# Why We Must Stop the Hernandez Proposition

岳东晓, Ph. D.

**2014/02/26**

The Hernandez proposition (SCA-5) to reintroduce racial preferences in the operation of California public education system has recently generated a lot of public debate. In this paper, we identify and analyze the problems that Sen. Hernandez attempts to address by race based laws. We find that despite a 20% high school dropout rate, Latinos enjoy a 35% enrollment ratio in the California State University system. At the University of California, Latino enrollment ratio is 19.2%. The lower latter ratio is largely due to a very low completion rate of the required courses by male Latino high school students, and can be improved through race and gender neutral alternatives such as stricter enforcement of school attendance laws. The Hernandez proposition violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and will be detrimental to the peace and prosperity of California. This we must stop.

## I. Equal Protection is an Individual Right

## 1. Equal Protection Forbids Racial Discrimination by the State

One and a half century ago at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln reiterated the founding principle of the United States, that all men are created equal. Immediately after the victory over the confederacy, Congress passed the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. To overcome the opposition of the rebel states, Congress divided the former confederacy into five military districts, and forced the South to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment.

With over 620,000 died in the American Civil War, one could argue that the Fourteenth Amendment, as the legacy of that monumental struggle, was written in blood. Every American should cherish the constitutional structure built on top of so much sacrifice and suffering.

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment provides that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Because the Fourteenth Amendment protects persons and not groups, it is an individual personal right that shall not be infringed by governmental actions based on race, color or any irrelevant group classification.

## 2. California Constitution Forbids State Racial Discrimination

In 1996, the people of California voted to amend their Constitution by Proposition 209 ("Prop 209"), which forbids the state government to discriminate individuals based on their race, color, sex or national origin. The proposition was approved by popular vote and was incorporated into Section 31 of Article 1 of the California Constitution[1], which reads in part:

> "The State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting."

In rejecting legal challenges to Prop 209, the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that "there is simply no doubt that Proposition 209 is constitutional." The Court further holds that "Proposition 209's ban on race and gender preferences, as a matter of law and logic, does not violate the Equal Protection Clause in any conventional sense", and where "a state prohibits race or gender preferences at any level of government, the injury to any specific individual is utterly inscrutable."

## II. The Hernandez Problems, Their Causes and Race Neutral Solutions

### 1. Latinos occupy over 31% of the seats in California public colleges

Since 2004, Latino members of the State legislature have introduced various bills to re-establish racial preferences in public education, but such efforts have been vetoed by separate Governors, mostly on constitutional grounds[2].

With the California Constitution being the obstacle for race based laws, State Senator Ed Hernandez proposed to amend the State Constitution and repeal Prop 209's ban on racial discrimination in public education. "Let the voters decide", he says, whether they want state imposed race preferences.

Hernandez's Senate Constitutional Amendment 5 ("SCA 5") initially called to apply race preferences in public postsecondary education only, but it was later expanded to encompass all public education. SCA5 has passed the State Senate by a vote of 27 to 9, and it has been introduced to the State Assembly. If it passes the Assembly vote, it will be then decided by popular vote.

"Distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of

---

[1] Ref. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/.article_1
[2] See, the legislative history of SCA 5 at http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sca_5_cfa_20130816_110047_sen_comm.html

equality." [3] The basis Hernandez proffered for his odious proposition is that Latinos are under-represented in California public colleges. Latinos have grown to 37.6% of the state population[4], and Hernandez alleges that his people are not getting commensurate dose of higher education.

We are not bound to accept Hernandez's assertions, and shall embark on independent fact checking.

California State University ("CSU") data shows that, as of 2012, there are 408,946 students enrolled in CSU system; among them, 136,839 are Latinos[5]. Excluding the 19,826 non-resident alien students, Latino ratio at the CSU is 35%. Overall, according to the California Postsecondary Education Commission ("CPEC")[6], in 2010[7], Latino undergraduate enrollment in California public higher education as a percentage of total was 31.4%; the corresponding percentage for Asians was 13.43%. These figures match quite well to the population ratios of the two.

It is hard to see how Mr. Hernandez can demonstrate gross under-representation of Latinos with a 35% Latino ratio at the CSU or the 31.4% enrollment ratio in all public colleges. Seeking to understand Hernandez's problems, we must look deeper and examine the enrollment data of the University of California ("U.C.") system, which consists of world renowned research universities.

As of Fall 2012[8], the U.C. enrolled 217,835 domestic students[9], Latino students totaled 41,810, or 19.2% of the domestic U.C. student body[10]. Since 19.2% is substantially smaller than 37.6%, this must be a problem for Hernandez.

The data also shows that the number of degrees Latino received in 2010 was only 22.38% of the total, while Asians took 15.48% of the degrees awarded. Thus, although Latinos occupied 31.4% of seats in college lecture halls, they were only getting 22.38% of the degrees. This must be another problem for Hernandez, as 22.38% is quite a bit less than 37.6%.

