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With the burgeoning of the Latina/o student population in postsecondary institutions, the federal government now designates institutions enrolling 25% or more undergraduate Latina/o students as Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). Enrolling over 50% of all Latina/o college students, HSIs are important contributors to the enrollment, persistence, and graduation of Latinas/os. The perennial question facing HSIs, however, is what does it mean to serve Latina/o students? As an emerging institutional form, HSIs are undergoing the process of establishing normative behaviors, values, and identities. Having a clear identity is an important way for organizations to establish legitimacy and manage their external environment. The purpose of this study was to determine the ways in which various members of a postsecondary institution co-construct their organizational identity as a HSI. Using a case study design inclusive of interviews with key institutional members, focus groups with students, document reviews, and formal observations, this research examined the way one large, public, four-year master’s granting institution (NSU) is undergoing the process of identifying as a HSI. This study contributes to a theoretical understanding of organizational identity construction, with a specific focus on one distinct
organizational label, and has implications for institutional practice and federal policy. Results exhibit that when asked “Who are we as an organization?” members used sensegiving processes to draw on formal identity claims about the most central, distinct, and enduring aspects of the organization’s identity. This included four core values of the organization including: regionally focused, committed to the community, dedicated to access, and serving of a diverse population. Evidence in this case posits that these four core identities are integrated with the HSI designation, although it is a latent identity less salient to most members. Through sensemaking processes, members drew on deeply held assumptions and embedded practices, constructing their HSI identity based on organizational structures and processes that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission. This study suggests that both sensemaking and sensegiving are important in the co-construction of an organizational identity while challenging the notion that the HSI identity is strictly manufactured and driven by enrollment. Furthermore, it proposes a theoretical framework for studying the organizational identity of HSIs.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Since 1992 when the federal government first recognized Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) as a formal category under the Higher Education Act (HEA), HSIs have received annual Congressional appropriations earmarked for these institutions. Federal legislation has historically been used to support the development of postsecondary institutions that serve underrepresented groups, including the HEA of 1965, which defined Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and ensured federal assistance for these institutions through Title III (Gasman, 2008; Wolanin, 1998). Title III (and later Title V) has since been expanded to provide capacity building aid to HSIs while other legislation, such as the America COMPETES Act of 2010 and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (HCERA) of 2010, has also increased economic support for these institutions. Federal funding for HSIs, however, has periodically been threatened during budget discussions (Dervarics, 2011), despite the fact that HSIs enroll over 50% of all Latina/o college students (Mercer & Stedman, 2008; Santiago, 2008). Although the White House has recognized the important role that HSIs play in educating the youngest and fastest growing racial/ethnic group in the country (White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, 2011), HSIs are coming of age during an era of decreased federal and state appropriations for higher education, increased attacks on affirmative action in admissions policies, and an enduring climate of racial/ethnic tension within educational settings. These challenges may ultimately affect an institution’s ability to become “Latina/o-serving.”

It remains unknown what it means for an institution of higher education to serve Latina/o students. Defined by the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), HSIs are accredited, degree-granting institutions that have at least 25% full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment of undergraduate Latina/o students (Laden, 2004). Beyond the enrollment
requirement, however, there are no other indicators of what a HSI should do in order to serve Latina/o students. Perhaps the bigger issue, then, is whether tax dollars should be allocated to institutions that are part of a category that has yet to be defined. Having an established identity is an important way for organizations to attract new audiences, manage external resources, and establish legitimacy (Hsu & Hannan, 2005). Furthermore, HSIs, as a collective organizational form, need recognition and legitimacy in order to foster support from state and local governments and well as the general public.

In a recent report entitled “Leading in a Changing America: Presidential Perspective from Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs)” Santiago (2009) documented the perspectives of 12 presidents who are at the forefront of transformational leadership at HSIs in California, New York, and Texas. Several presidents noted that being designated as a HSI means that the institution has to take responsibility to serve Latina/o students, but they also articulated the challenges of defining what it means to be “Hispanic-serving” (Santiago, 2009). One concern included the challenge of balancing costs, quality, and access while recognizing the unique needs of the diverse students enrolling in HSIs (Santiago, 2009). Another reported theme was that institutional success is inextricably linked to Latina/o student success, which means that HSIs must ensure positive outcomes for Latina/o students in order to realize overall organizational success in educating students.

Unfortunately, research has shown that Latina/o students attending HSIs are earning degrees at lower rates than those attending non-HSIs (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2008; G. A. Garcia, 2011; Malcom, 2010). Although G. A. Garcia (2011) found that institutional selectivity and resources are significant predictors of graduation rates for Latina/o students at HSIs, few studies have evaluated organizational practices that may lead to graduation at these
institutions. Contreras et al. (2008) proposed that the “Hispanic-serving” label is actually a “manufactured identity” while Malcolm (2010) suggested that HSIs are merely “Hispanic enrolling,” which may be the reason why HSIs are not adequately graduating Latina/o students. The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which HSIs define or redefine their culture, climate, and practices to truly serve Latina/o students, using an in-depth case study analysis to examine the organizational identity of one federally designated, four-year HSI.

**Problem Statement**

The Latina/o population in the US is projected to nearly triple between the years 2008 and 2050, bringing the number to 132.8 million, or 30% of the total population (US Census Bureau, 2008). In comparison, the Black population will increase from 14% to 15% of the total population while the Asian population will increase from 5.1% to 9.2% in the same time period (US Census Bureau, 2008). This exponential increase in the population of Latinas/os has implications for many US sectors, including postsecondary education. Although their rate of enrollment will be comparatively slower that their population growth, Latinas/os will continually increase their participation in higher education. In 2009, 13.4% of all students enrolled in postsecondary institutions were Latinas/os (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011a). By 2020, it is predicted that Latinas/os will increase their rate of participation in degree-granting institutions to 16.1% of all students, second only to White students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011b). These numbers indicate a steady increase in the participation of Latinas/os in higher education, although the predictions may actually be underestimated since NCES does not know the race/ethnicity of nonresidents. If the increase in Latina/o enrollment remains constant, it can be concluded that by 2050, over 25% of all students enrolled in postsecondary institutions will be Latinas/os.
It is assumed that as Latinas/os pursue postsecondary education in greater numbers, the increase in the number of institutions eligible to be designated HSIs will also remain steady because most are enrollment driven. Excelencia in Education estimates that there were 150 two-year and 143 four-year HSIs in the US (including Puerto Rico) in 2009-2010. Additionally, Excelencia in Education estimated that there were an additional 204 “emerging” HSIs enrolling between 15%-24% Latina/o students in 2009-2010, indicating that the number of HSIs will continue to increase over the next few years. Although they currently represent less than 10% of all postsecondary institutions, HSIs enroll over 50% of all Latina/o undergraduate students, making them important sources of access and success for Latina/o college students (Santiago, 2008; White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, 2011). Empirical research on these institutions, however, is scant but growing.

Contreras et al. (2008) used an equity index, which assesses proportionality at a single time point, to rate college access and graduation at five four-year institutions and five two-year institutions. They found that although a majority of the institutions in their sample provide equitable access for Latina/o, Black, and Asian American students, they are not doing as well in degree production. Similarly, Malcolm (2010) found that HSIs with greater than 33% enrollment of Latina/o students have lower graduation rates than HSIs with fewer Latina/o students and G. A. Garcia (2011) determined that graduation rates for Latina/o students are significantly lower at HSIs than they are at emerging HSIs and non-HSIs. Beyond graduation, Latina/o students who attend HSIs are also less engaged than Black students who attend Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) (Nelson Laird, Bridges, Morelon-Quainoo, Williams, & Holmes, 2007). This finding is likely due to the nature of HBCU’s, which tend to be small, residential campuses in comparison to the nature of HSI’s, which are often
large, commuter campuses. Interestingly, Latina/o students have similar levels of engagement at HSIs and PWIs (Nelson Laird et al., 2007). Faculty attitudes towards teaching and satisfaction with the quality of students are also similar for those teaching at HSIs and PWIs (Hubbard & Stage, 2009). The fact that both students and faculty have similar experiences at HSIs and PWIs suggests that HSIs are not unique environments for Latina/o students or faculty.

A closer look at the mission statements of 10 purposely selected HSIs revealed that none of them have an explicit mission to serve Latina/o students, although each is committed to diversity, multiculturalism, and/or access (Contreras et al., 2008). Unlike HBCUs and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), a majority of HSIs were not founded with the mission to serve Latina/o students. Since 1992, there has been an assumption that institutions that enroll a critical mass of Latina/o students know how to serve them, but the requirements for becoming truly “Latina/o-serving” remain elusive. One way to examine the programs and procedures that HSIs implement as a means of “serving” Latina/o students is to review the grant activities of those institutions that receive Department of Education (DOE) Title V Developing HSI grants.

The Title V program, as authorized by the HEA of 2008 as amended, provides capacity building grants that assist HSIs in enhancing the educational opportunities for and degree attainment of Latina/o students (US Department of Education, 2011). The grant process is competitive with very few institutions receiving monies each year. For the fiscal year 2009, 18 two-year institutions and six four-year institutions received individual grants while five cooperative grants (between one two-year and one four-year institution) were awarded. Typically, the institutions that receive funding have taken proactive steps to embrace their identity as HSIs and to mitigate the factors that are preventing Latina/o students from attaining advanced degrees. A review of the grant abstracts for the fiscal year 2009 provides the following
picture of the students enrolling in HSIs: Latina/o, minority, underrepresented, immigrant, low income, impoverished, academically underprepared, at-risk, first-generation, and transfer students. Unfortunately, these characteristics are often associated with lower levels of degree attainment for all students (DeAngelo, Franke, Hurtado, Pryor, & Tran, 2011), making it more important for HSIs to have adequate resources to serve these students. Although there are other types of students entering HSIs, these characteristics describe the average student that federally designated HSIs are trying to better serve, as suggested by their grant proposals.

The grant activities are also outlined in the abstracts, revealing that a majority of the HSIs want to increase access, outreach, and transition of Latina/o students into higher education and to enhance the retention, persistence, academic success, and degree attainment of Latina/o and other underrepresented students. Successful remediation and transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions are also stated goals of these institutions. Although the goals are similar, each institution proposes a different set of interventions specific to its needs and the needs of its students. Examples include the development of online support services, revisions to the curriculum, implementation of faculty development programs, and the establishment of a variety of student services that have proven to be best practices for academic success (i.e., supplemental instruction, summer transition programs, first-year experience programs, learning communities, tutoring, advising, and mentoring). The evidence that seems to be missing from these abstracts, however, is a complete picture of what is happening at the institutional level to facilitate a transformational shift in organizational practices that are deep and pervasive (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). Although these interventions may be effective in the short-term, their long-term institutionalization is questionable. A majority of the proposed interventions require funding for sustainability and may be difficult to continue when grant monies run out unless institutions
adopt them as part of their daily work in promoting student success. Of the 29 funded projects, only four have a stated goal to change the infrastructure of the institution in order to better serve students. Essentially, many HSIs, which may be considered the pioneers in thinking about their role in serving Latina/o students, are using small bandages to address problems that require major surgery. This analogy begs the question: what will happen when the bandage falls off? In order for HSIs to reach their full potential for enrolling, serving, and graduating Latina/o students, they must go beyond surface level interventions and begin examining their core organizational practices, institutional climate for Latina/o students, and identity claims as an organization.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the organizational identity of HSIs using an in-depth case study analysis that examines a federally designated, four-year HSI. By investigating one HSI that has taken progressive steps towards establishing its role as Latina/o-serving, I thoroughly analyzed the institutional culture, policies, practices, and climate for diversity as well as the organizational identity claims that individuals construct. The main research question that guided this study was: *In what ways do the students, administrators, faculty, and student affairs staff co-construct organizational identity at a HSI?* Two additional research questions supported the main question including: *(a) What are the shared cultural values and organizational practices embedded within the institution that indicate a “Hispanic-serving” mission? and (b) What is the climate for diversity (and Latinas/os in particular) as perceived by students, administrators, faculty, and staff?* 

Three overarching frameworks were used to develop this study including one focused on organizational identity formation, one on organizational culture, and one on the campus climate for diversity. Organizational identity is essentially a self-classification based on responses to the
question, “Who are we as an organization?” (Albert & Whetten, 1985). It is often ambiguous, complex, and difficult to define, especially at a time when an organization is faced with questions about its core values and purpose (Albert & Whetten, 1985). In their seminal piece, Albert and Whetten (1985) attempted to define the concept of organizational identity and proposed an identity distinctive framework for studying it as a construct. This framework included three necessary and sufficient criteria including claimed central character (central), claimed distinctiveness (distinctive), and claimed temporal continuity (enduring).

Although Albert and Whetten’s (1985) definition of organizational identity provided a basis for understanding it as a construct in this study, the Organizational Response to Identity Threats Model (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) was used to frame this study. The model empirically tested and built off of the Organizational Identity Dynamics Model developed by Hatch and Schultz (2002), who claimed that organizational identity is constantly being created, sustained, and changed through the interaction of culture (an internally held understanding) and image (an externally held perception) through four core processes including: (1) mirroring, (2) reflecting, (3) expressing, and (4) impressing. Likewise, Ravasi and Schultz (2006) contend that four key elements contribute to the co-construction of organizational identity including: (1) construing external images, (2) reflecting on cultural practices and artifacts, (3) projecting desired images, and (4) embedding claims in organizational culture. The main difference with Ravasi and Schultz’s (2006) model is that they proposed that an external threat will prompt an organization to reconsider and reconstruct its organizational identity through a series of sensemaking strategies. Based on the threat, members of the organization will evaluate their projected image, assess their embedded cultural practices, and revise their identity claims in order to determine what the organizations is really about (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In the present study, the change
in student demographics is not necessarily a “threat” to the institution, but it is a change prompted by an external force that can lead to dissonance about the organization’s identity.

In order to examine organizational culture, practices, image, and climate, more specifically, I used two theoretical frameworks that are specific to higher education. Organizational culture has been studied by a number of educational researchers including Tierney (1988) and Kuh and Whitt (1988). In this study, however, I was concerned with the way race and ethnicity have been incorporated into the core culture since HSIs have a more diverse population of students, staff, and faculty than non-HSIs (G. A. Garcia, 2011). Chesler, Lewis, and Crowfoot’s (2005) framework was therefore used. They claim that higher education institutions striving for an environment that values diversity must examine eight distinct organizational dimensions including mission, culture, power, membership, climate, technology, resources, and boundary management (Chesler et al., 2005). In talking to administrators, faculty, and staff, I investigated these dimensions in order to gain a better understanding of the way internal stakeholders perceive the culture for diversity and inclusion at their institution.

The Multi-contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012) was also used as a theoretical guide for this study. The model builds off of previous climate and organizational models in higher education and adds a layer of complexity by including contextual elements that are both micro and macro in nature and a cohesive set of educational outcomes. Hurtado et al. (2012) suggest using the model to scrutinize the organizational/structural dimensions of the institution, including those pertaining to institutional policies and practices that have historically discriminated against various groups. The MMDLE can also be used to understand the way people perceive and experience the climate for diversity in higher education while emphasizing the personal identity
of students (at the core) and of institutional actors as intricately related to how educational
practices (curricular and co-curricular) are enacted

**Scope of the Study**

In order to “investigate a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life
context,” a case study methodology was employed (Yin, 2009, p. 18). More specifically, a
single-case design was used in order to gather information about a representative or typical case
(Yin, 2009). The case provided in-depth information about the daily practices, embedded
culture, and climate for diversity at HSIs. Using established theories as a guide, this study aimed
for analytic generalization in which the case was used to test and challenge them (Yin, 2009).
Future research can use the findings from this case study to generate theory and develop studies
that are statistically generalizable across multiple institutions. This single-case design was ideal
for exploring the understudied phenomenon of HSIs in terms of culture, climate and identity that
translate into practices unique to the growing Latina/o population.

The focus of the case study was the institution with a series of layered or embedded cases
within the institution including students, faculty, student affairs staff, and administrators. By
giving voice to various individuals within the institution, this study provided a thorough
investigation of the ways they make sense of the environment while recognizing that
organizational members have different experiences and perceptions based on their social
identities, background, and position within the organization. A constructivist perspective
allowed me to study the realities constructed by different people in the organization while
acknowledging that each one is unique and valid (Patton, 2002). These constructed realities are
important since they have implications for the individuals’ lives and their interactions with each
other (Patton, 2002).
The site chosen for this study, Naranja State University (NSU), is officially designated as a HSI, enrolling 38% FTE Latina/o students in fall 2012, surpassing White students (28%), the second largest racial/ethnic group on campus. The institution is a large, public, master’s granting institution that is part of a larger system of state institutions. On multiple occasions it has been nationally recognized as a “Top 10” master’s institution for graduating Latina/o students. NSU has been federally designated as a HSI since 1997 and has received four DOE Title V Developing HSI grants, three Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) HSI Assisting Communities grants, and one US Department of Agriculture (USDA) HSI Education grant. The goals of the grants have varied and been directed by different program directors on campus. The sampling strategy purposefully targeted the program directors and staff that have been involved in coordinating grant activities in order to learn more about the historic development of NSU’s identity as a HSI.

Using this case study design, this research aimed to describe the organizational culture, practices, and climate of one HSI while striving to identify the ways in which members co-construct their organizational identity as a HSI. As a bounded unit, the scope of the study was the case with a unique contribution of ideas and perspectives from a variety of stakeholders within the institution including six central administrators, 22 faculty members, 19 students affairs staff members, and 41 students from diverse backgrounds. Although the impetus for this study was to understand what constitutes “Hispanic-serving,” it has implications for changing the lower graduation rates of Latina/o students attending HSIs in comparison to non-HSIs. Study participants inevitably talked about student outcomes, since one of the main goals of postsecondary institutions is to graduate students; however, judgments were not be made about the organization’s level of identification with it’s HSI status based on graduation or other
outcomes. Instead, this study aimed to define a HSI identity and what a postsecondary organization can and should do in hopes of providing an environment in which all students can succeed, especially those with growing numbers of Latina/o students. The student perspective was important for determining how well the actual culture, practices, and climate align with the desired identity projected by administrators, staff, and faculty. As an exploratory, descriptive study, I illustrated the way individual members make sense of the institution and construct their own reality within the organization while validating each person’s experience, regardless of their position within the institution.

**Contribution of Study**

The last decade has witnessed an increase in the empirical research focused on HSIs. Studies that use an organizational lens to analyze HSIs, however, are virtually non-existent. This study makes an empirical contribution to various bodies of research including HSIs in higher education, organizational identity and culture, and institutional transformation. Additionally, this study provides a basis for examining the organizational culture, practices, and policies of HSIs with the hope of encouraging future studies that focus on the organizational identity formation of HSIs.

Scholars studying HSIs have developed two main areas of research. First a number of studies have looked at the way that the organizational climate at HSIs enhances student connections with the institution, stressing the importance of the Spanish language and Latina/o cultural artifacts on campus. A second focus in the research has been on the persistence, retention, and graduation of Latina/o students attending HSIs. With fewer studies looking at organizational culture, policies, and practices at HSIs, the present study will make this unique contribution to the field of higher education.
The field of organizational identity is in its early stages of development, with a majority of the work focused on establishing a theory of organizational identity as opposed to defining the actual formation process. Empirical studies have also been limited to single organizations and have often looked at single factors that alter or threaten the organization’s identity, with little attention paid to the establishment of an organizational identity. This study, therefore, empirically tests one identity formation model that had yet to be tested in organizations and determines how individuals construct their organizational identity.

Institutional transformation and organizational change is a well-established area of research, with researchers empirically testing a number of theories including population ecology (which looks at the reasons why organizations are born and die within well established population forms) and neo-institutionalism (which looks at the ways that organizations change in response to coercion, mimicry, and normative processes). Higher education scholars have also examined transformational change, with an emphasis on the leadership process and context for change. This study makes a unique contribution by studying a newly established organizational form (HSIs) still seeking legitimacy within a larger population of postsecondary institutions.

**Significance of Study**

At a national level, the success of Latina/o students in postsecondary education is vital to the future of our country. As one of the fastest growing populations in the nation, studying the educational trajectory of Latina/o students is crucial. It is well documented that Latina/o students in the educational pipeline are underrepresented at every level (Cuádraz, 2005; Solórzano, Villalpando, & Oseguaera, 2005; Solórzano & Yosso, 2000), with few making it through high school and into higher education (Solórzano et al., 2005). For those Latina/o students that do enter postsecondary education, they are often concentrated in the community colleges and have low transfer and graduation rates (Cuádraz, 2005; Solórzano et al., 2005). As
a major point of entry into higher education, it is vital to understand the potential of HSIs to truly serve and cater to the needs of Latina/o students.

Currently, HSIs represent a small percentage of all colleges and universities but they enroll a large number of Latina/o college students (Santiago, 2008). Nationally, however, the Latina/o graduation rates at HSIs are significantly lower than those at non-HSIs and emerging HSIs (G. A. Garcia, 2011). This may be a result of the “manufactured identity” of HSIs (Contreras et al., 2008). In order for HSIs to adequately serve and graduate Latina/o students, they must first examine their organizational practices that are helping and/or hindering Latina/o students from succeeding. Additionally, they must embrace their identity as HSIs and develop a culture that supports and encourages the success of all students. The expected population shift suggests that Latina/o students will continue to enter institutions of higher education in greater numbers and will likely continue to enroll in HSIs. In order to ensure the access and success of Latina/o students in postsecondary education, it is important to explore the unique aspects of the institutions enrolling the largest number of these students.

This study is important to a number of constituents including administrators, faculty, and staff working at HSIs. At one level, this research can help these practitioners transform their institution into one that truly serves Latina/o students. As suggested by Kezar and Eckel (2002) senior administrative support is an important element in the transformation process. They must first recognize the changing nature of their institution and the students they serve before critically examining the way that their every day practices and policies affect students. By allowing multiple perspectives to be heard, this study highlights the importance of engaging different constituents in the transformation process, a strategy that Kezar and Eckel (2002) call collaborative leadership.
At another level, this study is important to the students attending HSIs, particularly Latina/o and other students of color, since it highlights the organizational practices and policies that are intended to improve their access, experience, and success in the institution. In order for Latina/o students to succeed, HSIs need to take a proactive role in understanding student needs while assessing their ability to meet those needs. By focusing on the institution, the deficit perspective often used to blame the student for his/her failure (Harper, 2007; Valencia & Solorzano, 1997) will be shifted to the institution. By holding the institution accountable for student success, the Latina/o students will ultimately benefit.

Understanding the unique role that HSIs play within the larger system of postsecondary education is also important for federal policy makers and HSI advocacy groups charged with convincing lawmakers that HSIs matter, as many of these institutions are under-resourced at the same time that they enroll students with high academic and financial need. By highlighting the characteristics that make HSIs distinct within the larger system of higher education, this study equips advocacy groups and policy makers with empirical data needed to fight for additional resources and funding for HSIs and other Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs). As a growing category within postsecondary education, HSIs need to be better understood for both research and practical purposes.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Over the last 30 years, the number of HSIs has been increasing rapidly, while educational researchers have been slower to provide empirical evidence on the experiences and outcomes related to attending these institutions (Laden, 2004). Early descriptive work by Berta Vigil Laden (2001, 2004) laid the groundwork while research has begun to burgeon in the last 10 years. In general, scholars have looked at retention and persistence, ethnic identity development, student engagement, climate related issues, and challenges facing students attending HSIs. Others have begun to explore classroom techniques, pedagogical practices, and the experiences of faculty and administrators at HSIs. Despite this progress, there is still much to be learned about HSIs. A majority of studies have looked at individuals as the primary units of analysis while few have focused on the organizational level. Furthermore, there is virtually a dearth of information on the organizational culture, practices, and identity of HSIs.

This review of the literature is divided into two major parts. The first part focuses on developing a general understanding about what is known about HSIs including a brief history of HSIs and their quest for a legitimate group identity followed by a discussion of the general characteristics of students who attend HSIs. Next, I review studies that have looked at the contextual effects for students attending HSIs followed by those looking at faculty, administrators, pedagogy, and curriculum. The section on HSIs will conclude with a study by Perrakis and Hagedorn (2010) which provided some empirical evidence for what is known about the organizational identity of HSIs.

The second part of this review focuses on organizational identity literature including an overview of why it is important to study the organizational identity of postsecondary institutions
followed by a conceptual definition of organizational identity. Then it reviews the concepts of organizational image and organizational culture with specific examples of how these concepts have been studied in higher education settings. Finally, this chapter concludes with a theoretical framework for studying organizational identity formation.

**Brief History of Establishing the Group Identity of HSIs**

As suggested by MacDonald, Botti, and Clark (2007), HSIs began their struggle for an autonomous identity over 40 years ago with the passage of the HEA of 1965. Although HSIs were not formally recognized in Title III of the Act (“Strengthening Developing Institutions”), the establishment of Title III ultimately opened the door of opportunity for Latina/o students and HSIs (MacDonald et al., 2007). During the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, Latina/o advocates, inspired by the Civil Rights Movement and the success of HBCUs, forged their way into higher education with the establishment of Chicano and Puerto Rican institutions of higher education (MacDonald et al., 2007; M. Olivas, 1982). Although eight institutions with a specific mission to serve Latina/o students were founded during this time, only three of the eight remain in business today, including National Hispanic University (San Jose, CA), Hostos Community College (Bronx, NY), and Boricua College (Brooklyn, NY) (MacDonald et al., 2007). In 1980 St Augustine College (Chicago, IL) was founded as the first bilingual/dual-language institution of higher education in the U.S. (excluding territories) and was established to meet the educational needs of Latina/o adults who wanted academic or vocational career training (St. Augustine College, 2009), making it the fourth postsecondary institution with a specific Latina/o-serving mission.

Beyond these institutional efforts, the primary struggle for federal recognition and funding for postsecondary institutions that enroll over 25% Latina/o students began in 1984 when Senator Paul Simon, prompted by dismal findings in a report entitled *The Condition of*
Education for Hispanic Americans, introduced H.R. 5240 (MacDonald et al., 2007; Santiago, 2006). Although the bill failed to be added to the 1984 HEA, many of its key points were eventually incorporated into the reauthorization of the HEA in 1992 (MacDonald et al., 2007). Additionally, Santiago (2006) contends that Simon’s bill increased awareness of Latinas/os as a definable group and brought awareness to institutions that enroll a critical mass of Latina/o students. A subsequent failure of Albert Bustamante’s Hispanic-Serving Institutions of Higher Education Act of 1989 and the establishment of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) in 1986 further laid the groundwork for establishing HSIs (MacDonald et al., 2007). The sole purpose of HACU was to develop a coalition of institutional leaders that could advocate for more funding and support for institutions that enroll 25% or more Latina/o students (Santiago, 2006). HACU became instrumental in convincing Congress to recognize HSIs and to provide federal appropriations for these institutions (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, 2009a).

The federal government eventually recognized HSIs under the HEA of 1992 and created a competitive grant program aimed at increasing capacity building activities at HSIs (MacDonald et al., 2007; Santiago, 2006). HACU was not completely satisfied with the outcomes of the HEA of 1992 because it placed stringent requirements on HSIs and ultimately provided dismal appropriations to a handful of HSIs (MacDonald et al., 2007). The 1998 reauthorization of the HEA ultimately legitimized HSIs by loosening the requirements for identification, recognizing them under Title V, and increasing funding for these institutions (MacDonald et al., 2007). Since 1998, federal appropriations for HSIs have remained steady while the number of HSIs has increased dramatically (Santiago, 2006). Although there are still some discrepancies in the way HACU defines HSIs (headcount enrollment of full- and part-time students) versus the federal
government’s definition (full-time equivalent enrollment; FTE) (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, 2009b), it is generally recognized that over 50% of all Latina/o undergraduates now enroll in HSIs (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, 2009a; Laden, 2001; Mercer & Stedman, 2008). HSIs, however, also provide opportunities for non-Latina/o students. The following section will provide an overview of the characteristics of students attending HSIs. Understanding the individual characteristics of students attending HSIs may be a first step in understanding the organizational identity of HSIs since students are prominent members of the institution (and arguably the most important).

**Characteristics of Students at HSIs**

As enrollment driven institutions, the most obvious characteristic of students attending HSIs is that they are Latina/o. In Fall 2001, HSIs enrolled 54.2% of all Latina/o college students nationally (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). In comparisons, HBCUs only enrolled 14.1% of all Black students and TCU's only enrolled 8.6% of all American Indian and Native Alaskan students (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Beyond Latina/o students, scholars have argued that HSIs provide increased access to other students of color. Nuñez, Sparks, and Hernández (2011) recently found that in addition to Latina/o students, Black, Asian American, and multiracial students are more likely to enroll in two-year HSIs than two-year non-HSIs.

Contreras et al. (2008) also found that two- and four-year HSIs increase access for Latina/o, Black, and Asian American students. Using an equity index, which assesses proportionality at a single time point, Contreras et al. (2008) rated college access at five four-year HSIs and five two-year HSIs in order to determine if their enrollment of students of color was proportional to the number of high school graduates of color in the same state. They included HSIs in California, Texas, New York, New Mexico, and Colorado and computed the equity index for Latina/o students by dividing the total number of Latina/o high school graduates
in each state by the total number of high school graduates in each state and then divided that number by the total undergraduate Latina/o students enrolled in each HSI in the same state by the total undergraduate enrollment in the same state. They found that three of the five four-year HSIs not only provided equal access for Latina/o students, but four of the five also performed extremely well in providing equitable access to Black and Asian American students (Contreras et al., 2008). The two-year HSIs in their sample also provided a higher rate of equitable access for Latina/o students with four of the five rating above equity (Contreras et al., 2008). By comparing the total enrollment of Latina/o (and Black and Asian American) students to the total number of Latina/o (and Black and Asian American) high school graduates, the equity index provides a clearer picture of educational access than the actual enrollment numbers do; however, Contreras et al. (2008) only looked at five states that arguably have the highest population of Latina/o students living in them. It cannot be assumed that their findings can be generalized to the other 45 states in the U.S.

Using a national dataset, Nuñez and Bowers (2011) were able to look more closely at the general characteristics of students that enroll in two- and four-year HSIs. They conducted a multilevel analysis using data from the NCES Educational Longitudinal Study 2002/06 (ELS: 2002/06) and determined that there were some significant differences in the student and high school characteristics of those who enroll in two-year HSIs and non-HSIs as well as four-year HSIs and non-HSIs. Their two-year model included \( n = 2,500 \) students nested in 530 high schools and their four-year model included \( n = 4,400 \) students nested in 570 high schools, which led to their use of hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to account for differences across high schools.
In comparing enrollment in two-year HSIs and non-HSIs, Nuñez and Bowers (2011) found that Hispanic students were more likely to enroll in HSIs while female students and students interested in the racial/ethnic composition of the institution were less likely to enroll. Similarly, Nunez et al. (2011) found that being male was a positive predictor of enrolling in a two-year HSI versus a non-HSI. For the high school level variables, students who attended high school in the Midwest and those who attended high schools with higher free and reduced lunch were less likely to enroll in two-year HSIs while students who attended public high schools and high schools with a higher percentage of Hispanic teachers, a higher percentage of minority students, and a higher student-teacher ratio were more likely to enroll in two-year HSIs (Nuñez & Bowers, 2011).

In contrasting enrollment in four-year HSIs and non-HSIs, Nuñez and Bowers (2011) discovered four student level variables that predicted enrollment. Hispanic students and students interested in living close to home were more likely to enroll in HSIs while first-generation immigrants and students with higher standardized mathematics scores were less likely to enroll in four-year HSIs (Nuñez & Bowers, 2011). Others have suggested that Latina/o students who want to live close to their family are more likely to attend HSIs (Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Cabrera, 2008; Santiago, 2007). At the high school level, students who attended high schools in the Midwest and public high schools were less likely to attend four-year HSIs while those that attended high schools in the West, high schools with high enrollment, and high schools with a higher percentage of Hispanic and minority students were more likely to attend a four-year HSI (Nuñez & Bowers, 2011).

Nuñez and Bowers (2011) provided a timely portrait of the types of students attending HSIs that can be used to better understand the context and culture of HSIs. Knowledge of the
students enrolling in HSIs provides a better understanding of the students that HSIs are most likely to serve. In addition to the characteristics Nuñez and Bowers (2011) found related to enrollment in two- and four-year HSIs, others have suggested that commuter students (González, 2008; Salinas & Llanes, 2003), older students (Bridges, Kinzie, Nelson Laird, & Kuh, 2008; González, 2008), low income students (de los Santos & Cuamea, 2010), underprepared students (de los Santos & Cuamea, 2010), transfer students (Bridges et al., 2008), and first generation college students (Nuñez et al., 2011; Salinas & Llanes, 2003) are more likely to be enrolled in HSIs. In the following sections, this literature review focuses on the contextual effects of HSIs, highlighting significant findings for different types of students within HSIs.

**Contextual Effects for Students Attending HSIs**

A number of researchers have examined the contextual effects for students attending a HSI. The following sections will provide an overview of key findings related to the effects of attending a HSI, which in many cases is related to the campus climate for students. Despite the fact that HSIs enroll a large number of Latina/o and other students of color, it cannot be assumed that the campus climate is congenial for these students since most HSIs were not originally established with the intention of serving them (Gasman, 2008). Several researchers, however, have found evidence that the environment at HSIs can in fact be amiable and supportive for Latina/o students. This has important implications for the present study because HSIs that embrace their identity as Latina/o-serving may provide an environment in which students see themselves as members of the community and may ultimately foster their success. This section, therefore, includes findings related to students’ sense of cultural connection with the campus and students’ persistence, retention, and graduation from HSIs.
Cultural Connections, Language, and Identity

**Latina/o and Spanish-speaking students.** A number of studies suggest that the personal identity of students attending HSIs is largely intertwined with the organization’s identity, thus fostering their cultural connections with the campus and enhancing their perceptions of the campus climate. Arana, Castañeda-Sound, Blanchard, and Aguilar (2011) examined indicators of persistence at one HSI located in the Southwest with 70% Latina/o student enrollment. They interviewed 16 current students, 11 non-persisting students, and 6 successful alumni in order to ascertain the various ways that the student context and college context contributed to students’ persistence decisions. One of the key findings was that persisting students talked about the importance of their self-identity aligning with the cultural atmosphere present at the university (Arana et al., 2011). The importance of alignment between personal identity and the organization’s identity was also apparent in an earlier study by Dayton, Gonzalez-Vasquez, Martinez, and Plum (2004) in which they talked to students and administrators about their experience at eight diverse HSIs in California and Texas. They found that several students indicated that having Latina/o faculty and staff on campus who speak Spanish was important for fostering connections with professors, increasing their motivation to succeed, and empowering them to excel academically (Dayton et al., 2004).

Several other studies have found that language is important to students attending a HSI. Language has the ability to foster cultural connections and enhance ethnic identity development, and may ultimately be an important way for students at HSIs to feel connected to the campus. Sebanc, Hernandez, and Alvarado (2009) specifically investigated the way language matters to students attending one small liberal arts HSI in Southern California. They surveyed and interviewed 46 English-Spanish bilingual, traditional-aged college students and discovered that
being bilingual was essential to developing friendships for these students. Participants talked about the importance of having friends that were able to understand their language as well as their historical and cultural background (Sebanc et al., 2009). Many said that their bilingual friends were more like family members and some said that having bilingual friends brought out their cultural pride (Sebanc et al., 2009). These findings suggest that by attending a HSI, Latina/o and other English-Spanish bilingual students may in fact experience a greater sense of belonging and enhance their ethnic identity simply by being exposed to more bilingual students than they would at a non-HSI.

In looking at the ethnic identity development of members of a Latino fraternity at one HSI (with 54.2% Latina/o student enrollment) located in the Southeastern U.S., Guardia and Evans (2008) also found evidence that language is an important determinant of students’ connections with the institution. They sought to determine how both participation in a Latino fraternity and attending a HSI enhances the ethnic identity development of Latinos and found that by attending a campus where faculty and staff identified as Latina/o and spoke Spanish, participants’ ethnic identity development was enhanced (Guardia & Evans, 2008). Additionally, the presence of Latina/o culture, language, and food on campus fostered further ethnic identity development (Guardia & Evans, 2008). Participants said that the environment was comfortable because people looked and talked like them (Guardia & Evans, 2008).

González (2010) also examined the ways that Florida International University (FIU), a HSI located in the Southeast with 52% Latina/o student enrollment, influenced the ethnic identity development of Latina/o students. More specifically, González (2010) focused on the ethnic identity development of Cuban American students and also investigated the White identity development of non-Hispanic White students. Through a series of interviews and focus groups
with 14 Cuban American students and 15 non-Hispanic White students, González (2010) found that the Spanish language and Hispanic culture prominent on campus affected the experience of both groups. Although Guardia and Evans (2008) found that Latino students in their study felt more comfortable on campus because faculty and staff spoke Spanish, González (2010) discovered that Cuban students who did not speak Spanish felt “ostracized or ‘shafted a lot’ for not being able to speak it” (p. 296). Similarly, non-Hispanic White students felt isolated or excluded on campus for not being able to speak Spanish (González, 2010). Combined, the two studies suggest that HSIs may need to find a way to effectively balance multiple cultures and languages in order to make sure all students are welcomed and accepted, regardless of their cultural and language preferences. It cannot be assumed that all Latina/o students attending HSIs will embrace their ethnic background in similar ways since they each enter the university at different stages of ethnic identity development and have different experiences that either enhance or hinder this development.

Another important consideration is that the identity of faculty, staff, and administrators may enhance students’ cultural connections with HSIs. Dayton et al. (2004) found that administrators in their study said that Latina/o faculty and staff are able to provide Latina/o students with support and guidance since many of them were first generation college students who faced similar struggles and challenges in their own college careers (Dayton et al., 2004). They concluded that Latina/o students attending a HSI gain a valuable support system in an environment where they share similar cultural experiences with faculty and other support staff (Dayton et al., 2004). The importance of having faculty and administrators with similar backgrounds to the students attending HSIs was further highlighted by Stanton-Salazar, Macias, Bensimon, and Dowd (2010). Specifically, they called these faculty members “institutional
agents.” They used thick descriptions to emphasize the way that four Latino faculty members in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) used their position and status in order to advocate for racialized students from low-income backgrounds. For example, Professor Martinez invited students to participate in his professional scientific networks and used these networks to create additional opportunities for students (Stanton-Salazar et al., 2010). Professor Tovar asked faculty members in his own department to work with students who may not have appeared as competitive on paper but had the potential to develop the skills necessary to succeed in STEM (Stanton-Salazar et al., 2010). Professor Ramirez created a program to help Latino students develop the skills necessary to be successful in STEM research labs and provided them with opportunities to develop networks with other faculty and the scientific community (Stanton-Salazar et al., 2010). Stanton-Salazar et al. (2010) stressed the importance of having institutional agents at HSIs in order to increase the access and success of Latinas/os into STEM majors and careers. As institutional agents working at HSIs that enroll between 35-40% Latina/o students, these four professors worked to make systemic changes that would ultimately benefit all racialized students attending the university (Stanton-Salazar et al., 2010).

Non-Latina/o students. As institutions that also serve a large number of non-Latina/o students, cultural and social diversity plays out in a number of ways at HSIs (Laden, 2001), which may ultimately benefit all students. For example, Maestas, Vaquera, and Muñoz Zehr (2007) found that for both White students and students of color attending the University of New Mexico (a HSI flagship institution in the state of New Mexico), socializing with different racial/ethnic groups contributed to their sense of belonging. Additionally, González (2010) found that for non-Hispanic White students, attending a HSI helped them to accept and appreciate Latina/o culture. HSIs, however, may also have the ability to promote an
environment of equality amongst Latina/o and White students that goes beyond the appreciation of diverse others. At FIU, González (2008) discovered evidence to suggest that the campus is undergoing a state of “transculturation” and “hybridity” of cultures where Latina/o and non-Hispanic Whites are adapting to one another, participating in civic activities with similar interests, and are less likely to revert to ethnic enclaves. Although a majority of studies have looked specifically at the way that that unique ethnicities, culture, and language at HSIs enhances the Latina/o student experience, these findings highlight the importance of looking at the way HSIs ultimately affect all students.

As suggested by previous studies (i.e., Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Hurtado, 1992; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009), students of color may have negative experiences at Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs), which could ultimately affect their persistence and success within the institution. The studies reviewed in this section, however, suggest that the campus climate at HSIs is quite different than TWIs, often fostering students’ ethnic identity, sense of belonging, and cultural connections with the institution. Although a majority of the studies have been conducted at a single site with a small sample of students, faculty, and/or administrators, they suggest that HSIs can make a unique contribution to the growth and development of their students. Perhaps this contribution should be further considered when thinking about the effectiveness of HSIs.

**Persistence, Retention, and Graduation**

HSIs are responsible for a conferring a large portion of the degrees awarded to Latina/o students in the U.S. (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). In Fall 2001-2002, HSIs awarded 55.6% of all associates degrees to Latina/o students and 42% of all bachelor’s degree (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Although these statistics suggest that HSIs may be effectively serving Latina/o students,
a number of scholars have further examined the persistence, retention, and graduation of students attending HSIs that may help to provide a full picture of the success of students attending HSIs.

Supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, the Computing Alliance of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (CAHSI) is an alliance of seven HSIs in four states and Puerto Rico. The goals of CAHSI include increasing the retention of Latina/o students in computing degrees, expanding the computing workforce, and supporting the advancement of Latina/o faculty in computing disciplines (Quiroz Gates et al., 2011). These goals have been addressed through three strategies including (1) increased dialogue between the institutions, industry, non-profits, and academic programs, (2) promotion of social science research focused on Latina/o student success, and (3) implementation of a number of initiatives to support students including preliminary computer science courses, Peer-Led Team Learning, mentoring activities, workshops, and research poster sessions (Quiroz Gates et al., 2011). In evaluating these efforts, Quiroz Gates et al. (2011) found that CAHSI schools have seen a steady increase in the number of computer science degrees awarded while there has been an overall decrease in degrees awarded in the U.S. and Canada and within institutions in comparable regions to those in CAHSI (Quiroz Gates et al., 2011). These findings highlight the important contribution that HSIs can make in regard to increasing the STEM pipeline for students of color attending HSIs.

Additionally, Quiroz Gates et al. (2011) provided evidence that grant funding can have a positive effect on the persistence and graduation of students attending a HSI. Furthermore, their findings reflect success at multiple HSIs, which is important since many empirical studies are focused on one institution.

Hagedorn, Chi, Cepeda, and McLain (2007) investigated the importance of Latina/o critical mass on the success of Latina/o community college students. Rather than looking at
graduation rates, transfer rates, or degrees conferred, they conceptualized success to include multiple measures including course completion ratios, cumulative GPA, and math and English course completion. This is an important distinction because success is often determined by graduation rates and degrees conferred; Hagedorn and colleagues, however, challenged this notion by looking at other measures of success. Using ordinal regression to determine the effect of age, English ability, academic integration, aspirations, attitudes, and the representational value of Latina/o students on overall success, they found that attitude, aspirations, and representational value increased the likelihood of Latina/o students’ success (Hagedorn et al., 2007). When they substituted students representational value for faculty representational value, they also found a statistically significant effect on success (Hagedorn et al., 2007). Although their sample was limited to nine California community college campuses, it indicates that a critical mass of Latina/o students and faculty on campus can increase the success of Latina/o students (Hagedorn et al., 2007). The idea of success is relative to the way it is operationalized; therefore, findings from this study could look different when compared to other empirical studies. The notion of success, however, should continue to be challenged when looking at unique environments such as HSIs.

Vaquera and Maestas (2008-2009) looked specifically at which pre-college characteristics contributed to the third and fifth semester persistence of Latina/o and White students attending the University of New Mexico. Using logistic regression, they found that for Latina/o students, attending a segregated, predominantly racial minority high school increased the likelihood of persisting in both the third and fifth years (Vaquera & Maestas, 2008-2009). Although this finding was contrary to other studies that have reported a number of negative effects for Latina/o students attending a segregated high school (i.e., Charles, Dinwiddie, &
the authors suggested that this finding was very specific to the institution under study and may not be generalizable. It, however, is an important finding for HSIs to consider since it suggests that Latina/o students who attended a segregated high school may feel more comfortable in a HSI environment where they continue to see a critical mass of Latina/o students, which may ultimately increase their likelihood of persisting. Although an environment inclusive of Latinas/os may contribute to the persistence of Latina/o students attending a HSI, these institutions must also be sure to prepare students for the eventual transition into their careers where the environment may not be as diverse (Dayton et al., 2004).

In reconceptualizing a model of persistence for Latina/o college students, Torres (2006) used a combination of interviews and survey data collected from Latina/o students at three urban institutions, two of which were HSIs. Using a structural equation model to fit the data, she found that Cultural Affinity had the largest total effect on Latina/o students’ intent to persist (Torres, 2006). Cultural Affinity was conceptualized as a latent construct consisting of students’ responses to three questions: (1) Latino faculty and staff help me to feel at home at this college, (2) Other Latino students help me to feel at home at this college, and (3) Latino cultural activities help me to feel at home at this college (Torres, 2006). More specifically, Cultural Affinity had a direct significant effect on academic integration and encouragement, which had a significant direct effect on institutional commitment and a significant indirect effect on intent to persist (Torres, 2006). For Latina/o students attending a HSI, the Cultural Affinity variable was an important variable to test since, although not proportionally larger, HSIs employ a significantly larger percentage of Latina/o faculty and staff than non-HSIs (Dayton et al., 2004; G. A. Garcia, 2011) and are more likely to host cultural events that make Latina/o students feel more at home.
HSIs, therefore, may be likely to contribute to Latina/o students’ Cultural Affinity and ultimately their persistence.

Although a majority of studies have focused on undergraduate students, Vaquera (2007-2008) looked specifically at the persistence of doctoral students attending a HSI. She found that for doctoral students attending the University of New Mexico, being Latina/o (in comparison to White) increased the likelihood of persisting. The author stressed that this finding, which was contrary to previous findings about Latina/o students’ persistence, was a testament of the diverse environment found at this HSI. Although it may not be generalizable across all HSIs, it does suggest that HSIs may provide an environment that fosters success for Latina/o graduate students. In addition to enhancing the success of doctoral students enrolled in HSIs, HSIs have been identified as efficient producers of future Latina/o doctoral students. For example, between 1980 and 1990, 29% of all the Chicana students who received doctorates attended 12 HSIs as undergraduates while 27% of all Chicano students who received doctorates in the same time period attended 8 HSIs as undergraduates (Solórzano, 1995). HSIs have also been found to be relatively more productive than non-HSIs when it comes to graduating Latinas who go on to receive doctorates, meaning they spend less per student while still producing an equitable number of future Latina doctorates (Wolf-Wendel, Baker, & Morphew, 2000). These findings suggest that HSIs may be important for increasing the representation and success of Latina/o students throughout the entire P-20 pipeline.

