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Goals

This study examines changes in the rates at which Chicano/Latino students graduate from the University of California, for the 1992-2002 frosh cohorts. This study also compares campus-wide six-year graduation rates at the UCs for the 1989-2002 frosh cohorts. The comparative data do not include UCSF and UC Merced.

The study then reviews the trends at UC Santa Cruz in greater detail, beginning with the 1989 cohort, including changes in the six and eight-year graduation rates of Latino students. This report also considers gender differences in Latino graduation rates.

This study is based on public official data. Unlike university sources, however, the data presented here allows comparisons across campuses, together with patterns of change over time.

The study’s goals are limited to describing “what happened” in the big picture. To take on the “why” questions would involve research strategies that address diverse student experiences, campus priorities and institutional support strategies.

Summary of Findings

Graduation rates across the University of California

- The different UC campuses vary considerably in terms of their six-year graduation rates, both in terms of campus-wide averages and for Latino students.

- Over time, there is a trend toward improvement in overall graduation rates across campuses. The ranking of campuses from highest to lowest in terms of graduation rates has changed little since 1989. However, differences between campus graduation rates have grown since 1989.

- The ranking of UC campuses in terms of overall graduation rates shows that UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz have consistently lagged behind the other UCs.

- For the 1992-2002 entering frosh cohorts, the UCs exhibit an upward trend in Latino graduation rates, though very uneven over time and widely varying across campuses.

- Several campuses have shown sustained improvement in Latino graduation rates over time, notably UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley.

Graduation rates at the University of California, Santa Cruz

- UCSC’s average six-year graduation rate rose from 66.6% for the 1989 frosh cohort to 71% for the 2002 entering class. With the exception of UC Riverside, all other UC campuses experienced substantially higher rates of graduation rate growth for the 1989-2002 cohorts.

- UCSC’s overall graduation rates were marked by a period of decline and variability for the cohorts entering in 1992 through 1997. There have been no periods of sustained upward improvement in campus-wide graduation rates as a whole (for 1989-2002 cohorts).

- UCSC’s Latino student six-year graduation rate improved at a higher rate than the campus average, from 55.6% in 1989 to 65.7% in 2002. Campus graduation rates climbed from 66.1% in 1989 to 71% for the 2002 entering freshman cohorts.

- The gap between the Latino six year graduation rate and the campus average has declined substantially - from 11% in 1989 to 5.3% for the 2002 cohort.
The total number of Latino frosh enrolled grew 158% between the 1989 and 2002 cohorts. Their graduation rates for this same period increased 18%.

On average, during this period Latina students received their degrees at a higher rate than Latino males, within both the six and eight-year benchmark. This gender gap closed for the 2002 frosh cohort, however. High year-to-year variability suggests that small cohort sizes may limit generalizations.
Retention and Graduation Rates

This study complements a comprehensive UCSC administration study that compares UC Santa Cruz’s graduation rates with a statistical construct of comparable students at many other non-UC campuses. This 2006 study compares UCSC with a national sample of 262 4-year universities, and finds that UCSC’s graduation rate was 8 percentage points higher than their average of this sample. Comparison with NCAA Division I institutions found that UCSC’s graduation rate was 9% higher. That study also includes discussion of year-to-year retention rates, an issue not discussed in this report. The findings are accessible at http://planning.ucsc.edu/retention/.

According to the Retention and Graduation Update Report (2007-2008), produced by the UCSC Office of Planning and Budget, graduation rates are the percentage of an entering class that graduate by the summer quarter of each year. Standard measures of graduation rates are six-year rates. For the purposes of this study, we find it useful to also look at the eight-year graduation rates of Latino students at UC Santa Cruz. The data show that in this longer term perspective, graduation trends for Latino students are higher than appear in the usual six-year benchmark. We believe that the experiences of these students should be included in the analysis of graduation rates. This study does not address the experience of transfer students, which may involve different trends.