---

[3] Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81, 100 (1943)

[4] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_California (2010 data)

[5] http://www.calstate.edu/as/stat_reports/2012-2013/feth01.htm. For the convenience of the reader, key data tables retrieved online are attached as Appendices A-F of this paper. Readers are encouraged to independently verify the data by accessing the links referenced.

[6] http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp

[7] The CPEC web site does not have more recent data, but Latino undergraduate enrollment has been steadily increasing since 1996, when the percentage was 20.94%.

[8] Source: "Statistical Summary of Students and Staff", University of California, http://legacy.its.ucop.edu/uwnews/stat/statsum/fall2012/statsumm2012.pdf

[9] Total number of U.C. students was 238,686; total number of international students was 20,851.

[10] The data also shows that, in year 1999, Latino students at the U.C. numbered 19,745 out of 170,210 (domestic students), or 11.6%. From 1999 to 2012, Latino student ratio in the U.C. had grown 65.5%.

Contact: dxyue@yahoo.com          3

A closer examination of the data further reveals another anomaly in the gender composition of Latino U.C. student body. There are 24,206 female Latinos enrolled in the U.C., but only 17,582 males. Female Latinos thus command a 37.7% numerical advantage over male Latinos in U.C. enrollment[11]. Moreover, 40,031 Latino women received college degrees in 2010, but only 25,248 Latino men did, resulting in a massive 58.55% numerical supremacy for Latino women over their brothers.

Latino men are indeed getting substantially less college education than Latino women on average.[12] This Latino gender "imbalance" in higher education must be yet another problem for State Senator Hernandez.

Now that we understand why Hernandez wants racial and gender preferences in public education, we will perform an independent analysis of the causes of and explore race neutral solutions to the Hernandez problems.

## 2. The roots of the Hernandez problems are in high school

Why are Latinos 37.6% of the California population but constitute only 19.2% of the UC student body? Why are Latino women doing much better than Latino men in public colleges? The answer is apparent when we look at California high school graduation data.

According to the CPEC [13], Latino male high school graduation rate averaged about 54%, while female Latino high school graduation rate averaged 64%. The overall Latino high school graduation rate was about 59%, substantially lower than the high school graduation ratios of whites, Asians, Filipinos and Pacific Islanders. According to the California Department of Education[14], 21% of Latinos simply dropped out of high school in 2010.

High school graduation does not equate readiness for attending a research university. The data for high school a-g course[15] completion ratio reveals another secret: only 10% of Latino boys and 16% of Latino girls fulfilled the a-g course requirement[16]. Assuming roughly equal number of male and female Latinos, only 13% of Latino high

---

[11] The cause of this Latino gender disparity will be analyzed later when we look at high school course completion data.

[12] In comparison, White female and male U.C. students figures differ by only 1.2% (with slightly more men), and Chinese female and male numbers separate by less than 1%.

[13] http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/HSGradReport.ASP

[14] http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/ . There seem to be a difference between CDE data and CPEC data, the former shows a Latino cohort graduation rate of 68.1% in 2010. These differences do not qualitatively affect our analysis.

[15] The a-g courses are high school courses required by the U.C. , see http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/freshman/requirements/a-g-requirements/

[16] http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/AtoGReport.ASP

school students met the course requirement for attending four-year public research universities. In comparison, about 52% of the Asian high school students met the a-g requirement. The low a-g completion rate explains why a lower percentage of Latinos were able to attend the U.C.

The huge gap between female and male Latino a-g completion rate also explains the big gender differential in Latino enrollment at the U.C.

The above data shows that Latino students, and male Latinos in particular, are not taking full advantage of the free high school education made available by tax payers.

We have thus identified the causes of the Hernandez problems. Are there race neutral solutions to these problems?

## 3. Race neutral alternatives exist to improve Latino performance

How can Latinos attain higher U.C. enrollment ratio without resort to State imposed racial preferences?

By improving high school graduation rate from the abysmal 59% , Latinos should see a major boost in college admission rate. By taking more required a-g courses, they can receive more admission letters from the U.C.

Are Latino high school students able to achieve these goals?

The answer is resoundingly "YES!"

The fact that 16% of Latino female students completed the a-g requirement but only 10% of male Latinos accomplished the same is very telling. This staggering 60% gender differential in favor of Latino girls needs no explanation. In fact, male Latino students' a-g completion rate was the absolute lowest among all race-gender combinations. See table in Appendix F. Should male Latino high school students study as diligent as their female counterparts did, and achieve a similar a-g completion ratio of 16%, the overall Latino preparedness for the U.C. should jump a healthy 20%.

At the college level, the Latinos can certainly increase their graduation rate. As the 2010 data indicated, Latinos occupied 31.4% of the seats in public higher education, but only received 22.38% of the degrees. They seem to be squandering the precious opportunities of higher education.

Sen. Hernandez surely can propose race neutral legislations to prod Latino students to study more. California's compulsory education laws require kids of school age to attend schools[17]. California Penal Code Section 270.1 actually imposes a $2,000 fine and up to one year imprisonment for parents who willfully fail to supervise the school

---

[17] http://www.lao.ca.gov/2004/compulsory_ed/020304_compulsory_education_laws.htm

attendance of their children[18]. Better enforcement of these existing laws will create disincentives for students to drop out of schools or miss classes.