However, not all scholars agree that HSIs are conferring an equitable number of degrees to Latina/o students. In order to determine the value added context for Latinas/os attending HSIs, Contreras et al. (2008) used data from the Fall 2004 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to explore degree production at five four-year HSIs and five two-year
HSIs using an equity index for degrees earned. They included HSIs in California, Texas, New York, New Mexico, and Colorado and computed the equity index for Latina/o students by dividing the number of Latina/o degree recipients in each state by the total number of degree recipients in each state and then divided that number by the total undergraduate Latina/o students enrolled in the same state by the total undergraduate enrollment in the same state. They found that all five four-year HSIs in their sample were below equity in degree production for Latinas/os compared to White students who were above equity in four of the five institutions (Contreras et al., 2008). Additionally, only one of the two-year HSIs was above equity for awarding associates degrees to Latina/o students. Although these findings are limited due to a sample size of ten purposefully selected HSIs, they shed light on the importance of being critical of graduation numbers. By simply looking at the raw number of degrees conferred to Latina/o students at HSIs, they are obviously higher than non-HSIs since HSIs enroll a larger of Latina/o students. The equity concern that Contreras et al. (2008) raise is whether the numbers are comparable to the total number of degrees conferred to all students, which is an important consideration.

Malcolm (2010) assessed the institutional performance of four-year HSIs (enrolling 25% or more Latina/o students), emerging HSIs (enrolling 15%-24% Latina/o students), and non-HSIs (enrolling less than 15% Latina/o students). Using a sample of 143 four-year institutions and IPEDS data from 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, she analyzed seven performance indicators. She concluded that four-year HSIs with Latina/o enrollment above 33% had lower six-year graduation rates than non-HSIs and emerging HSIs. These same institutions, however, outperformed non-HSIs and emerging HSIs in a number of other areas including employing a larger proportion of Latina/o faculty and administrators and enrolling an equitable number of
Latina/o students in STEM degrees when compared to the total Latina/o student enrollment (Malcom, 2010). They also had the smallest graduation gap between Latina/o students and White students and were the closest to equity when comparing the proportion of Latina/o students enrolled in graduate programs to the number of White students (Malcom, 2010). What Malcolm leaves unclear, however, is the graduation rates and graduate enrollment rates are comparable to those of White students, making it difficult to determine if closing the gap is a true measure of success. Overall, Malcolm (2010) argues that when looking at other measures of success, it appears that HSIs may in fact be effectively “serving” Latina/o students, despite lower graduation rates, and further highlights the importance of looking at how the context of HSIs may contribute to students’ holistic experience.

Persistence, retention, and graduation, by far, have been the most studied outcomes of HSIs. It is questionable, however, if these outcomes are the best way to determine how effective a HSI is. As broad-access institutions, HSIs must be considered in an organizational category of their own since many are open enrollment and collectively have lower average SAT/ACT scores for entering students (G. A. Garcia, 2011). A number of researchers have found an important connection between test scores/high school achievement and college degree attainment for Latina/o student (i.e., Crisp, Nora, & Taggart, 2009; L. M. Garcia & Bayer, 2005; Zwick & Sklar, 2005), making it seemingly obvious that an institution that admits students with lower exam scores will have lower graduation rates. An important consideration for HSIs is to first examine their role in serving students, particularly Latina/o students, before assessing student outcomes such as persistence, retention, and graduation.

Faculty and Administrators at HSIs

In addition to the burgeoning research that is being conducted in order to better understand the student experience and outcomes related to attending a HSI, researchers have
begun to unveil that unique experience and outcomes for faculty and staff at HSIs. For example, two-year community colleges that are HSIs have been found to positively predict a change in the proportional representation of women full-time faculty of color (Opp & Poplin Gosseti, 2002b) and women administrators of color (Opp & Poplin Gosseti, 2002a). Additionally, HSIs may be more likely to provide leadership opportunities toLatinas. In 2006 there were 26 Latina CEOs of community colleges and 68% of them were specifically employed by HSIs (Muñoz, 2009). HSIs may also foster an environment that is supportive of the personal and professional development of women faculty of color. A group of junior women faculty of color at one four-year HSI in Texas formed a support network to help each other through the pre-tenure process. As a group they have been able to explore their own ethnic identities (Murakami-Ramalho, Nuñez, & Cuero, 2010), discuss their experiences advocating for students at their institution (Murakami-Ramalho et al., 2010), and develop their pedagogical approach in order to effectively serve students at a HSI (Nuñez, Murakami-Ramalho, & Cuero, 2010). At the same time, these women noted that despite the efforts their HSI has made towards hiring and promoting women of color into faculty positions, the faculty reward structure continues to place less value on advocacy and social justice, both of which are values held by faculty of color in these institutions (Murakami-Ramalho et al., 2010).

Hubbard and Stage (2009), however, argued that the HSI context does not have a significant effect on the attitudes, perceptions, and satisfaction of faculty teaching at HSIs when compared to those teaching at predominantly Black Institutions (PBI) and PWIs with less than 10% enrollment of students of color. They posited that by studying faculty attitudes towards undergraduates, they could assess and compare the campus environment for students at these institutions. They used data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-
99) and restricted their sample to full-time faculty at Doctoral, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, and Community Colleges. Overall they found very few differences between responses of faculty at HSIs, PBIs, and PWIs. They found that faculty teaching at HSIs and PBIs preferred to spend a greater amount of time teaching undergraduates than their counterparts at PWIs (Hubbard & Stage, 2009). They also reported that faculty at HSIs and PBIs, compared to those at PWIs, were less satisfied with their authority to decide course content (Hubbard & Stage, 2009). Hubbard and Stage (2009) concluded that their findings provided evidence that the “manufactured identity” of HSIs may not have an effect on the attitudes and experiences of faculty at HSIs (Hubbard & Stage, 2009).

**Classroom, Pedagogy, and Curriculum at HSIs**

The fact that students matriculate to HSIs with different background characteristics may pose a number of challenges for the faculty teaching at these institutions. Surveying political science faculty at Texas institutions of higher education, Kiasatpour and Lasley (2008) found that faculty teaching at HSIs faced different challenges in the classroom than those at non-HSIs. Using a sample size of $n = 123$, the researchers compared survey responses across three types of institutions including HSIs that enroll over 40% Latina/o students ($n = 34$), “national” universities that are more selective and enroll a larger number of out of state students ($n = 36$), and “other” institutions that do not fall into either of the first two categories ($n = 53$). Over 80% of the faculty respondents were White and only 12 identified as Hispanic/Latino, 11 of whom taught at HSIs, again suggesting that Latina/o faculty are more likely to be concentrated in HSIs than their White counterparts. When compared to the two non-HSI groups, faculty at HSIs indicated that students faced significantly more challenges with meeting assignment deadlines, reading comprehension, writing skills, and speaking skills (Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008). Additionally, when compared to national universities, faculty at HSIs indicated that student
attendance and student retention were major challenges (Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008). When asked to identify additional challenges, some of the written responses that faculty at HSIs cited more often than the those at non-HSIs were “lack of preparation,” “poor academic background,” and “different learning styles.” Although the sample size for this study was small, it provides a foundation for understanding some of the differences faculty may see in the classroom when teaching at a HSI.

As a result of different background characteristics of students and the challenges posed by teaching in an environment that is culturally diverse, some faculty members at HSIs have incorporated different pedagogical practices into their classroom. Kiasatpour and Lasley (2008) found that political science faculty at HSIs incorporated service-learning and civic engagement activities as well as student-centered assignments, group work, and free writing activities more often than faculty at non-HSIs. Almost 60% of the faculty at HSIs said that speaking Spanish was also helpful in addressing some of the challenges in working with students at HSIs compared to only 10% of the faculty from non-HSIs (Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008). One professor teaching an MBA ethics course at a HSI in Texas also shifted her teaching practices as a result of the changing needs of the culturally diverse students at her institution (Simms, 2006). In order to incorporate the students’ voice in the classroom, she implemented personal storytelling and written journal reflections while also increasing service learning activities and student-teacher interaction (Simms, 2006). Bridges, Kinzie, Nelson Laird, and Kuh (2008) also reported that faculty at California State University-Monterey Bay (CSUMB) adopted an approach to talent development in which they assessed students strengths (i.e., speaking Spanish) and then connected them to course-based learning objectives. Faculty at the University of Texas El Paso have also incorporated active and collaborative learning in their classroom and have
helped students learn how to effectively use these activities to enhance their experience at the university (Bridges et al., 2008). Although there are only a few single-site examples of successful pedagogical techniques that faculty at HSIs have incorporated, they do suggest that faculty are becoming more aware of the changing needs of students at HSIs and making attempts to address these unique needs.

Cole (2011) conducted a more extensive investigation of the curriculum at HSIs in order to determine if they have shifted to become more inclusive of the Latina/o experience. He found that on average, only 3% of all courses offered at HSIs in 2002-2003 were ethnocentric. By ethnocentric he specifically referred to those courses focused on the history, experiences, and perspectives of one group (Cole, 2011). In his sample of \( n = 34 \) HSIs, he included \( n = 31 \) “incidental” HSIs (not founded with a specific purpose to serve Hispanic students), \( n = 3 \) “intentional” HSIs (founded with a specific purpose to serve Hispanic students), and \( n = 10 \) Puerto Rican HSIs. The intentional HSIs offered a higher number of ethnocentric courses (14%) than the Puerto Rican HSIs (7.9%) and the incidental HSIs (2.1%) (Cole, 2011). When looking at predictors for an increase in the number of ethnocentric studies courses offered, the number was not affected by an increase in Hispanic student enrollment nor an increase in the percentage of Hispanic faculty (Cole, 2011). Interestingly, the percentage of African American and American Indian student enrollment and the percentage of African American and American Indian faculty was positively related to an increase in the number of ethnocentric courses offered at HSIs (Cole, 2011). Cole (2011) provided timely information about the curriculum at HSIs that further supports the notion that HSIs lack a clear identity and purpose for serving Latina/o students (Contreras et al., 2008).
HSI Organizational Identity

As this review of the literature has implied, there is conflicting evidence about the extent to which HSIs have embraced their identity, changed their practices to adapt to a changing population, and ultimately had an effect on students, faculty, and administrators. Depending on the research questions being addressed, some scholars believe that the context of HSIs ultimately matters to Latina/o students while others do not think HSIs have done enough to embrace their identity as institutions that serve a unique population. Perrakis and Hagedorn (2010) made an attempts to assess people’s awareness of HSI status at one community college in Los Angeles and further explored whether or not this awareness affected people’s experiences on campus. Through interviews with fourteen students, one faculty member, one counselor, and two administrators, they found that none of the students were aware of the institution’s status as a HSI but all four non-student interviewees were keenly aware of this status (Perrakis & Hagedorn, 2010). The HSI status, therefore, did not affect how students experienced the institution but they did mention that being on a campus with a critical mass of Latina/o students was important to them and was a consideration when picking an institution to transfer to (Perrakis & Hagedorn, 2010). One administrator mentioned that students who transfer to a non-HSI four-year institution tend to struggle because they no longer see students like them and they have trouble finding Latina/o advocates and role models (Perrakis & Hagedorn, 2010). Additionally, the non-student participants talked extensively about the services their institution provided for Latina/o students, including MESA, Puente, and EOP&S, but were concerned that these services were not always available to students once they transferred (Perrakis & Hagedorn, 2010). The HSI status of the institution, therefore, was very important to the administrators and faculty and they felt like it had an effect on the daily experiences of the students, despite the fact that students in the study did not express the same sentiments (Perrakis & Hagedorn, 2010). These findings suggest
that students, faculty, and administrators construct their organizational identity differently. The questions still remains, however, whether a HSI is truly a HSI if administrators recognize this status but students do not. Although Perrakis and Hagedorn (2010) offered insight into the way various people in the organization defined their HSI identity and highlighted some major disparities in identity construction, their study was limited in that the focus of the study was on student success, not organizational identity, and lacked a thorough investigation of organizational elements that contribute to organizational identity formation. The present study, therefore, further addressed these gaps. The next section of this literature review focuses on the concept of organizational identity as defined by organizational behavior theorists.

**Why Study Organizational Identity?**

The field of organizational identity has evolved over the past 25 years with some arguing that it is now in its adolescent stage of development (Corley et al., 2006; van Rekom, Corley, & Ravasi, 2008). Others propose that the field of organizational identity is more of a topical area of research that evolved from more established theories such as neo-institutionalism, organizational ecology, and social movement theory (Negro, Kocak, & Hsu, 2010). Nonetheless, as the idea of organizational identity has evolved, it has become apparent that organizational identity is important to many types of organizations including corporations, hospitals, restaurants, and institutions of higher education. For market organizations, understanding their organizational identity is important for strategic management and for sustaining a competitive advantage (Stimpert, Gustafson, & Sarason, 1998). Although institutions of higher education may not think about competition in the same way as corporations do, organizational members must be able to develop strategies that will help the institution be more effective in regard to educating, serving, and graduating students while managing issues that are both internal and external to the organization. Gioia and Thomas (1996) found that organizational members at one
university interpreted and responded to current issues based on the way they saw their organizational identity. Additionally, they found that having a strong organizational identity provided the institution with the confidence to be proactive in their strategic decision making (Gioia & Thomas, 1996).

Understanding the organization’s identity may also make it more adaptable to instability and changes in the environment (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Ran & Golden, 2011), which is particularly important for institutions of higher education that often find themselves in turbulent environments (Gioia et al., 2000). For postsecondary institutions, changes may include those related to declining state budgets, shifting legislation that affects federal support for higher education, increasing tuition and its impact on student enrollment, matriculation, and persistence, and the changing demographics of college students. Studying organizational identity, therefore, can help institutions of higher education address some of these contemporary concerns that are often the result of changes in the environment. As argued by Hsu and Hannan (2005), reducing ambiguity surrounding an organization’s identity can also make it easier for an organization to manage its external environment, including material and symbolic resources that help sustain the organization. The more consolidated the organizational identity is, the easier it is for external audiences to evaluate the organization, which may ultimately affect its likelihood of success (Hsu & Hannan, 2005).

Having a strong understanding of the organization’s identity is also important when external factors question the organization’s purpose and mission (Ran & Golden, 2011; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) or when the organization is attempting to make a transformation in its core functions (Nag, Corley, & Gioia, 2007). These are important considerations for HSIs, in particular. Aside from the few examples discussed in the previous section (Bridges et al., 2008;
Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008; Quiroz Gates et al., 2011; Simms, 2006), it remains unclear whether HSIs are transforming their core functions as a result of the changing demographics of their student body. As highlighted by Contreras et al. (2008), the institutional missions of HSIs have not been updated to reflect the institutions’ commitment to serving Latina/o students. Additionally, Cole (2011) suggests that the curriculum has not changed in order to be more reflective of the student body while Simms (2006) and Kiasatpour and Lasley (2008) recommend that faculty begin to reconceptualize their pedagogical approach to teaching the diverse population enrolling in HSIs. Hurtado et al. (2012) suggest that examining the climate for diversity requires institutions to scrutinize the curriculum, teaching methods, co-curricular practices, and campus programming.

In studying the organizational identity of HSIs, it is important to understand the source of change for these institutions. It remains unknown if HSIs made a conscious decision to admit more Latina/o students or if it was an accidental result of the changing demographics of the surrounding community. As open systems, institutions of higher education are highly susceptible to changes in the state and may ultimately change forms as a result of coercive pressures from the environment and other organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). HSIs may actually feel pressured to conform to the institutional pressures to serve a larger Latina/o population because it provides legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Some postsecondary institutions, for example, may feel pressure to enroll a diverse student population because of the perceived benefits of diversity including the development of democratic principles (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002), complex critical thinking skills (Antonio et al., 2004), academic self-confidence (Nelson Laird, 2005), and overall satisfaction with college (Chang, 2001). Institutions that have become HSIs may have been intentional about
their enrollment of Latina/o students as a way to increase their legitimacy as institutions that value diversity and inclusion. As the individual identity of organizations becomes more solidified, Hsu and Hannan (2005) suggest that organizational forms will become more apparent as representations of a collective identity. Organizations that are part of the form will ultimately have to conform to the codes of membership and become validated by other organizations (Hsu & Hannan, 2005). In the case of HSIs, there must first be an examination of the individual identity of postsecondary institutions that meet the criteria to become a HSI followed by an analysis of the organizational form that includes the collective group of HSIs. This study focused on conceptualizing the individual organizational identity of one HSI with the hope of informing future research on the larger group identity.

**Conceptualizing Organizational Identity**

In order to effectively study organizational identity, it must first be defined and operationalized. Organizational behaviorists believe that organizational identity is essentially a self-classification based on member responses to the question, “who are we as an organization?” (Albert & Whetten, 1985). It is often ambiguous, complex, and difficult to define, especially at a time when an organization is faced with questions about its core values and purpose (Albert & Whetten, 1985). In their seminal piece, Albert and Whetten (1985) attempted to define and analyze the concept of organizational identity and proposed an identity distinctive framework for studying it as a construct. This framework included three necessary and sufficient criteria including claimed central character (central), claimed distinctiveness (distinctive), and claimed temporal continuity (enduring). As argued by Albert and Whetten (1985), the criterion of claimed central character is defined in relation to a specific organization, given a specific purpose, and from a given theoretical standpoint, in order to determine what is essential to the organization. The criterion of claimed distinctive character is used to classify organizations as
unique and recognizably different from other organizations with similar characteristics or within similar industries. The elements that make an organization distinct may be related to ideology, culture, rituals, or management philosophies. The criterion of claimed temporal continuity is an essential dimension since loss of an identity threatens the effectiveness of the organization. Although Albert and Whetten (1985) argued that organizational identity can evolve overtime from birth to growth and through maturity and retrenchment, they contended that the core identity remains stable and enduring overtime.

Since 1985 organizational identity as a field of study has exploded with a number of researchers questioning Albert and Whetten’s original framework while attempting to test it empirically and practically in a number of settings including large corporations, universities, and mental health facilities. Their original framework provided a basis for understanding organizational identity as a scientific concept worthy of examination and provided a number of empirical questions and hypotheses that can be used in studying organizational identity. The framework, however, did not adequately explain how organizational identity is constructed and altered in modern organizations. The next few sections will review how organizational identity is socially constructed and will show that it is much more fluid than originally conceived by Albert and Whetten (1985).

**Social Construction of Organizational Identity**

Organizational identity has undeniably been theorized to be a social construction (e.g., Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Negro et al., 2010; Ran & Golden, 2011; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Scott & Lane, 2000). As suggested by Clegg et al. (2007) organizational identity is located within the belief system of organizations and conceived by various constituents including managers, employees, clients, partners, regulatory bodies, and media. These belief systems are “shared assumptions that are socially constructed: they do not exist
objectively in reality but are culturally, socially, and cognitively developed assumptions about reality” (Clegg, Rhodes, & Kornberger, 2007, p. 499). As an illusive construct that merely reflects reality, according to observers, it becomes difficult to measure organizational identity, despite its consequences on the real lives of people.

Albert (1998) instead suggests that organizational identity is better understood through conversations and narratives about its relevance and importance within various contexts while Scott and Lane (2000) argue that “organizational identity is best understood as contested and negotiated through iterative interactions between managers and stakeholders” (p. 44). Sociologists refer to these stakeholders as “audiences” inclusive of employees, consumers, clients, critics, and government regulators (Hsu & Hannan, 2005). For the present study, the co-construction of the HSI’s identity was observed through the eyes of various audiences and conceptualized through the narratives of people within the organization (faculty, staff, and administrators, and students). From a theoretical standpoint, it was important to include multiple audiences since they hold different and often conflicting views of the organizational identity (Hsu & Hannan, 2005). Furthermore, the loosely coupled nature of educational systems (Weick, 1976), including institutions of higher education, indicated that some audience members would be strongly connected to the HSI identity while others would have failed to embrace it. From a methodological standpoint, these considerations presented a series of challenges, which were further discussed in chapter three.

**Fluidity of Organizational Identity**

One dimension of the framework presented by Albert and Whetten (1985) that has been challenged in the organizational identity literature is the claim of temporal continuity, with many researchers arguing that organizational identity is dynamic and fluid as opposed to enduring over time (e.g., Clegg et al., 2007; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia et al., 2000; Gioia & Thomas, 1996;
Harrison, 2000; Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Negro et al., 2010). In this respect, studies have concluded that a number of organizational characteristics can influence a change in identity including a change in strategy (Gioia & Thomas, 1996), and change in image (Gioia et al., 2000), a change in parent companies through corporate spin-off (Corley & Gioia, 2004), and a change in spatial proximity to other organizations (Clegg et al., 2007). For the present study, it was important to recognize the fluidity of organizational identity since being “Hispanic-serving” is not part of the original mission of most HSIs. What remained unanswered was whether HSIs have in fact shifted their identity in order to become more “Hispanic-serving” and whether members within the organization have attached their own meaning to this label. Empirical research suggests that a shift in organizational identity may take a considerable amount of time but it is possible within the proper context.

**Changing Labels Versus Changing Meanings**

Although researchers have concluded that organizational identity can and does change (Clegg et al., 2007; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia et al., 2000), some suggest that the changing nature of identity may be more related to the meanings that members attach to identity labels as opposed to the actual labels. Gioia et al. (2000) argued that the labels used to define organizational identity are enduring while the meanings that members attach to these labels are constantly changing. In an empirical example, Corley and Gioia (2004) found that within the wake of a corporate spin-off, identity ambiguity (which occurs when there are multiple interpretations of the core features of the organization) mainly happened at the level of meaning. Using a case study approach inclusive of interviews, observations, and document reviews, Corley and Gioia (2004) examined the process of identity change at one global technology service provider that was spun-off from its parent company. As managers changed the identity
labels used at the new company, members did not reject these labels but had trouble making meaning of them. Corley and Gioia (2004) further proposed that even if managers had not changed the identity labels, old meanings would not have made sense for the new organization.

Humphreys and Brown (2002) also found evidence to suggest that simply changing identity labels is not enough to change the identity of an organization, especially when members do not associate with the new labels. They reported that as senior administrators at one UK-based institution of higher education attempted to change the institution’s identity from a traditional, teaching-oriented institution to a modern, research-led university, the faculty pushed back on this change and ultimately prevented the institution from achieving its desired status as a university. Throughout the process, senior administrators and faculty authored different organizational identity narratives while external images of the organization shifted (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). This led to faculty disassociation with senior administrators and the organization as a whole (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). Additionally, there was a level of identity ambiguity as administrators pushed for a research focus and faculty maintained their emphasis on teaching (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). Power and legitimacy issues were problematic as administrators attempted to delete the institution’s previous identity narratives while disregarding those developed by individual members (Humphreys & Brown, 2002).

The Context for Change

Another consideration for fluidity of identity is that both the internal and external context ultimately affects a change in identity. Looking specifically at the way organizational identity is constructed within an emerging industry, Clegg et al. (2007) argued that organizational identity exists within an external context of paradox, inconsistency, and ambiguity. Within this context of uncertainty, managers may actually seek to legitimate and stabilize their identity (Clegg et al.,
Using the industry of business coaching as an example, they found that there were spatial differences in identity with regard to the way organizations positioned themselves in comparison to other organizations. Additionally, there were temporal differences in the construction of organizational identity over time.

Similarly, Corley and Gioia (2004) found that context mattered within the wake of a corporate spin-off. The growing sense of identity ambiguity amongst members happened at three time points including prior to the spin-off, during the spin-off, and after the spin-off (Corley & Gioia, 2004). Depending on the time point, identity ambiguity was prompted by a series of changes including the external social referent groups with which members compared their organization, discrepancies in the current identity of the organization and the future identity of the organization, and incongruities between internal members’ perceptions of the organization and their perceptions of the way those external to the organization view it (Corley & Gioia, 2004). The changing context associated with the spin-off ultimately affected the way members made meaning of their identity at different points in the process. Additionally, their meaning making was affected by both the internal and external context.

In another example, Gioia and Thomas (1996) found that for higher education administrators at a large public research institution, the internal context, including management strategies and information processing structures, was more important than the external environment for the way members made sense of the organization. Gioia and Thomas (1996) further argued that the internal context was more important than changes in the external environment when it came to strategic decision-making and action. This was an important consideration since the present study mainly focused on the internal context of HSIs; however,
the external environment was an important consideration since it affects institutions of higher education and cannot be ignored.

Beyond the internal context for change, HSIs may be forced to negotiate the external context, including social, political, and financial pressures that ultimately affect their organizational identity. Coercive pressures may come from other organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) including the state and federal governments. Institutions of higher education rely on both branches of the government for annual allocations and support through financial aid, research funding, and tax policies (Gladieux, King, & Corrigan, 2005). Hurtado et al. (2012) suggest that elements such as these, including financial aid policies, local and national agendas, and trustee decisions, are part of the institution’s exosystems and macrosystems. These external pressures may ultimately affect the decisions that institutions make, including those related to recruitment and admissions. As enrollment driven institutions, HSIs must negotiate state policies regarding affirmative action, which can ultimately affect their ability to recruit and admit diverse students. Additionally, affirmative action legislation makes it difficult to develop race-based support programs for students once they are admitted. For institutions that are part of a larger system of colleges or universities, they may also have to conform to pressures from the system. For example, individual institutions must adhere to systemic policies about enrollment and FTE requirements, as well as directives to improve graduation rates. These pressures from the state, if not properly managed, can ultimately affect the institution’s status as a HSI. Additionally, receiving the federal designation as a HSI may have an impact on the way various departments identify with being Latina/o-serving and ultimately how they adapt to this designation per requirements of their DOE Developing Institutions Title V grant. Along with the internal
context, these external pressures must be considered in relation to changes in the organization’s identity.

**Distinguishing Organizational Image and Culture**

Another idea that has been questioned in the original identity framework presented by Albert and Whetten (1985) is how distinct organizational identity is from organizational culture and organizational image. Several researchers contend that these are distinct concepts that should be studied separately and/or in conjunction with one another (e.g., Hatch & Schultz, 1997, 2002; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Scott & Lane, 2000; Whetten, 2006). In the following section, organizational image and organizational culture will be defined separately and their relationship to organizational identity will be highlighted.

**Organizational Image**

Organizational image was originally defined by Dutton and Dukerich (1991) as the way that organizational members believe others see their organization. The definition has since been expanded to distinguish between intended image and construed external image. Intended image is what the organization wants others to think about it and positions an organization in the minds of stakeholders (Brown, Dacin, Pratt, & Whetten, 2006). Managers and other positional leaders are usually responsible for developing and projecting the intended image (Brown et al., 2006). More specifically, Whetten, Lewis, and Mischel (1992) argued that this intended image is really a reflection of what “organizational elites” want outsiders to believe about the organization. Gioia et al. (2000) instead used the term projected image, agreeing that it is management’s way of conveying the most socially desirable aspects of the organization’s identity.

The construed external image, on the other hand, is what members believe others think of the organization (Brown et al., 2006; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). Dutton et al. (1994) call the construed external image a powerful mirror that reflects to members the perceptions that
outsiders have about the organization. It may also reflect the perceptions that others have of individual organizational members (Dutton et al., 1994). The construed external image is important since it tends to affect how organizational members view themselves as an organization, thus affecting the organizational identity (Brown et al., 2006).

A key aspect of organizational image is that it has typically been defined by those internal to the organization, although other fields have viewed image as emanating from external constituents. More specifically, Hatch and Schultz (1997) argued that organizational behavior literature has defined image as an internal construct while other fields have defined image as an external conception. In developing their model for organizational identity formation, Hatch and Schultz (2002) stated, “we define organizational image following the practices in strategy, communication and marketing, as the set of views on the organization held by those who act as the organization’s others” (p. 995). Throughout this section the term image will be discussed through an organizational behavior lens, which often focuses on internal members’ views, but Hatch and Schultz’s (2002) definition was used to distinguish more clearly who would be included in the sample. The term image, therefore, was loosely applied to both internal and external members’ perceptions of the organization, both of which were important to the present study.

**The relationship of image and identity in responding to issues.** A number of researchers have examined the relationship between organizational image and organizational identity. In a seminal piece from the organizational behavior field, Dutton and Dukerich (1991) developed an understanding of how organizational identity and image influence the way an organization interprets and responds to an issue in the environment. Using a case study design focused on the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, Dutton and Dukerich (1991)
analyzed the way the Port Authority responded to a growing issue they had with the homeless population infiltrating their transportation facilities. Using five sources of data including interviews with employees, internal documents, articles from local newspapers and magazines, conversations with the head of the Homeless Project Team, and notes from an all-day training sponsored by the Homeless Project Team, Dutton and Dukerich (1991) described the Port Authority’s response to this issue in five phases over seven years. At each phase, organizational members and managers shifted the way they defined their identity in response to the way they believed their image was being portrayed to those external to the organization.

Initially the Port Authority did not see the increase in homeless people at their facilities as an issue they were responsible for as it was not a part of their organizational identity. As the issue worsened, homeless people began to congregate at the Port Authority’s central facilities, including the World Trade Center, which began to affect the organization’s image. At that point, the organization believed it was an issue that needed to be addressed but it was not in the organization’s mission to provide social services. They intensified their efforts to minimize the amount of homeless people at their facilities and took steps to educate themselves and patrons about the population. In the third phase, issue related tension developed between the Port Authority and several external organizations, spurring negative press about the Port Authority. At the same time, the Port Authority decided the homeless issue was a moral issue that had to be addressed by the organization, thus they formed the Homeless Project Team. In the fourth phase, the negative press got worse and organizational members felt that the Port Authority’s reputation was being tarnished. Employees began to get emotional and angry with the bad press, especially since they had begun to address the issue by establishing drop-in centers near their facilities. In the fifth phase, the Port Authority’s relationship with the homeless issue was continually
evolving but it had clearly become something that organizational members felt committed to addressing.

The Port Authority case became a classic example of the way that organizational identity and image play a role in the way organizational members interpret and react to an issue affecting the organization. The organization’s image became a mirror of interpretation that members used to gauge and justify their actions towards the homeless issue. At the same time, the organization’s identity served as a reference point for members to use in assessing the issue and affected the way members made meaning of the issue. Dutton and Dukerich (1991) argued that image, which like organizational identity is constructed in the minds of members, is important because it represents what members think others ascribe to its character and serves as a point of action for the organization.

Although the Port Authority example is framed in a deficit perspective, one in which an analogy would make it seem as though Latina/o students have infiltrated HSIs and tarnished their image, this example can be used to think about the evolving nature of the organization’s image and identity. Like the Port Authority, HSIs may actually spend years reacting to the growing population of Latina/o students and may continue to reassess their image and identity. The process, however, may be positive if HSIs recognize the benefits of diversity and place value on the changing demographics of their student population. Like the Port Authority, HSIs should continually reflect on their organizational identity in order to determine strategic actions for responding to the changing nature of their student body. The question then becomes whether organizational actors within HSIs believe that serving Latina/o students is a part of their identity.

**The relationship of image and identity in strategic decision-making.** In another important piece in the organizational behavioral literature, Gioia and Thomas (1996) looked at
how organizational image and identity affect the way members make strategic decisions. Specifically, they created a grounded theoretical framework by gathering qualitative data from three top-level administrators as well as 25 other administrators at one public research institution. They then collected quantitative data from top administrators at 439 institutions in order to support and validate their framework. They sought to understand how top management teams at institutions of higher education make sense of issues that arise when managing strategic change (Gioia & Thomas, 1996).

Several key themes arose from the qualitative data. First they found that the management team interpreted organizational-level issues through the lens of their organizational identity and image (Gioia & Thomas, 1996). They also concluded that organizational-level issues were seen as strategic (related to the university’s goal of becoming a top 10 institution) or political (related to the management of competing interests and preferences). Gioia and Thomas (1996) then used path analysis and multivariate regression analysis to test the relationship of perceptual measures, such as identity and image, and issue interpretation. They found that identity type, identity strength, and desired future image were related to strategic interpretation while identity strength and present image were related to political interpretation (Gioia & Thomas, 1996). Together, qualitative and quantitative findings from this study had strong implications for theory related to organizational image and identity.

One important finding was that changing the organizational identity takes time. The top management team recognized this and focused on future image, as opposed to current image, in order to change the organizational identity. The interdependent connection between identity and image became obvious as management strategically focused on the desired future image of the institution in hopes of changing the way members perceived the organizational identity. Unlike
Dutton and Dukerich (1991), who found that a changing image can lead to various interpretations of organizational identity and future action, Gioia and Thomas (1996) discovered that top management teams may take proactive steps in order to change the institution’s image and ultimately its identity. In both cases, the connection between identity and image were obvious, suggesting that the two should be studied together.

Co-construction of organizational image and identity. In the studies conducted by both Dutton and Dukerich (1991) and Gioia and Thomas (1996), top management teams were the most important creators of organizational identity and image. Scott and Lane (2000), however, expanded on these models by looking more closely at the manager-stakeholder view. They argued that organizational identity is constructed and negotiated through an interactive process between employees, customers, suppliers, shareholders, managers, patrons, and board members (Scott & Lane, 2000). They suggested that the organization’s top managers project a desired organizational image in conjunction with organizational stakeholders’ reflected appraisals in order to define the organizational identity (Scott & Lane, 2000).

Scott and Lane (2000) recognized that this complicates the process of organizational identity construction, especially considering the complexity of defining internal and external members to the organization. Overall, they stressed the importance of studying both internal (identity) and external (image) perceptions of an organization together while also highlighting the importance of personal identification in the social construction of these concepts (Scott & Lane, 2000). Scott and Lane (2000) clarified two important concepts for consideration in the development of the present study. First, multiple stakeholders must be able to co-construct the organizational identity of HSIs, including administrators, faculty, and students. Additionally, the social identities of all stakeholders may ultimately affect the way they make sense of the
organization’s identity. The more directly aligned their social identities are with the organization’s identity, the more closely they may identify with the organization (Scott & Lane, 2000).

Although others agree that individual members’ identity is closely linked with their construction of the organization’s identity (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996), little work has been done to look more specifically at how different social identities (such as race, ethnicity, and gender) are related to the construction of the organizational identity. Since HSIs enroll a large number of Latina/o students and employ a significantly larger percentage of Latina/o faculty (15%) and professional staff (31%) than non-HSIs (2% each faculty and professional staff) (G. A. Garcia, 2011), individual social identities will be considered as one aspect that may affect the construction of organizational identity and image in this study.

A model for studying image in higher education. While scholars have stressed the importance of studying organizational image in relation to organizational identity, few models exist for collecting empirical data about organizational image. Additionally, higher education scholars have virtually ignored this concept, aside from Burton Clark (1972) who stressed the importance of organizational sagas in postsecondary institutions. Perceptions of the campus climate, however, have been thoroughly studied and can be used to understand how both internal and external members perceive the image of an HSI. Additionally, several theoretical models have been developed in order to examine the way the campus climate is experienced by multiple members of the campus community, making it a practical way to examine image as it relates to the organizational identity of HSIs.

Through an extensive review of the campus climate frameworks that have been developed over the past fifteen years, Hurtado and colleagues (2012) proposed the MMDLE to
be used for studying diversity in higher education. The framework incorporates both the individual level dimensions of the climate, including psychological and behavioral aspects, and the institutional level dimensions, including compositional, historical, and organizational aspects. The model assumes that diverse students, faculty, and staff are at the center while emphasizing that multiple contexts are at work within the institution in order to influence student outcomes. These contexts include microsystems (individuals within the institution), mesosystems (spheres of interaction), exosystems (external communities), and macrosystems (policies and socio-historical events). The way these systems interact can be seen in the model in Appendix A.

The historical dimension focuses on the socio-historical context of race, ethnicity, gender, and class within institutions of higher education that traditionally served White male students from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Hurtado et al., 2012). The organizational/structural dimension of the campus climate includes policies and procedures such as decision-making processes, budget allocations, and curriculum decisions that often reflect group-based privilege and structure the climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). The compositional dimension refers to the numerical representation of students, faculty, and staff from diverse background and has often been the first step that campuses take in order to create a more inclusive environment (Hurtado et al., 2012). The behavioral dimension of the climate refers to the formal and informal cross-racial interactions that individuals have on campus (Hurtado et al., 2012). The final dimension, the psychological, focuses on individual perceptions of the climate for diversity (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Although Hurtado et al. (2012) suggest that the five dimensions individually influence three outcomes, including habits of mind, competencies for a multicultural world, and achievement or retention, the present study used the MMDLE framework in order to understand
how organizational members perceived the climate and various organizational elements in relation to the HSI identity. Additionally, the MMDLE informed the way that individual identities were related to the organization’s identity. As already noted, HSIs may enact practices that enhance Latina/o students’ cultural connections on campus (Arana et al., 2011; Dayton et al., 2004), foster their ethnic identity development (González, 2010; Guardia & Evans, 2008), and nurture their linguistic connections with others (Guardia & Evans, 2008; Sebanc et al., 2009). Understanding the individual identities of students, faculty, staff, and administrators at HSIs, therefore, was important for learning how HSIs can use these identities to transform the curricular and co-curricular environment for student success as well as nurture students sense of belonging and validation (Hurtado et al., 2012). These identities were also important for elucidating a holistic understanding of organizational identities (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Scott & Lane, 2000).

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a complex notion that has been studied by anthropologists and borrowed by organizational theorists as a way of understanding and explaining behavior within organizations (Bess & Dee, 2008). Tierney (1988) argues that understanding organizational culture can help decision makers problem solve by identifying patterns of performance and effectiveness as well as conflicts within the organization. One specific definition is that culture “incorporate[s] the idea of a shared philosophy or ideology, or a set of values, beliefs, expectations, and assumptions that guide behavior in a social system” (Bess & Dee, 2008, pp. 362-363). Additionally, culture is often tacit, residing within the deep layers of the organization (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). The complex, multifaceted, paradoxical nature of organizational culture makes observing it rather elusive (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). One way to examine the culture
is to look at its physical manifestations including the internal symbols, rituals, and patterns of behavior in order to determine the normative aspects within the organization (Smircich, 1983). Borrowing from the fields of anthropology and organizational behavior, higher education researchers have developed specific frameworks for studying organizational culture within postsecondary institutions.

**Frameworks for studying organizational culture in higher education.** Through a case study approach, Tierney (1988) developed a framework that includes six essential concepts to be considered in an analysis of the culture: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. The environment should be examined from both an internal and external perspective since both have an effect on institutional identity. The mission should be analyzed in order to determine how it is defined, articulated, and used within the organization. Socialization refers to the experience faculty, staff, and administrators have in the organization and how they adapt in order to “fit in.” Information is important for all members of the organization so it should be determined who has the information needed, how it is shared, and how it is used. Strategy refers to the decision making style of the faculty and administration. The sixth component, leadership, should be analyzed to determine who the leaders are and what type of leadership style they espouse.

Tierney’s (1988) model is valuable because it was an initial attempt to develop a framework to be used to study culture in the university setting. Additionally, it includes several factors that are considered important in organizational analysis including the environment and leadership (Bess & Dee, 2008). Tierney’s model, however, is limited since he only studied one institution founded in 1894 in a fading industrial town. He recognized this limitation and noted that culture varies across institutions (Tierney, 1988). For this reason, the framework should be
used only to assess an organization and should allow for some flexibility in its application (Tierney, 1988). Additionally, it may be difficult to use Tierney’s model in research and practice because he did not elaborate on the six components.

Kuh and Whitt (1988) also proposed a framework for studying culture in higher education that included four main layers: the external environment, the institution itself, subcultures within the institution, and individual actors. The external environment includes local economic conditions, societal attitudes toward higher education, the expectations of an institution’s constituents, and the institution’s place within the hierarchy of American postsecondary education. The institution itself includes a look at organizational sagas, academic programs, distinctive themes (organizational distinctiveness), organizational characteristics such as size and formal structure, and other factors such as ethos, artifacts, and academic traditions. Many subcultures could be present within an institutional setting and may include those based on academic disciplines, professional staff, and social groups. Finally, individual actors include faculty, administrators, and students.

The framework presented by Kuh and Whitt (1988) has similar features as Tierney’s (1988) model but provides a more effective means for studying culture within institutions of higher education. Tierney’s model focuses primarily on the role that institutional leaders have on shaping the organizational culture while Kuh and Whitt emphasize the inclusion of other individuals within the organization, which is an important distinction between the two. Additionally, Kuh and Whitt emphasize the importance of enduring legacies and historical sagas within the organization. Although the framework offers a different perspective for looking at organizational culture, it was developed based on a review of existing literature and was not tested empirically; therefore, it may be difficult to validate certain aspects of the model.
Additionally, although Kuh and Whitt suggested that different people in the organization contribute to the culture, they failed to recognize the importance of looking at diversity by race, ethnicity, and gender within the organization, thus implying that all actors operate from the same perspective. Neither framework takes into consideration the changing demographics of students, which limits their applicability for studying HSIs.

**Frameworks for studying race within higher education.** In recognizing the need to focus on race within organizational studies of higher education, Chesler and colleagues (2005) proposed a framework that can be used by institutions striving for a multicultural environment. They contend that organizations move through three organizational stages including monocultural, transitional, and multicultural. The monocultural organization is committed to maintaining dominant, White male values and often excludes people of color and women from participation and decision-making (Chesler et al., 2005). The transitional organization has taken steps to confront racial and gender inequity and encourages intergroup collaboration, integration of the curriculum, and retention of people of color and women, yet still ignores racist and sexist policies and practices embedded deep within the organization (Chesler et al., 2005). The multicultural organization, on the other hand, has made considerable progress toward eliminating racism and sexism within all aspects of the organization. Although institutions may be striving to become multicultural organizations, Chesler et al. (2005) argue that no institution of higher education has reached that stage of organizational development.

The framework presented by Chesler et al. (2005) incorporates eight distinct dimensions of the organization that can be used to assess which stage of multicultural development the institution is in. These dimensions include mission, culture, power, membership, climate, technology, resources, and boundary management. The mission conveys the official and
unofficial purpose of the organization by highlighting what knowledge should be taught and valued, who is to be educated within the institution, which public services are to be performed, and what aspects the leadership of the organization should be committed to (Chesler et al., 2005).

The culture includes the core values and assumptions that are rooted within the organization. Chesler et al. (2005) argued that all too often the culture at monocultural and transitional institutions encourages White hegemonic values and undermines any attempt to achieve racial and gender equity within the organization. The power dimension includes decision-making processes and persons such as the president and vice presidents and elected boards and trustees. Many of the people in power in postsecondary institutions continue to represent White, male, upper-class values (Chesler et al., 2005).

The membership patterns of an institution include those practices and criteria that outline who can become a member of the organization, including students, faculty, administrators, and staff. For students it includes practices related to admissions and retention while those employed by the organization must endure practices related to hiring, promotion, tenure, and advancement. Changing the nature of the institutional membership is a necessary but insufficient means for becoming a multicultural institution (Chesler et al., 2005). Beyond membership, the organization’s social climate relates to the quality and associations and interactions between institutional actors. The campus climate often includes barriers for certain racial/ethnic groups and interactions are often monoracial/monoethnic in nature (Chesler et al., 2005).

The framework presented by Chesler et al. (2005) offers a unique perspective for studying organizational policies and practices. It is important to this study since it offers a critical way of examining institutions that are facing rapid changes in the demographics of their students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Unlike Tierney (1988) and Kuh and Whitt (1988),
Chesler et al. (2005) considered culture and diversity one aspect of the framework, although arguably they are looking at similar characteristics across the three models. For example, each stresses the importance of considering the university’s relationship with the external environment. This cannot be denied since universities are considered open systems that are influenced by the environments in which they operate (Weick, 1976). Additionally, all three frameworks imply that the interactions and experiences of the individual actors within the organization are important considerations in looking at the culture. Tierney (1988) and Chesler et al. (2005) stressed the importance of the institutional mission in determining the espoused values and culture as well as the focusing on the leadership and power dynamics within the organization. Chesler et al. (2005) and Kuh and Whitt (1988) both stressed the importance of examining the academic traditions in order to gain a better understanding of the organizational culture.

In conjunction with the framework presented by Chesler et al. (2005), the MMDLE was further used to study the organizational structures of NSU. Building off of models that emphasized the organizational nature of the campus climate for diversity (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005; Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005), Hurtado et al. (2012) proposed that campuses consider the broader context for establishing policies and practices, examine specific institutional policies and practices that discriminate against various groups, and enact processes that improve the climate for diversity. Like Chesler et al. (2005), Milem et al. (2005) defined several organizational structures that should be considered in this analysis including those related to tenure processes, decision-making processes, faculty and staff recruitment and hiring and budget allocations. Together, these frameworks were used to scrutinize the organizational
elements of one HSI while considering the influence of the exosystem and mesosystem on the institution.

**Organizational culture and identity.** Organizational identity theorists argue that identity and culture are related but separate concepts. In this study, the organizational culture was considered one influence on the construction of organizational identity. More specifically, Hatch and Schultz (1997) argue that “culture is not another variable to be manipulated, but rather a context within which identity is established, maintained, and changed” (p. 363). The cultural context may include the tacit assumptions, beliefs, and values that members use to make meaning of their organizational identity (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). Furthermore, Whetten (2006) posits that when culture and identity are portrayed as distinguishing properties of an organization, members will invoke legitimate identity claims that are central, enduring, and distinct aspects of the culture. It is obvious that organizational culture and organizational identity are so interwoven that it becomes nearly impossible to define one without including an analysis of the other.

**Organizational Identity Formation**

The Organizational Response to Identity Threats Model (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) was used to frame the construction of an organizational identity in this study. The model empirically tested and built off of the Organizational Identity Dynamics Model developed by Hatch and Schultz (2002), therefore both will be presented in this section. Hatch and Schultz’s (2002) basic claim was that organizational identity is constantly being created, sustained, and changed through the interaction of culture (an internally held understanding) and image (an externally held perception). They argued that the boundaries between internal and external stakeholders are blurred in such a way that both culture and image need to be considered as part of the
organizational identity formation process. Under the proposed model, Hatch and Schultz (2002) stated that:

Organizational identity is not an aggregation of perceptions of an organization resting in peoples’ heads, it is a dynamic set of processes by which an organization’s self is continuously socially constructed from the interchange between internal and external definitions of the organization offered by all organizational stakeholders… (p. 1004).

Their model was based on George Herbert Mead’s theory of individual identity formation in which the “me” is the internalized perception of self based on other people’s attitudes and the “I” is the reactions that one has to the attitudes of others (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). The “me” and the “I” are interdependent yet interactive aspects of one’s identity, according to Mead (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). In searching for organizational analogs for Mead’s theory, they proposed that the “me” is similar to an organization’s image and the “I” is similar to an organization’s culture. In thinking about the relationship between identity, image, and culture, Hatch and Schultz (2002) offered a dynamic model for organizational identity formation that includes four core processes. See figure 2.1 for an overview of the model.

