



Listening. Learning. Leading.®


CARE

National Commission on Asian American
and Pacific Islander Research in Education



iCOUNT:

A Data Quality Movement for **Asian Americans**
and **Pacific Islanders** in **Higher Education**



This report was made possible through the generous funding from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The collaboration between CARE and ETS emerged from an Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month speaking engagement (May 16, 2012) at ETS in Princeton, NJ. Central to the discussion was the need for data disaggregation to better understand the variation of the educational experiences and outcomes within the highly diverse Asian American and Pacific Islander student population.

The authors of this report are Robert Teranishi, Libby Lok, and Bach Mai Dolly Nguyen. Other contributors included Cynthia M. Alcantar, Laurie Behringer, Loni Bordoloi Pazich, Richard Coley, Jude Paul Dizon, Neil Horikoshi, Shirley Hune, Pearl Iboshi, Yue (Helena) Jia, Deborah Leon Guerrero, Margary Martin, Trung Nguyen, Tu-Lien Kim Nguyen, Erin Jerri Malonzo Pangilinan, Julie Park, Tina Park, Seema Patel, Oiyen Poon, Peggy Saika, Katie Tran-Lam, and Robert Underwood.

National Commission

Margarita Benitez

Excelencia in Education

Estela Mara Bensimon

University of Southern California

Carrie Billy

American Indian Higher Education Consortium

Michelle Asha Cooper

Institute for Higher Education Policy

A. Gabriel Esteban

Seton Hall University

Antonio Flores

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities

Larry Griffith

United Negro College Fund

J.D. Hokoyama

Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics

Neil Horikoshi

Asian & Pacific Islander American Scholarship Fund

Shirley Hune

University of Washington

Parag Mehta

U.S. Department of Labor

Mark Mitsui

North Seattle Community College

Don Nakanishi

University of California, Los Angeles

Kawika Riley

Office of Hawaiian Affairs

Doua Thor

Southeast Asia Resource Action Center

Robert Underwood

University of Guam

CARE Research Team

Robert Teranishi

Principal Investigator
New York University

Tu-Lien Kim Nguyen

Project Manager
Steinhardt Institute for Higher Education Policy

Margary Martin

Director of Research
New York University

Loni Bordoloi Pazich

Research Associate
New York University

Cynthia M. Alcantar

Research Associate
New York University

Libby Lok

Research Associate
New York University

Bach Mai Dolly Nguyen

Research Associate
New York University

Research Advisory Group

Mitchell Chang

University of California, Los Angeles

Dina Maramba

State University of New York, Binghamton

Julie J. Park

University of Maryland- College Park

Oiyann Poon

Loyola University Chicago

Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner

California State University, Sacramento

Rican Vue

University of California, Los Angeles

Design Team

Kurt Steiner

Creative Militia, LLC

Marita Gray and Ellie Patounas

ETS





TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOWARD A DATA QUALITY MOVEMENT	1
Data for Whom? Data for What?	
Why Representation in Data Matters for AAPIs	
Purpose of the Report	
EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVES ON AGGREGATED AND DISAGGREGATED DATA	5
The Racial Definition and Categorization of AAPIs	
What Disaggregated Data Reveals about AAPI Sub-Groups	
A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE COUNT ME IN CAMPAIGN	11
Impact on Data Collection	
Impact on Data Reporting	
Utility of Disaggregated Data	
A REGIONAL FOCUS ON HAWAI'I AND THE PACIFIC.....	21
A Portrait of Educational Attainment among Pacific Islanders	
A System's Use of Disaggregated Data – The University of Hawai'i	
An Institution's Use of Disaggregated Data – The University of Guam	
A CALL TO ACTION.....	29
Establishing momentum for change	
Recommendations for Data Collection	
Recommendations for Data Reporting	
Moving Toward Systemic Reform	
APPENDIX: DATA SOURCE AND METHODOLOGY	31
REFERENCES.....	33





PREFACE

In 2013, the National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education (CARE) and the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (WHIAAPI) – with generous support from ETS and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP) – began an Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) data quality campaign. This collaboration is centered on three interrelated goals. First, the campaign aims to raise awareness about and bring attention to the ways in which data on AAPI students reported in the aggregate conceals significant disparities in educational experiences and outcomes between AAPI sub-groups. Second, we aim to provide models for how postsecondary institutions, systems, and states have recognized and responded to this problem by collecting and reporting disaggregated data. Finally, we want to work collaboratively with the education field to encourage broader reform in institutional practices related to the collection and reporting of disaggregated data of AAPI students.

This report responds to our first two goals by providing both the need and rationale for disaggregated data. More specifically, we discuss the extent to which AAPI students are a dynamic, heterogeneous, and evolving population and the implications for how measurement standards and techniques are factors in how their educational needs, challenges, and distribution are represented and understood. Next, we provide examples about the ways in which institutions, systems, and states have collected and reported disaggregated data, and highlight how access to and use of these data increase and more influence higher education's ability to be more responsive to the needs of AAPI sub-groups.

This report was released in conjunction with the iCount symposium on June 6-7, 2013, which brought together leaders from K-12 and higher education, experts in demography, institutional research, and philanthropy for an open dialogue about ways to develop data systems that are responsive to the needs of AAPI students and families. Combined with the iCount convening and subsequent activities, this report offers a forward-looking perspective on the necessity and benefits of collecting and reporting on disaggregated data. It further suggests a pathway for implementing methods for collecting data that reflect the heterogeneity of the AAPI population. These institutional data practices are necessary for a more responsive system that more effectively addresses the specified needs of AAPI student sub-groups.





TOWARD A DATA QUALITY MOVEMENT

to say that we live in a data-driven society is an understatement. At no other time has the use of data been such a factor in how decisions are made in organizational settings, including education, health care, and business. There has been a surge of activity to establish a culture of inquiry and decision-making processes driven by evidence, rather than intuition, anecdotes, and hunches.¹ The wide spread use of data is furthered by technologies that are making data more accessible than ever.

The inquiry movement in higher education is driven by the belief that the use of data is critical for gauging more accurately who our students are, how they are performing, and how institutions can adapt to be more effective and efficient with their resources. Moreover, in a higher education system that has become increasingly concerned with accountability, the interpretation of data has become a key tool for informing the work of practitioners and policymakers alike. For example, in a survey that examined the use of data in higher-education decision-making, 88.1 percent of administrators reported utilizing data and research when making decisions. Among the kinds of decisions administrators made, 60.1 percent reported using data for curriculum and program planning, 56 percent for long-term strategic planning, and 55.5 percent reported using data for making decisions around budgeting and resource allocation.²

Data for Whom? Data for What?

Data play a critical role in exposing gaps in educational participation and representation.³ Data disaggregated for individual sub-groups – by race, ethnicity, gender, and other demographic distinctions – raises awareness about issues and challenges that disproportionately impact particular sub-groups within a population of students.⁴

Identifying such disparities in attainment and achievement enables higher education practitioners and policymakers to target resources where they are needed. Accordingly, the use of disaggregated data is an essential tool for advocacy and social justice, shedding light on ways to mitigate disparities in educational outcomes and improve support for the most marginalized and vulnerable populations.

