

(Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 7). Nevertheless, these socially constructed categories

have real social and political effects.

Finally, a more recent development in CRT concerns "differential racialization:

the ways the dominant society racializes various minority groups at different times in

response to shifting needs" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p.8). For example, the political

backlash from the low enrollment of a racial group might result in negative economic,

political, and social (intended, or unintended) consequences. This tenet allows us to

visualize access to higher education in California as a social tool that can be used to

implement a commitment to social and political justice. For underrepresented students of

color, the ability and opportunity to enroll in a university becomes noticeable in their

pursuit of upward mobility (Rendón, 1994).

Therefore, a CRT framework may help facilitate eligibility and admission policy

makers' examination of the political and social assumptions people make about their

world, as well as the stratification and racialized effect that *Master Plan* has created. A

critical race lens relies heavily on the roles of racism, power, and racialization of

opportunity, to illuminate how local meaning may not be reflective of the larger society's

meanings and/or needs.

Whereas this theoretical framework may address important aspects of the

development of UC eligibility and admission policies, and the diminishing rates of

eligibility and admission of African American males in higher education, it lacks some

important elements. More specifically, this theoretical framework, as well as the research

related to African American males' low participation in higher education, fails to address the role of student choice in pursuit of a college education (Freeman, 2005).

To truly understand the full range of what is occurring with African American males and their enrollment in higher education, in addition to college eligibility and admissibility, key aspects of their social, political and economic realities, familial influences, university prestige, and affordability must be investigated.

Institutional Theory. Institutional Theory was the second framework I chose, to gain understanding of the connection between politics and higher education institutions, as they related to UC eligibility criteria and admission policies in California. Institutional Theory examines how the creation, diffusion, and addition of these policies affect African American males' access to, and enrollment in, California's public universities, and to what extent they are affected. Three perspectives (i.e., historical, or regulative; sociological, or norms and values; and political, or cultural cognitive) exist within

Institutional Theory

The historical perspective of institutionalism is the central focus of the framework. In historical institutionalism, the focus is on big questions and issues of wide interest, situated within specific places and times (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). Race and politics are on-going issues that affect organizations. Historical institutionalism postulates that institutions were not created for functional reasons (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). Furthermore, they describe institutions as political economies that structure shared behaviors and outcomes (Hall & Taylor, 1996). Research in this area relies mainly on "path dependent" arguments about the ways in which institutions prevent change"

(Amenta & Ramsey, 2010, p. 20). Several theories have developed about why, or how, policies could be locked in (Armenta & Ramsey, 2010) as politicians and the public change their lives around a particular policy. Therefore, historical institutionalist arguments relying on a path of dependent strategies, focus on political processes and outcomes (Armenta & Ramsey, 2010, p. 20). In an attempt to understand the persistence and changes within UC eligibility policies, the historical perspective of Institutional Theory is appropriate and has been applied to my investigation.

The sociological perspective is the view that identifies, analyzes, and understands the creation, diffusion, and practice of UC admission and eligibility policies within the context of a public higher education institution. Sociological institutionalism is a response to views that organizations often neglect cultural structures and processes in explanations of how they operate (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). Sociological institutional descriptions vary in the ways in which they attribute the influences of political stability and organizational structures (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). What is appropriate for an organization, according to Meyer (2000) is highly dependent on a sense of commonality coupled with a recognition of uniqueness and distinctiveness. This viewpoint claims that key stakeholders in the organization are motivated by status concerns. "Seeking legitimacy among their peers, stakeholders adopt and maintain the characteristics of a parent or peers whom they perceive as being more legitimate" (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010, p. 8). Sociological institutionalism focuses on explaining a consistent set of socially appropriate norms, and the processes of policy imitation and diffusion, occurring to either

include or contest these socially appropriate norms (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010; Hall & Taylor, 1996).

Political institutionalism, like the sociological perspective, argues that political systems influence political processes, which are internal and external to institutions of higher education (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). As a very broad view of institutionalism, political institutionalism is an appropriate lens through which to investigate the UC's eligibility and admissions policies. Through a framework of Institutional Theory that includes historical, sociological, and political perspectives, the UC's eligibility and admissions policies, and policy discourse, can be examined to learn the intent and effects of the institution's admission and eligibility policies and practices.

The guiding frameworks of CRT and Institutional Theory provided a lens through which to investigate the intents, effects, and intersection of *Master Plan* and related UC eligibility and admission policy discourse and documents; specifically, they can permit exploration of the effects on African American males in higher education in the UC system.

Significance of Investigation

African American males' low UC eligibility and admission rates, dismal rates of college enrollment, low rates of baccalaureate degree completion, and general educational disengagement and underachievement, are among some of the most pressing and complex issues in higher education. Recognition of the troubled status of African American male students at all levels of education has thus far yielded few solutions (Harper, 2006). Positive educational outcomes for this population have remained

45

stagnant, or worsened, in recent years. This stagnation is attributable, at least in part, to the deficit orientation that is constantly reinforced in media, academic research journals, and educational practice (Harper, 2006). My research revealed several areas that may warrant policy attention, related to higher education access in California, and should appear on the agendas of the UC eligibility and admission policymakers. Increasing access to the public good of higher education in California is beneficial to everyone; public interests converge when more individuals across all racial/ethnic and gender lines can earn college degrees and assume societal roles that enhance global competitiveness, decrease crime and poverty, and help the United States enact its espoused democratic ideals (Harper, 2006; Kezar,et al., 2005; Lewis & Hearn, 2003).

Dissertation Overview

I have organized my dissertation into five chapters. The first chapter is the introduction, that contains the justification and research questions that guided my work. Chapter Two provides an extensive literature review that informs the investigation. I organized Chapter Two into three sections: (a) the issues of access and equity in higher education; (b) the definitions of merit over time; and (c) the role of prestige in higher education's eligibility and admissions policies. I also identify and explain my theoretical frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Institutional Theory, in this chapter. Chapter Three provides a detailed description of the methodology on which the investigation is based, and an account of the procedures used for collecting the data. I engaged in a review of several key documents: *Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California*

Postsecondary Education, UC eligibility documents, and admission policy documents from the 1960s through 2014. Chapter Four provides an analysis of the data, and the seven major themes I identified; merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. Merit consists of the ways in which UC eligibility and admissions has been defined and determined over time. Access refers to the opportunities that high school students in California, regardless of their background, must achieve UC eligibility and admissibility. The term eligibility is a construct developed by the original *Master Plan* policymakers to determine who could and/or should apply to UC, if they want consideration for admissions to a UC campus. Diversity, for the purposes of my investigation, is limited to racial and gender categories of American Indian, African American, Asian, Latino, White and males and females. Race, in the context that I have identified it, is a socially constructed phenomenon that has no basis in biology, and differs from ethnicity. Race, as I identified it, is a federal categorization of individuals for the purposes of census tracking. *Master Plan* provided the purpose or mission for each segment of higher education in California, and it was applied to my investigation in this context. Lastly, I defined prestige as a university's expectation that it would admit and enroll freshmen who fostered the academic indicators that supported high national and international ranking that would garner more external support and fiscal resources. I conclude with Chapter Five, where I present my findings, theoretical implications, reflections, policy implications, and recommendations for the future development of inclusive UC eligibility and admission policies.

Chapter 2

Introduction

Access to higher education has been framed as a right by several scholars

(Brennan & Naidoo, 2008; Bok, 2009; Burke, 2013; Clancy & Goastellec, 2007;

Douglass, 2007; Lynch, 2006; Perna, 2006; Trow, 2007), yet others frame it as a

privilege (Alon, 2009; Astin & Oseguera, 2004; Baum et al., 2013; Carnevale & Strohl,

2013a; Meyer, John, Chankseliani, & Uribe, 2013). Higher education access has also

been described as a K-12 pipeline issue (Chang, Witt-Sandis, & Hakuta, 1999; Contreras,

2005; Jackson & Moore, 2006; Lewis, 2003; Meyer et al., 2013; Teranishi, Allen &

Solórzano, 2004; Reid & Moore, 2008) or, as framed by other researchers (Brennan &

Naidoo, 2008; Kerr, 1978; Lang, 1987a; Liu, 2011; Oakes et al., 2002; Roithmayr, 1997;

Swartz, 2008; Woo, 1997), a challenge based upon a particular definition of merit. In

addition, access has been framed as a stratifying mechanism to facilitate prestige and

elitism among colleges and universities (Carnevale & Strohl, 2010; Hale, 2006; Kuh &

Pascarella, 2004; Lang, 1987a; Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007; O'Meara, 2007;

O'Meara & Meekins, 2012; Volkwein & Sweitzer, 2006; Wegener, 1992). This chapter

reviews and synthesizes the literature on barriers to higher education access. Specifically,

the chapter addresses the purported K-12, racial, ethnic, and economic stratification that

serves as access barriers to higher education (Carnevale & Strohl, 2010). Finally, the

chapter also addresses the ways in which definitions of merit, institutional norms and

values, along with the pursuit of prestige, affect the eligibility and admission criteria of

selective public universities, such as those in the University of California (UC) system.

The chapter's central argument is that the University of California has hindered the eligibility and admission access for African American males more than any other racial/ethnic group, while supporting and promoting enrollment access to other racial/ethnic groups, through its definitions of merit and its pursuit of prestige. Moreover, the UC's definitions of merit and pursuit of prestige, which originated with its charter as a selective institution in the 1868 Organic Act, have resulted in persistent, restricted access for African American males (Douglass, 2007). The definitions of merit and the pursuit of prestige are valued more highly than the promoted "broad and universal access" in the formation of UC eligibility and admissions policies, despite the UC's purported commitment to broad and universal access (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960).

In this chapter, access that includes eligibility and admission criteria is examined within the theoretical frameworks of Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Crenshaw,1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Harper et al., 2009; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Morfin, Perez, Parker, Lynn, & Arrona, 2006) and Institutional Theory (IT) (Meyer, 1988; Scott, 1995; Scott, 2013), which, when combined, address the links between race, definitions of merit, prestige, and institutional values and norms. These frameworks provide a scholarly understanding of the challenges involved with definitions of merit and the pursuit of prestige used by selective public universities. These frameworks inform an examination of the historical and political undercurrents fundamental to admission policy development. Studies on access, and the development of university admissions policies, contextualize definitions of merit, including the social and

political environments in which these definitions are developed (Kilgore, 2009; Meyer et al., 2013; Oakes et al., 2002; Woo, 1997). Few studies examine the interplay between definitions of merit and access, and how they, paired with the pursuit of prestige, affect the development of admissions policies, or the discourses that empower policymakers to construct admissions policies that justify the low eligibility and admission rates of African American males.

The chapter initially details barriers to higher education access, including social, political, and racial challenges, as well as educational opportunities and resources. Next, the chapter examines the negative effects of race and socioeconomic status on African American males' access to higher education. Finally, this chapter provides an analysis of the barriers to UC access, including the role of K-12 systems, race, socio-economic status, and institutional bias in the eligibility and admissions pipeline.

The second section examines the evolving definition of merit, and includes an overview of various definitions of merit that, over time, have supported or stalled African American males' access to higher education in the University of California system. This analysis provides a contextual understanding of how the mission of the university, racism, institutional barriers, norms and values have affected African American males' access to selective institutions of higher education similar to the University of California. The section also includes an examination of the interplay, or intersections, of race, definitions of merit, institutional barriers, and prestige within the context of the UC's eligibility and admission processes, as enacted by policymakers.

The final section of the chapter analyzes access through eligibility and admissions policies in higher education, and the relationship of these policies to the university's pursuit of prestige. African American males' access is limited, not only by definitions of merit, but also, and more crucially, by the university's pursuit of prestige, which equates to exclusivity. The chapter's sections work in concert to explain how access through eligibility and admission policies, as well as the discourses that are responsible for the development of these policies, negatively affect African American males in their pursuit of a college/university education. In addition, these sections provide a conceptual model that examines the circular effect of how access barriers affect definitions of merit, how these definitions affect prestige, and how prestige contributes to access barriers. Moreover, universities' definitions of merit can facilitate or further their pursuit of prestige, limit shape, and constrain access.

Access

Several scholars define college/university access as a students' ability to participate and persist in higher education (Bergin, Cooks, & Bergin, 2007; Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs, & Rhee, 1997; Louie, 2007; Mumper, 2003). In the United States, access to, and enrollment in, higher education has increased in the past fifteen years (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Trow, 2007; Zusman, 2005) due to greater student demand (Barr & Turner, 2013; Baum et al., 2013; Johnson, 2015), economic necessity (Baum & Payea, 2005; Brown, 2015; Nica & Popescu, 2014; Winters, 2014), and expanded educational opportunities (Baker, 2015; Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Karen, 1991; Shavit, 2007) for all Americans. However, this access has been as much about who is excluded, as it is about

who is included, and several scholars have argued it is distributed inequitably based on race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status (Archer, Hutchings, & Ross, 2005; Astin & Oseguera, 2004; Bastedo & Gumport, 2003; Baum et al., 2013; Chang, Witt-Sandis, & Hakuta, 1999; Clancy & Goastellec, 2007; Meyer et al., 2013; Wood & Harper, 2015). Other studies have postulated that college access is affected more by an applicant's high school of attendance, the availability of college counselors, family income, knowledge and familial history of college attendance, rigor of academic preparation, and whether or not the applicant's high school has a college-going culture (Corwin & Tierney, 2007; Liu, 2011; Mehan, 2015; Radcliffe & Bos, 2011). Whereas the latter may be reasonable assertions, college or university access fosters exclusion and preservation of the opportunities that a college/university education may provide for the individual and their community (Baum, Ma, & Payea, 2010; Brand & Xie, 2010; Carnevale, Rose, & Cheah, 2013; Kezar, et al., 2015).

Barriers to Access. Several access barriers to higher education include disadvantaged K-12 school systems and educational opportunities, race, socio-economic status, and institutional racism. These barriers align with historical patterns of racism, despite the popularized view that the United States are inclusive and supportive of all citizens' ability to secure a college education (Alon, 2009; Bowen & Bok, 2016; Kezar et al., 2015; Wood & Harper, 2015). Furthermore, the dominant discourse of higher education access promotes equality of opportunity, and ignores both the interdependency of social, political, racial, and economic conditions of individuals and groups (Bowen & Bok, 2016; Clancy & Goastellec, 2007; Kezar et al., 2015; Marable, 2015), as well as the

52

profound stratification processes within each of those factors (Lamont, Beljean, & Clair, 2014; Massey, 2007; Massey, Rothwell, & Domina, 2009)

K-12 Education. Central to the access discourse, K-12 education is the primary social institution responsible for the development of domestic college eligible students (Gándara, 2001; Hu, 2003). If this educational system does not develop a broadly defined, diverse, and inclusive pool of academically qualified college bound domestic students, then there will be a shortage of domestic enrollment in higher education institutions (Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 2005; Howard, 2008; Hoyle & Kutka, 2008; Teranishi & Briscoe, 2006). Moreover, K-12 education within the United States and California continues to be highly stratified along economic and racial lines, with the well-resourced schools primarily attended by affluent White students, producing the majority of college/university eligible applicants (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Darling-Hammond, 2007; Entwisle et al., 2005; Kozol, 2012; Perna, 2006; Powell, 1996). Meyer et al. (2013) argues that admission to a university education is often affected by institutional priorities, whereas a K-12 education is qualitatively different and based on a student's residence, since district funding is stipulated by local property taxes. Additionally, administrators and teachers in less resourced schools are less prepared and less well-equipped than those in well-resourced schools to prepare students for qualification and enrollment in selective colleges and universities, For example, less resourced schools consistently offer only a limited number of honors and AP courses based on school and district policies, qualified teachers, qualified students, and funding (Contreras, 2005; Solórzano & Ornelas, 2002; Solórzano & Ornelas, 2004). Finally, high school counseling is often tied to

college/university access, with poorly trained, or limited numbers of, college counselors being correlated with low college eligibility rates among students (McDonough, 2005). Poorly resourced schools statistically have lower numbers of counselors (Corwin, Venegas, Oliverez, & Colyar, 2004; McDonough, 2005). Furthermore, African Americans are more dependent than other ethnic/racial groups on their high school counselors for their college plans, yet they are more likely to have inadequate access to qualified high school counselors (Hugo, 2004; McDonough, 2005).

In addition to the fiscal strength of highly resourced school districts and schools, research has demonstrated that K-12's school policies, structural impediments, and negative perceptions of African American males, obstruct this population's academic preparation for college admissions (Bailey, 2003; Davis, 2003; Eston, 2003; Jackson & Moore, 2006; Noguera, 2003). More specifically, data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicated that in 2013, only 9.9 percent of eighth grade African American males in California were at, or above, proficiency levels in reading as compared to 14.7 percent of Latino males and 40.4 percent of White males; 10 percent of African American males were proficient in math compared to 12 percent of Latino males and 48.5 percent of White males (First Look, 2013). For the educational pipeline, NAEP notes that, in California, only 3.67 percent of African American males were enrolled in one Advanced Placement course, as compared to 4.1 percent of Latino males and 7.4 percent of White males (First Look, 2013). Each of the educational milestones, such as reading and math proficiency, if not achieved, negatively affects the African American males' ability to qualify academically for, and gain access to, postsecondary education.

Race and Racism. Race relations in the United States have a long and complex history (Sears, Van Laar, Carrillo, & Kosterman, 1997), and higher education in the United States has continued to be limited by, and immersed in, the social realities of race and racism (Kozol, 1991; Lewis, 2003). Racial and ethnic access barriers to higher education can be categorized as historical (Allport, 1979; Banks, 1995; Kozol, 1991; Lewis, 2003; Yosso, Parker, Solórzano, & Lynn, 2004), societal (Bell, 1992 Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Young, 1992), and institutional (Brown & Davis, 2000; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Delgado 1995; 1996; Duncan, 2002; Ferguson, 2000; Harper, 2012; Noguera, 1995).

From an historical perspective, racial access to higher education has been a road filled with unanticipated turns and twists (Harper et al., 2009; Tate IV, 1997; Thelin & Gasman, 2003; Thelin, 2011). The historical aspects of racial access for African Americans to higher education is built on the premises of exclusion, separate but unequal, selectivity, and access to specific types of postsecondary educational opportunities (Harper et al., 2009; Karabel, 2005; Kidder, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2006). The historical, and continued, heavy dependence on racially-biased SAT and ACT testing (college entrance exams), increased statewide admissions standards, and competition for a selected number of college/university spaces, highly segregated K-12 public schools, poor K-12 funding in neighborhoods with high concentrations of African Americans, and the lower social status granted to African Americans, have supported and facilitated the role race plays in African American males' access to higher education (Bowen & Bok,

55

2016; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Francis & Tannuri-Pianto, 2012; Light & Strayer, 2002; Solórzano & Ornelas, 2004; Yosso et al., 2004).

African American males in United States society have been characterized as "unintelligent, lazy, criminal, drug dealers, unemployed by choice, troublemakers, and individuals to be feared" (Blake & Darling, 1994; Davis, 2003; Marable, 2015; Nasir & Shah, 2011; Zimmerman & Maton, 1992). However, African American males have the highest suspension and expulsion rates in K-12 schools (Howard, 2008; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002; Townsend, 2000), highest dropout/pushout rates from high school (Calabrese & Poe, 1990; Ford & Moore, 2013; Orfield, 2004), lowest college eligibility rates (Johnson, 2016; Valliani, 2015), highest unemployment rates (Howard, 2013b; Marable, 2015), and highest incarceration rates (Kearney, Harris, Jácome, & Parker, 2014; Marable, 2015). These conditions are attributable primarily to racial bias and racism rather than personality or intelligence traits (Ford & Moore, 2013; Howard, 2015). The literature suggests that due to their poor K-12 educational experiences (Allen, 2013; Howard, 2013b; Howard, 2015), all of the aforementioned are inevitable. In addition, the self-fulfilling prophecies of these negative racialized conditions continue to reinforce society's negative and deficit view of African American males (Ford & Moore, 2013; Harper, 2015; Howard, 2013b).

The institutional aspects of racism in higher education within the United States are reflected in disparities in access to, persistence through, and graduation at, every educational level for African American males as compared to White males (Bowen & Bok, 2016; Howard, 2015). Institutional racism is often manifested through

56

microaggressive behavior (Allen; 2010; Kohli & Solórzano, 2012; Pérez Huber &

Cueva 2012; 1995; Perez Huber & Solórzano, 2015):

> Racial microaggressions are a form of systemic, everyday racism used to keep those at the racial margins in their place. They are: (1) verbal and non-verbal assaults directed toward People of Color, often carried out in subtle, automatic or unconscious forms; (2) layered assaults, based on race and its intersections with gender, class, sexuality, language, immigration status, accent or surname; and (3) cumulative assaults that take a psychological, physiological, and academic toll on People of Color. (Perez Huber & Solórzano 2015, p. 6)

Whether implicitly or explicitly expressed, institutional racism occurs when policies are

developed and implemented that systematically disadvantage, marginalize, and exclude a

certain group or groups by negating their lived experiences. These microaggressions are

often unrecognized as such, and they are interpreted instead as the vague daily norms of

an institution's operating practices (Allen, 2010; Perez Huber & Solórzano, 2015).

Institutional racism, as it relates to access in higher education, is manifested by how merit

is defined, according to who is deemed deserving of admittance, and how this definition

supports or reinforces the prestige-seeking agenda of the university (Volkwein &

Sweitzer, 2006; Zerquera, 2014). Moreover, the work of Marable (2003) highlights that,

whereas "the dominant beliefs about racial groups alone cannot produce inequalities, it is

the structural forms of racism that (re)produce the actual social arrangements that

legitimate the inequitable positions of Whites and non-Whites in U.S. society" (p. 28).

The institutional norms and values inadvertently reinforce racism, while the institution

claims to be accessible and inclusive in support of broad and universal access.

Finally, one of the major access barriers that faces higher education in the United

States is economics, including the schools of attendance and the student's socio-

economic status (Berg, 2016; Brown, Wohn, & Ellison, 2016; Hoxby & Turner, 2013; Johnson, 2016). Economic barriers include the underfunding of K-12, the benefits and opportunities provided by access to social capital (Hill, Bregman, & Andrade, 2015), and the ability to finance a post-secondary education (Hotz, Rasmussen, Wiemers, & Koegel, 2016; McLendon, Tandberg, & Hillman, 2014). The underfunding of K-12 schools, in economically poorer school districts, provides less college-ready resources and experiences, therefore making African Americans, and especially African American males, less prepared, because these are the schools that that they disproportionately attend (Howard, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2013). Inadequate academic preparation is one of the primary forces that limit college access and achievement for African American students (Bowen & Bok, 2016; Hines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013; Perna, 2005). The low-level of academic preparation for college, especially among African Americans, is attributable to both the absence of academically rigorous course offerings in their high schools of attendance, and their under-participation in the rigorous courses that are available. Rigorous courses are those that promote readiness for college-level academic demands and expectations (Adelman, 1999; Perna, 2005). In low-resourced schools, the availability of these courses is negatively affected by lack of school funding (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Howard, 2008; Howard, 2015) that stems from local income taxes, and affects the availability of appropriately trained teachers (Berliner, 2013; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Johnson, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu, & Donaldson, 2004; Simon & Johnson, 2015) and students' preparation/eligibility to take the courses (Bryant, 2015; Ford & Moore, 2013; Reid & Moore, 2008; Robinson, 2003). The lack of opportunity

and preparation is based on challenges within the K-12 educational system; it is not a lack of desire or intelligence (Hines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013; Howard, 2013; Stinson, 2013).

Research on college access among African American students indicates that a large number who aspire to pursue a bachelor's degree do not enroll in college or university (Roderick, Coca, & Nagaoka, 2011). These are several explanations for this lack of enrollment, and an important one is students' lack of information, and lack of guidance regarding how to navigate the application and enrollment process in a timely manner (Hill, 2012; Holland, 2011; Holland & Farmer-Hinton, 2009; Noeth & Wimberly, 2002; Perna & Titus, 2005; Plank & Jordan, 2001; Roderick, Nagaoka, Coca, & Moeller, 2008). This racial, and often economic, inequality in college/university access is described by several researchers as lack of "social capital for college" (Corwin et al., 2004; Roderick et al., 2008; Yosso, 2005; Yosso et al., 2004). Social capital is often defined as resources embedded in social networks that are utilized to achieve a goal (Bourdieu, 1986; Lin, 2000; Perna & Titus, 2005; Plank & Jordan, 2001). Here, social capital pertains to access to the resources provided by social networks that provide information related to college planning and college/university choice. African American males have less access than other ethnic groups to these networks. Furthermore, whereas parents are recognized as the most powerful entities in students' social networks, parents of African American males are often poorly positioned to provide them with the social capital necessary to engage in the critical strategies needed to support their eligibility, admission, and enrollment in selective colleges/universities. The network of individuals

available to educated and professional parents enhances their children's postsecondary educational access opportunities and often diminishes the role of race in college/university access (Cross & Lin, 2008; Hines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013; Lin, 2000; Perna & Titus, 2005; Strayhorn, 2010). Social capital focuses on the information and resources needed by students as outlined in a study by Kim and Schneider (2005), wherein their research demonstrated that the positive effects of parents' participation in school guidance programs included the provision of information about the college planning and application process to their children. Limited access to social capital by African American students serves as a significant barrier to college/university access (Hines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013).

Merit

The underlying principles of merit related to college admissions include the need for perceived fairness by the public coupled with public accountability and transparency, as well as student achievement as defined by high college graduation rates, and graduate and professional school enrollment. Merit definitions help universities determine which applicants will gain admission to a college or university, and their definition is based upon the probability of obtaining students who will persist, graduate, pursue a graduate or professional school education, and become notable alumnus from a particular college/university campus. Merit is a socially constructed concept (Meyer et al., 2013; Roithmayr, 1997). The work of Oakes et al. (2002) contends that the social interpretation of merit is more about shared beliefs, than it is related to actual work ethic or ability. They further state that hard work combined with privilege will usually override hard

work alone in a student's attainment of merit as required by college admissions offices (Oakes et al., 2002). In other words, those who deserve admission to a selective college or university are the K-12 students who perform academically at the top of their class or school, score highly on standardized tests, and have the highest probability of graduating.

Admission to a selective university, such as the University of California, is often framed within the definitions of merit, including the social, political, and economic context of the time when the definitions are constructed (Alon & Tienda, 2007; Banks, 2001; Kilgore, 2009; Oakes, Wells, & Jones, 1997). These definitions of merit are often revised based on institutional needs and priorities. Definitions of merit within the context of eligibility criteria and admissions policies are critical, in both the access discourse and research, because these definitions impede African American males' admission to, and enrollment in, higher education, which includes the social, economic, cultural, and political benefits of a university education. The research studies of Meyer et al. (2013), Swartz (2008), and Woo (1997) support the definition of merit in college admissions as more of a gatekeeping tool, and a reflection of the cultural ideas held by an elite group of individuals who possess the power to determine who gains acceptance and who does not. More often than not, the definitions of merit support the status quo; they are based upon a dependence on the traditional measures of high school GPA, course enrollment, and standardized test scores. Their research also acknowledges and supports the view that no definition of merit is neutral. Moreover, according to their research, all definitions of merit advantage one group while disadvantaging another (Meyer et al., 2013; Swartz; 2008; Woo, 1997).

The United States considers itself a meritorious society. Universities'

definitions of merit, which determine who gains admissions to selective

colleges/universities, and must be perceived as fair and transparent, may account for why

merit has often been defined in quantitative terms (Bowen & Bok, 2016; Mijs, 2016;

Wechsler, 2014; Woo, 1997). Furthermore, the research by Woo (1997) explains merit as

the "functional capacity to perform" (p. 517), and defines merit as a way to distribute

opportunity and access to the good of higher education. He asserts that merit has been

defined and redefined using "predictors" of academic success that have been traditional

(e.g., high school GPA and SAT scores), and therefore disadvantage African American

males and other people of color (Alon & Tienda, 2007; Roithmayr, 1997; Swartz, 2008;

Woo, 1997). Definitions of merit, according to Liu (2011), Meyer et al. (2013),

Roithmayr (1997), Swartz (2008), and Woo (1997), are constructed to exclude African

American males by prioritizing criteria in which African American males perform at the

lowest level of all ethnic groups within all categories. Specifically, the high reliance on

standardized test scores, high school GPA, and course enrollment affects African

American males negatively. This research is further supported by the low mean SAT

score of African American males, which was 1,271 as compared to 1,357 for Latinos,

1,660 for Asians and 1,589 for Whites in 2015 (College Board, 2015). This leads to the

low UC eligibility rates of African American males. In addition, according to Bowen and

Bok (2016), since the definition of merit is based solely on restrictive quantitative

academic criteria, the expansion of the definition for use in college admissions is more

complex and challenging to the policymakers, because it may yield unintended outcomes,

including low numbers of African American males eligible for admission, and ultimately affect attendance at selective universities. Definitions of merit based on traditional academic measures, such as high school GPA, course enrollment, and standardized test scores, deflect attention from issues of race, socio-economic status, school resources, and inequality of opportunity and access to higher education.

Finally, academic definitions of merit based on quantitative indicators such as high school GPA, course enrollment, in terms of the quality of the courses and the number of honors and AP courses, and SAT scores which is used by most selective universities, limits the applicant pool and affects student's decisions to apply (Au 2010; Freeman 2005; Harper et al., 2009; Swartz 2008). African American male students often will not apply to colleges/universities where they do not meet the academic criteria to gain admission, regardless of how the institution defines merit (Freeman, 2005; Muhammad, 2008; Uwah, McMahon, & Furlow, 2008).

The fairness, public accountability, and transparency of the definitions of merit produce an "institutional construct that cannot exist outside of the institution it serves as it reflects the 'watermark' of distributed power in society" (Liu, 2011, p. 386). A distributive justice model of merit concedes that the target quantity and type of reward should go to the individuals with the largest corresponding quantity of talent and/or ability. Merit, as a structure of distribution, fosters a sense of entitlement for those who assume they have earned whatever rewards they have gained (e.g., admission to the university of their choice) (Liu, 2011). This is manifest in the traditional ways that the University of California has defined merit (i.e., high school GPA, course enrollment, and

qualifying standardized test score) for highly sought admissions spots. While the UC

system purports equal opportunity for each admissions slot, its policymakers do not

consider the inequitable K-12 educational opportunities provided to its applicants. The

UC's admissions policies, similar to other selective colleges and universities, seek to

differentiate between what one deserves, and to what one is entitled (Liu, 2011).

In contrast, the definition of merit, both holistically and contextually, is key to the access

discourse and offers an alternate view. A contextual definition of merit takes into

account the additional hurdles that affect the experiences of African American males, and

it provides information on social, political, economic, and educational obstacles such as

racial and gendered discrimination and racism (Allen, 2013; Woo, 1997). Woo (1997),

Bial and Rodriguez (2007), Hurtado (2005), and Swartz's (2008) research asserts that

overcoming racism and discrimination can be deemed individual merit, as these actions

demonstrate "perseverance and the navigation" of various life challenges. This position

considers the complexity of a person, and it is mindful that all of an individual's traits

(i.e., gender, race, socioeconomic status) are a part of a person's viewpoint and interests.

This perspective is particularly noticeable in a university's consideration of the academic

achievements and K-12 experiences of African American males in their quest to achieve

eligibility and admissibility. Roithmayr's (1997) argument is these non-contextualized

meanings in college admissions reflect race-conscious social preferences that exist at the

time of admissions policy creation. These preferences purport to measure an applicant's

capacity to complete college level work by skills and academic abilities that speak to the

capacity to graduate from college. In other words, UC's eligibility and admissions

policies have marginalized and "othered" some students, such as African American males, and embraced the cultural, social, and educational values of elite White males, the standard by which it is argued all should be judged (Dancy, & Brown, 2012; Brown, Dancy, & Davis, 2013; Ferguson, 2000; Howard, 2013; Polite & Davis, 1999).

The definitions of merit are subjective (Liu, 2011; Roithmayr, 1997). Roithmayr (1997) contends in her radical constructivist theory that, "definitions of merit are socially constructed in ways that subjectively favor the abilities, and maintain the power, of wealthy White males, and supports the scholarship that views merit as not only subjective and socially constructed, but also inherently biased" (p. 383). Additionally, she concludes that definitions of merit "defer to and depend on the concepts that define social bias-concepts constructed to exclude people of color - based on their quantitative measures; and these can be traced to a history of discrimination and marginalization" (Roithmayr, 1997, p. 387). Furthermore, since the definitions of merit are cultural and ideological constructs that depend on a particular ideological discourse, they often defer to the social bias they seek to exclude (Roithmayr, 1997). Contreras's (2005) and Hurtado's (2005) research, similar to Kilgore's (2009), reflected the direction of UC's eligibility and admissions policies in the university's attempts to provide contextual information related to the student's environment and their K-12 educational experiences. Yet, acknowledgement of the African American males' social and political place was ignored. Contreras (2005), however, did suggest that equity in admission should be considered in the context of a recognition of the educational and fiscal resources that students have in their high school and communities. Nonetheless, the negative stereotypes of African

American males are not contextualized or recognized. Hurtado (2005) argues that the definitions of access should include access as a benefit for all, not just for those excluded from higher education. A post-secondary education within an inclusive and diverse environment provides social, political, and educational learning beyond the textbook. For Hurtado (2005), the definition of merit should include contextual information often ignored by traditional measures of merit (e.g., grades, and test scores), and measure individual accomplishments as well as group values, cultures, and languages. While high school grades measure student achievement and cognitive ability, and can capture important behavioral indicators of academic performance and class rank, they do not include other factors, such as race, social economic status, and K-12 educational opportunities (Alon & Tienda, 2007). There may be a benefit to balancing the weight given to grades, course enrollment, consideration of culture, and other K-12 educational experiences (Alon & Tienda, 2007).

Definitions of merit are purported to facilitate high college graduation rates and preparation for graduate and professional schools. In other words, definitions of merit are institutionally bound and self-serving. A university will maintain its definition of merit as long as it meets the needs, and serves the interests, of the institution, because access is often defined as enhancing the institution's status and organizational self-interest (Karabel, 2005; Kilgore, 2009; Swartz, 2008). The organizational self-interest is apparent in the eligibility and admission criteria of the University of California, as merit in admissions policies bears the ideals and interests of the university to remain a prestigious university that not all students could, or should, attend (Carnevale & Rose, 2003;

Contreras, 2005). The eligibility and admission criteria of the University of California's policymakers reflect the values, and the definition of who merits a place in the class of one of the most selective universities in the country, as mandated in the *California Master Plan for Higher Education*.

Study findings by Kilgore (2009), Liu (2011), and Roithmayr (1997) indicate that definitions of merit in selective college admissions serve the interests of exclusionary institutions and support the goal of prestige. The dependency on quantitative measures in defining merit for admissions purposes places African American males at a structural and systemic disadvantage (Caton, 2012; Harper et al., 2009). According to Kilgore (2009), the definition of merit includes organizational needs including student characteristics which assist universities increase their prestige and secure the best faculty, students, research dollars, and endowments. These help universities to improve their national and international rankings (Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007). Merit is not the only criterion that structures admission to a selective university: universities also seek to shape an entering class to reflect its mission, goals, and values, according to its admissions policies (Kilgore, 2009).

The University of California's definitions of merit are distinguished by the University's selective nature, because admission to the University is constrained by state policy to admit the top one-eighth of the state's graduating seniors per the *Master Plan* and must include its land-grant status whose mission is to provide access to all Californians (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). These requirements complicate admission policies, as the UC's definitions of merit include eligibility requirements that

set a floor for the preparation needed to pursue study at a UC campus, and these standards function as an entitlement: anyone who meets these requirements is guaranteed a place at the University of California (UCOP University of California Office of the President, 2003). In addition to the eligibility requirements, the UC campuses employ additional selection criteria to choose and admit students, singled out from the large number of UC eligible applicants, who are competitive academically and in demand for entrance.

The differential mission statements, admissions, and eligibility requirements within California's higher educational system produce an admittance system that is highly stratified and hierarchical in nature, with the University of California at the top of the public higher education pyramid. *Master Plan* upholds this stratification with its differential of mission between California Community Colleges, the California State University system, and the University of California system, and their definition of merit coupled with a high level of admissions selectivity among the campuses. Institutional definitions of merit are highly dependent on institutional priorities (Liu, 2011), and in the case of the University of California, these include high enrollment proportions of academically qualified students, high graduation rates, and large numbers of students who attend graduate and professional schools, all of which are markers of prestige (Bastedo & Bowman, 2009; Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007; Volkwein & Sweitzer, 2006.). The definitions of merit stem from an intangible and highly subjective definition of quality, and the articulation of these definitions serves to create and legitimize the differences of definitions of merit among California's

postsecondary education institutions (Liu, 2011; Meyer et al., 2013; Roithmayr, 1997). The definitions of merit utilized within the UC system's admissions have been used as justification for inequality of opportunity for its applicants (Meyer et al., 2013; Swartz, 2008; Woo, 1997). Similarly, the UC's definitions of merit, which are manifested through its eligibility and admissions policies, have marginalized some students, most persistently African American males, while supporting and advancing the acceptable institutional and cultural norms of a race-based society (Kilgore, 2009; Liu, 2011; Swartz 2008). The Fall 2015 admissions and enrollment numbers of African American males demonstrate the differential effect UC's definition of merit has on African American males. Specifically, in Fall of 2015, the total number of newly enrolled males at the UC was 14,345, yet only 463 (3 percent) were African American as compared to 6,046 Asian (42 percent), 3689 (26 percent) Latino and 3,399 (24 percent) White (UCOP University of California Office of the President, 2003).

The subjective nature of merit definitions, based on institutional priorities, allow non-contextualized meanings of student experiences in college admissions to reflect race-conscious social preferences existing at the time of policy creation (Roithmayr, 1997). However, they are not actually merit based, but rather privilege-based. In other words, the UC's eligibility and admissions policies have marginalized and "othered" some students, particularly African American males, even though they have embraced the cultural, social, and educational values of elite White males, the standard by which it is argued all should be judged (Dancy, & Brown, 2012; Brown, Dancy, & Davis, 2013; Ferguson, 2000; Howard, 2013; Polite & Davis, 1999).