This study uses data from the UC StatFinder online tool to illustrate UC-wide changes in the six-year graduation rate over time. This study also utilized data provided by the UC Santa Cruz Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies. Graduation data was also taken from the Education Trust website, the NCAA Report on the Federal Graduation Rates Data (1994-2002), and the UC Davis Graduation Rates and Time to Degree Report (2004).

In addition, the UC campuses categorize Chicano and Latino students differently. Several UCs use the term Mexican-American, while others allow their students to self-identify as Latino, Spanish-American, Hispanic, or Chicano. This study uses the broad umbrella term “Latino” to simplify the process of representing the data.

Note: The UCSC data from systemwide sources differs slightly from UCSC campus sources:


Comparing Average Six-Year Graduation Rates Across UC Campuses

Overall, graduation rates improved substantially across the UC system between the 1989 to 2002 frosh cohorts. Yet comparing the 2002 frosh cohort’s graduation rates across the different UC campuses reveals very different outcomes. For the entering class of 2002, UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley reached overall six-year campus graduation rates of 89-90%. Less selective institutions (based on campus admit rate) like UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside, had degree completion rates of 72% and 67%. Since 1989, the gap in graduation rates between the UC campuses has grown larger, as indicated in Table 1 and Figure 1. For example, there was a 12% difference in six-year graduation rates between UC Berkeley and UC Santa Cruz in 1989. In 2002, this difference grew to 18%. In 1989, the difference in graduation rates between UC Berkeley and UC Davis was 4%. In 2002, it was 8%.

UC Santa Cruz improved its overall graduation rate 5 percentage points between the 1989 and 2002 entering cohorts. Campuses that registered more notable gains in degree completion rates include UC Irvine and UC Santa Barbara with 13% increases, UC Berkeley with an 11% increase and UC San Diego with a 9% increase. Although these gains are impressive, not all UCs have substantially raised their rates. UC Riverside’s graduation rate increased 1%.

In addition to the broad trend toward improvement in campus wide average graduation rates, it is also notable that the ranking of campuses from highest to lowest in terms of graduation rates has changed little.

There is also a gap between the less selective UCs in terms of graduation rates. For the 1989 entering cohort, the gap between UC Santa Barbara and UC Santa Cruz was 3 percentage points. For the 2002 cohort, this gap had widened to 11 percentage points. The difference in six-year graduation rates between UC Santa Barbara and UC Riverside was 4 percentage points in 1989. In 2002, this gap grew to 16 percentage points. UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside continue to trail behind the other UCs in terms of degree completion rates.

Table 1: UC 6-Year Graduation Rates (%), 1989-2002 Entering Frosh Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UCSD</th>
<th>UCD</th>
<th>UCI</th>
<th>UCSB</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>UCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of California Statfinder (see appendix)
Figure 1:
University of California Six-Year Graduation Rates (%) by Campus, 1989-2002

Graduation Rates (%)

Comparing Latino Graduation Rates Across UC Campuses

The percentage of Latino students who entered as frosh and received undergraduate degrees from the University of California has increased over the years, but large gaps persist, both vis-à-vis campus averages and between campuses. Figure 2 shows that for the 1992 to 2002 cohorts, many UCs experienced a significant upward trend in Latino graduation rates. However, in some cases, Latino six-year graduation rates trailed behind campus graduation rates by as much as 10 percentage points, depending on the entering frosh cohort (see Appendix). The differences are most pronounced at UC Davis and UC Berkeley, where the Latino degree achievement gap is consistently high. For example, at UC Davis, the difference in Latino and campus six-year graduation rates has been as high as 15%. Yet, the UC campuses that are most selective in terms of admissions tend to have higher Latino student graduation rates than do other UC campuses.