With the increased influence of data in higher education decision making, there is also increased attention on the importance of having quality data. Increasing the amount of data does not automatically improve the quality of assessment; the kinds of data collected needs to be tailored to respond to specific needs. The Data Quality Campaign, a national advocacy organization that promotes the development and effective use of data in education, says, “We need a new paradigm in education where data is in context, reliable, timely, portable and flows in all directions.”⁵ At the core of understanding higher education performance and effectiveness is the

The Data Quality Campaign has said pointedly, “If we’re not using data to determine where our children are going, what are we using? Data is power. We can’t afford not to use it.”



need to work toward a more accurate rendering of our changing student demography. We need data that can inform efforts that effectively support an increasingly complex and heterogeneous student population.

Why Representation in Data Matters for AAPIs

In 2002, Shirley Hune said the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) population is in need

“Simply put, the aggregation of AAPI sub-groups into a single data category is a significant civil rights issue for the AAPI community that has yet to be resolved.”

of more nuanced demographic data to accurately capture their educational experiences and outcomes.⁶ Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, reinforced Hune’s point during his remarks at an event at the Center for American Progress on

New Research and Policy on Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders and Native Hawaiians.⁷ Disaggregated data are needed to reflect the heterogeneity in the AAPI population when it comes to ethnicity, immigration histories, language backgrounds, as well as other distinctions that exist between sub-groups.

The lack of nuanced data for AAPIs is not a new problem. In fact, there have been calls to disaggregate data to reflect the diverse needs of the population for decades. Below are just a few of the most prominent calls for change.

- ***Asian Pacific American Demographic and Education Trends*** found that homogeneity of statistics on AAPIs conceals the complexities and differences in English-language proficiency

and socio-economic backgrounds that affect the treatment of AAPIs in education policies and programs.⁸

- ***An Invisible Crisis: The Educational Needs of Asian Pacific American Youth*** pointed to how AAPI students are often placed in the wrong bilingual classroom and that their schools are failing the most vulnerable sub-groups.⁹

- ***Diversity among Asian American High School Students*** concluded that there are a lack of studies that represent low achievement among Asian American students, which has prevented counselors, teachers and policymakers from understanding the difficulties and problems of these students, and has, ultimately, “led to official neglect of programs and services for Asian American students.”¹⁰

- ***A Dream Denied: Educational Experiences of Southeast Asian American Youth*** documented how statistics routinely lump Southeast Asian students in with all Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, masking the high levels of poverty and academic barriers in these communities.¹¹

- ***Asian Americans in Washington State: Closing Their Hidden Achievement Gaps*** used disaggregated data to reveal that the newest AAPI immigrants had some of the lowest state test scores indicating aggregated data, “is a disservice to meeting the academic needs of individual students and of particular ethnic group members.”¹²

The common theme in this body of work is that continuing the use of data that treats AAPIs as an aggregate group is problematic. Doing so



conceals the unique challenges faced by AAPIs relative to the US education system. Simply put, the aggregation of AAPI sub-groups into a single data category is a civil rights issue for the AAPI community that has yet to be resolved.

Purpose of the Report

Building on the existing body of research on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education, this report makes a case for an AAPI data quality movement. We demonstrate how and why institutional, state, and federal datasets are a significant issue for the AAPI community, what changes are needed in how data are collected and reported, and the impact more refined data can have for the AAPI community and the institutions that serve them. We focus intently on three overarching themes:

1. We provide an empirically-driven rationale for how using aggregated data is problematic for the AAPI student population and why disaggregated data is a necessary tool for representing the heterogeneity that exists within the population.

2. We provide a case study of an AAPI data disaggregation movement in one higher education system – the University of California – a student-driven campaign called Count Me In.

3. We discuss the importance of disaggregated data for Pacific Islanders – a diverse and multifaceted population that is among the most disadvantaged sectors of the AAPI population.

Through this discussion, we demonstrate that disaggregating data is a significant issue for the AAPI community. The misrepresentation of the AAPI population through aggregated data has been a key barrier to policy and program development that advances the equitable treatment for the AAPI community. Now is the time to address this issue given the fact that data-driven decisions are more prevalent than ever. Moreover, an effort to collect and report more refined data is not only important for the AAPI community, but for the nation as a whole as it becomes increasingly diverse and heterogeneous. How we respond to the changing face of America will determine our future as a nation.





EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVES ON AGGREGATED AND DISAGGREGATED DATA

the AAPI category represents demographically, socially, and politically. We begin with the premise that the paradigm of race – how race is represented through data elements – is not fixed, and can and should evolve in how it is defined, measured, and reported on to capture a more accurate rendering of social groups. Jencks and Phillips discuss the importance of considering “labeling bias” in educational research, which refers to the mismatch between what an indicator claims to measure and what it is actually measuring.¹³ Attention to this distinction raises awareness to important, but often misunderstood problems in research on the AAPI population. Namely, the AAPI population is categorically unique, with a high degree of heterogeneity that is difficult to capture comparatively relative to other racial groups.

The Racial Definition and Categorization of AAPIs

While few would argue that the AAPI population is not a definable racial category, it is important to recognize that the boundaries that define “Asian American and Pacific Islander” are socially constructed, and need to be placed in a social, political, and institutional reality.¹⁴ Thus, while the population represents a single entity in certain contexts, such as for interracial group comparisons, it is equally important to understand the ways in which the demography of the AAPI population represents a complex set of social realities for the individuals who fall within this category.¹⁵

Figure 1 represents the population categorized as a single entity, as well as in distinct sub-groups. First, the *Asian American and Pacific Islander* racial category consists of two distinct categories. A commonly used definition of *Asian American* from

This section of the report discusses the reasons why data and inquiry-based decisions that include AAPIs require careful consideration of what

the U.S. Census Bureau is as follows: “People with origins in the Far East, Southeast Asia and the Indian Subcontinent.”¹⁶


The commonly used definition of *Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander*, also from the U.S. Census Bureau, includes “people having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.”¹⁷ Within the *Asian American* and *Native Hawaiian*

and *Pacific Islander* categories are a number of ethnic groups, which represent sub-groups with shared nationalities, languages, ancestries, cultures, and often collective group histories.

In 1997, the Office of Management and Budget announced revisions to Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting, requiring the “Asian or Pacific Islander” category to be separated into two categories: “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.”



Figure 1: The Racial and Ethnic Categorization of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010

It is also important to note that the concept of race has and will continue to evolve over time, demonstrating the complexity of the term and the varied ways in which its definitions have been used in scientific, social, political, and legal arenas. Thus, there are academic, social, political, and legal factors that shape how racial groups are

defined, and these definitions can and do change over time. A good case in point for the evolution of the changing definition of racial categories is evident through the evolving nature of the AAPI racial category by the U.S. Census Bureau, which revisits racial definitions and categories every 10 years.