A concept of deconstructive redescription (Roithmayr, 1997), is where merit which is created in the context of social institutions is not grounded in scholarly accounts of how institutions operate. University policymakers do have definitions of merit that include consideration of race, ethnicity, family background, and social economic status (Roithmayr, 1997), yet these are not held in high regard because some members of the university and policy community do not see that these correlate to the abilities needed for success at the university. Policymakers are comfortable with presuming that the standards are race neutral, and they seek to eliminate racism by removing bias and guaranteeing that opportunities are distributed on the race-neutral basis of merit (Roithmayr, 1997).

Finally, although *Master Plan's* vision, and its subsequent revisions, purport inclusion of all students, the standards that allow for assessment and definitions of merit, such as high school GPA, course enrollment, and SAT scores, constrain the potential for a representative group of African American males to meet the goals outlined in *Master Plan* for the University of California (Contreras, 2005). Woo's (1997) recognition of merit moves beyond the traditional measures of grades and standardized test scores and includes overcoming obstacles related to a host of factors including race, gender, and economic status. These characteristics serve as a part of a person's social and cultural history; they serve as a starting point for the consideration of just definitions of merit (Woo, 1997). The definitions of merit that possess an over-reliance on racially biased standardized college entrance exams (SAT/ACT) have an inherently discriminatory effect on African American males. In this view, scholars argue that these definitions be reconsidered to encompass a more inclusive definition (Woo, 1997).

Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Crenshaw, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Harper et al., 2009; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Morfin et al., 2006) views most definitions of merit as excluding people of color, because wealthy, educated White males define merit in ways that favor them and the individuals who reflect them in terms of racial, ethnic, social, and economic characteristics (Roithmayr, 1997). In addition, these definitions have reinforced and guided society's view and expectations of what admission to a selective university should require. CRT claims that traditional definitions of merit are invalid, due to bias: African American males are incorrectly assessed and, therefore, disenfranchised, from an institution that claims its mission is inclusion. Societal and institutional norms support the notion that universities must quantify merit by the standards developed by middle and upper class educated White males, to ensure that the definition is fair. However, two defining features of the merit definition are competition and equality of opportunity, yet the definition of merit based upon normative White males is a covert vehicle for White male opportunity masked as an ambiguous definition of merit. Equality of opportunity is arguably unattainable in a highly stratified society.

Prestige

For colleges and universities, prestige generally means having the "best," or optimal, students, faculty, and resources, including large endowments (Kilgore, 2009). The pursuit of prestige by colleges and universities is often deemed the antithesis to broad and universal access. This pursuit has a strange, and often difficult, relationship with merit definitions. Prestigious universities attain their stature based upon the quality

71

of students they keep out, more so than upon who they accept (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013).

A university's prestige is determined by national rankings (Baker & Brown, 2007; O'Meara, 2007; Volkwein & Sweitzer, 2006), fiscal and human resources garnered (Iglesias, 2014; Lang, 1987b; Volkwein & Sweitzer, 2006and student characteristics, and include both academic and non-academic criteria (Baker & Brown, 2007). Universities are considered as prestigious, prestige seeking, and reputation building, with prestigious universities positioned atop the academic hierarchy (Brewer, Gates, & Goldman, 2002). Prestige has been described as an 'elusive concept' in the context of higher education (Gardner, 2010); however, universities are often measured by their rankings in *U.S. News & World Report*, *Money*, and *Business Week* and their Carnegie classification (O'Meara, 2007). The ranking of universities is a relatively new concept, which began in 1970 with the Carnegie classification, and was furthered in 1983 in a reputational survey of university presidents (Meredith, 2004). The Carnegie classification system uses six variables, most of which could be associated with prestige, based on the academic qualifications of a university's entering students.

The disproportionate and negative effects of university prestige on African American males stems from the ranking classification variable of enrollment profile, that which deals with the standard criteria utilized to admit students to selective universities. The first classifying variable is the basic classification of a higher education institution as a doctoral, master's, baccalaureate, baccalaureate/associate's, associate's, special focus entity, or tribal college. The second variable of consideration includes programs, profiles,

size, and setting. Undergraduate Instructional Program focuses on the institution's undergraduate education. Graduate Instructional Program focuses on the nature of the graduate education, including the offered variety of degrees across disciplines. Enrollment Profile reflects the student population. Undergraduate Profile concerns three areas: the proportion of undergraduate students who are part-time or full-time, first-year academic achievement, and proportion of entering students who transfer from another institution; Size and Setting pertains to the university's size and number of students who live on campus (UCOP University of California, Office of the President, 2016a). It is primarily the criterion of enrollment profile wherein African American males are at a disadvantage.

Rankings of universities are used by students to facilitate their college search and by institutions to compare themselves to other institutions. A prominent measure of prestige includes rankings in *U.S. News & World Report* (USNWR), which utilizes seven variables to define college quality, all of which could be associated with prestige. As articulated by Kuh and Pascarella (2004, p. 53), the public believes that "the best colleges are the most selective." O'Meara (2007) argues that prestige translated as high rankings in USNWR is equated with quality, high graduation rates, and future earnings. While the rankings of USNWR are based on seven factors, the most weight is given to the academic credentials of the incoming students with a heavy reliance on SAT/ACT scores (O'Meara, 2007), of which African Americans score the lowest of all ethnic/racial groups (College Board, 2015). The SAT/ACT scores of incoming students have the most

influence on a university's ranking in USNWR (Kuh & Pascarella, 2004; O'Meara, 2007).

Higher educational institutions gain prestige when their academic indicators and admission selectivity increase (O'Meara, 2007). The role of student selectivity in influencing a university's prestige is considerable. Universities seek students with notable academic characteristics, primarily high SAT scores and GPAs, which often equate to higher family incomes and social capital, and meet the traditional definitions of merit. Under current evaluation criteria, institutions that enroll a high percentage of low-income and underrepresented students, even if the students have equal levels of academic achievement with their high-income White and overrepresented counterparts, are penalized by lower rankings (Chang & Osborn, 2005).

An institution's emphasis upon on rankings, equating to prestige, asserted O'Meara and Meekings (2012), has a negative effect on access by limiting the types of universities available to graduates of K-12 schools. An institution's focus on prestige narrows the definitions of merit and reinforce a model of universities as institutions designed for students with high academic qualifications, such as GPA, standardized test scores, and class rankings, which advantage the already privileged White males.

Universities with large student enrollments, high standardized test scores, high expenditure ratios per student, and high graduation rates climb the prestige scale (Ehrenberg, 2003; Volkwein & Sweitzer, 2006). There is a clear, causal link between rankings and admission factors (Bowman & Bastedo, 2009). Yet, other scholars (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Strauss & Volkwein, 2004) argue that what happens to

students while they are on university campuses is more important in facilitating an institution's prestige factor. A different view of prestige, postulated by Wegener (1992) is one where it is socially constructed as consensus, and defined by those who are viewed as already in possession of prestige, which excludes African American males, since they are not well represented among the tenured tracked faculty at universities who develop the eligibility and admission policies. Prestige promotes stratification: the "pursuit of prestige and the stratification it brings is like a race with no end in sight" (Carnevale & Strohl, 2010, p. 121).

Critical Race Theory and African American Male Access to Higher Education

Critical Race Theory (CRT) highlights the connection between external values and meanings, norms and belief systems, and their effect on African American males' access to the University of California, as articulated by its definitions of merit and the pursuit of prestige. A Critical Race framework identifies the role that race and racism, as tied to power, plays in framing meanings and assumptions about race's, and racism's, shared and independent roles in the quest for access to higher education (Solorzano et al., 2000). This framework highlights the interconnected relationship of race, racism, and power. CRT notes that, in the United States, race continues to be a critical characteristic in the determination of inequity (Hacker, 2010). The main tenets and themes of CRT, as outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001) support the notion that racial inequity affects and hinders African American males' higher education access in general, and the University of California specifically. The first tenet states that racism is pervasive and a permanent element of United States society; it is ordinary, not aberrational "normal

science" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 7). The employment and reliance on racism is the normative way that society conducts business (Ladson-Billings, 2013). This tenet suggests that the UC's definitions of merit, that lead with academic qualifications to include course enrollment, quality of high school curriculum, number of honors and AP scores taken, and standardized test scores is an example of such normative racism. Moreover, the ways in which K-12 students are selected for college preparatory, honors, and AP courses guarantees that African American males will have limited access to this curriculum (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). In addition, *Master Plan's* differentiation of mission in California's higher education institutions, and the placement of the UC schools at the top of the educational rankings' pyramid, with the mandate to select students from the top 12.5% of high school graduates, demands exclusion rather than promoting broad and universal access as postulated by this policy document. "The hierarchical structure of higher education in California allocates the 'privileging' of Whites and the 'othering' of people of color" (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27). CRT views merit as excluding people of color, because the definitions of merit utilize criteria that favor middle and upper income White males, positioning the K-12 experiences of affluent White males as the "norm" by which all other groups should be measured, even though the definitions have historically been biased against African American males (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT is a useful framework for the examination of admissions policies and definitions of merit, because racism is a factor in the disparities and opportunity gaps related to higher education access (Roithmayr, 1997).

The second tenet of CRT is interest convergence, or the "white self-interest principle" (Yosso et al., 2004, p. 7). This tenet implies that Whites will tolerate or encourage racial advances for African Americans only when such advances also promote White self-interest (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT challenges the dominant discourse of objectivity, neutrality, and colorblindness in access, definitions of merit, and UC eligibility and admissions policies. Moreover, CRT is key to this discussion since this interest convergence speaks to the notion that progress is slow, and Whites will support changes in definitions of merit and, consequently, admissions policies only on their timelines, and only when they continue to be the main beneficiaries (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013). This is demonstrated in the incremental changes that the UC policymakers apply to the university's admissions policies. One example is the expansion of Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC), where students are ranked academically within the context of their high school, from four percent to nine percent. The decision was made to heighten its importance in the admissions selection process by considering ELC status as core to the holistic review of an applicant. While the number of African American males who achieve the designation of ELC may be low, due to their numbers in high schools and college preparatory course enrollment, this policy shift does provide another avenue for their admission, and reviews the applicant contextually.

If the UC eligibility and admission policymakers included the K-12 educational experiences of African American males in their decision-making, they could design policies that are inclusive of students' uniqueness as applicants and facilitate their access, instead of hindering it (Harper et al., 2009). These policymakers could demonstrate the

value they place upon having African American male representation in their academic community, and such assertions could serve to dispel persistent myths and stereotypes that marginalize and disenfranchise these students in their quest to obtain access to a UC undergraduate education (Harper, 2015; Howard, 2008; Howard, 2015). A critical mass of African American males' presence on the UC campuses could foster racial understanding and change the discourse and comfort level of all students, supporting African American males' academic aspirations, achievements, and capabilities (Astin, 1993; Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002).

Finally, CRT is concerned with differential racialization: the ways that the dominant society racializes various minority groups at different times in response to shifting political and social needs (Zamudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011) Critical Race Theory also acknowledges the importance of the voices and experiences of people of color and their insights into the manifestations of racism that yield understanding of the lived consequences of the racially marginalized (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2009).

Institutional Theory and African American Male Access to Higher Education

Institutional Theory can explain how the creation, diffusion, and addition of eligibility and admissions policies affect access to, and enrollment in, California's public universities. Institutional Theory embraces three perspectives: historical, or regulative; sociological, or norms and values; and political, or cultural-cognitive (Scott, 2014). Each perspective speaks to the historical, social, and political nature of access. More specifically, the historical perspective of institutionalism, as it relates to access, definitions of merit, and the pursuit of prestige, is the central focus of the framework for

this investigation. In historical institutionalism, the focus is on the broad questions and issues of wide interest, situated within specific places and times. Additionally, race and politics are ongoing issues that affect higher educational institutions.

Institutional theory's sociological perspective can identify and explain the creation, diffusion, and practice of UC admission and eligibility policies within the context of a public higher education institution. Political institutionalism can challenge prestige and the selectivity of the UC, since both of these entities are highly politically charged (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). From a broad view, political institutionalism can be a useful lens through which to investigate UC's eligibility and admissions policies. Through a framework of Institutional Theory, that includes historical, sociological and political perspectives; UC's eligibility and admissions policies and policy discourses can be examined to explain the intent and effects of the institution's admission and eligibility policies and practices.

Conclusion

While access to participation in higher education and the potential for social mobility have been deemed as important (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Haveman & Smeeding, 2006; Hout, 2012; Palmer, Davis, Moore, & Hilton, 2010), universities' quest for prestige and definitions of merit, based on inequitable or discriminatory markers of achievement, hinder access, eligibility, admissibility, and enrollment for African American males in higher education. African American males are marginalized academically, economically, and socially, resulting in low high school graduation rates, low preparation in the areas of English and Math, and enrollment in few AP courses

79

resulting in the lowest UC eligibility and lowest admission rates of any major ethnic group (Valliani, 2015). Therefore, reliance on these measures has a distinct and deleterious effect on this population as applicants, students, graduates, and alumni. However, national and international rankings continue to rely heavily on the SAT scores of admitted students as concrete indicators of the applicants' academic quality, in spite of evidence that these scores are unreliable predictors of college achievement or college readiness. These tests have become, and remain, a way to identify vertical, hierarchal prestige. The college entrance exams, and other academic criteria used to determine eligibility and admittance, continue to be successful as limitations to access: they define merit as a way to facilitate prestige and they support the notion that African American males are not academically inclined (Harper et al., 2009). Therefore, these approaches hinder access to higher education in general, and the University of California in particular, for African American males.

The low UC admission rate among African American males is a social phenomenon rooted in politics, norms, and practices (Oakes et al., 2002). Race in the United States is an important marker of opportunity (Chang et al., 1999), and developing a 'colorblind' approach to definitions of merit and access is a goal that has yet to be realized. Universities are gatekeepers of class position and perpetuate society's stratification (Liu, 2011). The systemic exclusion of African American males is grounded in unfounded assumptions, based upon the African American males' social position, and upon deficit societal perspectives of African American male intelligence and capability that are ingrained in the United States educational system (Harper et al., 2009).

Chapter 3

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the methods and theoretical frameworks I employed to examine my central research question: What understanding of the university's mission and role within *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* (*Master Plan*) has been used in the development of the UC's eligibility and admission policies? This question addresses the policymakers' philosophical understanding of the intersection of *Master Plan* and the desire for university prestige in California's eligibility and admission policies. I approach this question through three subordinate questions. First, what roles do the definitions of merit and access play in the development of the UC eligibility and admission policies? This question addresses how these two terms have been defined over time in the university's effort to ensure that the broad and universal access tenets of *Master Plan* are being followed. Second, what are the articulated goals for the University of California's eligibility and admission policies? What dominant and

alternate discourses produce these policy stances? Third, what access positions do these

discourses make possible, or promote, through eligibility and admission policies?

In this chapter, I also outline the research design's scope, discuss the methodological fit

of policy discourse analysis and document analysis, and connect these methods with

interviews. I explain the sampling, data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods

used, and describe the limitations of my research.

Research Scope

My investigation identified the definition of merit and the role of prestige in the

UC eligibility and admission policy discourse and policies, and I examined the effects of

these policies on African American males' access to the UC. My investigation also

identified the goals of the policy discourse and policies and the priorities they advanced.

The resulting list of priorities served as an important inventory of the policies expressed

intent, as well as a basis for analyzing how those intentions reflected UC's commitment

to *Master Plan's* key tenets of broad and universal access. This cataloging also permitted

an analysis of how eligibility and admission policies at the UC may have been

constructed to facilitate, or deny, access to all Californians. An inventory of priorities,

along with the ways they were framed by the language of the policy documents, served as

the basis for developing an understanding of the discourse embedded in, and advanced

by, the UC's eligibility and admission policies. The analysis explored the discursive

implications of broad and universal access statements for African American males,

showing consideration for any implications of the discourse, and intended or unintended

consequences. Additionally, it sought to explain the policies' inferences for African

American males' access to, and enrollment in, the UC system. Therefore, I wanted to determine the extent to which the eligibility and admission policies of the UC were aligned with the principles of *Master Plan*, understand what factors facilitated that alignment, and examine the ways in which it took place. This investigation was, therefore, designed to examine the values implicit in key discursive expressions in the documents. Identifying these values, in turn, informed my understanding of the UC policymakers' assumptions, biases, and/or priorities in setting the UC eligibility and admission standards.

The analysis explored ways in which policy discourse construction, and the policies that result from it, affect prospective students, specifically African American males. I examined the investigation documents to identify discursive assumptions, and therefore to reveal frameworks through which the definitions of merit and access were constrained or advanced. The interpretation of such constructs had the potential to reveal pre-existing assumptions within the university community. The methodological tool used to identify these constructs was document analysis. I briefly discuss the history of document analysis, the rationale for applying it, and the opportunities and challenges it presented. First, I review Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Institutional Theory (IT), examining how they relate to document analysis (Bowen, 2009; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Merriam, 1998

Critical Race Theory. What role does race and racism play in determining higher education public policy design, implementation, and outcomes? CRT seeks to show how race and racism operate in law, and in society, and can be used as a tool through which to

define, expose, and address educational policy development (Parker & Lynn, 2002CRT emerged out of "a need to view education as one of the many institutions that both historically and contemporarily serve to reproduce unequal power relations and academic outcomes" (Zumudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011, p. 4). Devised during the mid-1970s, in response to the failure of Critical Legal Studies to address the effects of race and racism in United States (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004CRT focuses on the effects of race and racism while addressing the system of White supremacy, as reflected in "meritocratic" policies and rhetoric (Crenshaw, 1995; Matsuda, 1987; Zumudio, et al., 2011). CRT is grounded in a social reality, defined by the historical experiences of African Americans (Valdes, McCristal Culp, & Harris, 2002, p. 23).

CRT calls attention to the racism embedded in social contexts and structures (Parker, 2015Racism is viewed by CRT scholars as a normal part of our society that can simply be eliminated (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998) CRT provides a way to consider race in education. The CRT umbrella embraces scholars in various disciplines, and therefore serves as a broad forum for discussion of policies, and their effects on African American males.

CRT also engages in an "undressing" of the objective nature of policy documents (Parker & Lynn, 2002). Concepts such as color-blind interpretations of meritocracy are "unmasked" by critical race theorists to serve as control mechanisms (Parker & Lynn, 2002, p. 9). CRT reflects a social reality defined by the historical racialized and experiences of African Americans (Valdes et al., 2002; Zamudio, et al, 2011).

84

CRT discloses the "historical, ideological, psychological, and social contexts in which racism has been declared nearly eradicated, while racially subordinated peoples have been admonished for relying too much on race" to explain inequality of opportunities (Parker & Lynn, 2002, p. 10). Critical race theorists break the discourses of traditional definitions of merit that are deeply entrenched, and unquestioningly accepted, by society through the "legitimating of legal narratives of racial discrimination and the use of the power of the law against people of color" (Parker & Lynn, 2002, p.12). Therefore, CRT has important implications for the possibility of uncovering deep patterns of racial exclusion in the UC eligibility and admission policies.

The policy process in public higher education is developed and shaped by key individuals, including state boards, politicians, and administrators, and is influenced by their constituencies (Parker, 2015). However, several scholars have argued that public policy in higher education is racialized (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995;Delgado, 1996). Their central argument is that the law exerts a form of hegemonic control over people of color and ignores the role of race in United States law, policy development, and society (Gotanda, 1991Furthermore, it follows from this argument that public policy and public policymakers cannot deny the actual presence and effects of past racial exclusion, and discrimination over educational policy decisions.

A CRT framework provided a useful lens through which to view educational policy in my qualitative investigation. Many scholars (Bell, 1992; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995assert that, because CRT situates race at the center of policy analysis, it is a key tool in the

analysis of public universities' practices, the cultural and political environment, and the position of which are steeped in public policy. Given that CRT views racism as a central component of how society is organized and governed, it helps explain and illustrate how and why racism is accepted and taken for granted by society and higher educational communities.

CRT is connected to qualitative research as a framework for identifying and analyzing several aspects of policy development that maintain the subordination of African Americans (Parker & Lynn, 2002). Some scholars have even argued that CRT and policy analysis seek to change racial justice in higher educational policies (Solórzano, 1995; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). My investigation discussed the connection, intersection, and interplay among document analysis, UC eligibility and admission policy discourse and policies, and CRT.

My investigation strove to challenge the conventional paradigms under which the understanding of how race operates (e.g., the presumed academic inferiority of people of color), racial ideologies that minimize the existence and effects of racism, and race-neutral ideologies that rely solely on merit without accounting for societal racism and its effects. CRT was particularly useful in the document analysis, and the discourse about policies that affect African American males' access to higher education, as Harper (2012a) argues that racial subordination is among the critical factors responsible for racialized disparities related to access, equity, and higher educational opportunities. Furthermore, CRT scholars note that racism naturally extends to all societal systems, including higher education (Solórzano, 2013; Harper, 2012a; Hiraldo, 2010). In addition,

three important tenets of CRT were utilized in the analysis of the data: the permanence of racism, interest convergence, and the critique of liberalism.

The permanence of racism suggests that it is a powerful factor in the political, social, and economic realities of United States society (Hiraldo, 2010). In CRT, racism is an integral part of United States society that privileges Whites over people of color in most areas of life, including higher education (Hiraldo, 2010). In higher education, a structural impact lens can be used to analyze racism. Because institutions of higher education, and the public policies relevant to them, do not recognize the existence of systemic racism, diversity initiatives are ineffective, argues Hiraldo (2010). It is, therefore, important to consider how institutional policies and procedures promote racism when individuals are working toward improving an institution's plans for access and inclusion (Hiraldo, 2010).

The interest convergence tenet of CRT recognizes White individuals as the chief beneficiaries of civil rights legislation (Hiraldo, 2010). For example, whereas the premise of affirmative action was the need to address past injustices, and it was portrayed as a benefit to people of color, research shows that the greatest beneficiaries have been White women (Hiraldo, 2010). CRT's critique of liberalism focuses on the ideas of color-blindness, the neutrality of the law, and equal opportunity (Hiraldo, 2010). "Colorblindness is a mechanism that allows people to ignore racist policies that perpetuate social inequity" (Hiraldo, 2010, p. 56). Consequently, institutions of higher education were encouraged to recognize, and work toward, dismantling colorblind policies. The notion that the UC's eligibility and admission policies should be rooted in

neutrality, colorblindness, narrowly defined meritocracy, and objectivity runs counter to the ideal of equality of opportunity in higher education, given the deficiencies of K-12 education in California (discussed in Chapter 2), and rests on the questionable assumption that all students have a fair chance to attend college if they simply work hard.

Institutional Theory. Institutional Theory connects to qualitative research as a framework for identifying, analyzing, and understanding the creation, diffusion, and practice of UC admission and eligibility policies. Together, Institutional Theory and policy analysis foster discourse on change toward justice in higher educational policies. My investigation discussed the connection, intersection, and interplay between document analysis, policy discourse and policies within the context of Institutional Theory. Institutional Theory was particularly useful in the document analysis of policies related to access, equity, and higher educational opportunities that affect undergraduate admission, specifically that of African American males' access to higher education. Race and politics are ongoing issues that daily effect organizations and society; "institutions are often implicated in both the explanations and what is to be explained" (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010, p. 3). Institutionalist scholars argue that, within institutions, something is "identified at a higher level and used to explain processes and outcomes at a lower level of analysis" (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010, p. 1).

Choice of Methodology

Qualitative methods such as policy discourse analysis offer researchers the opportunity to address specific problems and questions that reflect a personal perspective on a particular phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Qualitative research has been

characterized by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) as "multi-method in focus, taking an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter" (p. 3) Qualitative research offers the researcher the opportunity to focus on the "why" rather than the "what" of social phenomena; it relies on the "direct experiences of human beings as meaning-making agents in their everyday lives and seeks in-depth understandings of social phenomena within their natural settings" (Savenye & Robinson, 1996, p. 45). One of the major strengths of qualitative research is that it is not easily "pigeonholed" (Dey, 1993, p. 3). Unlike quantitative research's rigid statistical methods, qualitative research methods allow for flexibility during the planning and implementation phases of research.

Qualitative research methodology attempts to present people on their own terms, capture behavior without judgement, and represent appropriate perspectives (Dey, 1993Qualitative research permits the research question to advance in tandem with the study, because the researcher wants to know what is happening, and avoids biasing the study by focusing the investigation too narrowly. The use of words, and the emphasis on the value of words and their meanings, are the distinguishing features of qualitative research. Furthermore, qualitative research has several important hallmarks. Specifically, it is,

> (a) conducted in a natural setting, without intentional manipulation of the environment; (b) typically results in highly detailed, rich descriptions of human behaviors and opinions; (c) acknowledges that individuals construct their own realities and proceeds from an understanding that what they do may be based on why they assume they do it; and (d) allows for the "multiple realities" individuals might construct in an environment. (Erickson, 1986p. 49)

Another point of relevance for this research methodology is that qualitative methodology is inclusive of individuals, society, and culture. It is particularly relevant to the investigation of *Master Plan's* role in the UC eligibility and admission policy development. Inductive method provides a broader view of the interactions, and the meanings attached to these interactions. In the present investigation, this view included organizational structure and institutional norms. Finally, qualitative research ensures, that "as the researcher you do not simply work out where to find data which already exist in a collaborative state. Instead you work out how best you can generate data from your chosen data sources." (Mason, 2002, p. 52). This approach allowed me to use the sources to ascertain the meanings that individuals and governing bodies attributed to the institutional mandates, policies, and values of the UC.

Methods

There are four common methods of data collection in qualitative research: participant observation, in-depth interviews, focus groups, and document analysis. Each method is utilized to collect a specific type of data:

> Participant observation is suitable for collecting data on naturally occurring behaviors in their usual contexts; in-depth interviews are optimal for collecting data on individuals' personal histories, perspectives, and experiences; and focus groups are effective in securing data on the cultural norms of a group and in generating broad overviews of issues of concern to the cultural groups or subgroups represented. (Mason, 2002, p. 43)

In my investigation, I utilized discourse analysis, as "an umbrella covering several traditions by which discourse may be analyzed" (Woolgar, 1988p. 68), including document analysis.

Discourse analysis helps frame the importance of document analysis. It approaches social interaction by examining communication through texts and transcripts (Gee, 2005). Discourse analysis is based on the understanding that when people communicate, there is more occurring than the transfer of information. It is not designed to capture literal meanings, but to examine what language does, or what individuals accomplish through language. Discourse analysis examines how meaning is constructed, and how power functions in society (Gee, 2005). Discourse analysis examines how language is used in text over a number of sentences, and it is considered within a framework of social and cultural conventions (Abrams & Harpham, 2005). Discourse analysis is an important methodology for several reasons. First, it begins at the basic level of what is said, yet also takes into consideration the social and historical context (Hajer, 1993). Discourse analysis is useful for exploring the political meanings that may inform written and spoken text (Barrett, 1995). Third, discourse analysis can be used to reach a positive social psychological critique of a phenomenon (Van Dijk, 1991). Fourth, discourse analysis is context specific (Fairclough, 1992Finally, discourse analysis can reveal the hidden motivation behind a text or the interpretation of that text (Gee, 2005).

Policy Discourse Analysis. In this inquiry, I adopted Allan's (2008) method of policy discourse analysis to bring to the forefront discourses related to definitions of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige found in the UC eligibility and admission policy. Policy discourse analysis seeks to identify assumptions and underlying biases advanced by policies, and examine the implications of these

assumptions and biases for individuals and groups affected by them. The application of policy discourse analysis serves a dual purpose: it facilitates the development of a systematic theoretical and descriptive account of the structures and strategies of written and spoken discourse, and it examines the relationships of the text and content to the relevant structures of their cognitive, social, cultural, and historical contexts (Van Dijk, 1984, 1987a, 1991, 1993In summary, policy discourse analysis studies text in context. Discourse analysis allowed my investigation to make a significant contribution to our understanding of the UC's eligibility and admission policies.

As written texts, the UC eligibility and admission policies can be understood as advancing discourses, setting expectations, and shaping norms of practice (Allan, 2008; Ayers, 2005; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006; Tierney, 2001). As a policy discourse analysis of the UC eligibility and admission policies, my investigation was a blend of critical, interpretive, and post-structural approaches to the document analysis of related policy documents (Allan, 2008)

Document Analysis. Document analysis is a systematic technique for studying or evaluating documents argues (Bowen (2009 0. Organizational and institutional documents are an important research method in qualitative research. Document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Documents are "social facts," which are produced, shared, and used in socially organized ways, argues Bowen (2009, p.47). The investigative method involves finding, selecting, making sense of, and synthesizing data contained in the selected documents.

Furthermore, "document analysis yields data (excerpts, quotations, or entire passages) that can be organized into major themes, categories, and examples specifically through content analysis" (Bowen, 2009, p.28). Finally, understandings into research problems including meanings are revealed through various document types (Bowen, 2009).

Another reason I chose document analysis for this investigation was the "unobtrusive and non-reactive" nature of documents; because unlike human, documents are unaffected by the research process (Bowen, 2009, p. 31). Additionally, document analysis avoided the concerns related to reflexivity (or the lack of it) characteristic in other qualitative research methods. "Reflexivity, which required an awareness of the researcher's contribution to the construction of meanings attached to social interactions and an acknowledgement of the possibility of the investigator's influence on the research, is usually a non-issue when using documents for research" (Bowen, 2009, p.31). More importantly, documents are stable, available for repeated review, and uncover events that occurred before the research began, and provide coverage for a long span of time (Bowen, 2009).

The most significant drawback of documents as a source of data is that, although texts and documents can be "interrogated," "deconstructed," and analyzed, "they have often been disconnected from their creation, thus it is impossible to explore original meanings and intent with confidence" (Yin, 1994, p. 42). It is argued by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that documents privilege certain preserved viewpoints over those not preserved, presenting a specific viewpoint or interpretation. Furthermore, no document is

a literal recording of an event (Yin, 1994) and, therefore, a document is not an action or event.

A university's identity is often defined through its documents, argues Prior (2003),

> A university (any university) is in its documents rather than its buildings. The charter together with other documents names the university, provides warrant to award degrees, and legitimizes the officers of the university and so on. Naturally, a university has buildings and equipment and lectures and students, but none of those things are sufficient for the award of university status. Only the charter can define the organization as a university, and in that sense, provide the one necessary condition for its existence. (p. 60)

What characteristics of a university give it its identity and differentiate it from other universities? How are these characteristics defined and given meaning? "A university is specifically composed of an undergraduate division, which confers bachelor's degrees, and a graduate division, which comprises of a graduate school and professional schools, each of which may confer master's and doctoral degrees" (University, n.d.). The act of documentation is central to helping define and shape the mission of the university, its definition of merit, and its eligibility and admission requirements.

Document analysis primary goals are to draw inferences about text and to obtain evidence about a sender, a message, and its audiences according to Krippendorff (2004). Another important aspect of document analysis is the ability to examine how content, according to Bowen (2009). reflects social and cultural issues, values, and phenomena as well as attitudinal and behavioral responses to communication. "It serves as a 'reality check' whereby portrayals of groups, phenomena or characteristics are assessed against a standard taken from real life" (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998, p. 10).

The analysis of documents in my investigation demonstrated how policy documents portray and define merit and access in higher education in California. Document analysis was utilized to determine the presence of certain words or concepts within various UC eligibility and admission documents, and then to analyze their effects on the definitions of merit and access.

Document analysis can provide information that may not be accessible by other methods, as "qualitative material can reveal frames of reference, reactions to situations, and cultural conventions" (Smith, 2000, p. 313). Moreover, language often displays more about people than they want to disclose and, therefore, helps guide questions (Smith, 2000Documents serve a variety of purposes within a research study (Bowen, 2009). There were three specific foci of the documents used in this investigation. First, the documents provided a source of data, in the context within which the research occurred. The collected documents provided background information, as well as historical insight, about the roots of specific issues, and, in turn, contextualized the political, social, and economic conditions that influenced my study. Second, the analyzed documents provided a means of tracking change and development over time. Many of the changes in, and updates to, the original *Master Plan* were reflected in updates of the UC eligibility and admission policies. Third, the investigated documents contained information that prompted other questions to ask of the documents, and of the individuals interviewed. For example, an interview with a former Director of Admissions indicated that the issue of *Master Plan's* inclusion or exclusion of African American males was never contemplated in policy discussions. This comment raised the question of why it was not, a question

relevant both for the document, and for the future development of UC eligibility and admission criteria.

Policy documents can constructor re-construct a social issue in a way that influences public perception, when that construction is communicated to the general public (Tuchman, 1978). Policy documents also help to transmit meanings to others who are not directly affected by the documents. A relevant example of this is the definition of merit at the UC, the definition is a socially constructed phenomenon that reflects society's perception of who deserves admittance to the most prestigious public educational system in the nation. Examples of this phenomenon also include the increase of admission by exception from 2% to 4% in 1978, to ensure the inclusion of minority and low-income students; the inclusion of race as a factor in the admission process in 1986, in response to civil unrest and the outcries of affirmative action supporters; and the 1995 passage of Proposition 209, which legally prohibited the consideration of race and gender in the admission process at all public universities.

Interviews. Interviews were the second data source used in my investigation. Documents either corroborated or conflicted with interview data. In the latter case, interviews helps "understand how individuals frame policy issues and were these frames come from (Yanow, 2007, p. 113). For this phase of the investigation, a model called responsive interviewing was employed. This model depends on the interpretive constructionist philosophy, mixed with critical theory, and then is shaped by the practical need of conducting interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p. 11).The design of the interview process was flexible and relational throughout the investigation; the goal was not to reach

definitive answers, but rather to discover how the interviewees understood what they heard. The interview technique for my investigation included three types of questions: main questions, follow-up questions, and probes. The main questions were designed to focus on the substance of the research problem. The follow-up and probe questions ensured the pursuit of depth, detail, and richness. In addressing the concept of depth, meaning and explanations were sought in conversations with individuals (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Exploring depth, in the different experiences of the individuals interviewed, led to many complementary, as well as conflicting, ideas and themes. The ideas and themes that resulted often included those not initially anticipated as part of this investigation.

Through my professional relationships with UC personnel, I identified current and former UC Admissions personnel with intricate knowledge of the UC eligibility and admission policies over time, and consequent insight into the process. My initial interviews led me to others, allowing the responses of my interviewees to guide me to new data.

Suitability of California for Investigation

California is the most populous state in the country, wherein African Americans constitute 5.8% of the population. California is home to the fifth largest Black population in the United States (Valliani, 2015). African American males constitute fifty percent of the total African American population (United States Census Bureau, 2011):

> African Americans in California are more likely to have a high school diploma and a college degree in 2016 than in 1990. Throughout the state, African

97

American students are also more likely to graduate from high school and college today than they were ten years ago Valliani, 2015, p. 3).

For example, 23% of working-age African American adults in California have a bachelor's degree or higher, whereas 42% of White adults have the same degrees. African Americans, overwhelmingly, attend low-performing elementary and high schools, which are characterized by lower than average test scores, inexperienced teachers, lower levels of resources and funding, and insufficient counselors (Valliani, 2015). As a result, African American high school students are less likely than students from most other racial/ethnic groups to graduate from high school and to have completed the sequence of "A-G" coursework that makes them eligible for application to California's public four-year universities (Valliani, 2015).

My investigation located public colleges and universities in California as politically constituted institutions of the state. Scholars argue that, over the past four decades, state flagship public universities have become increasingly more selective. As a result, considerable attention is turned to the factors that used in determining who is eligible and who to admit (Bowen et al., 2009). Even though the number of African American undergraduates enrolled in a college or university in California is 33% higher today than it was a decade ago (up from 127,000 in 2004 to 150,000 in 2013), this growth has been concentrated at for-profit institutions and California Community Colleges (CCC) (Valliani, 2015). According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics, the proportion of Black undergraduates in California has actually decreased in each sector, over the last decade, except at the for-profit colleges. Black students are less

likely to enroll in a four-year public or nonprofit university today than they were ten years ago (Valliani, 2015).

Summary of Policy Discourse Analysis

In summary, I used the policy documents (*Master Plan, Master Plan Renewed,* and the UC eligibility and admission policies) to provide background and context, determine additional questions to be asked, establish primary and supplementary data, and offer a means of tracking change and development. In addition, I reviewed Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) meeting minutes and Committee on Educational Policy documents. The primary goals were to reveal the social processes through which the policy documents were produced, in order to explain their form and content, and to gather important information about their authors and the circumstances in which they were making policy decisions (Scott, 1995).

In addressing these research issues, the connection of CRT in conjunction with Institutional Theory and qualitative studies provided a framework to identify, analyze, and transform those structural, cultural, and interpersonal aspects of policy discourse and development that may maintain the low status of African Americans (Parker & Lynn, 2002) within the context of a higher education institution.

Positionality of the Researcher

The researcher, especially in qualitative research, is an important instrument in the investigation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). His or her experiences, training, and perspectives influence the inquiry, including the motivation to undertake the investigation, and his or her approach to data collection and interpretation (Denzin &

Lincoln, 1994). The participation and membership role a researcher brings to the research will have an important effect on the kinds of data collected and analyzed (Dewalt & Dewalt, 2002). This investigation is not an exception. I acknowledge that my personal and professional experiences, worldview, and values cannot be separated entirely from this investigation. My perceptions of public higher education, and the eligibility and admission processes, have been shaped by my personal and professional experiences. From August 1995 to February 2008, I served as the Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach at the University of California, Irvine. I was responsible for assisting with the development and implementation of admission policy. I was also a member of the local admission committee, which consisted of tenured faculty and senior administrators. In addition, I was a participant in the UC system-wide admission committee, which was populated by tenured faculty from each of the UC campuses and senior level administrators. Since 2008, I have been the senior level manager for enrollment at a selective CSU campus, and I have been responsible for the admission and enrollment planning at that campus. In this position, I discuss policies and practices with the deans, faculty, and both campus- and system-wide senior level administrators. I regularly meet with policy makers at both the local and system-wide level who are engaged in developing and shaping enrollment policies that align with campus priorities, as well as the mandates of *Master Plan*. I assume that my understanding of admission policy development enhances my awareness, knowledge of, and sensitivity to, many of the challenges, opportunities, and issues encountered by the policy makers and practitioners who develop and implement admission policies on both

the local and system-wide level. I bring knowledge of the structure of higher education, admissions in California, and the role of policy makers to this investigation.