Figure 2.1 The Organizational Identity Dynamics Model
The four core processes of the Organizational Identity Dynamics Model include: (1) mirroring, (2) reflecting, (3) expressing, and (4) impressing (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). Mirroring is a metaphorical process by which the organization looks at itself through the eyes of its external stakeholders. The image that others have of the organization, which acts as the mirror, will affect how organizational members define their organizational identity. As suggested by Dutton and Dukerich (1991), organizational members will take action in order to change their identity when the images held by external stakeholders differ from their own ideas about what their organizational identity is. Similarly, Gioia et al. (2000) suggested that if there is a discrepancy between the way internal members define their identity and the way they perceive that others see them, they will make a change in the way they think about themselves or in the way they project their image to others outside the organization (Gioia et al., 2000). In the organizational identity formation process, Schultz and Hatch (2002) suggest that this occurs through a second practice known as reflection. When organizational members reflect on their identity, reflections become embedded within cultural assumptions and understandings. Members, therefore, form an understanding of their organizational identity based on the tacit manifestations of the culture.

Based on reflections of who they are as an organization, members make identity claims that are expressed as cultural understandings (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). The connection that identity claims have to these deeply held patterns of symbols, values, and assumptions give members the power to communicate their expressed organizational identity. The expressed identity of organizations will ultimately leave an impression on those external to the organization (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). In this fourth process in the Organizational Identity Dynamics Model, internal stakeholders make attempts to impress a positive image on those external to the
organization. Although high-level administrators often manage the expressed organizational identity, there are other influences on the organizational image including the projections of other internal and external stakeholders. This must be taken into consideration as organizations attempt to manage their identity.

The Organizational Identity Dynamics Model presented by Hatch and Schultz (2002) offers a comprehensive means for studying organizational identity formation by looking specifically at the way organizational culture and organizational image interact. Although they suggested that those in power within the organization have the ability to influence all aspects of the model, it provides researchers with a way to approach the study of organizational identity through the eyes of multiple stakeholders. The model, however, does not explain what factors may influence a change in the four core processes that lead to a change in organizational identity. The model, instead, implies that the process is continuous and circular, with little outside influence. Others (Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006), however, have argued that external factors may in fact prompt a change in organizational identity. Ravasi and Schultz (2006) expanded the model presented by Hatch and Schultz (2002), suggesting that an external identity threat may cause an organization to mirror its image and reflect on its cultural beliefs and assumptions.

Looking specifically at the way a Danish producer of audio-video systems (B&O) responded to external identity threats, Ravasi and Schultz (2006) found that a link between identity claims, external images, and organizational culture prompted change in the way organizational members made sense of central and distinctive attributes of the organization. Under the assumption that both sensemaking and sensegiving matter in the construction of organizational identity, the authors set out to develop a comprehensive framework that explains
how members’ understanding of their organizational identity is altered when faced with identity threats. Using grounded theory, they found a connection between organizational identity, culture, and image.

Similar to Hatch and Schultz’s (2002) model, the framework presented by Ravasi and Schultz (2006) has four key elements: (1) construing external images, (2) reflecting on cultural practices and artifacts, (3) projecting desired images, and (4) embedding claims in organizational culture. See figure 2.2 for an overview of the model. Ravasi and Schultz (2006) contend that when there is an external threat to the organizational identity, members use sensemaking strategies in order to answer the question, “what is this organization really about?” Through this sensemaking process members examine construing external images and reflect on cultural practices and artifacts in order to establish revised identity claims. Based on these revised claims, members use sensegiving processes in order to express, “this is what this organization is really about!” (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In this stage of the process members project desired images and embed claims in organizational culture in order to revise their understanding of their organizational identity.

---

*The dotted line indicates relationships and constructs for which we could collect only limited evidence.*

**Figure 2.2 The Organizational Response to Identity Threats Model**
Ravasi and Schultz (2006) were the first to empirically test the theoretical model presented by Hatch and Schultz (2002), thus providing longitudinal evidence for the interplay between organizational identity, culture, and image. Using data from five sources including semi-structured interviews, identity seminars, internal documents, external documents, and archival materials, they provided broad examples of the ways in which members made sense of their organizational identity through construed external images and reflections on cultural practices. For example, members at B&O compared their own perceptions of their identity to construed organizational images obtained through consumer surveys, blind tests, and expert panels. Members also reflected on their cultural heritage and continued to operate based on deeply held beliefs about the culture of B&O. Once members of B&O revised their official identity claims, a sensegiving phase began in which top managers communicated a new narrative that members were then able to attach new meanings to. In particular, B&O attempted to project their desired images by targeting retailers, clients, and the press. The new projected images prompted members to reconceptualize the organization although primarily through a rediscovery of embedded values and attitudes they had previously espoused. The evidence provided by Ravasi and Schultz (2006) supports the claims made by Hatch and Schultz (2002) that organizational identity construction is strongly influenced by culture and image. They added an important variable to the model, however, by looking specifically at the way external forces affect organizational culture, image, and identity.

For the present study, the changing demographics of the student population was considered the external force that may prompt change in the construction of an organizational identity. Although this may not be an identity “threat” per se, the changing demographics of the
population may in fact prompt a change in the way organizational members view their organizational identity, culture, and image. In order to address the research questions that guided this study, the models presented by Hatch and Schultz (2002) and Ravasi and Schultz (2006) were used to understand how multiple stakeholders within the institution co-construct their organizational identity. The framework presented by Chesler et al. (2005), in conjunction with the MMDLE (Hurtado et al., 2012), was used to understand the university’s culture and organizational processes, with an emphasis on the university as a multicultural institution. The MMDLE framework (Hurtado et al., 2012) was also used to understand the way members construct their identity in relation to their perceptions of the climate for diversity. Together, these theories helped to determine the overall identity of the organization as it relates to being “Latina/o-serving.” This study ultimately contributes to the theoretical development of the concept of organizational identity while providing empirical support for the organizational dimensions of the frameworks introduced here.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Organizational identity has largely been recognized as a social construction (e.g., Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Ran & Golden, 2011; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Scott & Lane, 2000), meaning it is based on people’s knowledge of reality (Patton, 2002). As such, the methods and analysis for this study are developed from a constructivist perspective. The constructivist perspective will allow me to study the realities constructed by various people in the organization while recognizing that each one is unique and valid (Patton, 2002). These constructed realities are important since they have implications for the individuals’ lives and their interactions with each other (Patton, 2002). Allowing various voices to emerge is also an important way to give power to all individuals, despite their position of authority within the institution. Patton (2002) stresses that by using a constructivist lens, there is no “right” or “true” reality, which has important methodological implications. This chapter will focus on the methods to be used in order to collect data that will reveal how multiple actors within one Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) socially construct their understanding of the organization’s identity as a HSI.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the organizational identity of HSIs using an in-depth case study analysis that examines one federally designated, four-year HSI. By investigating a postsecondary institution that has taken progressive steps towards establishing its role as Latina/o-serving, I sought to understand how the institutional culture and climate for diversity affect the way individuals within the organization construct their identity as a HSI. As argued by Hatch and Schultz’s (2002), organizational identity is constantly being created,
sustained, and changed through the interaction of an internally held understanding of the organization and an externally held perception. The main research question that guided this study is: *In what ways do the students, administrators, faculty, and student affairs staff co-construct the organizational identity at a HSI?* Two additional research questions supported the main question including: *(a) What are the shared cultural values and organizational practices embedded within the institution that indicate a Hispanic-serving mission? and (b) What is the climate for diversity (and Latinas/os) as perceived by students, administrators, faculty, and staff?*

**Research Method**

The stated research questions were answered using a case study design, which is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, p. 18). More specifically, I used an exploratory, single-case study that thoroughly described the current culture and climate at a four-year HSI in order to develop an understanding of the organizational identity of these unique institutions. As a relatively new phenomenon in higher education, a case study design was appropriate for studying the organizational identity of HSIs and should lead to further hypotheses and propositions that can be tested in future studies (Yin, 2009).

The institution was the focus of the case study with a series of nested or layered cases within the institution (Patton, 2002) including administrators, faculty, student affairs staff, and students. By concentrating on the institution, this study explored the phenomenon of organizational identity through the lived experiences of the people within the setting. Listening to their experiences gave voice to key members while providing a thorough investigation of the ways people make sense of the organizational identity. The research design further describes
how the data was collected and used to describe the overarching phenomenon of organizational identity within HSIs.

**Site Selection**

Conducting a single-site case study could be potentially dangerous if the site does not accurately reflect the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2009). For this reason, careful site selection was necessary. Choosing a representative case was challenging considering the fact that HSIs are heterogeneous, with 47% being four-year institutions, 53% being two-year, 70% being public, and 30% being private. Rather than focusing on institutional type, site selection was based on Latina/o enrollment, longevity as a HSI, and high-level of HSI grant activity. The site chosen for this study, Naranja State University (NSU; a pseudonym), is officially designated as a HSI. The institution is a large, public, four-year master’s granting institution that is part of a larger system of state institutions and it enrolls over 30,000 undergraduate and graduate students each year. Since the late 1990’s, it has enrolled 25% or more Latina/o students and has been officially designated as a HSI since the early 2000’s. In fall 2012, 38% of the undergraduate student population was Latina/o, which was the largest racial/ethnic group on campus. On multiple occasions, NSU has been nationally recognized as a “Top 10” master’s institution for graduating Latina/o students. These characteristics made it an ideal case as it met the longevity and enrollment requirements for selection.

Since becoming a HSI, NSU has received multiple HSI Title V Developing Institutions grants from the DOE, as well as HSI grants offered by other federal agencies. The grant activities have had diverse foci and have been led by various individuals on campus. During the data collection phase of this study, NSU had at least five active HSI grants from three federal agencies. The high level of grant activities on campus made it an ideal site, since there were several projects going on across multiple colleges and multiple departments.
Pilot Study

Prior to selecting the site for this study, I conducted a pilot study at NSU. The purpose of the study was to explore the campus climate and culture of diversity for student affairs staff members at NSU. Five coordinator-level and two director-level student affairs staff members from various departments participated in 60-90 minute in-depth interviews. Participants were asked to describe diversity at NSU, their experiences working with diverse students and staff at NSU, and their perceptions of key decision makers within the organization. They were also asked about the historical legacy of inclusion at NSU and about racial conflict and discrimination in the workplace. The final set of questions focused on their understanding and knowledge of NSU as a HSI. All seven participants were aware of NSU’s designation as a HSI but only one felt that it had a direct impact on her daily experiences since she was working directly with the Title V grant. Preliminary analysis, however, revealed that all seven value diversity at NSU and work towards creating an inclusive environment where all students can thrive, regardless of their organizational status as a HSI. The seven informants provided a basis for developing the present study by indicating that the HSI identity is enacted at a deeper level than the label implies. Additionally, all seven agreed to provide access to other student affairs staff members as well as student participants for this study, which was important for ensuring access across multiple levels of the institution.

Access to Site

Several administrators at NSU also agreed to provide access to the site for the purpose of this study. One administrator is a family friend who I consider a colleague, mentor, and advisor. He is very supportive of my research and was willing to provide access and support throughout the process of data collection. In addition to him and the seven participants from the preliminary
study, I also had pre-existing contacts in the Colleges of Education, Business, Human Development, and Natural Sciences whom I asked for assistance in recruiting participants.

**Researcher Bias**

In order to increase the credibility of qualitative research, Merriam (2009) suggests that the researcher examine personal biases and assumptions. There were three main identities that I continually explored throughout the process of the research in order to increase reflexivity including my identity as an alumna of a HSI, my identity as a Latina researcher, and my identity as a coordinator for a Title V grant at a sister institution of NSU. As an alumna of a HSI, I have a level of commitment and dedication to the institution under study as I have my own preconceived notions of what it means to attend a HSI. As an undergraduate student I was heavily involved in Latina/o student organizations, employed as a Resident Advisor in Residential Life, lived on campus for two years, and was highly immersed in campus life. My level of involvement helped me to feel validated academically, socially, and culturally, which I now attribute to the institution’s status as a HSI. At the same time, I did not have trouble remaining neutral throughout the research process because I have since developed a more critical understanding of HSIs beyond the psychological and behavioral feelings.

I also believe it is important to discuss my identity as a Latina researcher. My racial identity has a strong influence on the way I approach research including the way I frame my study, analyze my data, and report my findings. Although I am not using Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a guiding framework in this study, I ultimately believe that race matters in research and think it is important to keep race at the center of research, especially when the study is looking at a phenomenon like HSI identification, which is intrinsically tied to changing racial demographics. Merriam (2009) suggests that critical research seeks to empower and transform in hopes of bringing about a more just society. As a Latina researcher, my goal is to conduct
critical research and to influence transformative change that will encourage positive outcomes for people of color.

The third identity that is important to reveal is my previous role as a coordinator for three years on a Title V grant at another state institution in the same system. In my coordinator role, I became intimately involved with the details of our Title V grant, as I was responsible for implementing the activities of the grant and reporting annual outcomes related to grant activities. My role as a Title V grant coordinator shaped my understanding and expectations of HSIs and ultimately drives my research interests. In this study, I sought to conduct anti-deficit research that looks at positive outcomes for HSIs since the literature on HSIs is often deficit, highlighting the fact that they are less selective, under resourced, and do not produce equitable outcomes for Latina/o students. At the same time, I recognize that my role as the researcher is to report the most accurate story; therefore, I took the necessary steps to remain neutral throughout the process.

Ultimately, these three identities influenced my ability to be unbiased and neutral in this study. In order to increase trustworthiness, I continually reflected on these identities, took thorough field notes throughout the data collection process, wrote memos about any potentially biased conclusions I was making, and discussed my findings with a peer who has no prior experience with HSIs. My status as an alumna of a HSI was beneficial for data collection as I was able to develop a rapport with my research participants. As a Latina researcher, I was also able to develop a rapport with students, faculty, and staff of color and ultimately gained their trust. Being aware of these three identities helped to shape the research design and techniques reported in the next section.
Research Design

As argued by Yin (2009), a case study is an all-encompassing research method “covering the logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis” (p. 18). As such, each of these aspects of the method is further developed throughout this section. Yin (2009) stresses the importance of using a theoretical framework to guide the development and implementation of a single-site case study in order to increase the external validity of the study. Three theories, therefore, guided the development of the research questions, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures.

This research design was guided by the Organizational Response to Identity Threats Model developed by Ravasi and Schultz (2006) which has four key elements including: (1) construing external images, (2) reflecting on cultural practices and artifacts, (3) projecting desired images, and (4) embedding claims in organizational culture. Ultimately, members of the organization use various sensemaking processes in order to determine what the organization is really about (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Ravasi and Schultz’s (2006) model is the overarching framework that was used to define organizational identity (research question one).

The Organizational Response to Identity Threat Model hypothesizes that two main variables contribute to the construction of an organization’s identity including organizational culture (an internally held conception) and organizational image (an externally held conception). This study, therefore, was further guided by Chesler et al.’s (2005) framework for studying race and multiculturalism in higher education and Hurtado et al.’s (2012) MMDLE. Chesler et al.’s (2005) model was used to examine shared cultural beliefs and assumptions that are held by organizational members, specifically as they relate to notions of privilege and power (research question two). In conjunction with Hurtado et al.’s (2012) MMDLE, Chesler et al.’s (2005) framework was also used in order to investigate organizational practices such as membership and
leadership, decision-making processes, faculty and staff recruitment and hiring, and budget allocations (research question two). The third element to be probed was the climate for diversity, as perceived and experienced by students, administrators, faculty, and staff (research question three). This was guided by the MMDLE with an emphasis on the way that the individual social identities’ of participants affects their experiences and interactions with others. Together, these elements of data were used to determine how cultural beliefs, organizational practices, and experiences with the climate for diversity enact the organization’s identity as a HSI (research question one). By looking specifically at these elements, this study sought to go beyond organizational members’ projected identity, or what they want their identity to be, and instead focused on their co-constructed perceptions of reality about the organization’s identity.

Data Collection

This case study employed a series of methods for data collection including semi-structured interviews and focus groups, direct observations, and document reviews, which lend themselves to answering the three research questions.

Interviews and focus groups were conducted with administrators, faculty, student affairs staff, and students and ranged in time between 60-120 minutes. This length of time allowed for flexibility, late arrivals, and adequate time to complete the interview protocol (Morgan, 1997). A semi-structured interview protocol was used in both interviews and focus groups, allowing for the use of the same set of stem questions that provide consistency across interviews while enabling the interviewer to narrow the questions throughout the interview process and to respond to the participant’s worldview (Merriam, 2009). From a constructivist perspective, this is important since each person’s perspective was considered unique and contributed to an understanding of how various social identities and positions of power influence respondents’
experiences. All but four interviews were conducted on campus in a private office space established by the participant. Three interviews were conducted via telephone and one was conducted in the private home of the participant. The student focus groups were conducted on campus, either in the student union or in the residence halls. All interviews and focus groups were audio recorded in order to preserve details.

**Interviews.** In order to answer the stated research questions, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with administrators, student affairs staff, and faculty. Semi-structured interviews are defined as “an interview with the purpose of obtaining descriptions of the life world of the interviewee in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomenon” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 3). When properly conceptualized, designed, and implemented, interviews can unfold the meaning of lived experiences that can provide scientific explanations for the phenomenon under study (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For this study, interviews illuminated the way internal members conceive of the organizational identity through the process of reflecting on cultural practices, projecting desired images, and embedding their identity claims within the organizational culture (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006).

In interviewing the administrators, a number of factors were considered since they can be considered “elite interviews” (Kezar, 2003). First I used an open-ended format, which allowed the interviewee to shape and frame the discussion (Kezar, 2003). Additionally, I conducted an extensive review of each elite’s background in order to develop a level of rapport and respect with them during the interview while also recognizing that the relationship would not be one-way (Kezar, 2003).

The goal of the in-depth interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff was to understand people’s perceptions of the organizational culture and knowledge of organizational
procedures as they pertain to being a HSI. Additionally, I sought to understand their experiences with the climate for diversity and their beliefs about NSU’s identity as a HSI and whether or not this conflicts with other organizational identities. Interviews were also used to better understand the exosystems and mesosystems in which the university resides, including policies dictated by university trustees as well as local and federal legislation that may affect the institution’s ability to respond to changing demographics of the community. Questions were guided by Chesler et al.’s (2005) framework, which specifically examines the level of inclusion for multicultural groups within the mission, power structures, organizational membership, technology, and climate of the organization. The MMDLE also informed questions with an emphasis on perceptions and behaviors of diverse individuals and the way that people’s unique identities influence their construction of the organization’s identity. The interview questions, therefore, were structured around these topics and included a series of probes and follow-up questions that encouraged participants to provide details, elaborate on certain subjects, and possibly clarify or contrast their answers. Interview protocols are in Appendix B, C, and D.

Focus groups. In order to learn about the way students perceive the organizational culture, campus practices, and climate for diversity, focus groups were conducted. Focus groups are an advantageous form of data collection because they allow the researcher to observe and collect and large amount of data in a limited time (Morgan, 1997). Although students can arguably be considered internal members of the organization, they are often excluded from the formal decision-making on campus and therefore were considered external members of the organization since they are the primary receivers of the services provided by the university. As such, their perceptions of the campus culture and organizational climate were important for
determining the overall construction of the organizational identity, according the Ravasi and Schultz (2006).

The goal of the focus groups was to understand students’ experience at NSU with an emphasis on the culture and climate for diversity. Additionally, they were asked about their knowledge and perceptions of NSU as a HSI. Guided by Hurtado et al.’s (2012) framework, interview questions addressed students’ interactions with people within the organization who are different from them, their psychological perceptions of the environment, and their knowledge of organizational policies and practices that enhance diversity. Furthermore, they were asked about various ways that their social identities interact with the organization’s identity and what implications these interactions have for their connections and success on campus. A series of probes and follow-up questions encouraged participants to provide details, elaborate on certain subjects, and possibly clarify or contrast their answers. The focus group protocol is available in Appendix E.

Sample. For all groups, a purposeful sampling technique was used in order to ensure a diverse sample by race, gender, rank/year in school, and department/major. In addition to capturing a diverse sample of administrators, faculty, staff, and students on campus, purposeful sampling was used to ensure information-rich cases that yield in-depth understanding and insight (Patton, 2002). In sampling, the goal was to have variations in experiences and perspectives in order to identify both convergent and divergent themes within the data. Prior to each interview, personal data, including demographic information and other identifiers such as department/major and rank/year in school, was collected through a questionnaire completed by all participants. In order to maintain confidentiality, participants were asked to provide a pseudonym. If they did
not provide one, I assigned one to them. Below I will describe how participants were identified and provide an overview of the diversity within the sample.

**Central administrators.** As suggested by Gioia and Thomas (1996), higher education administrators play a key role in constructing the identity of an organization; therefore, high-level administrators were interviewed and considered key informants in this study. I recruited the administrators by email, first making contact with three who I had a prior relationship with. All three agreed to participate and helped me to connect with other administrators. In total, six central administrators participated, including one from the president’s office, two from the student affairs division, and three from the academic affairs division. One thing to note is that NSU had just appointed a new president while I was collecting data. I chose not to interview her since she had not yet been acclimated to the culture and climate of the institution and may not have thought about her conception of NSU’s identity as a HSI. Of the six central administrators who participated, four are White, one is Black, and one is Latina, while three are male and three are female. Table 3.1 provides an overview of the central administrators in the sample.

Table 3.1
*Participants: Central Administrators (n = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Broad Area</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sandra Brown</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Angela Devine</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Don Bridges</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Devin Hoffman</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Victoria Perez</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Morgan Howard</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty.** In-depth interviews were also conducted with faculty and student affairs staff. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggest that anywhere between 5-25 interviews be conducted, or as many as it takes to answer the research question(s). From the NSU website, I developed a list of potential faculty participants, identifying only those who are full time tenured or tenure track.
This was an intentional way to ensure that the faculty participants had adequate knowledge of the climate and culture of the institution as well as a level of commitment to the institution. I also identified potential participants based on their involvement in the faculty senate or the faculty union. I recruited faculty participants via email, requesting that I meet with them in person or via telephone. Only one faculty interview was conducted via telephone while one was conducted off campus in the private home of the participant. In total I interviewed 19 tenured or tenure track professors, including assistant, associate, and full professors, as well as four academic administrators (deans and associate deans). Broken down by broad discipline, five are from arts & humanities, six are from professional colleges (business and education), six are from social sciences, five are from STEM (science, math, and engineering), and one is self-classified as “other.” Seven of the faculty self identify as Latina/o or Chicana/o, compared to 16 non-Latina/o or Chicana/o, while 14 are males and nine are females. Table 3.2 provides an overview of the faculty sample.

**Student affairs staff.** I interviewed a total of 18 student affairs professional, including three administrators and 15 holding various positions across multiple offices on campus. Potential participants were identified via the NSU website, with a particular emphasis on people that provide services to underrepresented groups on campus. I also targeted the project directors and staff working with the HSI grants since they have direct experience in working with federal funding intended to support the campus’s development of its role as a HSI. Some participants were identified via snowball sampling, in which study participants identified other potential participants (Merriam, 2009). I made contact with potential participants via email, requesting an interview in person or via telephone. Two staff participants opted to be interviewed over the
Table 3.2

Participants: Faculty (n = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Broad Discipline</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bruce Moore</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Virginia Woolf</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eva Ortega</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Raquel Cedillo</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeff Dean</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Johnny Horne</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Desi Reyes</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carlos Vega</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samuel Banks</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Russel Pierce</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jamie Williams</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Audrey Newman</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carol Foster</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joseph Brando</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Todd Duncan</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dolores Canales</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charlie Feliciano</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Benicio Cruz</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Bullock</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rita Diaz</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dustin Nicholson</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rosario Arias</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sidney Davis</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>API</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

phone. Eight staff members self-identify as Latina/o compared to ten non-Latina/o, 12 as female, five as male, and one as transgendered. Table 3.3 provides an overview of the student affairs staff sample.

Students. According to Morgan (1997), two general rules of thumb for focus groups are to include 6-10 participants per group and to aim for 3-5 groups per project. My goal, therefore, was to conduct six focus groups with 6-8 participants each. Since the objective of the focus groups was to understand the culture and climate for diversity and inclusion, Latina/o, Black, Asian American, and mixed-race students were targeted for participation, although White
students were also included since they offer a different perspective on the subject. Emphasis was placed on recruiting sophomore, junior, and senior level students since they have more experience on campus than first-year students. Diversity by major was also important since some disciplines are more likely to enroll students of color than other disciplines, which ultimately affects their perceptions of the campus.

Since the emphasis of this study is on the identity of NSU as a HSI, I specifically targeted Latina/o students for participation. As an alumna of several national Latina/o student organizations that have chapters on campus, I utilized my insider-outsider status to make connections with possible participants and was able to secure two focus groups with organizations I had a direct affiliation with. I also targeted other student organizations that explicitly cater to Latina/o students and secured a third focus group this way. I then asked five
staff members who had participated in interviews to promote the focus groups to students they work with. I was able to secure three more focus groups that way. Students were offered $10 cash and free food for their participation.

I conducted a total of six focus groups ranging in size from 2-14. I also conducted six one-on-one interviews with students who wanted to participate but could not attend a focus group at one of the established time. Three groups were limited to Latina/o students in order to ensure their comfort in talking about issues related to diversity. Morgan (1997) identified this type of sampling as segmented, which allows for free-flowing conversations and facilitates an analysis of differences based on identities. The other three focus groups were mixed by race. One focus group only included females and two only included males, while the other three were mixed by gender. One focus group of six only included business majors as a result of the student organization they were recruited from. A majority of the students in the sample are Latina/o (70%). The sample, however, is more diverse by gender, major, and year in school. Most of the students are involved in at least one student organization. Table 3.4 provides an overview of students in the sample.

Observations. A series of direct observations were used to describe the setting, the people, and the activities that take place at the site (Patton, 2002). There are numerous advantages of directly observing the site including the ability to describe and understand the context, see things that people within the setting may not be conscious of, and learn about things that interview participants may be unwilling to talk about (Patton, 2002). I observed as a participant, meaning that my role as a researcher was the primary focus, although when possible participants were made aware of my status as an insider-outsider of the campus community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Race (Self Defined)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celia Banderas</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demi Peña</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Paulson</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Williams</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Fuentes</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Giraldo</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Gomez</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle Whitaker</td>
<td>Health Administration</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Guzman</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Sanchez</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivica White</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyra Washington</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naya Garibay</td>
<td>Health Administration</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupita Trejo</td>
<td>Family Consumer Sci</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito Ontiveros</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mexican Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Consuelos</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela Ortiz</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bela Alba</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Hispanic Mexican</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chela Plana</td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Poli Sci</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia Quinn</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Saldaña</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine Estefan</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Estrada</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Chan</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Asian Chinese</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Villaruuel</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Jones</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Cooper</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Sueños</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Martin</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancho Villa</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquin Monroy</td>
<td>Computer Animation</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul Herrera</td>
<td>Radio, TV, &amp; Film</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denzel Union</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Black African Am</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky Higuera</td>
<td>Health Administration</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Cuellar</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria De Leon</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Arnaz</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Rivera</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Black</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Black African Am</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Berry</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Longoria</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merriam, 2009). Observations were focused on formal interactions that could illuminate cultural practices and organizational structures that highlight the institution’s commitment to its identity as a HSI.

As interview participants described various aspects of the organization, I made a list of potential events that could support the development of research hypotheses. This included programs sponsored by the university and/or student groups as well as formal class sessions. I then asked participants for access to the event, unless it was open to the public. In summer and fall 2012, I attended University 100 (the freshmen transition course) courses, formal programs sponsored by the Title V HSI grants, and events held during orientation and welcome week. In addition to formal events, I made ethnographic observations each time I visited campus, taking note of the culture and climate and documenting the way I felt as a researcher on campus.

Merriam (2009) suggests that all observations be included in the field notes with specific information about the date, time, location, summary of observations, and a diagram. The observation guide used can be found in Appendix F.

**Document review.** Public documents were also reviewed and included as data. As suggested by Yin (2009), the use of documents in case study designs is primarily “to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 103). The documents, therefore, were used to confirm information and claims made by interview and focus group participants (Yin, 2009) as well as verify hypotheses, advance new categories, and provide historical understanding (Merriam, 2009). If there were discrepancies between data collected from participants and documents, I investigated further for clarification. Rapley (2008) contends that a number of documents can be considered as sources of data including newspaper clippings, leaflets, handwritten notes, and government publications.
For this study, I reviewed the State University’s mission statement and values through its formal webpage. I also reviewed NSU’s campus wide mission statement and values as well as individual departments’ mission statement and values, as expressed on their websites. The NSU website also gave me access to the schedule of classes, which I reviewed in order to gain a better understanding of the curriculum and courses offered, specifically those focused on the experiences of historically marginalized groups. I also reviewed the campus newspaper online (both current and archived) and accessed university documents through the library’s archival system. These documents provided me with historical information that became valuable to the analysis. Participants also provided me with documents to review including an accreditation report, summary statistics of the university’s graduation rates, and brochures for various programs and services. To gain a better understanding of NSU’s HSI grant activities, I accessed grant proposals submitted to the DOE, HUD, and the USDA.

Public documents were used to gain a better understanding of how both the internal context and the external environment shape’s the institution’s ability to enact the HSI identity. Since NSU is part of a larger system of universities, this context must be understood, including policies and executive orders determined by the system. For a list of all documents reviewed, see Appendix G. The combination of interviews, observations, and documents helped to shed light on NSU’s organizational identity as a HSI. Additionally, the triangulation of data increased the validity of the study (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002).

Data Analysis

The audio recordings of all interviews, focus groups, and field notes were transcribed verbatim in order to prepare for data analysis. The transcriptions were then imported into HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2 in order to organize the data. Documents collected for document review were converted to rich text files and also added to HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2. As
suggested by Yin (2009), a computer program such as HyperRESEARCH is a helpful tool for organizing case study data; however, the researcher is ultimately responsible for the analysis and must rely on rigorous techniques established for analyzing empirical data. To assist with organization of data, HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2 allows the researcher to code the data by individual cases, connect the codes to the original data source, run frequency reports, and test possible theories that develop throughout the analysis process.

Coding

Throughout the data collection process, the emergent nature of qualitative research undoubtedly leads to insights, ideas, patterns, and hypotheses for data analysis (Patton, 2002). These insights were carefully recorded in field notes and began what Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to as the data reduction phase in which major themes, concepts, and evolving issues are identified. The data reduction phase included open coding the interview and focus group data, which is a process of brainstorming and sorting through the data in order to identify large concepts that represent the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The first round of open coding occurred while I was transcribing 20% of the interviews. During the open coding process, the researcher remains open to all possibilities and interpretations of the data while looking for ways to categorize the concepts and themes that arise (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). While open coding I used a constant comparative process in which potential incidents in each category were compared with other incidents already coded in the same category (Glaser, 1965).

As categories are developed during open coding, Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest that researchers also identify axial codes, which are those that connect concepts and themes to one another. The constant comparative process assisted with the development of axial codes as incidents were compared to properties of the originally assigned category. Additionally, I began
to compare open codes and axial codes to a set of pre-established codes based on the theoretical frameworks (Chesler et al., 2005; Hurtado et al., 2012) that were used to develop the research questions (i.e., “macrolevel context,” “historical dimension of the climate,” and “organizational technology”). This allowed me to describe the organizational culture, formal practices, and climate for diversity, as understood through an established theoretical lens. The Organizational Response to Identity Threats Model (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) was also used to guide the development of additional codes that helped to explain the construction of an organizational identity.

In the second round of coding, I recoded the first 20% of the interviews and then coded the remaining transcripts, including focus groups. The methods described allowed me to seek meaning in the data, increase the reliability of findings, and remain open to the idea of new theories emerging. Relying on the theoretical propositions that were used to develop this case study allowed me to remain focused on the research purpose and questions for this study while also permitting for the development of rival explanations (Yin, 2009). By using both inductive and deductive analysis procedures I was able to consider multiple stories within the data in order to gain a more holistic understanding of the case. Throughout the coding process, I also used memos in order to keep track of all theoretical notions that arose from the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Memoing allowed me to reflect on code choices, emergent patterns and themes, unanswered questions, insights, and theoretical propositions (Saldaña, 2009). The HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2 program allows the researcher to create memos in direct connection with the data through “annotations.”

Throughout the process described above, I developed a codebook in HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2. Each code includes a label, a definition of the theme, and a description of when the theme
occurs (Boyatzis, 1998). Some of the codes also include a description of qualifications, exclusions, and examples (Boyatzis, 1998). When connected to a pre-established theory, codes also have a description of the theory that guided its development. The codebook has a total of 122 codes and 12 code groups that were established during the process of open coding and axial coding. Additionally, nine autocodes were added to the codebook in order to code the documents used in this study. Autocodes allow the researcher to automatically code large texts without reading the documents line by line. Autocodes, therefore, were established based on the major themes that developed throughout the analysis process (i.e. “access,” “HSI goals,” and “Chicana/o Studies Department”), and only used on the formal documents in order to corroborate findings.

**Analysis**

The research questions were addressed more thoroughly once the codebook was established. Using HyperRESEARCH 3.0.2, I ran a series of reports in order to determine the coding density. In order to more thoroughly describe and explain what was going on within each individual case, I used a series of data displays, or “visual formats that present information systematically, so the user can draw valid conclusions and take needed action” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 91). More specifically, matrices, which allow the researcher to view multiple lists of codes and themes through the use of defined rows and columns (Miles & Huberman, 1994), allowed me to see the data more accurately. I used matrices to organize the ways in which various codes interacted with one another and to develop crude scales that illuminated the processes that are occurring within emerging themes. A sample of a data matrix used in this study can be found in Appendix H.
Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that a comparative analysis is the best way to advance theories and assumptions that have developed throughout the process of data collection and analysis. It is crucial, however, “to have understood the dynamics of each particular case before proceeding to cross-case explanations” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 207). After each defined case was analyzed, I began the process of making comparisons across cases. Cases were compared in three distinct ways: (1) Latina/o participants versus non-Latina/o participants, (2) administrators (including academic deans and student affairs directors) versus faculty versus staff, and (3) grant participants versus non-grant participants. According to Scott and Lane (2000), comparing the way different stakeholders construct their organizational identity is an important way to understand this abstract concept. Comparing across positional groups also highlighted the power differentials that must be accounted for in the co-construction of an organizational identity. Additionally, by comparing cases by social identities, this study captured an important element of the MMDLE, since Hurtado et al. (2012) assert that individual identities should be placed at the center of all analyses. Matrices were also used to compare cases within individual themes that were developing.

From the data analysis procedures described, multiple codes were collapsed into multiple categories and then connected by three major themes (organizational values, organizational structures, organizational processes) (Saldaña, 2009). In order to develop these themes further, I used a series of grounded theory procedures prescribed by Charmaz (2006). I recoded the data connected to the three themes using gerunds, which allow the researcher to focus more on the actions and processes that are occurring throughout the data (Charmaz, 2006). I then used clustering, which is a non-linear visual connection of the categories (Charmaz, 2006). Similar to
conceptual mapping, clustering is a powerful way to gain control of the data before delving into the writing process (Charmaz, 2006).

**Trustworthiness**

As with any other research method, a case study must be trustworthy and credible so that others can judge the rigor of the procedures used (Yin, 2009) and be confident in the results (Merriam, 2009). A careful research design that applies generally accepted standards in the scientific community, therefore, is important (Merriam, 2009). Yin (2009) contends that there are four tests of quality in case study research, including construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) call these tests of trustworthiness in qualitative research credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Each of these tests of trustworthiness were addressed in various ways throughout the study.

**Internal Validity/Credibility**

For a case study researcher, internal validity/credibility is primarily concerned with making proper inferences from the data (Yin, 2009). More specifically, internal validity/credibility ensures that the findings are congruent with people’s construction of reality (Merriam, 2009). As such, the research design should have mechanisms for determining if inferences are correct and whether alternative explanations have been considered (Yin, 2009). During data collection, multiple visits to the site and formal observations allowed for prolonged engagement within the research context in order to account for distortions in the data and unexpected findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). During data analysis, the use of constant comparative methods allowed me to examine the accuracy of predictions and to question rival explanations. Negative case analysis was also used in order to narrow hypotheses until all cases had been accounted for (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This method became particularly relevant
when comparing cases by races/ethnicity (Latina/o versus non-Latina/o) as Latina/o participants were more likely to have divergent opinions requiring additional analysis.

To increase internal validity/credibility, a researcher must also define specific concepts to be studied and develop operational measures that can be used to measure those concepts (Yin, 2009). The most common way to do this is to utilize multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2009). More commonly, this is referred to as triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009). Denzin (1978) suggests that triangulation can be obtained through the use of multiple methods, multiple sources of data, multiple investigators, or multiple theories. For this study, triangulation was obtained by utilizing multiple sources of data, including interviews, focus groups, observations, and documents. Observations and documents were crosschecked with interview and focus group data in order to increase validity (Merriam, 2009). Additionally, data collected from students helped to confirm and disconfirm data provided by administrators, faculty, and staff.

The use of peer debriefing can also increase internal validity/credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009). In addition to a thorough review by my dissertation committee, a fellow graduate student reviewed my findings and provided feedback and constructive criticism. Researcher reflexivity, or the process of examining personal biases and assumptions, is also important for increasing internal validity (Merriam, 2009); therefore, I have disclosed my researcher biases and took steps to remain neutral and unbiased throughout this process. A reflexive journal was used in order to enhance the study’s credibility while reducing researcher bias (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The final step that I took in order to ensure internal validity/credibility was member checks, which is the process of soliciting feedback from participants on emergent findings (Merriam, 2009). All members were given the opportunity to
provide feedback on the full draft of the findings, with specific attention to sections in which they had been directly quoted. Thirteen participants asked to review the full draft as part of member checks and five responded for clarification or with questions. Based on the feedback, minor changes were made with a majority related to ensuring confidentiality and anonymity of the participants.

**External Validity/Transferability**

In general, external validity is established by determining if the study’s findings are generalizable beyond the sample (Yin, 2009). Yin (2009) argues that there are two types of external validity including statistical generalization and analytic generalization. In particular, the case study researcher is concerned with analytic generalization in which the results are compared to a particular theory of interest (Yin, 2009). In this study, multiple theories (Chesler et al., 2005; Hurtado et al., 2012; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) have been used in order to increase external validity.

Providing an index of transferability, as argued by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is not the researcher’s job; instead, the naturalist’s task is “to provide the data base that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers” (p. 316). They suggest that the best way to do this is through “thick descriptions” of the data. In this study, multiple sources of data were used to elicit a series of “thick descriptions” that provided a deeper understanding of patterns, traits, and behaviors of participants within their natural context with the aim of going beyond superficial meanings (Denzin, 1989). “Thick descriptions” should provide adequate descriptors that allow the reader to understand the culture and setting of the research (Denzin, 1989). In this study, I incorporated observations, field notes, and documents to support the development of thick descriptions throughout the analysis process.
Reliability/ Dependability

In case study research, the goal of reliability is to minimize errors and biases by establishing steps and procedures that a later investigator could follow in order to arrive at the same findings and conclusions for the same case (Yin, 2009). As such, case study researchers should operationalize all procedures and document these procedures in order for others to review if desired (Yin, 2009). Two procedures that can help establish reliability during data collection are the use of a case study protocol and the development of a case study database (Yin, 2009). The case study protocol for this study included open-ended interview questions for administrators and semi-structured interview questions for the student affairs staff, the faculty, and the students. Although many of the themes and questions were similar across groups, there were questions that were specific to each group. Yin (2009) argues that the case study protocol should not only include the questions to be asked of participants during the in-depth interviews and focus groups, but should also include general procedures to be followed during site visits. The protocol, therefore, also included a guide for making formal and informal observations and for collecting documents that were reviewed.

To increase reliability, I also developed a case study database that included audio files and written transcripts of the data collected during interviews, field notes, observations, and documents collected. Lincoln and Guba (1985) call this an audit trail, which they emphasize is vital for determining confirmability. Patton (2002) stresses the importance of field notes in all qualitative research and argues that they should be descriptive, including the date and location of observations, should be thorough, and should include reactions and feelings of the researcher.

Reliability and consistency can also be established through a system of intercoder reliability (Merriam, 2009). This process requires that checks be made in order to ensure that
there is agreement about the codes being used and the meanings attached to these codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I sought both intracoder and intercoder reliability through a series of steps in
the analysis. First I developed the codebook based off of 20% of the interviews, which I
transcribed verbatim and simultaneously coded line by line. Within the codebook I established
code groups and subcodes and included a clear description of each code.

I then recruited a fellow graduate student to assist with the intercoder reliability process.
In order to establish intercoder reliability, we both coded two segments and focused on two
codes ("admissions" and “HSI identity”). We used Cohen’s Kappa coefficient to determine
agreement and sought a .61-.80 agreement level, which is considered substantial (Stemler, 2001).
We reached .60 agreement level and considered it high enough to continue. At the same time, I
modified the codebook based on feedback from my peer. Using the modified codebook, I
recoded the same transcripts and continued to make changes to the codes and their subsequent
definitions. Once the codebook was complete, I simultaneously verified and coded the
remaining 80% of the transcripts, which had been sent out for professional transcription. I
continued to modify the codes throughout this process. In the final stage of establishing
intracoder reliability, I recoded the entire set of transcripts. I then checked for agreement
between the two passes of coding and made modifications as needed.

**Limitations**

A number of limitations presented by a case study design are similar to the general
limitations of qualitative research. The generalizability of the findings is probably one of the
most common concerns that critics of case studies have since the case is typically bounded to one
unique situation (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). As suggested by Yin (2009), case studies should
be considered “generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (p.
15). The goal of the case study, therefore, should be analytic generalization, which is the result
of comparing findings to existing theories (Yin, 2009). As such, I have provided descriptive evidence that can be generalizable only to the theories guiding this study and not to the universe of four-year HSIs. Another often cited limitation of case studies is that they lack rigor (Yin, 2009). Case studies, however, can be very rigorous with a carefully designed plan of research (Yin, 2009). Throughout this methods section, I have laid out a carefully designed plan that I used to ensure rigor and attention to detail in this study. Case studies may also be very time consuming (Yin, 2009) and may be difficult for the novice researcher to conduct (Merriam, 2009). As such, I allowed myself adequate time to develop this study (six months for data collection and six months for analysis) and was guided my dissertation committee throughout the process. The researcher is also the primary instrument of data collection and analysis in a case study, which can lead to problems with reliability and validity as well as author biasness and unethical reporting (Merriam, 1998). I laid out various steps for combating these limitations and for increasing the reliability and validity of this study.

In addition to the limitations of a case study design, the specific data collection techniques being used in this study present unique concerns. Focus groups may become problematic since responses are not independent of one another and participant interactions may cause biases (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). Additionally, there is always a potential for one or two group members to dominate the conversation, which limits the amount of data collected in a single session (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). Broader criticisms about interview knowledge that can also be applied to focus groups are that the data are individualistic (neglect social interactions), credulous (taken at face value), atheoretical (disregard theoretical analysis), and insignificant (produce trivialities) (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Similar to the limitations of a case study design, these criticisms can be combated with a rigorous plan of research that is
theoretically grounded, methodical, and reviewed by peers and experts in the field, as has been presented here.

Beyond these methodological limitations, a chief limitation of this study is that there is a lack of prior research detailing the formation of an organizational identity, particularly within institutions of higher education. As a new area of study, organizational identity formation has been largely theorized with few empirical studies to support its propositions (Negro et al., 2010). This limitation presented itself during the data analysis as there were few examples of how to interpret some of the emerging themes. Another area of concern is that the having a HSI identity is likely to be one of several identities that an organization possesses. Some researchers have found that spanning multiple categories or identities can present social and economic disadvantages for an organization (Hsu, Hannan, & Kocak, 2009; Zuckerman, 1999). One recent trend is that HSIs are also becoming Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs) that serve 10% or more Asian American, Native American, or Pacific Islander students; however, the federal government has limited institutions to one designation, which can put institutions at an economic disadvantage (ineligible for multiple federal grants) and a social disadvantage (forcing the institution to chose which population to serve). Another identity that may be in direct contrast to a HSI identity is a desire for institutional prestige and selectivity, since incoming student characteristics such as high school GPA and standardized test scores typically determine these identities. As previously noted, students with higher standardized mathematics test scores are less likely to enroll in four-year HSIs (Nuñez & Bowers, 2011) while students who are low income (de los Santos & Cuamea, 2010) and underprepared (de los Santos & Cuamea, 2010) are more likely to enroll, directly contrasting an institutions desire for prestige and selectivity. Being aware of these potential
limitations prepared me for these findings in the field and helped me to probe for these contrasting identities (which actually emerged as a strong finding).
CHAPTER 4
ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the core identity of NSU as expressed by multiple participants from multiple perspectives. Using a social constructionist approach, the identity of an organization is best understood by asking participants to describe, “Who are we as an organization?” (Albert & Whetten, 1985). In asking NSU members to make sense of who they are as an organization, they constructed their identity based on their views of their mission, core values as an institution, as well as a description of their student population, which can be considered reflections of their culture. As theorized by Ravasi and Schultz (2006), an organizational identity is often conceptualized through a dynamic interaction of culture and image. This interplay is best understood through the cognitive processes of sensegiving and sensemaking (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In constructing their identity, NSU members most often enacted the sensegiving function, which links identity to formal identity claims made by organizational leaders (Ravasi & Schulz, 2006). Formal identity claims are explicitly stated self-definitions about the organization that influence members’ perceptions of the central, enduring, and distinct elements of their identity (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). NSU members also enacted the sensemaking process throughout their construction of their identity, most often as a result of dissonance between formal identity claims and a collective understanding of the features that are central, distinct, and enduring (Gioia et al., 2000; Weick, 1995).

As members of NSU made sense of their identity, it began to reflect their identity within a larger system of universities. Their mission, core values, and student population are central and enduring aspects of their identity but may not be distinct since they are similar to other institutions within the system. Since NSU’s core identity is intertwined with its identity within a
larger system, I will begin by describing the stated mission and values of the State University system and NSU, followed by a description of their student population.

**Mission, Values, and Student Population**

The State University (SU) system prides itself on being a high-quality, accessible, student-centered, and affordable source of higher education that is meeting the needs of the state’s changing workforce. As one the most diverse public university systems in the United States, it provides a point of access to postsecondary education for the citizens of the state. The system enrolls a large percentage of students seeking a baccalaureate degree in the state, many of whom come from underserved communities.

The SU system was established to provide access to a majority of the state’s high school students seeking an undergraduate degree. As a master’s granting institution, the system is known for training future teachers, nurses, social workers, and engineers. In recent years, the system has begun to offer a doctorate in education and will soon offer a Doctor of Nursing and Doctor of Physical Therapy on some campuses. The SU plays a critical role in preparing students for the job market and has a tremendous economic impact on the state. The SU also believes in community engagement, often partnering with public agencies, nonprofits, businesses, and other groups to make a difference through service learning, community-based research, alternative break programs, and student-led service clubs. Annually, more than half of the students within the system engage in 32 million hours of community service.