Table 1: Census Categories for AAPIs, 1990, 2000, and 2010

Asian Americans	2010	2000	1990
Asian Indian	✓	✓	✓
Bangladeshi	✓	✓	--
Bhutanese	✓	--	--
Burmese	✓	✓	--
Cambodian	✓	✓	✓
Chinese (except Taiwanese)	✓	✓	✓
Filipino	✓	✓	✓
Hmong	✓	✓	✓
Indonesian	✓	✓	--
Japanese	✓	✓	✓
Korean	✓	✓	✓
Laotian	✓	✓	✓
Malaysian	✓	✓	--
Nepalese	✓	--	--
Pakistani	✓	✓	--
Sri Lankan	✓	✓	--
Taiwanese	✓	✓	--
Thai	✓	✓	✓
Vietnamese	✓	✓	✓
Other Asian	✓	✓	--

Pacific Islanders	2010	2000	1990
Native Hawaiian	✓	✓	✓
Samoa	✓	✓	✓
Tongan	✓	✓	✓
Guamanian or Chamorro	✓	✓	✓
Marshallese	✓	--	--
Fijian	✓	✓	--
Other Polynesian	✓	✓	✓
Other Micronesian	✓	✓	✓
Other Melanesian	✓	✓	✓
Other Pacific Islander	✓	✓	✓

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990, 2000, and 2010

Table 1 shows how the U.S. Census Bureau has changed the inclusion of ethnic sub-groups represented by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Among Asian Americans, there were seven additional ethnic sub-groups (Bangladeshi, Indonesian, Malaysian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Taiwanese and Other Asian) added to the 2000 defini-

tion. Between 2000 and 2010, three more ethnic sub-groups (Bhutanese, Burmese, and Nepalese) were included among Asian Americans. Among Pacific Islanders, Fijians were added in 2000 and Marshallese were added in 2010. Because some groups had not been identified as their own ethnic category prior to being added to the Census




racial and ethnic definitions, individuals from these groups were placed in other categories of data, and information on these groups were concealed when data were reported.

What Disaggregated Data Reveals about AAPI Sub-Groups

The description of the race and ethnicity definitions of AAPIs above helps to lay the groundwork for a deeper analysis of distinctions that exist between AAPI sub-groups. In this section, we begin by describing the degree to which ethnic sub-groups vary by their level of educational at-

tainment, according to disaggregated data on adults, age 25 years or older, derived from the U.S. Census Bureau (Figure 2). While large proportions of some ethnic sub-groups from East Asia (Chinese, Taiwanese, and Koreans) and South Asia (Asian Indians, Pakistanis, and Bangladeshis) have a Bachelor's degree or greater as their highest level of education, including some of whom earned their degrees in their homeland, there are other ethnic sub-groups with very different patterns of educational attainment. Southeast Asians (Hmong, Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese), for example, have a much greater likelihood of dropping out of high school.

Figure 2: Educational Attainment for Asian American Sub-Groups, 2008-2010




Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey



A number of factors contribute to differences in educational attainment between AAPI sub-groups. One significant factor in the wide variation in education is the degree to which AAPI sub-groups vary by socioeconomic backgrounds, which results in AAPIs occupying positions along the full range of the socioeconomic spectrum, from the poor and under-privileged, to the affluent and highly-skilled. Figure 3 shows the distribution of income for AAPI sub-groups, with a

focus on the distance in the median household income for sub-groups from the median household income for all AAPIs. It is important to note the extent to which median household income for AAPIs in the aggregate conceals differences between AAPI sub-groups. Moreover the differences in income can be in both directions with some groups earning much lower incomes and other groups earning much higher ones.

Figure 3: Difference in Median Household Income for Selected Asian American Sub-Groups from the Median Household Income for All Asian Americans, 2008-2010



Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey



AAPI ethnic sub-groups experience a range of different immigration pathways to the United States, as both refugees and asylees, as well as highly-educated and highly-skilled workers.

Another factor influencing the socioeconomic status of AAPI sub-groups is patterns of immigration. Consider that while a significant proportion of immigrants from Asia come to the U.S. already highly educated, others enter the

U.S. from countries that have provided only limited opportunities for educational and social mobility. Pacific Islanders, defined as people whose origins are from Polynesia, Micronesia, or Melanesia, are a diverse pan-ethnic group in themselves, whose histories include challenges such as struggles for sovereignty. These struggles, along with other very unique circumstances, are often overshadowed by being grouped with Asian Americans.

This section demonstrates the need for new ways of thinking about and engaging Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in research and policy in a manner that captures the multiple, nuanced, and complex features of different sub-groups. The next two sections of the report provide portraits of how and why higher education institutions and systems have collected and reported disaggregated data, and how it has informed the treatment of their AAPI students.

A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE COUNT ME IN CAMPAIGN

In the Spring of 2006 an article printed in the Daily Bruin, a student newspaper at the University of


California Los Angeles (UCLA), stated the University of California (UC) was admitting an “unprecedented number of Asian students” and the number of Asian American students were now accounting for more of the admitted class than Whites for the first time.¹⁸ Frustrated by the assumption that AAPI students were portrayed as a privileged group on campus, AAPI students at UCLA responded by pointing to the heterogeneity of the “Asian” population and the fact that Southeast Asian and Pacific Islander students were underrepresented in the UC system. The generalizations about AAPI students and the lack of information available to represent the diversity within the population led to the student-initiated *Count Me In* campaign, which sought to expand data collection on AAPI students within the UC system.

While *Count Me In* was initiated by UCLA’s Asian Pacific Coalition, a consortium of twenty-one AAPI student organizations, it was also joined by students who organized at UC Berkeley, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, the UC Student Association, as well as faculty and staff. They conducted workshops, rallies, and a postcard-signing campaign demanding the UC system expand and refine their data collection and reporting process. They were particularly interested in improving how the heterogeneity of the AAPI student population was represented among applicants, admitted

students, and in enrollment within the UC

system, as well as at individual campuses.¹⁹ Oiyen Poon and Jude Paul Dizon state that, “CMI was not simply an ethnic pride project. It was in fact a highly political campaign to gain recognition of significant educational disparities experienced by different ethnic subgroups within the AAPI category... [and] a panethnic campaign to gain tangible resources and institutional support for student-led education access projects.”²⁰

Count Me In campaign



Impact on Data Collection

Before the *Count Me In* campaign, the undergraduate application for UC campuses allowed AAPI students to choose from eight ethnic-subgroups (see Table 2). Students demanded that the number of AAPI ethnic sub-groups be expanded to include ten new ethnic groups (Thai, Bangladeshi, Hmong, Laotian, Cambodian, Malaysian,

Pakistani, Indonesian, Taiwanese, and Sri Lankan), that were not being previously represented in datasets on applicants, admitted students, and enrollees for the UC system and individual campuses. As a result of the *Count Me In* campaign, the UC Office of the President announced in November 2007 that they would implement changes to include twenty-three AAPI sub-categories on the UC undergraduate application.²¹

Table 2: University of California Undergraduate Application AAPI Categories

Before 2009-2010 (8 ethnic sub-groups)	After 2009-2010 (23 ethnic sub-groups)
Chinese/Chinese American	Chinese/Chinese American (except Taiwanese)
East Indian/Pakistani	Pakistani
Filipino/Filipino American	Filipino/Filipino American
Japanese/Japanese American	Japanese/Japanese American
Korean/Korean American	Korean/Korean American
Vietnamese/Vietnamese American	Vietnamese/Vietnamese American
Other Asian	Other Asian
Pacific Islander	Other Pacific Islander
	Asian Indian
	Bangladeshi
	Cambodian
	Fijian
	Guamanian/Chamorro
	Hawaiian
	Indonesian
	Laotian
	Malaysian
	Samoan
	Sri Lankan
	Taiwanese/Taiwanese American
	Thai
	Tongan