As a result of my experiences in working closely with faculty and administrators at the UC, I bring certain biases to this investigation. More specifically, I have always had concerns regarding the UC's definitions of eligibility and merit, and how these manifest in its admission policies. I am mindful that my previous experiences may shape the questions I ask, and the way I ask them, as well as the manner in which I interpret the data I collect.

Data Collection and Management

I examined publicly available policy documents, including the original *Master Plan* and several UC eligibility and admission policy documents (Appendix A). I chose these documents because they provided the written records of the UC eligibility and admission policy development, both before and after Proposition 209. These documents are critical because they provided the foundational mechanisms by which UC developed its eligibility and admission policies in compliance with the overall policy document that guides public higher education in the state of California, *Master Plan*. In addition to the policy documents, I also collected documents reflecting the discourse on each of the policy changes and/or documents (e.g. Reports to the Regents, BOARS meeting minutes, etc.). I chose not to do a sampling of the documents, because to do so would be to place greater or lesser value on some documents and would lead to a limited understanding of the policy discourse on the development/updating of eligibility and admission policies. In reading the many UC eligibility and admission policy documents, I selected documents

that (a) reflected or referenced definitions and/or themes of merit; (b) reflected or referenced definitions and/or themes of access and eligibility; (c) revealed or referenced terms associated with race and diversity; (d) established UC eligibility policy; (e) established UC admission policy; (f) reflected or referenced the UC's mission; (g) reflected institutional policy after Proposition 209; and (h) reflected or referenced definitions of and/or themes related to prestige. Appendix A provides a listing of all reviewed documents.

I inventoried the number of times each of the relevant terms and themes was mentioned in the documents, finding a total of 62 documents that mentioned one or more of the key themes: merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. I read each of the university documents at least twice, and some as many as four times, to ensure that I had a clear understanding of each. On the first reading, I sought to capture the gist of each document, its purpose, and its audience. On the second reading, I searched for, and coded, the words and themes mentioned above.

I coded for patterns, regular or consistent occurrences of data that appeared more than twice. A pattern suggests a variety of elements gathered in a specific arrangement (Saldana, 2016Patterns are somewhat stable indicators of human's ways of living and working, to render the world "more comprehensible, predictable and tractable" (Saldana, 2016, p. 6). In addition, patterns demonstrate habits and importance. Coding "generates the bones of your analysis … integration will assemble those bones into a working skeleton" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 45). My coding naturally moved to categories and sub-categories of themes and concepts, and finally to assertions and theory.

102

I applied multiple coding methods. More specifically, I used descriptive coding, which assigns labels to passages, summarizing the basic topic of each in a word or short phrase; evaluation coding, which assigns judgments about the merit, worth or significance of policy; and hypothesis coding, wherein I developed codes before collecting the data, predicting what it would show from my CRT framework (Saldana, 2016). I used theoretical coding to ground my investigation in the theoretical framework, and values coding to ascertain the values of the policymakers. I themed the data to identify what a unit of data was about and/or what it meant. Themes, as argued by Saldana (2016), consist of descriptions of behavior within a culture, explanations for why something happens, and iconic statements.

My goals in coding the documents were to (a) subdivide each of them into parts reflecting different aspects of intent; (b) determine the pervasiveness of the terms merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige; and (c) determine the pervasiveness of the themes related to definitions of those terms. This overall strategy was designed to facilitate subsequent analysis, which would catalog and contextualize the discourses that produced UC eligibility and admission policies. I adopted established qualitative coding practices (Miles & Huberman, 1994), in order to enhance credibility and support my research goals.

In reviewing each of the documents, I initially read each expression of intent to code along three major dimensions (or "bins") by asking three questions: (a) What is the purpose of the document (e.g. defining the mission of the university, enhancing prestige, defining merit, ensuring access, increasing or decreasing eligibility pools)?; (b) how does

the document/text express the cognitive or experiential connection of policy developers with the desired goal?; and (c) which parameters of access, if any, are expressly identified (e.g., merit, eligibility, diversity, mission, prestige)?

These broad coding dimensions grew out of my research questions and the methodological framework. I chose the initial coding framework as one likely to support my inquiry into the multiple aspects of the UC eligibility and admission policies, and into the discourses and external factors that helped shape the policies. The first readings of the documents and policies reinforced the selection of these areas as appropriate sectors of inquiry. I initially identified five factors (i.e., merit, access, eligibility, race, and diversity), and the same five themes in the text of each document. It was my expectation that the ways in which the policy documents described merit and access (the first dimension) would provide information on the assumptions and expectations of policymakers about UC eligibility and admission for African American males. Consideration of the articulated purposes of UC eligibility and admission, and the sectors they expressly sought to affect (the second dimension), provided information useful for addressing the research question about the understandings and meanings of the university's mission(s), and its role within *Master Plan* as used in the development of the UC eligibility and admission policies. This also addressed the policymakers' philosophical understanding of the intersection of *Master Plan* and university prestige in the UC's eligibility and admission policies. Broad and weak themes were considered across these areas, as knowledge of the discourses shaped understandings of the priorities and purposes of eligibility and admission policies. Finally, consideration of the

parameters of merit and eligibility that the university associated with access (the third

dimension) provided information on both of the specific parameters considered

significant with respect to access. Overall, my reading and interpretation of these

documents and policies, as products of discourse across each of these three dimensions,

yielded information on the range of discursive effects in policy and shaping the

population of admitted undergraduates at the UC.

The first coding classification provided information on the manner in which the

UC defined its mission, and the role of prestige, definitions of merit, and access in

increasing or decreasing the UC eligibility pool. I arrived at an initial set of codes for

these policy expressions through repeated readings of the data codes, informed by

descriptive coding. I developed codes that allowed me to distinguish differences in the

ways that policies positioned students relative to outcomes. For example, values coding

described a different outcome for students than theoretical and evaluation coding. The

resulting organization of the data provided material useful in examining the eligibility

and admission processes which, according to these policies, are the means by which the

UC advances the tenets of *Master Plan*.

The coded text within the second classification yielded content on the stated ends

of the eligibility and admission policies. I developed a set of codes through a combination

of deductive and inductive methods. My initial codes grew from the purposes of

eligibility and admission policies expressed across the existing literature. In particular, I

set codes associated with each of the themes of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race,

mission, and prestige. I also set codes to reflect those affected by the outcome, whether the student, community, or society.

Finally, the third classification inventoried the explicit identification, or lack thereof, of eligibility and admission policies inclusive of African American males. This information seemed likely to provide insights into the aspects of inclusion that were most prominent in the UC's eligibility and admission policy.

In summary, these three broad classifications were chosen to provide the coding structures necessary to address the overall research questions about eligibility and admission policies within the constraints of *Master Plan* and the discourses that produced these policies. These classifications of data supported specific analysis of eligibility and admission policies: When the UC considers merit and eligibility, what sort of access is it considering (classification 3)? What are the intended outcomes of defining merit and eligibility in the ways found in the data (classification 2)? And how does the UC describe the ways in which eligibility and admission connect to *Master Plan* (classification 1)? Collective and intersection consideration of these questions provided information on the intended outcomes of the UC eligibility and admission policies and the extent to which they advance, stagnate or diminish access for African American males. Through subsequent analysis, the data provided evidence useful in identifying the discourses that produced the UC eligibility and admission policies.

Within each of the three broad classifications, I coded the material to identify segments of the text that expressed specific ends within each broad area of inquiry. For the first classification on prestige, the inductive coding process resulted in five primary

codes to identify text that articulated the definitions of merit, access, diversity, race, and eligibility. In coding text, I found that these interpretive categories provided a useful schema for identifying the number of the expressed means by which policymakers interfaced with, and articulated, the policy goals and the spectrum along which they fell. I used seven primary codes to label the thematic articulation of intended outcomes of the policies. The primary codes are merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. These codes are associated with the purposes of access and definitions of merit I identified in Chapter 2, as those articulated by theorists and practitioners. The thematic codes I selected covered two broad and overlapping areas: outcomes associated with various student populations (ethnic and gender) and outcomes associated with societal expectations and norms. Finally, I identified, through inductive coding, interpretative dimensions of eligibility expressed across the set of policy statements. To inventory the various expressions, I added several shorthand codes to the previous seven: ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status.

The seven primary codes were identified in my research by the following shorthand phrases and questions.

Merit. How is the definition of merit framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents? Where is the theme of the definition of merit implied within the context of the sentence or paragraph? It may or may not be explicitly mentioned. Merit is defined based on academic and/or co-curricular activities.

Access. How is access to higher education framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents, and by policy makers? The theme of access is captured within the

framework of equality and equity of opportunity. It recognizes and takes into account differences in the opportunity structure.

      Eligibility. How is eligibility framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents? The construct of eligibility refers to requirements that individuals must achieve to be eligible applicants to the UC. This construct is designed to ensure that the UC follows the mandates of *Master Plan*.

      Diversity. How is diversity framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents? The theme of diversity examines differences; relevant differences for this investigation include racial, ethnic, gender and socioeconomic. These differences may or may not be explicitly mentioned. When used as a contrast or addition to equality, the theme of diversity focuses on recognizing group differences.

      Race. How is race framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents? Race is a social construct, not a biological phenomenon.

      Mission. How is the mission of the UC framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents, and by policy makers? The theme of mission related to explicit goals of the UC in fulfilling its role to teaching, research, and public service.

      Prestige. How is prestige framed, contextualized, and interpreted in policy documents? The theme of prestige uses the definition postulated by Brewer, Gates, & Goldman (2002) that "prestigious colleges and universities are more concerned with preserving that prestige than extending the advantages that selective admission confers" (p. 26). Prestigious institutions focus on the long-term vitality of the university, and are more likely to be faculty focused (Brewer et al., 2002).

Summary

My investigation was a qualitative analysis of documents and personal interviews, investigating the UC eligibility and admission policies and the discourses that shaped these policies. The tenets of universal and broad access to education that form the basis of *Master Plan,* and its influence on the UC's eligibility and admission policies affecting African American males, were also examined. The intents, effects, and intersection of *Master Plan* and the related UC eligibility and admission policy documents were examined from a CRT and Institutional Theory framework to advance an understanding of the social, political, racial, and interest convergence in these policy developments. In my data collection and analysis, I also sought to advance the understanding of various definitions of merit conceptualizations within the UC's eligibility and admission policies, for the role of access and prestige. To summarize, this inquiry into the examination of the UC's eligibility and admission policies from both the CRT and IT frameworks provided insight into the effect on African American males' access to the UC, an exploration of the expression of university priorities, and an interpretation of *Master Plan's* main tenets of broad and universal access.

Chapter 4

Findings

   This investigation addressed the question of whether the currently low University of California (UC) eligibility, admission, and enrollment rates of African Americans are, in part, a result of UC's eligibility and admission policies, policies that were informed by *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* (*Master Plan*), which was written in 1959 and adopted in 1960. Additional policies and documents related to *Master Plan* were analyzed to address this question, including *Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education* (*Master Plan Renewed*), 1987; Committee on Educational Policy meeting minutes, 1988-2011; and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) papers, 2000, 2007, 2009, and 2011. In this chapter, I will provide an in-depth analysis of these documents. This analysis is useful for the explanation of the priorities and intentions, both explicit and implicit, across these policy documents. Additionally, I present my interpretations of the policy themes, assumptions, and purposes.

   To develop my interpretations of the policy documents, I first reviewed them using thematic analysis, which reflected key themes of access, merit, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. After the thematic analysis, I completed a theoretical analysis using Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Institutional Theory (IT). The theoretical

frameworks of CRT and IT provided the coding structures that addressed the overall research questions about eligibility and admission policies within the constraints of *Master Plan,* and the discourses that produced these policies. CRT examines the role that race and racism play in framing meanings and assumptions about the shared and independent roles of race and racism (Bell, 1992). The use of this framework permitted an understanding of the intersection of race, politics, and higher education institutions as they related to the eligibility criteria and admission policies in California. The tenets of CRT utilized in the analysis of these documents and the policy discourses focused on the permanence of racism, which postulates that racism is a permanent component of United States life (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001); interest convergence, wherein according to DeCuir & Dixson (2004) "concessions are offered to the extent that they are not seen (or exacted) as a major disruption to a 'normal' way of life for the majority of Whites;" and a critique of liberalism, which states that we live in a colorblind society in which the law is neutral and we have incremental change (p. 28).

Institutional Theory provided the opportunity to examine how formal and informal control structures arise and how differences in cultural expectations shape universities and the way they operate, as they relate to policy development (Scott, 2014). The use of this theoretical framework also allowed me to connect micro and macro approaches to the understanding of social structure and processes. I analyzed these documents utilizing Institutional Theory's three pillars of an institution: regulative, which constrains and regularizes behavior-rule setting, monitoring, and sanctioning of activities (Abbott, Keohane, Moravcsik, Slaughter, & Snidal, 2000); normative, which includes

both values and norms (Heclo, 2008; March & Olsen, 1989; Selznick 1957; Stinchcombe, 1997); and cultural-cognitive, which is comprised of the "shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and create the frames through which meaning is generated" (Scott, 2014, p. 59).

This combination of theories provided a lens to investigate the intents, effects, and intersection of *Master Plan* with related UC eligibility and admission policy documents, and specifically examine the power that higher education policy wields over a specific population (African American males in California), particularly in achieving UC eligibility and admission. Seven primary codes were used to label the thematic articulation of the intended outcomes of the policies: merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. These thematic codes cover two broad and overlapping areas: (a) outcomes associated with various student populations (ethnicity and gender); and (b) outcomes associated with societal expectations and norms. Deductive coding facilitated an examination of interpretative dimensions of eligibility, expressed across the set of policy statements, through the theoretical frameworks of CRT and Institutional Theory. This investigation's findings provided insight into the UC system's priorities, as well as the UC's interpretation of *Master Plan's* main tenets of broad and universal access, and the effects of these factors on African American males' access to the UC. This chapter presents themes and findings from the document analysis.

Context of Documents

African American male eligibility and admission at UC is lower than that of all other major ethnic populations and ethnic/gender cross-sectioned populations in the same

institution (Valliani, 2015). The institution is guided by the original *Master Plan*, which has since been modified by several advising committees. The following section provides the context of the investigation through a discussion of those policies, the composition of advising committees, and the larger context of higher education during the period in which each policy document was created.

A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Prepared by The Master Plan Survey Team and presented to the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the UC, the conditions that promoted the emergence of *Master Plan* were large increases in enrollments (with even larger enrollments projected for the 1960s), fear of competition within each segment of higher education, a proposals to reorganize the California's higher education systems, and a preference of the State Legislature to separate politics and education to enable orderly growth (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). *Master Plan* was a means of organizing postsecondary education in California (Douglass, 2000). Specifically, the purpose of The Master Plan Survey Team was to study problems affecting the relationships between the public K-12 school system and the UC, and to make recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Regents of the UC through the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the UC President. *Master Plan*, representing these recommendations, presented eligibility and admission criteria for the UC, the California State University (CSU), and the California Community College (CCC) systems.

The major features of *Master Plan* focused on the differentiation of the three education systems and universal access (Douglass, 2000). Differentiation of functions

among the public postsecondary educational segments was articulated to clarify the

UC's mission:

> The University of California is the state's primary academic research institution and is to provide undergraduate, graduate and professional education. UC is given exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education for doctoral degrees (with the exception of Ed.D.) and for instruction in law, medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and architecture. (*Major Features*, 2009, p. 1)

The focus on universal access stemmed from the conviction that all interested and

capable students should be able to attend college:

> The establishment of the principle of universal access and choice, and differentiation of admission pools for the segments with UC selecting from among the top one-eighth (12.5%) of the high school graduating class; CSU selecting from among the top one-third (33.3%) of the high school graduating class; and California Community Colleges were to admit any student capable of benefiting from instruction. (*Major Features*, 2007, p. 1)

Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California

***Postsecondary Education* (*Master Plan Renewed*), 1987**. In the 1980s, the state

legislature raised concerns about the ability of postsecondary education, specifically the

UC system, to respond to the emerging demographics of the state and meet its changing

needs. These concerns gave rise to legislation calling for *Master Plan's* re-examination

and potential revision. The legislature established the Commission for the Review of

Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570, Nielsen, Chapter 1507, Statutes of 1984)

and a separate review of the UC system. The Commission, which consisted of the

governor, senate, and trustee appointees' representatives from UC, CSU, the Community

College Board, the Community College Association, Superintendent of Public

Instruction, California Postsecondary Education Commission, and other Commission

staff, conducted a review of *Master Plan* to determine which changes were necessary to ensure higher education's perceived success in educating the growing, number of diverse college-aged individuals in the state ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987). The resulting plan addressed the effect of California's changing racial and socioeconomic demographics, and delineated the roles, responsibilities, governance, and coordination of the three public postsecondary systems: the CCC, CSU, and UC systems.

Committee on Educational Policy Meeting Minutes, 1988-2011. The Committee on Educational Policy consisted of the UC Regents, who met monthly to approve previous meeting minutes, present updates, and discuss issues at hand. Faculty advisors and/or experts attended many of these meetings to address specific items on the agenda. During the meetings, the Regents had an opportunity to share their opinions, and, when called upon by the Chairperson, approve or disapprove the issues under discussion. Meeting minutes from May 19, 1988 to January 19, 2011, that captured policy discussions concerning higher education following the adoption of *Master Plan Renewed,* were collected for this investigation.

The minutes that presented the policy discussions most relevant to this investigation included "Proposed UC Policy on Undergraduate Admissions" (Regents, 1988); "Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions" (Regents, 1988); "Special Committee on Affirmative Action Policies: "Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate and Professional School Admissions" (Regents, 1995); "Proposed Establishment of UC Freshman Eligibility in

the Local Context" (Regents, 1999); "Examination of Factors Related to Academic Underperformance and Underachievement" (Regents, 2000); "Report on Comprehensive Review of Undergraduate Admissions" (Regents, 2001); "Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes"; "Proposal for Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions" (Regents, 2001); "Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes"; "Admissions Testing"; "Status Report on Implementation of the Eligibility in the Local Context Policy"; "The UC Center in Washington: A New Face in the Nation's Capital" (Regents, 2002); "Report of the Review of Master Plan"; "Proposed Establishment of the School of Education, Davis Campus" (Regents, 2002); "Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes"; "Update on Alumni Relations Strategic Plan"; "Academic Senate Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy" (Regents, 2008); and "Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes"; "Campus Presentation, San Diego Campus"; "Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions" (Regents, 2011). The UC eligibility of freshman applicants was a recurring theme of these meeting minutes.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). Established in 1920 by the UC's Academic Senate, the BOARS was charged with setting undergraduate admission policies in all its aspects. Originally known as the Board of Admissions, the group's title changed in 1939 to The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). It consists of one or more faculty members from each of the UC campuses. BOARS documents reviewed for the purposes of this investigation included "The University of California's Distinctive Freshman Admissions Process—White Paper"

prepared by BOARS (2005); "UC Freshmen Eligibility Reform Proposal" (2007); "Eligibility-Reform Proposal: Q and A" (2007); and "The Impact of the New Freshmen Eligibility Policy at the University of California, A Report to the Regents of the University of California" (2013). The BOARS documents collected for this investigation clarified past policies and revealed changes that had occurred within higher education over subsequent decades.

Presentation of Investigation Findings

An examination of *Master Plan*, 1960; *Master Plan Renewed*, 1987; the Committee on Educational Policy meeting minutes; and the BOARS policy documents through CRT and Institutional Theory frameworks allowed me to identify several themes relevant to the effects of admission and eligibility policies on African American males' access to the UC. Specifically, these themes concerned the expression of the UC priorities and interpretation of *Master Plan's* main tenets of broad and universal access. These themes are discussed below in respect to how each policy document addressed the central research question, "What understandings and meanings of the mission(s) of the University of California, and its role within *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California,* have been used in the development of UC's eligibility and admission policies?" and the sub-questions that guided this investigation: Sub-question A, "What role(s) do the definitions of merit play in the development of UC eligibility and admission policies?"; Sub-question B, "What role(s) does access and merit play in the development of UC eligibility and admission policies?"; and Sub-question C, "What access positions do these discourses make possible and promote through eligibility and

admission policies?" The following will outline seven themes within both *Master Plan* and *Master Plan Renewed* that highlight the pertinent findings. Said findings, when outlined by theme, do not necessarily happen within both documents, and therefore the theme is highlighted at the beginning of each section to guide the findings accordingly.

Master Plan

  Merit defines the quality of student expected by UC (Theme1). The theme of merit as defined for this investigation, encompassing academic and/or co-curricular activities, was demonstrated by the way that students were identified as qualified by the institution. *Master Plan* did not define or formally refer to merit. However, the idea of merit was evident within the policy. Policy creators specified that to raise the standards for lower division admission, the UC should select first time freshmen from the top eighth (12.5%) of all California public high school graduates (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960).

  The expected quality of students, as specified by The Master Plan Survey Team for CSU or UC, pointed to a meritocratic system, with merit defined as high academic performance. An additional criterion presented within the document was that selected applicants were to be "admitted to a particular institution, when all cannot be accommodated" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). This indicated that the "best students should be granted their first campus of choice" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960).

The theme of merit within *Master Plan* did not consider the differential K-12 educational system within California, nor did it consider the influence that socioeconomic status has on the educational and co-curricular opportunities that influence outcomes and affect high school academic indicators. However, since merit was defined in the broadest of terms, that automatically qualified the top 12.5% of high school graduates for admission, it allowed the UC to define it in limited terms, with high school grade point average, college preparatory course completion, and standardized tests at the forefront. These traditional measures of merit justify and legitimize the ways in which merit is currently understood, but also mean "students of color consistently fall to the bottom of the educational hierarchy" (Zamudio et al., 2011, p. 12). Moreover, this broad definition of merit outlined the institution's expectation that these objective measures of merit were objective and normative, without accounting for the influence of K-12 experiences and opportunities, parental income levels, college preparatory course availability, and high school teacher training and preparation. This created a pool where those who were at more academically rigorous and equipped schools and who had a more stable home life had an intrinsic, yet unearned, advantage over other students. As "top" was not defined by who earned the highest grade at each high school (which would better account for working hard within the space a student exists, lives, and is educated), but rather by who had the highest academic markers across all high schools, this created stratification favoring better funded public schools. It also did not distinguish public schools with much more wealthy and resourced students. This is an unequal playing field, because resources and other factors not related to a student's actual work ethic or academic ability

are factored in. African American males are disproportionately attending schools with limited resources, teachers who are not fully credentialed, and counselors who do not view them as college bound.

The structure of admission and eligibility determines access of qualified students to UC (Theme2). Access included the consideration of differences in the opportunity structure, as well as eligibility and admission criteria.

Opportunity structure. Although all qualified high school graduates have the ability to achieve UC eligibility, apply, and be admitted to UC, eligibility and admission criteria reflect the needs of the institution, as much as the needs of a growing and diverse society. The selection and admission specifications, therefore, allowed limited access to the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates that qualified for admission to the University of California (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). Additionally, the policy document stated that "state-supported institutions have an obligation to adjust their offerings and admission policies to meet the long-term needs and to fit the fiscal capabilities of the state, as ascertained by constitutional and statutory authorities" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 67). By including this statement, policy creators allowed admission policies to adjust to the needs of the institution. In the original *Master Plan* (and all subsequent documents that discussed access to the UC and its campuses), committee members agreed that all qualified students should have the opportunity to apply and be admitted to UC. There was no verbiage in this document that favored access for the students over the needs of the university. However, although access for students was promoted in this document, it was not what was actually occurring. Subsequent

policies following *Master Plan* included proposals, recommendations, and research on existing opportunities and ways to accommodate the UC and its campuses over the decades.

   Limitations of accessibility. Due to the growing population in California, the UC needed to determine how its campuses would meet the increased applicant pool. In doing so, accessibility to the UC campuses for freshman applicants was limited. *Master Plan* referred to the issue of freshman student overcrowding at the UC. It presented ways to decrease the number of lower division students by distributing those students to junior colleges. The Master Plan Survey Team suggested to the Liaison Committee that the "reduction in number of lower division students attending state colleges and (UC specifically) will contribute to the further strengthening of California's well-developed junior colleges program" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 65). This policy addressed the problem of overcrowding, while further limiting accessibility and enrollment at the UC and its campuses for high school graduates. The CCCs would admit any California high school students who intended to continue their education, and the CSUs would accept the top third of the high school graduating classes along with qualified transfer students (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). The low UC eligibility rates of African American males ensured that they would not be admitted. This plan allowed the UC to admit students who ranked in the upper 12.5% of all California public high school graduates, admit qualified transfer students, admit qualified graduates to graduate study at institutions of higher learning, and expand upper division and graduate enrollments faster than the lower division enrollments, while addressing the problem of

overcrowding. This made admission to the UC more exclusive; while this would indicate policy that was the opposite of universal and broad access, rather it was viewed as a strategic narrowing. Overcrowding was solved at the expense of true access and therefore paid for by the students least able to afford it. Another way to say this is that it further favored well positioned students, and since it assigned a "top percentage," overcrowding was not distributed equally throughout the applicant population.

Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants are based on the changing needs of society and the institution (Theme 3). This construct was designed to ensure that the UC followed the mandates of *Master Plan*. Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants were further described in both academic and supplementary documents. Over time, a more comprehensive review of academics, co-curricular activities, and student experiences were considered in the admission process. *Master Plan*, in terms of UC eligibility and its path to guaranteed admission, created one of the only systems of higher education that made this connection.

Grades, courses, and standardized tests were the basis of eligibility and admission criteria. *Master Plan* described selection criteria for admitting high school graduates to the UC and the CSU. As determined by *Master Plan* committee and advisory boards, eligibility differed according to the institution.

Master Plan detailed specific course and grade requirements for freshman applicants for each university system, along with required scholastic aptitude tests for admission to California's higher education segments. Based on the eligibility and admission specifications presented in *Master Plan*, approximately l5 percent of public

high school graduates qualified for admission to the UC system, and 50 percent qualified for admission to the CSU system.

The mission of UC represents the guiding principles and intentions of UC and its campuses (Theme 6). The mission of the UC referred to its explicit goals of teaching, research, and public service. The intent of the UC's mission remained the same; however, the institution recognized that to preserve the quality, perception, and prestige of the institution, its policies would have to reflect the changes occurring in the state. The UC proposed to maintain among its campuses a demonstration of commitment to educational goals and principles. The document was a means of organizing postsecondary education in California. The purpose of *Master Plan* was to study and address problems affecting the relationships between the schools of the public-school system and the UC. In doing so, *Master Plan* presented recommendations to the State Board of Education and the UC Regents through the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the UC president.

Recommendations pertaining to admission, eligibility, and governance moved toward providing quality higher education within the state's institutions. The outcomes from this plan, as they applied to admission demographics had both intended and unintended outcomes that essentially voiced UC's opinion regarding who did, or did not, deserve admission to the UC, and therefore deserved to receive the state's best public, most prestigious, and advantageous collegiate education. Consistent inclusion or exclusion of any identifiable demographic, but especially one with clear racial and gender markers, implies the UC's value of that group as students or potential students.

Prestigious universities maintain a level of quality among their

undergraduates and the institution overall (Theme 7). The UC maintained the intent

to attract and admit academically high achieving students. Although *Master Plan* did not

refer to prestige directly, the document referenced the expectation that the state's higher

education institutions would provide a high level of quality academic experience. It also

included recommendations presented by The Master Plan Survey Team to ensure that

California's tripartite system of public higher education would be saved from destruction

by unchecked competition (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). If the recommended

actions were taken, ""we provide public service-which dates back to UC's origins as a

land grant institution in the 1860s. Today, through its public service programs and

industry partnerships, UC disseminates research results and translates scientific

discoveries into practical knowledge and technological innovations that benefit California

and the nation." (University of California, Office of the President, n.d., para. 5)

Such a statement presented California's postsecondary educational institutions as

providing high quality educations and, in turn, having academically high achieving

students, based on the criteria of "A-G" courses, GPA, course enrollment, and

standardized test scores. This claim implied that the UC system sought out a specific

academic profile for its students, contributing to the perception that the institution limited

the number of students who could seek to become eligible and to apply for admission.

Selectivity, or exclusivity, flies in the face of broad and universal access. In addition,

reliance on an academic profile meant that some would not fit it, which declared them

inadmissible, which subsequently, for a university, meant they did not viably exist as students or potential students.

Summary of Themes within *Master Plan*. Five of the seven themes addressed in this chapter were found within *Master Plan*. The theme of merit, while not defined or formally referred to within the document, was implied in the UC eligibility and admission student selection process. The theme of access was addressed in terms of opportunity structure. Although all qualified high school graduates had the ability to apply and be admitted to the UC, admission criteria reflected the needs of the institution and determined how its campuses would meet the increased applicant pool by limiting accessibility to UC campuses for freshman applicants. The theme of eligibility emphasized academic criteria, such as grades, credit hours, and standardized tests, as the basis of admission eligibility. The theme of mission focused on the UC's explicit goals of teaching, research, and public service, which contained a commitment to educational goals. The theme of prestige was revealed in a concern with preserving, rather than extending, the advantages conferred by selective admission, and maintaining a high level of quality among both the undergraduates and the institution as a whole. These themes collude, and combine, to effectively disqualify most minorities students and those from poor backgrounds attending poor schools. Selectivity and prestige prove, through the numbers, incompatible with the stated mandate of broad and universal access. The themes of diversity and race were not referred to in *Master Plan*.

Connection with Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory argues that racism is a normal, deep-seated feature of United States society and is not apparent due to its

ordinary nature. According to CRT, racism is embedded in educational policies and actions, even though laws are expected to ensure that all citizens are treated alike (colorblindness) (Hiraldo, 2010). *Master Plan* (as a policy document designed to shape higher education in California) contained several macro-level policies that have shaped micro-level practices. "The quality of an institution and that of a system of higher education are determined to a considerable extent by the abilities of those it admits and retains as students" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 66). The underlying premise of this macro-level policy document was partly pragmatic and partly ideological. It was pragmatic in the sense that the UC needed to structure a system of higher education that would address the growing numbers of individuals, post WWII, who sought a university education, and *Master Plan* attempted to impose an objective, evenly applied standard of admission. However, there were underlying expectations and assumptions of the policy developers, who were using a macro level policy to determine UC eligibility and admission:

> For both the state colleges and the University, freshman admissions through special procedures outside the basic requirements of recommending units of high school work and/or aptitude tests (such as specials and exceptions to the rules) be limited to 2 percent of all freshman admissions in each system for a given year. (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 4)

Master Plan articulated eligibility and admission in broad terms; the UC translated these terms into specific requirements without acknowledging the racial implications, and the disparate impact, that these requirements would have across racial groups. This was evidenced by no stated consideration of race despite a growing/emerging demographic of racial minorities, and therefore potential applicants, in the California population.

Master Plan, as a macro-level policy document, per Gillborn (2005), addressed three important questions: "who or what is driving this policy, who wins and who loses as a result of the policy's priorities, what are the effects or outcomes of this document"? A CRT framework for the analysis of *Master Plan* indicates the ways in which the subtleties of race and racism are enacted. *Master Plan* was written, developed, and implemented by highly educated White men, primarily those who held advanced degrees. The majority of these men were upper middle-class professionals involved in postsecondary education as fully tenured professors, and included representatives of all segments of postsecondary education, including private colleges and universities. They participated on each of the plan's commissions and/or policy committees. The specific committee members included State Board members (William L. Blair, Raymond J. Daba, Mabel E. Kinney, Wilber D. Simons, and Roy E. Simpson) and Regents (Gerald H. Hagar, Cornelius J. Haggerty, Clark Kerr, Donald H. McLaughlin, and Jesse H. Steinhart) (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). The lack of racial diversity among the members of the higher education faculty, educational leaders, and policy makers was a longstanding trend, historically common in higher education and taken for granted as "normal" (Patton, 2016) in the development of policy documents.

When *Master Plan* was developed, White men were the primary beneficiaries of leadership positions in postsecondary institutions, government, and society" (Patton, 2016, p. 323). This was considered normal, and was not questioned. California, at the time of *Master Plan's* writing, was also a homogeneous state, largely populated by White Americans, who made up almost 90 percent of the state's population. Given the

demographics of California, definitions of merit that were racially inclusive were ignored, or deemed unnecessary, as evidenced by their exclusion in the policy documents. This implies that despite being drafted to anticipate the future of California's applicants, *Master Plan* was not written with them in mind, or for their advancement, so much to ensure maintenance of the status quo.

Master Plan, with its goals of ordered growth and its eligibility and admission policy documents, had racially coded language that marginalized African Americans, by using White men as the standard by which African Americans, and all other students, were measured. When students were deemed to have met those standards that were normative for White males, they acquired UC eligibility and admission. The concept of the permanence of racism required acceptance of the dominant role that race and racism play in United States society, through both conscious and unconscious acts (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). The themes of merit, prestige, and mission articulate this concept through the hierarchical structures that govern the role of the UC in California's tripartite system of public higher education. The UC was positioned atop the educational hierarchy with the most rigorous eligibility and admission criteria of the three public postsecondary systems, and with the implicit approval to narrowly define merit, using the construct of eligibility as its path to admissions.

Since *Master Plan* determined that the UC would select the top 12.5% of high school graduates statewide, this important policy was implemented. Furthermore, *Master Plan* did not refer to people of color, discuss diversity, or the underrepresentation of racial/ethnic groups. The primary reason offered by the architects of *Master Plan* for this

omission was "the prohibition against inquiring about the racial/ethnic identity of students, on the grounds that such identification had led to negative bias in the past" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 20). Walters (1993) affirmed an inherent bias against people of color, with African American men bearing low social standing (as noted earlier in chapter 1). Per CRT, it must be addressed, otherwise it is a reinforcement of the racist status quo. This further solidifies the need for racial consideration.

A CRT analysis of *Master Plan*, with its primary goal being to ensure broad and universal access to the growing numbers of individuals who sought a college education in California, exposed the master narrative of this policy document that assumed neutrality, colorblindness, and equal opportunity to achieve UC eligibility and admission, and asserted fair methods of assessment and evaluation (an assertion that included the premise that educational institutions and society were devoid of racism) The architects of the document, themselves, affirmed an absence of neutrality where race was concerned, though their flawed decision was to not consider it at all, rather than find a way to eliminate or lessen bias when it was revealed on the application. Therefore, the system already had implicit bias. Colorblindness assumed everyone was White, or had White norms, rather than recognize that there was a wide variety of racialized experience as it related to society and education. The only "fair assessment" for eligibility and admission would account for this inherent bias, and empower the UC to dismantle, eliminate, or mitigate it. Silence, and the absence of relevant language, perpetuates the bias, and then solidifies it, through silent consent.

Connection with Institutional Theory. Institutions are "multifaceted, durable social structures, made up of symbolic elements, social activities, and material resources" (Scott, 2001, p. 49). "They display" unique properties and are fairly resistant to change (Scott, 2008, p. 57) "Institutions by definition are the more enduring features of social life …giving 'solidity' [to social systems] across time and space. They can be transferred across generations, maintained, and reproduced (Scott, 2008, p. 57)." *Master Plan*, much like the institutions it created, involved structure, function, and coordination that reflected the pillars of institutional regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive systems:

> These are differentiation of functions, recommended priority lists for the establishment of new institutions, and the structure, function, and co-ordination of publicly supported higher education in the state. The first of these was assigned to the Joint Advisory Committee whose membership was augmented for the duration of the study by the appointment of the presidents of four independent institutions. This committee, like the technical committees, submitted its report directly to The Master Plan Survey Team. (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 24)

The regulative aspects of *Master Plan* were attempts to provide structure, function, and coordination:

> Although structure, function, and co-ordination are each sufficiently important to warrant a separate chapter, they are discussed together because of their intimate interrelationship. As the Survey proceeded, it became obvious that no one of the three problems could be settled alone; the solution of each required determinations for the other two (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 27). The Survey Team concluded that three major possibilities for restructuring the state higher education deserved more thorough consideration: (1) a single governing board for both the state colleges and the University; (2) a super board over the governing boards; and (3) two separate but parallel autonomous governing boards. For reasons given … the first two were rejected and the third adopted. (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 32)

Master Plan constrained and regularized behaviors, supplied rules, and provided a governing board to monitor and sanction activities in its establishment of the UC

eligibility and admission criteria. The regulatory process of *Master Plan* established the rules, instituted mechanisms to ensure conformity to them, and manipulated sanctions (rewards or punishments) in an attempt to influence future behaviors. More specifically, the institutional logic underlying the regulative pillar was an important one in the development of *Master Plan,* since the UC wanted to advance its interests to serve as the leader of higher education and designate the role(s) of the other public higher education institutions (the CSU and CCC systems) in California. The regulative system of *Master Plan* assigned missions to the different higher education segments, specified eligibility targets, with the UC responsible for the top 12.5% of all graduating public high school students, and expressed the state's intent that higher education should remain accessible, affordable, high-quality, and accountable. The UC was in direct competition with private schools for high achieving students, another incentive to encourage exclusivity. Either way, the narrowing to a "top percentage" narrows access.

Master Plan exemplified the normative systems of Institutional Theory by consistently expressing its foundation of values and norms. It imposed constraints on social behaviors, and enabled social actions of the UC, by conferring rights and responsibilities, privileges, duties, and mandates on all public institutions of higher education in California:

> It is the belief of the Survey Team that modification of the status quo projected distribution of enrollments among the various segments of higher education is necessary. Achievement of modified projections based on the assumptions given earlier in this chapter will place emphasis in the state colleges and the University of California on the divisional levels most appropriate to their defined functional responsibilities. Such modifications will allow these segments to concentrate more of their resources on the upper division, and graduate students who will be

131

seeking admission in greater numbers in the years ahead. The reduction in the number of lower division students attending these institutions will, moreover, contribute to the further strengthening of California's well-developed junior college program. (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 65)

The values and norms articulated in *Master Plan* included managing enrollment demand, overseeing the geographic and programmatic growth of California's higher education institutions, ensuring broad and universal access, and providing a place for all students who aspired to pursue a postsecondary education in California. The values and norms articulated in *Master Plan* involved institutional self-evaluation and emphasized the stabilizing influence of social assumptions and norms that were both internalized, and imposed by the government. *Master Plan's* infrastructure included a monitoring body to ensure that it was fulfilling the charges it was granted.