As the state’s premier public master’s granting institution, a majority of SU students come from the state. In fall 2011, 96% of all enrolled students came from the state with 87% of first-time freshmen and 90% of transfer students coming from the state’s high schools and community colleges. By ethnic group, the system enrolls a diverse student population, with the Latina/o group being the largest. In fall 2011, SU enrolled 92,764 Mexican American students.
(21.7%) and 32,455 other Latina/o students (7.6%). These numbers have been increasing dramatically in the last ten years: In fall 2002, the system enrolled 60,135 Mexican Americans (14.8%) and 21,990 other Latinas/os (5.4%). Although the Latina/o group is by far the largest ethnic group, the SU also enrolled a large percentage of other ethnic groups in fall 2011 including 14.4% Asian, 5% Black, 2% Filipino, and 3.7% mixed race. In comparison, White students made up 32.4% of the SU student population in fall 2011, declining from 37.9% in fall 2002. Annually, the system graduates nearly 100,000 students who go on to work in the state’s agricultural, business, hospitality, educational, health care, media, and entertainment industries.

**NSU’s Mission, Values, & Student Population**

A review of NSU’s mission statement revealed that its mission is to enable students to realize their educational goals by designing programs and services that help students develop academic competencies, professional skills, critical thinking, and ethical values. Furthermore, they are committed to teaching, scholarship, and active learning, excellence, respect for all people, alliances with the community, and encouragement of innovations, experimentation, and creativity. In its mission statement, NSU claims to be the intellectual, economic, and cultural heart of the region in which it resides. As a member of the SU system, NSU is one of the largest, enrolling over 30,000 students. In comparison to the system, NSU enrolled more Latina/o students (36%) in 2011, and fewer White students (28%) and Asian students (11%). In fall 2011, six percent of students were international, 94% were in-state residents, and 16% were older than 25 years old (with the average age being 23).

**NSU’s Core Identity**

This section will describe the most salient aspects of NSU’s organizational identity, as co-constructed by members, with a focus on the central and enduring features tied to their mission, values, and description of their student population. In this chapter, administrators,
faculty, and staff interviews were used to co-construct the organizational identity; while students’ voices were included in order to inform the way they experience the organization in relation to the core identity of the institution.

**We Are Regionally Focused**

The former president of NSU often referred to NSU as being “regionally focused and nationally recognized,” and rarely made a public speech in which she did not mention this core aspect of NSU’s identity. Several participants mentioned this moniker verbatim, while others simply made reference to the institution being regionally focused. Interestingly enough, none of the administrators cited the moniker verbatim, despite the fact that the president of the institution coined the term. Both Latina/o and non-Latina/o staff cited it more often than faculty and administrators, while three of the seven Latina/o faculty members cited it verbatim. Perhaps staff and Latina/o faculty are more likely than administrators and non-Latina/o faculty to make sense of their identity through formal identity claims residing in the sensegiving process. Whether they cited it verbatim or not, this formal claim about who NSU is as an organization transcended most institutional member’s co-construction of their identity.

Well, I mean I think that there is the big theme of our former President was about, you know, being nationally recognized and being sort of regionally serving our community and so I think that's really where the purpose of what [State Universities] are. You know, public institutions meant to serve the public and create access for the community. So I think it’s really, for the Valley [region where NSU is located], a place where people from [the] surrounding community have a place of higher institution. (Constance Berrera, Latina, program director)

For institutional members, being regionally serving means providing access to the surrounding community, which they call “The Valley.” In 2008, the Valley’s population was 1.75 million, with 42.4% Latina/o residents, 41.8% White residents, 10% Asian residents, and 3.6% Black residents. The population of NSU, therefore, is reflective of the Valley’s demographics in many
ways, confirming the institution’s regional focus. For many, being regionally focused makes sense because that is the mission of the SU system. With 23 campuses in the state, each SU has a region that they serve and each should, by the nature of design, be reflective of the immediate community in which they are located.

Although institutional members were aware of the tagline, “regionally focused, nationally recognized,” the former part of the moniker is most relevant to the core identity of NSU while the latter half was rarely mentioned by participants and/or questioned all together.

The nationally recognized, I don’t know to what extent that’s really inflated or sort of just like a way of saying that, and sometimes when I, in fact I will tell you this much. The first time I heard that I got the first part and wondered if the second part was really a way to not over emphasize that we’re only regional, right. So we’ll say regionally, whatever, regionally serving, but nationally recognized, right. Well, there are probably pockets within the institution that are nationally recognized, but as an institution as a whole, I don’t know that we’re nationally recognized, right. (Dr. Carlos Vega, Latino, associate professor)

Being nationally recognized, therefore, lacked saliency for some members despite the formal nature of the former president’s moniker. For participants, the sensemaking process allowed them to attach their own meanings to formal claims while rejecting aspects that they felt did not represent who they are as an institution.

Being regionally focused is naturally tied to NSU’s mission as well as the mission of the larger SU system. In the 2012 fact book for the SU system, they claim that for every $1 the state invests in the system, it returns $5.43 by way of jobs. Alumni of the system tend to live and work in the state and often become leaders in the state’s high-impact fields including teaching, business, hospitality, and entertainment. For institutional members at NSU, being regionally focused naturally lends itself to being a strong contributor to the Valley’s economy since alumni tend to live and work in the Valley.
And so, there are some of those pieces but also taking it a step further and getting people to understand all of the amazing things about this organization or this institution and that it really is focused on the region and serving as sort of a hub, a cultural hub, educational hub, and sustainable hub for [the Valley] which is pretty underserved if you think about it. If not for [NSU], what would be the draw of the [the Valley]? I mean, it feeds the community. It feeds the economy in this community, and so I think that’s a really, really important thing to note when I talk about, when I talk about the institution. (Jada Harris, Black female, coordinator)

Few people disagreed with NSU’s identity as a regionally serving institution, making this aspect both central and enduring. Being regionally serving is a major part of institutional identity, however, is not a unique identity since other campuses in the system are also regionally focused in their mission.

**We Are Committed to the Community**

As institutional members made sense of their identity, the institution’s commitment to being regionally focused became intertwined with its commitment to the community. Members, however, made sense of this commitment in different ways by articulating the importance of: obtaining community recognition as an institution, contributing to the community through service learning and community partnerships, and enrolling members of the community.

The first way that members described this aspect of their identity was by attaching it to tangible programs and services that were designed to inform the community about who NSU is as an institution in the Valley. One prime example is NSU’s Performing Art Center, which according to its stated mission, “offers a vibrant and diverse performance program to the University community every season, as well as serving as the intellectual and cultural heart of [the Valley].” For several participants, the Performing Art Center is an important element of their organizational identity.

And so definitely paying attention to serving our local community. I think the Performing Art Center is one example of [the former president’s] efforts, and saying we
need to establish ourselves so that our local community understands who we are, and what we do, and how we serve them. (Dr. Eddie Dandridge, White male, coordinator)

In addition to the Performing Art Center, some participants suggested that the newly built, state-of-the art Student Recreation Center also connects the institution to the community since it is open to community members. Employees and students alike take great pride in the Student Recreation Center, often weaving it throughout their identity as an important element for both the internal and external community. Both the Performing Art Center and the Student Recreation Center can be considered central and distinct aspects of NSU’s identity that set them apart from other institutions and contribute to the institution’s image.

A second way that members made sense of NSU’s identity as intertwined with its regional focus and commitment to the community was through research and partnerships. This was particularly important to faculty members who are writing grants, developing service-learning projects, and establishing community partnerships that enhance their academic programs. Dr. Carol Foster, the principal investigator of multiple HSI grants focused on serving the community, expressed this value as follows:

-- but the one thing that I liked about [NSU] is we take care of our back yard, our own communities. We're not [like], some of the other larger schools, and I'm not picking on them but, what we call R1 schools have a tendency to move into a community, do some research, and move out, whether it's a sustainable program or not. I think the one thing that [NSU] does well is they understand the concept of sustainability of a program that you initiate. (Dr. Carol Foster, White female, associate professor)

Faculty in the College of Education also talked about building partnerships with the local school districts and community colleges as a way of developing student competencies for working with diverse populations in the Valley. For these faculty members, NSU’s commitment to the community is an important aspect of NSU’s identity.
The value they placed on enrolling community members in the institution was the third way members made sense of their commitment to the community. They made sense of this aspect of NSU’s identity through a framework of opportunity for community members, particularly those from underserved communities.

But I think now, I, and especially with the work that I do, working with the population that I do, I really do feel that we’re an institution that offers opportunity to our community….I could see that the students really do go out there and we offer that opportunity for students to be able to reach their potential and take students from this community and bridge them out to other communities and offer that possibility for them. (America Vida, Latina, coordinator)

America works with NSU’s Title V grant programs and talked extensively about how the grant is creating more opportunities for Latina/o students and other students of color at NSU. When she referred to community, she was referring to her own community as a Latina working with the Latina/o student population. For Selena Mendes (Latina, coordinator), providing opportunity to low income, first generation, and Latina/o residents from the local community was at the root of what NSU does. She made sense of NSU’s identity as one that enrolls students who may not have the opportunity to attend a private institution for economic reasons or an out-of-state university because of a necessity to stay close to family. For these Latina staff members, NSU sends a message to community members that if you want to pursue a baccalaureate degree, you can do it at NSU. As stated by Rosie Moreno (Latina, counselor), “The big picture of NSU, in my eyes, is a place for people in the community to, it's a place for them to learn; um, also I feel like, to me, it's a place of learning.” Like America, Rosie made sense of the word community as her own Latina/o community, since she talked about the Valley being primarily populated by Latina/o residents. Perhaps these Latina staff members made sense of the institution’s commitment to the community as a result of their roles within the institution. In this case, they did not attach meaning to formal institutional claims but instead made sense of the organizational
identity through their own value system of serving underserved, Latina/o, low income, first generation students.

Although commitment to the community arose as both central and enduring aspects of NSU’s organizational identity for most members, they attached different meanings to this label based on their personal identities as well as their roles within the institution. Non-Latina/o respondents, for example, were more likely to refer to the community in broad terms while Latina/o participants connected more closely with the community by using the word, “we” and by describing the community in detail (i.e., Latina/o, first generation, low income). Roles also made a difference, with faculty being more inclined to refer to serving the community in connection to their grants and educational programs than non-faculty. Both Latina/o and non-Latina/o staff members working directly with the student population also associated more strongly with their role in serving traditionally underrepresented communities.

Central administrators were least likely to mention the institution’s commitment to the community, despite the fact that community engagement is a value of the SU system, as stated in its mission statement. One of the six central administrators mentioned NSU’s connection to the community by attaching it to formal identity claims based on the institution’s mission.

Well, the first thing I always think of is we have a mission and we live up to it, and our mission is to help our students achieve their educational goals. So for me that just imbues every single thing that we do here and every time we make a decision we're always going back to that piece of our mission and there's other parts of our vision which is our connectiveness with the community and our support for our faculty, but it comes back to the students all the time and as long as that's the focus of what we're doing that's a comfortable place to be. (Dr. Angela Devine, White female, central administrator)

Although other central administrators did not immediately mention their commitment to the community, they may in fact connect their commitment to the community with their mission to serve the region, which is intertwined in many ways. Being committed to the community,
however, must still be considered an important aspect of NSU’s identity since other members of
the institution made sense of their identity in this way, working through a series of sensemaking
processes that were tied more deeply to their role on campus and their social identities in relation
to the community.

**We are Dedicated to Access**

Intertwined with the ideas of being regionally focused and providing opportunity to
community members is the idealism of access to higher education. The SU system is historically
committed to access and touts this value in its mission and on its webpage. Dedication to access,
therefore, can be seen as a central and enduring aspect of both SU’s and NSU’s identity. When
asked, “Who are you as an organization?” NSU members talked not only about the value they
place on access but about how they have begun to set themselves apart from other institutions in
the system, perhaps seeing access as more of a distinct aspect of their institutional identity. As a
result of the 2008 fiscal crisis in the state, the Chancellor’s office placed a tremendous amount of
pressure on the institutions within the system, decreased funding to each campus, and asked
campuses to decrease enrollment to match state funding declines in revenues. Some institutional
members, however, claimed that NSU has remained committed to the idea of providing access to
the regional community in which they reside. One administrator, Dr. Arias (Latina, academic
administrator), articulated this commitment as follows:

Many of the other [SU] campuses have moved into “impaction” as a way to manage
freshmen enrollment. Well most of the campuses are receiving more applications from
freshmen than they can accommodate. And with impaction comes creating selectivity and
a higher bar from an admissions standpoint; and this campus has been very reluctant to
do that because it doesn't want to close the door to the population that we serve, which is
predominantly students from the [Valley’s school district], public agency, public district.

Commitment to access was very salient to members of the institution. In particular,
administrators described in detail the way the institution has intentionally drawn it’s boundaries
in order to continue to enroll large numbers of students of color, particularly Black students, who could easily be cut off if the boundaries are not carefully determined. Impaction, for many, leads to selectivity, an identity they rejected.

So as long as we choose to keep boundaries that are conscious of who is going to what school districts and that we have a shot at creating an opportunity for kids from those particular areas to meet our fundamental criteria and be admitted, then we are probably going to remain a very diverse institution. If we choose to constrain that area and pull it in, we could change the demographic profile and likely the first generation mix in terms of who comes here. So that’s one primary way in which a campus makes a choice and has an impact on its commitment to access. (Dr. Morgan Howard, Black male, central administrator)

Administrators expressed their commitment to access through formal claims and connected it back to their ability to serve a diverse population while non-administrators confirmed this commitment through their own construction of their identity.

It’s an open access institution, which I really appreciate. [NSU] takes a lot of chances on a lot of students that might not have chances elsewhere or that other institutions might not take chances on especially, even in the [SU] system. But that’s one of the things that the institution prides itself on, being accessible to students nearby, and so all that just to continue to refuel and re-energize and redistribute productive members of society. (Jada, Black, coordinator)

**External pressures.** Although access is a salient aspect of NSU’s organizational identity, one faculty member in particular, Dr. Pierce (White, full professor), when asked, “Who are we as an organization?” questioned the institution’s commitment to access in the last few years. Dr. Pierce blamed the fiscal crisis of 2008 for the institution’s lack of commitment to access, despite the fact that several administrators claimed that they had resisted the pressure to become impacted.

Now, what’s happened the last few years is those guiding principles, that the organization serves the needs of the students, that they care about the students, that teaching is first, have been undermined because of the state economy. Three years ago, we had a 32% raise in tuition, two years ago a 10% raise, last year 22% and we’re sitting on a two or 350 million dollar budget deficit [for the system] in the fall depending by who you want to listen to. That severely has challenged the institution to maintain those integrity goals,
but also to deal with the very real reality of we’re having, we’re pricing students out of the university. We’re offering less classes. We are reducing the number of faculty overall, but we’re also reducing the number of classes that they are capable of teaching.

Dr. Reyes (Latino, full professor) also questioned NSU’s commitment to access, as he has seen movement towards increased selectivity and impaction as a result of the economic crisis in the state. Despite the fact that Dr. Pierce and Dr. Reyes were the only two participants that questioned the institution’s commitment to access when asked to describe the institution’s identity, several other participants echoed their concerns when asked about external pressures that may affect students’ ability to enroll in NSU. Like Dr. Pierce, Dr. Moore (White male, associate professor) is concerned that NSU may be “pricing students out” of the institution.

So I worry, in an immense amount, that there is enough slack in the number of students, I'm suspecting, whose families could pay, you know, an extra grand a year or whatever, that it will just have this creeping insidious effect on enrollments. I worry, I know the Chancellor, for all his faults, I know that this is something that he…is really concerned about maintaining access. That, you know, he had seen his legacy as sort of enhancing access to the SU…so, I know that the university and the system are doing a lot to try to hang on to that but its, you know, money gets, the realities of the money and the realities of who can pay just make me pretty worried on this front.

America (Latina, coordinator) talked extensively about how students are concerned that they might not be able to get into NSU, despite the fact that they meet the basic admissions requirements. And for those that do get in, they may face structural barriers that the institution has established as a way to manage enrollment. These policies have inadvertently created a situation where students who lack proper guidance at home or from a college counselor may find themselves unable to enroll at NSU. For example, America told the following story about the “Intent to Register” form, which she sees as an institutional barrier to access.

There are certain requirements that have now become standard. I know for example, it's not that they were lenient about the Intent to Register, it's just that now, let's say for example, a student doesn’t submit an Intent to Register now, they will have a hard hold on their account, meaning that they won't be able to register if there was never an Intent. So to me, already, that's already a block for students to access the institution. Because in
the past, if you didn’t submit an Intent to Register by the due date, then you could still submit it later on without necessarily having a hard hold on your account.

But nowadays, if students, let's say for example, don’t submit their Intent to Register by May 1st, then their accounts will automatically have a hard hold and that will prevent them from accessing the university, even if they met the admission requirements, even if let's say they took the placement test and everything. If they didn’t submit that Intent to Register, it's a hard hold on their account.

Interestingly enough, when asked to describe NSU’s identity, Dr. Moore said, “we are a learning centered institution…[with] deep concern for our students,” while America suggested that NSU is a learning centered institution that provides opportunities to underserved communities. These statements are good examples of the contradictions that members expressed throughout the process of constructing their organizational identity.

When asked, “Who are we as an organization?” informants clearly drew from formal identity claims made by leaders of both NSU and the SU system. When given opportunity to delve deeper into the sensemaking process and to assign their own meaning to identity claims, contradictions often developed. Dr. Pierce called the formal identity claims “rhetoric” and argued that although administrators had the student’s best interest in mind, the fiscal crisis was creating a pressured enrollment situation that could potentially push low-income students, women with children, and students of color out of the institution. Struck by this reality, one administrator stated:

None of us are happy about it. It's really difficult but it's a state budget problem and the lack of support, for what we see as a lack of support for public higher education in the state. It's beginning to affect the culture of being open. We've been open. We've been available and suddenly we're told we can't do that anymore. (Dr. Rita Diaz, Latina, academic administrator)

Like other administrators in the study, Dr. Diaz began by describing NSU as innovative, dynamic, data-driven, and student centered, but an internal tension arose as she compared the ideological identity claims with the realities of the budget situation in the state. The external
environment has clearly begun to shape some member’s sensemaking, causing them to reevaluate their stated identity claims. The turbulent economic environment can be considered an external threat to the institution’s identity, which Ravasi & Schultz (2006) suggest will often force members to renegotiate their identity.

**Academic preparedness.** Another tension that is in clear competition with the ideology of access is the reality of academic preparedness. Nearly 60% of first-time freshmen enter NSU academically underprepared, requiring at least one developmental course in either math or English. Despite the fact that NSU and the SU system at large are committed to developing these students, as suggested by the Chancellor’s policy that allows students to complete all developmental courses within the first year of enrollment, some institutional members are at odds with this fact. One White male professor critiques the administration as being committed to access and egalitarian values at the expense of quality. Some faculty members see this as a value conflict.

That's the egalitarian value, you know, and that it's also an excuse for not having quality. Well, we're not after quality. We're after access, but we're not, in theory, we're, all [SU’s] are kind of equally accessible, except for the ones now that are impacted, and we struggle a little bit about that, like we have impacted some programs here in the School of Business, Finance and Accounting are impacted, as well as all [other schools in the system]. But some faculty, and to a degree this would include me I guess, see us as choosing access over quality. That it’s the equity efficiency trade-off that we used to talk about in the 70s in education that we have chosen equity over efficiency. So for a long time, there was a year when we had the lowest graduation rate for athletes of any division one school in America. And so it shows in our performance matrix often that we make that trade-off. (Dr. Johnny Horne, White male, full professor)

Dr. Horne is an anomaly in the sample, as he is the only person who expressed his concern about enrolling underprepared students at the expense of quality, but others did suggest that this is a strong sentiment held by faculty members on campus. Dr. Reyes (Latino, full professor), for example, said:
But there’s a whole conversation about, you know, do [underprepared students] really belong here? That has always been here. When I came here it was an issue. It’s still an issue, you know. So some of the faculty within the [SU] hold this kind of position you know. So that’s another kind of tension. So the question of equity and access is something that I think sometimes we have to force it on the table because it gets so marginalized and we get so swept up in this sort of budgetary kind of crisis.

Since faculty members participated in this study by choice, those who have similar concerns as Dr. Horne may not have been interested in talking about the institution’s identity as a HSI. The oppositional voice may not be loud in this co-construction of organizational identity, but there were underlying concerns about this voice, as suggested by Dr. Reyes. Perhaps academic preparedness is an additional identity threat that has forced institutional members to renegotiate their organizational identity.

A sense of cognitive dissonance has evolved for participants such as Dr. Pierce and Dr. Reyes, who are now questioning the formal identity claims of the institution. The question has become, “Are we really about access and equality?” There are clearly some tensions around NSU’s commitment to access, despite the fact that the formal institutional claims indicate that NSU and the SU system at large are deeply committed to being accessible to a large percentage of the state’s residents, particularly those from underserved communities. Although access continues to be both central and enduring aspects of NSU’s identity, there is growing tension around this value, which could cause people to renegotiate this aspect of their organizational identity.

**We Are Diverse**

Beyond the stated mission and values of the institution, some members made sense of their identity in relation to their student population, with 43% of the respondents across all groups either indicating the term “diverse” or describing the diversity of the student population when asked “Who are we as an organization?” To them, the diversity of their student population
is a good indicator of who they are as an organization. Although the term “diversity” was applied loosely and sometimes included race/ethnicity, ability, and sexual orientation, it was most often used to refer to the racial/ethnic composition of the students. By race/ethnicity, they often cited the large number of Latina/o students on campus and many indicated that Black and Asian students are also prominent on campus, albeit in smaller numbers than Latina/o and White students. Other ethnicities they cited included Armenians and Persians. In many ways, the student diversity is a direct reflection of the institution’s regional focus, commitment to the community, and dedication to access. Being regionally focused and committed to the community naturally lends itself to racial/ethnic diversity when you are an institution situated in the heart of a community that is racially and ethnically diverse.

Student diversity is clearly a salient aspect of NSU’s institutional identity. Although 57% of the participants did not immediately mention diversity in their description of the organizational identity, all participants talked about diversity at some point in their interview. For example, 40% of the participants cited diversity when asked about what originally attracted them to the institution.

Um, without a doubt it's the student population. Um, because this is, cause I was offered a job at [another institution], and I really wanted to be with the students who wanted to be here and realized it was, um, it was not a privilege, but, they really work, they really want to be here, and they're working really hard to be here so they have fulltime jobs, and they come from middle class families, and they just have a need to learn. Plus I love the diversity of this campus. It is tremendous! You don't find it anywhere else. So, that was all an attraction to me. (Dr. Audrey Newman, White female, assistant professor)

Interestingly, 14 of the 19 who mentioned diversity as a main attractor to NSU are non-Latina/o. Perhaps Latinas/os are more critical of “diversity” on campus and did not see it as prevalent when they first considered working at NSU. This may be particularly true for seasoned faculty members who have been on campus for an extended amount of time and can remember when it
was predominantly White by composition. Dr. Rita Diaz (Latina, academic administrator), for example, when asked about what attracted her to NSU said, “At that time I didn't know very much about the campus and it wasn't as diverse. The campus student population was not as diverse as it is now. I didn't know very much about it.”

The saliency of diversity also entered people’s construction of their organizational identity through their narratives about the institutional culture. For Jack Dash (White male, coordinator), diversity is an experience at NSU, as indicated below:

There is a feeling here, there is a liveliness here, and it’s very much about people who believe in the students. Diversity is one of the biggest things that has kept me [here] because this is such a diverse campus. There's just a pulse to this campus, with people who actually care about one another, caring about making a difference for the students. It's just, it’s lively and I have formed some really beautiful great relationships, and so I connect with those people on that level as well.

Although diversity is clearly recognized by institutional members, valued, and connected to the organizational identity, their definition of diversity may be based solely on compositional diversity. Focusing solely on numbers could be a barrier for an institution that is striving to eradicate racism within its structures.

I think one of the coolest things about us is our diversity. I have not been on a campus as diverse as ours and I have visited quite a few campuses across the country. We don’t have a huge number of African American students, but Asian I think we do very well. And obviously as an HSI, we hit the Hispanic and Latino communities pretty well. Whites, one thing I like bragging about here, are in minority if you considered them relative to all the other groups, and so our campus looks and feels diverse. If you walk in any classroom, you will hear any number of languages out in the campus community, which I think is pretty neat. One of the things I do in my classroom is at the end of the semester we have a party and I tell people to bring something that their grandmother would make, because there are so many different ethnicities on campus so we have some really cool food. (Dr. Charlie Feliciano, Latino, full professor),

Although Dr. Feliciano is clearly proud of NSU’s diversity, his statement suggests that White students are considered the minority at NSU and diversity is solely celebrated through food and language. This type of thinking could be problematic for several reasons. For one, when people
start to see White people as “the minority,” they often begin to think that we live in a post-racial society in which racism does not exist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). This is highly problematic for an institution of higher education that continues to espouse racist practices within its structures, despite its compositional diversity. There are several indications of racist practices that persist within NSU’s structures. To begin with, the racial/ethnic diversity of the faculty, staff, and administration is not reflective of the student racial/ethnic diversity, which can create a power imbalance. The tenured and tenure track faculty of color represent approximately 30% of the faculty, many of which are situated within the ethnic studies departments. Additionally, White students continue to graduate in disproportionate numbers, with 58% graduating from NSU within 6-years compared to 44% of Latina/o students and 30% of Black students. The next chapter will go in depth into the structures of NSU and highlight the way people make sense of these disparities in relation to their HSI identity.

Diversity is clearly a central and enduring aspect of NSU’s identity that many people take pride in. Some participants also suggested that NSU’s diversity is a distinct aspect of their identity. Dr. Sidney Davis (Asian American/Pacific Islander male, academic administrator), for example, compared NSU’s diversity to a sister campus in the system.

But really what attracted me to [NSU] was the focus on diversity on this campus. Not to say that [the sister campus that I worked at previously] doesn't have it, it was just more intense here at [NSU]. There was a much stronger emphasis on diversity…

Non-Latina/o administrators, faculty, and staff cited diversity as a distinct aspect of NSU’s identity more often than Latina/o participants, perhaps again because Latina/o are more critical of the word “diversity” and what that really means for NSU, indicated by statements like “we’re diverse by numbers only.” Dr. Eva Ortega (Chicana, full professor) questioned the diversity of
the full-time, tenure track faculty, indicating that if you removed the faculty of color from the ethnic studies departments, you virtually lose all the diversity in the faculty.

And I'll tell you when I was chair for Women's Studies for a while I used to go to these meetings where they would just tout, the administration would just tout how the large number of Latinos in our faculty and I would say, "OK, if you take out Chicano Studies, take out Pan-African Studies, and you take Asian American Studies…if you take them out, now give us the data of faculty." It was poor. It was low. So they would use us to pad their numbers. And it's true we are on campus but we are quote, "segregated," right, and we've hired each other. They have not hired us. And they continue not to. And if they hire one that's somehow, that's it. There is one in sociology, there's one in psychology, there's one in, you know? At most, there's one in [each department].

Diversity, despite its salience to the organizational identity of NSU, is continually questioned and scrutinized by various members of the organization throughout their sensemaking process of constructing their organizational identity. The formal identity claims indicate that the institution is diverse, “by numbers”, but the meaning that members attach to diversity varies, altering their ideas of what features are central, enduring, and distinct to the overall organizational identity.

**The culture is diverse.** The student participants did not answer the question, “Who are we as an organization?” Instead, they were asked to describe the culture of NSU. Although they did not talk about NSU being regionally focused, committed to the community, and dedicated to access, students did talk extensively about the diversity at NSU. While faculty, administrators, and staff made sense of NSU’s organizational identity by describing the diversity within the student population, the students confirmed that diversity as both central and enduring to NSU’s identity. Some also talked about it as a distinct feature of NSU’s identity, comparing it to other campuses they had visited or to their hometown. Terrence Jones (African American male, senior, kinesiology major), for example, compared NSU to a sister campus in the SU system.

Well, I went to, I want to say the walk through but they gave me a tour of the campus at [SU sister campus] and I noticed that the ethnicity there was like, it was mainly predominantly Caucasians, so as compared to here it’s a lot more African Americans. But I really didn’t base [my decision to come here] on that, I am just speaking as far as -- but
I have already seen like on the campus mainly at [that SU sister campus] was more -- that one [socioeconomic] class and more people [whose] parents come from wealthier backgrounds and what not.

From one campus visit, Terrence noticed a visible difference in race and class between the two campuses. Although he said it did not have an effect on his decision to attend NSU, the fact that he mentioned it indicates that it did enter his consciousness and very well could have influenced his decision.

In describing the culture, students talked extensively about diversity of races and ethnicities, naming multiple groups including Mexicans, Salvadorians, Central Americans, African Americans, Asians, Filipinos, Syrians, Kuwaitis, Iranians, Muslims, Arabs, Persians, and Armenians. Some students went beyond racial and ethnic differences, describing intersectional social identities. Jessica Consuelos (Latina, junior, journalism major), for example, said, “Basically there is everything of anything at this campus, like you will see an African American who is a Muslim or you will see an international student from Europe that practices Taoism.”

The students painted a vivid picture of the diversity on campus, often contrasting their experience at NSU to their experience at home, which for many was a homogenous environment.

Another part of the university that personally I have experienced, coming to a class where they have different ethnicities and different backgrounds of the world, you may see an Asian guy, you may think he is Japanese and he's from South Korea or Filipino and there are people from the east that are Persian, some are Armenian, there are Mexicans, there are Argentinos, and you can tell by their accents, "Como esta, yo soy Argentino," so you kinda realize, oh wow it's pretty cool, and that's how I started mocking them, cause when I first came to NSU, my first semester, there were some Argentina guys, I was talking to them and I thought they were White, just by looking at them, I was like, "These guys are Caucasian," and then they started speaking Spanish and I was like, "Oh snap." So that is diversity to me, walk into a classroom where it's different ethnicities, different backgrounds, walking around campus, going to the library, same thing, it's not like [at home] where it was just Mexicans, Latinos, and African Americans. (Oscar Sueños, Mexican American male, senior, sociology major)
Like Oscar, other students talked about coming from a place where it was predominantly Latina/o or predominately Black. For them, entering a diverse environment like NSU was a culture shock. The heterogeneity of Latinas/os also became very apparent to students. Oscar talked about his first experience with “Argentinos” while Delia Quinn (Mexican American female, junior, business management major), a Mexican American identified woman from a city with a predominantly Mexican and Mexican American population, said she did not realize how many Central Americans there were until she got to NSU. Laughter erupted in her focus group, as the other Mexican American-identified women in the group nodded in agreement. As students described the culture, it often sounded like a utopian microcosm of diversity, one in which everyone gets along.

There’s no real segregation amongst us, we're all as one and as a university as a whole. I feel that we can also get along with everybody, everybody gets along with everybody, it's not like they're snobby and they don't want to talk to each other or they keep to themselves, everybody is social. Everybody is here for one reason, to graduate and to network. So I feel like diversity can, is less of a barrier because everybody is willing to interact with each other. (Joaquin Monroy, Mexican male, junior, computer animation major)

The way participants describe the diversity at NSU, it seems almost unreal until you actually visit the campus. As I sat in the theater in the student union observing a program at new student orientation designed to inform first year students about issues they may face, including those related to transitions, relationships, body abuse, and prejudices, it struck me like a ton of bricks, “This is what people mean by diversity at NSU.” I suddenly could not describe the diversity either. Throughout my interviews I would probe people to give me a deeper understanding and description of the diversity they touted, but they often could not do it. “It’s just diverse,” is what they would say. I tried to distinguish between the different races and ethnicities I saw, particularly those of the 11 students on stage performing, but I just could not do
it. Suddenly it did not matter because on multiple levels the students on stage represented the students in the audience, and in many ways represented me. I felt a part of the audience; a part of the campus, like I belonged there, regardless of my social identities and regardless of my age in comparison to the incoming students in the audience; the campus felt welcoming to me.

Despite this elated feeling, I probed students to give me more, to help me to understand the nuances of diversity at NSU. As students continued to reflect on the climate for diversity, they began to make distinctions about the diversity that did not always sound as harmonious as Joaquin described it. Several students talked about racial “cliques” on campus, often identifying specific places on campus where certain groups hang out.

I was going to say that [NSU] is very diverse but one thing I noticed is that if people aren't in some kind of organization or group, they aren't really pushing themselves to meet other ethnicities. I don't know if you know from class but [NSU] has tendencies to have cliques. I know right by [Azul] Hall, that's where they say all the African Americans hang out and then you go to [Morado] Hall where all the Armenian kids hang out. So I would say if people aren't exposed to organizations or groups then they really aren't putting themselves to be diverse but [NSU] as a whole, overall, there's a lot of different people. (Aria De Leon, Sri Lankan male, senior, psychology major)

For some students, these racial cliques prevented the campus from becoming truly multicultural in the sense that all cultures are mixing in harmony. Others justified it as a “natural” occurrence of human nature and did not see it as problematic. Although scholars have argued that racial balkanization can polarize a campus and have negative effects on students of color, Villalpando (2003) found that Latina/o students benefit by associating with Latina/o student groups that help to mitigate racial barriers within the institution. Perhaps the Black students and Armenian students that Aria referred to found similar benefits -- not necessarily self-segregating, but rather self-preserving, as implied by Villalpando (2003). Tatum (1997) argues that it’s natural for people of color to find comfort in groups that look and talk like them. For the Armenian students and Black students on campus, these “cliques” are perhaps an important part of their racial/ethnic
identity development (Tatum, 1997) and a way to alleviate the effects of racism on campus (Villalpando, 2003).

Interestingly enough, when participants noted which groups that they saw forming “racial cliques,” they often referred to Armenian students and Black students, and never mentioned Latina/o students. This made me wonder why people noticed the Black and Armenian groups but rarely noticed the largest ethnic group on campus. Is it that they have reached a numeric threshold by which they no longer need “cliques” to protect themselves? I doubt they have achieved dominant status because they certainly have not achieved equality in outcomes, as noted by the disparity in graduation rates.

While sitting in the student union having lunch, I couldn’t help but notice a group of 12 males congregating close by, carrying on, laughing, and speaking in what I assumed to be Armenian, based on my assumption that they were Armenian. They were having a good time, teasing each other, smoking, and socializing. I took note of it, finished my lunch, and went to my next interview. The next day, I sat in the same spot for lunch, and once again noticed the group coming together. This time, I arrived before them so I saw the group gradually grow as new members arrived. I also noticed that the group got progressively louder as it grew in numbers. It became difficult not to be enthralled by this group of men who were clearly having a good time together. I began to think about what participants had been telling me, that the Armenian students are a large group on campus, and it suddenly made sense. It’s not that Armenians are necessarily larger in terms of numbers on campus, it’s that they have a more visible presence (e.g. congregating at the same time everyday in the same lunch area).

This observation made me realize that the Armenian “cliques” are more noticeable because they are loud and attract attention. Latina/o students may seem less visible on campus
because they have found support in many other spaces on campus. As a HSI, perhaps Latina/o students are able to enhance their racial/ethnic identity development and combat racism through formal students groups, the academic curriculum, and support programs on campus. The next chapter will delve deeper into the structures of the institution, revealing spaces on campus that have responded to the needs of the large Latina/o student population.

In returning to students’ description of the diversity on campus, they often referred to Azul Hall as one place on campus that represents the essence of diversity. Azul Hall is the home of most of the ethnic studies departments on campus and therefore the place where students of color often hang out. Not only is Azul Hall a place where students can visibly see racial/ethnic differences, but also a place on campus where they have a different experience. Lupita Trejo (Latina, graduate student, family consumer science major) said the following:

My major is in the Family and Consumer Sciences building and it’s a whole different environment there and sometimes I go to like [Azul] Hall and that area, which I hardly ever go to, it’s just like I get a whole different vibe, you know, and like he said, you know, the murals and just like this whole Chicano presence like is completely there and if you move to the other side of the campus, it is different. I mean it’s still diverse, but it’s just, I guess, not as strong. I mean it’s just like different spots where it is more stronger culturally, I don’t know, it’s just different…

Students gave vivid descriptions of their experience in Azul Hall, often expressing feelings of cultural pride, excitement, and inclusion on campus. In thinking about Azul Hall as a racialized space on campus, there are perhaps two perspectives from which to view spaces like this. As suggested by Calmore (1995), the racialization of space can be seen “as a process of racial formation and its associated racial projects that undergird oppression and domination by force and hegemony” (p. 1237). From this perspective, racialized spaces on campus might in fact be places of racial segregation where social domination is reinforced. The way students talk about these spaces, however, suggest the opposite. Instead they may be considered what Solózano,
Ceja, and Yosso (2000) call “counter-spaces.” In observing Black undergraduate students experience with racial microaggressions on campus, Solózano et al. (2000) found that students create “counter-spaces” which “serve as sites where deficit notions of people of color can be challenged and where a positive collegiate racial climate can be established and maintained” (p. 70). Azul Hall is an important aspect of NSU’s organizational identity, serving as a counter-space of cultural pride and inclusion for students of color.

Beyond racialized spaces on campus, students also noted the differences in the types of students in various majors and classes. Stacey Chan (Asian Chinese female, junior, accounting and finance major) and Stan Villaruel (Filipino male, senior, marketing major) said there are a lot of White, Asian, Latina/o, and international students in their business classes, but they rarely see any Black students. Erika Estrada (Mexican American female, senior, linguistics major) noticed that her English classes are primarily filled with White students. Although Susana found this to be problematic, she also talked about how she could easily find cultural connections with others on campus by taking Chicana/o Studies courses for her general education requirements. Vivica White, (African American female, psychology major) went a step further, arguing that the dominance of White people in her department led to unbalanced research focused primarily on the White population.

I agree, I believe [NSU] is multicultural, it’s diverse, but being a Psych major I noticed that there aren’t many, I should say there aren’t many, it’s not very -- well the reason, the studies that students do is not very diverse, it’s all, it’s all focused on one race, I’ve noticed, and it’s applied to everyone, but that could just be because it’s psychology, not everybody wants to participate in certain studies, but I noticed that here at [NSU].

Vivica noted that although White researchers are primarily using White participants in their studies, they are generalizing their findings across all racial groups. For her this is problematic, especially on a campus with such a diverse student body where students of color could easily be
solicited as research participants. As suggested by these students, you could have an entirely different racialized experience at NSU, depending on your major. As students contributed to the co-construction of the organizational identity, it became apparent that the term diversity can have different meanings attached to it, depending on the respondent’s identity, location, and perspective on campus.

Of the 41 students in the sample, only one actually questioned the diversity on campus. Gloria Giraldo (Latina, junior, journalism major) said that NSU is “diverse to a certain extent.” Although she agreed with other students that there is visible diversity on campus and she talked extensively about the opportunities she has to take all her general education requirements from various perspectives, whether it be through the Pan-African Studies Department or the Chicana/o Studies Department, she also questioned the “authority” at NSU.

Because, like if you looked in the authority level -- this is, for example, let’s look at [Associated Students], the senators, most of them are White. They are not representing the diversity. If it were diverse you would see many cultures in the chairs as senators and all those positions and I have gone and it’s gotten me mad because [NSU] is labeled to be like -- I forgot what it was but it’s mostly Hispanics now…so whenever there is the majority, you would expect the majority to be in authority also, but at least that’s what I want to see like to see that they are being represented, but they are not and how can you expect, if like the authority isn’t diverse, then how can you expect there to be like an equality of diversity throughout the campus?

Gloria focused her criticism primarily on the student leaders on campus, by way of Associated Students (AS), since she had witnessed covert discrimination in AS meetings. She talked about an instance where AS did not allocate equal funding to a Black student group and how they actually questioned the need for Black student programs on campus, including Black graduation. Although Naomi is a counter-case in this sample, she helps to highlight the ways in which diversity on campus can be questioned when observed beyond the compositional representation of students. Like Dr. Eva Ortega, who made note of the imbalances in the compositional
diversity of the administrators and tenure track faculty on campus, Gloria questioned equity, rather than diversity, by making distinctions over the allocation of resources and the distribution of power. Few participants were critical of this distinction and very few questioned the deeper roots of inequality as reflected in organizational elements such as budgets and positional leadership.

Diversity is an element of NSU’s organizational identity that most members take pride in, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students. Latina/o participants, however, were more likely to question how equitable the institution really is in regard to serving Latina/o students and producing equitable outcomes. Despite the lack of parity, diversity continued to arise as a central aspect of NSU’s identity. Throughout their sensemaking, participants pulled from the processes and activities that make NSU diverse, often inciting deep feelings of elation and harmony. Although diversity may also be an enduring aspect of NSU’s identity, most would argue that it has not always been that way. As cited by Esperanza Lopez (Latina, counselor), people historically fought their way into the university.

Well I mean people had to fight for [diversity], I mean they literally took over offices back in that late 60s for that at [NSU]. If you haven't seen that you should check it out. You know, so you know I think it's something that has been -- it's a fact of demography, but it's also richly ironic because even in [the early 1990’s] the school was still predominantly White and still fairly exclusive as it had been for, since its beginning.

Diversity may also be a distinct aspect of NSU’s identity, as noted by several participants when comparing it to other institutions, particularly those within the SU system. When given the opportunity to make sense of who they really are, NSU members will call themselves diverse, making it a core part of their identity.

NSU’s Integrated Identities

Based on the above analysis of what members believe is fundamental (central), persistent over time (enduring), and unique (distinct) to the institution’s identity, it becomes quite obvious
that there are multiple perceptions of what NSU is really about. Pratt and Foreman (2000) suggest that multiple identities exist when members have different conceptualizations about what is central, enduring, and distinct to the organization. In order for multiple identities to be present, they argue that two key elements must exist including 1) the identities must refer to the organization as a whole and 2) there must be several different views about the organizational identity, some of which may be in conflict with one another while other identities may be universally shared by all members (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Additionally, some members may not be conscious of all the identities, which Pratt and Foreman (2000) refer to as latent identities. If multiple identities are salient to members, institutional leaders may decide to manage the identities by determining the right level of plurality (how many) and synergy (how much should they interact) (Pratt & Foreman, 2000).

Based on NSU members’ reactions to the question, “Who are we as an organization?” it can be determined that there are four central and enduring elements that members perceive to be part of the organizational identity: 1) regionally focused, 2) committed to the community, 3) dedicated to access, and 4) enrolling diverse students. Beyond being central and enduring, access and diversity are also distinct to NSU’s identity, according to some participants. These four elements have a great deal of synergy and overlap in many ways, creating what Pratt and Foreman (2000) call an integrated identity. With an integrated identity, several distinct identities come together to form a new identity; however, there can continue to be some autonomy between the identities (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). The advantage of having an integrated identity is that the organization can respond more effectively to changes within and external to the organization (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). The data suggest that members do not immediately
include their HSI designation in the construction of their organizational identity; however, it is often integrated with their core values. This will be explored further in the next section.

**NSU’s HSI Identity**

NSU has enrolled 25% or more Latina/o students since 1997, has been federally designated as a HSI since 2001, and has received multiple HSI capacity building grants from various federal agencies. Despite this fact, the institution’s designation as a HSI is nearly non-existent in its formal documents, on its website, and in institutional member’s co-construction of their identity. It was not until September 2012, that the NSU website had a banner that indicated that it is a HSI. When clicked on, the banner took you to a page with general information about HSIs and a brief overview of one of the HSI grants on campus. The banner was active for a couple weeks in September and has since been removed from the website. Beyond the NSU website, the institution has a formal Facebook page called, “NSU Hispanic Serving Institution” that was created on November 1, 2011 and currently has 84 likes. The Facebook page provides information about the most current NSU HSI grants but has not been extensively promoted, as indicated by the small number of likes, or updated since March 2012. The lack of information about NSU’s designation as a HSI per these formal documents sends a message that the HSI identity is not part of the institution’s core identity.

The HSI identity is also invisible to members, as reflected in the co-construction of their organizational identity. Of the 47 non-student informants in this study, only three indicated that NSU is a HSI when asked to describe, “Who we are as an organization?”

> Uh, we are a Latino Serving Institution, largely just because of the numbers, I think, and I didn't look at the most recent data, but we're like, Latino students are like 33% of the population, just by sheer numbers we are Latino-serving. How well we do it, I don't know, but we are. (Dr. Eva Ortega, Chicana, full professor)
Of the three, two are Latina/o faculty and one is a White female staff member who admitted that she only included HSI in her description because she knew the purpose of the study. Talking further about the HSI identity, she said that beyond the label, she has never heard anyone talk about it on campus.

I mean never, I’ve never heard it come out the President’s mouth. I’ve never heard it come out of our Vice President for Student Affairs. I don’t hear people talking about it here except maybe once in a while, yeah, I don’t see anything going on that I don’t think wouldn’t be going on at another institution that had a large Latino community. (Dina Richards, White female, coordinator)

Although these three respondents mentioned the HSI designation in response to the general prompt, they did not attach meaning to the designation. The fact that 44 of the 47 participants did not include HSI as a part of who they are is not a result of the lack of awareness as only 2 of the 47 indicated that they were unaware of the HSI designation prior to the interview. The two participants who were unaware of the designation are both staff members, one Latina and one Black. Despite knowledge among the majority of participants, they did not include HSI in their construction of their organizational identity; instead they enacted the sensegiving process, describing themselves through formal identity claims specific to the institution and the system at large.

Beyond the general prompt intended to uncover their core identity, participants were asked to describe what it means to be a HSI? When asked this question, Latina/o faculty and staff often questioned how well NSU is “serving” Latina/o students. Like scholars who have criticized HSIs for being “Hispanic-enrolling” as opposed to “Hispanic-serving” (Contreras et al., 2008), Latina/o faculty and staff had similar sentiments. In the statement above, Dr. Ortega questioned how well NSU serves Latina/o students while Dr. Canales and Constance stated the following:
Well it means, to qualify, from what I understand, you know, you have a large population, a significant population of Latinos. Now what is should mean, is that we’re doing something for them. Now I’m not sure that we’re doing that, especially in the time of crisis. (Dr. Dolores Canales, Chicana, full professor)

You know, I mean, to be honest, I mean, I think there are two answers to that, one is what I feel is that exactly it means is that we are an institution that serves, you know, a large number of, you know, Latino/Hispanic students. Whether or not we do that well, I don’t know the answer to that, you know, but do we serve them, absolutely. I mean percentage-wise, they are a large percentage on our campus, more so than White/Caucasian. Again, but I always have, I always like to distinguish between just because you are a majority doesn’t mean you are not underrepresented, and so yes, they are a majority on our campus in some ways, but does that make us, does that mean that we are necessarily doing something for them, you know, I think that’s happening in pockets [of campus practice] for sure. But how well are we doing that, I don’t know. (Constance Barrera, Latina, program director)

Constance specifically questioned whether a critical mass of Latina/o students on campus actually means that equity and parity has been met or that the campus really does have some unique program that enacts their role as an HSI. For her, the large number of Latina/o students on campus is insufficient if they are lacking representation in regard to academic achievement and graduation. Her sentiments, however, were in exact opposition to some of the sentiments of non-Latina/o participants.