In addition to stricter enforcement of attendance laws, the State can also provide financial incentives to low income families whose children successfully complete high school. In short, there are many race neutral ways to help Latino kids to study more.

## III. The Hernandez Proposition Violates Equal Protection, is Detrimental to Latinos and Dangerous to All Californians

There is nothing inherently immoral or selfish in Hernandez's desire for his race to achieve college enrollment ratio equal to or higher than its population ratio. What is wrong is using institutionalized racial preferences to attain that goal. Mr. Hernandez doesn't want to make Latinos study harder by race neutral alternatives such as stricter enforcement of school attendance laws. Instead, he plays the race card. Mr. Hernandez is misguided for several reasons.

### 1. The Hernandez Proposition is Racial Discrimination

"Preferring members of any one group for no reason other than race or ethnic origin is discrimination for its own sake. This the Constitution forbids." University of California Regents v. Bakke, 438 US 265, 307 (1978). Strict scrutiny must be applied to dissect Hernandez's racial preference scheme.

Latinos represent 19.2% of the U.C. student body and 35% of the CSU student mass. Overall, Latinos represent over 31.4% of California public higher education. At every level, there is no question that diversity and "critical mass" have been attained by the Latinos. For Hernandez, the problem is that these significant percentages, and the U.C. ratio in particular, are lower than the 37.6% Latino population ratio in California. In other words, Hernandez is demanding State imposed racial balancing.

"[O]utright racial balancing... is patently unconstitutional". Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 US 306, 330 (2003). The Hernandez proposition would require virtual segregation of the races, which runs afoul against Equal Protection.

### 2. The Hernandez Racial Scheme Is Demeaning and Harmful to Latinos

"[When] the government treats any person unequally because of his or her race, that person has suffered an injury that falls squarely within the language and spirit of the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection." Adarand Constructors v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200, 230 (1995). The Hernandez scheme will not only hurt those treated unfavorably by

---

[18] http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ai/tr/

the proposed law, but will also injure the intended beneficiaries of preferential racial treatment.

"Preferential programs may only reinforce common stereotypes holding that certain groups are unable to achieve success without special protection based on a factor having no relation to individual worth". Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 298 (1978) (opinion of Powell, J.) Racial preferences "may in fact promote notions of racial inferiority and lead to a politics of racial hostility." Richmond v. J. A. Croson Co., 488 U. S. 469, 493 (1989)

Turning a deaf ear to the teachings of the Supreme Court, Hernandez has thrown in the towel on Latino kids. In his view, institutionalized racism is the only salvation for the intellectual development of his race. But Hernandez's tacit admission of Latino inferiority is unfounded. The fact that Latino girls are 60% better than Latino boys in meeting a-g requirements does not lead to the conclusion that gender preference must be invoked to balance the education levels of the Latino sexes, but simply illustrates the need for Latino boys to study a bit more.

Artificially inflating college admission ratio may not necessarily increase college graduation rate unless the State simultaneously lowers college graduation standards. Such experimentation has been conducted by the Communist Party of China in its effort to enhance the ratio of college degree holders from peasants and workers, with disastrous consequences to the nation's educational and research institutions. Moreover, the whole generation of Chinese college graduates were later marked with contemptible labels, regardless of their personal merits. China's lesson tells us that lowering education standards to inflate statistics does no good but only weakens the society at large.

A recent Duke University study found that actually a higher percentage of Latino high school graduates attained college degrees after Prop 209 went into effect. An explanation of this surprising phenomenon is that students of affected groups tend to study harder and become better prepared after Prop 209 removed the racial bonuses. In addition, post-Prop 209 college students of the affected groups can avoid the stigmatization of "affirmative action", and be proud of their personal achievements. Such pride and dignity are the true basis of racial equality.

## 3. The Hernandez Solution is Dangerous to All

"When the government prefers individuals on account of their race or gender, it correspondingly disadvantages individuals who fortuitously belong to another race or to the other gender." Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson, 122 F.3d 692, 701-702 (9th Cir.1997). The Supreme Court has warned us that racial distinctions "threaten to stigmatize individuals by reason of their membership in a racial group and to incite racial hostility." Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630, 643 (1993).

Senator Hernandez's open advocacy for State racial preference has sent shockwaves across the Asian community. The Asians, who represent over 30% of the

U.C. student body, are squarely in the cross hairs of Senator Hernandez. In the wake of SCA5, people can no longer regard themselves as Californians or Americans only, but must entrench themselves along racial lines. No stranger to racial discrimination, Asians are deeply alarmed by this dangerous trend.

The central purpose of the Equal Protection Clause "is the prevention of official conduct discriminating on the basis of race." Once the State institutes racial discrimination in public education, one can expect more of the kind to come. Don't other racial groups have higher median household income than Latinos? Are then Latinos under-represented in the economic sphere? Shouldn't Hernandez racial balancing scheme be equally applicable to educational rights and property rights? It is a slippery slope.