A political or cultural-cognitive system analysis of *Master Plan* included "shared concepts that constituted social reality and created the frames through which meaning was made" (Scott, 2003). *Master Plan* had an internal interpretation that was shaped by several external cultural frameworks. More specifically, Douglass (1999) argued that "the cultural groupings were the cognitive containers in which *Master Plan* defined and negotiated California's social interest in the differentiation of functions, access, and differentiation of admission pools in public higher education" (p. 12). "Proceeding on the assumption that a constitutional amendment is unlikely to pass if opposed by any one segment, the team then undertook to work out the composition of a coordinating agency that would be acceptable to all segments" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 38). Viewed through a cultural-cognitive lens, *Master Plan* provided the opportunity for the

UC to operate at multiple levels, from a shared definition of the local situation, to the common frames and patterns of assumptions that comprised the organization's culture, the organizing logic that structured the organization, and the shared assumptions and ideologies that defined *Master Plan*.

Master Plan Renewed

Merit defines the academic quality of student expected by UC (Theme 1). This document made no specific reference to merit, nor any reference to the quality of students the institutions sought to recruit. The purpose of *Master Plan Renewed* was to meet the growing population and diversity within the state of California through unity, equity, quality, and efficiency ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 3). Quality in this document did not refer to the type or level of student preferred by California's higher education institutions, but to the type of instruction that should be provided to students. Quality, because it was not defined, assumed the norms of the committee, or that the default was then the restrictive definition of merit from the original Master Plan, since there was no specific ratification of that language. Therefore, the renewed version was identical in terms of White normative academic expectations that characteristically marginalized the African American male students/applicants. Therefore, there was an intent to address diversity, but in terms of merit, there was no actual policy action that allowed this intent to be realized.

The structure of admission and eligibility determines access of qualified students to UC (Theme 2). Extending from *Master Plan*, *Master Plan Renewed*

presented studies, and proposed changes to admission and eligibility policies, that would accommodate the economic and demographic needs of California's high school students.

As stated in the document, *Master Plan* provided access to higher education to an unprecedented number of students. These students were an ethnically homogeneous population of students who did not have the financial challenges that made attendance at the UC difficult, and were well prepared, 18-22 year-old students. California's changing ethnic demographics was not foreseen, nor was the growing number of older, or part-time, students who would enter higher education. Due to population changes, *Master Plan Renewed* made recommendations to address issues of improving access and eligibility, especially regarding the underrepresented minorities ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987). Suggestions for change included an aggressive outreach program to identify and encourage Californians, particularly underrepresented minorities and first-generation students, to attend a postsecondary institution. Those who enrolled in a CCC would be guaranteed that, if they prepared themselves by completing the transfer curriculum, they would progress to the upper division level at a university and, capacity permitting, the public university campus of their choice. The document noted, "an effective transfer system was essential to meet the needs of California's highly diverse population" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 16).

Within the four core principles discussed in *Master Plan Renewed*, access was "guaranteed to the baccalaureate degree for qualified students" ("Commission for the

Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 4). This agreement differed

slightly from access as framed in *Master Plan*. Qualified students would advance from

lower-division instruction in a CCC to upper-division instruction in a four-year

institution. *Master Plan Renewed* concentrated on the need to safeguard opportunities for

all freshman applicants and existing students to attend the state's higher education

institutions. Access to the UC was more so, but in name only, because after being routed

into community colleges, another bar for admission to the UC system, which might or

might not have room for them, was placed on those students through the medium of

transfer criteria. Since they were primarily composed of minority and poor students, the

policy's race-blind wording further regulated and limited true access to the UC, since it

failed to consider their academic/social/remedial needs.

**Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants are based on the changing needs
of society and the institution (Theme 3).** Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants

were described in both the academic and supplementary criteria. *Master Plan Renewed*

introduced changes to eligibility criteria in which more comprehensive reviews of

academic preparation, co-curricular activities, and student experiences were captured

through the admission process.

Master Plan Renewed recommended changes to admission and eligibility criteria

to accommodate the growing and increasingly diverse population of California. Proposed

changes to the admission requirements included UC selection of first-time freshmen from

those who ranked among the top one-eighth of all California public high school

graduates, with graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools held to the same

levels; and a new UC requirement for students who were not eligible regularly for admission as freshmen (other than those admitted under special provisions) to complete the transfer core curriculum at a CCC. Those who completed the required courses with a minimum grade point average would then be guaranteed access to the UC system as transfer students with full degree credit for that coursework.

Master Plan Renewed articulated the select groups that were eligible for guaranteed admission to the UC, as well as those eligible for transfer into the UC or the state system upon completion of specific requirements. The changes to eligibility criteria were intended to provide increased opportunity for postsecondary education for students within the state of California. The modifications favored the same population who continued to be admitted, the White and Asian students, while race and the other factors that affected the African American males in disproportionate ways were not among list of special considerations. Additionally, the changing needs of society, to incorporate the poorer and discriminated against populations, were only minimally addressed, to the point of being ineffective, and the university's need for prestige superseded a true address of those changing needs.

Diversity of freshman undergraduates is emphasized in establishing and reflecting equality and unity of UC as well as the increased diversity of California (Theme 4). Among the members of committees for respective policies, diversity was a major concern discussed in *Master Plan Renewed*. There was concern among state legislatures regarding whether proposed and/or implemented policies would affect the ethnic/racial diversity of the UC and its campuses.

The state of California experienced a growing, and both ethnically and racially diverse, population in the 1980s; as the state was growing, so too was the freshman applicant pool. *Master Plan Renewed* was the first formal document to address the issue of diversity. Its recommendations for changes in eligibility and admission policies suggested movement toward the recruitment and admittance of underrepresented minorities. *Master Plan Renewed* recommended specifically that "there should be aggressive outreach programs to identify and encourage Californians, in particular underrepresented minorities and students whose family members have never been to college, to attend a postsecondary institution" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 16)

Unity and equity were two core principles discussed in *Master Plan Renewed*, both of which addressed the issue of ethnic/racial diversity and underrepresented minorities. In unifying the admission and transfer system, the document stated that it was the Commission's strong assumption that the admission policy agreed upon in 1960 was correct then, and was still correct in 1987 ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987). The CCC campuses had the physical capacity, and with the reforms recommended by the Commission, had the academic capacity, to deal with a large increase in lower-division transfer enrollment at considerably less cost than the UC or the CSU systems.

Master Plan Renewed also presented a guarantee of equity in various aspects of a student's educational experiences, to ensure that all California residents had an opportunity to be admitted, secure a mentor, and be taught by faculty and staff who

reflected their backgrounds ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987):

> To substantially raise the admission and retention rates for underrepresented minorities, we must significantly increase the number of minority faculty mentors on the campuses. Very small numbers of underrepresented minorities are now in the "academic pipeline," and national competition for their recruitment will be intense; graduation rates among Black, Hispanic, and American Indian, and certain other underrepresented groups are low in both the California State University and the University of California. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 22)

Master Plan Renewed referred to the growing ethnic/racial diversity in the state of California, and the resulting need for its higher education institutions to accommodate its diverse populations. Despite the discussion of efforts to address the demographic shifts of California, *Master Plan Renewed* acknowledged that not all members of all racial and/or ethnic groups would have the same academic potential to be eligible for the UC or the CSU systems. The proposal to strengthen transfer programs was an effort to encourage all minority students in the CCC system to develop their academic skills, and to help them prepare to take advantage of academic opportunities at UC or CSU. *Master Plan Renewed* addressed the importance of the UC reflecting the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the state of California, at the institutional level, in the context of both the changing demographics and needs of California. While race, minority status, and what they would need was specifically mentioned, none of it was favorable. Their solution was not broader access for minorities to the UC system, but more concentration on access to the community colleges (which then assumed a direct route; however, the only real direct route would be freshman admission). They acknowledged minority

138

students would be unqualified for immediate UC admission, but they wanted to address this at the CCC level, and by recruiting more faculty. Neither solution addresses the needs of the students. The UC would get more prestige via faculty recruitment of limited minorities (something they acknowledged was competitive), and they also assigned the community colleges to "qualify" students, rather than setting up admission and remediation policies at the university that would include these students. The least academically qualified, therefore, remained the least qualified, despite wording allegedly intended to bring them into the UC system.

Race is reflected through the inclusion of all ethnicities, specifically in the form of unity and equity (Theme 5). Race is a social construct, not a biological phenomenon (Haney-Lopez, 1994). *Master Plan Renewed* did not use the word "race," or its derivatives, except in the context of affirming a commitment to equality and unity among UC students. *Master Plan Renewed* outlined and described unity and equity as two goals of *Master Plan*. Two of the four principles outlined in the document focused on unity, "to assure that all elements of the system work together in pursuit of common educational goals," and equity, "to assure that all Californians have unrestricted opportunity to fulfill their educational potential and aspirations" (*Master Plan Renewed*, 1987, p. 3). Race could apply to the way equity was described in *Master Plan Renewed*; however, the document makes no reference to equity for specific demographic groups. African American males were never addressed in either document, and this failure to address race was reinforcement of racism, or an inherently racist policy. There was an absence of language that would create potential change and make African American and

African American males "present". How can there be unity and equity among groups of people if those groups are not identified?

The mission of UC represents the guiding principles and intentions of UC and its campuses (Theme 6). The UC's mission to teach, conduct research, and provide public service are the three pillars of its mandate as a research university. The UC is engaged in several aspects of California, and has both a national and international presence with its ten campuses, five medical centers, three national laboratories, one hundred and fifty academic disciplines, six hundred graduate degree programs, and over two hundred and forty thousand students (UCOP University of California, Office of the President, 2016b). The UC is also home to sixty-one Nobel laureates, and two hundred and sixty-four Fulbright award recipients. Six of the UC system's ten campuses are members of the prestigious sixty-two-member Association of American Universities (AAU). (UCOP University of California, Office of the President, 2016b). The UC's faculty and students are key players behind inventions that shape and affect the lives of people in the United States, and throughout the world (UCOP University of California, Office of the President, 2016b). The UC trains almost half of the medical students and medical residents in California (UCOP University of California, Office of the President, 2016b). Lastly, the UC is involved in the educating of millions of California's K-12 students, with its educational partnership programs, teaching centers, graduate programs, and outreach programs. The intent of the UC's mission has remained the same over time, as outlined in the original version of *Master Plan*. The UC's mission statement in 1974 articulated its three primary functions as

The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organizational knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge. ("Mission statement from the University of California Academic Plan," 1974-1978, p. 1)

The UC recognized that in order to preserve the high academic quality, and the prestige

perceptions of the institution, it would have to address the demographic changes

occurring in California. More specifically, the equity narrative confronted the fact that

many Californians, "particularly Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians, continue to be

underrepresented in the postsecondary system" ("Commission for the Review of Master

Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 5). The underrepresentation of the aforementioned

groups, coupled with their growing numbers within the state, would not only negatively

affect these groups because of the societal barriers to educational opportunity, but the

entire state would be disadvantaged, both because of the economic and social effects of

the lack of a postsecondary education for these minority groups, and the failure of part of

the UC's mission to public service. The quality narrative in the UC's mission spoke to

the UC's responsibility for "improving instruction in the public school through

improvement in the training of teachers, basic research into methods of teaching and

learning, and the encouragement of professional service to the schools by college and

university faculty" "(Commission "for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education,"

1987, p. 5). The UC, mindful of the important roles it served within the state,

acknowledged that investment in the postsecondary educational opportunities of all its

citizens would "pay large dividends to the state in terms of a highly-trained, well-educated populace with enhanced opportunities for social, political, and economic growth" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 6). Finally, the UC's mission to teach, conduct research, and provide public service, would enhance California's strength, based on its readiness to invest in the education of all the State's citizens ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987). The purpose of *Master Plan Renewed* was to

> maintain, but also build upon the successful elements of *Master Plan* with additional significant provisions that would respond to new challenges while recommending changes directed toward the achievement of four principal goals: unity (all elements of the system working together in pursuit of common educational goals), equity (all Californians having unrestricted opportunity to fulfill their educational potential and aspirations), quality (excellence characterizing every aspect of the system), and efficiency (making the most productive use of finite financial and human resources). ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 3)

As part of the mission of *Master Plan Renewed*, the Commission "reexamined the roles and missions of California's public and private postsecondary institutions in light of the changes that have occurred and may be expected as the state approaches the 21st century" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 9). While asserting that "what is in *Master Plan* may be reaffirmed," *Master Plan Renewed* also proposed that "the mission of each of the public segments should be stated with greater clarity in terms of its contribution to instruction and research within a unified system" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 9). The UC's stated mission excluded meeting the educational needs and viable opportunities for African American male constituents. Overall, the UC is not meeting their mission for

142

certain segments of the population, and this is especially true for the least educated, and the least academically prepared, which according to UC eligibility and admissions data, is African American males. Their exclusion is therefore directly tied to the mission of the university. So, the UC either: overlooks them; fails to truly consider them; appears to consider them, but does so in name only; actively discriminates against them; or utilizes some combination of those actions.

Prestigious universities maintain a level of quality among their undergraduates and the institution overall (Theme 7). As the population of California grew and became more diverse, UC redefined prestige to reflect an accommodation for the growing and diverse needs of society. *Master Plan Renewed* upheld the original *Master Plan,* and suggested carrying out some of its stated intentions. This included the specific intentions of differentiation of mission, and broad and universal access. Specifically, these intentions included that each of the segments, the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University, and the University of California (UC) would carry out their assigned functions, and that this action was dependent upon the UC's admission policies. The Commission assumed that the policies established in *Master Plan* continued to be valid. However, *Master Plan Renewed* detailed changes, which needed to be made, to accommodate California's changing demographic, and would potentially affect the prestige of the state's higher education institutions. *Master Plan Renewed* (1987) focused on unity, equity, quality, and efficiency, addressed students, faculty, and institutions as a whole, and referenced the theme of prestige more than *Master Plan*. The changes for African American males were

143

in name only, if by quality they meant using the same academic qualifications for defining merit; therefore, it appeared that university's needs, in regard to handling the shifting demographics, were more important than the needs of the students who were represented by those demographics.

Summary of Themes within *Master Plan Renewed*. Five themes were identified within *Master Plan Renewed*. The theme of access was demonstrated in how the structure of admission and eligibility affected qualified students; in particular, it addressed which students had access to the UC. *Master Plan Renewed* identified the need to consider educational opportunities for all freshman applicants and existing students to attend the states' higher education institutions. The theme of eligibility was articulated in the UC's efforts to address the changing ethnic/racial demographics of California, and the public institutions that served the state, by developing criteria for freshman applicants that were described as both academic and supplementary. The changes to the UC's eligibility criteria provided greater opportunity for all students to participate fully in the public postsecondary educational opportunities in California. The theme of race was reflected in the references to, and inclusion of, all racial groups, affirming a commitment to equality and unity among students who sought a UC education. The mission theme was reflected through the four principal goals (unity, equity, quality, and efficiency) that built on the key tenets of *Master Plan*, but also met the new challenges of the UC. The theme of prestige continued to manifest itself in *Master Plan Renewed,* as it had in *Master Plan*, with its responsibility to admit the top 12.5% of high school graduates, ensuring that it educated only the top students as defined by "A-G" courses, GPA, college preparatory

course enrollment, and standardized test scores. The UC's concern with, and concentration on, increasing and maintaining prestige outpaced all stated intentions, specifically as they would apply to more access and inclusion for African American males.

Connection with Critical Race Theory. Analyzing *Master Plan Renewed* from a CRT perspective forced me to take a closer look at the definition of merit as articulated in Chapter 2, and its associated role with access, race, mission, and prestige. CRT questioned the neutrality of the UC eligibility and admission standards. From a CRT framework, race was a part of *Master Plan Renewed* that reframed California's higher education rhetoric, suggesting that, whereas many students have excellent K-12 educational experiences to prepare them for UC, academic preparation can and often does vary by race. A CRT analysis argues that "the majoritarian storyteller recalls history selectively, minimizing past and current racism against communities of color and disregarding the unequal K-12 schooling conditions that lead to minimal college access" (Yosso et al., 2004, p. 7).

The myth of meritocracy, as interpreted previously by the UC eligibility and admission policies, reached a climax in *Master Plan Renewed*. The assumption in *Master Plan* that UC eligibility and admission was afforded equally to all of California's public high school students was based in the hypothesis that institutions of higher education in California were devoid of racism and bias; *Master Plan Renewed* acknowledged the opposite. The document accepted the permanence of racism, and it challenged the UC to look beyond the numbers (i.e., A-G courses, GPA, college preparatory course enrollment,

145

and standardized test scores) and include race as a factor for consideration in the UC's admission selection policies. Despite California's shifting demographics, moving from 87% White and 13% non-White in 1960, to 83% White and 17% non-White in 1980 ("Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1960 & 1980") "schools serving large concentrations of low-income students, as well as those serving large numbers of Blacks and Latinos, disproportionately receive fewer of the resources that matter in a quality education, resulting in lower student achievement" ("Joint Committee to Develop," 2010, p. 2). However, the gatekeeper for UC admission, the standards for UC eligibility, were not modified. *Master Plan Renewed* saw the permanence of racism as a normative aspect of United States society, and made accommodations for it, but it did not consider the realities of local conditions and contexts that affected students' performance, thereby continuing to impose a White norm for college-bound students' academic achievement. Consequently, distancing academic performance from the experiences of students' lives and school conditions, the construct of UC eligibility effectively masked the existence of social and structural inequities that persisted in the African American males' lives (Harper, 2012b).

A CRT perspective argues that *Master Plan Renewed* continued use of the UC's construct of eligibility, one based solely on academic indicators of achievement, had disparate effects on students of color, especially African American males. *Master Plan Renewed* relied on the constraints of UC eligibility, which represented an implied intentionality on the part of policymakers, many of whom were White males, to exclude

or marginalize African American males, who typically performed the lowest on traditional measures of academic achievement (Harper, 2012b):

> Among the graduates of California's public high schools, White students are roughly twice as likely as their Black and Latino peers to attain CSU and UC eligibility, and Asian graduates are roughly twice as likely as their White counterparts to attain CSU and UC eligibility—a relationship that has existed since 1983. ("Joint Committee to Develop," 2010, p. 3)

The interest convergence tenet of CRT established itself at the forefront of *Master Plan Renewed*. The document acknowledged the changing ethnic/racial demographics of the state of California (e.g., more students of color, increasing numbers of immigrants, and a greater proportion of low income students), also noting California's need to respond to the demographic changes by addressing the underrepresentation of African American and Latino students in public four-year postsecondary systems:

> It reflects a persistent pattern of White graduates attaining California State University and University of California eligibility at roughly twice the rate of their Black and Latino counterparts, and Asian students attaining eligibility at about twice the rate of their White peers. ("Joint Committee to Develop," 2010, p. 59)

Interest convergence argued that *Master Plan Renewed*, by devoting an entire section to equity, supported the policy developers' maintenance of the UC's prestige through continuing to accept students with the highest standardized scores, A-G courses, GPA, and enrollment in college preparatory courses. "The Commission confronts the fact that many of our citizens—particularly Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians—continue to be underrepresented in the postsecondary system" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 5). "Not only are the underrepresented groups themselves severely disadvantaged by societal barriers to educational opportunity,

147

but the entire state suffers because of its failure to draw upon the talents of all its citizens" ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 5).

"College readiness" was one concept in the access discourse of *Master Plan Renewed*. Readiness was determined by students' K-12 educational experiences. Current and past research has argued that students of color disproportionately attend schools with fewer resources, have limited access to advanced placement courses, and typically have lower standardized test scores (Fletcher & Tienda, 2010; Hallett & Venegas, 2011; Losen & Martinez, 2013). With minor exceptions, the shaping of this discourse was imbedded in the assumption that people of color are unable to academically perform as well as other ethnic/racial groups, rather than addressing systemic and structural inequities that hinder them from performing well. This assumption focused on their perceived weaknesses, rather than the positive attributes they bring to higher education communities. Race was addressed in *Master Plan Renewed*, exemplifying the recurring, rather than the linear movement of racial reform, since *Master Plan Renewed* was written after the social unrest of the 60s and 70s. As California was becoming more economically, ethnically, and racially diverse, its educational policies needed to respond to the social, cultural, and political changes inherent in a highly diverse society:

> Yet, a highly diverse, postindustrial society will also demand ever more advanced skills in industry, commerce, agriculture, finance, government, and other fields. It will demand, too, more firmly held common values and a deeper understanding of the currents of social, cultural, and political change that will continue to shape the lives of peoples and nations for centuries to come as they have for centuries past. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 3)

Master Plan Renewed maintained racial justice as the underlying value in its eligibility

and admission policies that could help the UC move toward the goal of racial equality.

Analytically speaking, CRT argued that the contingencies involved in racial inequality,

the dominance of Whiteness, coupled with converging and colliding interests between

groups, and the intersections of race with class and gender, were contained within *Master*

Plan Renewed. In other words, *Master Plan Renewed* acknowledged that some people of

color might have far more privilege and opportunities than other people of color.

The connection between *Master Plan Renewed,* and the notion that colorblindness

existed within K-12 educational structures, functioned to obscure the realities of White

privilege that existed in public schools due to the segregation and desegregation of these

schools. *Master Plan Renewed*, as analyzed from a CRT perspective of colorblindness,

connected with questions of student academic achievement, teacher quality and seniority

funding, and college preparatory course offerings and enrollment policies. Additionally,

Master Plan Renewed did not address the ways K-12 was structured, policies were

adapted, and practices were implemented that served to advance broader political, social,

and economic purposes (Gillborn, 2015). College preparatory or AP course enrollment

requirements, which were presented as objective, served to legitimatize the disadvantage

of students who might be unequally affected by inherently biased practices and policies.

Moreover, the choice of which college preparatory classes were offered, to whom they

were offered, when they were offered, and whose cultures and languages were

represented in them at a given school (Yosso, 2002), were not explicitly addressed in

Master Plan Renewed:

In 1960, the public schools were not recognized as a significant issue for higher education. The school system was believed to function reasonably well, college students were adequately prepared, and little was heard about dropout problems, inadequate teacher preparation, or the need to improve the public-school curriculum. Since then, our judgments and expectations have changed profoundly, and these matters are now the subject of vigorous debate. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 2)

Furthermore, the liberal ideology of colorblindness assumed that we lived in a meritocracy where educational access and academic success was achieved on a level playing field. The way K-12 education in California is actually structured is racially unequal, with limited infrastructure to assist African American males in achieving UC eligibility and admission. K-12 education in California is not colorblind, as illustrated in its funding, teachers' credentials and level of expertise in the subject matter, and course offerings based on race, socioeconomic status, and school location (Tintiangco-Cubales, Kohli, Sacramento, Henning, Agarwal-Rangnath, & Sleeter, 2014). In 2007, Regent Lansing argued, "there is a shortage of credentialed, qualified teachers in both the urban and rural areas, which is a major impediment to providing students with A-G courses" ("Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy," 2007, p. 6).

The concept of the permanence of racism requires acceptance of the roles that race and racism have played in our society, through various actions and omissions (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). The language used in *Master Plan Renewed* reflected its recognition that race matters, however this articulated need was not met. It appears that all it intended to do was for naught, because African American males were not specifically addressed. It would be necessary to directly address the subject of African American male students at that intersection, because of the gross inequities in K-12

education that single them out for non-access, rather than access, to UC. *Master Plan Renewed* called for each segment of California's public higher education to strive to approximate the ethnic, gender, and economic structure of California's high school graduates (Douglass, 1999).

Connection with Institutional Theory. *Master Plan Renewed*, like *Master Plan*, had a formalized rule system, and the rule system included its obligations. The institutional logic underlying the regulative pillar was that policymakers developed rules and policies that they assumed would advance their own interests, creating the perception of expanded opportunity in *Master Plan Renewed*. More specifically, a comment to Gary Shansby by Glenn Rothner exemplifies this position:

> The comments that follow should not be misinterpreted as general disagreement with our process or report, which I voted to adopt and generally endorse. I am particularly pleased with the recommendations designed to increase the representation among the students and faculty of underrepresented segments of our diverse society, the recognition that educational quality suffers from increased student-faculty ratios and excessive use of part-time faculty, and the Commission's warning to the public that we can maintain educational opportunity and quality only through the repeated modification of Article XIII(B) of the State Constitution-the Gann limitation. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 76)

The values and norms espoused in *Master Plan Renewed* included addressing the changing demographics of California by providing more access, and including reference to race in UC's admission policies, but only to the extent that the system maintained its definition of merit and supported the UC's mission and quest for prestige. "The success of the whole enterprise is heavily dependent upon the extent to which qualified students from all backgrounds are encouraged to progress through the system" ("Commission for

the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 7). The values and norms

adopted by all aligned with the cultural-cognitive acknowledgement that California

needed an educated population to meet the demands of the 21st century, yet *Master Plan*

Renewed assumed that students were not operating from a level playing field. The

students did not all have an equal opportunity to achieve UC eligibility and admissibility

based on the traditional measures of academic achievement and a strong work ethic.

> Within this framework, our report contains recommended modifications to carry California postsecondary education into the 21st century. Changing demographics, need for a better educated citizenry, increased demand for more highly trained workers, and the evolution toward a global society are the basis of these recommendations. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. i)
>   This diversity is a resource that must be carefully and sensitively developed to ensure the continued success of our state as a society and as a world leader. As we approach the 21st century, our interaction with the rest of the world will demand the entrepreneurship, multiple talents, language abilities, and understanding of other cultures that a diverse society offers. ("Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education," 1987, p. 1)

The values and norms contained within *Master Plan Renewed* stressed the importance of

the "logic of appropriateness" (March & Olsen, 2011, p. 160), which determined

appropriate policy adjustments based on the situation, the changing demographics, and

the unrest in the United States *Master Plan Renewed* assumed that UC had an obligation

to ensure a postsecondary education to the top 12.5 percent, inclusive of African

American males. "The University of California shall select first-time freshmen from

those who rank among the top one-eighth of all California public high school graduates,

with graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools held to at least equivalent

levels" (Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education, 1987, p. 15).

While the document gave lip service to address racial inequities it was just that and the institution (UC) was more protected by *Master Plan Renewed* than the students this new version claimed would be included. African American males were not "carefully and sensitively" developed for admission as it articulated in the low UC eligibility and admission rates. The numbers and inequities for eligibility to UC are so dismal in this population that a "careful and sensitive" approach is not effective enough –that such an approach better serves UC rather than African American males.

The cultural-cognitive pillar of UC, as established in *Master Plan Renewed*, noted the role of the social construction of a common framework of meanings related to merit, mission, access, and prestige.

Committee on Educational Policy

Merit defines the quality of student expected by UC (Theme 1). The University of California wanted to enroll students who represented the highest level of academic performance and defined merit accordingly. The UC's strict reliance on a definition of merit utilizing the experiences and standard of academic quality based on White students, A-G requirements, GPA and standardized test performance supported this position, the academic quality of students was not a specific topic of any policy meeting minutes obtained, however, eligibility and admission criteria pertaining to the quality or meritocracy of students were discussed. The discussion of merit and the expected academic profile of UC students articulated the UC's expectations that merit was based on academic criteria. At the May 19, 1988 meeting, *Proposed UC Policy on Undergraduate Admissions* (the first obtainable dated Committee on Educational Policy

document) was presented to Regents and advising faculty, explaining the academic profile of student applicants expected by UC and CSU. The document specified that "the University seeks to enroll, on each campus, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic and socioeconomic backgrounds characteristic of California" (Board of Regents 2102, 1988, p. 1). Although the definition of merit and admission criteria were not solely based on academic criteria, Regents supported the position that students enrolled at UC should meet high academic standards.

The definition of merit permeated the July 16-17, 2008 meeting, which also included a discussion by *Academic Senate "Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy"* and explicitly stated the level of merit expected from UC admission to conform to regent guidelines, within the following principles:

> UC Admission should be awarded primarily on the basis of academic achievement during pre-college years; assessment of this achievement should be based on multiple sources of evidence; assessment of achievement should account for circumstances in which it occurred; and all of California's college-ready students, regardless of background, should be afforded the chance to have their qualifications fairly and accurately assessed for purposes of admission to UC. ("Academic Assembly Passes," 2008, p. 2)

The Academic Senate's proposal sought to address two main problems. The problem relevant to this discussion was the "level of academic achievement," or the merit of the applicant (Academic Assembly Passes, 2008, p. 2). As one regent stated, "Most eligible students are in fact high-achieving students, but it is not the eligibility status that provides information to the UC regarding an applicant's quality" (Committee on Educational Policy, 2008, p. 12). The president put it in simpler terms: "There are highly qualified

students who are competitive with admitted students and the University is overlooking them" (Committee on Educational Policy, 2008, p. 12). By "expanding the discretionary zone … under a more holistic admissions process, the thinking is that UC may achieve greater diversity and quality of its student body" (Committee on Educational Policy, 2008, p. 12).

The narrow definition of merit continued to be challenged at the January 19, 2011 meeting that discussed *Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*, during which the president recommended alternative evaluation criteria for admission, a proposal that was approved. One of these resolutions addressed a specific guideline from the 1988 *Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*—the reference to merit: "The University of California … seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent" (UCOP University of California Office of the President: UC Regents adopt changes to freshman eligibility, 2012, p. 1).

The policy documents and the discourses that surrounded the development of these policies signify the challenges that UC had in identifying and securing meritorious indicators other than academic criteria, and definitions of merit that are inclusive of the ethnic, racial and socioeconomic realities and diversity of Californians. More importantly, the discourse acknowledges that UC's admissions policies are exclusive of ethnic and racial minorities as well as low-income students. Lastly, it illustrates how important prestige, defined by the academic indicators of high school GPA and standardized tests scores, *U.S. & World News Rankings* and selectivity were to UC.

When UC could not neatly and jointly prioritize racial access and merit, merit won out, which by default means that White normative cultural expectations won out.

The structure of eligibility and admission determines access of qualified students to UC (Theme 2)**.** The constraints imposed on UC by its eligibility construct challenged UC to reconsider its reliance on academic criteria alone to admit freshmen. The meeting on July 14, 1988 presented *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions,* which would go into effect in the Fall semester of 1990. Regents decided that between forty and sixty percent of freshman applicants at each campus shall be selected strictly on the basis of "academic criteria" ("UC Eligibility and Admissions Study Group, Final Report", 2004, p. B-2-4), Whereas the remaining freshmen [under fifty percent shall be selected on the basis of "special circumstances adversely affecting applicants' life experiences, and ethnic identity, gender, and location of residence" ("UC Eligibility and Admissions Study Group, Final Report," 2004, p. C-1-3).

The UC continued to be challenged by its policy requirements to facilitate broad and universal access to enrollment on each of its campuses after implementation of SP-1 and Proposition 209. Consequently, although there were two pathways to achieve UC eligibility, through statewide context or examination, the UC continued to struggle to ensure eligibility, admission, and enrollment of underrepresented students. UC needed to find alternative ways to address this problem. At the November 14, 2001 meeting, *Proposal for Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions* was discussed. The president recommended changes to UC's admission policy:

Effective for students entering UC for Fall 2002, the Regents' policy expressed in the 1995 SP-1 resolution (Policy ensuring Equal Treatment—Admissions) and referenced in the 2001 RE-28 resolution (Future Admissions, Employment, and Contracting Policies—Resolution Rescinding SP-1 and SP-2) will be modified to eliminate the provision that no less than 50 percent and no more than 75 percent of the regularly admitted class be admitted solely on the basis of academic achievement and institute a comprehensive review process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment. (Regents of the University of California: The Committee on Educational Policy, 2001, p. 1)

The July 16-17, 2008 meeting included a discussion of *Academic Senate Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy,* which noted additions to traditional ways in which freshman could access and become eligible for admission to UC. The revisions to eligibility criteria, the requirements for the new category called Eligibility in the Local Context, and the newly defined applicant pool of those Entitled to Review, provided additional pathways for high school graduates to access UC.

The UC was persistent in its efforts to try to mitigate the effects of SP-1 and Proposition 209 and ensure the admission of underrepresented students, and continued to seek ways to facilitate inclusion. The January 19, 2011 meeting discussed the *Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*, in which the president recommended resolutions to be adopted. The 1988 Policy on Undergraduate Admissions contained a comment concerning access: "The University of California campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of California high schools and regions to achieve the potential of the University's admission policy for California's students" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2011, p. 2). The significance of the structure of eligibility and

admission determining access of qualified students is that if high school students do not obtain UC eligibility as defined by "A-G" course completion and grade point average and performance on standardized test scores, they would not be considered for admission to UC. The policy changes provided the UC the ability to expand access to racial/ethnic and economically disadvantaged students, increase admissions by expanding the number of students who would be considered eligible for admission, i.e. those who rank within the top 4% of their graduating class or Eligibility in the Local Context. This change was the first policy-based acknowledgement that K-12 schools differently prepare students and have access to differential resources. This policy change also recognized that merit can be measured and achieved in multiple ways considering students' educational and psychosocial experiences and challenges. The UC's policy of Eligibility in the Local Context was also a recognition that K-12 schools in California are highly segregated along racial and economic lines (Kahlenberg, 2013). Lastly, the shift defined eligibility within the context of the student's educational environment and expanded the number and academic types of student who would be considered for admission, which accepted the assumption that not all students have the same educational opportunities and often traditional measures of potential for timely graduation at the UC are not the best measures for racial, ethnic and low-income students. In addition, for African American males this continued their exclusion as they are not represented within college preparatory courses nor at the top of their high school graduating class. The meetings confirm the customary exclusion of African American males and although this was an attempt to expand access to them and others, there was a continued discrepancy in intent

v. outcome that was predictable. In addition, while concerns of access may have been raised at these various meetings/committees they did not make it into policy in a concrete way or a way that outweighed merit and prestige.

Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants are based on the changing needs of society and the institution (Theme 3). The construct of UC eligibility and academic preparation for academic persistence, timely graduation and preparation for graduate and professional schools at UC dominated the UC admission policies for years. *Master Plan* was utilized as the policy document to align UC's eligibility criteria with the goal of enrolling the top 12.5% of high school graduates while maintaining broad and universal access as articulated in *Master Plan*.

Academic Criteria. During the July 14, 1988 discussion of *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*, the following eligibility criteria were approved to be implemented in the Fall semester of 1990:

> (a) GPA calculation of all academic courses completed in subject areas specified by UC's eligibility requirements; (b) scores on SAT, ACT, and College Board Achievement Tests; (c) review and consideration of the number and content of courses completed beyond the minimum specified by UC's eligibility requirements; and, (d) review and consideration of the number of UC approved accelerated, AP, and honors courses completed or in progress. (University of California Admissions, p. 2)

The January 20, 2000 meeting included *Examination of Factors Related to Academic Underperformance and Underachievement*. Regents acknowledged that "given the challenge that the University of California faces in working within low performing schools, there is enormous potential for generating improved student achievement and enriching the effectiveness of the UC's partnerships with the K-12 segment" (Regents of

the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000 p. 2). This challenge included eligibility limitations for students at low performing schools, many of whom were minority students who sought to attend UC. Professor Noguera stressed that UC's outreach programs were "a long-term approach that will not pay off immediately in the increased eligibility of underrepresented students", (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000, p. 6) and that programs within K-12 schools that could improve student access and eligibility to UC and/or other selective institutions still include the use of standardized tests as a measure—one that is perceived invalid—of a student's overall knowledge (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000). The regent further noted that the standardized SAT exam could also limit the number of students eligible for UC admission, especially those from low performing schools.

The May 15, 2002 meeting included a presentation of *The Status Report on Implementation of the Eligibility in the Local Context Policy* (*ELC*), which went into effect for the Fall 2001 admission cycle at UC. *ELC* made "the top four percent of each California high school class eligible for UC if they have completed specific academic course work by the end of the junior year" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2002 p. 1). Under this policy, "virtually all the students who were identified [as qualified] became eligible using statewide criteria" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2004).

At the July 16-17, 2008 meeting, Regents discussed components of *Academic Senate Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy*:

Students who are eligible for UC but not admitted to any campus to which they applied are placed into a referral pool. Such students will receive a referral offer of admission to a campus with remaining space, which in recent years has been UC Riverside or UC Merced … [R]eferral offers of admissions are declined by the vast majority of students who receive them. Virtually all applicants who are found by the reviewing campuses to be ineligible are denied admissions, many of whom are high-achieving. (University of California Academic Senate, 2008, p. 9)

The committee reviewed the current eligibility requirements.

(a) the applicant must take the SAT or ACT, (b) the applicant must complete the "A-G" curriculum, consisting of 15 year-long courses certified by UC in every California high school, and (c) the applicant must meet the minimum threshold on the eligibility scale—a sliding scale index based on GPA and test scores. (University of California Academic Senate, 2008, p. 1)

The alternative for high school students to achieve statewide eligibility by meeting these three requirements was ELC, under which applicants were required to achieve a 3.0 GPA, take the required "A-G" courses, and rank in the top 4% of their graduating class. The Entitled to Review category of eligibility allowed the inclusion of "students who satisfy certain minimal markers of college readiness. Under the proposal, such students are not guaranteed admission, but do receive a commitment from UC that their application will be reviewed comprehensively" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008 p. 13).

The narrative changed with these policy changes. The adherence to strictly academic criteria to determine UC eligibility and admission selection proved to be an ineffective policy. The discourse and policies developed to provide a new path to UC eligibility and potential admission, Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) and Entitled to Review (ETR) expand the academic criteria expected of potential UC students. This discourse and policy development evaluate students' academic performance within the

161

context of the student's learning environment and seeks to provide them with an equal opportunity to secure a space on a UC campus. These pathways, different from previous pathways, redefine merit and access that ensure more representation of all racial and ethnic groups as well as low-income students. Additionally, these pathways continue to ensure that UC maintains its prestige as academics remain center stage since the determination of ELC is based on "A-G" course enrollment and performance in those courses, yet a pool for admission consideration that includes all racial and ethnic groups is ensured. However, whereas this pathway ensures eligibility, it does not guarantee admission and is yet another factor for consideration in the admission selection process utilized by campuses. Similarly, ETR expands the pool of applicants for admission consideration and continues to maintain its mandate under *Master Plan* to enroll the top twelve and a half percent of the graduating high school seniors. Whereas ETR is an improvement it not enough since African American males are not enrolled in significant numbers in "A-G" courses. Additionally, ETR is not specific or substantive enough in addressing the challenges faced by African American males throughout their K-12 educational experiences. Instead, these adjustments address what UC "understands" which is a variation of their pre-established requirements – ones that prove exclusionary to African American males. In addition, the proposed K-12 programs – which schools will UC provide services and to what extent will they operate – sufficiently enough to ensure eligibility. If the answers do not get at the "bottom of the bottom" ranking wise and social stratification wise, they will not reach African American males.