Dr. Johnny Horne (White male, full professor), for example, said, “No, it’s interesting, I hadn't actually considered some of [these HSI identity questions] because, like I say, it’s become sort of the water we swim in so we don’t sort of contemplate it.” In referencing the recruitment efforts for some of NSU’s HSI grants, Dr. Virginia Woolf (White female, full professor) indicated that it is not necessary to target Latina/o students for special sections because, “You realize, well, put your net in the stream full of fish and what do you know, HSI stream, HSI fish, first generation stream, first generation fish. And you don't really want to segregate people.” Dr. Sandra Brown (White female, central administrator) had a similar analogy,
I think that for most people it's probably the water, it's the air, it's like we're fish swimming in this pond and we don't know that we're swimming in water because we're just moving around, so -- so the diversity is here. The fact that 25% of the population, it's actually more like 32%, I think, is of a certain ethnicity. I don't think it's something that you really notice after the first time you noticed it.

These statements imply that for some people, and in particular non-Latina/o organizational members, being Latina/o has become part of the normative culture. Similar to Whiteness in U.S., being Latina/o at NSU is somewhat invisible. But is it the same as being White in society? Until there are equitable outcomes for Latinas/os at NSU, it is arguably not the same thing. To the non-Latina/o respondents who talked about Latina/o as the new normal, the fact that Latina/o students have met a critical mass on campus indicates that they no longer need to work towards creating a welcoming experience and equitable outcomes for these students. To some, numbers are enough to consider the environment accepting and nurturing, while to Latina/o faculty and staff, critical mass is not enough to ensure equity or to guarantee that NSU is actually “serving” Latina/o students.

In addition to questioning how well they “serve” Latina/o students, Dr. Vega stated that the HSI identity does not have any implication for his work as a faculty member or the work that he does in his department. He said that he has not seen departments using the HSI identity to recruit or to serve students and therefore it has little meaning to most people on campus, including himself. Although the label lacks meaning for him and others, you can sense his frustration with the HSI label and the way the campus has failed to embrace it.

And but that’s just a lot, there is a lot, so many disconnects there, right, because that’s, as an individual faculty I don’t know what like, I couldn’t really tell you exactly what we ought to be doing as an HSI, like I can’t tell you if we’re obliged to ensure some level of success for our growing Latino/Hispanic population or if its simply a label that is attached to us because we met a percentage, but I would think that if we met a percentage, that we have an obligation to ensure that the growing percentage of students are successful, just as we have an obligation to ensure that all of our students are successful, right. So I mean I personally, I’m not -- I’ll be the first and probably not the
last to say that I’m not exactly sure how this HSI label should impact how I approach my work as an individual faculty, let alone how we as institution should approach our work with all of our students so. (Dr. Carlos Vega, Latino, associate professor)

There was a general sense of frustration and skepticism from Latina/o respondents when asked what it means for NSU to be a HSI while non-Latinas/os considered it “the water we swim in.”

Both Latina/o respondents and non-Latina/o respondents agreed that being a HSI is not part of NSU’s core identity, but instead is based on the percentage of Latina/o students on campus. Unlike the Latina/o respondents, however, non-Latina/o respondents never really questioned whether NSU is actually “serving” Latina/o students. Instead, several expressed great pride in the HSI label and talked about how important it is for NSU to close the achievement gaps between Latina/o students and White students.

As an institution overall, I would just have to say, yeah, it's something we're proud of, we're happy to have that designation. We certainly want to do a good job moving underrepresented students to graduation and closing those gaps -- that applies to other groups as well, but, Hispanic is a huge part of [our region]. So, we are proud to be someone who's giving an education -- students are earning an education here and we're really proud of that. (Dr. Sandra Brown, White female, central administrator)

Dr. Brown and others talked about the importance of educating and graduating underrepresented students, but unlike the Latina/o respondents, they did not question how well NSU is doing that. In learning about the HSI designation, some students also expressed that it is a good identity to be associated with. Stan Villaruel (Filipino male, senior, marketing major) for instance, said, “If the federal government is trying to I guess rectify the things they did in the past then okay, that’s fine by me.” Despite the fact that he did not know much about the designation, he thought it was good for the institution to strive for equality.

Non-Latina/o participants also used the term “opportunities” when describing the HSI identity. For some, the HSI label means that there are additional opportunities to apply for HSI specific grants.
It means that, I know by the numbers, it means that you have a certain percentage of your students on campus that are Hispanic or self claimed Hispanic. What it meant to me was that it opened up many more doors for funding. (Dr. Carol Foster, White female, associate professor)

Dr. Foster has been successful in acquiring several federal grants that are specifically designated for HSIs. With her grants, she has been able to develop programs for Latina/o communities in NSU’s region. The word “opportunity,” therefore, transcends the campus and creates opportunities for the community.

So the fact that we can apply for these $5 million grants that can help, literally, educate people, community members, students, teachers, is just phenomenal, you know? I mean where else you gonna find a program where you can educate new Hispanic mothers who don't speak any English how to breastfeed and how the importance of that? Who's gonna do that? It's our job, as a [university], and plus, on the other side is the students who want to become lactation consultants, this gives them the opportunity and then they can go back and help their community, if they want, if not, they can move somewhere else, you know, they don't have to. That is the beauty, to me, that is the beauty of being HSI. Opportunity, the key word for me is opportunity. (Dr. Audrey Newman, White female, assistant professor)

For faculty members like Dr. Foster, who are acquiring federal grants, and Dr. Newman, who did research on the HSI grants on campus and developed a public relations plan for the campus, the HSI label is important, despite the fact that it is not NSU’s most salient identity. Unlike Dr. Vega, the identity has changed the way they view the campus and they way they approach their work. But for others on campus, who have no interaction with the HSI grants and the work being done under these grants, the HSI designation is simply a label and has no meaning for them.

As suggested by Ravasi and Schultz (2006), the sensegiving process of identity construction, which is tied to the social actor perspective of organizational identity formation, will occur until an external stimuli forces members to renegotiate who they are as an organization. For those people on campus who are involved with HSI grants, the grants may
serve as an external stimuli, causing them to make sense of their identity as a HSI in different ways than those that do not play a role in the grant development. Although being a HSI is not part of the institution’s core identity, according to most, it may in fact be a latent identity that is intertwined with the other four integrated core identities.

**NSU’s Latent Identity as a HSI**

As suggested by Pratt and Foreman (2000), an institution may have latent identities that are not immediately conscious to members. For NSU, the HSI identity is not immediately salient to members but the way that they construct their integrated identities is directly connected to their identity as a HSI. This section will demonstrate the way the latent HSI identity is intertwined with the salient core identities already described.

**Regionally focused.** For NSU, becoming a HSI was a result of location, changing demography, and an institutional focus on the region. As suggested by Nuñez and Bowers (2011), students attending HSIs have a strong desire to live at home while attending college and will commute to campus from nearby neighborhoods. Overtime, therefore, HSIs should in fact begin to reflect the communities in which they exist. For NSU, the core identity as a regionally focused institution is directly connected to the institution’s identity as a HSI. When asked what it means to be a HSI, some informants went back to their original description of who they are as an institution, oftentimes without making any connection between the two. Being regionally focused, therefore, became interconnected with the HSI identity.

It's something about the community that the university serves because, you know, the university is a part of a region and it's part of a broader community. And so, what I would take [being a HSI] to be is that we have sorta -- we're a university that has a strong interest and commitment to working with and serving, you know, all the community at large, of course, but then doing things particularly for, you know, well I guess mainly the Central American around here, but Central, South American, and anybody who falls under the designation "Hispanic," and I don't want to fight about the Spanish and stuff
like that, I've read a couple papers on that, but yea, you know, just things of concern and I think that's what we do. (Dr. Bruce Moore, White male, associate professor)

For many, the university’s Latina/o population is a logical extension of the region in which they are situated. At a visceral level, it’s just who they are (a HSI) and whom they serve (Latinas/os). Although some treated it as though there was never any intentional efforts to reach out to the community, others mentioned that the student outreach and recruitment office has not only been instrumental in focusing on the region’s feeder schools that are predominantly Latina/o, but have also developed TRIO programs (federally-funded educational opportunity programs) in order to enhance their outreach efforts to underserved communities in the region.

**Committed to the community.** In many ways, NSU’s regional focus and commitment to the community are connected to each other and to the HSI identity. In making sense of their HSI identity, members said they foster relationships with the surrounding Latina/o community and encourage students to form relationships with local Latina/o neighborhoods. Dr. Carol Foster, as mentioned previously, has obtained HSI grants to go directly into the community to develop programs. For her, the campus’s HSI identity is very connected to its commitment to the community. At the same time, others on campus expressed a strong sense of commitment to the community, regardless if the institution has the HSI designation or not. In referring to NSU’s community service program, Jack Dash (White male, coordinator) talked extensively about his efforts to send students into the neediest surrounding communities, which he estimated to be 90% Latina/o.

So here’s the thing, what I do, I’m not sure if it is unique within our program or not but what I do is I survey our [region] and look for populations that are really in need of specific services and usually it relates to socio-economic conditions and so when I find populations [in the community] what I notice is that those populations are being hit very hard economically and because of that we try to provide those needs as much as we can -- We do assessments for that area and the reason why I bring this all up is because what I found in these areas is that they’re, and I don’t have a specific stat, but something like
you know 90 percent Hispanic in these areas and so, while that is different and what you’re question is pertaining to our students, it does relate back to our students because what I found -- is that a lot of students who are serving these populations, some of them usually come from these populations as well and happen to be Hispanic students.

Jacked referred to the interconnection of the institution’s HSI identity and its core identity to serve the community and then related it to Latina/o students’ identity as well. For him, the identities are integrated, despite the fact that he had previously stated that nobody on campus talks about its designation as a HSI. Student participants also talked about the importance of serving the local community and related it back to being a HSI. When asked what he thinks it means to be a HSI, Stan Villaruel (Filipino male, senior, marketing major) said the following:

I guess to me it serves the population, in general, of the Valley, which is good because I think it’s best to reflect what’s local, what’s around you, as opposed to like, “Oh we’ll reach out to those people [outside the Valley].” Dude, you’re in the Valley so focus on what’s around you, don’t go reaching out somewhere [else].

**Dedicated to access.** A third aspect of NSU’s salient organizational identity that is interconnected to its HSI identity is its dedication to access. Although it seems like an elusive value, most members considered access to be connected to the value of equalizing opportunities for all students, regardless of racial or ethnic background. As members expressed their understanding of the HSI label, dedication to access was strongly connected with NSU’s identity as a HSI.

Well, I think, certainly the numbers set the bar, the need to serve a group of students who have not historically had access to higher [education] and even when they had access, their persistence and graduation rates were not where we needed them to be. And so there is, I see HSI philosophy being an infusion of resources to assist, to implement creative strategies to assist underserved students, but in the process, particularly given that we’re in [a state] where we can't select on the basis of ethnicity or race, it really is a larger philosophical perspective that we need to be creative and innovative in serving all of our students, with a special eye on those that are underperforming, and if that happens to be Hispanic or other, it is more about the underperformance and less about the ethnic background of the student. And so I think in that sense it aligns very nicely with the original spirit of what I think it means to be a HSI, which is to serve populations that
have historically underperformed or have not had access to higher education. (Dr. Rosario Arias, Latina, academic administrator)

As suggested by Dr. Arias, being a HSI is not only about providing access to Latina/o students, but to all students. For NSU members, serving all students equally was an important theme that transcended their definition of who they are as an organization. Her comments provide insight into the context in which NSU is situated, as they are in a state that has outlawed the use of affirmative action in college admissions. For this reason, members were careful to use inclusive language throughout their identity construction, often stating that they are committed to access and equality for all students, not just Latina/o students.

At the same time, being a HSI means that you must recognize that students of color, and Latina/o students in particular, may not have the cultural capital to gain access and succeed within institutions of higher education. Admission to the SU system is based on successful completion of basic courses in high school spanning seven distinct categories. An institution committed to access of traditionally underserved communities, however, recognizes that it is not sufficient to expect the most disadvantaged students to complete these requirements without some assistance. In conceptualizing what it means to be a HSI, Dr. Devin Hoffman (White male, central administrator), highlighted this:

One is, I doubled up, so I described [us] as urban-serving before, which it means that you are a reaching out to a variety of Hispanic-serving populations, a variety of Hispanic populations that are largely first-generation students. They’re coming from very diverse backgrounds and families. If they [HSIs] have the capability to work with students and their families, if you’re just working with the students you’re assuming that they have the academic capital to make it here on their own, and historically they don’t. So what are you doing to work with the families and support structures?

For Dr. Hoffman, a HSI must not only provide access to Latinas/os and other underrepresented groups but also connect with the families of these students while providing a supportive structure that enables them to excel in the university. Several members mentioned that outreach and
recruitment services on campus play an integral role in providing a supportive structure that helps students to gain access to the institution. The role of outreach and recruitment services was so salient that students also talked about the importance of this organizational element.

And also I know that they have ambassadors in the school that they go to high schools or like community colleges [and] they go and talk about the school so they get more students involved and learn about the school, because I know my sister was an ambassador for [a sister campus] and she would also bring a lot of transfer students to [the campus] and since she also had her work, you know, her people that worked with her, she knew the ambassador at [NSU] and she would always also -- bring Latinos to come into the school and to look into the school. I guess that's also a key role to [being a HSI], the ambassador positions, how they go out and speak to the [Latina/o] students from other community colleges. (Erika Estrada, Mexican American female, senior, linguistics major)

**Diverse serving.** As suggested in the previous section, many members believe that NSU’s HSI identity is connected to providing access to diverse populations, not just Latina/o students. Participants, therefore, often constructed their HSI identity in relation to their identity as a diverse serving institution. Diversity was defined in a number of ways, including by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, immigration status, and college generation status. As indicated by Dr. Ortega, being at a HSI means being committed to serving all populations.

Right, right, Latino-serving, working class-serving, immigrant-serving, whoever it would serve, because, although we are Latino-serving, and I know that’s the focus of your [study], I don’t see myself just serving Latinos, I see myself serving immigrant students, and we get a lot of immigrants from other parts; from Armenia, from Korea, and Vietnam, so we get a lot of immigrant students from all parts of the world and I see myself as committed to them as I am, and all working class students, I find myself committed to them, any student that walks in here, can’t write a sentence, I’m committed to them, to them becoming better writers. (Dr. Eva Ortega, Chicana full professor)

Identifying as a diverse serving institution is also important because many of the intersectional identities that Latina/o students connect to are relevant to other populations. Being first generation, or low income, or a commuter student, therefore, transcends the Latina/o identity. For many participants, enrolling and serving a diverse population is a more accurate
description of their identity as a HSI. Being diverse serving was an identity that members felt comfortable with and used more often. Some even stated that they preferred to be diverse because it creates a better learning environment.

I don’t think it changes what we do. Whether we have 20% Hispanic, 40% Hispanic or 60%, they’re students, and they have the same needs. My preference is that to have a much more diverse student population. If we were 100% Hispanic, it would be kind of difficult to teach the cultural differences and you’ve got to deal with them. So, it’s nice having a diverse, I’m not sure Hispanic-serving has really any meaning other than the president likes it because he or she can say, “We are this,” so it’s a talking point on speeches. (Dr. Jeff Dean, White male, full professor)

This colorblind perception of students, however, could be dangerous for an institution that crosses that critical mass threshold. As suggested by Dr. Dean, all students have the same needs. But do they really? This directly contradicts Selena’s perception of being a HSI, which means that you must understand every student’s unique needs.

I think [being a HSI] means to support students that are Hispanic and attending the university in multiple different ways and [to] have an understanding of how to help them as well. So it’s not just providing services but it’s also becoming familiar with different pressures, different things that Hispanic students may or may not be going through or may or may not be experiencing. So I think it's more than just providing a service, it's an understanding and being proactive and trying to do everything possible. (Selena Mendes, Latina, coordinator)

In many ways, these tensions in the organization’s identity were clearly connected to informant’s social identities, with White participants being less critical of what it means to be “represented” on a college campus.

Similar to the faculty, staff, and administrators, students felt more comfortable calling NSU “diverse” as opposed to being labeled a HSI. Many were surprised to hear that NSU is designated as a HSI. Zoe Sanchez (Hispanic female, sophomore, undecided major) said, “I thought we were the minority,” when she found out that there were over 30% Latina/o students on campus. Instead, she said she regularly interacted with Asians and Middle Easterners on
campus. Students stated that NSU is so diverse that one group does not seem to overpower another, making it difficult to embrace the idea that the campus “serves” one group more than another.

Yea because we’re very diverse. Like you don’t -- you walk into campus when everyone is like rush hour and you don’t see like a big group of just Hispanics or just Asians or just you know, something, there is a bit of everything, its not like you spot out, who is who and who is what because there is just a bit of everything and you wouldn’t expect it to just be pure Hispanics or Caucasians or whatever. (Demi Peña, Latina, senior, journalism major)

When asked if the HSI label could make other groups feel excluded, participants generally felt like it wouldn’t be a problem because there was such a strong sense of diversity on campus that one group does not overshadow another.

Well I feel like [the HSI label] didn't affect us because we see the diversity, we see everybody, everywhere, like everybody. It feels like the whole world is at [NSU]. Like I've met people from countless countries. [Laughter]. And I just, it's pretty amazing to me. (Joaquin Monroy, Latino male, junior, computer animation major)

Some students went as far as saying that the HSI identity could create opportunities for all groups, not just Latinas/os. For example, some talked about the ethnic studies departments and the cultural student organizations that have helped them feel more connected to the campus. As a HSI, those types of programs exist not just to help Latina/o students, but to assist all students. Some students also mentioned that just because the Latina/o group is the largest now does not mean that another group might not be larger in the future. In this case, the fact that the campus has begun to recognize race and ethnicity as important, and particularly the Latina/o race/ethnicity, may help improve the situation for other groups in the future. The HSI identity, therefore, opens doors of opportunity to other racialized groups on campus. Interestingly, the non-Latina/o students seemed more open to the idea of being a HSI because they felt like it created equality for Latina/o students who had been historically denied access to certain
privileges, including education. Halle Whitaker, for example, said that she wished that the designation was not needed because it means that there is still a lack of equality.

Like I am glad that like, I am glad that every one is getting like a fair opportunity -- but at the same time its kind of almost sad that like, that its like an accomplishment, when it should just be a right almost, you know what I mean? Like everyone -- I just kind of wish everyone like had that equal opportunity to do everything. (Halle Whitaker, Mixed race female, health administration major)

NSU’s identity as a HSI is clearly connected to its integrated identities of being regionally focused, committed to community, dedicated to access, and diverse serving. Although there are a number of tensions that arise in constructing this identity, particularly those related to how well the campus “serves” Latina/o students, members initiate the sensemaking process when given the opportunity to determine their HSI identity. Throughout the sensegiving process, participants continually pulled from formal identity claims in order to determine who they are as an organization. But when given the chance to make sense of their HSI identity, they often connected this identity to the core identity of the institution, often times without cognition. Through sensemaking, members not only interpret and frame their identity, but they also connect it to a deeper level of organizational processes and activities that occur (Weick, 1995). In the next chapter, I will further describe these processes and activities that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. This chapter, however, provides evidence that the HSI identity is more than just an enrollment driven identity, but instead is a latent identity that lays dormant until an external stimulus allows it to rise to a more cognitive, organizational level of recognition. For members, the HSI identity has a varying level of saliency, depending of their location and position within the institution.
CHAPTER FIVE
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Researchers have theorized that organizational identity is constructed by internal members when asked the question, “Who are we as an organization?” (Albert & Whetten, 1985). The question elicits a number of responses often tied to the most central, distinct, and enduring aspects of the organization’s identity (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Organizational identity, therefore, is attached to the way internal members characterize and describe their institution. For NSU members, the most central, distinct, and enduring aspects of their identity are related to their stated mission and values as well as the compositional diversity of their students: They state they are regionally focused, committed to the community, dedicated to access, and committed to serving diverse populations. In many ways, these four core identities are connected to each other as well as their federal designation as a HSI. Although being a HSI is not a salient identity, members find ways to describe this latent identity when given the opportunity to make sense of this label.

According to Ravasi and Schultz (2006), when faced with an identity threat, organizational members will utilize both sensegiving and sensemaking cognitive processes in order to determine who they are as an organization. During the sensemaking process, members will reflect on construing images of the organization and on espoused cultural practices (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). They will then utilize the sensegiving process to project a desired image and embed claims back into the culture (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In chapter four, I illustrated the way members used sensemaking processes to reflect on their aspiring image (not necessarily construed image) as a HSI, which was integrated with their core organizational identities. In this chapter I will focus on the way they utilize sensemaking processes in order to reflect on their cultural practices that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. I will focus on the organizational
structures that are most connected to the institution’s identity as a HSI including the curriculum, pedagogical practices, and programs and services. I will also show the way these cultural practices are intertwined with the social identities of faculty, staff, and administrators, and more specifically Latina/o identities.

**Culturally Relevant Curriculum**

As suggested by Chesler, Lewis, and Crowfoot (2005), postsecondary institutions that are striving to be more multicultural and less racist and discriminatory should evaluate their core means of converting raw materials (technology) into finished products (e.g. student learning outcomes). One primary aspect of technology is the curriculum, including the content that is taught and they ways that students are evaluated for learning the content. There is evidence that incorporating diversity and multiculturalism into the college classroom provides students with overall benefits including increased cognitive development (Bowman, 2010), improved democratic citizenship (Gurin et al., 2002), enhanced perceptions of the overall climate for diversity (Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2005), and decreased racial biases (Chang, 2002; Denson, 2009). Offering a curriculum that is culturally relevant is also important to people’s perceptions of their organizational identity as a HSI.

Banks (2010) argues that curriculum that focuses on the hegemonic experiences and histories of mainstream Americans is harmful to both White students and students of color. He proposed four approaches for integrating multicultural content into the curriculum including (1) the contributions approach, (2) the additive approach, (3) the transformation approach, and (4) the social action approach (Banks, 2010). With the contributions approach, the curriculum remains virtually unchanged except for the inclusion of racial/ethnic heroes/heroines and cultural artifacts (Banks, 2010). These heroes/heroines are often highlighted in ways that show their success as a result of acculturation and often without any emphasis on the racist structures and
systems that they had to overcome in order to succeed in mainstream America (Banks, 2010). With the additive approach, teachers/faculty do not make substantial changes to the curriculum but instead add concepts, themes, or perspectives of minoritized or racialized individuals, often through the addition of a book, unit, or perhaps a course focused on these groups (Banks, 2010). With this approach, communities of color are still viewed through the eyes of the mainstream population and often interconnected to the experiences and histories of dominant populations (Banks, 2010).

With the transformation approach, the fundamental goals, structure, and perspectives of the curriculum are changed (Banks, 2010). This approach allows multiple perspectives and voices to emerge as significant, including those of White/Anglo and racial/ethnic people (Banks, 2010). The fourth approach, the social action approach, allows students to take control of the curriculum, making decisions about who and what should be studied (Banks, 2010). This approach is an interdisciplinary, fluid, and progressive approach to curriculum development (Banks, 2010).

When asked to describe organizational elements that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission, respondents pointed to the curriculum, with an emphasis on the Chicana/o studies department and the journalism department. Some participants (including students and faculty), stated that other disciplines, including science, mathematics, and linguistics, upheld traditional mainstream curriculum. Below I will describe how the curriculum is segmented at NSU, with the Chicana/o studies and journalism departments using a transformation approach to curriculum design for Latina/o students, while the curriculum in other departments remains virtually unchanged. Some departments have subscribed to an “additive” approach, meaning that they have added several classes that are centered on the experiences of traditionally underrepresented groups, but the
entire departmental curriculum has not been transformed in the same ways that it has in Chicana/o Studies and journalism. The conclusions drawn here are based on interviews and focus groups as well as a review of the university catalog (available online) and departmental websites.

**Transformative Approach to Curriculum Design**

**Chicana/o Studies Department.** By far one of the most cited disciplines for reflecting a Latina/o-serving mission was the Chicana/o studies department. Respondents talked about the ways in which the Chicana/o studies curriculum raises political consciousness, encourages activism, and addresses current issues that affect Latinas/os. According to their website, the establishment of the NSU Chicana/o studies department has its roots in the Chicana/o Movement of the 1960’s and 1970’s. During that time Chicana/o students and communities had become disillusioned and dissatisfied with their education and the social systems that had historically attempted to assimilate them into mainstream culture. Chicanas/os were dropping out of high school in alarming rates and very few were successfully matriculating into the university system.

A review of institutional archives (available online through the campus library) provided a more in depth look at the history of the Chicana/o studies department. In the late 1960’s, NSU had less than 50 Chicana/o students enrolled amongst the 20,000 plus students on campus. Black and Chicana/o activists organized protests and eventually took over the administration building, demanding that the university establish programs that would help communities of color be successful in the university as well as recruit more faculty of color that could establish culturally relevant academic programs. Subsequently, the Chicana/o studies and Pan African studies departments were established. The Chicana/o studies department has since grown to one of the largest in the country, employing 27 full-time, 8 emeriti, and 28 part-time faculty and now
offering a major, minor, and master’s degree. The Chicana/o studies department remains committed to the holistic development of students by offering culturally relevant courses that encourage students to embrace humanitarian principles and to serve local, national, and global communities.

In constructing their identity as a HSI, both Latina/o and non-Latina/o respondents said that the Chicana/o studies department is a core aspect of their identity. The department is nearly forty years old and is so embedded within the culture of NSU that it is a central and enduring aspect of their identity. In many ways it is also distinct, as respondents talked about the founder of the department (whose name has been concealed in order to maintain confidentiality of the institution) as a historical figure within the Chicana/o studies discipline. Additionally, the Chicana/o Studies department has become embedded within the general education curriculum, often serving as the primary place where first-year students take a series of required courses.

I think that it is a huge, huge element, it's an incredible component of what it means to be at [NSU], to recognize that we have the largest Chicano Studies Department, probably in the nation. And, they don't just teach Chicano Studies. They also teach writing, public speaking. And so the ability to introduce freshmen, and not just Chicano Studies or Chicano students to faculty and themes that are germane to the culture but to really, just kind of find a way to remove from the marginalization that often happens with ethnic programs, move it out of the margins to the center and make it a part of the fabric of an institution. So I think that's a very powerful way in which the campus takes Chicano Studies and Central American Studies and Women Studies and puts them right in the center of the psyche of an incoming freshmen. (Dr. Rosario Arias, Latina, academic administrator)

Nearly 80% of the students that take classes through the Chicana/o studies department are not Chicana/o studies majors. As mentioned by Dr. Arias, this makes the department unique since they are serving a large portion of NSU students who have the opportunity to take English composition and general speech courses through the department, which are courses that are required for all students to graduate. Dr. Bruce Moore (White male, associate professor) went as
far as saying that the academic college that houses Chicana/o studies actually survives on the enrollment of students in Chicana/o studies courses. It is a crucial aspect of the campus, generating a tremendous amount of FTE credits. By removing the Chicana/o studies department “from the marginalization that often happens with ethnic programs,” and making it part of the core curriculum, it has become part of the fabric of the institution.

Beyond offering general education courses, the department contributes to the feeling that NSU is Latina/o-serving. Respondents described the murals on the walls, the music in the building, and the strong sense of Latina/o culture in Azul Hall, where the department is located. Some people also mentioned the tutoring center that is sponsored by the Chicana/o studies department and the student organizations that are connected to the department.

Another program that I've seen help Hispanic students is the Chicano department. And it's a whole department in itself where they have not only the classes in Chicano culture and diversity and just literature, they also have the tutoring services in the Chicano lab. And they have the extracurricular activities and the clubs and the involvement, the student involvement that I felt does help the Hispanic [students]. And it does help us reiterate the fact that we are a Hispanic Serving Institution. (America Vida, Latina, coordinator)

The student organization MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlan) was often cited as one that is not only connected to the department but also contributes to the HSI identity by sponsoring programs that are intended to raise awareness of the Latina/o culture. For example, they sponsor programs to celebrate *dia de los muertos* (Day of the Dead) and to commemorate the independence of Central American countries.

Although both Latina/o and non-Latina/o respondents talked about the importance of the Chicana/o studies department to the HSI identity of NSU, non-Latina/o participants often talked about the department as a source of pride for the entire campus while Latina/o participants were more critical of the fact that the Chicana/o studies department is one of the only places on
campus where people can find cultural connections. You can see this divergence of opinions in the following comments by Dr. Sally Freeman and Dr. Eva Ortega.

In terms of Hispanic-serving specifically -- and one of the things that I’m proudest about at [NSU] is that we have this really strong tradition of Chicano/a studies and that we have been expanded and acknowledged that there's also a huge population of folks who are from Central America or whose parents are from Central America and that that experience is different. (Dr. Sally Freeman, White female, unit director)

In the [Chicana/o Studies] department we do a lot of rituals, actually, we've done a lot of healing and we've started doing that now and it's in the department, we do the healing, we actually, when we go to student activist sessions they ask for like a blessing before. When the students started their hunger strike, I think you heard about that, they asked us to give the blessing, and Father Greg Boyle [a popular priest from East Los Angeles] was actually on campus that day and he came with us and we gave a blessing to the students. So its all within our department, we work hard, we really work hard and we work, you know, beyond what other departments do and other faculty do to give the students the things that they think that they need. (Dr. Eva Ortega, Chicana, full professor)

Students also stated that the Chicana/o studies department is the only place on campus where the curriculum is culturally relevant. In fact, a majority of students talked about a segmented experience, with their main academic home offering a hegemonic, mainstream curriculum and the Chicana/o studies department offering a multicultural, Latina/o centered curriculum. Erika Estrada (Mexican American, senior, linguistics major), for example, said that her linguistics courses do not offer culturally relevant textbooks, activities, or examples but her Chicana/o Studies courses have been very progressive as far as addressing topics most relevant to Latina/ students.

Yeah, since [I’m primarily] focusing on English, probably I am being biased or something, just because of that, but I mean I have taken my other like Chicano studies, like my electives, and yeah, of course, we always talk about you know, what's going on with immigration and all of that. We do, basically its not traditional within those courses, just because they focus on the present, and what's going on right now and how us Latinos should be aware of that stuff and politically-wise as well like, learning how to vote, being informative, just not you know, be oblivious of every information that's given to us, actually do the research. That's what a lot of my Latino, like my professors from Chicano studies have told us overall.
Benito Ontiveros (Mexican Latino, senior, journalism major), talked extensively about the ways in which NSU feels like a “Latino campus;” however, he also suggested that it is very segmented. As a student in the Spanish-language journalism minor, he is required to take Chicana/o studies courses while also taking culturally relevant courses through the journalism department, making his experience very different from a Latina/o student who is in a department that has not shifted the curriculum to be more culturally responsive. He said the following about the segmented experience as NSU:

Well I have different experiences. I have had different experiences because it depends what you where you are on campus and also there is a very large influence of the history that happened here with the Chicano movement and students and like there is like murals in certain buildings. So I think that the Hispanic presence is big in certain areas and also this is the only school for journalism that has a minor in Spanish language journalism and they are trying to make it a major, so that’s kind of unique, so that attracts more Latino students.

By placing Chicana/o studies courses within the general education requirements, NSU has taken what Bank’s (2010) calls a transformative approach to multicultural curriculum development. Students are able to view concepts, events, issues, and themes from the perspective of Latina/o people, and many choose to take these courses. Nearly every Latina/o student in the sample mentioned that she/he had taken at least one Chicana/o studies course while at NSU. Although this cannot be generalized across all Latina/o students, it is an indicator of the prevalence of the Chicana/o studies program on campus. Rather than adding one Latina/o themed unit to an English composition course or one book by a Latina/o author to a literature course (an additive approach), NSU has developed a series of courses that allow both Latina/o and non-Latina/o students to view the world through a different lens. The NSU catalog lists the following courses through the Chicana/o studies department: Spanish, art, film, painting, freshmen composition, speech communications, music, literature, theater, American history,
research methods, contemporary issues, constitutional issues, critical thinking, social movements, bilingual education, and counseling, to name a few. There are currently 87 courses offered by the Chicana/o studies department, making it difficult for students to avoid taking at least one course from this perspective.

**Journalism Department.** The journalism department at NSU is an anomaly in many ways, but its programs may be considered a distinct element of its identity. The journalism department has responded to the changing needs of Latina/o students by developing an interdisciplinary curriculum, offering courses that focus on diversity, and creating a Spanish-language journalism minor. In short, the department has created a specialty that serves Latina/o populations in the state and nation.

According to its website, the minor in Spanish language Journalism is the first of its kind in the U.S. and prepares students to write and report on Spanish-speaking and Latino communities. As an interdisciplinary minor, students take courses in journalism, Chicana/o studies, Spanish, and Central American studies. The minor helps students to better understand both Spanish-language Latino media and communities. Courses offered through the journalism department include the Spanish-language news environment and Spanish-language media writing. The department also sponsors a Spanish-language newspaper, Spanish-language television channel, and student organizations for Latina/o journalism majors. The department employs Latina/o and Spanish-speaking faculty, both full- and part-time, who have helped to shape the Spanish-language journalism minor. The former department head is an influential Latino male who, along with two faculty members in the department, spearheaded the development of the Spanish language journalism minor, in response to the growing need of Spanish-speaking students at NSU. They currently have aspirations of making it a major at
NSU. The department has clearly embraced its identity as being Latina/o-serving.

Dr. Audrey Newman (White female, assistant professor), however, suggested that the Journalism Department is embracing the HSI label, regardless of the official federal designation.

Well I'll tell you, our [department], we're very advanced, because we have a small Spanish-speaking, no we have a Spanish-language journalism minor. So we've embraced, we have several Spanish-speaking faculty members. So we've really embraced the whole bilingual newsroom, you know, um, social media, we have [a Spanish language] newspaper, we have, you know, TV shows, so we have not only embraced it but we've made it a minor [specialization with academic credit]. And so, … with or without HSI [designation], we're doing this, because we see a tremendous demand.

Dr. Newman is a huge advocate for NSU’s identity as a HSI. She believes in it, embraces it, and supports the campuses efforts to become it. The provost chose Dr. Newman to conduct research on the campus’s identity as a HSI and to make suggestions for promoting it. As a result, she developed a public relations course dedicated to consulting NSU on its efforts to raise awareness of its status as a HSI. The students in the course were required to form teams of three or four and to develop a public relations plan to present to NSU for developing its identity as a HSI. She said that the class was racially and ethnically mixed and not one person questioned the course’s emphasis on being a HSI, and instead developed extensive and creative plans for NSU to promote this identity. The students created a website full of information they had collected throughout the semester and wrote an article for the NSU alumni newspaper. The information generated from the class was shared with the public relations department at NSU in order to support their efforts to create awareness of the institution’s designation as a HSI. The curriculum led by faculty, therefore, has helped students to shape the institution’s identity as a HSI.

In addition to the Chicana/o studies department, the journalism department is contributing to NSU’s identity as a HSI through curriculum transformation. By taking a transformative approach (Banks, 2010), the journalism department is allowing students to learn about media and
journalism through diverse perspectives, and specifically through the eyes of Spanish-speaking audiences. The program has created a strong reputation and recognition beyond the borders of NSU, with companies like Telemundo and Univision heavily recruiting its graduates. Javier Gomez (Latino, junior, journalism major) and Benito Ontiveros (Mexican Latino, senior, journalism major) both mentioned that they chose to attend NSU because of the reputation of the Spanish-language journalism minor. Both students would argue that NSU feels like a HSI as a result of the curriculum, the Latina/o faculty who have developed culturally relevant experiences for students, and the Latina/o student organizations. As argued by Hurtado and colleagues (2012), the social identity of the faculty is central to the creation of diverse learning environments in college. The Latina/o identity of key faculty members in the journalism department has been essential to the development of a culturally relevant experience that transcends the curriculum.

**General Education curriculum.** Beyond the Chicana/o studies department and the journalism department, there are other approaches to incorporating diversity into the curriculum that are transformative. Similar to the way respondents talked about serving a diverse population, not just a Latina/o population, they also referred to aspects of the curriculum that reflect the value they place on the inclusion of all diverse students.

Within the general education requirements, all students are required to take six units of comparative cultural studies including gender, race, class, and ethnicity studies. Several participants said that NSU has historically valued a cross-cultural curriculum, dating back to the 1970’s with the introduction of Chicana/o studies and Pan African studies. Since then they have established an Asian American studies program, a Central American studies program, a Women and gender studies program, and a Jewish studies program. They also offer minors in American
Indian studies and Queer studies. As a result of the six-unit requirement to graduate, most NSU students take at least two, if not more courses in one of these areas. Dr. Sally Freeman (White female, unit director) argued that the requirement is a unique aspect of NSU’s identity.

Well one of the things we have done is that our general education package has an additional category that none of the other [campuses in the system] have. And it's comparative cross cultural studies and so all students have to take six units in that area and because it's [NSU] unique even transfer students generally come in without it, and so there are every course in that part of the curriculum, and every student has to take two courses in that part of that curriculum, [and it] has to deal with diversity in, you know, in a sort of specific, under a specific set of guidelines...and it's the biggest section of GE so it's not just that it has Chicano/a Studies courses in it, though it does, but it also has you know courses from all the traditional disciplines that you might expect like anthropology and geography and art, [and] also courses from classics and English and religious studies and they all sort of follow the same set of guidelines about understanding how diversity shapes the world and how it does so through culture, gender, sexuality, race, religion, class, ethnicity, language, and really focuses on differences.

For participants, focusing on a cultural curriculum is historically embedded in their value system as an institution. One student, Gloria Giraldo (Latina, junior, journalism major) said that she has taken all her general education requirements through ethnic studies courses, including traditional courses like psychology and English. She said that she had already learned the White hegemonic perspective in high school so NSU has given her the opportunity to learn things from a different perspective. The fact that she could fulfill all her general education requirements through these cultural courses indicates that curricular offerings in these areas are abundant. The course catalog currently lists 150 courses across 40 departments that fulfill the comparative cultural studies requirement, not including the additional ethnic studies courses that are offered as requirements for the majors and minors in these areas. The comparative cultural studies requirement is unique to NSU’s identity and reflective of their commitment to diversity. At the same time, this requirement is important because previous research has found that students who
complete required undergraduate diversity courses have decreased racial prejudices (Chang, 2002).

**Additive Approach to Curriculum Design**

Despite the breadth of culturally relevant course offerings at NSU, the campus as a whole has not reached what Bank’s (2010) calls a transformation approach or a social action approach. Instead, there is a level of curricular separatism on campus, with a number of departments and disciplines making no changes to their curriculum while others have used the additive approach suggested by Banks (2010). Using an additive approach, these departments have incorporated one, two, or maybe three courses to their curriculum that reflect cultural relevancy and perhaps fulfill the cross cultural requirement of the general education curriculum. This curricular separatism is not surprising as previous research indicates that the likelihood of faculty members incorporating diversity-related course content is related to academic departments (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006b).

The College of Business, for example, has subscribed to the additive approach. A review of the course catalog revealed two business courses that have an emphasis on a different culture, including women in law and cross-cultural management, and two courses with an international emphasis, including marketing and accounting. Otherwise, the general sentiment from respondents was that if the students are diverse, the curriculum will naturally change to reflect difference.

So, I won't say that we have a particular curriculum that drives a recognition of diversity. It’s probably more in the other direction, that the population, when you’re a teacher, is extraordinarily diverse, the students bring up their background in the discussions and it becomes part of the curriculum and what goes on. And that’s because interactive overtime, that faculty respond to the environment they’re in. (Dr. Dustin Nicholson, White male, academic administrator)
This approach may not be the best one for a HSI to take, considering that intentionality is typically needed in order to incorporate culturally relevant curriculum. Faculty in these areas have taken a color-blind approach to curriculum development, assuming that either students from culturally diverse backgrounds do not notice that their voices are excluded from the curriculum or that diverse perspectives in the classroom environment are enough to transform the curriculum. The consequence of this approach is that White students may continue to espouse racist values (Hughes, Bigler, & Levy, 2007) while students of color may lack sense of belonging and connectedness to the institution (Hurtado et al., 2012).

**No Cultural Approach to Curriculum Design**

Other disciplines, including mathematics, natural sciences, and physical sciences continue to teach from a traditional, White hegemonic perspective, perhaps because the faculty fail to recognize the need to incorporate culturally relevant material into these disciplines. When asked if the mathematics curriculum should change in response to the increased Latina/o population, Benicio Cruz (Latino, assistant professor) said, “Not in math, I mean there might be some things that might make a small impact but I cannot really think of any.” Although few studies have examined the effects of incorporating culturally relevant material into math and science curriculum, there is evidence that weaving together math content and cultural knowledge can help increase the academic achievement of American Indian students (Lipka & Adams, 2004; Lipka et al., 2005).

As a broad-access, diverse-serving institution (identities NSU strongly espouses), over 50% of first-time freshmen enter the university at a remedial level in mathematics and reading. Students that enter NSU are also more likely than students at other State University campuses to need development courses. Although it seems as though they have failed to recognize the need
to make curricular changes within some of the most vital disciplines, including mathematics, there are support programs that have been created to address this curricular shortfall. Dr. Dolores Canales (Chicana, full professor), who is a historical icon on campus and nationally known for receiving numerous federally funded grants that serve underrepresented students in the sciences, talked about a successful summer program that is intended to help prepare students who are not college ready in math and English when they enter NSU.

The program originally targeted underrepresented students of color in science and math (Black, Latina/o, American Indian) and was eventually expanded to students who are eligible for Pell grants (low income). Although it is not a part of the required math curriculum, it has proven successful as a bridge program into the university.

So that’s part of it and it’s been pretty successful. It’s been varied, has varied a bit but what, but last year was probably one of our better years and ninety percent of the students who were in the program, in the Math and summer program, Math and English for a month program, passed their, their Math classes that they took in the fall and that the control group, which are people who were accepted but did not come, they said no we are not going to come. Those kids passed at about seventy percent and in previous years it’s been worse than that so it seems to work, so the idea is to maintain them. (Dr. Dolores Canales, Chicana, full professor)

The program is tied to the curriculum because faculty members in the College of Science and Mathematics developed it, but it does not go beyond the remedial level of math. NSU, therefore, is taking steps to develop programs that support students academically in areas that they are struggling in but it seems to stop once they are “college ready,” as opposed to transcending the entire curriculum. The Title V grant is also being used to enhance the campus’s math remediation program, which helps incoming students complete their development math courses prior to their first semester on campus. Although this is a stated goal in the grant, very few people mentioned the math remediation program, indicating that the program is less salient to the
HSI identity construction of participants. This may be due to the fact that the program was already in existence prior to the grant and has numerous funding sources.

**Relationship of Curriculum with HSI identity**

When asked what organizational elements reflect a Latina/o-serving mission at NSU, curriculum was an important indicator. The Chicana/o studies and journalism departments have undergone transformative changes, often the result of one or two faculty members of color pushing for change, Chicana/o Studies historically so, and journalism more recently in response to the needs of Spanish-speaking students. Dr. Bruce Moore (White male, associate professor) said that his department, which has been a traditionally White department in humanities, has made huge strides in incorporating Latina/o relevant material because of one Latina/o faculty member in the department. The dynamic interplay between the establishment of culturally relevant curriculum and the social identities of faculty, therefore, cannot be ignored (Hurtado et al., 2012; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006b; Sleeter, 2011). For this reason, the hiring and retention of Latina/o faculty must be considered an essential aspect of an institution’s HSI identity.

One area for consideration in enhancing the curriculum of a HSI is the DOE’s Title V grants. Although NSU has a Title V grant, curricular transformation is virtually unexplored in the grant. Instead they are focusing on training faculty to use culturally relevant pedagogy (which is discussed in the next section) and on co-curricular experiences. For example, they have added sections of University 100 to the course offerings (without any particular consideration of culturally relevant curriculum into these sections), created math tutorial programs, developed a mentoring program for students, and enhanced career training and advising for students. Dr. Samuel Banks (White male, full professor) said the following:

> Well, I mean [curriculum] is something that we don’t want to get into just simply because the curriculum is a matter for the department and the faculty affairs, faculty governance,
so we don’t want to step on anyone, on their toes in that regard. And so we assume that, content wise it is the right content that they're teaching, it’s that pedagogically maybe they can do things a little different and so that's why we have the faculty learning community where they meet, the faculty meet regularly every month to get training on effective pedagogies that they can easily infuse into their classroom to be more successful at what they're already doing.

Despite the good intentions of faculty involved in the grant activities, it is problematic to ignore the curriculum when thinking about the institutions ability to be Latina/o-serving. The curriculum, as a main technological element used to convert inputs into outputs, was connected to participant’s construction of their HSI identity. To assume that the faculty at a HSI will teach the “right content” is to assume that they recognize the need to incorporate material that is relevant to Latina/o students, which is clearly not the case.

There are many factors, however, that must be considered. Two faculty members in the study said that proposed curriculum changes often get caught in “turf wars,” with two departments arguing over who should be able to teach what content. Others factors to consider are supported by previous literature such as the department’s commitment to diversity, which is a positive indicator of the likelihood of a faculty member to incorporate culturally relevant material, and faculty members’ attitudes and beliefs about diversity (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006b). Although the curriculum may be one aspect of the organization that has the potential to reflect the institution’s Latina/o-serving mission, pedagogical practices are also important and will be examined next.

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

There are a number of terms that have been used to describe pedagogy that is socially just and inclusive of minoritized groups including culturally responsive, culturally relevant, culturally congruent, and culturally sensitive (Morrison, Robbins, & Rose, 2008). These terms have most often been used to describe how primary and secondary teachers incorporate pedagogical
practices that are culturally and socially just for students in the K-12 setting. Few studies, however, have examined how faculty develop culturally relevant pedagogy at the postsecondary level, despite the fact that scholars (Hurtado et al., 2012; Tuitt, 2003) have recognized its importance in higher education settings, and particularly within HSIs (Nuñez et al., 2010). The ideas and concepts stemming from the rich body of literature on culturally relevant pedagogy, however, can be used to analyze the pedagogical styles of faculty in institutions of higher education.

Ladson-Billings (1995) proposed a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy that “not only addresses student achievement but also helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate” (p. 469). Ladson-Billings (1995) argues that culturally relevant teachers help students to be academically successful, culturally competent, and critically conscious. Furthermore, she posits that they have ideologies and philosophical beliefs centered on their conceptions of self and others, social relations, and knowledge (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Although her theory is based on a study of eight elementary school teachers working with a primarily African American population, her framework is relevant for assessing the pedagogical practices at NSU. The next section will be divided into “recognition” and “ability” with a look at the faculty’s recognition (or lack thereof) of the need to develop culturally relevant pedagogy and their ability (or lack thereof) to do so.