The Hernandez proposition is not only alarming to the Asians, but is dangerous to all Californians. In a racially charged atmosphere, everyone breathes the same infectious air of poisoned race relations. Diversity has hitherto been California's strength, it will become our Achilles' heel if the Hernandez Proposition is written into the Constitution.

## IV. Conclusion

The foregoing analysis shows that the right way to increase Latino presence at the U.C. is to require Latino high school students to study more and drop out less. The Hernandez proposition violates Equal Protection, promotes sense of racial inferiority and incites racial hostility. If the racial preference scheme in public education becomes the law of the State, Californians can expect a broader racial balancing system to arrive in the not so distant future. In that case, the damage to the Californians' way of life and the State's global competitiveness will be immeasurable.

To safeguard our peace and prosperity, Californians must vote NO to the Hernandez proposition.

## Appendix A

## CSU Enrollment by Ethnic Group, Number and Percent of Total, Fall 2013

Source: http://www.calstate.edu/as/stat_reports/2012-2013/feth01.htm

```
                    CSU Systemwide Enrollment by Ethnic Group, Number
                          and Percent of Total, from Fall 2003
```

|  | | | | | | | | Postbacca- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lower Division | | Upper Division | | | Total | | | laureate | | Graduate | | Total | |
| N | P | N | P | N | P | N | P | N | P | N | P | N | P |

Mexican American

| 18,680 | 16.5 | 31,227 | 14.9 | 49,907 | 15.5 | 5,375 | 15.5 | 5,267 | 10.2 | 60,549 | 14.8 |
| 18,858 | 17.4 | 32,607 | 15.5 | 51,465 | 16.1 | 3,641 | 14.4 | 5,930 | 11.4 | 61,036 | 15.4 |
| 20,315 | 17.9 | 34,547 | 15.8 | 54,862 | 16.5 | 3,154 | 14.0 | 6,021 | 11.8 | 64,037 | 15.8 |
| 22,770 | 18.6 | 35,940 | 16.2 | 58,710 | 17.0 | 2,980 | 14.1 | 6,202 | 12.0 | 67,892 | 16.3 |
| 25,206 | 19.0 | 37,004 | 16.4 | 62,210 | 17.4 | 3,188 | 14.5 | 6,212 | 11.8 | 71,610 | 16.5 |
| 26,899 | 20.0 | 38,016 | 16.7 | 64,915 | 17.9 | 3,180 | 15.4 | 6,465 | 12.0 | 74,560 | 17.1 |
| 29,355 | 22.8 | 40,025 | 17.3 | 69,380 | 19.2 | 2,848 | 15.4 | 6,350 | 11.8 | 78,578 | 18.1 |
| 31,532 | 25.8 | 41,531 | 18.4 | 73,063 | 21.0 | 2,382 | 16.5 | 5,989 | 12.0 | 81,434 | 19.7 |
| 36,660 | 28.2 | 47,625 | 20.1 | 84,285 | 23.0 | 2,236 | 17.4 | 6,243 | 13.4 | 92,764 | 21.7 |
| 40,493 | 30.3 | 53,843 | 21.9 | 94,336 | 24.8 | 2,177 | 19.1 | 6,499 | 14.4 | 103,012 | 23.6 |

Other Latino

| 6,814 | 6.0 | 11,794 | 5.6 | 18,608 | 5.8 | 1,712 | 4.9 | 2,242 | 4.3 | 22,562 | 5.5 |
| 7,006 | 6.5 | 12,523 | 5.9 | 19,529 | 6.1 | 1,177 | 4.6 | 2,408 | 4.6 | 23,114 | 5.8 |
| 7,653 | 6.8 | 13,227 | 6.1 | 20,880 | 6.3 | 1,001 | 4.4 | 2,527 | 4.9 | 24,408 | 6.0 |
| 8,658 | 7.1 | 13,936 | 6.3 | 22,594 | 6.6 | 996 | 4.7 | 2,612 | 5.1 | 26,202 | 6.3 |
| 9,637 | 7.3 | 14,810 | 6.6 | 24,447 | 6.8 | 1,187 | 5.4 | 2,563 | 4.9 | 28,197 | 6.5 |
| 10,352 | 7.7 | 15,500 | 6.8 | 25,852 | 7.1 | 1,141 | 5.5 | 2,649 | 4.9 | 29,642 | 6.8 |
| 10,261 | 8.0 | 16,409 | 7.1 | 26,670 | 7.4 | 1,009 | 5.5 | 2,936 | 5.4 | 30,615 | 7.1 |
| 10,510 | 8.6 | 16,769 | 7.4 | 27,279 | 7.8 | 898 | 6.2 | 2,961 | 6.0 | 31,138 | 7.6 |
| 10,755 | 8.3 | 17,977 | 7.6 | 28,732 | 7.8 | 831 | 6.5 | 2,892 | 6.2 | 32,455 | 7.6 |
| 11,351 | 8.5 | 18,930 | 7.7 | 30,281 | 8.0 | 736 | 6.4 | 2,810 | 6.2 | 33,827 | 7.7 |