Supplementary Criteria. Over time, recommendations were approved to include

additional criteria, such as co-curricular activities and leadership services, in the

admission process. The additional criteria expanded the growing pool of qualified

students eligible for UC admission. Regents discussed admission eligibility

considerations such as special talents and achievements, extra-curricular activities, and

services that demonstrated the student's leadership. Supplementary criteria were applied

to select freshman applicants after 60 percent of academically qualified students were

selected. Regents stated that the remaining percentage of freshman admitted, exclusive of

applicants admitted through special action, should be selected utilizing academic and

supplementary criteria:

> Special talents, interests, or experiences that demonstrated unusual promise for
> leadership, achievement, and service in particular field, and special circumstances
> that adversely affected applicants' life experiences, such as disabilities, personal
> difficulties, low family income, refugee or veteran status, ethnic identity, gender,
> and location of residence, were to be considered in order to provide cultural,
> racial, geographic, and socioeconomic diversity within the student population.
> (Douglass, 2007, p. 144)

On May 18, 1995, the Special Committee on Affirmative Action Policies presented its

report, *Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate and Professional*

School Admissions. Within the report, two specific elements of the admission policies

that referenced eligibility to UC were identified as a "commitment to admit all state's

eligible applicants to one of University's campuses" and to "ensure fairness in the

admissions process" (Pusser, 2004p. 88).

During a March 18, 1999 meeting, *Proposed Establishment of UC Freshman*

Eligibility in the Local Context was presented, with eligibility criteria that would make

approximately 300 high school students newly eligible without displacing any other

student from the eligibility pool. These criteria required that high school students

> (a) be identified at the end of their junior year, (b) not exceed 4% of juniors who
> were on track to graduate from a particular high school, (c) complete a specified
> pattern of required courses by the end of their junior year, (d) be selected through
> a ranking of the GPA achieved in the required academic courses, and (e) apply for
> admittance and complete remaining eligibility requirements prior to enrollment as
> a college freshman. (University of California Admissions, p. 1)

The significance of this additional pathway to UC admissions would be to

consider students within the context of the academic, social and economic conditions in

which they academically achieved. This was another important step in UC policymakers

acknowledging that high school students have differential educational experiences based

on their high school of attendance, course offerings at their high school and

socioeconomic status and ethnic/racial demographics. This expanded consideration was

an important component of defining merit in a more inclusive way, expanding access,

understanding the structural impediments imposed by the statewide path of UC

eligibility, and holding true to the mission of UC. Yet it still assumes avenues of

leadership activity, and the like that are less prevalent in schools that African American

males attend. What's more supplementary is expansive, but it is still not primary, which

means priority on merit defined as academic achievement remains the core focus. Lastly,

no measurement of how special admission criteria may outweigh or interrupt core

academic criteria makes the whole process more subjective and therefore the default is

reliance on merit defined narrowly, which takes African American males back to the

bottom.

Comprehensive Review. In meeting the needs of an increased and diverse

population of California, UC approved a broad evaluation of freshman applicants that

considered all the information in the freshmen's application and evaluated students'

achievements in the context of their school and personal circumstances.

During the October 17, 2001 presentation of *Report on Comprehensive Review of*

Undergraduate Admissions, members and the president discussed UC's "formula for

eligibility that combines grade point average and test scores. The University asserts that

every UC eligible California student would be admitted to a UC campus" (Regents of the

University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2001, p. 3). They argued for

the use of comprehensive review during the admission process, agreeing that "the

comprehensive review process is important for highly selective campuses that are not

able to admit all eligible students" (UCOP University of California Office of the

President: Comprehensive review, 2001, p. 5).

At the November 14, 2001 meeting, *Proposal for Comprehensive Review in*

Undergraduate Admissions was presented by the Academic Senate. Within the proposal

was a statement that reflected eligibility and admission opportunities addressing a greater

number of freshman applicants. "The proposal reinforces the underlying tenets of related

UC eligibility criteria, including the Eligibility in Local Context" (Regents of the

University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2001, p. 3). Eligibility in the

Local Context as well as Comprehensive Review were adopted "to widen the eligibility

pool" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2001, p.

6). Therefore, UC could continue to support the principles of *Master Plan* to facilitate

broad and universal access and enroll an undergraduate student body that better

reflected the ethnic/racial and socioeconomic diversity of California. Although

Comprehensive Review is better, it is not enough as it concerns African American males.

Policymakers and admissions personnel would need to have more a comprehensive

understanding of African American males' K-12 educational experiences to develop and

conduct an adequate Comprehensive Review. UC should consider expansion and

deepening of the admission application that will draw and/or qualify more African

American males.

Diversity of freshman undergraduates is emphasized in establishing and

reflecting equality and unity of UC as well as the increased diversity of California

(Theme 4). The changing ethnic, racial, and socio-economic demographics of California

challenged UC to, in a meaningful way, intentionally seek avenues to foster the

inclusivity of all Californians in its eligibility and admissions policies discourses and

policies.

Growth. During the presentation of *Proposed UC Policy on Undergraduate*

Admissions at the May 19, 1988 meeting, a reference was made to diversity as part of

UC's mission. Consequently, UC admission policymakers were compelled to consider

ways in which its admission policies were aligned with this goal. In other words, UC had

a social and moral responsibility to ensure that as a public institution receiving public

dollars (state funding), it served the needs and population of the state of California:

> Mindful of its mission as a public institution, UC has a historic commitment to
> provide place within UC for all eligible applicants who are residents of CA.
> Beyond that, the University seeks to enroll, on each campus, a student body that

demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of CA. (UCOP University of California Office of the President: UC Regents adopt changes to freshman eligibility, 2012, p. 1)

The senior vice president brought to the attention of the meeting that "there had been no policy, no guidelines on the subject [of quota or numbers for underrepresented minorities] however it had been [the] University's practice to have each campus reflect a diverse student body" (Pusser, 2004, p. 62). A UC regent reinforced the notion that quotas were not a part of UC's admissions policies:

[The proposed] policy does not propose quotas or a commitment to specific percentages of ethnic groups; the University, as it defines its affirmative action programs, takes into account the percentage of minority students who are present at any given campus, although no quota is imposed. (Pusser, 2004, p. 62)

Other members discussed their concern that the proposed policy could be interpreted as a description of the way in which UC will allocate its eligible students to provide for diversity on each of its campuses. Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 was also brought to the attention of attendees. It called upon the Regents to increase the representation of minorities to reflect the composition of high school graduating classes. During that same meeting, *Report on UC Admissions and on Admissions by Special Action* was presented. A regent suggested "it would be appropriate for BOARS to develop a method by which Chancellors could identify minority students who are not eligible for admission but who have the potential to succeed at the University" and noted that, at the time, there was "no sense of how successful each campus has been at bringing in underrepresented minorities through special action (Board of Regents 2104, 2001). This discourse indicated that race was indeed an important consideration if UC wanted to ethnically and racially diversify

who enrolled at UC and compelled the university to develop ways to achieve this goal.

The recognition, policy discourse, and policy development that Chancellors would

identify minority students - American Indian, African American and Latino students - to

admit to UC signified that the traditional criteria, "A-G" course enrollment and

performance and scores on standardized exams, were not the only valid measures of

student merit in an unequal K-12 educational system.

During the May 18, 1995 presentation of *Special Committee on Affirmative Action*

Policies: Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate and Professional

School Admissions, UC's admission process was discussed as shaped by four elements,

one of which addressed diversity:

> The eligibility requirements are exclusively academic in nature and include no consideration of criteria such as ethnicity or disadvantage. The policy allows up to 6% of newly enrolled students to be admitted by exception to the eligibility requirements, of which two thirds may be used to admit students from underrepresented minority, low income or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. In 1994 of 22,400 enrolled freshmen University-wide, 1,025 or fewer than 5% were admitted by exception. Of these, 19% were African American. The University designates as underrepresented any ethnic group whose rate of eligibility falls significantly below 12.5%, and considers African Americans and Chicano/Latinos to fall into this group. The eligibility gap that separates Whites and Asian Americans from African Americans and Chicanos/Latinos is the reason ethnicity is used in the admission process. (Pusser, 2004, p. 88)

Therefore, UC concluded that it needed to utilize race and or ethnicity in its admissions

criteria to help facilitate and ensure inclusion of American Indians, African Americans

and in its undergraduate student body. This consideration would also affirm UC

commitment to *Master Plan's* tenet to enroll the top 12.5% of the graduating high school

seniors. UC recognizes that measures need to be taken, yet that they are still avoiding

concrete numbers-related tracking and closing the gap requires this. Addressing African Americans is important and a 19% representation of African Americans among the small 5% admitted through special exception demonstrates overrepresentation in this population, implying significant exclusion without it. African American males are still a minority within a minority and that non-gendered policy that addresses minorities in terms of education, by default favors or addresses girls over boys among African Americans.

Providing Opportunity. UC was concerned with ensuring opportunities for access to its campuses for underrepresented minorities. At the January 20, 2000 meeting on *An Examination of Factors Related to Underperformance and Underachievement*, statistics from the past thirty years were discussed. These statistics indicated that certain groups of students, particularly African Americans and Latinos, had lower scores on general aptitude tests used for college and professional school admission than other groups. These data produced a negative effect on higher education's attempt to be as inclusive as possible. A regent also emphasized the importance of considering the "relevance of standardized tests and how they are used … in order to avoid a complete drought of minority students at selective institutions" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000, p. 5).

In the November 14, 2001 meeting, the Academic Senate presented its *Proposal for Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions*. The proposal acknowledged that the recommended process placed greater emphasis on a rigorous review of the academic coursework from a student's four years of high school. It also acknowledged

the range of educational settings in California and rewarded those who had achieved the most with what was available to them. As a regent suggested, the "process demonstrates the value the University places on different backgrounds and opportunities" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2001, p. 8).

The July 16-17, 2008 meeting included a discussion of the Academic Senate's *"Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy."* The president suggested that by "expanding the discretionary zone … under a more holistic admissions process, the thinking is that the UC may achieve greater diversity and quality of its student body" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008, p. 12). Criticisms were shared, one that "the availability of "A-G" courses affected minority admissions." Affirming his commitment to diversity, the UC's president recommended that "presenters return to the Regents with their best estimate of the proposal's effect on diversity, including specific data, or reports that support an assumption that the proposal will increase diversity" (Committee on Educational Policy, July 2008, p. 18). Despite efforts and conflict, the policymakers remain unsure of how to best include racial diversity without diminishing "quality" – as if the two are somehow in conflict with each other or inherently mutually exclusive. Additionally, this still does not get at including African America males since a deep understanding and acknowledgement of the K-12 educational experiences are not fully considered. Even in providing opportunity, it is more focused on accounting for academics/merit than actual broadened access – despite intention.

Race is reflected through the inclusion of all ethnicities, specifically in the form of unity and equity (Theme 5). The UC's efforts to include all racial and ethnic groups in its admissions pools were addressed in the UC's early discussions to include for admission consideration students whose educational and life experiences were not those of mainstream Californians who could benefit from a UC education while the UC could benefit from their enrollment. More specifically, the advantage of including minority students in higher education according to Kerby (2012) includes, diversity on college campuses, which is not just a benefit for American Indian, African American and Latino students. "The ability to learn with and academically engage with people from a variety of backgrounds encourages collaboration and fosters innovation, thereby benefitting all students" (Kerby2012, p. 2). "Research shows that the overall academic and social effects of increased racial diversity on campus are likely to be positive, ranging from higher levels of academic achievement to the improvement of near- and long-term intergroup relations" (Kerby, 2012, p. 2).

Moreover**,** the implications of race-neutral policies in higher educational opportunities are detrimental to the state of California**.** Admission policies that do not consider race are predicted to "decrease representation of students of color at the most selective four-year institutions by 10 percent" (Kerby, 2012, p. 2). With 50% of the projected workforce being people of color, less education of this population is under educating 50% of the workforce. Given that our future workforce is projected to be representative of at least half people of color, it will be important for the UC to create policies and process for facilitating and expanding eligibility and admissions

171

opportunities to all students. Lastly, scholars have already debunked the myth that a class-based admission system is an adequate replacement for a race-based admission policy as a means of creating greater levels of diversity. A study by a Harvard professor, concluded,"None of the alternative admissions models analyzed could replicate the composition of the student population that was in place before the termination of affirmative action in California (Koretz, Russell, Shin, Horn, & Shasby, 2002, p. 39). "Giving preference to students on the basis of other socioeconomic or demographic variables had only modest effects on the representation of black and Hispanic students; none that we examined brought minority students to proportional representation." (p. 27). A wide breadth of research concludes that race-conscious practices are necessary in some capacity to achieve a level of diversity that truly encompasses the diversity of California (Kerby, 2012, p. 3).

The May 18, 1995 meeting presented *Special Committee on Affirmative Action Policies: Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate and Professional School Admissions*, which stated that the UC's admission process was shaped by four elements, two of which specifically referred to the theme of race: A commitment to the tenets of the California Master Plan for Higher Education and a commitment to sound educational principles, especially academic excellence and diversity (Pusser, 2004, p. 88).

As discussed under the theme of diversity, commitment to the tenets of California Master Plan for Higher Education recognized the need for broad and universal access to the UC. The policy allowed up to 6% of newly enrolling students to be admitted by

exception to the eligibility requirements, and up to two thirds of such exceptions (or 4% of all newly enrolling students) could be used to admit students from underrepresented minority groups, low-income households, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. In 1994, of the 22,400 enrolled freshmen at the UC, 1,025 (fewer than 5%) were admitted by exception. Nineteen percent of those admitted by exception were African American. The eligibility gap that separated Whites and Asian Americans from African Americans and Latinos was noted as the reason that ethnicity was used in the admission process (Pusser, 2004).

The meeting minutes also indicated that the UC had made concerted efforts to increase the number of eligible underrepresented minority students, encouraged enrollment among the small number who were eligible, and attempted to provide a welcoming environment when they arrived. It also noted that system-wide goals were no longer set for the number of underrepresented students each campus should strive to enroll. The Committee on Educational Policy further noted that the progress of eligibility was steady until 1989 when, as an effect of the economic downturn, there was a decline in the overall number of high school graduates, especially African Americans. Relatedly, competition from other institutions served to reduce the number of underrepresented students enrolling at the UC; the number of African Americans enrolled in 1994 lagged behind the number enrolled in 1988, which was the peak year for this group (*Beyond Bias,* 2007). However, the meeting minutes pointed out that UCLA enrolled freshman classes in the previous five years that were representative of the entire California population, and that the campus would not have reached its present level of ethnic/racial

diversity without the use of ethnicity/race as one of the additional factors in the

selection process. The report concluded with the idea that, given the secondary

educational experiences of minority students in California, it was essential that the

applications of underrepresented minority students or students with high levels of

socioeconomic disadvantage (who were also in the lower academic ranks) be considered

to achieve broader access and diversity (Pusser, 2004). Overall, policies not specifically

addressing African American males still leave them the least enrolled demographic group

in terms of representation in the state. Ultimately, race and ethnicity must be included

and articulated if the UC wants to be achieve true racial/ethnic diversity.

The November 14, 2001 meeting included *Proposal for Comprehensive Review in*

Undergraduate Admissions. Upon approval of the comprehensive review as part of the

admission process, the Committee recommended an amendment per the UC president's

recommendation:

> There shall be an annual review and reporting to The Regents of the effect of this
> action and that, in approving the action, the Board of Regents states that these
> comprehensive review policies shall be used fairly, shall not use racial
> preferences of any kind, and shall comply with Proposition 209. (UCOP
> University of California Office of the President: Comprehensive review, 2001, p.
> 1)

Proposition 209 made it illegal for any campus to deny or grant access to a student based

on race. Both the amendment and the president's recommendation to include the

comprehensive review within the admission process were approved.

During the May 15, 2002 meeting, specific racial groups were identified in the

Status Report on Implementation of the Eligibility in the Local Context Policy.

Specifically, the report noted that "the percent of Latino applications stimulated by ELC totaled 14 percent and for African Americans 7.5" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2002, p. 11). In other words, this policy was positively affecting the number of African American and Latino applicants who could achieve UC eligibility and possibly admission. This was significant because it expanded the pool of eligibility students, increased the racial and ethnic diversity of the UC eligible pool and increased the probability that the enrolled undergraduate student body would reflect the racial and ethnic demographics of the state.

The July 16-17, 2008 meeting included a discussion of the Academic Senate's *Proposal to Reform the University of California Freshman Eligibility Policy,* with reports on the "racially disparate outcomes in eligibility and admissions" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008, p. 10). Based on the May 2008 meeting, the report indicated that the UC's eligibility construct had disparate effects on students, based on their racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds as well as their high schools of attendance:

> The University does have some exposure in terms of [those] outcomes and that it has a responsibility to determine whether these outcomes are educationally justified or whether alternative practices might achieve the UC's admissions objectives with less or no disparate impact. (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008, p. 10)

A report the Undergraduate Work Team of the Regents' Study Group on Diversity indicated, "that disparate impact on eligibility and campus admissions were severe but could be minimized through best practice approaches in admissions" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008, p. 10). Regents pointed

out that "the University has a practice of reviewing its admission policies on a periodic basis" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2008, p. 10). Consequently, the UC was mandated to consistently review and conduct the appropriate studies to assess the effects of its admission policies to ensure that they were in alignment with the UC's commitment to reflect the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the state of California, and the mandates of *Master Plan*. The removal of race/ethnicity in consideration was removal of other demographics that were already disadvantaged by the White normative system – namely SES and high schools of attendance (as stated in the quote on the prior page). Essentially, because race is so intertwined with other forms of disenfranchisement, within and beyond education, eliminating it as prioritized factor created more inequality by downplaying related social and educational factors as well. In short, it is important to include all types of diversity that do not adhere to the established, White norm. This is truer for African American males given the social political environment in which they exist as well as their K-12 educational experiences and college attendance expectations.

The mission of UC represents the guiding principles and intentions of UC and its campuses (Theme 6). The UC continued to recognize that in order to preserve the quality and perception of the institution, it would have to reflect the demographic changes that occurred in the state. Since a primary mission of the UC is to serve the people of the state of California, there was pressure from the legislature and ethnic and racial groups, to reflect the racial and ethnic make-up of the state and continue to enroll the top one-eighth of California's high school graduates. Moreover, the UC sought to

176

maintain its mission to teach, conduct research, and provide public service to its

stakeholders in California and the world.

Commitment to Educational Goals. The May 19, 1988 meeting addressed

Proposed UC Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. Within the discussion there was

reflection on the mission of the UC.

> Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the UC has historic commitment to
> provide a place within the UC for all eligible applicants who are residents of CA.
> Beyond that, the University seeks to enroll, on each campus, a student body that
> demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that
> encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic and socio-
> economic backgrounds characteristic of CA. (UCOP University of California
> Office of the President: UC Regents adopt changes to freshman eligibility, 2012,
> p. 1)

The importance of this policy statement was the UC's acknowledgement that as a public

university, committed to broad and universal access and ensuring the enrollment of all

citizens in the state of California who academically achieved within the top one-eighth of

high school graduating seniors, the UC developed admission policies to ensure

enrollment of students who reflect the cultural, racial, geographic and socio-economic

backgrounds characteristic of California and Comprehensive Review should achieve this

goal. Comprehensive Review argues that inclusivity of curricular and co-curricular

aspects of a student's K-12 educational and life experiences is instrumental in ensuring

this important enrollment objective.

The May 18, 1995 discussion of the report of the Special Committee on

Affirmative Action Policies, *Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and*

Graduate and Professional School Admissions, acknowledged the mission of the UC as

applied to the admission process, noting the UC's "commitment to sound educational

principles" (Pusser, 2004, p. 88), especially academic excellence and diversity. As

discussed under the theme of eligibility, the UC would not have reached its present level

of ethnic diversity without the use of ethnicity as one of the supplemental factors in the

selection process.

      Strengthening Legitimacy. In maintaining its relevancy as an institution, the UC

built upon the main tenets of *Master Plan*. However, building upon the tenets of *Master*

Plan required the consideration of a more comprehensive review of applicant information

that would allow for a larger and more diverse undergraduate student body that reflected

the growing and diverse population of California.

      During the July 17, 2002 meeting, a *Report of the Review of Master Plan* was

provided to fulfill the requirement of a 10-year review. The purpose of the review was "to

learn from the success of the original *Master Plan*, which has made California's public

higher education systems the envy of the world, and to create a blueprint for restoring K-

12 education to the leadership position it once held" (Regents of the University of

California: Committee on educational policy, 2002, p. 2). The UC's concern was to

ensure that "in this process no harm was done to the guiding principles and practices that

have served the state well for over forty years" (Regents of the University of California:

Committee on educational policy, 2002, p. 2). The intent of the report and review was to

ensure that the main tenets of the 1960 *Master Plan* continued to be executed. This would

ensure that the UC would maintain its commitment to broad and universal access and

could redefine merit in a more inclusive manner while maintaining its prestige as nationally recognized system of Tier I research universities.

The January 19, 2011 meeting presented the *Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*, during which the president recommended resolutions to be adopted. One recommendation in particular was also noted in the 1988 *Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*:

> Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the UC … seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity … of backgrounds characteristic of California. (UCOP University of California Office of the President: UC Regents adopt changes to freshman eligibility, 2012, p. 1)

Although the policy reflects the UC's intent to represent the state of California in its undergraduate student body, this means that five percent of the undergraduate student body should be African American and half of that should African American males. However, the UC's construct of eligibility and its admission policies continue to marginalize and disenfranchise African American males because the social political environment in which they receive their K-12 education is not acknowledged. Additionally, these policies do not take into consideration the low social and educational status as well as the negative images projected of African American males in the media and within society. Prestige still tops the priority list and the language itself, the "leading" of academic and personal talent (as measured through academics and merit) ahead of diversity is indicative of the true admissions priorities.

Prestigious universities maintain a level of quality among their undergraduates and the institution overall (Theme 7). *Master Plan's* requirement that

UC's accept the top one-eighth of high school graduates and the related eligibility and admission criteria placed the UC at the top of the hierarchy of selectivity within California's public universities. This placement ensured that the UC would be viewed as more selective, academically rigorous, and prestigious among higher educational institutions in California and the United States in addition, admissions selectivity is often used by institutions interested in promoting themselves to gain higher visibility and, ultimately, greater distinction.

The importance of prestige was affirmed by neglecting to mention its implication within *Master Plan*. Failure to address prestige's priority, leaves it as a priority and this benefits a certain elite, of which African American males are most definitely not a part of and have limited to no access to become a part of. It also equates "quality" of undergraduates with "ranking" of the university. If quality defines merit then the university is equating its standing with the academic and therefore educational and socio-cultural standing of its students, which for the UC is the top 12.5 percent–which of course, is not African American males, so "broad and universal" access is not involved or prioritized.

Summary of Themes within Committee of Educational Policy Meeting Minutes. All seven themes were present within the Committee of Educational Policy meeting minutes. Although each theme was not reflected in every set of meeting minutes analyzed, more than one theme was referenced within each of the Committee of Educational Policy documents. The themes of merit and access were reflected in half of meeting documents. Although admission criteria are not solely merit based, and therefore

not referred to specifically, Committee minutes showed agreement that students

enrolled at the UC should meet high academic standards, and reflect the quality of

student admitted by the institution. Therefore, access, the second theme, was noted to be

limited to those meeting the level of academic quality expected by the institution. The

theme of eligibility was apparent in all meeting minutes. Committee members reviewed

and approved academic criteria, supplementary criteria, and the later addition of

Comprehensive Review to the admission process. Discussions about how the UC could

accommodate the growing pool of freshman applicants, while enhancing its racial, ethnic,

and socio-economic diversity, continued and led to a more thorough review of applicant

information, which examined personal experiences and talents to include in the admission

selection process. The themes of diversity and race also appeared within meeting

minutes. Diversity of freshman undergraduates was emphasized in establishing equality

and unity at the UC and reflecting the increased diversity of California. In as much as

diversity was referred to within policies and documents, race was only reflected through

the inclusion of all ethnicities, specifically in the form of unity and equity toward

underrepresented minorities, such as African Americans and Latinos. The theme of

mission was evident in various meeting minutes. With each proposed change to eligibility

and admission criteria, committee members acknowledged *Master Plan*. Committee

members referenced the theme of prestige in one meeting designated to review *Master*

Plan's success in making California's postsecondary education system "the envy of the

world" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2002,

p. 2). All the themes were addressed in ways that overlooked the particular needs or what

would best provide actual access to this intersectional demographic of African American and male. The decision to place prestige as defined by academic merit has created a stratified educational system that has negatively affected African American males' access to the UC.

Connection with Critical Race Theory. The Committee on Education Policy discourse focused on the UC admission policies with eligibility as a pathway to admission, unlike the previous policy documents, *Master Plan* and *Master Plan Renewed*. The foundation for analyzing the discourse of UC admission policies from a CRT framework is in the concept of the UC eligibility. Whereas admission criteria differed from campus to campus, all applicants who sought admission to the

UC were required to meet system-wide eligibility standards, standards that changed over time to ensure compliance with *Master Plan*'s expectation that they accept the top 12.5% of high school graduates.

Through a CRT lens and its focus on the permanence of racism as a normal factor of what occurs in society, our social world with its rules, practices, assignments of merit and prestige, and the corresponding power these assignments yield, is socially constructed by what verbiage is provided by and absent from policy documents. The discourse in the meeting minutes of the Committee on Educational Policy supported the argument that Whites would encourage the racial advances of African Americans when they promoted White self-interest. "Keeping California competitive is dependent upon raising student achievement and closing the gaps among groups of students … confident that there is broad, bipartisan support in the Legislature for the need to address this

achievement challenge" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2004, p. 2).

More specifically, there was a growing interest in inclusion within the UC's admission policies as directed toward students and communities of color, which considered a more comprehensive and contextual view of the admission requirements. This committee's quest to secure other means (beside race) to be inclusive, such as a comprehensive review which included both curricular and co-curricular aspects of a student's life and eligibility in the local context, was facilitated by self-interest. The demographics of California and the expectation of communities of color within California that students of color would be marginalized and discriminated against forced the discussion. (Parish, 2017The meeting minutes articulated that change was necessary, yet must occur at a pace deemed favorable or realistic by the UC so as not to be unsettling to the larger society or risk destabilizing the credibility or prestige of the UC:

> It was recalled that, despite progress, California is still confronted by significant disparities in educational outcomes based on race, ethnicity, and income level … The consequences of these disparities in graduation rates inevitably also affect the college-going rates of these populations. (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2007b, p. 8)

The dominant narrative of meritocracy found throughout these meeting minutes that simultaneously affirms anyone can attend UC, exemplifies the myth of merit as an equal opportunity construct:

> Regent Island expressed his concern about data indicating that 70 percent of schools where minority students make up the majority of the student body do not offer "A-G" courses. He stressed that SAT scores and "A-G" coursework are not the sole definitions of merit and the potential to contribute to society. (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2007b, p. 6)

The meritocracy narrative is coupled with the prestige of the UC and the assumption

that prestige is coupled with selectivity, limited access, and counter to the UC's support

of broad and universal access. Rather than challenge the notion of meritocracy and its

structural impediments, as it was defined narrowly by traditional academic measures ("A-

G", GPA, course enrollment, and standardized test scores), the discourse in the meeting

minutes sought to address it in other ways, especially after Proposition 209 made it illegal

to make race an admission criterion. Instead of examining race, the policymakers

considered factors such as what courses were available for students to take at their

schools, if they were the first in their family to attend college and socioeconomic status:

> Regent Lansing noted that there is no doubt that many schools do not offer "A-G"
> courses, including basic math courses. She stated that this is one of the greatest
> problems that the UC faces in fulfilling its mission and suspected that it greatly
> affects diversity at the UC. Regent Lansing emphasized the need for the UC to
> start addressing other ways to meet the goals of access and diversity, in addition
> to its current outreach programs. (Regents of the University of California:
> Committee on educational policy, 2007b, p. 6)

In addition, to seeking alternatives to race as a consideration for admission, the UC talked

extensively about the importance of developing a pipeline of UC eligible and

"competitive" students to enlarge the pool of underrepresented students applying to the

university:

> Regent Lansing declared, that these outreach strategies form "a core part of
> California's public educational mission … [by assisting] to raise academic
> achievement for all groups, enrich academic content, assist students to become the
> first in their families to go to college, align instruction among all segments of
> education and increase [the State's] economic competitiveness. (Regents of the
> University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2004, p. 8)

The significance of the regent's focus on outreach strategies appeared to acknowledge that in order to ensure a diverse and academically competitive future pool of UC applicants, the UC needed to work with the K-12 public system in an expansion of its outreach efforts to include pipeline development, and teacher training. It was clear that the UC needed to work with K-12 schools and community organizations to ensure they understood the academic expectations of future students and K-12 align their academic and programmatic initiatives to support and reinforce these important goals.

The myth that access is solely the result of hard work, and has nothing to do with systemic racism in the UC's eligibility and admission policies, is misguided. Each year, admission counselors identify top students attending top schools, but these students are usually White or Asian and middle-class. Additionally, many of the schools attended by people of color offer fewer course options and academically inferior courses. Therefore, racial diversity is minimized as "White students fill up university seats, and fewer students of color are represented" (Patton, 2016, p. 327). CRT argues that

> the lack of representation is not accidental yet by design: institutions, states, federal policies, and policymakers—most of whom are White—all play a role in who gains access to higher education and who is afforded prime opportunities to thrive in these environments. (Patton, 2016, p. 196)

Given the preponderance of post racial rhetoric, higher education as an entity has been complicit in submitting to the ideals of colorblindness and race neutrality, which are neither blind nor neutral in their negative effect on African American males.

The discourse attempted inclusion and access for all Californians to the UC via its eligibility and admission policies, but

typically resulted in three outcomes: (a) a diminished significance of race due to diversity efforts in eligibility and admission, (b) an understanding of inclusion that was synonymous with race only, or (c) a huge burden of the work toward racial diversity placed on racial minority groups. ("A Manual on Admissions")

"The selection and retention devices suggested will not guarantee either that all able young Californians will go to college or university or that those who do will attend institutions best able to serve their needs" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 77). *Master Plan* and its eligibility and admission policy documents have racially coded language that further marginalized people of color. These policies used White males as the standard to which students of color were measured, and when students were deemed to meet this standard, they gained access or UC eligibility and adherence to one standard or type of student is homogeneity in practice rather than diversity in reality.

The idea of diversity is a worthy concept used throughout the discourse on UC eligibility and admission policies, regardless of context. The Committee's discourse was unwavering in its support of having diversity in its applicant and admission pools. However, committee members debated how to achieve this diversity without the use of race.

As evidenced in the meeting minutes, the UC attempted to move from a definition of merit based on strict academic criteria to a comprehensive review of the student's application and performance, as well as a guarantee of review for every applicant, regardless of their academic profile. "The University particularly acknowledges the acute need to remove barriers to the recruitment, retention, and advancement of talented students, faculty, and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently

underrepresented" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2007, p. 2-3).

The discourse related to determining admission based on more than "A-G", GPA, course enrollment and standardized test scores, and with consideration to the context of the opportunities available to students, supported CRT's critique of liberalism where change is incremental. The UC focused primarily on this academic, often referred to as objective, criteria for over forty years before considering that merit should be defined more broadly, despite the research that indicated a need for a more holistic view of admission (Stenberg, 2010; Stenberg, Bonney, & Gabora, 2012). Additionally, the discourse addressed how concessions to admission policies were made to facilitate the self-interest of the dominant group, and used language that would expand access but not disrupt the normal rate of eligibility and/or admission for the dominant group. Finally, the policy examined the three pathways for admission to the UC, all of which had eligibility and academic criteria at the forefront, making the other items and considerations supplemental additions.

The standards of merit were constructed and articulated in the meeting minutes to maintain the power of dominant groups; the admission policy statements reflected this notion. Merit had no real meaning, except as a way for those policymakers to preserve the existing hierarchy and for the UC to maintain its prestige in national and international reputation and rankings. The evolution of the UC admission policies and shift in language acknowledged that judging all races by the same academic standards and assuming they all had the same opportunities neither broadened access nor supported an even playing

field. However, the discourse related to admission policies and the UC eligibility

contradicted the policy changes. The language in the policy documents addressed

admission, yet did not address eligibility. What's more, the discourse continued to utilize

Master Plan as a backdrop for eligibility, accepting the existence of systemic racism in

K-12 education and reinforcing structural and institutional racism (DeCuir & Dixson,

2004).

The discourse linked the achievement of UC admission with individual academic

success including timely graduation and preparation for graduate and professional

schools. Language such as comprehensive review and achievement within the local

context supported the notion of Hiraldo's (2010) mention of DeCuir & Dixson's (2004)

"colorblindness as a mechanism that allows people to ignore racist policies that

perpetuated social and educational inequity" (Hiraldo, 2010) and provided incremental

palatable change. This language continues to ignore the psycho-social-, economic and

political experiences and depictions of African American males while permitting a small

palatable, socially acceptable/comfortable, number of African American males to gain

admission to the UC. In addition, this enables the K-12 educational system to continue to

overlook the post-secondary needs and aspirations of African American males.

Connection with Institutional Theory. The institutional logic that underlies the

regulative pillar is one in which policymakers develop rules and policies that they assume

will advance their interests, and create the perception of expanded opportunity in the

Committee on Educational Policy discourse. The values and norms embraced in the

discourse included addressing the changing demographics of California by providing

more access and being mindful of race in the development of UC's eligibility and admission policies while maintaining its definition of merit and support of the UC's mission and pursuit of prestige.

The values and norms supported all aligned with an understanding that California needed an educated population to meet the demands of the 21st century, yet assumed the presence of a level playing field where all students have an equal opportunity to achieve UC eligibility, based on the traditional measures of academic achievement. The UC's pursuit of their interest equated to discriminating against African American males who, education and opportunity wise, are the farthest from White males. In addition, meetings discussing various outcomes, demographics and factors while not honing in on African American males implies a pervasive example of IT. The UC as an institution makes no specified space for African American males in its discussion, let alone in policy.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Papers

Merit defines the academic quality of student expected by UC (Theme 1). On October 17, 2001, during a presentation of *Report on Comprehensive Review of Undergraduate Admissions*, BOARS members shared the details of the comprehensive review under consideration for use in the admission process. Some Regents raised concerns about the possible "erosion of academic quality" (*UCOP University of California Office of the President: Comprehensive Review, 2001*, p. 4) because of the comprehensive review. Additionally, the Regents, as a collective group, stated, "students who are admitted under a comprehensive review process must not be less qualified than those who are selected using the tiered admissions process" (Regents of the University of

California: Committee on educational policy, 2001, p. 8). The Regents speculated that the elimination of the academic tier system would result in lower academic quality and affect the prestige of the UC.

The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal (2007) suggested changes to selection criteria that would "substantially strengthen its commitment to identify and select from the top one eighth of California high school graduates, as mandated by *Master Plan for Higher Education* (p. 283). The BOARS proposal would replace the then current practice of academic achievement, the "required high school courses and standardized tests," with a "simpler and fairer system in which all students who meet specified criteria of college readiness would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their applications" (Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007, p. 283). The UC senior faculty recognized that many qualified high school students were failing to achieve eligibility because "of minor deviations from the specific pattern of courses and tests that constituted the statewide index" (Academic Assembly Passes, 2008, p. 3). BOARS redefined the role of merit, which suggest that the UC recognized that the term could, and should be defined in more than just traditional academic terms. It also suggests that the definition of merit, similar to the high school graduates, needed to change over time to better reflect the experiences of students. The proposed changes to criteria were implemented in 2012. In other words, the same criteria that did not serve African American males was once again recognized – this time by BOARS – as insufficient for UC. Moreover, "comprehensive review" is still missing some relative qualifiers that are inclusive of the K-12 educational and psycho-social experiences of African American males. Consequently, if the

definition of merit and the criteria for admission selection remains the same, African American males will not achieve UC admissions. The criteria continue to marginalize and exclude the experiences of African American males and support the dominant group's traditional definition of merit.

The structure of admission and eligibility determined access of qualified students to UC (Theme 2). At an October 17, 2001 meeting, BOARS members presented *Report on Comprehensive Review of Undergraduate Admissions,* which described the nature of the comprehensive review process to be used in the admission process. As part of freshman applicants' ability to access the UC, BOARS defined comprehensive review as "the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student demonstrated academic accomplishment" (UCOP University of California Office of the President: Comprehensive Review, 2001, p. 1).

BOARS created *UC Freshmen Eligibility Reform Proposal* (2007) with the purpose of inviting applications from a larger number of qualified applicants and then using all of the application information to decide which applicants were in the top eighth. The proposal "invite[d] a larger number of graduating seniors from California public high schools to apply for freshman admission" (Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007, p. 3) or to be identified as Entitled to Review based on course completion and SAT test scores. The new policy would not guarantee admission, but would consider students through a comprehensive application review for anyone who met

certain basic criteria of academic achievement. The proposed changes, made in 2012, were implemented to provide a greater number of students' access to the UC. Proposed and implemented changes identified UC's need to be less limited in their selection of freshman applicants. Recognition that this did not result in significant percentages or changes for African American males would suggest or imply that admission not stemming from course completion and SAT scores was not enough but was a step in the right direction.

Eligibility criteria for freshman applicants are based on the changing needs of society and the institution (Theme 3). BOARS' documents outlined eligibility and admission criteria in 2002 for incoming freshmen and proposed changes. *The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal* (2007) indicated that the effects of proposed changes to eligibility criteria (such as the category Entitled to Review) would be to invite a larger number of high school seniors to apply for freshman admission based on course completion and SAT scores, and would allow campuses to "continue to select freshmen as they do now, using comprehensive review to consider all the information in the application, and to evaluate students' achievements in the context of their school and personal circumstances" (Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007, p. 1). The BOARS proposal replaced the practice of checking the application for the required high school courses and standardized tests without examining academic achievements. This created a fairer system in which all students who met specified criteria of college readiness would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their applications. Alongside this statewide guarantee of a review, the top 4% of each high school class would be

identified by grades in "A-G" courses, as was done in 2007, to determine who was Eligible in the Local Context. This report re-conceptualized the way that the top 12.5% was understood and was implemented in 2014 and has the potential to acknowledge some of the K-12 educational experiences of African American males in the UC's selection process. However, this policy change, does not address the construct of UC eligibility, which continues to serve as a gatekeeper to opportunity.