Figure 2 shows that some campuses have made considerable gains in Latino graduation rates. For example, UC Santa Barbara improved Latino graduation rates from 64% for the 1992 frosh cohort to 77% for 2002. UC Los Angeles improved its Latino degree attainment rates by 13.2%, UC Davis by 9% and UC Berkeley by 10%. This rapid pace of change, however, was not shared by all campuses, and their slower rates of improvement were difficult to characterize. At UC Riverside, however, Latino rates are very close to and in some years better than the campus average.

In contrast to the stable ranking of the different UCs in terms of their campus-wide average graduation rates, campus rankings for Latino graduation rates changed significantly, with notable improvements at UCLA, UCSB, UCB, and UCD.

Figure 2 and Table 2 demonstrate that while progress has been made in terms of the percentage of entering frosh Latino students receiving UC degrees, they also show that one should not assume that these trends are consistent. The substantial variation across campuses, and over time, calls for further research on student experiences, as well as on each campus’ institutional strategies for supporting retention.
Figure 2:
Six-Year Graduation Rates (%) for UC Latino Frosh Cohorts, 1992-2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UCSD</th>
<th>UCD</th>
<th>UCSB</th>
<th>UCI</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>UCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of California StatFinder. *Note: While each campus tracks ethnicity somewhat differently, this data reflects the totals for Chicano and Latino students, counted together.
UC Santa Cruz: A Closer Look

By taking a closer look at UC Santa Cruz’s long-term graduation trends through the experiences of Latino students, we can see changing patterns of educational inequality. At UCSC, publicly accessible data on graduation rates, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, date back to the 1989 entering cohort. While future research may take into account other, possibly related, student characteristics (such as whether a student is the first in their family to go to college, or whether languages other than English are spoken in the home), these data only began to be systematically collected relatively recently. Moreover, while some students who do not complete their UCSC degree transfer and graduate from other institutions, the data on this phenomenon is limited.

Data beginning with the 1989 UCSC frosh cohort show that the six year graduation rate for Latino students has been consistently lower than the campus average. However, over the years the gap has tended to decline, from 11% for students entering in 1989 to 5.3% for the 2002 cohort (see Table 3).

What is notable about both UCSC’s overall graduation rate, and the specific pattern for Latino students, is that the trends in degree attainment rates are not consistent across time. UCSC’s overall graduation rates were marked by a period of decline and variability for the cohorts entering in 1992 through 1997 (see Figure 3).

Both the campus-wide and Latino graduation rates declined for the 2001 entering cohort, and then rose slightly for 2002 frosh. It is difficult to predict what the long term trend will be. However, the example of other UCs shows that more dramatic improvement in the graduation rates of Latino students is possible, even over a brief period of time.

The increase over time in the eight year graduation rates for Latino students shows that students who take longer than six years to complete their UCSC degrees should also be taken into account, (see Table 3-1). The factors that determine how and why these students are eventually successful in obtaining their degrees warrant further research in order to inform potential outreach strategies to more effectively help those who have left the campus, but still wish to graduate from UCSC. The eight year graduation rates for Latino students jumped from 66.6% for the 1999 entering cohort to 71.3% for the 2002 entering cohort. This 4.7% increase in graduation rates demonstrates that higher eight year graduation rates for Latino students are possible.
Figure 3:
Comparison of Six-Year and Eight-Year Graduation Rates (%):
Overall Campus and Latino Averages, 1989-2002

Graduation Rates (%)

Cohort Entry Year

Source: UC Santa Cruz Retention and Graduation Tables, 1989-2002
### Table 3:
Campus Six-Year Graduation Rates (%) in Comparison to the Graduation Rates of Latino Students, 1989 to 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Campus Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-1:
Campus Eight-Year Graduation Rates (%) in Comparison to the Graduation Rates of Latino Students, 1989 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Campus Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to provide context for these trends, it is relevant to consider UCSC’s trends in Latino frosh enrollments. Table 4 shows the data for Latino frosh enrollments at UCSC since 1989, including both the total number of Latino frosh enrollments and the Latino percentage of the cohort total. There appears to be a relationship between the size of entering cohorts and graduation rates for Latino students at UCSC. This could be because the numbers of under-represented students need to reach a “critical mass” in order to sustain a supportive community of peers.