**Appendix B**

# Total Enrollment at Public Higher Education: Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010

Total Enrollment rates were calculated by dividing the number of Latino students enrolled by the total number of students enrolled at Public Higher Education for academic years 1996-2010

Source: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp

| Total Enrollment Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | Women | | Ethnicity Total | |
| Year | Total | Num | Pct | Num | Pct | Num | Pct |
| 1996 | 1,808,901 | 159,754 | 8.83% | 207,753 | 11.49% | 367,507 | 20.32% |
| 1997 | 1,828,321 | 173,385 | 9.48% | 229,804 | 12.57% | 403,189 | 22.05% |
| 1998 | 1,855,205 | 175,122 | 9.44% | 236,328 | 12.74% | 411,450 | 22.18% |
| 1999 | 1,938,311 | 185,235 | 9.56% | 251,512 | 12.98% | 436,747 | 22.53% |
| 2000 | 2,135,956 | 215,637 | 10.10% | 282,458 | 13.22% | 498,095 | 23.32% |
| 2001 | 2,266,110 | 237,699 | 10.49% | 313,356 | 13.83% | 551,055 | 24.32% |
| 2002 | 2,354,414 | 243,810 | 10.36% | 329,686 | 14.00% | 573,496 | 24.36% |
| 2003 | 2,251,174 | 232,895 | 10.35% | 325,307 | 14.45% | 558,202 | 24.80% |
| 2004 | 2,187,904 | 227,753 | 10.41% | 320,843 | 14.66% | 548,596 | 25.07% |
| 2005 | 2,221,220 | 243,117 | 10.95% | 331,773 | 14.94% | 574,890 | 25.88% |
| 2006 | 2,269,221 | 253,444 | 11.17% | 342,443 | 15.09% | 595,887 | 26.26% |
| 2007 | 2,376,276 | 274,185 | 11.54% | 366,546 | 15.43% | 640,731 | 26.96% |
| 2008 | 2,456,849 | 291,439 | 11.86% | 382,774 | 15.58% | 674,213 | 27.44% |
| 2009 | 2,456,526 | 280,992 | 11.44% | 370,955 | 15.10% | 651,947 | 26.54% |
| 2010 | 2,393,522 | 321,464 | 13.43% | 413,579 | 17.28% | 735,043 | 30.71% |

**University of California 2011-2012 Enrollment Data**
**Source:** http://legacy.its.ucop.edu/uwnews/stat/statsum/fall2012/statsumm2012.pdf