The University of California Academic Senate (2008) report, examined the effects of the 2012 admission changes that were implemented at the UC. These changes included

> (a) the elimination of the SAT subject test as a requirement for eligibility; (b) a decrease from 12.5% to 9% of California high school graduates who were identified as eligible statewide; (c) an increase from 4% to 9% of graduates who were identified as eligible in the local context (ELC); and (d) the introduction of a new category, Entitled to Review, which assured applicants of a comprehensive review of their application at all campuses to which they applied, truly broaden access to the UC. (Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007, p. 3)

Such changes also brought modifications of the eligibility constructs of GPA and SAT, and affected the demographic and academic characteristics of students who would apply, are admitted, and state their intent to register, facilitating a more diverse population at the UC. Therefore, there was a move to greater racial and ethnic diversity on UC campuses. This policy change has the potential to change the tide, even though not quite enough, and be inclusive of African American males in the future. However, the data needs to be disaggregated to ensure that the challenges of African American males are included in the eligibility and admission criteria.

Diversity of freshman undergraduates is emphasized in establishing and reflecting equality and unity of UC as well as the increased diversity of California

(Theme 4). BOARS' documents proposed changes to the admission and eligibility criteria for freshman applicants. Presented in *The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal* (2007) were findings that "the percentage of California high school graduates who were Chicano, African American or Native American is about two times bigger, and growing faster, than the percentage of UC freshmen from these groups" (Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007, p. 284). One benefit of the proposed changes to selection and admission criteria would be a greater representation of California's various communities and more American Indian, African Americans and Latinos on UC campuses. After implementation of BOARS proposed criteria, the University of California Academic Senate (2008) report presented data showing large demographic shifts, with enrolled students constituting a greater representation of California's diversity. Students who indicated their intent to register were more diverse in ethnicity and socioeconomic status than in the years preceding the change in eligibility policy. BOARS addressed the need to accommodate the growing diversity in California's population, specifically focusing on high school graduates of underrepresented minorities. However, these policy changes did not affect African American males in the same positive manner they affected Asian American and Latino students and this was primarily due to the construct of the UC eligibility. African American males continued to lag behind all other racial and ethnic groups in achieving UC eligibility based on their K-12 educational and psychosocial experiences. In addition, the dramatic increase in Asian American and Latino students in California's K-12 public schools coupled with lack of a critical mass of African Americans' enrolled throughout K-12 schools helped diminish

African American males' probability of the UC admission. The current changes are a step in the right direction but not equitable in reaching underrepresented students, with black males still receiving the least access. In addition, an invitation of more applicants does not do much if the circumstances and high schools from which they are applying fail to be adequately considered.

The mission of UC represents the guiding principles and intentions of UC and its campuses (Theme 6). *The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal* (2007), suggested changes to the eligibility and admission requirements for freshman applicants and African America males still go unaddressed. As BOARS noted in both documents, efforts were made to improve the overall institution of postsecondary education in California, not only by conducting comprehensive reviews of applicant material, but also by performing ongoing evaluations and analyses of reviews and program offerings at the UC, CSU, and CCC.

Prestigious universities maintain a level of quality among their undergraduates and the institution overall (Theme 7). BOARS' documents made no direct reference to prestige and did not imply a concern with prestige; however, prestige was reflected in policy changes to meet the need, and quality of students who applied for admission.

In *The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal* (2007) documents, BOARS endorsed changes to the eligibility of high school graduates that extended selective admission criteria in an effort to invite and enroll a more qualified group of students. This proposal did not preserve the previous practice of guaranteed admission to all students who met a

195

narrow set of criteria based on course taking, GPA, test taking, and test scores, nor did it focus on faculty. Instead, the proposal suggested changes that focused on attracting applications from a broader range of students. BOARS deemed the prestige of UC as reflected in admission practices that would enroll a larger, broader selection of qualified students.

The theme of prestige included a concern with the preservation and extension of the advantages of a selective institution, and that the UC would remain competitive with other prestigious higher education institutions. The UC maintained the aspiration to attract and admit academically high achieving students. Over time, *Master Plan Renewed* and BOARS, while maintaining the institution's commitment to preserving the quality of the institution, demonstrated a need to change the admission standards in order to maintain that level of prestige. As African American males are unassociated and often seen as oppositional to academic prestige by stereotypes, academic qualifications and historically low percentages of UC admission and attendance, relative to other groups – including underrepresented minority males, there is an implication that pursuit of prestige as the institution understands it is not pursuit of these students or opening access to them.

Summary of Themes within Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Papers. BOARS documents included six themes—merit, access, eligibility, diversity, mission, and prestige. The theme of merit was reflected in *The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal* (2007), which suggested changes to selection criteria that would identify, more accurately than in the past, the top one eighth of high school graduates. The BOARS proposal would replace the evaluation of academic achievement

196

with a simpler system and guarantee a comprehensive review of the application

(Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee, 2007). BOARS addressed the theme

of access and proposed eligibility reform with the purpose of inviting applications from a

larger number of qualified applicants. This change led to consideration of all application

information to determine which applicants were in the top one eighth. The theme of

eligibility was apparent in BOARS recommendation to consider applicants' overall

background and experience, rather than only educational attainment, and reflected the

changing needs of society. The theme of diversity, particularly of freshman

undergraduates, was demonstrated in BOARS documents that proposed changes to the

admission and eligibility criteria for freshman applicants, specifically underrepresented

minority high school graduates who mirrored the growing diversity of the state.

Regarding the theme of mission, BOARS members continued to reflect their

purpose; recommendations were made to the UC Regents, the CSU Board of Trustees,

and the Board of Governors of CCC system that could improve the relationship between

California's higher education institutes and K-12 public education. Documents included

recommendations for the improvement of access to UC by the UC admission offices

utilizing comprehensive review of application materials, yet also through ongoing

evaluations and analyses of program offerings at the UC, CSU, and CCC. BOARS

documents noted prestige was demonstrated in changes to policies that met the needs of

applicants yet it is much less so for African American males. BOARS' documents

followed the intention of *Master Plan Renewed*—to maintain the institution's

commitment to preserve the quality of the institution, and therefore level of prestige,

which required a change in admission standards. Whereas these policies are "better but not enough" because these are not specifically taking race into account. Moreover, the policies are not worded in a way that empowers admissions decision makers to account for or measure the systemic and unique educational challenges of African American males in the state.

Connection with Critical Race Theory. The discourse among BOARS members focused on their continued effort to redefine merit while facilitating access and maintaining prestige. "Therefore, the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services, and administration" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2007a, p. 2).

It was determined by BOARS that merit had to be redefined contextually. The discourse that surrounded the definition of merit paid close attention to the lives, experiences, and daily environments of people of color (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Stovall, 2006), contextualizing eligibility and admission policies, since CRT is a contextual framework.

The discourse about the development of updated admission policies continued to ignore CRT's fundamental premise that race matters (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), and that racism in the United States is pervasive. BOARS' members sought to assist with the admission of students of color, especially considering SP-1. However, in this discourse, the policymakers were adamant that academic criteria remain at the forefront of their

consideration so that the mission and prestige of the UC would not be diminished. The traditional measures of SAT, course enrollment, and GPA were continued and remained primary, therefore White male performance remained the standard of acceptable achievement. Therefore, the standards employed are not about true diversity yet compelling a group as unequal from White males as possible to adhere to their norms to gain eligibility and it is discriminatory.

BOARS' members used the coded language of selective admission to support the UC's pursuit of prestige and top national rankings. This language communicated that excellence/prestige and diversity may not go together, because based on their data, students of color did not possess the same academic profiles as White and Asian students. The policy discourse negated the long history and deeply embedded role of race in the United States. Moreover, this particularly negates equitable access for African America males, who as a group are seen as threatening to or oppositional in power and ability to White men. The prestige narrative by BOARS changed and accepted the premise that the process was broken and that race was relevant to admission policy and practices. While BOARS members struggled with the restrictions imposed by SP-1 and the internal and external discourse that surrounded how to acknowledge that race mattered, the UC was unable to use race in admission policies. In other words, BOARS ultimately preferred prestige over racial and ethnic diversity in its admission policies.

The construct of colorblind ideology that focuses on the perspectives of groups who experienced racism and other forms of domination (Bell, 1992; Parker & Lynn, 2002), was discussed and accepted in BOARS' decision to contextually review the

199

students' education and curricular opportunities in the admission process. BOARS members were able to maintain their institutional viewpoint, which ultimately favored prestige, though there were incremental changes typical of liberals that did not do enough to truly level the playing field for African American males. The discourse that pressed for more outreach in underrepresented communities acknowledged that diversity came with the conscious or subconscious acknowledgement of the realities of racism (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000) which includes "practices, beliefs, social relations, and phenomena that work to reproduce a racial hierarchy and social structure that yield superiority, power, and privilege for some, and discrimination and oppression for others" (Cole, 2016). Racism is representational, ideological, discursive, interactional, institutional, structural, and systemic according to Cole (2016). In addition, racism occurs when an unjust social structure is produced by the *failure* to account for race and its historic and contemporary roles in society (Cole, 2016). Although the discourse that surrounded BOARS efforts to redefine merit, and ensure access to UC began to accept the structural, legal, and practical aspects of racism in the United States, the educational and social benefits and opportunities were given out and/or denied based almost exclusively on race, the idea that the UC eligibility and admission policies were not colorblind or neutral, and therefore discriminatory, was not discussed by BOARS. "Colorblindness makes it nearly impossible to understand the normalizing effects of Whiteness. Hence, the colorblind discourse, articulated by CRT, almost always referred to underrepresented students, because being White is considered normal or the default" (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Moreover, the colorblind discourse was adopted as a way to justify ignoring and

dismantling race-based policies. In the case of the policy discourse related to BOARS'

discourse, these discussions were a way for UC to address the challenges that SP-1

presented to the university and were designed to address societal inequity. In other words,

the argument that UC admission policies should be colorblind ignored racism, inequity

and oppression as historical artifacts that would not be remedied by ignoring race.

The notion of interest convergence (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Taylor, 2000), in

the language of comprehensive review and Entitled to Review, demonstrated the familiar

language that revealed a direct benefit to all students—often code for White and Asian

students within the context of predominately White institutions. There was little chance

that the policy would not receive wide acceptance, public approval, or institutional

funding (Solórzano et al., 2000). The interest-convergence discourse reflected the UC's

interest in reflecting "the richness of the state of California in its student population"

(Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education, 1987, p. 44) through

its admission policies and inclusive language about who merited a spot on a UC campus.

The discourse indicated that the UC, as a public university, must address the external

community's concerns that African Americans were shut out based on the UC's

eligibility and admission criteria. According to this logic, African American males,

theoretically, have access to a high-quality education within their current K-12 schools.

Yet studies conducted by the UC related to eligibility and academic performance did not

confirm this assertion (Perna, 2002; Fisher, 2015). Therefore, UC's self-interest in the

definitions of access and merit conflicted with African American males' ability to enroll

and perform well in the appropriate classes to achieve UC eligibility. Moreover, African

American females achieve UC eligibility at twice the rate of African American males (Henderson, 1992).

Gains for underrepresented groups, including African Americans, were discussed throughout the policy documents in the language of fairness to all. In this discourse, "equality rather than equity was pursued; and the processes, structures, and ideologies that justify inequality were not addressed and they were dismantled" (Singleton, 2013, p. 104). This dismantling occurred when race and gender were no longer allowed to address past and current racial discriminatory practices. The remedies assumed that all students had the same opportunities and experiences. Race and experiences based on race are not equal; therefore, the experiences that African American males have with respect to race and racism create unequal situations.

Connection with Institutional Theory. An analysis of the BOARS discourse through an Institutional Theory lens reflected how the broader cultural forces contributed to the stability of practices. "Neo-institutional theory holds that broader cultural scripts guide organizational behavior" (Burch, 2007Organizations adopt the policies and practices that make them look like other organizations and signal their legitimacy. BOARS' discourse sought alternative admission policies and practices to ensure that underrepresented students, including African Americans, were provided an equal opportunity to achieve UC eligibility and admissions:

> The resolution in the current item requests that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of comprehensive review, which is already Regional policy, while allowing flexibility for less selective campuses that can demonstrate that an alternative approach employed is equally effective in

achieving campus and University goals. The resolution builds on existing policy and has been endorsed by both the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Academic Council. (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2011, p. 8)

Institutional theory argues that policy designs and behavior are connected to larger social and cultural assumptions and these frames can change over time (Burch, 2007). Through interaction, individuals and organizations can alter the meaning of policy and create new ways to address problems, and updated frames are incorporated into new policies and the institutions created to support them (Burch, 2007). BOARS' on-going discourse sought to address the challenges of access, inclusion, and definitions of merit, as well as the knowledge that other selective colleges and universities had revised their admission policies to view the student within the context of the opportunities available to them at their high school, minimized or eliminated the importance of standardized test scores, and provided all applicants with a review. The discourse surrounding Entitled to Review was a clear example of this new frame of addressing the social problems of broad and universal access to UC. The Entitled to Review path to UC admission was designed to

> offer greater equity to students from schools where advanced coursework is not as readily available, any applicant who competes eleven out of the fifteen courses by the end of the eleventh grade will be entitled-to-review, but not guaranteed admission, at each UC campus to which the student applies. (Lin, 2009)

Moreover, the discourse reflected the rules and structures of the wider society (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Meyer, Scott, Strang, & Creighton, 1988; Ogawa, 1992) that all students deserved the opportunity to be evaluated fairly and achieve a good education.

Scholarship that applied institutional theory to education also offered explanations for why organizations that were located in diverse settings and had little interaction with

their external communities and other educational institutions tended to adopt policies

and practices that were similar and self-serving (Ogawa, 1992; Rowan & Miskel, 1999).

The BOARS discourse acknowledged the importance of outreach and the need to develop

relationships with the communities in order to become accessible to the communities they

were charged to serve. "UC San Diego can achieve a more diverse student population

only through outreach to prospective students and their families. Efforts therefore far

have focused on helping students from underrepresented groups become UC-eligible,

persuading eligible students to apply" (Regents of the University of California:

Committee on educational policy, 2011, p. 3).

The merging of policies and practices among organizations that operate in similar

environments although competing for the same goods is referred to as structural

isomorphism (Burch, 2007). More specifically, universities often adopt practices that they

think others view as a model (Burch, 2007). This was reflected in the BOARS's discourse

about the UC as the "model" university of access for the country:

> Campuses adopted various approaches to comprehensive review, including a fixed
> weight method …, and the single-score holistic method, characterized by the
> extensive use of context or school-based information to assess individual student
> achievement in the light of opportunities available to each applicant … and UC …
> also began using a holistic model. (Regents of the University of California:
> Committee on educational policy, 2011, p. 8)

More explicitly, when a policy idea gains widespread acceptance across universities, that

is removal of the SAT II exam, the idea gained legitimacy and started to be seen as

necessary in contributing to the university's innovation (Burch, 2007). These ideas could

then become codified in policy, as when BOARS decided to eliminate the SAT II exams

and implement comprehensive review and Entitled to Review to facilitate more underrepresented inclusion in the applicant and admission pools. Spillane and Burch (2006) credit Parson's (1960) statement that "actions taken to align organizations with societal norms and values conflict frequently with activities designed to foster organizational goal attainment" (Spillane & Burch, 2006, p. 88). In the case of UC, the balance between prestige and access was a constant dilemma, yet prestige has always and continues to prevail.

The UC was seen as striving to conform to many different, and potentially inconsistent, rules and regulations, including alternate definitions of merit and the subjectivity of comprehensive review and Entitled to Review utilizing more than quantitative measures of the definition of merit. The UC presented the concern that the implementation of such different rules would produce less qualified students and diminish the prestige of the UC. "Regent Marcus cautioned that perceptions of subjectivity in scoring and inconsistencies among campuses could be troublesome, particularly since UC is a public institution … He stated that admissions standards should be consistent, fair, and uniform" (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2011, p. 11). Therefore, the implication is that inclusiveness and broader access diminish prestige. The larger point of seeking to offer accessibility while steeping reputation in exclusivity is an inherent conflict.

When policymakers identify a problem as meriting attention, they take steps toward resolving it in a new manner with new strategies (Burch, 2007). Over time, these strategies move from being seen by stakeholders as mere ad hoc responses to solutions.

For example, conventional approaches to the definition of merit included standardized test scores, high school GPA in college preparatory courses, and AP course enrollment. In the BOARS discourse, the UC introduced an expanded lens for the way it defined merit as well as ways of selecting students for admission that emphasized the evaluation of students based on contextual information and providing each applicant with a review. The discourse also provided several options to the policymakers who attempted to solve the recurrent UC problem of inclusion and access to the UC for underrepresented students. Their options were to (a) disagree with established practice, (b) ignore the problem, (c) explain it away as a case of something they were more familiar with, or (d) begin to acknowledge the problem as unique and reframe it (Scott, 2001; Suchman, 1995). BOARS chose the last option in its discussions of comprehensive review and Entitled to Review. The BOARS discourse exemplified the term field effects, which refers to increases in the ideological, human, and financial resources available to individuals or organizations addressing a specific issue or problem (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This includes both organizations already involved in the work and those that will become involved in the future. This was exemplified in BOARS' expectation that the UC would include stakeholders, including high school personnel, university non-admission personnel, and university faculty and community members in the review of the UC applicants under comprehensive review and Entitled to Review. Without de-institutionalized instruction, African American males would continue to be viewed less favorably or as less qualified even by these external stakeholders.

Institutional Theory offered a lens for examining the UC's organizational and instructional values and norms that included mandates and policy strategies aligned to those mandates to ensure that UC policymakers could continually provide improvements in eligibility and admission policies (Burch, 2007). The BOARS discourse required that the UC provide annual reports that covered data on the effects and implications of its comprehensive review and Entitled to Review policies. The table below outlines the policy discourses and policy themes and categories within this investigation.

Table 2. *Table of Policies that Reference Variables*

Theme	Categories		
Merit	Quality of Student		
Access	Opportunity Structure	Limitations of Accessibility	
Eligibility	Academic Criteria	Supplementary Criteria	Comprehensive Review
Diversity	Growth	Provide Opportunity	
Race	Inclusion		
Mission	Commitment to Ed. Goals	Strengthening Legitimacy	
Prestige	Preserve a Level of Quality	Change the Standards	

Summary

This investigation addressed the question of whether the current low UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment rates of African Americans males are in part a result of the UC's eligibility and admission policies—policies that are informed by *Master Plan*. Through the theoretical frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Institutional Theory, three broad classifications were chosen to provide insight into how the UC considers merit and eligibility: (a) When UC considers merit and eligibility, what sort of access is it considering (Classification 3)?, (b) What are the intended outcomes of defining merit and eligibility in the ways found in the data (Classification 2)?, and (c) How does UC describe the ways in which eligibility and admission connect to Master Plan (Classification 1)?

Deductive coding was used during the analysis of policy documents—*Master Plan*, *Master Plan Renewed*, Committee on Educational Policy meeting minutes, and BOARS policies—from which seven primary themes were developed: merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. Within each theme, categories were used to identify how, through CRT and Institutional Theory, UC policies addressed the eligibility and admission of underrepresented minorities.

As framed and defined for this investigation, merit referred to academic and/or co-curricular activities. Within the policy documents, the theme of merit was demonstrated through the identification of students meeting a level of academic quality expected by the institution. *Master Plan* stated specifically that CSU would recruit from the top third (33.3%) and the UC from the top eighth (12.5%) of all California public high school graduates (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 73). During subsequent years, other documents proposed to broaden the level of quality of students, yet did not define that level. The theme of access recognized and considered differences in the opportunity structure of African American. However, overall the UC does not – though they do at times, consider African American students without distinguishing gender in their analysis of the effect of their eligibility and admission policies.

Admission and eligibility requirements for undergraduates were found in most documents, especially when proposed changes were made to the criteria by which high school graduates were evaluated for admission. Within all documents that discussed access to the UC and its campuses, committee members agreed that all qualified students should have the opportunity to apply and be admitted to the UC. *Master Plan* stated that "state-supported institutions have an obligation to adjust their offerings and admission policies to meet the long run needs and to fit the fiscal capabilities of the state, as ascertained by constitutional and statutory authorities" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 67). By including this statement, policy creators allowed for changes to admission policies based on the needs of the institution, and this accessibility could be limited to a subset of high school graduates. However, BOARS and the Committee on

Educational Policy continued to propose changes to admission and eligibility policies that would allow greater opportunity for access to high school graduates. These measures did not "reach" African American males in the way it did other minorities and other underrepresented minority males.

Eligibility criteria were prominent in all documents. The criteria expanded from academics to supplementary criteria, and later to a more comprehensive review that included the applicant's academic and co-curricular achievements, as well as consideration of the applicant's background and experiences. Supplementary criteria and a comprehensive review were proposed as a means of expanding the eligibility pool, specifically to increase the racial and ethnic representation on campuses. Failure to consider race, in particular, worked against this intention and ostracized and reinforced ostracizing of African American males.

The theme of diversity was apparent through categories of growth and opportunity. *Master Plan* explored the issue of overcrowding among the state's higher education institutions and determined that the more advanced students would be favored over the less advanced in the state's effort to contain the number of students at UC and CSU. Therefore, underrepresented minority groups were being funneled to CCC. Diversity focused on policymakers' recognition of group difference; as various racial and ethnic groups became a larger proportion of California's population, the UC acknowledged that the institution needed to try to represent those groups.

Although policy creators noted over time that opportunities for access and eligibility should be expanded, the theme of race was demonstrated only through

reference to inclusion of underrepresented minorities. *Master Plan* was the only document that did not include any reference to inclusion of underrepresented minorities. Beginning with *Master Plan Renewed*, emphases were placed on equality and unity, but issues of equality or unity generally did not target or identify specific races or ethnicities, except to note those groups that fell into the category of underrepresented minorities, such as African Americans and Latinos. This is another missed opportunity for African American males who are worked into access by omission rather than being identified, which is critical to meeting their needs to level the playing field for their admission. With race not specified, there was no opportunity to further specify the intersection of race and gender in a disadvantageous way.

The mission of the UC related to the explicit goals of the institution with respect to fulfilling its role in teaching, research, and public service. The intent of UC's mission has remained the same since creation of *Master Plan*, although the UC recognized that preserving the quality and perception of the institution required reflecting the changes occurring in the state. *Master Plan Renewed* recognized four principal goals that should be incorporated into the main tenets of *Master Plan*: unity, equity, quality, and efficiency. Subsequent years reflected such principles as a commitment to educational goals and to strengthening the legitimacy of the UC's mission.

In line with its mission, the UC intended to maintain a high level of prestige. As articulated by Brewer, Gates, and Goldman (2002), prestigious colleges and universities are more concerned with preserving than extending the advantages that selective admission confers. Within *Master Plan*, a concern for the prestige of the UC was

demonstrated by the aspiration to preserve its level of quality. *Master Plan Renewed* and BOARS documents proposed that in order to maintain a level of prestige, standards of quality needed to change. Policymakers' efforts to change the standards allowed UC to focus on the education provided to its students in a manner reflecting the demographic and economic changes in the state, changing not only the standards but also how the UC determined and defined its prestige. Yet they did so through what CRT and IT agrees is an institutional lens, with CRT pointing out it is one that does not accurately view African American males. The investigation findings provided insight into the effects of UC policies on African American males' access to the UC, UC's priorities, and UC's interpretation of *Master Plan*'s main tenets of broad and universal access, however, for African American males not specifying a focus has resulted in access for them not being broadened or widened.

The UC maintained admission and eligibility criteria that accommodated changes in the growth yet not the diversity of that growth. In this manner, UC was able to maintain its narrow definition of prestige, based on its selective admission of freshmen. The frameworks of CRT and Institutional Theory and policy documents acknowledged the factors of merit, accessibility to the institution, eligibility, student diversity, race, mission, and level of UC's prestige in its consideration of how to meet the needs of underrepresented minorities. Policy documents showed both the preservation of and changes to UC eligibility and admission deemed necessary to reflect both the needs of California's high school students and the level of quality the institution sought to exhibit.

The implications of these findings and further recommendations are discussed in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

Given the presence of UC eligibility and admissions policies' influences on the demographic makeup and discourse of each institution, the effect of UC's eligibility and admission policies on African American males represents an important avenue of inquiry.

African American males' eligibility, admission, and enrollment at the UC, California's premier public research university, provide non-African American students with opportunities to interact with (on both intellectual and social levels) and reject the negative portrayals of African American men often seen in the media and society (Frierson, Pearson, & Wyche, 2009). Moreover, a degree from a selective university, such as the UC, can positively affect the graduates' earning power (Dale & Krueger, 2011). More pointedly, African American students are more likely than those from dominant racial and ethnic groups to attend graduate and postgraduate institutions after graduating from a prestigious university (Bowen & Bok, 1998).

Research shows that African American males' status in higher education has garnered considerable attention at national conferences, in the media, and in published scholarship over the past twenty years (Robinson, 2014). As scholars have (Harper, 2006Harper, 2014Harper, 2015; Robinson, 2014) researched the complexities of African American males in K-12 and higher education, the role of eligibility and admission policies have often been overlooked and more often understudied. The K-12 educational experiences and achievement levels, UC eligibility, and admission and enrollment rates of African American males at the UC are lower than those of any other major racial or ethnic group. These differences in UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment opportunities are more about the definitions of merit and prestige and less about the abilities of African American males. Research suggests the percentage of African American male students enrolled at each stage of schooling declines from middle school through graduate degree programs (Strayhorn, 2014). Currently, the rate at which African

American males do not complete a K-12 education and move into the pipeline to prison far exceeds the rate at which they graduate and reach high levels of academic achievement (Baldwin, Fisler, & Patton, 2009; Cuyjet, 2006;). It is time to change the narrative about African American males' academic abilities, which includes, but unfortunately, is not limited to, their achieving UC eligibility, admissibility, and enrollment. This investigation of the UC's eligibility and admission policy discourses and documents, in alignment with *Master Plan* and its main tenets of broad and universal access, is a scholarly effort to reshape this disparaging narrative.

This investigation sought to achieve two goals. The first goal was to examine three concepts - broad and universal access at the UC, definition of merit, and prestige related to UC's eligibility and admission policies and policy discourses—and examine the effect of these concepts on African American males' UC eligibility and admission. The concept of the UC's broad and universal access was examined through the articulated goals outlined in *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975; Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education, 1987 (Master Plan Renewed);* Committee on Educational Policy meeting minutes; and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) meeting minutes and policy documents. These documents provided insight into the UC's eligibility and admission policies and the discourses and positions they advance. The definitions of merit were examined in the context of the pursuit of prestige. The concept of prestige was addressed through this investigation's attempt to identify and measure the policies and policy discourses that advanced prestige, yet adversely affected African

215

American males' UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment. Each of these objectives were important prerequisites to address the research questions posed in this investigation. The second and more central goal of my work was to investigate the effects of prestige on the definitions of merit and broad and universal access, focusing on the policies and policy discourses that influence African American males' access to the UC. The focus on UC is justified in that its campuses are designated, under *Master Plan*, as the research arm of education of the state of California (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960), and as the premier public higher education institution in the state and the nation.

The analyses and resulting findings highlighted a number of salient points about the influence of *Master Plan* and *Master Plan Renewed* on UC's eligibility and admission policies, the extent to which California's changing demographics influenced UC's eligibility and admission policies and policy discourses (as well as UC's definition of merit), and the consequences of the definitions of merit and prestige on access for African American males. This chapter discusses these findings based on the themes I identified of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige, from Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Institutional Theory frameworks. Recommendations for further research and policy at the state and UC levels are posed in light of this discussion.

Discussion and Implications of the Investigation's Findings

In Fall of 2016, only 4% of the population enrolled at the UC was African American, which was lower than all the other major racial groups at the UC (Institutional Research & Academic Planning, 2016). Asian Americans represented 35%, Whites 24%,

and Latinos 22% (Institutional Research & Academic Planning, 2016); these figures were not reflective of the proportion of college aged African Americans in California. The guidelines for eligibility and admission at the UC were determined by *Master Plan*.

My investigation sought to reveal whether eligibility requirements and admission policies at UC, informed by *Master Plan*, were responsible for the low enrollment rates among African American students with a focus on African American males. My research examined UC eligibility and admission policies with a focus on African American male students and their access to, and enrollment in, the UC system. What understandings of UC's mission and role within *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California* have been used in the development of UC eligibility and admission policies? This question addressed the policymakers' philosophical understandings of the intersection of *Master Plan* and university prestige in California's eligibility and admission policies. What roles do the definitions of merit and access play in the development of eligibility and admission policies? This question addressed how merit and access were defined historically to ensure that the tenets of *Master Plan*, specifically regarding broad and universal access, were addressed and framed my contribution to the academic discourse on access and equity of outcomes in UC eligibility and admission policies.

To inform the scholarly discourse related to the low UC eligibility and admission rates of African American males, I examined *Master Plan*, *Master Plan Renewed,* Committee on Educational Policy meeting minutes, and BOARS meeting minutes and policy documents. Through the lenses of CRT and Institutional Theory, my analysis investigated discourse construction to explain the ways that the UC had developed

217

eligibility and admission criteria in line with *Master Plan*'s tenets of broad and universal access and its articulated obligation to guarantee a space on one of its campuses to the top one-eighth (12.5%) of California's high school graduates (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960)

The main themes in the UC's eligibility and admission policies and the policy discourses that I identified and examined in this investigation were: merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige. Within UC policy discourse and the policy documents studied, the theme of merit was articulated through the identification of students meeting a level of academic quality expected by the institution; the theme of access acknowledged differences in the opportunity structure; admission and eligibility criteria for undergraduates were prominent in over half of the documents, especially in the proposed changes to the criteria on which high school graduates would be evaluated for admittance. The criteria expanded from those based solely on academic measures to include supplementary criteria, and, later, a broader comprehensive review, which included academic and co-curricular achievements in the context of applicants' background and experiences.

Master Plan did not address ethnic, racial, or socioeconomic diversity because of the homogenous nature of California at the time it was written, yet indicated that in addressing the issue of overcrowding among the state's higher education institutions, a growing number of previously academically advanced students would be less favored in the effort to control the number of students at UCs and CSUs (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). In addition, *Master Plan* outlined the mission of the UC to serve as the

research arm of the state and serve as the sole public university to grant the doctorate of philosophy and professional degrees, MD's, and JD's. Within *Master Plan*, a concern for UC prestige was demonstrated through the intentional preservation of academic quality, as articulated through its definition of merit, which included "A-G" course enrollment, GPA, and performance on standardized tests. *Master Plan Renewed* and BOARS documents proposed that, in order to maintain a level of prestige, standards of academic quality (including the definitions of merit) must change. Changes to the academic standards and definitions allowed the UC to focus more on education in a manner that reflected the state's demographic and economic changes, and altered not only the standards, but also how the UC determined and defined its prestige.

Implications of the Findings

I used the theoretical frameworks of CRT and Institutional Theory to guide the analysis of my research. CRT was employed as a framework to explain the roles of merit, access, eligibility, diversity, race, mission, and prestige in UC's eligibility and admission policy discourses and policies. The political and social influences of the aforementioned themes and UC's policy discourse and policy development were revealed and explained using CRT. CRT considers the roles that racism and power dynamics play within micro-levels of society, such as the UC's Committee on Educational Policy and the BOARS committee, as well as higher education in general. In addition to CRT, the present research was analyzed through the framework of Institutional Theory. Institutional Theory includes three perspectives that inform larger institutional processes: sociological, historical, and political (Amenta& Ramsey, 2010). The sociological perspective helped

identify the formation, implementation, and dissemination of admission and eligibility policies at the UC. Whereas the historical perspective attempted to explain the persistence and modifications to UC eligibility. Finally, the political lens of Institutional Theory, whereas not employed directly in the analysis, is defined as the "process by which states and political systems are influenced by political process and outcomes" (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). These two frameworks were the fundamental building blocks of my research that provided lenses to analyze *Master Plan*, *Master Plan Renewed,* the UC admission policy discourse and documents, and the effects these discourses and documents have had on African American male applicants' eligibility in higher education in California. Further and future research of the matter should be carried out to ensure there is equality of applicant acceptance based on unbiased decisions from the admission committee, as this was not part of this investigation.

Seven key themes were pursued throughout this investigation as a means to examine the UC system's eligibility and admissions policies. These themes also affected African American males' ability to receive a high-quality education in California, specifically at the UC. These themes are now reviewed before there is a discussion of how UC can serve African American males in the future in a more effective way than in the past.

Merit. Scholars have argued that the role of merit in higher education institutions is to uphold the validity of United States social order, and to provide employment opportunities for college graduates (Alon & Tienda, 2007; Astin & Oseguera, 2004; Haveman & Smeeding, 2006Thelin, 2011). From this point of view, perceptions of merit

are significant for admission policy. Although merit is not addressed explicitly in the documents, this investigation presented and interpreted ideas about student quality, which reflected thematic characteristics operationally defined as merit. The characteristics pertaining to merit also included academic and co-curricular activities during high school. *Master Plan* indicated that the admission committee was to admit top students, specifically the top eighth, for undergraduate admission. This focus on top quality students could be considered an attempt by the admission committee to force the student body to have certain characteristics, which could be based subjectively on their personal values and judgments and therefore biased. On the other hand, *Master Plan Renewed* did not refer to student quality (although it was the only document studied that did not do so). Through the perspective of CRT, race and socioeconomic status affected the enrollment of minority and low-income students, according to the research of (Harper, 2009). Students from low-income households, including those who needed to work during high school, were less likely to have time for extracurricular activities. Therefore, based on UC admission committee preferences, these students would not be considered of high academic quality.

The way in which the UC has defined merit over time raised the question of what conditions in the external and internal environments might be the impetus for a change in definition. This is a limitation of the investigation, and much remains to be learned in the area of the social, political, and economic implications of merit as it relates to African American males' access and UC's prestige. Additional investigations need to be conducted to capture the contextual influences of the various definitions of merit. This

may point to other influences not captured by my investigation. For instance, most of the studies conducted on African American males' academic achievement were positioned from a deficit model (Harper, 2009; Harper, 2014; Harper, 2015) rather than from the strength and cultural capital that this population brings to the UC.

Furthermore, predictors of academic success that were not significant in defining merit are worthy of consideration in further research. For example, recognizing and building upon the strengths of African American males and their learning styles (Kunjufu, 2010; Payne, 2010Tatum, 2011) were not addressed and could raise questions about the effectiveness of UC's and CSU teaching credential program in supporting the academic achievements of African American males.

Access. Historically, colleges and universities were described as "elite, middle, or bottom" (Ackoff, 1994), and this stratified classification system is a result of historical inequalities and unequal distribution of social benefits in society (e.g., access to innovative technology or prestigious professional networks). Researchers have argued that social stratification could be embedded within admission policies and policy strategy (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001The revisiting of admission policies by policymakers and stakeholders internal and external to the university is common in the current world of globalization and ever-changing demographics (Burke & McManus, 2011Institutional Theory suggested that policy creators at the UC allowed the admission policies to change based on the needs of a specific industry or area of study. More specifically, California's need for more graduates in the science, technology, engineering and math disciplines placed more emphasis on the need for better math and science preparation in K-12. This

sets up an automatic distinction between changes based on the need to reevaluate the applicant review process and changes based on institutional legitimacy. In some distinction from *Master Plan*, *Master Plan Renewed* established the need for higher education to create opportunities for freshman applicants and current students from a variety of backgrounds to have the same access as their White peers. One of the BOARS documents proposed changes that pointed to a need for the UC system to lift limitations on applicant selection. Another UC consideration that affected access to higher education during the 1970s was funding (Lopez, Madrid-Barela, & Macías, 1976). Because of the growing number of applicants and the increased need for additional facilities, the cost for students increased, and this prevented certain demographics from equal access to UC through the inability to pay tuition and related costs or qualify for enough reasonably priced loans to do so. This barrier was coupled with the financial feasibility of providing higher education and resources for students. Through the lens of CRT, *Master Plan*'s suggestion that "reduction in number of lower division students attending state colleges and [UC specifically] will contribute to further strengthening of California's well-developed junior colleges program" (The Master Plan Survey Team, 1960, p. 10limits accessibility to and enrollment at UCs for high school graduates. These limitations affected disproportionately minority students' admission and enrollment (Allen & Solórzano, 2001because of economic factors. The disclosure of the racial inequality in access could have encouraged future policy makers and high school guidance counselors to approach eligibility and admission, and enrollment in a fair and unbiased manner.

Furthermore, both the CRT and Institutional Theory frameworks provided a beneficial

analysis that should be employed in future investigations.

The examination of UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment rates of African

American males revealed pointed findings on *Master Plan*'s goal of broad and universal

access, particularly how little eligibility, admissions, and enrollment criteria and policy

have changed from the 1980s to 2015. Generally, these findings note that the policies and

policy discourses were not mindful of the K-12, social, and economic conditions of the

African American male experience. African American males are the most

underrepresented of the four, primary racial and ethnic groups within UC's eligibility and

admission numbers. Additionally, the rate at which African American males' enrollment

criteria and policy have changed over time has not kept pace with their overall population

in the state. The increases in some segments of higher education in California in contrast

to the decline in the eligibility, admission, and enrollment patterns of African American

males at the UC (Institutional Research & Academic Planning, 2016) are of consequence

considering the state's commitment to access to higher education. A commitment to

higher education cannot thoroughly and consistently exclude a major race/gender

demographic and be considered a legitimate commitment.

Eligibility. All the documents analyzed contained criteria for admission to the

UC. The academic requirements for eligibility were static throughout both iterations of

Master Plan and accompanying documents. References to shifting admission committee

standards, such as changes to standardized testing (elimination of SAT II as a

requirement) that effect eligibility as outlined in *Master Plan,* echo similar results of

other themes such as access and merit. Therefore, a change of the eligibility criteria and significance to UC produced incremental changes that were insufficient to provide equal access to African American male students and others in disadvantaged demographics. Through the lenses of an equal opportunity and eligibility scope of historical institutionalism, the documents indicated the tension between the UC's reliance on state support and the UC's expectation to remain competitive in the collegiate landscape. The concern of the policymakers was for the UC more so than all students in CA, because once competitiveness and prestige/ranking are predominant, then, the scope narrows to students who are deemed most competitive and therefore eligible.