**Recognition of Need to Utilize Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

**Lack recognition.** In some cases, the faculty failed to recognize the need to change their pedagogical techniques in order to appeal to the learning styles of Latina/o students and other culturally diverse students. For those in technical disciplines (i.e., mathematics, science,
business), there was a general consensus that culturally relevant pedagogy is not needed in these areas because the subject is objective and straightforward. This would be in direct opposition to the social sciences where students talked about there being many answers that need to be discussed during class. When asked if the math department has had discussions about changing its pedagogical approach in order to meet the needs of the changing student demographics, Dr. Benicio Cruz (Latino assistant professor), a faculty member in the math department, said the following:

No, I don’t think there is that kind of debate in the department. Maybe it’s because math is traditionally taught in [a] certain way, which I think is pretty prevalent. Maybe at the middle school level it’s different or the elementary school but in college I don’t think it differs that much. So we haven’t had that discussion…not in math, I mean there might be some things that might make a small impact but I cannot really think of any.

Other participants mentioned metaphysics, biomechanics, and supply chain management as subjects that are objective and straightforward and therefore continue to use traditional forms of pedagogy. Students confirmed this rationale. In particular, Stan Villaruel (Filipino male, senior, marketing major) and Stacey Chan (Asian Chinese female, junior, accounting & finance major), whom are both business majors, said that their business professors use traditional lectures and PowerPoint presentation in class while their social science classes (such as anthropology and Asian American Studies) are usually discussion based.

Stan: I don’t know I just like discussion because people are, I’m pretty sure people have different points of view, there’s right or wrong answers, that’s the thing with some of these classes, but like with the technical classes like there is a right answer, like in math class there is a right sum or product with this question -- you cant argue that 4 plus 4 is 19 unless there’s, you have theory behind it, anyway so --

Stacey: It’s more technical and, because I think when we say discussion we mean like when you share experiences and you just sorta share stories and bounce ideas off each other and in a class that’s more technical, like say this one class, cost accounting, there are methods to follow and then you do it and then you get the right answer or you don’t and you discuss it -- it’s just discuss what did you do wrong, like, “Do you need help?”
That’s the discussion that happens and it’s you bouncing off ideas, it’s more you asking for help or giving help to one or the other.

Stan and Stacey did not seem to mind the fact that their technical classes utilized traditional pedagogy, therefore agreeing with the faculty teaching these courses that there may not be a need to incorporate culturally relevant pedagogy.

A few faculty members justified their use of traditional pedagogical techniques by arguing that “good pedagogy is good pedagogy.”

I think in the larger picture, you know, I mean on some level I believe that good pedagogy is good pedagogy. You know if you’ve reached them, the students, it doesn’t really matter what, where they come from and you know and it has to ultimately be like that. We can’t compartmentalize too much because that, that’s a road I wouldn’t really be very comfortable going down. You know it’s got to work for people and that’s my goal and I teach, you know, and my class is certainly probably in two terms, its probably half Hispanic, you know, just because that’s what it is and I don’t think I had any sort of issues that related to not being able to connect with the people. (Dr. Todd Duncan, White male, full professor)

Dr. Duncan is well aware of the changing demographics at NSU and talked extensively about his role in training future teachers, a majority who are Latina/o, but he has not recognized the different needs that Latina/o students may have, including pedagogy that recognizes their cultural wealth such as language and ways of knowing. This is not only problematic for the Latina/o students he is teaching at NSU but is even further compounded by the fact that a majority of his students will primarily be teaching students of color when they become K-12 teachers in the region. Is NSU training future teachers to use culturally relevant pedagogy in the region’s school districts that are primarily serving communities of color? Returning to the institution’s core identity as a regional serving institution and its connection to the HSI identity, the pedagogical practices used are essential to the institution’s ability to be Latina/o and regionally serving.
When Dr. Rita Diaz (Latina, academic administrator) was asked if she agrees with the statement, “good pedagogy is good pedagogy,” she said the following:

You and I know it's not. I mean, I don't know that [pedagogical practices] need to change but I think we need to examine them in relationship to [the Latina/o] population… I don't know that pedagogy needs to change, but one of the things I learned from what [the Title V grant] is doing is that the faculty need to be more aware of what causes these academic gaps. Why student sometimes miss a class. Maybe they have to take the grandmother to the doctor. Maybe they have, maybe, whatever. Some faculty don't know those things and some faculty do. It's a combination of examining the pedagogy, examining faculty awareness, and what to do about it to help students succeed.

In order for faculty to work more effectively with Latina/o students they need to develop the cultural competence that Ladson-Billings referred to. Assuming that “good pedagogy is good pedagogy” is not enough at a HSI. There needs to be an intentional effort to make faculty aware of the cultural differences between White and Latina/o students and conscious changes in pedagogy. Their approach lacks intentionality and effort on the faculty’s part. Some faculty also made assumptions that by having a critical mass of Latina/o students, eventually Latina/o issues would make there way into the classroom environment.

It has to do with, you know, if every day you go to class and your students are, you know, 30% Hispanic and all these other groups that are there, it can’t help but affect what goes on in the classroom. Students always bring their experience, you know, and we react in the sense of, you know, as I mentioned, a lot of our students don’t have chief executive officers at home. So we try and supplement that by bringing them into the classroom. (Dr. Dustin Nicholson, White male, academic administrator)

The question of intentionality becomes important. Should faculty at a HSI recognize that Latina/o students have different needs and make an intentional effort to meet these students where there are, culturally and socially, or should they assume that Latina/o students will eventually assimilate to the dominant culture of an institution that was historically oppressive and exclusive to communities of color? Although the racial identity of the faculty was intertwined with their responses, with White males being more likely to lack recognition of the
needs of Latina/o students, the norms of the discipline also matters as we saw with Dr. Cruz, a self-identified Latino.

**Faculty recognition of differences.** Other faculty members did in fact recognize the need to change their pedagogical approaches in order to meet the needs of their changing student body. The faculty members involved with NSU’s Title V grant see the importance of training faculty to work with Latina/o and other students of color in unique ways. One of the goals of the grant is to develop a training program that will make faculty more aware of issues that Latina/o and first generation college students face. As stated in the grant, the objectives the grant (which include increasing six-year graduation rates, improving freshmen persistence rates, and closing the graduation gap between Latina/o and White students) will be met through the implementation of a faculty learning community and a faculty mentoring program. The faculty involved in the learning communities and mentoring program are not only excited about it but have found it very helpful for their own development.

We've continued that group with the next generation of faculty members and peer mentored them and shared our learning experiences and teaching experiences with the Hispanic students and what works, what doesn't work, what, when they tell you that they're working two jobs but they're also the primary care giver for their grandparent in the house and they have to go somewhere to take that grandparent to the doctor's appointment; you have to understand that's part of that culture. Just things like that, that those of us that aren't Hispanic don't know that those are barriers. That's been a very good learning curve for us. (Dr. Carol Foster, White female, associate professor)

As mentioned by Dr. Foster, learning how to be more culturally competent presents a learning curve for White faculty who may not understand common barriers and challenges that students of color face. Unfortunately, faculty self-select into the training program; therefore, those that may need it the most might not actually participate. The director of the Title V grant mentioned that he has seen a disproportionate number of faculty from the College of Health & Human Development participate while fewer faculty from the College of Business have chosen to
participate. As mentioned, faculty members must first recognize the need to change their pedagogical techniques before they can actually develop culturally relevant approaches. Again, those faculty from more technical disciplines appeared to be less interested in changing their approach to teaching a diverse student body. For faculty members participating in the training program, including Dr. Foster and Dr. Joseph Brando (White male, full professor), the institution’s identity as a HSI has become more salient. They not only recognize the institution’s latent identity as a HSI but have taken steps to embrace and enhance the identity by becoming more culturally relevant in their pedagogical approaches.

**Ability to Use Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

Beyond recognizing the need to adapt pedagogical practices to be more relevant to Latina/o students, there also needs to be an ability to do so.

**Lack ability.** Many participants, and in particular White participants, recognize the need to adopt culturally relevant pedagogical practices but lack the ability to do so. Others may not even realize how they come off in the classroom, which is related to their lack of recognition for the need for culturally relevant pedagogy. Until faculty realize that students may interpret their teaching in unintended ways, they cannot become fully responsive to the changing needs of the population. Additionally, some suggested that faculty need to be aware of processes that occur when students are asked to do seemingly meaningless activities such as form groups for an assignment, with students often forming racially or ethnically homogeneous groups. Even when they are aware, they may not know how to change it, as vividly expressed by Dr. Bruce Moore (White male, associate professor):

> You know, it is one of these things that, it's, I don't know, to a lot of people and myself especially, it's one of those things, once you realize just how much these sorts of things can matter it becomes, a) shocking and b) like, "Holy crap, how do I fix this?"
Whether or not faculty have the ability to be culturally relevant, it may be assumed that they possess these skills, simply by the nature of teaching at a HSI. Dr. Virginia Woolf (White female, full professor), for example, said the following:

Most of the faculty I'm hiring, most, but not all, I hadn't thought about this, they're [NSU] faculty already and they know our students and our application requires that they talk about their ability to teach a diverse student body. So, they already possess some kind of basic competence whether through experience or some other means. [But] this is actually interesting. I should probably make a note to myself because I need to think about it. So, how am I guaranteeing that we develop [cultural competence in faculty]? Because what we're doing, well -- I don't think I foreground diversity or cultural competence.

This color-blind approach lacks intentionality and may be problematic for a HSI. Can you assume that all faculty working at a HSI have the skills necessary to teach culturally diverse students? There is evidence to suggest that you cannot make this assumption.

**Faculty ability.** Although culturally relevant pedagogy is not universal at NSU, there are faculty members that have been successful at utilizing pedagogical practices that reflect the institution’s Latina/o-serving mission. In particular, Latina/o faculty and faculty members from the Chicana/o Studies department are utilizing pedagogy that is critical, humanitarian, and Latina/o student-centered. There is evidence that they utilize pedagogical practices that align with Ladson-Billings (1995) criteria for culturally relevant pedagogy, therefore her framework will be used to describe their techniques.

**Helping students to succeed.** On average, Latina/o students enter four-year colleges with lower standardized test scores and lower high school grades (DeAngelo et al., 2011). Nearly 60% of Latina/o students at NSU in particular enter the university underprepared in math, English, or both. Ladson-Billings (1995) contends that despite the disparities that students of color face in the academic setting, culturally relevant teachers look beyond prior performance and strive to help students succeed. An excellent example of this type of pedagogy taking place at NSU was described by Esperanza Lopez (Latina, counselor) who is an academic advisor on
campus but periodically takes courses for her own growth and learning. She talked about her experience in a course with a Chicana/o Studies professor who incorporates basic skills development into her art class.

And it was very interesting because she really worked with an incredible amount of patience, more than I would have -- to get them to engage in discussion and stuff and also to get them to learn how to do note taking. She just forced her hand. She would give them assignments that made them do it. So she was teaching them study skills. So that clearly came from, probably because -- probably for the next person who is going to see [the student], and this is just a general ed class, mostly the people who are not Chicano Studies majors -- and she is just trying to help them figure out how to do these readings, how to take notes from the readings, how to have a notebook that has your notes and things like that, and she was teaching them stuff, that some stuff I have to say would have thought that might be learned in high school.

As they constructed their identity as Hispanic-serving, Latina/o participants, in particular, talked about the importance of helping students succeed, regardless of prior training and background.

The professor that Esperanza referred to was willing to utilize her class time to train students to be successful in the future, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or major. The ethic of care is clearly embedded into the culturally relevant pedagogy of Latina/o faculty at NSU.

Non-Latina/o faculty, however, also recognize the need to help culturally diverse students succeed. Dr. Eddie Dandridge (White male, coordinator), a student affairs practitioner and adjunct faculty member, talked about the importance of recognizing the educational differences that diverse students bring to the classroom.

And there is such a varied difference in their writing skills, and in their cognitive skills that it’s almost like I have to have two grading scales. So I could just imagine that’s the same for most of our faculty. And is it fair to do that? And many would argue no, but many would also argue on the opposite end well, it’s definitely fair because you can’t hold these two students to the same standard when their backgrounds don’t allow for that. So it’s tough.

In order to be culturally relevant, do you have to utilize different measures of success for students from different backgrounds? Most would agree that this is not the meaning of a
culturally relevant pedagogy (i.e., Hurtado et al., 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Tuitt, 2003). But as Dr. Dandridge suggested, faculty at NSU must recognize the differences that students possess and be willing to tackle the tough questions related to outcomes if they are to continue to espouse the values of access and diversity. These institutional qualities lend themselves to different student abilities, making it important for faculty to strive for student success, despite their background. More importantly, they may need to redefine success, which is difficult to do in an assessment driven environment such as postsecondary education. Father Gregory Boyle (2010) suggests that progress alone may be considered success. But how does this translate into an academic environment that is faced with educating and graduating students with various abilities and training?

**Becoming culturally competent.** Not only do culturally relevant teachers help students succeed academically but they also find ways to value the ways of knowing that racial and ethnic students bring to the classroom (Ladson-Billings, 1995). The Chicana/o Studies faculty at NSU do this in a number of ways. Dr. Raquel Cedillo (Chicana, full professor) talked about how the faculty in the Chicana/o Studies department recognize the shared oppression that students have including racism, sexism, and classicism. By acknowledging these oppression, they are able to see students as individuals who may have faced challenges in the past or who are currently facing systematic challenges that may interfere with their progress in the university. By recognizing shared oppression and challenges, Chicana/o Studies faculty allow students flexibility in meeting the demands of the university while maintaining a high level of expectations for their students. Faculty in the Chicana/o Studies also talked about telling stories and using food, music, and language to connect with Latina/o students.

Plus, I'm a storyteller so I tell stories and then I'm like, "Oh yeah, that happened to me too. Oh my dad, I remember my dad --" but it's all related to the content but that's
another element that creates a bridge for them to connect to feel safe, to feel validated. I mean like on the last day, one of my kids, they brought food, they brought the *comal, tortillas*, I mean *ayi estamos*, on the last day of class. What other class are you going to get to that? Did you *calentar tortillas* in [your major]? Probably not. You know what I'm saying? So like, these elements that help validate who they are ethnically, there's no shame, right? (Dr. Raquel Cedillo, Chicana, full professor)

As members of the Latina/o community, faculty in the Chicana/o Studies department are able to utilize their cultural competence to connect with students in ways that non-Latina/o faculty might not be able to. Joaquin Monroy (Mexican male, junior, computer animation major), talked about the ways in which his Chicana/o Studies professor expressed his cultural competence.

I actually had a professor also last year...he is a very intellectual man. I can say he's like the guy from the Dos Equis bottle, he's the most interesting man in the world. [Laughter]. He, the stories, everyday he would come up with a story that had a meaning that had to do with the class. Every story had a meaning towards it. And every time he would talk, he was a Chicano man so he was part of the Chicano Revolution, the everything, the upbringing of Chicanos in the United Stated, he was one of the activists, so when he tells me a story that he's been in front of cops taking pictures, it intrigues me, it grabs my attention and I focus in class. That was probably one of my favorite classes that I have taken, because of him.

Students like Joaquin are passionate and excited about learning from faculty with whom they have a cultural connection. The racial/ethnic identity of the faculty is of utmost importance in creating this connection and is intertwined with the HSI identity of the institution. Even when faculty and students are unaware of the HSI identity, these connections are being formed as a result of the cultural competence that Latina/o faculty can bring to the table.

Non-Latina/o faculty at HSIs can also connect with students in culturally relevant ways, as suggested by Dr. Russell Pierce (White male, full professor) who talked about the importance of being aware of current events that are relevant to students of color.

You have to know the institution, you have to know the students, you have to know what’s happening, you have to know pop culture, what the latest incident was, the Trayvon Martin, that when we talked about that in class, I had White students that we’re like, "I don’t quite understand" and the African American students who are like, "We understand," right, differences in their cultural experiences and bringing that out and
placing it in context when we talk about norms, when we talk about the general curriculum of a classroom.

Cultural competence can clearly be connected to the racial/ethnic identity of the faculty, but as expressed by Dr. Pierce, it may also be acquired, albeit intentionally.

**Developing critical consciousness.** Ladson-Billings (1995) suggests that culturally relevant teachers help students to develop critical consciousness by recognizing social inequities. Latina/o faculty at NSU are able to do so by discussing social inequities in their classes. Dr. Eva Ortega (Chicana, full professor) talked about how it is important to teach all student to think critically about social inequities, not just students of color, and the ways in which critical consciousness is raised through both the curriculum and the pedagogy.

…it's teaching students to think in a different way, to break out the box of Western dualistic way of thinking, which is part of the pedagogy that I incorporate. That you need to teach all students to not look at things in the way that we normally look at things as, you know, this is good, this is bad, this is black, this is white, this is man, this is woman, right? So you break that way of thinking to begin with as you incorporate the different elements or populations in our society, it's the two things together. It's not just pedagogy and it's not just content of who you're reading about but it's together.

Dr. Desi Reyes (Latino, full professor) discussed the importance of training non-Latina/o students to develop the consciousness necessary to work with communities of color in K-12 schools. For him, training teachers to be aware of the cultural and social concerns of communities of color is important since most of his students will be working with elementary and secondary school children in compositionally diverse school districts. Dr. Carlos Vega expressed the same sentiments, comparing his pedagogical approach to his White colleagues’ techniques.

…and maybe [other faculty] will talk about being culturally proficient and they talk about how we have to understand people’s differences and celebrate their differences, and maybe it doesn’t go beyond that, right, whereas if I were to teach that course, I would say, “Yeah that’s cool. We got to do that, but that’s easy right? That’s easy.” I go, “Let’s talk about what that means in terms of how we teach these students. Let’s talk
about what the issues [are] that are presented to us as educators and leaders when we work in an inner city school where you know 80% of your kids are English learners, where their parents want to be involved, but don’t know how to be involved, and the school assumes that they don’t want to be involved, but yet they’re not communicating. Let’s dig deep into what that means. Let’s find out what it means to be a male of color who, nowadays, is not succeeding at the same rate. Like how do you as an educator approach all those? How do you setup and forge relationships with communities of color, with parents?”

As Dr. Vega indicates, developing critical consciousness in the classroom goes beyond tolerance and celebration of difference, but instead delves deeper into the critical issues.

Students also talked about how faculty in the Chicana/o studies department encourage activism as a way of raising political consciousness. By encouraging students to become involved in politics and to speak up on behalf of social justice, faculty help students become more culturally aware. Students talked about participating in “walk-outs” and other demonstrations on campus that address current social issues including immigration and the declining state support for education. Their participation allows them to see their classroom conversations in action.

**Theoretical underpinnings of culturally relevant pedagogy.** As suggested by Ladson-Billings (1995), culturally relevant teachers accomplish the above three facets through conceptions of self and others, social relations, and knowledge. These theoretical underpinnings were omnipresent within the Chicana/o studies department, as expressed by both faculty and students. Conceptions of self includes seeing yourself as a member of the community in which your students are part of. Dr. Joseph Brando (White male, full professor), for example, talked about how he volunteers at local health organizations as a way to be more involved with the regional community, which is primarily Latina/o. He then encourages his students to do the same in order to gain the cultural competence necessary to be good health educators for the local
community. Furthermore, conceptions of self include believing that all students are capable of success, as seen in the following quote:

I tell you right now, my students in my class always grow. I know that, it's a given. Even if it's just this much [hand signal], they change because of the way I teach my courses. I hold them accountable in a way that no one else -- that's the other thing, right? To hold students accountable in a loving, caring and respectful way is something new for them. But some of them have been waiting for that moment to have that opportunity to say, "Hey, I am a good student and you're providing me a mechanism by which to flourish and to show people that.” (Dr. Raquel Cedillo, Chicana, full professor)

Conceptions of social relations include maintaining a fluid student-teacher relationship, connecting with students, and developing a community of learners (Ladson-Billings, 1995). One good example of this is the use of “circles” at NSU. Several students talked about faculty using circles instead of traditional rows and described how the circles created a feeling of connectedness and engagement for all students. Chela Plana (Mexican American, sophomore, sociology and political science major) for example said the following:

Something I personally like about classes, and I have seen it [in] most of like my Chicano Studies classes, is the professor will make it so that everybody is in a circle, and you are kind of talking to each other [as] opposed to sitting in front of the classroom and listening to them talk, and its more like interaction between the students [as] opposed to the teacher just talking.

A number of students talked about the importance of the circles in class as a way of connecting with other students and the faculty members teaching the courses. Several students said that the circles are prominent in Chicana/o Studies courses but they also said that faculty have used them in University 100 courses, anthropology courses, and argumentation courses.

Although a majority of the examples of culturally relevant pedagogy came from the faculty in the Chicana/o Studies program, Latina/o faculty in other departments also possess the skills necessary for becoming culturally relevant in the classroom. For example, Dr. Carlos Vega (Latino, associate professor) teaches in the education department, but in many ways
practices the tenets laid out by Ladson-Billings. In particular, he talked about the importance of infusing his own work using critical race theory as a lens in the classroom environment.

I also let them know that there are certain theoretical approaches that they will hear me talk about that I don’t expect them to completely agree [with]. But that they know where I’m coming from because in my examples I might for example talk about racial microagressions. I might talk about a hostile campus climate, and whether they agree with it or not I need them to understand why I’m coming at it like that.

As suggested by Ladson-Billings (1995), his conception of knowledge is critical, passionate, and fluid, therefore reflecting cultural relevant pedagogical practices. White faculty may also be culturally relevant in the classroom by way of their personal conception of knowledge. In particular, faculty members in some disciplines, including communications and sociology suggested that they have been trained to be socially conscious because they discuss issues of power and oppression in their field. Jack Dash (White male, coordinator), a student affairs professional and adjunct faculty member on campus, said the following:

But then you have other camps such as the camps that I am more privy to, where, because Communications Studies is just so critical based and critical thinking in pedagogy, critical pedagogical base, that they do think about this consciously and they do intentionally implement these into their classrooms, that was the type of classrooms that I was a part of.

Although White faculty members in certain disciplines have the ability to be culturally relevant and are practicing these skills at NSU, the racial/ethnic identity of the faculty matters when it comes to practicing pedagogies that are relevant to Latina/o students.

**Relationship of Pedagogy with HSI Identity**

When asked to identify institutional elements that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, faculty and students, both Latina/o and non-Latina/o, made references to the pedagogical practices at NSU. There appeared to be a difference in both desire and ability to implement culturally relevant pedagogy based on discipline, with those in technical majors (or disciplines
that are based on natural/physical sciences) being less likely to practice alternative forms of pedagogy than those in the social sciences. With approximately 33% of NSU students enrolled in technical majors, including business, engineering, mathematics, and science, should the faculty in these areas be concerned with implementing culturally relevant pedagogy? As suggested by Dr. Samuel Banks (White male, full professor), there appears to be fewer faculty from the College of Business participating in the faculty development program implemented by the Title V grant.

In addition to differences by discipline, there were stark differences in the use of culturally relevant pedagogy by faculty of color compared to White faculty. Although Dr. Ortega, Dr. Cedillo, Dr. Vega, and Dr. Reyes were critical of the HSI label (as seen in chapter 4) and questioned the extent to which NSU is truly Hispanic-serving, the four are in fact contributing to the institution’s ability to serve Latina/o students by utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy. The racial identity of the faculty matters and is intertwined with the institution’s HSI identity. Faculty of color, and in this case Latina/o faculty, have the ability to bring their own experiences into the classroom, are culturally competent, and are often trained to have conversations about race that raise students’ level of critical consciousness (Hurtado et al., 2012; Sleeter, 2011).

For non-Latina/o faculty, there is evidence that some have a strong desire to teach through a culturally relevant lens but often lack the ability. The desire, therefore is important to the identity of the HSI but the ability is crucial. NSU’s Title V grant is clearly making strides in training faculty to be more aware of background characteristics and achievement differences that Latina/o and other students of color matriculate with. They are also learning about cultural difference and talking about ways to accommodate student needs while maintaining a high level
of expectations for success. As suggested by Mathew and Grunwald (2006), faculty who attend organized workshops that promote sensitivity towards diversity are more likely to incorporate diversity relevant content into their courses. The Title V grant is one organizational element that has been instrumental to enhancing NSU’s identity as a HSI in relation to the pedagogical practices being used on campus, at least it is part of their intentional plan with the funding.

**Programs and Services**

In addition to aspects of the curriculum and pedagogical practices at NSU, there are formal programs and services that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. The Multi-contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) (Hurtado et al., 2012) can be used to examine the campus climate for diversity as well as culturally relevant practices used in postsecondary institutions. The framework includes five dimensions including psychological, behavioral, compositional, historical, and structural aspects that can be used to determine the institution’s commitment to serving a diverse population. The three organizational level dimensions (compositional, historical, structural) will be used to frame the extent to which NSU incorporates Latina/o-serving values within their programs and services.

The historical dimension focuses on the enduring inclusivity (or exclusivity) of groups from various racial, ethnic, gender, and class backgrounds within postsecondary institutions that traditionally served White affluent males (Hurtado et al., 2012). The structural dimension includes policies and procedures such as decision-making processes and budget allocations for diversity related initiatives (Hurtado et al., 2012). The compositional dimension refers to the numerical representation of students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds (Hurtado et al., 2012).
Historical Dimension

NSU was founded in 1958, enrolling approximately 2,500 students in its first semester. By 1968, enrollment had increased to approximately 15,600. Although enrollment increased rapidly as the campus grew physically, students of color were virtually excluded from the opportunity to participate in higher education at NSU. According to archives (available through NSU’s library), in 1968, students stormed the administration building, not only demanding culturally relevant curriculum and faculty that represented their struggles and background, but also insisting on the establishment of programs and services to support them from matriculation through graduation. At the time, less than two percent of the student population was Black and Latina/o. After a White football coach got into a physical altercation with a Black football player, demonstrations broke out, as students demanded better opportunities and programs. Students of color felt that they were not being given equal opportunities to matriculate into the institution, often as a result of lower access to financial resources. Student activism, both at NSU and on other campuses in the system, resulted in a statewide law being passed in 1969 requiring all institutions within the State University system to establish an Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). It is a state-funded program that was founded as a commitment to affirmative action and has endured the test of time, despite the elimination of affirmative action in NSU’s home state.

For more than forty years, EOP at NSU has provided low income, first generation college students with the support necessary to excel in postsecondary education. As a result of its historical presence, participants often referred to EOP as a central, enduring, and distinct aspect of NSU’s identity as a HSI. Although EOP does not target students by race/ethnicity, a majority of their student population identifies as Black and Latina/o, as a large number of low income and
first generation students are also Black or Latina/o. For this reason, the EOP program can be considered essential to the HSI identity, as they have helped NSU to enhance access to diverse students, including Latina/o students, and have always been committed to serving Latina/o students.

You know there was such an emphasis in trying to diversify this place and these people who were just again fiercely committed to try and do it, and because one of the -- your hard, largest population in [“The Valley], who is our primary service area for Latinos, especially in the east side, that you can tell that the models that [EOP] used, that the things that they did, and they still continue to do when possible, were aimed specifically on Latinos. (Esperanza Lopez, Latina, counselor)

Esperanza indicated that although students of color initially had to fight for inclusion, the campus’s commitment to EOP indicates its commitment to inclusivity, particularly of Latina/o students. Constance Barrera (Latina, program director) also talked extensively about the ways in which the HSI identity is tied to the EOP program and the support that the program provides for Latina/o students; however, both Esperanza and Constance continually referred to the historical struggle that the program has had to endure. The director of EOP (a Latino alumnus of NSU) is a historical figure on campus, cited as an activist in the original struggle for EOP and called “The Yoda of EOP” by one central administrator. In many ways, the legitimacy of the program is connected to his historical presence on campus.

In addition to EOP, several other programs were historically established to help support Black and Latina/o students on campus. The Minority Engineering Program (MEP) and the Minority Business Program (MBP) were both founded in the early 1970’s to support Black and Latina/o engineering and business students. The programs were supported by the university, had full staffs including directors and academic advisors, and housed within the academic colleges. They provided students with academic advisement and tutorial services and sponsored a number of educational programs. Both programs thrived for over twenty years before being dismantled.
as affirmative action in the state was outlawed, removing targeted programs for specific groups. Although the programs no longer exist, their presence is still felt in many ways. The College of Engineering, for example, currently has a DOE Title V collaborative grant that the principal investigator says was modeled after the MEP program.

So the goals we set out for ourselves, in a way reinventing MEP, you know, we said, we need to have a community, because these students come in and one of their reasons for not succeeding is that they don't have that community to fall back upon. So how can we build that community. So right away from the start we said we need to have cohorts. (Dr. Sidney Davis, Asian Pacific Islander male, academic administrator)

The legacy of programs like MEP, therefore, live on through HSI grant activities and continue to support Latina/o students and the campus’s identity as a HSI.

Historically, NSU has supported Latina/o students through support programs such as EOP and MEP/MBP. These programs, however, have been under attack on multiple occasions and have had to prove their legitimacy to the campus. Although the MEP and MBP programs were dismantled due to external legal pressures, there is still an underlying message that these programs are not important to the campus. Both programs have since been converted to “EOP Satellites,” which is a model unique to NSU. In the next section, I will talk about the ways in which the historical legacy of the EOP program has affected institutional norms and campus practices.

**Structural Dimension**

Although the curriculum and pedagogy are also part of the structural dimension of the institution (Hurtado et al., 2012), this section only focuses on support programs since the classroom practices have already been discussed. When asked about organizational elements that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, participants often highlighted the EOP program. Despite the fact that the program is not exclusive to Latina/o students, participants recognized
that a large percentage of EOP students are in fact Latina/o. The previous section focused on the historical aspects of EOP, and the ways in which this history is connected to the HSI identity, while this section will focus on the institutionalization process of the program. As suggested by the dismantling of MEP and MBP, programs targeting students of color, low income, and first generation students are not always guaranteed longevity in the institution. So what is it about EOP that has made it a central, distinct, and enduring part of NSU’s identity?

The EOP program at NSU was founded to provide low income, first generation college students with the tools necessary for succeeding in higher education. More than forty years later, the program is thriving and annually enrolls between 3,000-3,500 students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In addition to providing financial assistance to its students (by way of small grants), the EOP program also offers academic advising, mentoring opportunities, and transitional assistance (by way of a series of “bridge” programs). At NSU, EOP has recently established a scholarship program to support foster youth as well as an initiative to raise awareness and support for the needs of undocumented students.

Although EOP may do similar things as other EOP offices in the State University system, participants talked about the distinctive features that make it an important aspect to the campus’s identity as a HSI. The campus uses a “satellite” model in which there is a central EOP office, which is housed in the main administration building in the same wing as the campus president’s office (sending a strong message about its value to the campus), as well as decentralized offices in each of the eight academic colleges. The satellite offices each have a director as well as fulltime academic advisors and office administrators to serve the students in the college. The EOP satellite offices are responsible for not only serving EOP students in their particular college but also advising all students in that college, whether they are EOP eligible or not. The satellite
directors, therefore, report to the central EOP director as well as the dean of his/her academic college. The central EOP office and the academic colleges dually fund the satellite programs. This model is unique to NSU and something that participants talked about extensively. To them, this model sends a strong message that EOP is a central, distinct, and enduring aspect of the campus’s organizational identity. Additionally, it is tied to the institution’s identity as a HSI since EOP has historically served Latina/o students. It is important to note that on some SU campuses, the EOP programs are marginal rather than central. While visiting another SU campus (an emerging HSI) during the pilot study leading to this study, I discovered that the EOP program had been completely dismantled and was struggling to gain legitimacy on campus.

Both Latina/o and non-Latina/o central administrators are supportive of EOP. As suggested by Cox (2001), getting organizational leaders to support diversity initiatives is vital to creating a multicultural organization. The central administrators talked extensively about the importance of decentralizing EOP and following a satellite model to extend the reach into the different college units.

I think that I would probably emphasize the fact that we have a very successful EOP on this campus, that again, unlike other campuses, not in the fringe, but in the center. Every college has an EOP satellite office and they serve the EOP students but they also are asked to serve all students in the college. And so that differentiation is less evident here and it reflects the commitment to all; the commitment to bringing best practices to the benefits of all the students, with of course a special commitment to the EOP students because they're the primary targeted group. But we often find with a lot of these initiatives, what works well for these populations are usually strategies that apply to all students, especially in the [State University] system where a very high percentage of our students, regardless of their ethnic background, are first generation college students, so they need that extra support, they need that mentoring, they need those strategies to help them succeed. (Dr. Rosario Arias, Latina, academic administrator)

As suggested by Dr. Arias, the support strategies used by EOP are important strategies that the campus believes are important for all students. The campus, therefore, has strategically used
EOP as a model for excellence and “scaled up” the program, as suggested by Dr. Morgan Howard (Black male, central administrator).

The illustration of that [scaling up a program] is the EOP here. In my view, virtually everything that we have done over time in the academic advisement area and in dealing with students from a holistic perspective and in training faculty in a certain perspective was born out of -- in fact the work that we did in the EOP program. And then when we made an organizational decision to then move EOP from a centralized program out into the colleges, we then took those skill sets and those particular dimensions out there and that now defines the advising and developing culture.

From an organizational perspective, NSU has embedded the EOP program within its structures by “removing it from the margins” and placing it at the center of all advisement. They have developed their advisement model around the practices of EOP and now require all students to seek out advisement through the satellite offices. This has essentially changed the culture of the institution. In regard to the institution’s identity as a HSI, Dr. Devin Hoffman (White male, central administrator) noted that in addition to developing the Chicana/o Studies and Central American Studies programs, the campus provides services to the most challenged groups (i.e., Latina/o, first generation, low income) through EOP and advising centers, “[essentially] providing more than a service, we are providing a high-quality academic experience, [which is] probably the areas of interest [to a HSI].” He was very intentional about connecting the EOP program to the academic mission of the university. Arguably, both the academic programs and student support programs are essential to the university’s identity as a HSI.

Not only did administrators talk extensively about the connections between EOP and the campus’s identity as a HSI, Latina/o staff members also referred back to the program when asked what organizational practices reflect a Latina/o-serving mission. America Vida (Latina, coordinator) said that the campus’s Title V grant program has been intentional about working directly with the EOP program in order to develop it’s programs and services, again drawing
from their expertise in dealing with students of color, low income students, and first generation students. Rosie Moreno (Latina, counselor) touted the EOP for its ability to not only support students but to graduate them. She talked about the importance of the EOP’s graduation ceremony as a symbol of success for Latina/o and other students of color.

Constance Barrera (Latina, program director) also talked about how EOP often creates programs that the campus adopts campus wide. She gave the example of an academic early alert program that EOP developed, which has since been adopted by the entire campus as a way to provide extra support to students who may be struggling in their classes. She also talked about the recent addition of the programs that support foster youth and undocumented students, noting that EOP serves the most neediest students on campus. This, however, could be problematic, as there are many Latina/o students on campus who are not “needy” in the sense that they are low income, first generation, or undocumented. Dr. Desi Reyes (Latino male, full professor) and Selena Mendes (Latina, coordinator) were two of the only people who questioned EOP’s ability to serve the entire campus.

Um, I don't know, I would say, some of that might be true but I know there are a lot of, um, great services like EOP and what we're trying to do with the [Title V] grant that are reaching out to a lot of students and a lot of students are participating in them, um, but my thing, "Is that enough?" (Selena Mendes, Latina, coordinator)

What happens to the Latina/o students that do not qualify for EOP because they are not low income? They obviously receive advisement through the EOP satellite offices (since it is required) but many of them seek out other means of cultural support. The EOP program, therefore, cannot be the only program expected to carry the burden of supporting Latina/o students at HSIs. As suggested by the following conversation between Latina students in one focus group, the EOP program may be so big that it fails to provide students with peer connections and a sense of belonging.
Manuela Ortiz: I know they have EOP but I wasn’t, I don’t know anything [about it].

Chela Plana: Yea, I don’t know anything [it].

Delia Quinn: It seems like EOP isn’t really connected because I know a lot of people that are in it and they are just like, when they are like, “Oh I'm in EOP,” they are like, “Oh you're in EOP too,” and I'm just like, “Didn’t you guys not like meet each other?” It’s like, don’t they have like a summer before they became freshmen? Yeah, they have a summer so I was like, “Shouldn’t you be able to meet people there?”

Bela Alba: Yeah.

Manuela Ortiz: But I heard it’s like a lot of people though, like, classes and classes of people, of minorities so that's probably why they don’t meet each other. [Laughter].

These Latina women (all business majors, except Chela who is a sociology and political science) are part of an organization that caters to Latina/o business majors. Other students in the sample are in the Latina/o journalism club and/or Latina/o Greek organizations. They sought out support by means of student-run organizations, as opposed to the structural support provided by programs like EOP. Although they are student organizations, the campus leaders recognize the importance of these groups and therefore support them, economically.

We have a campus equality fee and IRA fee that provides money and support for the cultural groups across campus. And I’d say we, within the law, we supply as much support to these groups as we possibly can, because we still have the [affirmative action] stuff we have to watch out for and things like that, because that’s been a, um, we’ve made the assumption that unless it’s a supportive community for students they’re not going to stay. It’s not just the academic programs that [are] going to keep them, it’s the masses, it’s the numbers, and it’s culture that’s going to keep them here. (Dr. Devin Hoffman, White male, central administrator)

Again, Dr. Hoffman suggested that the HSI identity is intricately connected to not only the academic and support programs but to the various organizations that provide students with a cultural connections and a sense of belonging. This supports previous research that indicates that HSIIs enhance students’ cultural connections (Arana et al., 2011; Dayton et al., 2004) and ethnic identity development (González, 2010; Guardia & Evans, 2008).
Thus far, this chapter has provided evidence that academic elements in the institutional structure, including curriculum and pedagogy, and support services, including EOP and advising, are essential to the construction of a HSI identity. As suggested in previous sections, the social identity of faculty is essential to the use and implementation of culturally relevant academic practices. The next section will provide further evidence that the social identity of staff is just as important, particularly to the construction of a HSI identity.

**Compositional Diversity**

As participants talked about the essential support programs that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, they also talked about the ways in which the identity of the staff are intertwined with the identity of the organization. The compositional diversity of the staff and administration, therefore, is an important indicator of a Latina/o-serving mission. Although many participants said that non-Latina/o could in fact advocate on behalf of Latina/o students (and many have, including Dr. Devin Hoffman, a white male central administrator), they also talked about the importance of having Latinas/os in staff and administrative positions at a HSI. In particular, the Latina/o participants stressed its importance. Dr. Raquel Cedillo (Chicana, full professor), for example, said that she refers students to support offices on campus, she is intentional about referring them to a Latina/o, even if she does not have a relationship with that person.

> When [I refer students to counseling], there used to be a woman, now there's a Chicano that's in the counseling department, I always refer them to that individual. I don't even know that person. But as long as it's a Brown person and I figure at a minimum, there will be a cultural connection. And he identifies as Chicano so I feel safe like, if he identifies, he’s politically conscious so I send them to him.

She went on to stress that she sends students to the writing center in the Chicana/o studies department and to other tutorial programs provided by the department because that way she can trust that the students will at least have a cultural connection with the people they are talking to.
Latina/o staff members stressed that the people who work in EOP and other support programs are often dedicated to serving Latina/o students because they come from the same communities. One staff member said that his Latina/o colleagues on campus are so passionate about what they do that they have inspired him to reach out to Latina/o students and to “give back” by through a series of talks and workshops.

Then the other is a colleague of mine who teaches a class here and he is just big on it, like he asked me to talk at one of the EOP meetings, I didn’t get chance to, but he, he is really big on you know helping Latino students to see that they can, you know, go to college and they can make a difference. So these two guys, you know, if you talk to them within an hour time span they will talk about the need to reach out the community or something of that sort, it’s their, they’re both big on it. (Danny Del Toro, Latino male, coordinator)

Although non-Latinas/os can and do support Latina/o students at NSU, having Latinas/os in staff and administrator roles is vital to the identity of a HSI. Constance Barrera (Latina, program director), for example, recognizes the interconnection of her Latina identity, the identity of students, and the institution’s HSI identity.

You know, I coordinated a series of academic success workshops for EOP and it really came out of me being a Latina, going okay, here are these students and, you know, they are lost and they need support and they have questions and how do I get a group of them together and try to answer them. I mean that's how it started when I came here 9 years ago. And it started off with these little things and it has just grown into this really set program within the EOP but you know, I think, I think there is that micro level of what we each individually do with the work or the position we have and then there is the macro level of what the institution is doing.

There is a tremendous amount of value in hiring and retaining Latina/o staff at a HSI, particularly those that are not only dedicated to serving Latina/o students but also those who have been through the same struggles of successfully matriculating and graduating from college.

When asked about the ways in which NSU reflects her identity as a Latina, Erika Estrada (Mexican American, senior, linguistics major) said that the both her counselors (EOP and major advisor) are Latina/o, and therefore they are important indicators of NSU’s identity as a HSI.
But I do get that [cultural connection] with my counselors. Since in EOP they do provide you with your own counselor that you meet every once in a while -- they do help you a lot. They mentor you; they tell you, “Okay, for you to do this you need to take the credentials and the test,” and they kind of do give you a heads up.

In addition to having dedicated Latina/o staff, some participants talked about the importance of having Latina/o administrators. The most celebrated Latino administrator on campus is the director of EOP, who many consider a historical icon, a hero, and symbol of progress for the campus as a HSI. Moreover, the representation in the President’s cabinet signals the importance and value of the Latino administrator to campus central decision-making.

That to me is truly a Hispanic Serving Institution. And I’m sure you’ve heard a little bit about [the EOP director], and his role in [the presidential] Cabinet in particular. That’s something you don’t see everywhere. That’s probably another thing that makes [NSU] unique. You don’t see the EOP director on the Cabinet, and that was a very strategic move on both [the former president and the provost’s] part to send a very strong message to the rest of the campus about the importance of serving student populations, largely Hispanic but certainly they’re serving a lot of other disenfranchised groups as well through our EOP program. (Dr. Victoria Perez, Latina, central administrator)

**Relationship of Programs and Services with HSI Identity**

In addition to the curriculum and pedagogical practices at NSU, co-curricular programs and services were essential to participants’ construction of their HSI identity. Unlike Latina/o faculty who critiqued and questioned the institution’s identity as a HSI, Latina/o staff and administrators were more likely to accept this designation at face value. Furthermore, they found ways to attach their programs and services to the HSI identity. Rosie Moreno (Latina, counselor) who said, “You know, even though the [HSI] name isn't there, branded on the walls, I think it feels like that currently,” made references to the culturally relevant practices espoused by staff members in offices such as EOP and student outreach, and further described her own efforts to make sure that undocumented students received the information they needed from her office in order to be successful.
Using the MMDLE to frame participants’ conceptions of the organizational identity in relation to core structural elements of the institution provided a deep understanding of the way the HSI identity is historically embedded within the institution’s programs and structures. Additionally, there was a strong connection between the institution’s structural practices and compositional diversity of the staff and administration. Although numerically, Latina/o staff and administrators do not match the representation of Latina/o students in HSIs (Santos & Acevedo-Gil, 2013), NSU has made strides in hiring and promoting Latina/o staff and administrators, which is reflected in their policies and practices.

**Chapter Summary**

Overall, this chapter has provided evidence that the organizational technology, including the curriculum, pedagogy, and programs and services, are important indicators of an institution’s HSI identity. Again, when given the opportunity to delve in sensemaking processes, participants co-constructed their identity beyond the stated mission and values and formal identity claims of the institution. At the same time, we saw that context matters. In particular, culturally relevant practices were more prevalent in particular departments, including the Chicana/o Studies department, the journalism department, and the EOP program. Social identities also mattered, with Latina/o faculty, staff, and administrators being more likely to espouse culturally relevant characteristics. People’s relationship with the Title V grant activities were also important, with faculty involvement in the learning communities and mentoring program being more likely to recognize the need to incorporate culturally relevant academic practices. The stated objectives of the grant are also connected to the structural elements of the institution, with implicit goals for increasing retention and persistence by enhancing the pedagogical practices and student support services.
CHAPTER 6

ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES IN CONSTRUCTING A HSI IDENTITY

Organizational identity is most commonly understood as the central, distinct, and enduring features of the organization, as defined by its members (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Despite the fact that theorists continue to embrace this early definition of organizational identity, many have argued that it is more dynamic than originally conceived (e.g., Clegg et al., 2007; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia et al., 2000; Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Harrison, 2000; Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Negro et al., 2010). Identity threats, or events that disrupt the organization’s self perceptions and self categorizations, may cause members to question who they are as an organization and force them to reconsider their central and distinct elements (Elbsbach & Kramer, 1996; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). For HSIs, the changing demographics of the student population may prompt institutional members to reconsider their core identity, although it may take time. The present case, for example, has been a HSI since 1997, but has just begun the process of internalizing this identity through a series of organizational processes.

At NSU, members utilize sensegiving processes to construct their organizational identity by widely articulating their institutional core values and compositional diversity. At the same time, they use sensemaking processes to further construct their identity based on deeply held practices and assumptions embedded within their organizational structures. As a social construct, members attach different meanings to their HSI organizational identity based on context, including discipline and department, and members’ social identities. This chapter will focus on the ways in which NSU’s HSI identity is fluid as a result of various processes occurring within the institution. These processes include developing awareness of the HSI label, championing the HSI identity, and capacity building as a result of HSI funding.
Developing Awareness of HSI Identity

It is assumed that institutional members must first be aware of the HSI designation before they can attach meaning to it, embrace it, and make sense of it. Although chapter five revealed that NSU in many ways is “Latina/o-serving,” participants also suggested that they would be commitment to serving Latina/o and other traditionally underserved communities regardless of the HSI designation. Awareness, therefore, may not be necessary. On the other hand, NSU members have begun a series of processes that are moving the institution towards embracing a deeper meaning of the HSI label. Below I will describe the various stages of awareness that people are undergoing and the way their awareness is connected to their conceptions of the HSI identity.

Lack Knowledge of a HSI Designation

Some participants lacked awareness of NSU’s federal designation as a HSI, probably because it is an acquired designation driven by enrollment more than by institutional mission. Since it is not part of the institutional mission, organizational members do not necessarily think about it, despite the fact that some organizational practices may indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, as seen in chapter five. Rosie Moreno (Latina, counselor) was unaware of the institution’s federal designation as a HSI but said that it “feels” like a HSI, both in the structures and practices of the institution. Within her own work, she takes extra steps to provide much needed information to Latina/o undocumented students, simply because she is passionate about helping these students, not because of the institution’s identity as a HSI. She also talked about other support programs that reach out to students of color.