Table 4:
The Total Number of Latino Frosh and the Latino Percentage of the Cohort Total, 1989 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Latino Frosh</th>
<th>Total of Entering Frosh</th>
<th>The Latino Percentage of the Cohort Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 13.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Latino Frosh</th>
<th>Total of Entering Frosh</th>
<th>The Latino Percentage of the Cohort Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3353</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2977</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 15.0
The total number of entering Latino frosh increased dramatically in the period from 1989 to 2007, from 203 to 643. However, in terms of the percentage of self-identified Latino frosh in each cohort, the trend is inconsistent - peaking at 17.2% in 1994, falling to 11.5% in 1997, and then gradually returning to 17.4% in 2007, as indicated in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: Comparison of Trends in Latino Frosh Enrollments at UCSC, 1989-2007](image)

We can also compare the growth rates, in total and relative terms, for the size of graduating Latino cohorts at UCSC. Figure 5 shows the trends in Latino six-year graduation patterns, both in total and relative terms. It shows the contrast between the significant increases in the overall numbers of Latino students in each frosh cohort and the gradual increase in their graduation rate.
The total number of graduating Latino students grew 158% between 1989 and 2002. The six-year graduation rates for those cohorts increased by 18%. Campus-wide frosh enrollments increased by 74% between 1989 and 2002, while campus-wide graduation rates increased 6%.

Table 5:
Comparison of Trends in Latino Graduates at UCSC-Six-Year Graduation Rates: Percent Increase for 1989-2002 cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort/6-year</th>
<th>Latino Graduates</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Total of Entering Frosh</th>
<th>Campus Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Increase: 158%  18%  74%  6%
Gender Differences in Latino Graduation Rates at UC Santa Cruz

An analysis by gender of the Latino student population at UCSC reveals significant differences in trends for men and women. Latinas enter in consistently larger numbers and graduate at higher rates than Latino males. This is consistent with UC-wide trends.

In 1989, the entering class of Latina frosh included 125 women and 75 men. Since then, in the 1989 to 2007 frosh cohorts, Latina enrollment increased by 209%, while Latino male enrollment grew by 228%. While both of these trends indicate significant progress, a comparison of the absolute numbers of Latino men and women indicate a persistent gender gap. In 2007, 387 Latina females enrolled and only 256 Latino males entered as frosh. Table 6 details the patterns in Latino frosh enrollments since 1989.

Figure 6 and Table 6-1 show the differences in the six-year Latino male and female graduation rates for the 1989 to 2002 frosh cohorts. Historically, Latinas have had higher graduation rates than Latino males. Between 1989 and 2002, Latina graduation rates increased 9.12%. The six-year graduation rate for Latino males increased by 34.8% for the 1989 to 2002 frosh cohorts. However, for the 2000 frosh cohort, the six-year graduation rate for Latina females decreased. In 2001, the Latina six-year graduation rate decreased to 66.7% from 71.1% in 2000. The 2002 Latina frosh cohort declined to 64.6%. On the other hand, Latino males increased their six-year graduation rate in 2002 to 67.4%, an all time high. The 2002 cohort marked the first year in which Latino male six-year graduation rates surpassed that of Latina females.

These differences suggest that future research into precise explanations of UCSC’s Latino graduation rates should take gender into account.