## Table 7k: Enrollment by Ethnicity, Gender, and Level: University Total

| | Fall 2011 | | | Fall 2012 | | | One-year change | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ug | Gr | Total | Ug | Gr | Total | Ug | Gr | Total |
| **International** | 8,203 | 9,277 | 17,480 | 11,134 | 9,717 | 20,851 | 36% | 5% | 19% |
| Female | 3,842 | 3,190 | 7,032 | 5,276 | 3,380 | 8,656 | 37% | 6% | 23% |
| Male | 4,356 | 6,086 | 10,442 | 5,849 | 6,335 | 12,184 | 34% | 4% | 17% |
| Unknown | 5 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 11 | | | |
| **American Indian** | 1,218 | 412 | 1,630 | 1,290 | 424 | 1,714 | 6% | 3% | 5% |
| Female | 689 | 215 | 904 | 730 | 220 | 950 | 6% | 2% | 5% |
| Male | 528 | 197 | 725 | 558 | 204 | 762 | 6% | 4% | 5% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | | | |
| **African American** | 6,672 | 1,610 | 8,282 | 6,817 | 1,712 | 8,529 | 2% | 6% | 3% |
| Female | 4,097 | 960 | 5,057 | 4,115 | 1,028 | 5,143 | 0% | 7% | 2% |
| Male | 2,573 | 650 | 3,223 | 2,696 | 684 | 3,380 | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | | | |
| **Chicano/Chicana** | 26,949 | 2,599 | 29,548 | 28,898 | 2,737 | 31,635 | 7% | 5% | 7% |
| Female | 15,837 | 1,395 | 17,232 | 17,082 | 1,442 | 18,524 | 8% | 3% | 7% |
| Male | 11,101 | 1,204 | 12,305 | 11,800 | 1,295 | 13,095 | 6% | 8% | 6% |
| Unknown | 11 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 16 | | | |
| **Latino/Latina** | 8,093 | 1,716 | 9,809 | 8,503 | 1,672 | 10,175 | 5% | -3% | 4% |
| Female | 4,596 | 893 | 5,489 | 4,827 | 855 | 5,682 | 5% | -4% | 4% |
| Male | 3,496 | 823 | 4,319 | 3,670 | 817 | 4,487 | 5% | -1% | 4% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | | | |
| **Filipino/Pilipino** | 7,837 | 844 | 8,681 | 8,016 | 815 | 8,831 | 2% | -3% | 2% |
| Female | 4,314 | 459 | 4,773 | 4,408 | 436 | 4,844 | 2% | -5% | 1% |
| Male | 3,522 | 385 | 3,907 | 3,606 | 378 | 3,984 | 2% | -2% | 2% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | |
| **Chinese** | 27,725 | 4,191 | 31,916 | 27,604 | 4,094 | 31,698 | 0% | -2% | -1% |
| Female | 14,006 | 2,147 | 16,153 | 13,856 | 2,066 | 15,922 | -1% | -4% | -1% |
| Male | 13,714 | 2,044 | 15,758 | 13,744 | 2,026 | 15,770 | 0% | -1% | 0% |
| Unknown | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 6 | | | |
| **Japanese** | 3,409 | 706 | 4,115 | 3,355 | 749 | 4,104 | -2% | 6% | 0% |
| Female | 1,776 | 356 | 2,132 | 1,741 | 381 | 2,122 | -2% | 7% | 0% |
| Male | 1,632 | 350 | 1,982 | 1,614 | 368 | 1,982 | -1% | 5% | 0% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| **Korean** | 8,224 | 1,023 | 9,247 | 8,046 | 1,048 | 9,094 | -2% | 2% | -2% |
| Female | 4,148 | 530 | 4,678 | 4,066 | 548 | 4,614 | -2% | 3% | -1% |
| Male | 4,075 | 493 | 4,568 | 3,979 | 500 | 4,479 | -2% | 1% | -2% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | |
| **Other Asian** | 14,466 | 2,331 | 16,797 | 14,672 | 2,339 | 17,011 | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Female | 7,984 | 1,254 | 9,238 | 8,050 | 1,253 | 9,303 | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Male | 6,480 | 1,077 | 7,557 | 6,619 | 1,085 | 7,704 | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| **Pakistani/East Indian** | 6,727 | 1,873 | 8,600 | 7,444 | 1,955 | 9,399 | 11% | 4% | 9% |
| Female | 3,428 | 798 | 4,226 | 3,801 | 820 | 4,621 | 11% | 3% | 9% |
| Male | 3,298 | 1,075 | 4,373 | 3,641 | 1,134 | 4,775 | 10% | 5% | 9% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | |
| **White** | 53,568 | 21,682 | 75,250 | 51,098 | 21,739 | 72,837 | -5% | 0% | -3% |
| Female | 27,460 | 10,177 | 37,637 | 26,050 | 10,137 | 36,187 | -5% | 0% | -4% |
| Male | 26,090 | 11,503 | 37,593 | 25,025 | 11,598 | 36,623 | -4% | 1% | -3% |
| Unknown | 18 | 2 | 20 | 23 | 4 | 27 | | | |
| **Not Stated/Unknown** | 8,417 | 6,919 | 15,336 | 6,621 | 6,187 | 12,808 | -21% | -11% | -16% |
| Female | 4,123 | 3,304 | 7,427 | 3,291 | 2,993 | 6,284 | -20% | -9% | -15% |
| Male | 4,070 | 3,607 | 7,677 | 3,185 | 3,190 | 6,375 | -22% | -12% | -17% |
| Unknown | 224 | 8 | 232 | 145 | 4 | 149 | | | |
| **University Total** | 181,508 | 55,183 | 236,691 | 183,498 | 55,188 | 238,686 | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Female | 96,300 | 25,678 | 121,978 | 97,293 | 25,559 | 122,852 | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Male | 84,935 | 29,494 | 114,429 | 85,986 | 29,614 | 115,600 | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Unknown | 273 | 11 | 284 | 219 | 15 | 234 | | | |

Graduate student headcounts include Health Sciences Residents

**Appendix D**

## Total Degrees Awarded: Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010

Total Degrees Awarded rates were calculated by dividing the number of Latino students obtaining a degree by the total number of students obtaining a degree from Public Higher Education for academic years 1996-2010.

Source: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp

| Total Degrees Awarded Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | Women | | Ethnicity Total | |
| Year | Total | Num | Pct | Num | Pct | Num | Pct |
| 1996 | 194,191 | 11,692 | 6.02% | 16,317 | 8.40% | 28,009 | 14.42% |
| 1997 | 198,909 | 12,944 | 6.51% | 18,332 | 9.22% | 31,276 | 15.72% |
| 1998 | 199,672 | 13,214 | 6.62% | 19,127 | 9.58% | 32,341 | 16.20% |
| 1999 | 207,560 | 13,843 | 6.67% | 21,457 | 10.34% | 35,300 | 17.01% |
| 2000 | 204,762 | 14,127 | 6.90% | 22,445 | 10.96% | 36,572 | 17.86% |
| 2001 | 222,067 | 15,219 | 6.85% | 24,604 | 11.08% | 39,823 | 17.93% |
| 2002 | 237,129 | 16,757 | 7.07% | 27,760 | 11.71% | 44,517 | 18.77% |
| 2003 | 244,657 | 17,686 | 7.23% | 29,788 | 12.18% | 47,474 | 19.40% |
| 2004 | 253,069 | 17,900 | 7.07% | 31,257 | 12.35% | 49,157 | 19.42% |
| 2005 | 259,853 | 18,872 | 7.26% | 33,426 | 12.86% | 52,298 | 20.13% |
| 2006 | 266,490 | 20,140 | 7.56% | 34,813 | 13.06% | 54,953 | 20.62% |
| 2007 | 273,769 | 21,840 | 7.98% | 36,640 | 13.38% | 58,480 | 21.36% |
| 2008 | 276,452 | 22,496 | 8.14% | 37,390 | 13.52% | 59,886 | 21.66% |
| 2009 | 280,384 | 23,770 | 8.48% | 38,698 | 13.80% | 62,468 | 22.28% |
| 2010 | 291,746 | 25,248 | 8.65% | 40,031 | 13.72% | 65,279 | 22.38% |