But I personally have not heard that [HSI label]. Now I know that we have programs in our student outreach and EOP that reach out to, you know, minority students and diverse communities, including our Center on Disabilities for our handicap and deaf students. So I’m sure all of that is there but I personally have never heard that.
Although Rosie lacked awareness of the HSI designation (prior to her interview), her response indicates that awareness may not be necessary for organizational members to make sense of it.

Despite the fact that 45 of the 47 employees interviewed were aware of NSU’s HSI label, students were less likely to have knowledge of this identity. This finding is similar to one by Perrakis and Hagedorn (2010), who found that students at one community college in Los Angeles lacked awareness of the HSI identity while administrators and staff were keenly aware of it. At NSU, some students were actually surprised that the institution is labeled as “Hispanic-serving” because, unlike Rosie Moreno, it does not “feel” like a HSI.

No, I honestly don’t think they put a focus on [being a HSI], like they do events and stuff, I know they do -- okay for example they are opening up this like new Gay and Lesbian Center, I think next week, and they have been promoting that like for a long time. I think they like focus in on a lot of ethnicities other than Hispanics, that’s how I feel. Because like whenever like the Chicano department does something, I don’t really see like a lot of advertisement and stuff, but comparing this to like other departments, yeah. (Gloria Giraldo, Latina, senior, journalism major)

In Gloria’s opinion, Latinas/os are not highlighted enough on campus, making it difficult to become aware of the institution’s identity as a HSI. Interestingly enough, two students who were interviewed work as peer mentors for the Title V HSI grant program and neither of the students was aware of the HSI designation, or the fact that their positions are being funded by grant money. Perhaps the grant administrators do not feel it is necessary for student employees to be made aware of the HSI designation and the source of the funding since the peer mentoring activities are open to all students, not just Latina/o students.

**Acknowledging the HSI Identity**

For those institutional members that have knowledge of the HSI identity, there are a number of ways that they choose to process the information. For some, they recognize that NSU is a HSI but do not consciously change their behavior as a result of it. For these people, the HSI
designation is simply a label with little meaning. Dr. Carlos Vega (Latino, associate professor), for example, said that the HSI label does not change the work that he does as a faculty member and is not part of his efforts to recruit students into his program. Dr. Victoria Perez (Latina, central administrator), said, “It's not, in my opinion, I think I've seen MSI [Minority Serving Institution] more than HSI and I think we could do more to talk about our work as an HSI.” As argued by Humphreys and Brown (2002), changing identity labels is not enough to change the identity of an organization, especially when members do not associate their own work with the new labels. As suggested by Dr. Perez, there needs to be more of an attempt to make people aware of the HSI identity; however, awareness is not enough if people are not making sense of the label.

In an attempt to make people more aware of their designation as a HSI, NSU posted information on their website with a basic definition of HSIs and information about the programs being developed through HSI grants on campus. The information was posted during the same time period as the student focus groups so several students had recently become aware of the HSI designation. One student (Ricardo Rivera, Hispanic male, sophomore, kinesiology major) said, “I was going to say I just saw that today. I just found out and I read up about it and I didn't know that but I was like, ‘Oh, that's tight, makes sense.’” Beyond thinking, “that’s tight,” Ricardo did not give the HSI label much thought.

Stan Villaruel (Filipino male, senior, marketing major) said that he heard about the HSI designation in his political science class but it was not a big deal. Beyond the label, his professor had not engaged the class in a conversation about what it means for NSU to be a HSI. Terrence Jones (African American male, senior, kinesiology major) said that when he read about the HSI label on the NSU website, he had no reaction because he had read about it before and was aware
of similar designations at the high school level. The reactions of these students are indicators that awareness is not enough for institutional members to attach meanings to the label. As suggested by Corley and Gioia (2004), although members do not reject changing labels, it does not automatically mean that they make meaning of them.

Some participants indicated that although they are aware of the HSI label, they are confused about its meaning. In this case, they did not attach meaning to the label simply because they lacked a true understanding of what it means to be a HSI. Dina Richards (White female, coordinator), for example, said that when she started working at NSU she was aware of its designation as a HSI but has never heard anybody talk about it.

No, honestly, when I came here, I knew that it was a Hispanic Serving Institution. I know more or less what that means, just from my, you know, educational background. I’m interested in that kind of an institution, I always have been, but to me it’s, when I’m here I don’t hear anything about it. Nobody ever mentions it. And so sometimes I even find myself honestly there’ve been times over the last two years where I’ve been like, I’ll tell people that it’s an HSI and then I’m like, “Is it?” And I start to question myself because I never hear anybody talking about it.

Dina suggested that if NSU wanted to espouse the HSI identity, they should start with basic education and awareness building. She had trouble idealizing HSIs because her only knowledge of HSIs is based on the enrollment of Latina/o students. Dina had a genuine sense of concern about the lack of acknowledgement of the HSI identity on campus.

And now you’re like giving me all these like thoughts, and I’m like, oh I should find out like, what is the -- what is the retention rate for you know Latino students? What kind of programming is going on beyond what I see here in [my department]? Because nothing really jumps up. I mean, I know that there is the Chicano Student Center, the little house, and I know that there are things that go on, but I don’t hear much about it.

The dissonance expressed by Dina hindered her ability to co-construct the institution’s identity as a HSI. In order to make progress toward constructing their HSI identity, members must be able to attach meaning to the HSI label.
Similarly, Jack Dash (White male, coordinator) had similar concerns over his own lack of ability to make sense of the HSI identity.

The fact that I don’t know about the nitty-gritty detail by HSI limits me from saying what it is we should be doing then. Because I don’t even know, and I’m being quite honest with you, is I don’t even know what HSI really is. I mean yeah you brought it to my attention, yes I remember the [President’s] speech, yes I know that we get certain funding because we are serving a community, well I think what it is -- I don’t even know what it is?...This is my point, is that the fact that I don’t even know that, limits my ability to say what we should be doing to be successful. And I wish I did know more about this so that I can be more an advocate to be pushing for that because I believe in HSI, I believe in this whole policy without question. Especially within the community we serve, especially within the larger historical context of our state in the first place.

Benito Ontiveros (Mexican Latino male, senior, journalism major), a student, expressed similar frustrations.

In the last semester they were talking about [the HSI label], that’s how [NSU] was classified as and the reason it popped up, because in the paper the last President gave a speech saying like, “Oh our campus is so diverse,” or something like that, “But let’s embrace diversity,” something like that. There was a quote in there or whatever but they were saying, “Oh that’s funny because this is supposed to be like a Hispanic Serving Institution,” but I didn’t know what that meant. I don’t know if that’s supposed to mainly support the community, I don’t know. I don’t know if it means that community or just the community within the campus is supposed to serve the Hispanic -- like it’s classified as that, but I didn’t understand what it was and how were they related into saying that it was a very diverse campus, let’s celebrate the diversity or something. I mean I don’t know if they meant it, that it’s not diverse or it is diverse or something like that.

Obviously, media about the HSI label in the newspaper or on the campus website is simply not enough for campus community members to make sense of the label at a deeper level.

As members begin to make meaning of changing organizational labels, they may begin to experience identity ambiguity in which they have a loss of clarity in regard to who they are as an organization (Corley & Gioia, 2004). At NSU, some institutional members are aware of the label but have either chosen to ignore it or are too confused by it to make sense of it. Others have become more critical of the fact that they lack awareness of the HSI identity, either because
they want to be included in the HSI grant activities or because they feel they are not being given equal opportunities to apply for the HSI grants themselves.

There’s probably some that if I had awareness of I should be participating in, and trying to get some of that funding myself for my programs. I think it’s exactly how you described it, those who are involved and immersed in it, that’s their world. And there is a lack of transparency to the rest of the campus about those efforts. It’s almost like, “Well we’re helping our own, and we don’t need your help. Maybe that’s not the correct attitude, but that’s the perception I think held by many. (Dr. Eddie Dandridge, White male, coordinator)

Dr. Dandridge wants to know about the programs being developed through HSI Title V grants but feels excluded. People’s awareness and meaning-making began to diverge based on context.

Many of those who are confused about the HSI identity, frustrated about their lack of knowledge, or who, like Dr. Dandridge, wish they were more involved with the current HSI activities on campus, were from the student affairs division. The academic affairs division is responsible for a number of HSI activities being developed since a majority of those people writing grants are faculty members. This has clearly created a divide in awareness and meaning making, as suggested by Dr. Dandridge. There was also a difference by department with those faculty members in the social sciences feeling left out of the HSI conversations.

The joke is, I mean we all know in our department that we're a Hispanic Serving Institution. The joke is that all those funds that come to [NSU] to meet the needs of the Chicano/Latino students has never come to our department. It's always gone to other departments because we have not been invited to the table to be a part of that, and obviously for a good reason, according to them, right? I mean I would disagree with that myself but that's their opinion of the surrounding [NSU] community. (Dr. Raquel Cedillo, Chicana, full professor)

Whether or not some departments are being targeted for writing HSI grants cannot be determined; however, faculty in “technical” majors, including business and engineering, are in fact the majority of principal investigators on the HSI grants at NSU. This discrepancy is questionable considering the fact that chapter five suggests that the faculty in social science, and
in particular Chicana/o Studies, are the faculty using culturally competent curriculum and pedagogy, while those in technical majors have failed to make adjustments to their teaching practices as a result of the changing demographics. As noted by Dr. Samuel Banks (White male, full professor), faculty in the College of Business are also participating in grant activities at lower levels than those is the College of Health and Human Development.

**Aware of HSI Identity, Attaching Meaning to Identity**

Some participants showed signs of a third level of awareness. Not only are they aware of the label but they attach meaning to it. The people who find the HSI identity meaningful are those typically involved in the HSI grant activities including faculty and staff. As noted above, however, students working with the grant activities were not necessarily aware of the HSI identity.

Elexis Ferrera (Latina, coordinator) talked about her awareness progression since, as a student at NSU, she was unaware of the campus’s HSI designation, but has since graduated and is now working with the grant. Through her own research, she has taken time to learn about the designation and is now not only aware of the HSI identity but is proud of it and working to promote it. In talking about her role she said,

> It’s like the identity process, trying to get everyone to connect with it. So, making the logo for it, building the website, doing the social media for it, just making sure there is communication there so students have a place to find more information about it. I feel like there is not enough. People don’t talk about it enough.

To Elexis, being a HSI means developing programs on campus to help students, training faculty to be more culturally competent, and enhancing the regional Latina/o community. Now that she makes sense of the HSI label in this way, she works hard to promote it to others on campus through her media efforts.
Samuel Banks (White male, full professor) went through a similar progression of not knowing about the HSI identity to now being involved with the HSI grant activities. As a faculty member, he learned about it by doing research on various grant opportunities. One he learned about the HSI designation, his first level of meaning making was that the HSI identity essentially means that faculty are eligible for grants that are specifically designated for institutions that are HSIs. He has progressed to being more committed to the goals of increasing overall success of Latina/o students and is now working to make others aware of the outcomes associated with the HSI grant activities. He said,

So yes, I think that if we're able to make the case that this is a project and a program that works that gets people excited, and that has positive outcomes for student success, I think there's going to be much more embrace and willingness to adopt the various practices to the various silos if you will. “Well, if it's been working so well in that department, why shouldn't, why can't we do it here?” and if there is a tangible precedence and so I think it's going to happen, it's just a matter of time for us to make the case that this is indeed effective.

For Samuel, developing the HSI identity includes multifaceted programming that ultimately leads to greater graduation outcomes for Latina/o students. As a person on campus with a tremendous amount of knowledge of the HSI identity and the programs being developed on campus, his commitment is now to disseminating this information to the campus community so others are aware of it.

Being involved with the HSI grant activities clearly creates a different level of consciousness for people on campus. The context, therefore, matters when it comes to constructing the organization’s identity as a HSI. Various contexts that can alter the way member’s make meaning of an organizational identity include time and space (Clegg et al., 2007; Corley & Gioia, 2004). As suggested by Samuel and Elexis, the awareness and meaning-making process is temporal and progressive over time.
There are also people on campus that are not working with the grant activities but still make meaning of the HSI identity in different ways. For them, the meaning making has also been temporal, moving from basic awareness to pride. Administrators, in particular, are proud of the HSI identity because it means that they serve a diverse population. Furthermore, the designation creates opportunities for the campus that would not otherwise be available.

It is the reality of what we are, but it's an understanding too that this is a really a good thing because there's opportunities for grants, and there's opportunities for support, which is nationwide kind of support, and there's opportunities for connections with other HSIs, which is a fantastic thing to be able to do. There [are] opportunities for connections nationally and statewide, but especially nationally and with all the way through the executive branch of the President's office through the legislature through lots of areas to have this understanding and it really, its an understanding of the value that we have as an institution which is connected with the access piece of it, and respect for all people and also to work across difference and understand what that means. To be an HSI, I think, is an honor, I really do. And it helps us to stand out for what we're really doing and again provides opportunity. (Dr. Angela Devine, White female, central administrator)

Several people used the word opportunity to describe the HSI identity. This is an advanced level of awareness, to not only be able to construct the HSI identity as an enrollment driven designation but to be able to see that the HSI identity can be used to create opportunities for all students and the community.

It's, we all know that we have a huge Hispanic population but what does that mean? And what can we do about it? And so this designation gives us the opportunity to make more programs to help out that community. (Dr. Audrey Newman, White female, assistant professor)

This advanced level of awareness leads members to embrace the HSI identity at a deeper level, as something that not only provides opportunities to the campus and community, but also enhances the education of all students, regardless of background.

I think [being a HSI] also means that some of the classes and things that we offer, whether it be Chicano Studies or something, are important, and not only important to Latinos, but also important to other people who are serving Latinos or people who want to operate in a diverse world, because regardless of what they think, this is what’s happening. So you need to be a well-versed and aware and that kind of thing. (Nia Reynolds, Black female, unit director)
People on campus who attach meaning to the HSI identity are finding ways to share their knowledge with others on campus. Although there are three levels of awareness, organizational members are making progress in different ways as a result of their affiliation with the HSI grant activities and their position on campus, with faculty and administrators possessing much deeper levels of awareness and understanding than student affairs staff and students. But for some who have the advanced level of awareness, they are now committed to sharing their knowledge and passion with others. In particular, there are several people on campus who are acting as both advocates for Latina/o students and “champions” for the HSI identity.

**Championing the HSI Identity**

There are a number of people at NSU who are not only advocating on behalf of Latina/o students but championing the efforts to develop the HSI identity. This is a second process that is occurring at NSU in different forms, at different levels, and within different contexts. For many Latina/o and non-Latina/o faculty, staff, and administrators, it is important to advocate for Latina/o students, regardless of the HSI designation, because of the critical mass of Latina/o students on campus. “HSI champions,” however, are advocating for students through grant writing and program development in connection with the HSI designation, as opposed to those who are advocating for Latina/o in general, despite the HSI designation. This section is divided in two, first examining advocacy for Latina/o students and then delving deeper into the activities of HSI champions.

**Advocates for Latina/o Students**

Stanton-Salazar (2010) defines institutional agents as “high-status, non-kin, agents who occupy relatively high positions in the multiple dimensional stratification system, and who are well positioned to provide key forms of social and institutional support” (p. 1066). Institutional
agents support underrepresented students and have the status and capital necessary to challenge the structural hierarchies and social inequalities (Staton-Salazar, 2010). Institutional agents are related to the HSI identity in a number of ways as they not only support Latina/o students in their development and success but also work towards creating equality on campus and minimizing the structural barriers that students face. At NSU, institutional agents advocate for Latina/o students in a variety of ways.

**Advocacy through student support and services.** One way that institutional agents support Latina/o students is through their commitment and dedication to Latina/o students. Their dedication is connected to the organizational identity since they are committed to advocating for students from the region who have been historically underrepresented. Those who chose to work at a regional, master’s granting institution that is designated as a HSI see themselves as advocates for Latina/o and other students of color. When asked to identify what sets institutional agents for Latina/o students apart from others on campus, participants talked about the ways in which faculty and staff support students. The faculty in the Chicana/o Studies department, for example, encourage students to be activists, while the academic counselors in the EOP satellite offices work tirelessly to ensure that students get the academic advisement and social support they need. One participant referred back to when she was a student, talking about the importance of her academic counselor.

My EOP advisor --- he is another one who I feel is a really big advocate for the Latino community, students in general, but I think he’s another one that as a student of color when I was disqualified, he was on top of me monthly to make sure, “Are you passing those classes over there? Are you paying attention? Are you doing what you are supposed to do? Okay, when you're ready to come back and when you pass those classes, here’s what I need you to do. Make this happen and get back here.” Maybe that’s POCs [People of Color] period. Maybe it’s just ---maybe it’s not but I always felt that advocacy from him. (Jada Harris, Black female, coordinator)
As we saw in chapter five, culturally competent educational practices are related to the HSI identity, as are the student support programs. EOP was the main program that participants referred to as reflecting Latina/o students; however, there are other programs on campus that support Latina/o students.

A number of these programs are responsive to the Latina/o population because of the advocacy efforts of those working in these areas. Some participants talked about the coordinator for student organizations, a Latino male, who has made tremendous progress in getting Latina/o students engaged on campus. Others referred to a colleague who has since left NSU, but who made a tremendous impact on the campus as an advocate for Latina/o students.

But, um, she was tireless in her direct mentoring of students, uh, she did work with the Latino Business Association for several years as a direct advisor. The orientation program, which is still tremendously important and produces a tremendous impression on our campus about the diversity of campus, she literally led from that position for eight years, she made a huge impact, and it's just who she is...and you know I said a while ago we made sure that the parent program addresses Spanish speaking students. Well, to be honest, before she was on staff we made some attempts to do so and um...but it was limited then and [led by a Latino student]...[she] created the parent program that really underscored the importance of making sure that those who were there, Spanish speaking, didn't feel like you are not a part of this program. (Marlon Ross, White male, unit director)

Again, the social identity of the faculty and staff is intertwined with their passion and desire to advocate for Latina/o students and ultimately connected to the institution’s identity as a HSI. Participants, however, suggested that race is not the most important indicator of advocacy, with several non-Latina/o administrators being named as strong advocates for the Latina/o community. Being self-identified as Latina/o may be important for those directly supporting Latina/o students, either through advisement or through other student support services, but advocacy can be created in other ways.
**Advocacy through leadership.** Although there are not as many Latina/o administrators as some participants would like to see, there is strong support for Latina/o students at the higher levels of the institution. Participants talked about the importance of relationship building in advocating for Latina/o students. Chicana/o Studies faculty, for example, talked about communicating with the provost and president as a form of advocacy. By staying connected to these central administrators, the faculty in the Chicana/o Studies are able to keep the Latina/o student agenda active while pushing administrators to support these students. Many participants (and in particular Latina/o participants) felt strongly that the central administrators on campus are “reasonable and thoughtful” when it comes to addressing the issues faced by students of color.

But that’s, I think, a battle that we have been facing with the enrollment management, because really there is some faculty who really feel, “Hey, if you are not prepared then maybe we should stop having them come so have room for the ones who are.” And its really our leadership saying, no, and that’s [our provost] and again that’s our director of EOP constantly fighting for our students and saying, “That’s not fair, you forgot about them, what are you going to do about this?” So you do have to have people who are rallying for the students who are easily, you know, can be overlooked. (Constance Berrera, Latina, program director)

Numerous participants referred to the provost as a strong advocate for Latina/o students on campus, saying things like, “Yes, yeah. Yeah [the provost] is very supportive, yeah he is very reasonable, very thoughtful.” (Dr. Dolores Canales, Chicana, full professor). Beyond being reasonable and thoughtful, leaders on campus who advocate for Latina/o students ensure that Latina/o students are seen as a heterogeneous group on campus with multifaceted needs, avoid marginalizing students through deficit rhetoric, encourage faculty and staff of all races and backgrounds to support Latina/o students, and work with the community to ensure their commitment to NSU and its Latina/o students.
**Advocacy through grant writing.** A third way that participants talked about advocacy was through grant writing. This is particularly true for faculty who write grants, and particularly for those who write capacity building grants that support the structural development of the institution, as opposed to those writing grants that are strictly for the purpose of their own research. One faculty member in the College of Science and Math is somewhat of a hero on campus when it comes to advocacy through grant writing. She is extremely valuable to the campus because she has acquired millions of dollars from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, and has been steadfast in her efforts to support students who have been underrepresented in science and math. As suggested by Dr. Charlie Feliciano (Latino, full professor), the grants and programs that she has developed have had a major impact on the campus as a whole.

MARC, MBRS, RISE, [NIH-sponsored programs] yeah, so she has brought in over $20 million over the years to engage those students in research, graduate and undergraduate levels, and that’s helped everybody, obviously the students, the faculty members have those students in their labs. They are sort of pre-picked. They are trained in things that the average student isn’t trained in, so when they come in your lab they can hit the ground running, more than a typical undergraduate would be able to. I think those things are pretty significant impacts on the students in those communities as well as the campus, because it’s not just biology, there is chemistry faculty involved, there are psychology faculty involved. You know it’s hit several colleges across campus.

The way participants referred to Dr. Dolores Canales, it was clear that her efforts to obtain grants are not self-serving, as grant acquisition is typically seen as something faculty do in order to get tenure. Her tireless efforts to support all students in the sciences, however, are noble and come from genuine desire to advocate for all students at NSU. Despite the HSI designation, Dr. Canales has created a culture of support in the sciences and math, ultimately affecting the structures of the institution. As a result, NSU has been named in the top ten master’s granting programs for sending students of color into doctoral programs in the sciences.
HSI Champions

Despite the fact that participants indicated that they would advocate for Latina/o students, regardless of HSI designation, there are also people who are intentionally advocating for Latina/o students on campus because of the designation. Championing the HSI identity is a necessary process in the temporal progression towards becoming a HSI.

Sitting at the highest level of leadership in academic affairs, the provost Dr. Devin Hoffman has been instrumental in championing the HSI identity. There are a number of HSI champions at NSU who credit the provost for his leadership and advocacy in developing their definition of what it means to be a HSI. When he arrived at NSU, he knew it was a HSI and he had already begun to attach his own meaning to an institution that serves a large Latina/o population. Coming from a university system that serves a large urban population, he considers NSU to be very similar in that students are dealing with the same issues and facing the same challenges, academically and personally. He has spent time working with presidents and academic leaders at other HSIs, both within and outside the State University system. He also considers institutions like University of Texas, El Paso (UTEP) to be NSU’s aspirational peer and looks to them for guidance. When he arrived at NSU, he spent the first few years observing, learning, and scouting institutional agents, before he began his own plan for developing the institution’s HSI identity.

I’d been thinking about it, and then it’s a matter of discovering the people who you think can move it along. Because you can’t come in and just decide to do something, you have to come in--figure out what you want to do by talking to people and observing the place, then find out the people who can get the job done. Who are the people or the faculty who can carry the water on these things? Who wants to do it? Who are in the networks that can get this stuff done? You have to know the culture before you can get anything done effectively. That takes a couple of years to see. (Dr. Devin Hoffman, White male, central administrator)
A second HSI champion arrived a few years after the provost and assumed a position in academic administration. As the dean of one of the eight academic colleges, Dr. Rosario Arias also began working with Dr. Hoffman to champion the HSI identity. Prior to her appointment at NSU, Dr. Arias had spent time at another campus in the system where it was routine to talk about what it means to be a HSI and where there was a tremendous amount of HSI related activity going on. To her, it was shocking that NSU had not applied for HSI grant funding in over five years. She immediately took her concerns to Dr. Hoffman and began talking to others about HSI funding opportunities.

Having come from a campus that had a solid track record in securing HSI grants, I remember really constantly raising that issue, "Why are we not applying for," or "We should be applying for," and really trying to raise awareness about the need to take full advantage of the HSI opportunities. (Dr. Rosario Arias, Latina, academic administrator)

At the same time, Dr. Arias began working on a proposal for a HSI RFP that had been released. Her and another faculty member quickly submitted a proposal that was not funded but it was later used to develop the Title V grant that is currently active on campus. The principal investigator of that grant used Dr. Aria’s original proposal as a backbone and further developed it, adding pieces that would force people to collaborate across academic colleges and various units. When that grant was funded, it was evident that a spark had been ignited on campus, under the direct influence of Dr. Hoffman and Dr. Arias. Others on campus began applying for HSI grants, getting creative with the types of grants, as funding agencies limit the number of grants a campus can have at one time.

Dr. Hoffman identified a third HSI champion, Dr. Rita Diaz, to begin coordinating HSI grant efforts since there were clearly a number of interested constituents that wanted to take part in the grant application process. There are now multiple HSI specific grants in multiple academic colleges at NSU (including the College of Business, College of Engineering, and the
College of Health and Human Development) and funded by multiple federal agencies (including the DOE, the USDA, and HUD). Although there are limits to the number of HSI grants an institution can have, NSU has gotten savvy by applying for different types of grants (i.e., single institution grants and cooperative grants) from different agencies. With each grant they have acquired, the process of social reproduction has taken place, making them more eligible for the next HSI grant they have the opportunity to apply for.

Dr. Diaz now serves in an unofficial role coordinating the various activities going on with each grant. She stated, “The campus has not created a position for campus coordinator of HSIs, but if they do, I'd love to do it. It just hasn't happened yet. Okay.” Although her role is not official, the provost has asked her to serve in the role because he believes that she is the best person to do it. She spends a tremendous amount of time talking to people, planning meetings, attending regional and national HSI conferences, and finding HSI grant opportunities. By attending a system-wide meeting, she leaned about a federal RFP for a STEM grant and worked with the dean in the College of Engineering to develop ideas for implementing strategies and best practices for retaining engineering students. The dean submitted a proposal and his grant was also funded.

The leadership provided by these three HSI champions has been instrumental in developing the institution’s organizational identity as a HSI. As Dr. Arias said,

That is, I think, one of the roles that as an administrators, as a campus leader, we can play, is helping others see the bigger vision and not falling into the trap of feeling like you have to be the sole voice, the sole representative of what it means to be a HSI or what it means to be, you know, thoughtful about or mindful about whatever the issue is.

Their leadership has further enhanced faculty member’s ability to apply for and manage HSI grants. Several faculty members are involved in HSI grant activities under Dr. Aria’s leadership and feel empowered by her advocacy.
That's the kind of collaborative effort and our dean is very supportive of that. She gives us a lot of opportunity. She'll give you release time from teaching if she thinks you'll be successful in writing a grant. She did that for me.

In addition to the leaders who are enabling faculty members to apply for grants, the people implementing the activities were also identified as HSI champions. Dr. Joseph Brando (White male, full professor) identified the faculty members who coordinate the faculty training program as strong HSI champions because they are really pushing the bar and helping faculty develop the cultural competence necessary to work with students at a HSI. In particular, he said that faculty who are well respected on campus are more successful at becoming HSI champions.

Because they have the respect of the faculty and so when they get involved in it other people get involved in it or they stand up and take notice, that if somebody that did it that was new they might not get the same kind of following or the same type of attention because they know what she gets involved in is for good reason and the quality of what she is able to produce is always very high.

The data obtained from this unique case suggest that developing a strong HSI identity is a multifaceted process. One aspect of the process is the advocacy that takes place, starting with the well-respected leaders on campus who historically advocated by Latina/o students on campus. The data, however, imply that HSI champions are also critical to moving the institution forward in identifying as an institution that truly serves Latina/o students. HSI champions like Dr. Hoffman, Dr. Arias, and Dr. Diaz have successfully engaged and mobilized people, and in particular faculty members who are willing to apply for HSI grants. These faculty and other staff have committed themselves towards further developing programs on campus that serve Latina/o students. The case of NSU reveals that identification is a temporal process that requires the right amount of synergy between leadership, advocates, and champions willing to dedicate their time and effort to the process.
Capacity Building Through Grant Activities

A third process that is occurring at NSU is that the HSI grants are enabling members to shape what a HSI looks like while helping them make meaning of the HSI identity. Those involved with the grant programs are the most engaged in the construction of the HSI identity. Without HSI funding, enhancing and developing programs that support Latina/o and other students of color is possible, but becomes more difficult, especially in a time when postsecondary institutions are facing economic challenges. Some participants indicated that HSI grant funding “is like the icing on top” that helps the campus better serve Latina/o students and other students of color.

The principal investigators who determine the aspirational goals and objectives laid out explicitly in the HSI grants are shaping the HSI identity by determining what the campus should be focusing on in order to become more “Hispanic-serving.” This section will focus on the stated goals of the HSI grant projects at NSU and their connection to both the federal government’s goals for HSIs and the way members construct their HSI identity. The data are drawn from a combination of the grant proposals submitted to federal agencies, websites outlining the grant requirements of the federal agencies, websites dedicated to the grant-funded projects, and interviews with the project directors and others involved with the grant-funded activities. In order to maintain the site’s confidentiality, direct references are not provided for the documents, but a generic list of the documents reviewed can be found in Appendix G.

Federal HSI Grants and Guidelines

The DOE is the main federal agency that provides funding to HSIs via the Title V Developing Hispanic Serving Institutions Program. According to their website, the program is authorized under Title V, Part A of the Higher Education Act and is intended to “provide grants to assist HSIs to expand educational opportunities for, and improve the attainment of, Hispanic
students. The HSI Program grants also enable HSIs to expand and enhance their academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability” (US Department of Education, 2013). The types of projects that the program seeks to fund fall under the following guidelines:

Funds may be used for activities such as: scientific or laboratory equipment for teaching; construction or renovation of instructional facilities; faculty development; purchase of educational materials; academic tutoring or counseling programs; funds and administrative management; joint use of facilities; endowment funds; distance learning academic instruction; teacher education; and student support services.

The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEOA) amended Section 503(b) of the Higher Education Act to include, among the authorized activities under the HSI Program: activities to improve student services, including innovative and customized instruction courses designed to retain students and move the students into core courses; articulation agreements and student support programs designed to facilitate the transfer of students from two-year to four-year institutions; and providing education, counseling services, and financial information designed to improve the financial and economic literacy of students and their families. The HEOA also amended the authorized activities to use the term "distance education technologies" in place of "distance learning academic instruction capabilities" (US Department of Education, 2013).

The program currently offers five-year individual institutional grants, five-year collaborative grants, and one-year planning grants (US Department of Education, 2013).

In addition to the Title V, Part A program, the DOE also has a HSI program funded through Title III, Part F, HSI Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) and Articulation Program, which was authorized under the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (US Department of Education, 2013). According to the 2010 Request for Proposals (RFP):

The purpose of the HSI STEM & Articulation Programs is to expand and enhance educational opportunities for, and improve the academic attainment of, Hispanic students. The program has two "absolute" priorities to pursue that goal. First, applicants must address how their project will increase the number of Hispanic and other low-income students who will attain degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Second, applicants must address how their project will development model articulation agreements between two-year HSI institutions and four-year institutions (US Department of Education, 2013).
Institutions can apply for each type of DOE grant, including single institution, cooperative, and STEM HSI grants, but can only have one of each at any given time.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) also offers HSI grants under the Hispanic-Serving Institutions Assisting Communities (HSIAC) grant program. According to HUD’s Office of University Partnerships’ (UOP) website, the grants can be used to “revitalize local communities while fostering long-term changes in the way Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) relate to their neighbors and communities.” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2013). Furthermore, UOP has programs for Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian Institutions, Historically Black Colleges/Universities, and Tribal Colleges and Universities. The HSI program aims to address “the most critical social and economic issues that this country faces, including poverty, education, housing, healthcare, and local neighborhood capacity building. In addition, the program assists colleges and universities in integrating community engagement themes into their curriculum, academic studies, and student activities.” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2013).

The USDA is a third federal agency that offers multiple programs for HSIs, including the Hispanic-Serving Institutions National Program and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) HSI Education Grants Program. The HSIs National Program helps to promote the growth of HSIs through strategic partnerships with colleges and universities and more specifically by offering fellowships, scholarships, and internships to faculty and students at HSIs (US Department of Agriculture, 2013). They help faculty to identify grant and funding opportunities for HSIs (US Department of Agriculture, 2013). The NIFA has a competitive grant program for HSIs that is “intended to promote and strengthen the ability of HSIs to carry out higher education programs in food and agriculture (USDA National Institute of Food and
Agriculture, 2013). The goals of the program are to increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students who pursue careers in food, agriculture, nutrition, and natural resources (USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, 2013).

**HSI Grants at NSU**

Since becoming a HSI, NSU has become savvy at securing HSI grants from the various federal agencies offering HSI programs. Table 6.1 lists the HSI specific grants they have obtained since 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Project Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Title V Developing HSIs Program</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Dorothy Bullock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Title V Developing HSIs Program</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Dr. Samuel Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Title V Promoting Post Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Not included in sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Title V STEM &amp; Articulation Program (Cooperative)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Dr. Sidney Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>HSIAC Program</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Not included in sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>HSIAC Program</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Not included in sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>HSIAC Program</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Dr. Carol Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>NIFA HSI Education Program</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Dr. Carol Foster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eight grants listed, five are active with a majority of the academic colleges currently engaging in HSI grant activities. Five colleges, including the College of Business, the College of Engineering, the College and Health and Human Development, the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the College of Social Sciences, are participating in the single institution grant funded by the DOE while the College of Engineering is also involved in a collaborative STEM grant funded by the DOE. The College of Health and Human Development houses two grants that are focused on community engagement, funded by HUD and the USDA. The College of Education houses the fifth active HSI grant that is funded by the DOE’s Title V Promoting Post Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans program. According to their website,
the grant is intended to promote the post-baccalaureate educational opportunities of Latina/o students by increasing their participation in teacher credential programs and master’s programs focused on multicultural education. I was unable to interview the project director for this grant and could not access the grant proposal from the federal government; therefore, I have excluded further analysis of this program for this study. I have also excluded analysis of the HSIAC grants funded in FY 2000 and FY 2002 for the same reasons; however, archived abstracts listed on the HUD website revealed that both grants focused on establishing and expanding neighborhood service programs in a regional neighborhood where 70% of the residents at Latina/o and 50% receive some form of public assistance.

One thing to note is that few student services departments are participating in the grant process with the exception of the university library and the career center. A majority of the activities, however, are focused on enhancing the academic success of students through support services such as peer mentoring, first year experience courses, tutoring, and transfer assistance. One grant is focused on faculty development and training with the ultimate goal of enhancing the learning environment for students while the grants funded by HUD and the USDA are externally focused, aside from employing NSU students to work with the community.

In using the grant proposals, documents pertaining to the grants, and interviews with the project directors to analyze the way NSU co-constructs its identity as a HSI, I recognize that the principal investigators writing the grants are placing value on the chosen activities, as are the federal agencies funding these programs. As laid out in the previous section, each federal agency has specific goals for their HSI programs and develops RFPs based on the specific needs of their agency and the federal government as a whole. As a fellow in the USDA HSI National Program (June 2006) I learned that the USDA is prioritizing HSIs as a way to recruit more
Latinas/os to replace the retiring White “baby boomers.” They have a specific interest in employing more people of color and believe that focusing their outreach efforts on MSIs is an important way to fulfill their goal. The implementation of the HSI STEM and Articulation program in 2010 is connected to President Obama’s goals to increase support for HSIs (White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, 2011) and recommendations to increase the number of STEM undergraduate degree holders by one million over the next decade (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 2012).

Although some faculty expressed concerns about the fact that NSU’s grants and contracts office targets certain areas with HSI grants, the reality is that the federal government determines the priorities of these grants based on their own objectives. In order to be successful at securing HSI funds, NSU has been strategic about whom to involve in grant activities. The HSI champions discussed in the previous section are targeting faculty that can develop proposals that are likely to be funded based on the guidelines set forth by the federal government. For example, Dr. Rita Diaz (Latina, academic administrator) worked directly with the College of Engineering in order to secure a HSI STEM and Articulation grant from the DOE. Although the Chicana/o Studies program is connected to the way participants make sense of NSU’s identity as a HSI, the faculty in the Chicana/o Studies Department may not be a good match for developing a project connected to the DOE’s focus on STEM recruitment and retention. At the same time, many of the HSI program goals are broad enough to allow flexibility and creativity in developing proposals. The Chicana/o Studies Department could certainly find ways to match their abilities with the goals laid out by the general Title V Developing Institutions Program. Either way, the strong influence of the external environment, and more specifically the federal government, cannot be denied when examining NSU’s co-construction of their HSI identity. To further
illustrate this, Table 6.2 shows the correlation between the goals listed by the DOE, HUD, and USDA for their HSI programs and the goals listed for four of the five active grant projects.

Table 6.2  
*Correlation Between Federal Agency Goals and Project Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; FY</th>
<th>HSI Program Goals</th>
<th>Project Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE Single Institution FY 2010</td>
<td>To provide grants to assist HSIs to expand educational opportunities for, and improve the attainment of, Hispanic students. The HSI Program grants also enable HSIs to expand and enhance their academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability</td>
<td>The goals are to (1) improve six-year graduation rates of all students, (2) to close the graduation rate gap for Latino students, (3) to increase fall to fall retention of Latino freshmen students, and (4) to increase [NSU’s] endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE STEM Cooperative FY 2011</td>
<td>The program has two &quot;absolute&quot; priorities: (1) applicants must address how their project will increase the number of Hispanic and other low-income students who will attain degrees in STEM and (2) applicants must address how their project will develop model articulation agreements between two- and four-year HSI institutions</td>
<td>The primary objectives are to: (1) increase the number of Hispanic and low-income students who successfully transfer from [community college A and B], (2) to increase the number of Hispanic and low-income students who graduate from NSU in engineering and computer science, and (3) to develop a model, seamless transfer program for Hispanic and low-income students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA FY 2010</td>
<td>The goals of the program are to increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students who pursue careers in food, agriculture, nutrition, and natural resources</td>
<td>Increase retention of undergraduate Hispanic nutrition students from 62% to 72%; Increase the professional competencies of 48 Hispanic and underrepresented nutrition undergraduates in the field of breastfeeding education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD FY 2010</td>
<td>To revitalize local communities while fostering long-term changes in the way HSIs relate to their neighbors and communities</td>
<td>The goal of this project is to reduce the overweight and obesity rate of children in the [regional] community by 9% by the end of the grant period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this section will further describe five of NSU’s HSI grants (one historical grant and four active grants) with an emphasis on the way the stated goals and objectives are connected to participant’s construction of NSU’s HSI identity. Table 6.3 provides a summary of the thematic analysis conducted on three of the HSI grant proposals obtained through the federal government’s Freedom of Information Act Request (FOIA). More specifically, I quantified the
number of times that each grant made reference to the four core values connected to NSU’s identity as a HSI (see chapter four). The analysis was limited to the abstract and narrative provided in the grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; FY</th>
<th>Regionally Focused</th>
<th>Commitment to Community</th>
<th>Dedicated to Access</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE FY 2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE FY 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD FY 2010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that the way principal investigators perceive of and idealize NSU’s identity is not necessarily aligned with the way members co-constructed their identity in this study. The most references were made to some form of diversity (coded to include reference to broad terms related to diversity as well as individual groups such as Latina/o, low income, and underserved). There were very few references to the institution’s commitment to access. There was, however, a greater emphasis on retention and graduation in both the DOE grants, as suspected, in order to align with the DOE’s HSI program goals. Perhaps there is less emphasis on access within these grants because NSU is already strongly committed to access. Instead, they are using these grants to enhance their weaknesses, which include graduating Latina/o students in lower numbers compared to White students. Within the HUD narrative, there was a greater emphasis on partnering with the region and providing service to the community, again related to the goals of HUD’s HSI program. Although the thematic analysis suggests that there is a disconnect between the way principal investigators construct the HSI identity within grants narratives in comparison to participants in this study, there are other ways that the two are connected.
Increasing Latina/o Student Success Through Library Services (DOE FY 2002)

NSU received a five-year, $1.6 million DOE Title V grant in 2002. The grant helped shape the early construction of the HSI identity, with an emphasis on strengthening the library archival services and collections in order to increase the success of Latina/o students. As stated in the grant, Latina/o student success will be enhanced through the following activities: (1) continue to build an outstanding Library collection, including print, electronic, and media that supports the University's teaching and research mission related to Hispanic history, social sciences, and culture, (2) continue to build a Teacher Curriculum Center collection that supports the University’s credential candidates and teachers from the surrounding community, (3) acquire, process, and digitize archival and rare publication collections to preserve and provide access to Hispanic heritage, and (4) contribute to student academic success by increasing library use and information competence.

Despite the criticism from some participants that these grants are only being obtained by those that are not connected to the areas on campus that are most reflective of the institution’s commitment to serving Latinas/os, the 2002 library grant was connected to the Chicana/o Studies program and focused on Chicana/o history, art, and social sciences. Additionally, the grant had an emphasis on teacher education and curriculum development, a discipline on campus that is heavily populated by Latina/o student enrollment. The goals of the grant were also connected to NSU’s commitment to serving the region, with 33 references made to this goal throughout the narrative (the second most cited as seen in Table 6.3). Although it is difficult for the library to accurately track library competence and usage by racial/ethnic groups, the grant had a number of tangible goals that have been met, including increasing electronic, print, and media collections that reflect Latina/o culture.
The fact that the federal government funded the grant indicates that the infrastructure of an HSI is connected to the HSI identity. At NSU, the campus library is an important structural dimension that reflects an HSI identity, despite the fact that few participants talked about it. In referring back to the culturally competent educational practices at NSU, the fact that the library has an extensive collection of Chicana/o and Latina/o holdings is reflective of the value placed on Chicana/o and Latina/o history, arts, and culture. By funding this grant, the federal government placed a value on this type of infrastructure development as a way to enhance the HSI identity.

Although it was not her intention, the project director for the 2002 library grant also helped to shape the institution’s identity as an HSI. In many ways she did not want to be the face of the HSI grant and talked extensively about the way she saw her role.

And my philosophy was, it’s not my subject area, Chicano history, Latino history. I had to research it to write the application, but that’s not, I’m a [social science] librarian, that’s not my subject of discipline, that doesn’t, I don’t think I have to be Latina to study it, but it just wasn’t -- I was just like, “Bing, you’re it.” Because the Chicano Studies librarian was like, “I don’t have time to do this.” And she didn’t, she’s really busy so, and I was untenured and my dean said, “Write this grant. It will look really really good when you go for tenure if, especially if it’s funded.” I said “Well I don’t know, I’m scared, I’ve never written a federal plan.”

So my philosophy was, “I’m the pencil pushing geek in the background. I get the funding, I write the checks,” you know, I mean sort of. But I mean I, that was, I was the administrative side of it, but in terms of the -- And I wrote the basic goals and objectives of the grant, you know, in consultation with all of the people that had more of a stake in it, more of a vested interest. (Dorothy Bullock, White female, program director)

Dorothy preferred to stay in the background because she did not want people to question her motivation. As a White woman with little expertise in Chicana/o Studies, she worried that people would wonder why she was the project director on a grant that focused on Latina/o student success and the enhancement of the library’s Chicana/o collections. Dorothy said, “I was just purely; I was in the wrong place at the wrong time.” Although she was originally having
conversations with librarians at other campuses with the hope of applying for a collaborative grant, she ultimately was the sole author on the grant and applied because her dean encouraged her to. Although it served her well, as she got tenure, she struggled with it. She believed in what they were doing with the grant and worked hard to fulfill the goals of the grant, but never intended to become an expert in Chicana/o Studies, the face of the grant, or more importantly, the face of NSU as a HSI. Although few participants talked about the 2002 library grant or the ways the outcomes of the grant reflect their identity as a HSI, Dorothy said that outsiders still contact her for advice in writing HSI grants and for more information about the activities and outcomes of the grant. A website dedicated to the grant is still active from the main NSU website, sending a message about its permanence within the structures of the institution. Few internal members, however, connected the grant and its activities to the development of a HSI identity.

Improving Success for Latina/o and Low Income Students (FY 2010)

NSU received a second multimillion-dollar Title V grant from DOE in 2010. As an active grant on campus that engages multiple faculty and staff across multiple disciplines, it is having a tremendous effect on the construction of a HSI identity for NSU. When participants talk about HSI grants at NSU, they immediately refer to “Samuel’s grant.” According to the proposal submitted, the grant has the following stated goals: (1) to improve the six-year graduation rates of all students at the University, (2) to close the graduation rate gap for Latino students, (3) to increase fall to fall retention of Latino freshmen students, and (4) to increase NSU’s endowment. More specifically, the grant funding is being used to augment existing programs including expanding the first year experience program (with an emphasis on disciplines), expanding a community service-learning program, enhancing a math pre-remediation
program, and extending the faculty mentorship program. Additionally, the grant has been used to develop a peer-mentoring program, offer a peer learning facilitators program, implement a faculty training program, and launch a career pathways program.

The coding density (reference Table 7) suggests that the language used in the grant is not strongly correlated with the core values used by participants to construct their identity. Aside from the heavy use of the term diversity in its various forms, there were minimal connections to the institution’s commitment to access and its regional focus. Perhaps, again, because the focus was on fulfilling the objectives laid out by the DOE, which is primarily concerned with retention and graduation. The rhetoric used in the grant and by those working with the grant, however, suggests that there are a number of vital processes connected to the organizational identity of a HSI. First, mentoring was a strong theme, both in the grant application and throughout participant’s construction of their identity as a HSI.

Particularly, I think this project brings a mentorship experience at the forefront of what we do. We integrate mentorship, both peer mentorship and faculty mentorship throughout the various interventions that we do, and that’s, I think, something that was not strongly embedded in our programs and the cultures before, and I think that’s something that this project uniquely brings to the table, and so if there’s one thing that I wish, I hope that will be taken and be embedded into the university practices is the mentorship. (Dr. Samuel Banks, White male, full professor)

A suggested by Dr. Banks, mentoring activities were largely missing at NSU prior to the acquisition of the grant. As the principal investigator, he chose to focus on mentoring as an important element. Mentoring was also missing from the rhetoric used by participants in constructing their identity as a HSI. Although mentoring is often cited as an important process in supporting Latina/o students (Hernandez & Lopez, 2004-2005; Hurtado & Kamimura, 2003; Zalaquett & Lopez, 2006) it may not be an essential element in the construction of an organizational identity for HSIs. This is a point of contention between what the grant writers and
grant funders believe to be important for Latina/o students and the actual construction of a HSI identity. Through interviews, mentoring did not rise as a deeply held values or practice by people at NSU, although aspects of mentoring were present in participant’s reflections of culturally competent pedagogy. Ladson-Billings (1995) suggests that culturally relevant teachers focus on social relations with their students and the communities in which their students are from. In many ways, good mentors do the same thing.

A second theme that was strong within the context of the grant was faculty training. In looking at the organizational structures that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission, culturally competent pedagogy was both present and necessary. The grant, therefore, is helping to enhance faculty member’s ability to be more culturally relevant and responsive to the needs of Latina/o students. Those faculty that are involved with the faculty learning community talked extensively about their own development, crediting the grant for their progression in regard to serving Latina/o students. An important thing to note is that in the way they are approaching faculty training, they are considering the faculty to be deficient in skills, as opposed to the dominant rhetoric of viewing the student as deficient, often as a result of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic background.