Master Plan Renewed included ratified and revised verbiage that opened opportunities for students who might not have had access to a college education in the past. *Master Plan* and the accompanying documents function as mechanisms to carry out actions deemed legal, necessary, and advisory by the UC and to cease, eliminate, or lessen actions that do not support access and equal opportunity. In short, these documents and the themes I identify propel certain actions from people who operate within the system (e.g., admissions officers) to adhere to their stated language. Furthermore, the UC admission committee noted the challenge of coordinating with lower academically performing high schools, attended by many minority and low-income students. This indicated a limitation of using CRT to understand eligibility and inclusion of students who wanted to attend UC. CRT does not address students' aspirations or students' expectations of K-12 educators.

Diversity. People of color are underrepresented among both students and faculty at institutions of higher education. African Americans have been excluded from the field of academia and other spheres of high social class through institutionalized racism, which is defined as the unfair treatment of certain racial groups in an institution (Bell, 1973a). The documents in this investigation acknowledged the importance of diversity considering the shifting demographics in California. The 2010 proposal to recruit minority faculty sought to increase the potential for academic success among minority students and motivate minority students to enroll. The use of an Institutional Theory framework indicated that race and diversity were understood at the institutional level of UC in conjunction with societal demands. However, the subject of diversity was often times ignored due to the personal preferences of the decision-making committees (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000). *Master Plan Renewed* included unity and equity as two core principles, which further addressed the influence of diversity and underrepresented minorities on UC campuses. In 1980, members of the admission committee advised six less-selective universities in the UC system to enact special admission processes. These processes were intended to help build diversity and address low minority enrollment. Through the lens of CRT, this investigation's research indicated that the increasing diversity of California and growing interest in the UC system by minority applicants resulted in policy changes. As the minority population grew between the 1970s and 1990s, policies changed to accommodate the diversity. BOARS posited in the 2008 meeting that the UC system should accommodate the increasingly diverse population with an emphasis on minority

226

applicants, specifically African American male applicants. These policy changes

involving diversity varied depending on the selectivity of each institution within the UC

system. What remained common was adherence to UC's recognition of wanting greater

racial diversity without assigning or mandating numbers, or formulas or further policy

due to Prop 209. There was no "picture" of what racial diversity would look like on any

of the UC campuses, just an acknowledgement that it was important and that all UC

campuses should strive to achieved it. This system-wide resistance to taking action that

would ensure diversified access through eligibility demonstrates an interconnectivity

between CRT and Institutional Theory as diversity, inclusion, and access were

institutional mandate but due to the colorblindness and resulting racism noted by CRT,

policies were not implemented successfully to include the most marginalized population.

     Race. Presented research illustrates the elusive nature of equal access in

education. Although California's system of higher education was driven by two major

variables, that of population and economic growth and the policy making process

(Douglass, 1999), race is a variable that was not taken into consideration. CRT research

asserts that Whereas race was not a founding factor of consideration in the development

of *Master Plan,* racism is ever-present throughout the document. CRT scholar Bell

(1973a), posited that African American and minority applicants have an automatic

disadvantage given that college and universities have historically been the gatekeepers of

social class and position. Nationally, African Americans, in particular African American

males, have been seen unfavorably within education, and California is no exception.

Subsequently, documents and policies that had been created to account for and decrease

227

the historic underrepresentation of certain races in UC and California Higher

Education, as it became clear that these populations were a growing component of the

future of California. However, without taking into consideration the historical elements

that were at and continue to be at play with documents and policies surrounding higher

education in regard to race, Whites and Asians benefitted at the expense of African

American males. For example, although in opposition to the intent of *Master Plan*, the

revision in 2010 (SP-1) and the subsequent drop in minority student enrollment showed

that policymakers could act as gatekeepers of socioeconomic status while using their

personal opinions to influence the admission outcome. More specifically, it was assumed

by policymakers that race and ethnicity for underrepresented students are often linked to

low SES, and the policymakers used SES as a proxy for race because certain races are

linked to low SES, which did not ensure better and specified access to them and excluded

those of poorer/lower SES for admission. Alongside the other thematic elements that I

identified in the present investigation, it was important to address the significance of race

given the historical efforts of the UC campuses to be more inclusive. For African

American males, they were categorically disfavored (evidenced by their numbers) as

candidates, therefore attempts at inclusivity in admissions fell short for this demographic

since including the most marginalized minority (intersection of being both African

American and male) would clearly require more targeted, intentional and direct measures

that were not undertaken or, according to the records, considered as a strategic option.

Generalized inclusion policies and practices would repeatedly fail to address the viability

of this specific group of applicants. Through the CRT lens, it is clear that equality and

opportunity are both elusive in the context of admission to institutions of higher education (Hurtado, 2005).

Mission. The explicit goals of the UC system that include teaching, research, and public service are outlined in the UC mission statement. As the demographic makeup of California shifted, diversifying the state between the 1970s and 1990s, the mission of UC changed to ensure that it was mindful of racial, ethnic and socioeconomic demographics. *Master Plan* originally contained several of UC's goals that included inclusion, and broad and universal access and provided a limited structure to address these goals within the system. However, *Master Plan Renewed* helped bolster the importance of the main tenets of *Master Plan* by identifying four principal goals: unity, equity, quality, and efficiency. In this investigation through the lens of Institutional Theory, *Master Plan Renewed* presented a structure that addressed post-secondary education as an umbrella institution, which helped the UC system focus more on diverse student backgrounds and ways the structure could benefit potential underrepresented applicants. Attendees of a BOARS meeting in 2008 called for a review of the current structure with a way to evaluate if all elements of Outreach sufficiently attracted, prepared, or serviced all students across diverse backgrounds.

The tendency for universities to be selective has sometimes weakened the university's pursuit of its own mission (O'Meara, 2007My investigation found that because the UC admission committee evaluated UC's course offerings on multiple occasions and deemed them acceptable or favorable, the committee's assessments were actually evaluating how the UC's courses' prestige factor satisfied its mission as opposed

229

to assessing it to find how the courses met the university's mission through student

satisfaction among a diversified student population. UC requirements did not always line

up with UC's mission (or benefit students). This was more in line with prior research that

demonstrated that the pursuit of prestige could do a disservice to students by encroaching

on university access and affecting the diversity of higher education institutions (Brint &

Karabel, 1989Kezar et al., 2005; Lang, 1984; O'Meara & Meekins, 2012).

      Prestige. Higher education institutions view selectivity in admission as helping to

establish prestige and further increase the perceived value of higher education (Brewer et

al., 2002) from internal and external stakeholders. The UC mission statement that

included "Preserving a Level of Quality" also subscribed to notions of prestige, as

demonstrated by the preservation of quality levels in *Master Plan.* Prior research has

highlighted that prestigious universities are sometimes more concerned with keeping the

advantages associated with high levels of quality than with opening their campus to other,

non-White populations (Brewer et al., 2002). Historical institutionalism (the preservation

of historical values and standards) helps explain why UC prioritized maintenance of

students deemed "high quality" at UC campuses; selective admission committees must

employ discretion to remain competitive (Chang, Witt, Jones, & Hakuta, 2003). The

historical prestige factor influences admission selection, which could also cause

significant bias in the criteria. The benefits associated with African American students

graduating from a prestigious university are part of a socially constructed reality that is

perpetuated through restriction of admission and maintenance of high academically based

admission standards. Institutions emphasize the ranking of undergraduate students based

on GPA, SAT scores, and reputation of schools, in order to achieve an image of high selectivity (Ehrenberg, 2003). Outside organizations and entities that rank colleges and universities value the perception of prestige by academics at other institutions, and this further emphasizes the importance of institutional models and preservation of institutional legacy when policymakers and internal and external stakeholders examine UC admission criteria and policy construction. My examination of CRT from a historical perspective was beneficial in understanding these processes. Because the UC system is comprised of institutions founded by White Americans, the legacy is predominantly White as well and this could greatly bias the admission process. CRT sees the viewpoint of Whites as inherent and it is reinforced beyond the documents in the population of people who set the policy, interpret it, attend the university, and include their relation to legacy both recognized and living and breathing through the documents that manifests inequality along racial lines as the price of securing prestige.

CRT highlights aspects of society, universities, and schools and enables investigation of the narrative of the functions, meanings, causes, and consequences of racial educational inequality. CRT theorists postulated that race is a central structure in society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2015; Yosso, 2005). Both society and university communities assume that racism is no longer a prominent social problem, but race in the United States permeates all aspects of our social, historical, political, and economic being (Solórzano, Villalpando, & Oseguera, 2005). The concept of meritocracy assumes a level playing field where all individuals in society have an equal opportunity for individual attainment. Meritocracy also assumes that one's work ethic, values, drive,

and individual attributes, such as aptitude and intelligence, determine outcomes, as shown in Chapter 2.

Our failure to challenge the lens through which we see and process the world sustains the myth of meritocracy and this concept of meritocracy remains as the dominant factor in consideration of who should achieve UC eligibility and who deserves an admissions position at UC. Policymakers and internal and external stakeholders must revisit the concept of meritocracy and explore definitions that indicate equal opportunity and contribution to racial equality. If UC focuses only on the documented efforts and talents of individuals, it will fail to understand the policies in K-12 and higher education that help some students succeed in achieving UC eligibility and admission while driving others toward failure.

Limitations of the Investigation

Research on African American males and college enrollment often fails to address the agency associated with the student decision-making process (Freeman, 2005, p. xix). The present research focused on, K-12 educational experiences and the psychosocial development and expectations of African American males that are external to the student, through the lenses of CRT and Institutional Theory. Research ultimately indicates that these experiences and expectations appear to negatively influence African American male students' UC eligibility and admission through less engagement with the K-12 system that is sometimes reflected in their GPAs, as well as standardized test preparation and therefore lowered test scores. With admission criteria focused on factors that can indicate African American male student disengagement and estrangement more so than an

accurate measure of actual intellectual or cognitive capability, viable applicants fail to be recognized as such. Yet we must consider that the choice of students not to enroll at the UCs was also a rationale for the low numbers of African American males at the UC's. For example, a student who is aware of social stratification at a university might choose not to enroll there. The theoretical frameworks of this investigation did not address that possibility. This important aspect of UC eligibility, admission, and enrollment should be considered in future research and analysis. This research was rooted in static archival documents that did not fully account for the present state of the UC. The advent of online courses, free colleges, and web resources could have altered the perception of UC policies and the influences these policies have on minority students.

Recommendations for Future Research

The historical perspective within Institutional Theory suggests that it is unlikely that institutions were created to serve a functional purpose. Future research should explain institutional policies in terms of construction and persistence (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010) that proclaim one intention (e.g., inclusivity) while manifesting another (e.g., marginalization) or the polar opposite (e.g., exclusivity). In recent years, numerous domestic and international governments that recognize the importance of adequate education for their constituents have begun examining the motivations and impact of their respective higher education policies. They identify and examine who the policymakers are and both the short-term and long-term implications of the policies (Musselin & Teixeira, 2013). A UC regent questioned the use of standardized tests in admission decisions because of the affect these tests have had on the admission of minority

applicants. Future research should attempt to examine the affect and implications that reliance on exams such as the SAT and ACT carry for admission policy. Concern for bias inherent in standardized testing regarding socioeconomic class and educational achievement was expressed by Bowen and Bok (2016) whose investigation demonstrated a difference in academic performance between high and low socioeconomic students. However, the results of previous studies on this subject have been inconclusive. The factors that could influence the differences in academic performance in terms of test outcomes, socioeconomic status, high school of attendance, and "A-G" course completion need to be explored. The admission evaluation should include the voices of all SES, high school attendance and "A-G" course offering data. Considering the power of worded policy as explored in this investigation, both quantitative and qualitative indicators with stated purposes for all components of eligibility and admission evaluation should be explored.

Although this qualitative analysis provided insight into the UC policy formation, future research could also incorporate interviews with African American male applicants. The perspectives of these students will help future researchers begin to examine the role that UC eligibility and admission policies play in African American males' college choice decisions. In turn, this could provide valuable insight into how the students themselves perceive the UC policies in relation to their own experiences. Interviews with both board members, as the policymakers, and internal stakeholders could also add to the current examination of policy documents and their formation within the social and

political environment in which the UC's eligibility and admission policies are developed and implemented.

Summary and Conclusions

Race matters, university prestige matters, and university access matters. How meritocracy is defined matters. African American males' UC eligibility and admissibility matter. If UC is going to maintain its commitment to broad and universal access for all Californians, as set out in *Master Plan*, the state's K-12 educational system must find ways to address the leaky educational pipeline and the inherently racialized eligibility and admission policies that result from the pursuit of prestige. UC must arrive at a definition of merit that is inclusive of the K-12 and societal experiences of African American males.

The UC must develop policies that ensure access and are responsive to the people who have, historically, been denied access. The UC must develop policies that address society's misrepresentation, negative stereotypes, and fear of African American males. UC should understand that such access is inherent to its mission and that expansion of prestige through being highly ranked as an institution should not be favored over incorporating the most disenfranchised. The UC should address the historic and current K-12 educational problems of African American males by conducting research and developing effective strategies to educate and prepare this population. Finally, the UC can examine its K-12 to college pipeline programs to better address their effectiveness at increasing the college access and eligibility of participating students before they apply to the university. Further, UC must develop race based eligibility and admission policies that take the racialized society and institutional structures of the 21st century into

account, with the objective to dismantle systemic racist practices through the opportunity of college access. The UC must come to grips with the fact that without race based policies it will not achieve equity in inputs or in outcomes.

As indicated in this investigation, since racism is embedded in our thought processes and social structures, then the ordinary business of society—the routines, practices, and institutions that we rely on to carry on society's work—will keep African American males in subordinate positions (Delgado& Stefancic, 2001). Whereas at the institutional level UC policymakers may think that UC's eligibility and admission policies are colorblind, those policies have serious differential effects on African American males' access to the UC because they are not inclusive enough and considerate of the K-12 experiences of African American males. These experiences include high suspension rates in K-12, low enrollments in college preparatory courses, and low high school and college graduation rates.

Three important questions posed by Gillborn (2005) should guide UC's eligibility and admission policies: "Who or what is driving the policy?" "Who wins and who loses as a result of UC's eligibility and admission policy priorities?" Third and finally, "What are the ethnic and gender effects of these policies?" These questions are important because they capture the policy's intent and its effects.

The use of the SAT, which according to Weissglass (1998) was influenced by the intent to decrease certain ethnic groups' access to higher education, has had a disproportionately negative effect on African American test takers, particularly males (see discussion in Chapter 2). Whereas White Americans from middle and upper-class

backgrounds have benefitted from policies such as the use of SAT scores for college admission decisions and the ability to secure access to the larger SAT preparation industry, the use of standardized testing by admissions committees to determine college admission has affected African American males negatively and contributes to an academic achievement gap (Love, 2004). More racially inclusive tests should be developed and utilized in place of the current standardized test.

The racial and class biases inherent in higher education policies favor the already privileged middle and upper-class Whites. However, in admission decisions, these biases are presented as valid, fair, and objective admission criteria. The higher one's SAT scores, the greater the likelihood that one will attend a top college or university, and, in turn, will obtain a better job with higher pay, accumulate greater wealth, and significantly secure and improve one's life. In this way, the entire K-12 educational process, from the first day of kindergarten until university graduation, serves to reproduce existing historical racial inequalities. Education fails to be the "great equalizer" in society; rather, schools and universities are active participants in the process of maintaining dominance for Whites. Schools and universities sort students by race, class, gender, and citizenship status, and use pseudo-objective standards that ensure the hierarchy continues and statuses remain unchanged (Knoester & Au, 2012). Universities miss the opportunity to intervene in the processes that reproduce inequality when they insist that standardized tests, including the SAT, are colorblind and that scores are an objective measure of merit (Solórzano et al., 2005).

The UC should reconsider the use of the SAT since, as discussed in previous chapters, Whites generally score higher than people of color, the wealthy score higher than the poor, and men score higher than women (Zamudio et al., 2011). These numbers suggest that Whites will continue to enter the best universities, as defined by *U.S. News and World Report*, acquire the best training, secure the best jobs, increase their income potential the most, and expand their post-graduation opportunities more widely than minority students (Zamudio et al., 2011), even as the latter continue to increase in numbers and population percentage of California and the larger United States.

The UC has used the construct of eligibility as a pathway to admission, yet its eligibility criteria tend to be exclusive of African American students, which due to pre-existing social constructs, further suppress African American male students. The construct of UC eligibility, as postulated by *Master Plan*, pre-screens the admission pool and denies the broad and universal access stipulated in *Master Plan*. Until the UC revisits its objective criteria of eligibility, there will be only a marginal change in the admission of African American males. No amount of outreach or pre-collegiate eligibility and admission advising can change society's perception of African American males, the K-12 educational system, and the eligibility and admission policies of UC that will continue to hinder African American male access to UC.

Racism manifests itself in numerous ways within the access routes to higher education. It is evidenced by racialized academic achievement and UC's eligibility and admission policies. It is reflected in GPA, "A-G" course completion, and standardized

test scores; it also includes suspension rates and high school and college graduation rates (Regents of the University of California: Committee on educational policy, 2000)

Affirmative action during the 1970s, 1980s, and through 1995 provided a tool for African American males to access the UC. It allowed UC eligible, qualified African American males the opportunity to fulfill their potential at all UC campuses. As noted in the *Affirmative Action: Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate and Professional School Admissions,* (Jaschik, 2014) although Affirmative Action was not a perfect solution, it provided a means to address the bias of the SAT and the injustices of the K-12 educational system. CRT reminds higher education policy makers that the value placed on race solidifies the inequity in educational opportunities afforded to non-White, African American males. Interest convergence from a CRT perspective reveals the lack of a genuine commitment to principles of equality. Interest convergence is the concept that the racial majority displays justice to minorities only when there is an interest gain. Intersectionality, which connects to interest convergence, illuminated the complexity of racism as it intersected with the UC's definitions of merit and aspirations for prestige. The definition of merit is racialized and does not support African American males, but because it does not state this explicitly, it is a powerful tool to enact racism. In the context of a university's aspirations for prestige, the low social position of African American males, becomes a determinant of lacking individual and group attainments, unless a wider definition of prestige one that is aware of CRT is developed and implemented, African American males will be the group viewed as least emblematic of prestige and therefore the least deserving of a UC education.

The problems of *Master Plan* relate to access, and are centered on public schools, which noted previously, are exacerbated for African American males. This was not an issue for the framers of the original *Master Plan* or *Master Plan* Renewed. The goal of the UC reflecting the state of California remains unfulfilled. The UC will only achieve this goal with the revitalization of pre-collegiate education in the K-12 public schools. A new conceptual lens needs to be developed for those at UC who determine eligibility and admission policies in order for the stakeholders to better understand who benefits from these policies. This lens may inform policymakers of the new policies that can be created which are inclusive of race and gender. Through such policies, the UC can end the segregation of students along racial and ethnic lines.

References

A manual on admissions policies and procedures after the University of Michigan decisions (n.d). Retrieved from https://academicudayton.edu/race/ 04needs/PreservingDiversity.pdf.

Abbott, K. W., Keohane, R. O., Moravcsik, A., Slaughter, A., & Snidal, D. (2000). The concept of legalization. *International Organization, 54*, 401-19.
`

Ackoff, R. (1994). Higher education and social stratification. *Interfaces, 24*(4), 73-82. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25061909

Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box. academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment* (Rep. No. PLLO-1999-8021). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED431363.pdf

Allan, E.J. (2008), *Policy discourses, gender, and education: constructing women's status*. London: Routledge

Alexander, K., Bozick, R., Entwisle, D., Dauber, S., & Kerr, K. (2005). Framing the future: The development and meaning of educational expectations among urban youth. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Alexander, J. (2008). *Rethinking inclusive education: The philosophers of difference in practice.* Dordecht: Springer.

Allen, Q. (2010). "Racial microaggressions: The schooling experiences of Black middle-class males in Arizona's secondary schools." *Journal of African American Males in Education* 1 (2): 125–143.

Allen, Q. (2013). "They think minority means lesser than, Black middle-class sons and fathers resisting Microaggressions in the school." *Urban education*, *48*(2), 171-197.

Allen, W. R, Bonous-Hammarth, M., & Teranishi, R. (2002). Stony the road we trod…The Black struggle for higher education in California. Los Angeles: CHOICES, UCLA.

Allen, W. R., Jayakumar, U. M., & Franke, R. (2009). Till victory is won: The African American struggle for higher education in California (GESIS, Trans.). Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

Allen, W. R., & Jewell, J. O. (1995). African American education since 'An American dilemma': An American dilemma revisited. *Daedalus 124*(1), 77-100.

Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Basic books.

Alon, S. (2009). The evolution of class inequality in higher education: Competition, exclusion, and adaptation. *American Sociological Review, 74*(5), 731-755.

Alon, S., & Tienda, M. (2007). Diversity, opportunity, and the shifting meritocracy in higher education. *American Sociological Review 72*, 487–511.

Amenta, E. (2005). State-centered and political institutionalist theory: Retrospect and prospect. In T. Janoski, R. Alford, A. Hicks, and M. A. Schwart (Eds.), *Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Amenta, E., & Ramsey, K. (2010). Institutional theory, In K.T. Leicht and J.C. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of politics: State and society in global perspective, 15 handbooks of sociology and social research*. Springer Science Business Media, LLC.

Archer, L., Hutchings, M., & Ross, A. (2005). *Higher education and social class: Issues of exclusion and inclusion*. Routledge.

Ashton, P. (2011). The education of D.C.: How Washington D.C.'s investments in education can help increase public safety. *Justice Policy Institute.* Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute.

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 25*(2), 44-49.

Astin, A. W., & Lee, C. B. T. (1972). *The Invisible Colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Astin, A. W., & Oseguera, L. (2004). The declining ''equity'' of American higher education. *Review of Higher Education 27*, 321–341.

Atkinson, P. A. & Coffey, A. (1997). Analyzing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice, London: Sage, 45–62.

Au, W. (2010). *Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York. NY: Routledge.

Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. *The Review of Higher Education 28*(4), 527-549.

Bailey, D. F. (2003). Preparing African-American males for postsecondary options. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *12*(1), 15-24.

Baker, D. (2015). Mass higher education and the super research university. *International Higher Education*, (49).

Baker, S., & Brown, B. (2007). Images of excellence: constructions of institutional prestige and reflections in the university choice process. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *28*(3), 377-391.

Baldwin, C. P., Fisler, J., & Patton, J. M. (2009). Who's afraid of the big bad wolf? Demystifying Black male college students, in H. T. Frierson, W. Pearson, J. H. Wyche (eds.) *Black American males in higher education: Diminishing proportions* (pp. 181-205). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Banks, J. A. (1995). The historical reconstruction of knowledge about race: Implications for transformative teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *24*(2), 15-25.

Banks, R. R. (2001). Meritocratic values and racial outcomes: Defending class-based college admissions. Working Paper No. 26.

Barr, A., & Turner, S. E. (2013). Expanding enrollments and contracting state budgets: The effect of the Great Recession on higher education. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *650*(1), 168-193.

Barrett, M. (1995). Discoursing with intent. *Times Higher Education Supplement*.

Barrow, C. W. (1996). The strategy of selective excellence: Redesigning higher education for global competition in a postindustrial society. *Higher Education 31*, 447-469.

Bastedo, M. N. (2003). Cascading minority students in higher education: Assessing the impact of statewide admissions standards. Paper presented at the ASHE conference, 2003.

Bastedo, M. N., & Gumport, P. J. (2003). Access to what? Mission differentiation and academic stratification in US public higher education. *Higher Education*, *46*(3), 341-359.

Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2009). US News & World Report college rankings: Modeling institutional effects on organizational reputation. *American Journal of Education*, *116*(2), 163-183.

Baum, S., & Ma, J. (2007). Education pays: The benefits of higher education for individuals and society. *Trends in Higher Education Series.* Washington, DC: College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.

Baum, S., Ma, J., & Payea, K. (2010). Education pays, 2010: The benefits of higher education for individuals and society. *Trends in Higher Education Series.* Washington, DC: College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.

Baum, S., Kurose, C., & McPherson, M. (2013). An overview of American higher education. *The future of children, 23*(1), 17-39. 17-39. doi:10.1353/foc.2013.0008

Baum, S., & Payea, K. (2005). Education pays 2004: The benefits of higher education for individuals and society: Trends in higher education series (College Board Report 5664. In *Retrieved on June.*

Bell, D. (1973a). Racism in American courts: Cause for Black disruption or despair. *California Law Review, 61*(1), 165-204.

Bell, D. (1973b). *The coming of post-industrial society.* New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93*, 518-533.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bell, D. (1995). Who's afraid of critical race theory. *University. Ill. L. Rev.*, 893.

Bell, D. (2004). Silent covenants: Brown v. board of education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benjamin, L. R., Henry, K. D., & McMahon, L. R. (2005). Inez Beverly Prosser and the education of African Americans. *Journal of The History of the Behavioral Sciences, 41*, 43-62. doi:10.1002/jhbs.20058

Bennett, L. (1988). *Before the Mayflower: A history of Black America* (6th ed.). New York: Penguin.

Berg, G. A. (2016). *Low-income students and the perpetuation of inequality: Higher education in America*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Berger, J. B., & Calkins, M. V. (2002). Higher education in the United States— System. Retrieved from http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2044/Higher-Education-in-United-States.html#ixzz2F6HdWvQz

Bergin, D. A., Cooks, H. C., & Bergin, C. C. (2007). Effects of a college access program for youth underrepresented in higher education: A randomized experiment. *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(6), 727-750.

Berliner, D. (2013). Effects of inequality and poverty vs. teachers and schooling on America's youth. *Teachers College Record*, *115*(12), 1-26.

Bial, D., & Rodriguez, A. (2007). Identifying a diverse student body: Selective college admissions and alternative approaches. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2007*(118), 17-30.

Blake, W. M., & Darling, C. A. (1994). The dilemmas of the African American male. *Journal of Black Studies*, *24*(4), 402-415.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools Minutes of Meeting. (2004). Retrieved from http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/boars/boars.10.8. 04. minutes.pdf

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (2005). Response to the 2003-04 eligibility and admissions study group finding/recommendation 5: Examination of the policy of admitting students from the full range of the eligibility pool

Board of Regents, The University of California. (1988). Regents policy 2102: Policy on undergraduate admissions. Retrieved from http://regents.University of California.edu/governance/policies/2102.html

Board of Regents, The University of California. (2001). Regents policy 2104: Policy on comprehensive review in undergraduate admissions. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/2104.html

Board of Regents, The University of California. (2011). Regents policy 2108: Resolution regarding individualized review and holistic evaluation in undergraduate admissions. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/ governance/policies/2108.html

Bohn, S. (2014). California's need for skilled workers. *Public Policy Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-need-for-skilled-workers.

Bok, D. (2009). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton University Press.

Booker-Baker, P. (2005). The Impact of cultural biases on African American students' education: A review of research literature regarding race based schooling. *Education and Urban Society, 37*(3), 243-256.

Bottoms, G., & Carpenter, K. (2003). Factors affecting mathematics achievement for students in rural schools. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED477284).

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). Greenword Press.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27- 40.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (2016). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton University Press.

Bowen, W. G., Chingos, M. M., & McPherson, M. S. (2009). *Crossing the finish line: Completing college at America's public universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo, M. N. (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of US News and World Report on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(5), 415-436.

Brand, J. E., & Xie, Y. (2010). Who benefits most from college? Evidence for negative selection in heterogeneous economic returns to higher education. *American sociological review*, *75*(2), 273-302.

Brennan, J., & Naidoo, R. (2008). Higher education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice. *Higher Education*, *56*(3), 287-302.

Brewer, D. J., Gates, S. M., & Goldman, C. A. (2002). *In pursuit of prestige: Strategy and competition in United States higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community Colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, J. R. (2015). What's the value of a college education? World Economic Forum. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/03/whats-the-value-of-a-college-education

Brown, M., & Lang, P. (2005). The children Hurricane Katrina left behind: Schooling context, professional preparation, and community politics. In *Now they are wet: Hurricane Katrina as a metaphor for social and educational neglect* (pp. 160-175). New York, NY.

Brown, M. C. (1999). Ebony men in the ivory tower: A policy perspective. In V. C. Polite & J. E. Davis (Eds.), *African American males in school and society: Practices and policies for effective education*, (pp. 122-133). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Brown, M. C. (2001). Collegiate desegregation and the public Black college: A new policy mandate. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*, 46–62.

Brown, M. C. II, & Dancy, T. E., II. (2008). An unsteady march toward equity: The political and educational contexts of African American educational attainment. In M. C. Brown & R. D. Bartee (Eds.), *The broken cisterns of African American education: Academic performance and achievement in the post-Brown era*, (pp. 17-42). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Brown, M. C., II, Dancy, T. E., II, & Davis, J. E. (2013). Educating African American males: Contexts for consideration, possibilities for practice. *Counterpoints: Studies in the Postmodern Theory of Education. Volume 383*. Peter Lang New York: New York, NY.

Brown, M. G., Wohn, D. Y., & Ellison, N. (2016). Without a map: College access and the online practices of youth from low-income communities. *Computers & Education*, *92*, 104-116.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954).

Brown-Wright, L., & Tyler, K. M. (2010). The effects of home-school dissonance on African American male high school students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 79*(2), 125-136.

Bryant, R. T. A. (2015). College preparation for African American students: Gaps in the high school educational experience. *Center for Law and Social Policy, Inc. (CLASP)*.

Burch, P. (2007). Educational policy and practice from the perspective of institutional theory: Crafting a wider lens. *Educational Researcher, 36*(2), 84-95.

Burke, P. J. (2013). *The right to higher education: Beyond widening participation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Burke, P. J., & McManus, J. (2011). Art for a few: exclusions and misrecognitions in higher education admissions practices. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(5), 699-712.

Bush, E. C., & Bush, L. (2010). Calling out the elephant: An examination of African American male achievement in community colleges. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 1*(1), 40–62.

Calabrese, R. L., & Poe, J. (1990). Alienation: An explanation of high dropout rates among African American and Latino students. *Educational Research Quarterly*.

California master plan for higher education: Major features. (2007). UC Educational Relations Department, UC Office of the President.

Carnevale, A. P., & Rose, S. J. (2003). Socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and selective college admissions. *A Century Foundation Paper.*

Carnevale, A. P., Rose, S. J., & Cheah, B. (2013). *The college payoff: Education, occupations, lifetime earnings*. Retrieved from https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/collegepayoff-summary.pdf

Carnevale, A. P., & Strohl, J. (2010). *How increasing college access is increasing inequality, and what to do about it.* Retrieved from https://tcf.org/assets/downloads/tcf-CarnevaleStrivers.pdf

Carnevale, A. P., & Strohl, J. (2013). *Separate and unequal: How higher education reinforces the intergenerational reproduction of white racial privilege*. Retrieved from https://cew.georgetown.edu/cew-reports/separate-unequal/

Caton, M. T. (2012). Black male perspectives on their educational experiences in high school. *Urban Education*, *47*(6), 1055-1085.

Chang, M. J., Astin, A. W., & Kim, D. (2004). Cross-racial interaction among undergraduates: Some consequences, causes, and patterns. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(5), 529-553.

Chang, M. J., Witt, D., Jones, J., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (2003). *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London, UK: Sage Publishing.

Clancy, P., & Goastellec, G. (2007). Exploring access and equity in higher education: Policy and performance in a comparative perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *61*(2), 136-154.

Cole, N. L. (2016). *Definition of racism in sociology: A system of power, privilege, and oppression.* Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/racism-definition-3026511

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 95–120.

College Board (2015). 2015 College-bound seniors total group profile report. Retrieved from http://media.collegeboard.com/digitalServices/pdf/research/2013/TotalGroup-2015.pdf

Comeaux, E., & Watford, T. (2006). Admissions & omissions: How "The Numbers" are used to exclude deserving students. *Bunche Research Report 3*(2).

Commission for the Review of Master Plan for Higher Education. (1987). *Master Plan renewed: Unity, equity, quality and efficiency in California postsecondary education*. http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/MPComm1987.pdf

Committee on Governance: Advisory Committee (2007). Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2007/gov907.pdf

Contreras, F. E. (2005). The reconstruction of merit post-Proposition 209. *Educational Policy, 19*(2), 371–395.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research, 3*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Corwin, Z. B., & Tierney, W. G. (2007). *Getting there-and beyond: Building a culture of college-going in high schools.* Los Angeles, CA: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis.

Corwin, Z. B., Venegas, K. M., Oliverez, P. M., & Colyar, J. E. (2004). School counsel how appropriate guidance affects educational equity. *Urban Education*, *39*(4), 442-457.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1995). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, K. Thomas, (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 103-122). New York, NY: The New Press.

Crimmins, E. M., Hayward, M. D., & Seeman, T. E. (2004). Race/Ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and health. In N. B. Anderson, R. A. Bulatao, & B. Cohen (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Differences in Health in Late Life* (Chap. 9). Washington DC: National Academies Press (US).

Cross, J. L. M., & Lin, N. (2008). Access to social capital and status attainment in the United States: Racial/ethnic and gender differences. *Social capital: An international research program*, 364-379.

Cuyjet, M. (2006). African American college men: Twenty-first century issues and concerns. In M.J. Cuyjet (Ed.), *African American men in college* pp. 3-23. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dale, S., & Krueger, A. (2011). Estimating the returns to college selectivity over the career, using administrative earning data. *Journal Human Resources 49*(2), 323-358. doi: 10.3368/jhr.49.2.323

Dalton, H. (1995). *Racial healing: Confronting the fear between Blacks and Whites*. New York: Doubleday.

Dancy, T. E., & Brown, M. C. (2008). Unintended consequences: African American male educational attainment and collegiate perceptions after Brown v. Board of Education. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51*(7), 984-1003.

Dancy, T. E., II, & Brown, M. C., II. (2012). *African American males and education: Researching the convergence of race and identity*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Daniel, B. K. (2016). Big data in higher education: The big picture. *Inside Higher Ed,* 19-28. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-06520-5_3

Darensbourg, A., Perez, E., & Blake, J. J. (2010). Overrepresentation of African American males in exclusionary discipline: The role of school-base mental health professionals in dismantling the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 1*(3), 196-211.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000a). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 166-173.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). New standards and old inequalities: School reform and the education of African American students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 263-287.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465-583). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of "No Child Left Behind." *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(3), 245-260.

Davis, J. (2014). The mathematical experiences of Black males in a predominantly Black urban middle school and community. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, 2*(3), 206-222. doi:10.18404/ijemst.55341

Davis, J. E. (2003). Early schooling and academic achievement of African American males. *Urban Education, 38*(5), 515-537.

Davis, J. E., & Jordan, W. J. (1994). The effects of school context, structure, and experiences on African American males in middle and high school. *The Journal of Negro Education, 63*(4), 570-587.

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, *June*, 26-31.

Delgado, R. (1995). *The Rodrigo chronicles: Conversations about race in America*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Delgado, R. (1996). *The coming race war: And other apocalyptic tales of America after affirmative action and welfare*. NYU Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2000). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: an introduction*. New York, NY: University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2013). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Denzin, N.K & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.

DeWalt, M. & DeWalt, R. (2002). *Participant observation: a guide for fieldworker*s. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Dey, I. & Boomgarden, G (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

California student aid commission: Discussion of the upcoming review of California's Master Plan for Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.csac.ca. gov/comm/comm/111909/tab%205.pdf

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*,147-60.

Dixson, A., & Rousseau, C. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*, 7-27.

Dixson, A., & Rousseau, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Critical race theory in education: All god's children got a song*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Douglass, J. A. (1999). The evolution of a social contract: The university of California before and in the aftermath of affirmative action. *European Journal of Education, 34*(4), 1-16.

Douglass, J. A. (2000). *The California idea and American higher education 1850 to the 1960 master plan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Douglass, J. A. (2007). *The conditions for admission: Access, equity, and the social contract of public universities*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Duderstadt, J. J., & Womack, F. W. (2003). *Beyond the crossroads: The future of the public university in America*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Duncan, G. A. (2002). Beyond love: A critical race ethnography of the schooling of adolescent Black males. *Equity &Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 131-143.

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2003). Reaching for the brass ring: The U.S. News & World Report rankings and competition. *Review of Higher Education 26*(2), 145-162.

Enrollment by ethnicity for 2013-14: Statewide enrollment by ethnicity and grade (n.d.). Retrieved from http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Enrollment/EthnicGrade. aspx?cChoice=StEnrAll&cYear=201314&cLevel=State&cTopic=Enrollment&m yTimeFrame=S&cType=ALL&cGender=B

Ensminger, M. E., Lamkin, R. P., & Jacobson, N. (1996). School leaving: A longitudinal perspective including neighborhood effects. *Child Development, 67*, 2400-2416.

Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. (2005). First grade and educational attainment by age 22: a new story 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, *110*(5), 1458-1502.

Erickson, F., & Wittrock, M.C. (1986). *Qualitative methods in research on teaching.* East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Eston, T. D. (2003). Sharing the responsibility: Increasing Black male student enrollment. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, *20*(22), 1-4.

Executive order 11246, as amended. Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.dol.gov/ofccp/regs/statutes/eo11246.html

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline: The role of school policy. *Urban Education, 42*(6), 536-559.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *The nation's report card: A first look: 2013 mathematics and reading* (NCES 2014-451) Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Fletcher, J., & Tienda, M. (2010). Race and ethnic differences in college achievement: Does high school attended matter? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 627*(1), 144-166.

Flores, A. (2007). Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or opportunity gap? *The High School Journal, 91*, 29-42. doi:10.1353/hsj.2007.0022

Ford, D. Y., & Moore, J. L. (2013). Understanding and reversing underachievement, low achievement, and achievement gaps among high-ability African American males in urban school contexts. *The Urban Review, 45*(4), 399-415.

Francis, A. M., & Tannuri-Pianto, M. (2012). The redistributive equity of affirmative action: Exploring the role of race, socioeconomic status, and gender in college admissions. *Economics of Education Review, 31*(1), 45-55.