Source: ED-2012-OESE-0009, Data Disaggregation Response from University of California




Impact on Data Reporting

The *Count Me In* campaign also pursued changes in how data on AAPI students were being reported. Specifically, while the UC system had been collecting data on eight ethnic sub-groups, they were only reporting aggregated data on AAPIs, with only one sub-group – Filipinos – reported separately.²² Students demanded that data on Pacific Islander students be reported separately

from the Asian category in summary statistics for UC-wide reports as they believed it would better represent the educational challenges that were unique to Pacific Islander students relative to UC admissions. The UC system responded to the *Count Me In* campaign by separating Pacific Islanders from the Asian American category when reporting summary statistics for the UC system and individual campuses (see Figure 4).²³

Figure 4: AAPI Data Categories Reported in Summary Statistics for the University of California Before and After *Count Me In* Campaign



Source: University of California, Office of the President, Statistical Summary and Data on UC Students, Faculty, and Staff

To date, data on all twenty-three AAPI sub-categories are not made publicly available by the UC Office of the President. The UC wide annual report *Statistical Summary of Students and Staff*, includes a section titled “Enrollment by Ethnicity, Gender, and Level,” which reports data on six sub-categories – Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Other Asian, and Pakistani/East Indian.²⁴ However, the data are made available to UC campuses and has been utilized by AAPI student groups to inform their outreach and retention efforts.

AAPI students are gaining access to and using disaggregated data to inform student-directed programs at many UC campuses. Data have informed which populations should be targeted and where there are particular gaps in university outreach and retention strategies. Data is also used for funding proposals to the university to request resources for student-run organizations.

The Utility of Disaggregated Data

This section discusses what disaggregated data for AAPI sub-groups reveal about applicants, admits, and enrollment for two UC campuses – UC Berkeley and UCLA – and how these data have informed the work of student groups that are engaged in outreach and retention efforts.

Disaggregated data on AAPI applicants to the UC system and individual campuses identify important information on more discrete sub-groups of AAPI students. Table 3 reports the number and proportional representation of AAPI residents by

ethnicity, as well as the number and proportional representation of AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley in 2010. The data reveals two trends. First, a number of AAPI sub-groups have disproportionately *higher* representation among AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley relative to their representation in the state (Indian, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Korean, Malaysian, and Pakistani). Second, a number of other AAPI sub-groups have disproportionately *lower* representation among AAPI applicants relative to their representation in the state (Cambodian, Fijian, Filipino, Guamanian/Chamorro, Native Hawaiians, Hmong, Indonesian, Japanese, and Laotian).

Table 3: Number and Proportional Representation of AAPI Residents in California and AAPI Applicants to UC Berkeley, 2010

	Number of AAPI Residents in California	Percent Representation of AAPI Residents in California	Number of AAPI Applicants to UC Berkeley	Percent Representation of AAPI Residents to UC Berkeley
Asian Indian	528,176	11.1%	2,183	12.6%
Bangladeshi	9,268	0.2%	76	0.4%
Cambodian	86,244	1.8%	111	0.6%
Chinese (including Taiwanese)	1,246,215	26.1%	7,085	40.9%
Fijian	19,355	0.4%	26	0.2%
Filipino	1,195,580	25%	1,695	9.8%
Guamanian/Chamorro	24,299	0.5%	20	0.1%
Hawaiian	21,423	0.4%	26	0.2%
Hmong	86,989	1.8%	168	1.0%
Indonesian	25,398	0.5%	67	0.4%
Japanese	272,528	5.7%	813	4.7%
Korean	451,892	9.5%	2,428	14.0%
Laotian	58,424	1.2%	43	0.2%
Malaysian	2,979	0.1%	28	0.2%
Pakistani	46,780	1.0%	290	1.7%
Samoan	40,900	0.9%	23	0.1%
Sri Lankan	10,240	0.2%	58	0.3%
Thai	51,509	1.1%	75	0.4%
Tongan	18,329	0.4%	20	0.1%
Vietnamese	581,946	12.2%	1,804	10.4%
TOTAL AAPI*	4,778,474	100.0%	17,332	100.0%

Note: Total AAPI includes "Other Asian" and "Other Pacific Islander." Data for UC applicants is reported for domestic applicants only

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1; UC Office of the President, Applicant Flow AAPI Sub-Groups, 2010



The disproportionate representation of AAPI sub-groups among applicants to UC Berkeley is shown in Figures A and B, which aggregates AAPI sub-groups to five major categories (East Asian, Filipino, Southeast Asian, South Asian, and Pacific Islander). While East Asians make up 42.4 percent of AAPI residents in California, they represent 60.2 percent of AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley. Similarly, while South Asians make up 12.2 percent of AAPI residents in the state, they represent 14.7 percent of AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley. Conversely, Filipinos (25.0%), Southeast Asians (18.2%), and Pacific Islanders (2.2%) make up a much lower representation of AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley (9.8%, 13.1%, and 0.5% respectively).

Figure A:
Representation of Broad Sub-Groups among
AAPI Residents in California





Figure B:
Representation of Broad Sub-Groups among
AAPI Applicants to UC Berkeley



Note: "East Asians" include Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans; "South Asians" include Indian, Bangladeshi, and Pakistani; "Southeast Asians" include Vietnamese, Hmong, Cambodian, and Laotian; "Pacific Islanders" include Native Hawaiian, Guamanian/Chamorro, Samoan, and Tongan.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1; UC Office of the President, Applicant Flow AAPI Sub-Groups, 2010




The Southeast Asian Student Coalition (SASC) at UC Berkeley aims to unite Southeast Asian communities and address the economic inequalities, social injustices, and political underrepresentation that they face.

“We’ve used this data to legitimize the work that we do. This year, I am the co-director of SASC Summer Institute – an educational program that brings high school students and community members nationwide to the UC Berkeley campus. We started this program as a direct consequence of SEA underrepresentation in higher education, shown in the numbers.”

Pauline Nguyen, *Co-director for Southeast Asian Student Coalition, Summer Institute at UC Berkeley*

Figure 5 depicts the inequitable distribution of AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley relative to their representation among AAPI residents in California. This is represented as a ratio of the proportional representation of AAPI ethnic sub-groups among applicants to UC Berkeley compared against their proportional representation of AAPI residents in the state. The data reveal a particularly bleak picture of disproportional representation of AAPI sub-group applicants to UC Berkeley relative to their representation in the state. Low representation among AAPI applicants is a particularly problematic trend for Pacific Islanders (Samoans, Guamanians, Tongans, and Native Hawaiians), Southeast Asians (Laotians, Cambodians, Hmong, and Vietnamese), and Filipinos. Samoans, for example, are seven times less likely to be represented among AAPI applicants to UC Berkeley than Malaysians, relative to their proportional representation in the state.