# Bachelor's Degrees Awarded: Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010

Bachelor's Degrees Awarded rates were calculated by dividing the number of Latino students obtaining a degree by the total number of students obtaining a degree from Public Universities for academic years 1996-2010.

| Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Latino as a Percent of Total, 1996-2010 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | Total | Men | | Women | | Ethnicity Total | |
| | | Num | Pct | Num | Pct | Num | Pct |
| 1996 | 82,540 | 4,529 | 5.49% | 6,309 | 7.64% | 10,838 | 13.13% |
| 1997 | 81,985 | 4,827 | 5.89% | 6,882 | 8.39% | 11,709 | 14.28% |
| 1998 | 83,104 | 5,125 | 6.17% | 7,247 | 8.72% | 12,372 | 14.89% |
| 1999 | 85,980 | 5,376 | 6.25% | 8,069 | 9.38% | 13,445 | 15.64% |
| 2000 | 88,344 | 5,576 | 6.31% | 8,712 | 9.86% | 14,288 | 16.17% |
| 2001 | 90,050 | 5,428 | 6.03% | 8,960 | 9.95% | 14,388 | 15.98% |
| 2002 | 96,179 | 5,870 | 6.10% | 9,943 | 10.34% | 15,813 | 16.44% |
| 2003 | 98,837 | 6,021 | 6.09% | 10,204 | 10.32% | 16,225 | 16.42% |
| 2004 | 104,320 | 6,165 | 5.91% | 10,922 | 10.47% | 17,087 | 16.38% |
| 2005 | 107,630 | 6,573 | 6.11% | 11,635 | 10.81% | 18,208 | 16.92% |
| 2006 | 110,990 | 7,004 | 6.31% | 12,194 | 10.99% | 19,198 | 17.30% |
| 2007 | 112,474 | 7,353 | 6.54% | 12,461 | 11.08% | 19,814 | 17.62% |
| 2008 | 115,548 | 7,805 | 6.75% | 13,362 | 11.56% | 21,167 | 18.32% |
| 2009 | 117,309 | 8,072 | 6.88% | 13,057 | 11.13% | 21,129 | 18.01% |
| 2010 | 118,901 | 8,112 | 6.82% | 13,149 | 11.06% | 21,261 | 17.88% |