Frazier, V., & Rhoden, E. (2011). Review: Black American males in higher education: Diminishing proportions. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 2*(2), 234-238.

Freeman, K. (2005). *African Americans and college choice: The influence of family and school*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Frierson, H. T., Pearson, W., Jr., & Wyche, J. H. (2009). *Black American males in higher education: Diminishing proportions.* Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald.

Gade, M. L. & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (United States) (1993). *Four multicampus systems: Some policies and practices that work.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.

Gándara, P. (2001). *Paving the way to postsecondary education: K-12 intervention programs for underrepresented youth*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001205.pdf.

Gardner, S. K. (2010). Keeping up with the Joneses: Socialization and culture in doctoral education at one striving institution. *Journal of Higher Education, 81*(6), 728-749.

Gee, J.P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gillborn, D, (2005). Education policy as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20(4).*

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, critical race theory, and the primacy of racism: Race, class, gender, and disability in education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*, 277-287.

Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *Foundations of critical race theory in education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gotanda, N. (1991). A critique of "our constitution is color-blind." *Stanford Law Review, 44*(1), 1-68. doi:10.2307/1228940

Grutter v. Bollinger 538 US 306 (6th Cir. 2003).

Gumport, P. J., & Bastedo, M.N. (2001). Academic stratification and endemic conflict: Remedial education policy at CUNY. *Review of Higher Education 24*, 333-349.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*(3), 330-367.

Hacker, A. (2010). *Two nations: Black and White, separate, hostile, unequal*. Simon and Schuster.

Hagedorn, L. S., & Tierney, W. G. (2002). *Increasing access to college: extending possibilities for all students*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse coalitions and the institutionalization of practice. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (Eds.), *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning* (pp. 43-76). London, UK: UCL.

Hale, S. (2006). Widening participation, equalizing opportunity? Higher education's mission impossible. *Politics*, *26*(2), 93-100.

Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. R. (1996). Political science and the three institutionalisms. *Political Studies, 44*, 936–957.

Hallett, R. E., & Venegas, K. M. (2011). Is increased access enough? Advanced Placement courses, quality, and success in low-income urban schools. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 34*, 468–487. doi:10.1177/016235321103400305

Halpern, S. C. (1995). *On the limits of the law: The ironic legacy of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haney-López, I. F. (1994). *The social construction of race: Some observations on illusion, fabrication, and choice.* Retrieved from http://scholarship.law. berkeley.edu/facpubs/1815

Harper, S. R. (2006). Peer support for African American male college achievement: Beyond internalized racism and the burden of 'acting White'. *Journal of Men's Studies, 14*(3), 337-358.

Harper, S. R. (2009). Niggers no more: A critical race counter narrative on Black male student achievement at predominantly white colleges and universities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22*(6), 697-712.

Harper, S. R. (2012a). *Black male student success in higher education: A report from the national Black male college achievement study*. Retrieved from https://www.armstrong.edu/images/uploads/move/Black_Male_Student_Success_ in_Hgher_Ed.pdf

Harper, S. R. (2012b). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutionalism norms. *Review of Higher Education, 36*, 9-29.

Harper, S. R. (2013). Am I my brother's teacher? Black undergraduates, peer pedagogies, and racial socialization in predominantly White postsecondary contexts. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 183-211.

Harper, S. R. (2014). (Re)Setting the agenda for college men of color: Lessons learned from a 15-year movement to improve black male student success. *Men of Color in Higher Education: New Foundations for Developing Models for Success*, 116-143. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Harper, S. R. (2015). Success in these schools? Visual counter-narratives of young men of color and urban high schools they attend. *Urban Education, 50*(2), 139-169.

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), 389-414. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0052

Haveman, R., & Smeeding, T. (2006). The role of higher education in social mobility. *Future of Children 16*, 125–150.

Heclo, H. (2008). *On thinking institutionally*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Hefner, D. (2004). Where the boys aren't: The decline of black males in colleges and universities has sociologists and educators concerned about the future of the African American community. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 21*, 70 –75.

Henderson, V. C. (1992). Factors affecting success of African-American male graduate students: A grounded theory approach. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Retrospective Theses and Dissertations (Paper 9834).

Hill, L. D. (2012). Environmental threats to college counseling strategies in urban high schools: Implications for student preparation for college transitions. *The Urban Review, 44*(1), 36-59.

Hill, L. D., Bregman, A., & Andrade, F. (2015). Social capital for college: Network composition and access to selective institutions among urban high school students. *Urban Education, 50*(3), 316-345.

Hiraldo, P. (2010). The role of critical race theory in higher education. *The Vermont Connection, 31*, 53-59.

Hines, E. M., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2013). Parental characteristics, ecological factors, and the academic achievement of African American males. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 91*(1), 68-77.

Hodge, S. R., Harrison, L., Jr., Burden, J. W., Jr., & Dixson, A. D. (2008). *Brown* in black and white—then and now: A question of educating or sporting African American males in America. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51, 928-952.

Hoffman, J., & Lowitzki, K. (2005). Predicting college success with high school grades and test scores: Limitations for minority students. *The Review of Higher Education, 8*(4). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2005.0042

Holland, N. E. (2011). The power of peers: Influences on postsecondary education planning and experiences of African American students. *Urban Education 46*(5), 1029-1055. Doi:10.1177/0042085911400339

Holland, N. E., & Farmer-Hinton, R. L. (2009). Leave no schools behind: The importance of a college culture in urban public high schools. *The High School Journal*, *92*(3), 24-43.

257

Hotz, V. J., Rasmussen, J., Wiemers, E., & Koegel, K. M. (2016). Role of parental wealth & income in financing children's college attendance & its consequences. Retrieved from http://www.sole-jole.org/17564.pdf

Hout, M. (2012). Social and economic returns to college education in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *38*, 379-400.

Howard, T. C. (2008). Who really cares? The disenfranchisement of African American males in preK-12 schools: A critical race theory perspective. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(5), 954-985.

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matters in schools: Closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Howard, T. C. (2013a). How does it feel to be a problem? Black male students, schools, and learning in enhancing the knowledge base to disrupt deficit frameworks. *Review of Research in Education, 37*, 54-86.

Howard, T. C. (2013b). *Black male (d): Peril and promise in the education of African American males*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hoxby, C., & Turner, S. (2013). Expanding college opportunities for high-achieving, low income students. *Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper*, (12-14).

Hoyle, J. R., & Kutka, T. M. (2008). Maintaining America's egalitarian edge in the 21st century: Unifying K-12 and postsecondary education for the success of all students. *Theory into Practice*, *47*(4), 353-362.

Hu, S. (2003). Educational aspirations and postsecondary access and choice. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *11*(14).

Hugo, E. (2004). *Rethinking counseling for college: Perceptions of the school and counselor roles in increasing college enrollment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 595-610.

Hurtado, S., Inkelas, K., Briggs, C., & Rhee, B. (1997). Differences in college access and choice among racial/ethnic groups: Identifying continuing barriers. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(1), 43-75. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42 43618

Iglesias, K. (2014). *The price of prestige: A study of the impact of striving behavior on the expenditure patterns of American colleges and universities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Seton Hall Dissertations and Theses (ETDs).

Ingram, T. N. (2013). Fighting F.A.I.R. (Feelings of Alienation, Isolation, and Racism): Using critical race theory to deconstruct the experiences of African American male doctoral students. *Journal of Progressive Policy and Practice, 1*(1), 1-18.

Irving, M. A., & Hudley, C. (2005). Cultural mistrust, academic outcome expectations and outcome value among African American males. *Urban Education, 40*, 476-496.

Jackson, J. F., & Moore, J. L. (2006). African American males in education: Endangered or ignored? *Teachers College Record*, *108*(2), 201.

Jaschik, S. (2006). Momentum for going SAT-optional. *Inside Higher Ed*, Retrieved from http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/05/26/sat

Jaschik, S. (2014). Merit, diversity and grad admissions. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/new/2014/07/14/scholar-explores-how-graduate-admissions-committees-view-measures-merit-and

Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1998). *The Black-White test score gap*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Johnson, J. D. (2015). *Models of success: African American males and their pathways toward enrollment in doctoral programs at a predominantly white institution.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (37337713).

Johnson, H. P. (2016). *Higher education in California*. Public Policy Institute of CA.

Johnson, H. & Sengupta, R. (2009). Closing the gap: Meeting California's need for college graduates. *Public Policy Institute of California*. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_409HJR.pdf

Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Kauffman, D., Liu, E., & Donaldson, M. L. (2004). The support gap: New teachers' early experiences in high-income and low-income schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *12*(61).

Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education. (2010, September 9). *The California master plan for education.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/

acadinit/mastplan/master_plan2002.pdf

Jones, L. (2002). *Making it on broke promises: Leading African American male scholars confront the culture of higher education.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Jones, R. A. (1985). *Research methods in the social and behavioral sciences, 2.* Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Kahlenberg, R. D. (2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. *American Educator, 6, 2-40*. Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Kahlenberg.pdf.

American Educator, 6, 2-40. Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Kahlenberg.pdf

Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Karen, D. (1991). The politics of class, race, and gender: Access to higher education in the United States, 1960-1986. *American Journal of Education*, *99*(2), 208-237.

Kearney, M. S., Harris, B. H., Jácome, E., & Parker, L. (2014). The economic facts about crime and incarceration in the United States. *The Hamilton Project*. Retrieved from http://www.hamiltonproject.org/blog/the_economic_challenges_of_crime_incarceration_in_the_United_States

Kena, G., Musu-Gillette, L., Robinson, J., Wang, X., Rathbun, A., Zhang, J., . . . & Velez, E. D. V. (2015). *e Condition of Education 2015* (NCES 2015-144). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved [date] from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch

Kerby, S. (2012). 10 Reasons why we need diversity on college campuses. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2012/10/09/41004/10-reasons-why-we-need-diversity-on-college-campuses/

Kerr, C. (1978). Higher education: paradise lost? *Higher Education*, *7*(3), 261-278.

Kerr, C. (2001). Reconsiderations after the revolts of the 1960s. In *The uses of the University*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The Gold and the Blue, Volume One: A Personal Memoir of the University of California 1949 – 1967, Academic Triumphs*. University of California Press

Kezar, A. J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429-459

Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., & Burkhardt, J. (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kidder, W. C. (2003). The struggle for access from Sweatt to Grutter: A history of African American, Latino, and American Indian law school admissions, 1950-2000. *Harvard. BlackLetter Law Journal*, *19*(1).

Kim, D. H., & Schneider, B. L. (2005). Social capital in action: Alignment of parental support in adolescents' transition to postsecondary education. *Social forces*, *84*(2), 1181-1206.

Kimmel, M. (2000). *The gendered society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kluger, R. (1976). *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's struggle for equality*. New York: Knopf Doubleday.

Knoester, M., & Au, W. (2012). Standardized testing and school segregation: Like tinder for fire? *Journal of Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(1), 1-14. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2015.1121474

Kober, N. (2001). It takes more than testing: Closing the achievement gap. *A Report of the Center on Education Policy*. Washington, DC: Center on Educational Policy.

Kohli, R., & Solórzano, D. G. (2012). Teachers, please learn our names!: Racial microaggressions and the K-12 classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *15*(4), 441-462.

Koretz, D., Russell, M., Shin, C. D., Horn, C., & Shasby, K. (2002). Testing and diversity in postsecondary education: The case of California. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(1). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n1/.

Kozol, J. (2012). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.

Krippendorf, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Krippendorf, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Kuh, G. D., & Pascarella, E. T. (2004). What does institutional selectivity tell us about educational quality? *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, *36*(5), 52-59.

Kunjufu, J. (2010). *Reducing the Black male dropout rate*. Chicago Heights, IL: African American Images.

Labuschagne, E. E. (2003). *Factors to consider in the transition from a teacher-centered model to a learner-centered model in a computer-rich learning environment.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Pretoria, South Africa.

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*, 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 206-214.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational researcher*, *35*(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). "Who you callin' nappy-headed?" A critical race theory look at the construction of Black women. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 12*, 87-99.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Lack of achievement or loss of opportunity. In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.), *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers college record*, *97*(1), 47.

Lamont, M., Beljean, S., & Clair, M. (2014). What is missing? Cultural processes and causal pathways to inequality. *Socio-Economic Review*, *12*(3), 573-608.

Lang, D. (1987a). Equality, prestige, and controlled mobility in the academic hierarchy. *American Journal of Education*, *95*(3), 441-467.

Lang, D. (1987b). Stratification and Prestige Hierarchies in Graduate and Professional Education. *Sociological Inquiry, 57(1),* 12-31. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682x.1987.tb01178.x

Lee, J. M. (2012). An examination of the participation of African American students in graduate education without public HBCUs. In R. T. Palmer, A. A. Hilton, & T. P. Fountaine (Eds.), *Black graduate education at historically Black colleges and universities* (pp. 61-82). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Lemann, N. (2000). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lewis, A. (2003). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms and communities*. Camden, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lewis, D. R., & Hearn, J. (Eds.). (2003). *The public research university: Serving the public good in new times*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Lewis, S., Simon, C., Uzzell, R., Horwitz, A., & Casserly, M. (2010). A call for change: The social and educational factors contributing to the outcomes of Black males in Urban Schools. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED512669.

Light, A., & Strayer, W. (2002). From Bakke to Hopwood: Does race affect college attendance and completion? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *84*(1), 34-44.

Lightcap, B. (2016). The Morrill Act of 1862. Retrieved from http://www3.nd.edu /~rbarger/www7/morrill.html

Lin, J. (2009). UC Regents approve admissions reform. UCLA Newsroom. Retrieved from http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/uc-regents-approve-admissions-80362

Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in social capital. *Contemporary sociology*, *29*(6), 785-795.

Liu, A. (2011). Unraveling the myth of meritocracy within the context of U.S. Higher Education. *Higher Education, 62*(4) pp. 383-397.

Lloyd, H. (2013). *The impact of racial identity, masculinity, and academic self-concept on the academic achievement of African American males in high school* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Lopez, R., Madrid-Barela, A., & Flores Macias, R. (1976). Chicanos in higher education: Status and issues. *Monograph 7*.

Losen, D. J., & Martinez, T. E. (2013). Out of school & off track: The overuse of suspensions in American middle and high schools. *The Center for Civil Rights Remedies*. Retrieved from https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/

projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/out-of-school-and-off-track-the-overuse-of-suspensions-in-american-middle-and-high-schools/Exec_Sum_OutofSchool_OffTrack_UCLA.pdf

Louie, V. (2007). Who makes the transition to college? Why we should care, what we know, and what we need to do. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(10), 2222-2251.

Love, B. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling: A critical race theory analysis of the 'Majoritarian achievement gap' story. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*, 227-246.

Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketization: The implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, *5*(1), 1-17.

Mahoney, J., & Schensul, D. (2006). Historical context and path dependence. In R. E. Goodin and C. Tilly, *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Marable, M. (2003). *The great wells of democracy: The meaning of race in American life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Marable, M. (2015). *How capitalism underdeveloped Black America: Problems in race, political economy, and society*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. New York: Free Press.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (2011). The logic of appropriateness. In R. E. Goodin (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science* (479-497). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Marginson, S. (2012). Including the other: Regulation of the human rights of mobile students in a nation-bound world. *Higher Education, 63*(4), 497-512.

Marginson, S., & Van der Wende, M. (2007). To rank or to be ranked: The impact of global rankings in higher education. *Journal of studies in international education*, *11*(3-4), 306-329.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). Designing qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage Publications.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, D. S., Rothwell, J., & Domina, T. (2009). The changing bases of segregation in the United States. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *626*(1), 74-90.

Matsuda, M. (1987). Looking to the bottom: Critical legal studies and reparations. In K. Crenshaw et al. (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory* (pp. 36-79). New York, NY: New Press.

Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(1), 63–88.

McDonough, P. M. (2005). Counseling and college counseling in America's high schools. *State of college admission*, 107-121.

McLendon, M. K., Tandberg, D. A., & Hillman, N. W. (2014). Financing college opportunity: Factors influencing state spending on student financial aid and campus appropriations, 1990 through 2010. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 655*(1), 143-162.

Mehan, H. (2015). *In the front door: Creating a college-going culture of learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mello, Z. R. (2005). *Across time and place: The development of educational and occupational expectations from adolescence to adulthood in relation to gender, racial/ethnic group, and parental and neighborhood socioeconomic status*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Meredith, M. (2004). Why do universities compete in the ratings game? An empirical analysis of the effects of the US News and World Report college rankings. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(5), 443-461.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Meyer, H. D., St. John, E. P., Chankseliani, M., & Uribe, L. (2013). The crisis of higher education access-a crisis of justice. In *Fairness in access to higher education in a global perspective* (1-11). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Meyer, J. W. (2000). Globalization: Sources and effects on national states and societies. *International Sociology, 15*, 233-248.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G., & Ramirez, F. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*, 144-181.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*, 340-363.

Meyer, J., Scott, R., Strang, D., & Creighton, A.L., (1988). Bureaucratization without centralization: Changes in the organizational system of United States public education, 1940-80, in L. G. Zucker (Ed.). *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment* (139-168). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Mijs, J. J. (2016). The unfulfillable promise of meritocracy: three lessons and their implications for justice in education. *Social Justice Research*, *29*(1), 14-34.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis, 2*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Milner, H. R. (2007). African American males in urban schools. No excuses-teach and empower. *Theory into Practice, 46*, 239–246.

Morfin, O., Perez, V., Parker, L., Lynn, M., & Arrona, J. (2006). Hiding the politically obvious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education. *Educational Policy, 20*, 249-270.

Morrison, H. R., & Epps, B. D. (2002). Warehousing or rehabilitation? Public schooling in the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Negro Education, 71*(3), 218.

Muhammad, C. G. (2008). African American students and college choice: A consideration of the role of school counselors. *Nassp Bulletin*, *92*(2), 81-94.

Muhammad, C. G., Smith, M. J., & Duncan, G. A. (2008). College choice and college experiences: Intersections of race and gender along the secondary to post-secondary education continuum. *The Negro Educational Review, 59*, 141-146.

Mumper, M. (2003). The future of college access: The declining role of public higher education in promoting equal opportunity. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *585*(1), 97-117.

Musselin, C., & Teixeira, P.N. (Eds.). (2013). *Reforming higher education: Public policy design   and implementation*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Nasir, N. I. S., & Shah, N. (2011). On defense: African American males making sense of racialized narratives in mathematics education. *Journal of African American Males in Education*, *2*(1), 24-45.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). School composition and the Black-White achievement gap. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/

Nettles, M., Millett, C., Ready, D., Ludwig, J., & Forman, J. (2003). Attacking the African American: White achievement gap on college admissions tests. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy, 6*, 215-252.

Neyland, L. W. (1990). *Historically Black land grant institutions and the development of agriculture and home economics 1890-1990*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida A&M University Foundation.

Nica, E., & Popescu, G. H. (2014). The Economics of Higher Education in the United States. *Knowledge Horions. Economics*, *6*(1), 87.

Noeth, R. J., & Wimberly, G. L. (2002). Creating seamless educational transitions for urban African American and Hispanic Students. *ACT Policy Report*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475197.pdf

Noguera, P. (2003). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education, Vol. 38*(4), 431-459.

O'Meara, K. A. (2007). Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research: Volume 22* (121-179). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

O'Meara, K. A., & Meekins, M. (2012). Inside rankings: Limitations and possibilities. *New England Resource Center for Higher Education Publications*. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context= Nerche_pubs

Oakes, J., Rogers, J., Lipton, M., & Morrell, E. (2002). The social construction of college access: Confronting the technical, cultural, and political barriers to low-income students of color. In W.G. Tierney. & L. S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing access to college: Extending possibilities for all students* (pp. 105-121). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Oakes, J., Wells, A. S., & Jones, M. (1997). Detracking: The social construction of ability, cultural politics, and resistance to reform. *Teachers College Record, 98*(3).

Obama, B. (2009). *State of the Union address* [Transcript].009). Retrieved from http://www.ontheissues.org/Celeb/Barack_Obama_Education.htm

Ogawa, R. T. (1992). Institutional theory and examining leadership in schools. *International Journal of Educational Management, 6*(3).

Ogbu, J. U. (1997). Understanding the school performance of urban African Americans: Some essential background knowledge. In H. Walberg, O. Reyes & R. Weissberg (Eds.), *Children and youth: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 190-222). London: Sage.

Ogbu, J. U. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Oliver, M. B. (2003). African American men as "criminal and dangerous": Implications of media portrayals of crime on the "criminalization" of African American men. *Journal of African American Studies, 7*(2), 3-18.

Orfield, G. (2004). *Dropouts in America: Confronting the graduation rate crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Oreopoulous, P. & Petronijevis, U. (2013). Making college worth it: A review of the returns to Higher Education. *Future of Children, 23*(1), 41-65.

Osborne, J.W., & Walker, C. (2006). Stereotype threat, identification with academics, and withdrawal from school: Why the most successful students of color might be most likely to withdraw. *Educational Psychology, 26*(4), 563- 577.

Palmer, R. T., Davis, R. J., Moore, J. L., & Hilton, A. A. (2010). A nation at risk: Increasing college participation and persistence among African American males to stimulate US global competitiveness. *Journal of African American Males in Education (JAAME), 1*(2).

Parish, D.J. (2017). Campus civility in a politically charged era. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2017/03/03/campus-presidents-should-be-civil-and-measured-speakinng-about-national.

Parker, L. (2015). Critical race theory in education and qualitative inquiry: What each has to offer each other now? *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*, 199-205.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? CRT's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 7-22.

Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education, 51*, 315-342.

Paulsen, M. B., & St. John, E. P. (2002). Social class and college costs: Examining the financial nexus between college choice and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(2), 189-236.

Payne, M. (2010). *Educational lynching: Critical race theory and the suspension of Black boys* (Unpublished master's thesis). San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA.

Pérez-Huber, L., & Solórzano, D. G. (2015). Racial microaggressions as a tool for critical race research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(3), 297-320.

Perna, L. W. (2002). Retaining African Americans in higher education: Challenging paradigms for retaining students, faculty, and administrators. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(5), 652-659. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2002.0049

Perna, L. W. (2005). The benefits of higher education: Sex, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic group differences. *The Review of Higher Education*, *29*(1), 23-52.

Perna, L. W. (2006). Studying college access and choice: A proposed conceptual model. In *Higher Education:* (pp. 99-157). Springer Netherlands.

Perna, L. W., & Titus, M. A. (2005). The relationship between parental involvement as social capital and college enrollment: An examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *The journal of higher education*, *76*(5), 485-518.

Plank, S. B., & Jordan, W. J. (2001). Effects of information, guidance, and actions on postsecondary destinations: A study of talent loss. *American educational research Journal*, *38*(4), 947-979.

Polite, V. C., & Davis, J. E. (Eds.). (1999). *African American males in school and society: Practices and policies for effective education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Powell, A. G. (1996). *Lessons from privilege: The American prep school tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research.* Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Prison Census Data as of June 30, 2013. (2013). Sacramento, CA: Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

Pusser, B. (2004). *Burning down the house: Politics, governance, and affirmative action at university of California.* State University of New York Press: Albany, NY.

Pusser, B., Kempner, K., Marginson, S., & Ordorika, I. (Eds.) (2012). *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge creation and state building in the era of globalization.* New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Radcliffe, R., & Bos, B. (2011). Mentoring approaches to create a college-going culture for at-risk secondary level students. *American Secondary Education*, 86-107.

Raffo, C., Dyson, A., Gunter, H., Hall, D., Jones, L., & Kalambouka, A. (2007). Education and poverty: A critical review of theory, policy and practice. York, UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Ranbom, S., & Lynch, J. (1988). Timeline: The long road to educational equality. *Educational Record, 69*(1), 16–22.

Reed, D. (2008). California's future workforce: Will there be enough college graduates? *Public Policy Institute.* Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books/about/ Californias_Future_Workforce.html? id=_FI1Sep4tyYC&printsec=frontcover &source=kp_read_button#v=onepage&q&f=false

Regents of the University of California, The. (2000). Committee on educational policy: January 20, 2000. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/ minutes/2000/edpol100.pdf

Regents of the University of California. (2001). Committee on educational policy: November 14, 2001. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/ minutes/2001/edpol1101.pdf

Regents of the University of California. (2002). Committee on educational policy: July 17, 2002. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/ 2002/edpol702.pdf

Regents of the University of California, The. (2004). Committee on educational policy: May 19, 2004. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2004/edpol504.pdf

Regents of the University of California, The. (2007a). Committee on educational policy: July 19, 2007. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2007/edpol707.pdf

Regents of the University of California, The. (2007b). Committee on educational policy: September 19, 2007. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2007/edpol907.pdf

Regents of the University of California, The. (2008). Committee on educational policy: July 16-17, 2008. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2008/edpol7.pdf

Regents of the University of California, The. (2011). Committee on educational policy: January 19, 2011. Retrieved from http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2011/edpol1.pdf

Reid, M. J., & Moore, J. L. (2008). College readiness and academic preparation for postsecondary education: Oral histories of first-generation urban college students. *Urban education*, *43*(2), 240-261.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in Research.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. New York: New York University Press.

Robinson, E. L. (2014). *African American males in higher education*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge College.

Robinson, M. (2003). Student enrollment in high school AP sciences and calculus: How does it correlate with STEM careers? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, *23*(4), 265-273.

Robinson, S., Stempel, A., & McCree, I. (2005). Gaining traction, gaining ground: How some high schools accelerate learning for struggling students. Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

Roderick, M., Coca, V., & Nagaoka, J. (2011). Potholes on the road to college: High school effects in shaping urban students' participation in college application, four-

year college enrollment, and college match. *Sociology of Education*, *84*(3), 178-211.

Roderick, M., Nagaoka, J., Coca, V., & Moeller, E. (2008). *From high school to the future: Potholes on the road to college.* https://consortium.uchicago.edu/ publications/high-school-future-potholes-road-college

Roithmayr, D. (1997). Deconstructing the distinction between bias and merit, 85 Calif. *L. Rev*, *1449*(10).

Rong, X. L. (1996). Effects of race and gender on teachers' perception of the social behavior of elementary students. *Urban Education, 31*, 261-290.

Rowan, B., & Miskel, C. G. (1999). Institutional theory and the study of educational organizations. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration,* (pp. 359-382). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Bell, A., & Perna, L. W. (2008). Contextual influences on parental involvement in college going: Variations by socioeconomic class. *Journal of Higher Education, 79*(5), 564-586.

Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452226651#sthash.dLqCjQP4.dpuf

Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication.

Saunders, J., Davis, L., Williams, T., & Williams, J. (2004). Gender differences in self-perceptions and academic outcomes: A study of African American high school 125 students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33*, 81-90. doi:10.1023/A:1027390531768

Savenye, W., & Robinson, R. (1996). Qualitative research methodologies. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), *The Handbook of Research for Educational Communications Technology*, 1171-1196. New York: Simon & Schuster MacMillan.

School-to-Prison Pipeline. (2011). Retrieved from https://www.nyclu.org/en/ issues/racial-justice/school-prison-pipeline-0

Scott, W. R. (1995). Introduction: Institutional theory and organizations. *The institutional construction of organizations*, 11-23.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, W. R. (2008 *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (4th ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Sears, D. O., Van Laar, C., Carrillo, M., & Kosterman, R. (1997). Is it really racism? The origins of White Americans' opposition to race-targeted policies. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*(1), 16-53.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shavit, Y. (Ed.). (2007). *Stratification in higher education: A comparative study*. Stanford University Press.

Simon, N. S., & Johnson, S. M. (2015). Teacher turnover in high-poverty schools: What we know and can do. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(3), 1-36.

Singleton, G. E. (2013). More courageous conversations about race. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The urban review*, *34*(4), 317-342.

Smith, C. P. (2000). Content analysis and narrative analysis. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*, (pp. 313-335). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smith J. (2013). Bad newz kennels: Michael Vick and dogfighting. In J. R. Blaney, L.R. Lippert, J. S. Smith (Eds.), *Repairing the athlete's image: Studies in sports image restoration* (pp. 151-168). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Snyder, T. D., & Zillow, S. A. (2012). Digest of education statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012001.pdf.

Solórzano, D. (1995). The doctorate production and baccalaureate origins of African Americans in the sciences and engineering. *Journal of Negro Education, 64*, 15-32.

Solórzano, D. (2009). Forward. In W. Perez, *We ARE Americans: Undocumented students pursuing the American dream* (pp. ix-xiii). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Solórzano, D. G. (2013). Critical race theory's intellectual roots: My email epistolary with Derrick Bell, In M. Lynn & A. Dixson, (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory in Education Handbook*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(1/2), 60.

Solórzano, D. G., Allen, W., & Carroll, G. (2002). A case study of racial microaggressions and campus racial climate at the University of California, Berkeley. *UCLA Chicano/Latino Law Review, 23*, 15-111.

Solórzano, D. G., & Ornelas, A. (2002). A critical race analysis of advanced placement classes: A case of educational inequality. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *1*(4), 215-229.

Solórzano, D. G., & Ornelas, A. (2004). A critical race analysis of Latina/o and African American advanced placement enrollment in public high schools. *The High School Journal*, *87*(3), 15-26.

Solórzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 272-294.

Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2002). "Critical race methodology: Counter storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research." *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 23-44.

Spillane, J. & Burch, P. (2006). The institutional environment and instructional practice: Changing patterns of guidance and control in public education. In H. D. Meyer and B. Rowan, *New Institutionalism in Education*, 87-100. Albany NY: SUNY Press.

Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1960. (n.d). Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/library/publications/1960/compendia/statab/81ed.html

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 613–629.

Sternberg, R.J. (2010) *College admissions for the 21st century*. Harvard University Press.
Cambridge, Massachusetts. pp. 12-13.

Sternberg, R., Bonney, C. R., Gabora, L., & Merrifield, M. (2012). WICS: A model for college and university admissions. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(1), 30-41.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1997). On the virtues of the old institutionalism. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 1-18.

Stinson, D. W. (2013). Negotiating the "White male math myth": African American male students and success in school mathematics. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *44*(1), 69-99.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2010). When race and gender collide: Social and cultural capital's influence on the academic achievement of African American and Latino males. *The Review of Higher Education*, *33*(3), 307-332.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2014). What role does grit play in the academic success of Black male collegians at predominantly White institutions? *Journal of African American Studies*, *18*(1), 1-10.

Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory, socialist critique, and the quest for social justice in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 243-260.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571-610.

Swartz, D. (2008). Social closure in American elite higher education. *Theory & Society*, 37, 409-419.

Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education, 22*, 195–247.

Tatum, A. W. (2011). Brother author: Writings from the African American male summer literacy institute. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/wnet/tavissmiley/tsr/too-important-tofail/brother-author/

Taylor, E. (2000). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the backlash against affirmative action: Washington state and initiative 200. *The Teachers College Record, 102*(3), 539-560.

Teranishi, R., Allen, W. R., & Solórzano, D. G. (2004). Opportunity at the crossroads: Racial, inequality, school segregation, and higher education in California. *Teachers College Record, 106*, 2224-2245.

Teranishi, R., & Briscoe, K. (2006). Social capital and the racial stratification of college opportunity. *Higher Education:* (pp. 591-614). Houten, Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

The Master Plan Survey Team. (1960). *The Master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975.* California State Department of Education: Sacramento.

Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thelin, J. R., & Gasman, M. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, *4*, 3-22.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A., Kohli, R., Sacramento, J., Henning, N., Agarwal-Rangnath, R., & Sleeter, C. (2014). Toward an ethnic studies pedagogy: Implications for K-12 schools from the research. *Springer Science Business Media 47*(1), 104.

Townsend, B. L. (2000). The disproportionate discipline of African American learners: Reducing school suspensions and expulsions. *Exceptional Children*, *66*(3), 381-391.

Trent, W. T., Owens-Nicholson, D., Eatman, T. K., Burke, M., Daughtery, J., & Kathy, N. (2003). Justice, equality of educational opportunity and affirmative action in higher education. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education*, (pp. 22–48). Stanford, CA: Stanford Education.

Trow, M. (2007). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. In *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 243-280). Springer Netherlands.

Trusty, J. (2002). African American's educational expectations: Longitudinal causal models for women and men. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD, 80*(3), 332-345. Retrieved from http://proxy.library.cpp.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/219015309?accountid=10357

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: a study in the construction of reality.* New York: Free Press.

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (1995). *Affirmative action: Undergraduate admissions and graduate and professional school admissions: To members of the committee on educational policy and the special committee on affirmative action policies: Item for discussion for joint meeting of May 18, 1995.* (OCLC No. 380848156). Oakland: Office of the President.

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2001). *Comprehensive review.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2001/comprev.pdf

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2003). *UC fall enrollment headcount by level and residency.* Retrieved from https://www.university ofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/fall-enrollment-headcounts

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2005). *The University of California's distinctive freshman admissions process: A white paper prepared by the board of admissions and relations with schools.* Retrieved from http://senate. universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/boars.freshadmprocess02.05.pdf

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2007). *The BOARS eligibility-reform proposal.* Retrieved from http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/ _files/committees/boars/boars.supplmnt..eligibility.propsl.09.07.pdf

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2007b). *California Master Plan for Higher Education in perspective.* Retrieved from http://senate.University ofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/boars/boars.supplmnt..eligibility.propsl.09.07.p df

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2009a). *California Master Plan for Higher Education: Major features.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/ acadinit/mastplan/mpsummary.htm

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2009b). *UC Regents adopt changes to freshman eligibility.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/student-affairs/_files/GUIDELINES_FOR_IMPLEMENTATION_OF_UNIVERSITY_P OLICY_on_UG_ADM_Revised_July2012.pdf

UCOP University of California Office of the President. (2012). *Guidelines for implementation of university policy on undergraduate admissions.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/student-affairs/_files/GUIDELINES_FOR_ IMPLEMENTATION_OF_UNIVERSITY_POLICY_on_UG_ADM_Revised_Jul y2012.pdf

UCOP University of California, Office of the President. (2016a). *Institutional research and academic planning* [data file]. Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu /institutional-research-academic-planning/content-analysis/ug-admissions/ index.html

UCOP University of California, Office of the President. (2016b). *The UC system* [data file]. Retrieved from https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-system

Ugo, I., & Hill, L. (2017). *Student achievement and growth on California's K-12 assessments* (Rep.). Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=1235

United States Census Bureau. (2011). *Demographic Information from 2010 Census for California, Delaware, Kansas, Pennsylvania and Wyoming*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010_census/cb11- cn156.html.

University. (2016). In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/university.

University of California. (2002). *Eligibility in the local context program evaluation report.* Regents Meeting 2002. Retrieved from http://regents.universityof california.edu/ regmeet/may02/304attach.pdf

University of California. (2004). Eligibility and admissions study group: Final report to the president. *Research and Evaluation Reports*.

University of California Academic Senate. (2008). *Academic assembly passes the academic council's modification of BOARS' proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility policy*. Retrieved from http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu /_files/assembly/jun2008/as.eligibility%200608.pdf

U.S. News and World Report Announces the 2014 Best Colleges. (2013). Retrieved from https://www.usnews.com/info/blogs/press-room/2013/09/10/us-news-announces- the-2014-best-colleges

Uwah, C., McMahon, H., & Furlow, C. (2008). School belonging, educational aspirations, and academic self-efficacy among African American male high school students: Implications for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*(5), 296-305.

Valdes, F., McCristal Culp, J., & Harris, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Crossroads, directions and a new Critical Race Theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Valliani, N. (2015). The state of higher education in California: Blacks. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED571120.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1987a). *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1987b). Episodic models in discourse processing. In R. T. Horowitz and S. J. Samuels (eds.), *Comprehending oral and written language*, (pp. 161-196). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the press*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* Volume: 4 issue: 2, page(s): 249-283.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Volkwein, J. F., & Sweitzer, K. V. (2006). Institutional prestige and reputation among research universities and liberal arts colleges. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(2), 129-148. DOI: 10.1007/s11162-005-8883-5

Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development, 99*, 9-15.

Walters, J. E. (1993). Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Retrieved from Educational Resources Information Center. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED355997.pdf

Weber, R. P. (1990). Basic content analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wechsler, H. S. (2014). *The qualified student: A history of selective college admission in America*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Wegener, B. (1992). Concepts and measurement of prestige. *Annual review of sociology*, *18*(1), 253-280.

Weissglass, J. (1998). The SAT: Public-spirited or preserving privilege? *Education Week*, April 15.

Winters, J. V. (2014). STEM graduates, human capital externalities, and wages in the US. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, *48*, 190-198.

Woo, M. (1997). Reaffirming merit in affirmative action. *School of Law Faculty Publications, 295*. Retrieved from http://lsr.nellco.org/nusl_faculty/295

Wood, J. L. (2013). The same…but different: Examining background characteristics among Black males in public two year colleges. *Journal of Negro Education, 82*(1), 47-61.

Wood, D., Kaplan, R. & McLoyd, V. C. (2007). Gender differences in the educational expectations of urban, low-income African American youth: The role of parents and the school. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 36*(4), 417-427. doi:10.1007/s10964-007-9186-2

Wood, J. L., & Hilton, A. A. (2013). Moral choices: Towards a conceptual model of Black male moral development (BMMD). *Western Journal of Black Studies, 37*(1), 14–27.

Wood, J. L., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Advancing Black male student success from preschool through PhD*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Woolgar, Steve (1988). *Knowledge and reflexivity: new frontiers in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Sage Publications.

Yanow, D. (2007). Interpretation in policy analysis: On methods and practice. *Critical Policy Studies, 1(1),* 110-122. doi:10.1080/19460171.2007.9518511

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods, 2*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yosso, T. J. (2002). Toward a critical race curriculum. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 93-107.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(1), 69-91.

Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D. G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education, 28*(1), 1-25.

Young, I.M. (1992). Five faces of oppression. In T.E. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power (pp. 174-195)*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Zamudio, M., Russell, C., Rios, F., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical race theory matters: Education and ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Zerquera, D. D. (2014). *The consequences of prestige seeking for fulfilling an access-centered mission: An analysis of changes in access over time at urban-serving research universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.

Zimmerman, M. A., & Maton, K. I. (1992). Life-style and substance use among male African American urban adolescents: A cluster analytic approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *20*(1), 121-138.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges*, *2*, 115-160.