Table 6:
Gender Differences in Latino Frosh Enrollments at UCSC, 1989-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Latina Females</th>
<th>Latino Males</th>
<th>Difference in Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6:
Latino Six-Year Graduation Rates by Gender:
Entering Frosh Cohorts, 1989-2002

Graduation Rates (%)

Cohort Entry Year


Source: UC Santa Cruz Retention and Graduation Rates by Gender and Ethnicity, 1995-2002
Tables 7 and 8 and Figure 7 illustrate the pattern in eight-year graduation rates for Latino students broken down by gender. Latinas receive their UCSC degrees at higher eight-year rates than Latino men, though the rate of growth in the male graduation rate was higher. The eight-year graduation rates of Latina females increased from 64% in 1989 to 74.20% in 2000. The eight-year degree attainment rates of Latino males increased from 55.1% in 1989 to 66.7% in 2000.

### Table 7: Latino Six-Year Graduation Rates (%) by Gender, 1989-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latina Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Latino Eight-Year Graduation Rates (%) by Gender, 1989-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latina Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7:
Latino Eight-Year Graduation Rates (%) by Gender, 1989-2000
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Source: UC Santa Cruz Retention and Graduation by Gender and Ethnicity, 1989-2002
Concluding Remarks

This study compares six-year graduation rate trends, both across UC campuses and in terms of change over time, for the entering classes from 1989 through 2002, looking both at campus averages and Chicano-Latino graduation rates. For UCSC students, this study examined six-year graduation rates, eight-year outcomes, and gender differences.

The main findings include:

- The average graduation rates of each UC campus show an overall trend towards improved degree attainment rates. However, some campuses have shown dramatic improvement while others have not. Additional research is needed to explain this variation across campuses. This research would be most useful if it addressed what types of campus strategies are most effective at improving graduation rates.

- The ranking of UC campuses in terms of overall graduation rates show that UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz have consistently lagged behind other UCs.

- For the 1992-2002 entering frosh cohorts, many UCs exhibit an upward trend in Latino graduation rates. UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley have shown dramatic, sustained improvement in Latino six year graduation rates.

- At UCSC, the data beginning with the 1989 entering cohort shows that the six-year graduation rate for Latino students has been consistently lower than the campus average. This gap has narrowed substantially over time, however, as the overall Latino student population has increased.

- The gap between UCSC Latino graduation rates and the campus average narrows even more when one looks at eight-year completion rates. For the 2000 entering frosh cohort, for example, the Latino eight-year rate was 71.3% and the campus average was 72.3%.

- Latina females receive UCSC degrees at a higher rate than Latino males, within both the six and eight year benchmarks. This trend changed in the 2002 cohort, when the six-year graduation rate for Latino males reached 67.4%, while the rate for Latinas was 64.6%.

The available data represented in this study portrays a limited picture of graduation rates, both UC wide and at UCSC, over time. Survey data, ethnographic research, and institutional analysis, as well as longer term historical data, would help to deepen our understanding of retention and graduation issues facing the University of California.

UCSC now has the second-lowest gap between Latino and average graduation rates among UC campuses. Over time, the Chicano-Latino graduation rate has increased substantially, from 55.6% in 1989 to 65.7% for the 2002 cohort. This has led to a notable narrowing of the gap between Chicano-Latino student outcomes and the overall UCSC campus average. For Latina students, this gap has narrowed even further.

However, the reduction in the gap between Latino and average campus graduation rates was made possible in part by the much slower rate of improvement in the overall campus average graduation rate. Moreover, this growing convergence between Latino and average graduation rates does not necessarily imply that the determining factors for each rate are the same, nor does it imply that the kinds of initiatives most likely to further increase graduation rates would be the same for all types of students. Additional study of those UC campuses that have managed to increase Latino graduation rates more rapidly would help to inform the UCSC discussion.
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## Appendix

### 6-Year Graduation Rates (%) Among Latinos by UC Campus

#### UC Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UC Berkeley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UC San Diego

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Entry Year</td>
<td>Latino Graduation Rate</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rate</th>
<th>UC Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year</th>
<th>Latino Graduation Rate</th>
<th>UC Davis</th>
<th>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Entry Year</td>
<td>Latino Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Frosh Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of California Statfinder