## *Public High School Graduation Rates*

Source: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/HSGradReport.ASP

| Ethnicity | Gender | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | Men | 50% | 51% | 47% | 49% | 50% | 49% | 49% | 48% | 50% | 49% | 49% | 51% | 50% | 51% | 52% | 52% | 53% | 49% | 48% | 47% | 49% | 50% |
| | Women | 59% | 59% | 57% | 58% | 61% | 60% | 60% | 61% | 63% | 61% | 60% | 61% | 59% | 61% | 64% | 63% | 64% | 59% | 58% | 58% | 59% | 60% |
| Native American | Men | 60% | 54% | 55% | 57% | 54% | 51% | 52% | 54% | 58% | 54% | 58% | 55% | 55% | 59% | 65% | 69% | 61% | 59% | 58% | 61% | 62% | 58% |
| | Women | 64% | 53% | 57% | 59% | 61% | 57% | 59% | 57% | 62% | 61% | 66% | 62% | 62% | 67% | 68% | 72% | 68% | 63% | 64% | 69% | 68% | 63% |
| Asian | Men | 87% | 92% | 87% | 88% | 89% | 89% | 86% | 85% | 85% | 84% | 83% | 81% | 82% | 82% | 84% | 85% | 85% | 84% | 85% | 87% | 88% | 85% |
| | Women | 95% | 96% | 94% | 98% | 98% | 99% | 95% | 96% | 95% | 94% | 90% | 88% | 90% | 90% | 93% | 93% | 93% | 92% | 91% | 93% | 95% | 93% |
| Pacific Islanders | Men | 66% | 62% | 58% | 58% | 61% | 63% | 57% | 59% | 55% | 73% | 67% | 62% | 62% | 72% | 74% | 68% | 68% | 66% | 64% | 69% | 71% | 66% |
| | Women | 61% | 67% | 67% | 67% | 66% | 65% | 60% | 66% | 63% | 71% | 65% | 67% | 68% | 72% | 80% | 72% | 77% | 69% | 73% | 76% | 77% | 70% |
| Latino | Men | 50% | 52% | 53% | 53% | 51% | 49% | 48% | 49% | 49% | 51% | 52% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 52% | 52% | 53% | 48% | 48% | 50% | 54% | 51% |
| | Women | 58% | 61% | 61% | 61% | 61% | 60% | 59% | 62% | 61% | 62% | 62% | 60% | 61% | 62% | 64% | 64% | 65% | 59% | 59% | 61% | 64% | 61% |
| White | Men | 66% | 67% | 67% | 68% | 67% | 67% | 66% | 68% | 68% | 70% | 71% | 72% | 71% | 70% | 73% | 73% | 73% | 72% | 73% | 74% | 75% | 70% |
| | Women | 72% | 74% | 73% | 74% | 74% | 73% | 73% | 75% | 76% | 76% | 78% | 78% | 79% | 78% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 79% | 79% | 80% | 82% | 77% |
| Filipino | Men | 84% | 83% | 78% | 79% | 79% | 80% | 80% | 79% | 83% | 81% | 79% | 80% | 80% | 82% | 87% | 87% | 86% | 80% | 81% | 85% | 84% | 82% |
| | Women | 95% | 95% | 85% | 87% | 89% | 89% | 90% | 93% | 92% | 93% | 87% | 89% | 89% | 89% | 94% | 93% | 95% | 90% | 88% | 91% | 92% | 91% |
| **Overall Rate** | | 66% | 67% | 66% | 67% | 66% | 65% | 64% | 66% | 66% | 67% | 67% | 67% | 66% | 66% | 69% | 68% | 68% | 65% | 65% | 66% | 68% | 67% |

Data Generated on Wednesday, February 26, 2014 at 3:38:58 PM

# Public High School A-G Completion Rates

The a-g completion rate is calculated by dividing the number of public high school students who successfully completed the a-g course requirements with a grade "C" or higher in a given year by the number of Freshmen four years earlier as reported by the schools.

| Ethnicity | Gender | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | Men | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 12% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 13% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 11% | 9% | 12% | 11% |
| | Women | 16% | 15% | 17% | 17% | 18% | 17% | 19% | 20% | 21% | 20% | 19% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 21% | 18% | 19% | 17% | 20% | 18% |
| Native American | Men | 11% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 11% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 14% | 12% | 13% | 13% | 12% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 13% | 12% | 14% | 16% | 15% | 13% |
| | Women | 13% | 9% | 13% | 13% | 16% | 14% | 18% | 16% | 17% | 16% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 18% | 22% | 21% | 18% |
| Asian | Men | 44% | 45% | 47% | 47% | 47% | 46% | 47% | 48% | 50% | 49% | 48% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 47% | 48% | 48% | 48% | 49% | 47% |
| | Women | 50% | 52% | 53% | 56% | 55% | 55% | 56% | 59% | 60% | 59% | 57% | 56% | 57% | 57% | 57% | 59% | 61% | 60% | 60% | 61% | 61% | 58% |
| Pacific Islanders | Men | 16% | 13% | 11% | 16% | 19% | 17% | 16% | 18% | 17% | 20% | 17% | 15% | 17% | 17% | 17% | 19% | 18% | 16% | 18% | 17% | 21% | 17% |
| | Women | 14% | 20% | 21% | 19% | 17% | 15% | 19% | 21% | 21% | 22% | 23% | 20% | 21% | 23% | 24% | 23% | 28% | 26% | 24% | 26% | 27% | 23% |
| Latino | Men | 9% | 9% | 9% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 9% | 9% | 10% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 10% | 12% | 10% |
| | Women | 11% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 13% | 12% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 15% | 15% | 16% | 16% | 16% | 17% | 19% | 18% | 17% | 16% | 19% | 16% |
| White | Men | 20% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 23% | 22% | 24% | 25% | 26% | 27% | 27% | 27% | 27% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 27% | 26% | 26% | 27% | 28% | 25% |
| | Women | 24% | 26% | 27% | 27% | 29% | 28% | 31% | 33% | 34% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 36% | 36% | 36% | 37% | 38% | 36% | 36% | 36% | 38% | 33% |
| Filipino | Men | 30% | 31% | 30% | 33% | 32% | 28% | 32% | 32% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 32% | 35% | 35% | 36% | 32% | 34% | 35% | 35% | 33% |
| | Women | 40% | 42% | 41% | 42% | 42% | 39% | 42% | 48% | 45% | 46% | 45% | 47% | 48% | 46% | 48% | 49% | 52% | 48% | 47% | 48% | 49% | 46% |
| Overall Rate | | 20% | 21% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 23% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 24% | 24% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 24% | 24% | 23% | 25% | 24% |

Data Generated on Wednesday, February 26, 2014 at 3:41:40 PM