Figure 5: Ratio of AAPI Sub-Group Applicants to UC Berkeley to AAPI Sub-Group Residents in California, 2010



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1; UC Office of the President, Applicant Flow AAPI Sub-Groups, 2010



Figure 6: Distance from Mean AAPI Admit Rate for AAPI Sub-Groups at UCLA, 2010



Source: UC Office of the President, Applicant Flow AAPI Sub-Groups, 2010

Data on the rate of admission to UC campuses show another perspective on issues of disproportionality that exist among AAPI sub-groups. Figure 6 reveals the rate of admission (students applying/students admitted) at UCLA for AAPI sub-groups relative to the overall rate of admission for AAPIs in the aggregate. Disaggregate data reveal that the average rate of admission for AAPIs in the aggregate is not representative of individual sub-groups. Some AAPI sub-groups (Taiwanese, Malaysians, Chinese, Asian Indians, and Japanese) have a higher rate of admission than the average rate of admission for all AAPIs. On the other hand, there are other sub-groups (Hmong, Bangladeshis, Filipinos, Thais, Cambodians, Indonesians, Pakistanis, Vietnamese, Sri Lankan, and Koreans) with a lower rate of admission compared to the mean rate of admission for all AAPIs. The gaps between some sub-groups are significant. Taiwanese have a rate of admission to UCLA that is 7.7 percent higher than the average for AAPIs in the aggregate while Hmong have a rate of admission that is 13.1 percent below the average. Put another way, Hmong applicants have a rate of admission that is 20.8 percent lower than Taiwanese applicants.

In addition to utilizing disaggregated data to inform outreach efforts, AAPI student organizations have used data to support retention efforts through addressing the well-being of AAPI students on campus.

“We have received data from UCLA’s Counseling and Psychological Services to look at how frequently and how many Filipino students seek counseling and what are their reasons for seeking counseling, so that we can tailor our project’s services to address the mental health issues in our community.”

Rose Lyn Castro, *Director, Samahang Pilipino Education and Retention, UCLA*



While there are many factors that contribute to how and why students are admitted to a particular campus,¹ it is important to place this data in the context of differential access to resources in high schools available to help students be competitive for admissions to highly selective institutions. Table 4 provides data on three public high schools in California with some of the highest numbers and proportions of Chinese, Hmong, and Filipino students. These schools vary by the proportion of students from low-income back-

grounds (e.g., eligible to receive free or reduced lunch) and the proportion of students classified as English Language Learners. These schools also vary significantly by the background of the teachers. The school in Alhambra, which serves mostly Chinese students, has a teaching workforce that has more years of teaching and more likely to be fully credentialed than teachers at the school serving Hmong students in Sacramento or the school serving Filipino students in Daly City.

Table 4: Characteristics of High Schools in Selected AAPI Ethnic Enclaves, 2010

	Sacramento Predominantly Hmong	Alhambra Predominantly Chinese	Daly City Predominantly Filipino	California
Demographics				
Total Enrollment	1,966	2,452	1,196	6,217,002
AAPI Enrollment	865	1,761	479	724,335
Percentage AAPI Enrollment	44.0%	71.8%	40.1%	11.6%
Free or Reduced Meal	87.1%	60.8%	57.2%	56.7%
English Language Learners	37.3%	21.9%	23.4%	3.2%
Teacher Experience				
Number of Years Teaching (average)	8.9	17.4	10.9	13.8
Teachers with < 3 Years Experience	11.9%	3.5%	8.1%	5.4%
Teachers with MA or Greater	31.4%	70.9%	35.5%	41.2%
SAT and the AP Exams				
AP Passing rate	15.7%	79.5%	22.0%	58.2%
SAT Critical Reading (average)	375	522	398	495
SAT Math (average)	419	613	409	513
SAT Writing (average)	380	521	401	494
SAT Total Score > 1,500	7.6%	69.7%	12.8%	48.3%
College Eligibility				
AP Passing rate	0.9%	54.8%	33.6%	36.9%

Note: Data were unavailable for specific AAPI ethnic sub-groups. However, the majority of AAPI students in each school were predominantly of one AAPI ethnic background, as determined by the schools' neighborhood compositions.

Source: California Department of Education, 2013


¹ UCLA conducts a holistic review of all applicants, which takes into consideration both academic and non-academic achievement in the context of the opportunities students have access to in their schools. See http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr.htm. Also see "Gaming the System: Inflation, Privilege, and the Underrepresentation of African American Students at the University of California (*Bunche Research Report* Volume 4, Number 1: January 2008).



Students at the predominantly Chinese public school in Alhambra are also much more likely to take AP and SAT exams, pass the AP exam, and get higher scores on the SAT, compared to the other two schools. Finally, the likelihood of fulfilling

the coursework to be eligible to attend a UC or CSU campus varies significantly across the schools, which is another indicator of the quality of the instruction across these schools, as well as the differential access to college preparatory curriculum.

Difference from the Mean AAPI Reading Score on the CAT/6 Standardized Achievement for AAPI Sub-Groups, 2003-2008



Source: V. Ooka Pang, P. Han, and J. Pang. Asian American and Pacific Islander Students: Equity and the Achievement Gap. *Educational Researcher*, 40, 8, Pg 382

Note: The California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6) was a standardized achievement test administered to all seventh graders from 2003 to 2008. It is a norm-referenced standardized test through which student scores can be compared.



The Asian American Legal Center, a research and advocacy organization based in Los Angeles, has utilized disaggregated data on AAPIs to inform their work.

“The data has helped us better understand the challenges that Asian American and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (NHPI) student face in accessing the UC system. Contrary to the myth that Asian American and NHPI student have no problem gaining entry, the data showed that NHPI, Laotian, Filipino, Cambodian, Pakistani, Indonesian, and Bangladeshi American students have below average rates of admission to the UC system. The finding underscores the importance of tools like affirmative action in promoting educational access for all students of color, including Asian Americans and NHPI.”

Daniel Ichinose, *Director of the Demographic Research Project at the Asian American Legal Center of Southern California (APALC)*

The use of disaggregated data has already made a difference at UCLA and UC Berkeley. First, it has allowed administrators to see what student populations are underrepresented on their campus. Second, it has informed campus wide policies, programs and services, so that resources are used more effectively. Third, professors and researchers have a rich data source for understanding the

AAPI student population. Lastly, student organizations have been able to justify funding for their programs and advocate for the needs of their communities. Disaggregated data have allowed for a clearer picture of the realities and barriers to higher education for AAPI sub-groups that are too often overlooked and underserved.



A REGIONAL FOCUS ON HAWAII AND THE PACIFIC

The populations for whom data disaggregation is most important are the most marginalized and vulnerable AAPI sub-groups. Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders (NHPIs), for example, face some of the largest disparities in educational attainment relative to AAPI educational outcomes reported in the aggregate. As a result, NHPIs are among the most overlooked and underserved AAPI sub-groups. In this section of the report, we discuss the need for disaggregated data for reporting disparities in educational attainment for NHPIs and share case study findings on how the University of Hawai'i and the University of Guam have used disaggregated data to inform institutional practice and policy.


A Portrait of Educational Attainment among Pacific Islanders

One way to understand the need for disaggregated data for Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders is to examine their educational progress from a pipeline perspective. A cross-sectional analysis of census data in Figure 7 provides a pipeline perspective for AAPIs in the aggregate, as well as Native Hawaiians and Guamanians/Chamorro

which are represented here as three cohorts of 100 high school graduates. The first indicator to note – college going rates – reveals significant disparities in college participation among Native Hawaiian and Guamanian/Chamorro high school graduates, compared to AAPI high school graduates in the aggregate. While 87 out of 100 AAPI high school graduates attend college, only 63 out of 100 Guamanian/Chamorro and 58 out of 100 Native Hawaiians will do so.

which are represented here as three cohorts of 100 high school graduates. The first indicator to note – college going rates – reveals significant disparities in college participation among Native Hawaiian and Guamanian/Chamorro high school graduates, compared to AAPI high school graduates in the aggregate. While 87 out of 100 AAPI high school graduates attend college, only 63 out of 100 Guamanian/Chamorro and 58 out of 100 Native Hawaiians will do so.

Figure 7: Cohort Analysis of 100 AAPI, Chamorro, and Native Hawaiian High School Graduates



Source: American Community Survey, 3-Year PUMS

Note: This is cross-sectional analysis starting with cohorts of high school graduates




Among high school graduates across the three cohorts, there are significant disparities in the likelihood of completing college with a degree. While 73 out of 100 AAPI high school graduates will persist to earn a degree, the rate of completion for Guamanian/Chamorro (28 out of 100) and Native Hawaiian (25 out of 100) high school graduates is much lower. Guamanian/Chamorro and Native Hawaiian high school graduates who do attend college are much more likely to leave college without earning a degree. At this stage of the educational pipeline, 72 percent of Guamanians/Chamorro and 75 percent of Native Hawaiians will have a high school credential as the highest level of education they will earn.

Among Guamanian/Chamorro and Native Hawaiian college students who persist to earn a college degree, there is a greater likelihood of obtaining an associate's degree as their highest level of education, and a lower likelihood of obtaining a bachelor's or advanced degree, compared

to AAPIs in aggregate. At the level of advanced degrees – often the educational prerequisites for positions of leadership – we see a very low proportional representation among Guamanians/Chamorro and Native Hawaiians.

A broader context in which to place disparities in educational attainment among Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders is to consider the intergenerational mobility rates for these sub-groups relative to the nation as a whole. The question is, to what extent, if at all, are younger generations of sub-groups achieving greater upward educational mobility compared to their parents' generation? This is an important question for our nation as the U.S. continues to be out-educated by the youth of a number of other nations. The analysis in Figure 8 uses disaggregated data on Native Hawaiians, Guamanians/Chamorro, and Samoans to examine educational attainment relative to age-cohorts.

Figure 8: Age Cohort Analysis of College Degree Attainment for the Total US Population and Selected NHPI Sub-Groups, 2008-2010



Source: American Community Survey, 3-Year PUMS, 2008-2010



When comparing the educational attainment rates of 55-64 year olds to 25-34 year olds in the national cohort, we see a modest increase in bachelor's degree attainment. However, age-cohort analysis of disaggregated data on Guamanians/Chamorro, Hawaiians, and Samoans shows two disturbing trends. First, the educational attainment of the younger generation of Guamanians/Chamorro, Native Hawaiians, and Samoans is lower than the older generation of these populations. Second, what then occurs is a widening gap between these NHPI sub-groups and the national average, rather than a closing of the attainment gap. These trends of downward educational mobility speak to the need for a more concerted effort to better represent these populations in institutional datasets.

In the following sections, we examine how institutions in the Pacific region collect and use data to identify and respond to challenges that exist for NHPI students. Data disaggregation methods across the region vary widely; however, at the core of these various data collection systems is a commitment to serving their most marginalized students by using disaggregated data to target resources and create services that improve their academic achievement.

A University System's Use of Disaggregated Data – The University of Hawai'i

The University of Hawai'i (UH) System – comprised of three universities and seven community colleges – began using disaggregated data as early as 1986 to identify barriers that Native Hawaiian students faced in postsecondary education. An impetus for the use of disaggregated data came from the University of Hawai'i Studies Task Force,

which consisted of 18 members representing Native Hawaiian faculty. The task force released the Ka'ū Report,²⁵ which documented challenges for the Native Hawaiian student population. Specifically, the report discussed how Native Hawaiian students were being impacted by their representation in curricula and faculty selection, and the extent to which student recruitment and retention of Native Hawaiians was a key challenge for the university system. The task force highlighted that a plan was needed to address their “access to and persistence in higher education.”²⁶ The Ka'ū Report, made several recommendations to address these issues including the collection, analysis, and reporting of data to further address retention of Native Hawaiians. To more accurately capture their Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander student population, UH added a specific indicator about Hawaiian ancestry on their application which provided better identification of Native Hawaiian students, many of whom are mixed and may not identify with being solely Native Hawaiian when selecting ethnicity.

Disaggregated data now available in the UH system reveal key data points to which the campuses can develop policy strategies. In the UH community colleges, for example, the degree completion rate for Native Hawaiians was six percent lower than their peers.²⁷ At the UH Mānoa campus, Native Hawaiian students were graduating at both lower and slower rates than their peers and nearly “half of the Native Hawaiian students who enter as freshmen drop out of UHM.”²⁸ This was reflected in the difference in the representation of Native Hawaiians in UH Mānoa enrollment compared to their representation among graduates (Figure 9 and 10).



Figure 9:
Representation of AAPI Sub-Groups in Total Enrollment at UH Mānoa (Fall 2010)





Figure 10:
Representation of AAPI Sub-Groups in Graduates at UH Mānoa (2010-2011)



Source: University of Hawai'i Institutional Research and Analysis

The use of disaggregated data by UH has not only raised awareness about the educational needs of Native Hawaiians, it has also impacted practices on UH's campuses. Based on the educational gaps highlighted by disaggregated data in these reports, the UH system has created several initiatives to address the needs of Native Hawaiian students. Most recently, the *Hawai'i Papa O Ke Ao Plan*, released in 2010, built a framework of recommended strategies for the university system to become a model indigenous-serving institution. Among the characteristics that define their role as a model indigenous serving institution is fulfilling the goal of "Hawaiian enrollment at parity with Hawaiians in the Hawai'i state population" and "Hawaiian students performing at parity with non-Hawaiians."²⁹

Each campus also has their own specific efforts to address the needs of their Native Hawaiian students. For example, UH Mānoa has instituted mandatory advising for freshmen to improve retention rates. Kapi'olani Community College's Malama Hawai'i Center offers a place for students to share their culture, language and history. The center offers academic advising, peer tutoring and assistance with financial aid and scholarship applications. At UH West O'ahu, Kealaikahiki, a Title III funded program, provides targeted services to Native Hawaiian students and also promotes Native Hawaiian awareness throughout campus by providing seminars for faculty, staff and students. Additionally, Kealaikahiki has an academic advisor designated specifically for Native Hawaiian students.



In the same vein, the seven UH community colleges jointly participated in the *Achieving the Dream Initiative* (ATD). Based on the ATD model – data-driven decision making to improve student success – the seven community colleges developed initiatives to address the success of Native Hawaiians and underrepresented minorities using disaggregated data. Some of the activities included mandatory new student orientation, supplemental instruction, freshmen cohorts, and course re-design for remedial math and English courses.³⁰

All seven UH community college campuses have reported positive gains in improving Native Hawaiian enrollment as a result of their data-driven efforts using disaggregated data. For example, Leeward Community College reports that between 1997 and 2007, enrollment of Native Hawaiians has increased significantly. In fact, Native Hawaiian and Filipino students now represent the largest ethnic population in UH's community colleges.³¹ In addition to increased rates of enrollment, UH's Hawai'i Graduation Initiative set a goal of increasing degree attainment of Native Hawaiians by 6-9% per year. Since 2008, UH has exceeded these goals and continues to do so by larger margins.³²

UH's initiatives were driven by improved tracking of Native Hawaiian students, an imperative identified in the 1986 Ka'ū Report, highlighting their commitment to changing practice and policy that impact this marginalized student population. Further, UH has effectively tracked the impact of changes to showcase the improved outcomes for their Native Hawaiian student population.

An Institution's Use of Disaggregated Data – The University of Guam

Disaggregated data from the University of Guam (UOG) reveals a diverse Asian American and Pacific Islander student population. As of Fall, 2011, UOG had a student population that was 50% Pacific Islander and 40.6% Asian.³³ Pacific Islanders attending UOG are a particularly heterogeneous population. In addition to seven Asian subgroups, UOG also collects and reports detailed data on their Pacific Islander students. The campus has "established that it is important that we have the ability to identify and disaggregate the demographics of our student population."³⁴



In addition to collecting data on seven Asian American sub-groups, The University of Guam collects data on four Chamorro sub-groups (Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian) and seven Micronesian populations (Carolinian, Chuukese, Kosraen, Marshallese, Palauan, Pohnpean, Yapese), as well as other Pacific Islander sub-groups.

Asian	Chamorro	Micronesian	Pacific
Chinese	Guam	Carolinian	Other
Filipino	Rota/Saipan/Tinian	Chuukese	
Indian		Kosraen	
Japanese		Marshallese	
Korean		Palauan	
Vietnamese		Pohnpean	
Other		Yapese	

Source: University of Guam Fact Book, 2012

UOG has documented the importance of disaggregated data and recognizes the value of identifying student needs through effective data collection. For example, the Director of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research states, "It's quite important to continue to disaggregate data because we're servicing not only the students of Guam but the Asian Pacific..." The impact [disaggregated data] has had on the campus is the creation of programs that address student success and retention."³⁵ Other offices and personnel on the UOG campus have also found the value in the use of disaggregated data as the UOG Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research has observed an increased rate of requests for data. In the past six to eight months alone, there have been approximately ten requests for disaggregated data for various purposes including a review of enrollment and graduation trends by

ethnicity by the Office of the President and a longitudinal study of math placement and matriculation of students by ethnicity from the Mathematics Department.

UOG utilized their disaggregated data as part of their effort to become an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander serving institution (AANAPISI). In addition to serving as a fundamental part of their proposal to obtain the grant, data were used to identify the focus of programmatic efforts on recruitment, retention, and graduation rates. Funding from the AANAPISI grant was used to develop a mentorship program, provide tutoring services, offer targeted academic advisement, and other academic enrichment. As a result of these services, there have been reported increases in the rate of course completion and student satisfaction among Pacific Islander students.



The University of Guam in collaboration with 11 other institutions in the Pacific Rim, including the University of Hawai'i, has also used disaggregated data in their work through the Pacific Post-secondary Education Council (PPEC). With the goals of articulating a shared vision for regional planning of the Pacific institutions, addressing problems facing Pacific people and their environment, promoting the Pacific region's people and culture, and improving transferability between institutions through educational program compatibility, PPEC uses disaggregated data to reflect the heterogeneity in the Pacific Islander student population.³⁶

The 2009 PPEC Fact Book, a joint effort by institutional researchers from member institutions,

serves as a reference for peer comparison and provided information to support accreditation efforts and access to funding. Included in the Fact Book are disaggregated data on student demographics, reported by region. It provides PPEC member institutions information to consider the needs of specific student populations, such as their capacity to transfer, particularly from community colleges to Pacific region universities. For example, the UOG tracks student transfer information from other PPEC member institutions to its own institution.³⁷ It is through disaggregated Pacific Islander student data that PPEC can work toward systemic change to improve access and success for the most marginalized Pacific Islander sub-groups.

Tutoring Services: To increase progress and pass rates in developmental math

- Total number of students using tutoring services increased by approximately 40%
- Student satisfaction with tutoring services increased by approximately 27%
- Developmental math course completion rate of students using tutoring services increased by 14%

Mentorship Program: To implement a mentorship program to increase student retention

- Recruitment of 17 campus administrators, faculty and student leaders as mentors
- 181 students were matched with an on-campus mentor

Academic Advisement and Enrichment: To reduce the number of students with undeclared majors

- Workshops including College Major Perspectives, Career Exploration and Team Building provided to students
- Additional accessibility to career and academic advisement led to an increase in appointments with academic advisors





A CALL TO ACTION

Aggregated data provide a misleading statistical portrait of a heterogeneous

AAPI population that consists of sub-groups that experience divergent trends in educational outcomes. This is particularly problematic when it conceals significant disparities in opportunities and outcomes for some AAPI sub-groups. This report provides examples of institutional, system, and statewide models for effectively collecting and reporting disaggregated data, discussing what has been done, how it was done, and the difference it has made. The use of disaggregated data is a powerful tool for measuring and reporting on the changing demography of AAPI students and the population generally, measuring participation and representation in different sectors of higher education, and enabling stakeholders to mitigate disparities and inequality that exists between sub-groups.

There are several implications that emerge from the research in this report. We focus our recommendations around needs assessment, data collection procedures, and data reporting practices.

Establishing momentum for change. For the campuses discussed in this report, the movement to disaggregate data for AAPI students was built upon a shared rationale that change was important and necessary. Change was not only initiated by administrators and faculty, but also students and the broader community. Campuses that do not disaggregate data should explore with student groups and local community groups if there is a need or rationale for pursuing changes to their datasets.

Recommendations for data collection. There is not a single standard for ethnic sub-group categories to collect data on AAPI students. Campuses that are collecting disaggregated data often use categories that make sense for representing the demography unique to their students. However, the U.S. Census Bureau tends to have the most up-to-date listing of AAPI sub-groups, and a procedure for addressing Hispanic-origin populations, racial categories, as well as ethnic-level sub-groups.

Recommendations for data reporting. Disaggregated data can be reported in many forms (e.g., aggregated to the level of race or reporting for individual sub-groups). Regardless of the method, it is important for disaggregated data to be accessible for use by institutional researchers, administrators, faculty, and students engaged in the assessment and evaluation of campus services and programs. Data can also be shared across institutions within systems or consortia, across sectors (e.g., K-12 and higher education), as well as across political boundaries (e.g., states and territories), which enables tracking AAPI students throughout the educational pipeline.

Moving Toward systemic reform. Discussions between institutions about the collection, reporting, and use of disaggregated data can be facilitated through partnerships and working groups. These efforts should be supported by philanthropy, which can help offset the cost associated with changing systems and being a part of a broader network of support. The U.S. Department of Education can also play a role in providing guidance and technical assistance to institutions, and more importantly, collecting and reporting disaggregated student population data.





APPENDIX: Data Source and Methodology

Data in this report were drawn from a number of sources. Our main source of national data on demographic and community trends was the U.S. Census Bureau. Summary File 1 (SF1) is a 100 percent file that contains detailed demographic information collected from all people and households in the United States. To examine data about AAPI subgroups, we used the American Community Survey (ACS) 3-year Public Use Microdata Sample files (PUMS), a database that allows for the analysis of data for the nation and individual states aggregated over a three year period (2008-2010). We opted to use data from this source because it contained larger sample sizes for sub-populations.

Institutional and student-level data about AAPIs in higher education were drawn from a number of different national datasets. Analyses of trends in enrollment and participation in higher education relied on the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). While IPEDS consists of full population data, the analyses were exclusively descriptive and tests for significance were not conducted.

Case studies of the University of California relied on a number of different data sources. We contacted student-led AAPI programs and university-led programs at UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC Irvine, UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and UC San Diego. We also reached out to alumni from UC Berkeley and UCLA who were students during the *Count Me In* campaign. Those contacts connected us with current student organizers. In total, we interviewed 14 current and former students and six administrators in the UC system with knowledge of and insight on the campaign. In addition, we were able to locate several newspaper articles on the Count Me In campaign as well as two academic journal articles. Lastly the RFI response from the UC Office of the President, disaggregated AAPI student data from the UC Office of the President, and the UC Office of the President's website and summary statistics were

used to build context and check facts about data collection and reporting.

Case studies of the University of Guam and the University of Hawai'i also included a number of data sources. At the University of Guam, we corresponded with the president, the director of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research, and the program director for the AANAPISI grant. At the University of Hawai'i, we contacted the Director of Institutional Research and Analysis. These contacts gave us access to disaggregated data and information on the specific programs, services, and initiatives that were impacted by the use of disaggregated data at each institution. We supplemented UOG interviews with analysis of requests for disaggregated data by campus offices and their 2012 AANAPISI Annual Report, both provided by the Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research. Additionally, we used the UOG Request for Information response to the U.S. Department of Education and the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council's 2009 Fact Book. The enrollment and degree attainment datasets at the University of Hawai'i were accessed through the Institutional Research and Analysis Office data portal. This was supplemented by information and reports found on UH institution's website regarding Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander focused initiatives and services.

used to build context and check facts about data collection and reporting.





REFERENCES

- ¹ K. McClenney, B. McClenney, & G. Peterson, *A Culture of Evidence: What Is It? Do We Have One?* (Ann Arbor, MI: Society for College and University Planning, 2007); NERCHE, *Brief 18: Creating a Culture of Inquiry* (Boston, MA; New England Resource Center for Higher Education Publications, 2008).
- ² D. Jenkins & M. Kerrigan, *Faculty and Administrator Data Use at Achieving the Dream Colleges: A Summary of Survey Findings* (New York: Achieving the Dream Report Initiative, CCRC Teachers College, Columbia University, MDRC, 2009).
- ³ A. Dowd, *Data Don't Drive: Building a Practitioner-Driven Culture of Inquiry to Access Community College Performance* (Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education, 2005).
- ⁴ E. Bensimon, *Closing the Achievement Gap in Higher Education: An Organizational Learning Perspective* (Hoboken, NJ: New Directions for Higher Education, 2005).
- ⁵ Data Quality Campaign, *Data is Power*. (Washington, DC: 2011).
- ⁶ S. Hune, *Demographics and Diversity of Asian American College Students* (Los Angeles, CA: New Directions for Student Services, 2002).
- ⁷ A. Duncan, *Speech at Center for American Progress* (October 17, 2011).
- ⁸ S. Hune & K. Chan, *Special Focus: Asian Pacific American Demographic and Education Trends* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1997).
- ⁹ L. Olson, *An Invisible Crisis: The Educational Needs of Asian Pacific American Youth* (New York, NY: Asian Americans Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy, 1997).
- ¹⁰ H. Kim, *Diversity among Asian American High School Students* (Princeton, NJ: ETS Policy Information Center, 1997).
- ¹¹ K. Um, *A Dream Denied: Educational Experiences of Southeast Asian American Youth* (Washington, DC: Southeast Asia Resource Action Center, 2003).
- ¹² S. Hune & D. Takeuchi, *Asian Americans in Washington State: Closing Their Hidden Achievement Gaps* (Seattle, WA: Washington State Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs, 2008), p. 27.
- ¹³ C. Jencks & M. Phillips, *The Black-White Test Score Gap* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1998).
- ¹⁴ M. Omi & H. Winant, *Racial Formations in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 1994).
- ¹⁵ R. Teranishi, *Asians in the Ivory Tower: Dilemmas of Racial Inequality in American Higher Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2010).
- ¹⁶ E. Hoeffel, S. Rastogi, M. Kim, H. Shahid, *The Asian Population: 2010 Census Brief* (Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ F. Doshi, "UC accepts unprecedented number of Asian students," (Los Angeles, CA: *Daily Bruin*, April 27, 2006).
- ¹⁹ K. Vue, "You Can 'Count Me In!'" (Santa Cruz, CA: *SNAP! Asian American/Pacific Islander Resource Center, UC Santa Cruz*, 2008).
- ²⁰ O. Poon & J. Dizon, *Count Me In!: Asian American & Pacific Islander College Students Transforming Higher Education* (Manuscript Under Review).
- ²¹ R. Vasquez, *Asian American, Pacific Islander data collection launches* (Oakland, CA: UC Newsroom, November 16, 2007).
- ²² D. Takagi, *The Retreat from Race: Asian American Admissions and Racial Politics* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993), p. 150-152.
- ²³ C. Brown, "Ethnic category list to be update: Differences between Asians, Pacific Islanders to be recognized by UC, conference tackles issue" (Los Angeles, CA: *UCLA Daily Bruin*, November 18, 2001).
- ²⁴ University of California, *Student Workforce Data* (Oakland, CA: Office of the President).
- ²⁵ University of Hawai'i, *Hawai'i Papa O Ke Ao Report* (Honolulu, HI: Office of the President, 2010).
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ³⁰ Interview with P. Iboshi, Director of Institutional Research and Analysis, University of Hawai'i.
- ³¹ University of Hawai'i, *Leeward Community College, Strategic Outcomes & Performance Measures* (Pearl City, HI: Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment, 2008), p. 16.
- ³² University of Hawai'i, *Hawai'i Graduation Initiative* (Honolulu, HI: Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost).
- ³³ University of Guam, *2011-2012 Factbook* (Mangilao, Guam: Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research, 2012).
- ³⁴ Response to the U.S. Department of Education's Request for Information on data disaggregation practices in education.
- ³⁵ Interview with D. Guerrero, Director of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research, University of Guam.
- ³⁶ Pacific Postsecondary Education Council, *Regional Fact Book* (2009).
- ³⁷ Pacific Postsecondary Education Council, *A Progress Report on Transfer Students to the University of Guam* (2009).

Copyright © 2013 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. ETS, the ETS logo and LISTENING. LEARNING. LEADING. are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service (ETS). All other trademarks are property of their respective owners. 22540

CARE

National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education



Listening. Learning. Leading.®