And so the faculty learning community is trying to address some of those deficiencies by providing the faculty with a little bit, I mean its not a whole lot, but it’s a little bit of the tools that they can integrate easily to carry with them to their classrooms. So that's, I think, is one thing that we've done as a way of alleviating that issue. (Dr. Samuel Banks, White male, full professor)

Although faculty self select into the program, they are committed to disseminating the information to others in their college who are willing to engage in conversations about helping Latina/o students. The theme of training faculty to be more culturally relevant is aligned with
the rhetoric used by participants to describe the ways in which the institution reflects a Latina/o-serving mission, as culturally relevant pedagogy is considered an essential structural element.

A third theme within the grant is the enhancement of the first year experience program. NSU has had a long standing first year experience program in which students take a University 100 course in order to learn about the basic skills for surviving in college. Often used by postsecondary institutions as a tool for retention, the grant enabled NSU to offer additional sections of University 100. But in addition to the course, the grant has added elements that make the experience more holistic for students. The students participating through the Title V program are enrolled in three courses together in order to create a cohort experience for them. Additionally, there is an emphasis on their discipline so that students in the same major are taking courses together in order to learn more about the discipline in their first year. Students are also assigned a peer mentor and receive career advising through the Career Center.

The other one is in the freshman connection program where we infuse so much more richer resources to their learning experience, so it may not be necessarily what they learn that we added, but what they -- the resources that are available for them in learning, the tools that are available for them in their learning experience that we've enhanced that make it a much more robust experience. So adding the peer mentor, adding the faculty mentor, and adding a career advisor to incoming freshman, how powerful that was to the existing freshmen connection program, which was really a bare bones type of a program where you, they just took a class and another class together and that was it. Now we’ve added all this additional support services to it. (Dr. Samuel Banks, White male, full professor)

The grant has basically taken existing elements and strung them together into a holistic experience for students. According to the project director, preliminary results show that participating students are successfully persisting into the second year, which is a main goal of the grant.

Aside from those involved in the grant activities, few participants suggested that the freshman experience program is reflective of the Latina/o population at NSU. Despite the fact
that the program has been in existence at NSU for over 10 years, and one in which several participants have taught in, it was not a powerful theme. This is another area where the rhetoric of the grant diverges from the actual practices that were suggested as the most reflective of the institution’s HSI identity. Perhaps as Dr. Banks suggested, the grant is giving the campus the opportunity to experiment with this intervention as a way to enhance the experience for Latina/o students and it may ultimately become intertwined with the HSI identity.

Few participants not directly involved with the grant talked about the grant activities, indicating that the programs have not become engrained within the structures of the institution in the same pervasive way that EOP and Chicana/o Studies have; however, the grant-funded activities are in fact contributing to the institution’s identity as a HSI. Those that are involved with the activities are proud to be involved and are excited about the opportunities that the grant is offering to the campus. Unlike Dorothy, Dr. Banks has embraced his role and understands that he has become the face of the HSI grant and ultimately the HSI identity. He said the following about his initial motivations for becoming involved in the grant activities,

The reason I got involved -- I have been involved with other projects… I have been involved in community engagement a lot. And so I was looking for additional resources to support the community engagement activities that I have been pursuing in the past 10 years. And having been designated as a HSI, that provided us with a window of opportunities and different grants and sources of funding that we would not otherwise be eligible for.

And so that was our, my initial interest, and then all of a sudden there was that and so much more and it provided us with an opportunity, not only to affect our students in my department, which is what I've been doing in the past, but much broader in the college and university wide. So that's been a really exciting part of this whole project. It's the ability to [have an] impact on a macro level…[have an impact] on so many different fronts.

Dr. Banks believes in the grant and in the HSI identity and is wholeheartedly committed to the success of the program as well as increasing the retention and success of all students, not just
Latina/o students. Others had similar sentiments as suggested by Dr. Virginia Woolf (White female, full professor):

And I mean, I certainly uphold the cultural belief that anything we do for any students here is good for all students here and good for the institution, so it's clear that strengthening support for people enrolled in designated sections of University 100, if you can support those students and give them someone to look to for help or for community, then you are more likely not to lose more students even if they're not in the class because there will be a habit of, "Well, I know, let me help." That will be the dominant cultural model for the university. That's probably all I can say but feel free to ask me further or again.

**Attracting, Inspiring, and Mentoring Engineering Students (DOE STEM FY 2011)**

In 2011, NSU received a collaborative DOE Title V STEM and Articulation grant in order to support and retain more engineering students. The College of Engineering is working with two local community colleges to increase the success of students interested in engineering. There are three main goals of the grant including: (1) to increase the number of Hispanic and low income students who successfully transfer from the community college into engineering degrees at NSU, (2) to increase the number of Hispanic and low income students who graduate from the College of Engineering, and (3) to develop a seamless transfer program that will assist Hispanic and low income students. More specifically, they have created a cohort program that admits 15-30 students per year at each of the three campuses over the five years of the grant. The students remain involved in the program until they graduate. The students take classes together, receive academic counseling, participate in tutorial and mentoring activities, and gain career advisement.

The main goals of the cohort are to create a sense of community for students and to provide academic assistance. The students receive a stipend for participating and are given the opportunity to conduct academic research with a faculty member over the summer. The summer research component is an important way for students to develop a deeper understanding of engineering at an early stage in their academic career. Students are also asked to give back to the
community by providing outreach to their high schools and talking to incoming students about engineering. In order to create a seamless transfer experience, faculty at each of the three campuses are also developing stronger articulation agreements for the core engineering courses and working collaboratively with the use of tablet PCS.

So one of the aspects of our grant is we have tablets, tablet PCs, and the faculty would actually, let's say you have a Tablet and I have one, and, we're working on a course together, you come in and say "Sidney, what do you think about this way of teaching?" And, I respond, and we build curriculum together so that, ultimately at the end of the semester, the curriculum that is developed in the community college is fully vetted by the faculty at the university. Why would we not articulate it at the point because you and I have worked on it together? (Dr. Sidney Davis, Asian American/Pacific Islander male, academic administrator)

The project director talked extensively about his commitment to the success of all undergraduate students in engineering. In applying for the grant, his main motivation was to increase the institution’s capacity for supporting Latina/o and other underrepresented students. He believes that the grant is not only connected to the institution’s HSI identity but that it sets NSU apart from sister campuses in the system that are also HSIs. He stated, “Now, if you look across the system...we are unique in that we have demonstrated success. The grant is one example of that.” Like Dr. Banks, he strongly believes that the outcomes of the grant will have an institutional effect.

To the point that, I firmly believe, that, whatever success we achieve with this grant will have broad ramifications across the university. For instance, in articulation, everything we do in this grant, there is no reason why it can't work with the other community colleges here. (Dr. Sidney Davis, Asian American/Pacific Islander male, academic administrator)

Assisting the Regional Community (HUD FY 2010; USDA FY 2010)

In addition to the current DOE HSI grants that focus on building the institution’s capacity for successfully graduating Latina/o students, NSU is actively serving the regional community using grants from HUD and the USDA. Under the direction of Dr. Carol Foster (White female,
associate professor), there are a number of community-based programs that are being implemented, further contributing to the institution’s identity as a HSI. Unlike the two DOE grant proposals reviewed, the HUD FY 2010 grant proposal made a high number of references to serving the community and being committed to the region. The HUD grants, however, are intended to increase connections between HSIs and their regional community. The language used in the grant, therefore, was dictated by the RFP and the objectives laid out by HUD.

The goals of the HUD FY 2010 grant are to increase children’s physical fitness and improve their healthy eating habits. Specifically, NSU is implementing a comprehensive, multi-component program at three regional elementary schools, each with at least 80% Latina/o student enrollment. Latina/o and low-income people, with a 29% childhood obesity rate, largely populate the region. The program is being implemented by five faculty members who are working to educate and inform both children and parents in the community about the benefits and requirements for incorporating a healthy lifestyle. Using a three-prong approach, they are focusing on physical activity, recess time, and nutrition.

Dr. Foster also directs a two-year USDA grant that is addressing the obesity issue in regional communities through breastfeeding awareness and education. The goal of the grant is to decrease obesity, as the prevalence of obesity in both children and mothers decreases through nursing. The funding is being used to train master’s and undergraduate students who are bilingual in English and Spanish to become certified lactation educators. These students receive stipends while providing a valuable service to the regional community. Not only is the grant benefitting the regional Latina/o community but it is also helping Latina/o NSU students fund their education.

The funding that I gave them was at their discretion. If they already had some type of a loan for tuition or their books, I gave them childcare, bus, parking, whatever the other
barriers might be and they didn't have to tell me what they were, they just had to give us the receipts and we just paid them up to a certain amount every semester. We found, I found that to be more valuable than dictating what the student might need. (Dr. Carol Foster, White female, associate professor)

Dr. Rosario Arias (Latina, academic administrator) further underscored the importance of these programs in increasing the pipeline for Latinas/os into graduate programs. She talked about a lack of representation of Latinas/os in various graduate programs in health but has found that by providing students with training in areas such as lactation education, they are able to learn about different pathways into the health field while gaining valuable experience that can increase their chances of gaining admission into graduate level programs.

Assisting the regional community is clearly related to the core values that members expressed when defining who they are as an organization. Although participants defined community in different ways, they expressed a commitment to serving the people of the local region. The grants focused on assisting the community, therefore, are strongly connected to the organizational identity as co-constructed by members. Additionally, when asked what the measure of success would be for a HSI, participants talked about the importance of community.

I think that if we can show that we're serving students and meeting their needs, both in the classroom and in the community and in their families, and, watching their success when they leave, that would be a success. That the fact of the matter is that we're touching lives. You know, even touching the lives of like the mothers who never ever, no one ever approached them for lactation services or the kids who are obese and we're trying to change that, you know? I think that would be successful. (Dr. Audrey Newman, White female, assistant professor)

The capacity building activities that are going on at NSU are related to the construction of the HSI identity in a number of ways. The grant proposals themselves can be used to determine the ways in which organizational members (and more specifically the principal, investigators) construct their identity as a HSI. The actual activities also incite a variety of responses from members who see the activities and programs as necessary to the construction of
an organizational identity as a HSI. Although a number of members are unaware of the grant activities, particularly those working in student services units, their importance cannot be overlooked. As a result of their grant activities, NSU is in a position to become an exemplar HSI, as they are applying to grants from different agencies in order to develop a variety of programs and services that are ultimately connected to their core values.

Chapter Summary

Early theories of organizational identity suggested that an organization’s identity is enduring over time (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Organizational behaviorists, however, now believe that an identity can in fact change over time as a result of internal or external stimuli (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). At NSU, there is evidence that the way members construct their organizational identity is shifting as a result of both internal processes and external factors. The most powerful external factor is the change in the population of college-aged students. Although NSU originally served a predominantly White population, they have been enrolling a large number of compositionally diverse students for a majority of their history. “Serving” Latina/o students, therefore, is part of their core identity despite any federal designation that they have. The question, however, is how well do they serve Latina/o students? Lower graduation rates for Latina/o students in comparison to White students suggest that they still have some work to do in order to effectively “serve” Latina/o students. Learning what it means to be an effective HSI is a temporal process being shaped by a number of factors.

As seen through the process of capacity building at NSU, the federal government is shaping what it means to be a HSI. NSU has become savvy at securing federal grant money, suggesting that there is a level of social reproduction in that “success breeds future success,” making it easier for NSU to obtain HSI grants because they have been quite successful in the past few years. But the reality is that the federal government is a powerful player in the grant
world, with individual agencies placing value on the types of capacity building activities that institutions participate in. Increasing the pipeline of students of color into STEM careers, for example, is a priority for the federal government (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 2012). Grant proposals that address this concern, therefore, are likely to be weighted higher in the review process. Institutions like NSU that have figured out the formula for success in obtaining grants are well aware of the values the federal government places on a variety of activities, making them more likely to focus on these types of activities in their grant applications. But how does this shape the way NSU constructs its identity as a HSI? Chapter five focused on the deeply held assumptions and cultural practices that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, including the historical presence of culturally relevant curriculum, pedagogy, and student services. Aside from the 2002 library grant, however, the Chicana/o Studies program has been absent in most of the HSI grants, with little attention being paid to the significance that the program has had on shaping the institution’s identity as a HSI. Understanding the factors related to this oversight, however, is beyond the scope of this study.

Although the federal government has a powerful influence on the HSI identity, there is also a level of agency that institutions must possess in constructing their organizational identity. First and foremost, as the population shifts, postsecondary institutions must decide whether or not to respond to these changes. Although NSU is actively thinking about its diverse population, it may in fact be an anomaly. By this I mean that institutions do not automatically adjust to external pressures, particularly those related to changing demographics. Advocates and “HSI champions” have actively embraced NSU’s identity, causing a shift in the way people think about serving their Latina/o students and other students of color. HSI champions recognize that they cannot be the sole people responsible for “holding the HSI flag,” and instead have found
ways to empower others to embrace this identity and enabled them to attain the grant funding necessary for shaping the institution’s HSI identity. NSU has multiple people at all levels of the institution taking control of their identity and the ways in which people think about their status as a HSI. Although it may only be a handful of institutional members, they have in fact developed the agency to shape who they are as an organization.

The processes occurring at NSU are essential to the construction of an organizational identity as a HSI. Although it is assumed the awareness of the HSI identity is important, it may not vital, as there are a number of structures that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission, despite the HSI designation. Once people are aware of the HSI designation, however, they must also attach meaning to this label. The level of meaning making that they have is unequivocally related to the context in which they reside within the institution. Beyond awareness, the advocacy efforts of both Latina/o and non-Latina/o institutional agents are essential in moving the organization’s identity forward. Enhancing the institution’s capacity to serve and graduate Latina/o students and other students of color is also essential. These processes contribute to the already established programs and services that are present, as seen in chapter five, and ultimately shape the way institutional members construct their organizational identity.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

In the last four decades, there has been a burgeoning of the Latina/o student population in both two- and four-year colleges and universities. This proliferation has led to the development of a new federal designation, Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), for postsecondary institutions enrolling 25% or more undergraduate Latina/o students. HSIs currently enroll over 50% of all Latina/o college students (Mercer & Stedman, 2008; Santiago, 2008) and have been recognized as important contributors to the educational advancement of Latinas/os (White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, 2011). Although President Obama and his current administration continue to support HSIs, as suggested by the inclusion of HSIs in recent legislation including the America COMPETES Act of 2010 and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (HCERA) of 2010, federal funding for these institutions continues to be threatened (Dervarics, 2011). For this reason, there is a need for empirical data to show the unique contribution that HSIs can have in educating an increasingly diverse student body.

The perennial question facing HSIs is what does it mean to serve Latina/o students? As an emerging institutional form, HSIs are undergoing the process of establishing a clear set of normative behaviors and values that can be used to answer this question. With the support of organizations such as the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), HSI administrators are working towards establishing themselves as a well-established organizational field, defined by DiMaggio and Powell (1983) as an aggregate of organizations bounded by commonalities including resources, suppliers, consumers, products, and regulatory agencies. This identification process is temporal, ongoing, and vital to the survival of HSIs. Having a clear organizational identity is an important way for organizations to establish legitimacy and manage their external environment (Hsu & Hannan, 2005). By determining what it actually means to be
a HSI, these institutions can establish themselves as a legitimate organizational form that requires support from the federal government in order to serve the public good while contributing to President Obama’s 2020 goal of having the most college graduates in the world.

The purpose of this study was to determine the ways in which various members of a postsecondary institution co-construct their organizational identity as a HSI. Using a case study design, I examined the way one large, public, four-year master’s granting institution (Naranja State University; NSU) is undergoing the process of identifying as a HSI. Rather than searching for a generalizable way for all institutions to define themselves as HSIs, this study contributes to a theoretical understanding of organizational identity construction, with a specific focus on one distinct organizational label. The evidence provided by this case challenges the notion that the HSI identity is strictly manufactured (Contreras et al., 2008). Contreras and colleagues (2008) contend that the HSI identity is “manufactured” because it is strictly enrollment driven, making it unplanned, unstable, and variable from year to year. Furthermore, they argue, “their conversion [to HSI] seems to be accidental and evolutionary rather than strategically planned” (Contreras et al., 2002, p. 85). This, however, fails to account for individual agency within HSIs, as evidenced in this case by NSU’s historical legacy of social activism and transformation, their long-term commitment to providing access to traditionally underserved communities (which often includes Latina/o students), their intentional capacity building activities developing as a result of HSI grants, and their enduring championship and advocacy for Latina/o students.

Through their review of the institutional mission statements of 10 HSIs, Contreras and colleagues (2008) assert that the HSI identity is “closeted” and “invisible,” simply because none of the 10 made reference to the institution’s identity as a HSI. At the same time, Contreras et al. (2008) recognize that the role of institutional mission statements is controversial, with some
scholars citing that mission statements are intentionally ambiguous and others arguing that they have a cultural significance that sends a message about the institution’s commitment to certain groups, values, and priorities. Although Contreras and colleagues make important points about the relevance of institutional mission statements, to conclude that the HSI identity is fake or “manufactured” because of the omission of “HSI” from the mission statement of 10 institutions fails to recognize that some HSIs are in fact enacting a Latina-serving mission in other ways. This study posits that the HSI identity is integrated with the institution’s core mission and values and enacted through activities and processes at various levels of the organization.

In addition to their argument that the lack of recognition of HSI status in the institutional mission statement denotes a “closeted” identity, Contreras et al. (2008) show a lack of equitable outcomes for Latina/o students at HSIs, which could also be indicative of a “manufactured” identity. Arguably, an institution that is effectively “serving” Latina/o students should in fact graduate them in equitable numbers as White students at HSIs and/or equal numbers as Latinas/os at non-HSIs. In recognizing that Latina/o students are more likely to be oppressed throughout their educational trajectory, HSIs must work harder to combat the discrimination and racism that these students have endured, which often renders them less prepared for college and less likely to graduate. This is obviously difficult for institutions to do. Contreras et al. (2008) declare that, “HSIs [have] yet to create a sense of collective responsibility and accountability among institutional leaders and faculty members for producing equitable educational outcomes for Latina/o students (p. 87). Although the data in this case verify that their continues to be a lack of equitable outcomes for Latina/o students at HSIs, as the graduation rates for Latina/o students at NSU are in fact lower than those of White students, to say that institutional leaders and faculty members have not created a sense of collective responsibility for changing the
outcomes of Latina/o students, however, is not substantiated by the data. Some administrators, faculty, and staff at NSU recognize these disparities and are enacting their agency in order to enhance outcomes for all students. Evidence shows that this is happening in segments across the campus, which may be why the outcomes of Latina/o students continue to fall behind those of their White counterparts. Although Contreras and colleagues (2008) make a strong case for calling the HSI identity “manufactured,” this study highlights the ways in which the HSI identity may be in fact become real and intentional as opposed to intangible and haphazard.

In this chapter I will detail the process of constructing an organizational identity. Guided by a model proposed by Ravasi and Schultz (2006), this study provides proof that both sensegiving and sensemaking are used during the co-construction of the organizational identity in postsecondary institutions. I will then discuss the main research question by providing a summary of the three findings chapters, which specifically examined the organizational values, structures, and processes that were used to construct the HSI identity at NSU. In this discussion I will present an emerging theoretical framework that is specific to the construction of a HSI identity in postsecondary institutions that can subsequently be useful in investigating the 311 institutions that are HSIs and 242 emerging HSIs (in 2010), which educate the majority of the growing Latina/o population. In conclusion, I will offer implications for research, practice, and policy.

Co-constructing an Organizational Identity

It is generally accepted that organizational identity is the perception that members have about the central, distinct, and enduring features of the organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Organizational scholars, however, have developed different views of how organizational identities emerge and change over time, with two distinct perspectives on organizational identity including the social actor perspective and the social constructionist perspective (Ran & Golden,
The social actor perspective is based on principles of institutional theory whereby an organization’s self-categorization is based on social norms and is dependent on the context (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). From this perspective, organizations develop a self-definition based on their own conception of self in comparison to other organizations, with an inherent need to determine identity claims that are unique from other organizations in the same category (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Sensegiving is used to construct an organizational identity based on consistent and legitimate narratives that founders and subsequent leaders provide for members about the collective sense of self (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Proponents of this perspective view organizational identities as deeply held beliefs rooted in formal identity claims that endure over time and are fairly resistant to change (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006).

Scholars who believe in the social constructionist perspective view organizational identities as more malleable, often evolving as a result of both internal and external stimuli (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Organizational identities are instead based on a collective understanding of central and distinct elements in organizations (Gioia et al., 2000). From this perspective, shared understandings about organizational self are negotiated and modified in light of changes in the environment (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Proponents of the social constructionist perspective argue that although labels are enduring over time, the meanings that members attach to these labels change (Gioia et al., 2000). As a cognitive process, members use sensemaking to construct an understanding of central features that make them distinct from other organizations (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). The process of sensemaking, which literally means to make sense, is most relevant to organizations that are loosely coupled and more open to the environment (Weick, 1995), as are postsecondary institutions.
Building off of Hatch and Schultz’s (2002) theory of organizational identity, which states that identity is a dynamic interplay of both culture and image, Ravasi and Schultz (2006) offered a theoretical model for understanding the way an organization revises its understanding of self in response to an external identity threat. They proposed that both the sensegiving and sensemaking processes should be juxtaposed in order to understand the interaction between formal identity claims and shared understandings, with the assumption that identity is related to both culture (deeply held assumptions and shared practices) and image (beliefs about how others view the organization) (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In response to an external identity threat, organizational members will revise their formal identity claims by making sense of their identity through a process of reflection on cultural practices and organizational image (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). They will also revise their shared understanding by giving sense to their identity through a process of embedding formal claims in the organizational culture and projecting a desired image (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006).

This case study focusing on one HSI at one point in time was limited in its ability to test the model proposed by Ravasi and Schultz (2006), as the four core processes they presented (construing external images, reflecting on cultural practices, projecting desired images, and embedding claims in culture) must be examined longitudinally. The model’s emphasis on the dynamic interplay between culture and image also proved to be limiting. The case provided little evidence for the process of reflecting on construed external images, perhaps because institutions of higher education, in comparison to market organizations, are not as regularly concerned with the way they are portrayed to external constituents. Recent cases of scandal, such as the alleged child molestation and institutional cover-up at Penn State, are probably more likely to lead to a reflection of construed image than are naturally occurring pressures on the organization’s
identity. This leads to another limitation of the model, which was developed in order to better understand the way an organization responds to an external threat to its identity. Ravasi and Schultz (2006) developed their framework based on a case study of a Danish producer of audio-video systems (B&O), which faced three major identity threats over three decades, including international competition, a general recession and loss of market appeal, and an open threat of imitation from competitors. Although these threats are common for market organizations, institutions of higher education may not respond to these types of pressures from the environment, making it difficult to apply the model.

As a result of these limitations, the model was used as a foundation for understanding the way an external “threat” to the organization’s original identity leads to the dynamic interplay between sensegiving and sensemaking in the process of constructing an organizational identity. The identity “threat” in this case is the changing demographics of the surrounding community in which NSU is located. This is a “threat” to the organization’s identity, not because it is bad to have an increasingly diverse population to enroll, but rather because it is different from the original conception of the institution. To be Latina/o-serving was not part of the mission of NSU from its inception, and therefore is not part of the formal identity claims made by organizational leaders. This is not to say that the HSI identity will never exist within the formal identity claims, as institutions may very well decide to formalize it. But as it stands, the HSI identity exists at a more covert level within the institution, reflected in this study as a latent identity integrated into other distinct features of an organization’s identity.

From a social actor perspective, the HSI label is not formalized through the sensegiving process, as it is not part of the central, distinct, and enduring identity of the organization and cannot be conceived in relation to other organizations like it. In chapter four, this became
obvious, as the HSI label was virtually absent from most of the participants formal construction of NSU’s identity. They, instead, pulled from formal identity claims based on the mission and values of the organization. From a social constructionist perspective, however, the HSI label has meaning through the sensemaking process, as members reflect on their deeply held cultural assumptions and values. In chapter five, members were able to make sense of the cultural practices that are in fact Latina/o-serving, despite their rejection of the HSI label during the sensegiving process as they explained who they think they are as an organization. At an ontological level, the HSI label became a reality as they talked about the organizational structures, particularly the technology (process of converting inputs into outputs), that provide evidence of a Latina/o-serving mission. They also talked about how some aspects of the organization have historically been reflective of the compositional diversity at NSU, as expected of an institution serving a region with a growing Latina/o population.

Ravasi and Schultz (2006) claimed that as members revise their identity claims, they will then embed them into the culture of the organization and project a desired image, leading to a revised collective understanding of the identity. For NSU, this aspect of the organizational development model has not fully come into fruition. In chapter six, I demonstrate that members who are most closely connected with the HSI grants have begun this process by striving to create awareness of the HSI identity while looking for ways to institutionalize the grant activities designed to transform the organization into a HSI. There is a lot of tension, however, in the way that members construct their identity as a HSI. Although their understanding of the HSI label is integrated with their core values and mission (as seen in the sensegiving process), they do not fully connect these ideas as they construct their HSI identity (in the sensemaking process).
Instead, the HSI label is a latent identity that does not yet have meaning for most members and is still under construction.

The main research question sought to understand the ways that students, administrators, faculty, and student affairs staff co-construct their organizational identity at a HSI. This was understood by asking members to describe who they are as an organization and then asking them to make meaning of the HSI designation. Results indicate that the HSI identity is not salient to most people, with very few (three out of 47 non-student participants) including HSI in their construction of who they are as an organization. Instead they described their identity based on formal identity claims that indicate their core values, mission, and student population. When given the opportunity to attach meaning to the HSI identity, however, their core organizational identity overlapped with their HSI identity, suggesting that the identities are integrated. The next three sections will review the findings as they relate to the construction of a HSI identity. Figure 7.1 provides an overview of the emerging theoretical model that was informed by this study. It shows that the process of identification is ongoing and inclusive of member’s perceptions of the integrated values of the organization, the organizational structures that are Latina/o-serving, and the organizational processes specific to becoming a HSI.

**Integrated Organizational Values**

When asked to describe who they are as an organization, NSU members drew most heavily from formal identity claims based on their mission and values as an institution, and in particular as a public master’s granting institution that is part of a larger system. Specifically, members constructed their identity as encompassing three core values: (1) regionally focused, (2) committed to the community, and (3) dedicated to access. Furthermore, they made sense of their identity by describing the population they serve: diverse.
Figure 7.1 Framework for Studying Organizational Identity of HSIs

**Regionally Focused**

One way participants made sense of their organizational identity was in reference to their regional focus. More specifically, some members referred to a moniker coined by the previous president of NSU, “we are regionally focused and nationally recognized.” Although the latter part of the saying was not salient to most members (and one member even questioned it all together), the former part was used as a way for members to construct their identity. To be regionally focused means that they recruit, enroll, and serve residents of “the Valley,” which is the surrounding region that is compositionally diverse with a large Latina/o population. This was a central and distinct aspect of NSU’s identity as described by my members.

To be regionally focused, however, is part of the mission of the larger state system of institutions in which NSU is a member. Other campuses, therefore, may also see themselves as regionally serving, making it a less distinct feature of the organization but part of the initial charge of a larger system that coordinates service and outreach to communities. Some
participants suggested that other institutions in the system have diverged from their stated mission of serving the region, especially as they have faced fierce economic challenges in recent years. NSU diligently asserted its commitment to remaining focused on the region, despite declining state resources for postsecondary institutions. One way they have remained committed to the region is by intentionally drawing their admissions boundaries in a way that does not have a negative impact on diverse areas within their region. For example, they are reluctant to cut off admissions to the “east Valley,” which is largely populated by Black residents. Instead, they have remained committed to serving those regions that are segregated by race and ethnicity as a way of remaining committed to serving the most diverse populations.

One way that postsecondary institutions are supplementing state funds is through the recruitment and enrollment of out-of-state students and/or international students, both of which pay higher tuition than in-state, domestic students. Unlike other institutions in the system, NSU has whole-heartedly rejected this economic model and will continue to focus its efforts on serving the regional community. This commitment to the region makes this aspect of NSU’s organizational identity more distinct than other campuses in the system.

Data suggest that the regional focus of the institution is also intertwined with the institution’s identity as a HSI. By enrolling residents from the local community, which is heavily populated by Latinas/os, the institution will naturally begin to reflect the composition of the region. For NSU, being located in a compositionally diverse region and relying on the region’s residents for enrollment makes it a natural extension of the community. The way people made sense of the HSI identity directly connected back to their core values as an institution, despite the fact that most participants did not consider the HSI label as a core aspect of their identity.
The HSI identity of an institution, however, is fluid. As a federal designation driven by enrollment, an institution can lose its designation as a HSI if fewer Latina/o students (and low-income or Pell eligible students) enroll in the institution. For example, if a HSI that is located in a racially diverse region decides to admit more international or out-of-state students who do not identify as Latina/o, it could very likely lose its designation. The regional focus cannot be denied, however, as it is highly unlikely for an institution that is located in a state with a large compositionally White population to have the HSI designation.

As a malleable identity, an institution could make a conscious decision to become a HSI through recruitment efforts. Notre Dame de Namur University in California, for example, made a conscious decision to become a HSI as a way of increasing enrollment (Schnoebelen, 2013). As institutional leaders realized they were graduating their Latina/o students at equitable rates as their White students, they decided they should take pride in this accomplishment and work towards becoming even better at serving this population. As a result, they extended their recruitment efforts to focus on Latina/o students by printing materials in Spanish and reaching out to students at community colleges with large Latina/o populations (Schnoebelen, 2013). This decision was a conscious one made by administrators at Notre Dame de Namur University. The commitment to the region, however, was present, suggesting that Notre Dame may follow similar progress as NSU in becoming a HSI.

**Committed to the Community**

A second way that member’s constructed their identity was through their focus on the community. Participants, however, made sense of their commitment to the community in different ways. For some, NSU’s identity is connected to the community by way of programs and services for the Valley. In particular, participants mentioned the Performing Art Center and
the Student Recreation Center as two main programs that serve the greater community. The Performing Art Center was a project initiated by the former president and very connected to her vision of being regionally focused. She saw the Performing Art Center as a way to deliver art to the community through musical and theatrical performances. The Student Recreation Center was a student-led initiative that has become a major feature of the institution’s identity.

Some participants made sense of their commitment to the community through service, civic engagement, and partnerships with local schools. Faculty members, in particular, who access grant money in order to develop community-focused programs talked extensively about the institution’s commitment to serving the diverse community. One faculty member, for example, is combating the prevalence of diabetes in the Latina/o community by developing programs in local elementary schools that foster an active lifestyle and teach students about nutritional eating. The schools in which these programs are being developed enroll over 80% Latina/o children. The faculty in the College of Education are also forming educational partnerships with local school districts that serve a primarily Latina/o population.

A third way that participants made sense of the idea of serving the community was attached to their own social identity as Latinas/os. For them, serving the community means providing assistance to Latina/o students on campus and encouraging them to give back to their local communities. These participants were passionate about their role on campus and committed to the success of all students, but in particular of Latina/o students. Some talked about going out of their way to help Latina/o students succeed while others touted the services and programs on campus that assist Latina/o and other students of color.

The differences in the way participants made meaning of NSU’s identity in relation to the community were driven by social identities and their role on campus, with Latinas/os staff and
both Latina/o and non-Latina/o faculty being more committed to the community than administrators. In idealizing HSIs, several people also talked about community outcomes being connected to the success of HSIs. This included their desire to enhance programs that increase access to the community (i.e., Upward Bound), graduate students that go out and work in the regional community, and increase the institution’s connections with the local business, arts, science, and entertainment industries.

The institution’s identity as a HSI is seemingly intertwined with both its identities as being regionally focused and community serving. The context, however, cannot be denied as the institution is situated in a region that is heavily populated by Latinas/os. For an institution that is located in an area that is heavily populated by residents with another social identity (not Latina/o), being regionally serving and community serving could have a very different meaning. For example, an institution located in the Appalachian region of the country would find that being regionally focused and community serving indicates that they are an Appalachian Serving Institution. At the same time, an institution may very well be located in a region that has a large Latina/o population and still not be considered a HSI if it does not possess the values of being regionally focused and community serving.

**Dedicated to Access**

The third value espoused by NSU and used by members to construct their organizational identity was access. Although a majority agreed that there is an institutional commitment to access, there were a number of growing tensions as members made sense of this value. In particular, the looming economic crisis in the state is a strong external force making it more difficult for NSU to remain committed to access. Not only is the state decreasing their funding stream to all state institution, the system wide leadership is also mandating decreased enrollment,
which has ultimately led to impaction (increased selectivity) at several campuses. Some participants questioned NSU’s increasing selectivity while others questioned the negative effects of admission policies being implemented (or more regularly enforced). Administrators, however, stressed that NSU is remaining committed to access by avoiding the impaction model that other institutions in the system have turned to.

The way the institution responds to the environment is an important indicator of its commitment to Latina/o and other students of color. If they respond to the environment by increasing admission requirements, decreasing enrollment, or admitting more out-of-state students, perhaps they are not as committed to access as they have stated. But if they continue to find other ways to increase their revenues, their actions will align with their stated values as an institution that is committed to access and to the local community. Their identity, therefore, will remain congruent with their values.

A second value that some members questioned was the institution’s commitment to academically underprepared students. Although few participants stated that underprepared students do not belong at the institution, some made reference to other members in the institution that have this sentiment. In many ways NSU is historically committed to access, both in its mission and values, but the pressured enrollment system is forcing members to reevaluate who they are as an institution. Growing questions include: do we continue to admit and enroll students who have not met the minimum mathematics and English requirements? Is the State University system’s role to remediate students who are not adequately prepared for college upon graduation from high school? Members who truly value the institution’s commitment to access are worried that these questions will continue to creep their way into Faculty Senate meetings.
and other spaces where important decisions are being made about student access, enrollment, and matriculation.

NSU is at an important crossroad, as are other broad access institutions, in which they must decide if they will remain committed to access for their regional community. There is a tremendous amount of inequity between those who enroll in the most selective institutions and those that enroll in the less selective institutions, with students from low SES backgrounds being less likely to enroll in highly selective institutions (Astin & Oseguera, 2004). HSIs have the opportunity to play an important role in enrolling students from low SES background, as long as they remain committed to their value of access to underserved communities. Oftentimes those students from low SES backgrounds are Latina/o, which will continue to affect its HSI identity. This is not to say that more selective institutions will never be HSIs; instead, this case elucidates the importance of maintaining a commitment to access for Latina/o and other underserved students despite other potentially conflicting identities (i.e., selectivity). The integrated identity of HSIs indicates that there is a relationship between a regional focus and a strong dedication to access. Institutions more committed to prestige and reputation that access and equity may never fully become “Latina/o-serving” in the same way an institution like NSU is. At the same time, NSU is only one case, and future studies should challenge this notion, with a particular emphasis on the idea of inclusive excellence.

Another important question is whether or not HSIs can have a democratizing effect within higher education. Community colleges have been found to have a democratizing effect on access by increasing overall enrollment in higher education and decreasing the gap in enrollment between different groups (Roksa, 2008). It is still unclear, however, if HSIs will have this same type of effect. If HSIs are truly committed to access as a core value, they may in fact
contribute to the democratizing effect of postsecondary institutions by increasing access for the most underserved communities, particularly racialized and low income students. At the same time, there was evidence in this case that there continues to be inequities at NSU (i.e., lower graduation rates for Latina/o students when compared to White students). Future research, therefore, should further examine the potential democratizing effect of HSIs.

Diverse Serving

In addition to their stated values as an institution that is regionally focused, committed to the community, and dedicated to access, members made sense of their organizational identity by describing their diverse population. All non-student participants referred to diversity at some point in their interview, with some including it in their description of who they are as an organization and others talking about the climate for diversity, which evokes perceptions of positive cross-cultural interactions and inclusion. Some participants indicated that the diversity of NSU attracted them to the campus, although Latinas/os were less likely than non-Latinas/os to mention diversity as a main element that attracted them.

In general, Latinas/os were more critical of the institution’s diversity and of its ability to serve Latina/o students well. This is perhaps understandable, as Mayhew, Grunwald, and Dey (2006a) found that women and people of color are less likely to perceive the institution as achieving a positive climate for diversity. Latinas/os in the sample questioned diversity more, noting the difference in graduation rates between Latina/o and White students and the disparity of fulltime tenure and tenure track faculty of color. Although the White student population at NSU is approximately 30%, the White tenure and tenure track faculty represent 70% of the population. Furthermore, the faculty who are racially and ethnically diverse are concentrated in ethnic studies departments, indicating a level of racial segregation. In sampling faculty for this
study, it was difficult to gain access to Latinas/os in disciplines outside of Chicana/o Studies. One anomaly was in the department of mathematics where there is an exceptionally high percentage of Latina/o tenure and tenure track faculty. When asked about it, however, math faculty said they have just been lucky, as opposed to an intentional plan to recruit Latina/o faculty. Even in departments like sociology where a large percentage of Latina/o students enroll, there is a dearth of Latina/o faculty. When asked what they are doing to address this disparity, most participants gave an answer related to the lack of qualified candidates in the hiring pool. This is one area where NSU has failed to develop as strong plan of action, as a HSI, to recruit and retain more Latina/o faculty. The lack of representation of Latinas/os in faculty and administration is a perennial issue that will continue to plague HSIs, despite reaching the threshold of compositional diversity in their student body.

Despite the differences in the way Latinas/os and non-Latinas/os described diversity, the way members constructed the HSI identity was integrated with the institution’s identity as being diverse serving. In articulating what it means to be a HSI, participants stressed that they are committed to serving all students, regardless of race or ethnicity. They also talked about intersecting identities, using terms like, “low income,” “first generation,” and/or “immigrant” to connect to the Latina/o identity. At NSU, the rhetoric around diversity is largely influenced by the external climate, as it is located in a state that has banned affirmative action in college admission practices and race-targeted benefits (e.g. financial aid, special programs). As a result, administrators, faculty, and staff code their language so that it is race neutral and inclusive of all groups. Despite the fact that HSI is a federal designation and therefore can be used to target a specific racial group, members seemed quite reluctant to do that, even those working with HSI grants on campus. For them, serving Latinas/os means that you are also serving other
underrepresented groups who fall into any number of categories including low income, first
generation, undocumented, transfer, or commuter. As an institution that identifies as broad
access and committed to serving the compositionally diverse region, NSU naturally embraces its
identity as diverse serving.

**Climate for diversity.** Student participants were not asked to describe who NSU is as an
institution, but they were asked about the culture at NSU. They painted a vivid picture of
diversity on campus where students from all races, genders, and backgrounds mix harmoniously.
Through their descriptions, they contributed to the co-construction of the institution’s identity as
diverse serving while providing an understanding of the climate for diversity for students. Their
contribution to the study is important because they provide a unique narrative about the way the
institution’s identity as being diverse serving is enacted. Additionally student voices help to
triangulate the data by confirming and disconfirming the perceptions of staff, faculty, and
administrators.

Students used the word diversity often and loosely, but had trouble defining diversity at a
deeper level, as it is so embedded in their every day experiences on campus. To them diversity
means, “different from me,” without any recognition of the social structures that continue to
oppress racialized groups. For example, very few students found it problematic that there is a
lack of administrators and faculty of color at NSU, despite the obvious diversity of students.
One student said that he does not have to interact with faculty on a regular basis in the same way
he interacts with fellow students, therefore the lack of diversity at that level is not a problem.
Only one student thought more critically about the lack of power that Latinas/os and other people
of color have on campus. Perhaps this is a function of their consciousness in regard to issues of
power and oppression. Instead of questioning the extent of diversity, their outlook on diversity is
positive, with those who came from homogenous racial neighborhoods defining diversity as inclusive of other racialized student groups. Some discovered that diversity can mean that there are Latinas/os from other ethnic groups while others included religion, sexual orientation, and other unique combinations of social identities in their definition.

As I pressed students to dig deeper into their definition of diversity, they began to get beyond the euphoric feeling of diversity and were able to criticize some of the incongruities they saw. A common theme was the presence of racial cliques on campus, most often used to refer to groups of Black and Armenian students on campus. As they described these racial cliques, they attached little meaning to them, failing to recognize the importance these groups may have for their members. Perhaps these students found comfort in these cliques, either using them as a place to explore their own ethnic identity development (Tatum, 1997) or as a place to combat racism on campus (Villalpando, 2003). Students, however, did not talk about Latina/o racial cliques. This could perhaps be an indicator that Latina/o students no longer have a need to associate with racial cliques on campus because they feel supported in other ways. Although research shows that Latina/o students feel more comfortable in institutions that have a larger enrollment of Latina/o students (Hurtado, 1994), this comfort level could overshadow the fact that Latina/o students have perpetual needs that the institution should not overlook, regardless of compositional representation.

As students described their experiences with diversity in class, they described segregated experiences, with faculty and students being more diverse in some disciplines than in others. Their classroom experience was diverse within the social sciences and ethnic studies courses, but few had distinct incidences of diversity within their more technical classes (i.e., business). They also described prominent racialized spaces on campus; however, they attached positive feelings
to these spaces. For example, students often referred to Azul Hall as a place that is reflective of the Latina/o population as a result of murals, cultural music, and the Chicana/o Studies department.

Although HSIs enroll a large percentage of Latina/o and other students of color, the campus climate may not be amiable because they were not originally established as a HSIs (Gasman, 2008). The students in this study, however, constructed the climate as welcoming for diverse groups, confirming what other scholars have found in studying HSIs (Arana et al., 2011; Dayton et al., 2004; González, 2010; Guardia & Evans, 2008; Sebanc et al., 2009). They described diversity as a harmonious feeling, but also talked about diversity being concentrated in spaces on campus, whether it be in Chicana/o Studies, classes, in Azul Hall, or within their Latina/o student groups. But is it problematic for there to be racialized spaces at a HSI? Does being a HSI mean that diversity and Latinidad transcend all boundaries? Perhaps not, as students, faculty, and staff constructed their HSI identity in connection with their diverse population, instead of their Latina/o population.

Diversity is recognized and valued by all members of NSU, and clearly connected to their organizational identity, with members making sense of it in different ways based on their social identities and location on campus. As argued by Weick (1995), organizational sensemaking begins with the individuals who define the organization based on who they believe they are. As such, there were clear tensions in the ways members made sense of their identity as a HSI, often as a result of their own self-identification as Latina/o. In Dutton and Dukerich’s (1991) study of the New York Port Authority, there was a link between the way individual members view themselves and they way they believe others view the organization. Through the process of mirroring, the organizational image becomes a reflection of who they are (Dutton & Dukerich,
1991). For Latinas/os, more so that non-Latinas/os, the HSI identity may be more of a reflection of who they are since the identity is intertwined with race and ethnicity. Their criticism of the organizational commitment to serving Latina/os may also be connected to their own racial identity development and their level of consciousness in regard to the ways in which social structures continue to oppress racialized groups, despite the level of critical representation at a HSI.

As the dominant “minority” group at HSIs, there is a potential for members to ignore the needs of Latina/o students. Some members at NSU used colorblind language, typical of those who think we live in a postracial society (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Rather than seeing race as a social structure that continues to marginalize Latinas/os, they only consider the compositional diversity. Compositional diversity, however, does not equal parity, as is obvious at NSU. While the tenured and tenure track faculty of color represent approximately 30% of the faculty at NSU, Latina/o faculty represent approximately 11%. Of the 11%, many are located in Humanities and Social Sciences, and specifically within the Chicana/o studies department. In the College of Business, 2% of the faculty are Latina/o and in the College of Engineering, almost 4% are Latina/o. There are also fewer Latina/o administrators at NSU, with the director of EOP being one of few Latinas/os who leads a division. The disparities are also reflected in the graduation rates, with 58% of White students graduating from NSU within 6-years compared to 44% of Latina/o students and 30% of Black students. Until parity is reached at a HSI, all members must recognize that there are structural barriers that must be addressed in order to reach a level of being truly Latina/o-serving.
Integrated Identities

Despite the recognition that organizations can have multiple identities, organizational behaviorists have largely treated the study of organizational identity like a single dimensional phenomenon (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Albert and Whetten (1985) distinguished between ideographic multiple identities, which is the presence of multiple identities that are not universally held by all members, and holographic identities, which is the construction of multiple identities that are held by all members of the organization. Pratt and Rafaeli (1997) found that nurses in the rehabilitation unit of a hospital held multiple conceptions of identity that differed based on shift (day versus evening) and hierarchical membership (management versus staff) (ideographic). Golden-Biddle and Rao (1997), however, found that board members of a nonprofit organization universally held multiple perceptions of the organization’s identity (holographic). Pratt and Foreman (2000) suggest that the integration of multiple identities occurs “when managers attempt to fuse multiple identities into a distinct new whole” (p. 30). This is one of four strategies for managing multiple identities suggested by Pratt and Foreman. At NSU, there is some level of intentional integration occurring as administrators and members involved with HSI grants are beginning to make others aware of the HSI identity and are finding ways to institutionalize their efforts. Additionally, integration is naturally occurring as the multiple conceptions of NSU’s core values are aligning with its identity as a HSI, often without cognition on the part of the person constructing the identity.

Organizational Structures

The second part of the main research question was focused on understanding the shared cultural values and organizational practices embedded within the institution that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. Through the sensegiving process, members constructed their organizational identity using formal identity claims related to the mission and values of the
institution. But when given the opportunity to make sense of the HSI identity, they reflected on their cultural practices that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. Although the HSI identity is not salient to most members, the way they talked about structural elements that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission suggest that the identity is latent, meaning members are not cognitively aware of it. As a latent identity it is relevant and present within their value system, despite the fact that it lacks saliency. In this section, I will summarize findings from chapter five, which looked more specifically at the structural elements of the institution.

Two frameworks were used to analyze NSU’s organizational structures as they pertain to being Latina/o-serving. There are a number of organizational theories and models that have been developed for the specific purpose of studying the culture of postsecondary institutions (i.e., Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1988). For this study, I chose two that not only focus on organizations of higher education but also include race as a central aspect of the model. This was important since the HSI identity is driven by changes in the racial/ethnic background of students. Chesler, Lewis, and Crowfoot (2005) contend that there are eight distinct dimensions of the organization that must be understood by any institution interested in combating the long term effects of institution racism. These dimensions include mission, culture, power, membership, climate, technology, resources, and boundary management. The mission, culture, and climate were largely addressed in chapter four as understood through the co-construction of NSU’s organizational identity. Membership and technology will be further discussed here.

The second framework used was the Multi-Contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE), developed by Hurtado and colleagues (2012) as a way to examine diversity in higher education. The MMDLE is comprised of five elements of the climate for diversity including psychological, behavioral, compositional, historical, and structural aspects.
Similar to Chesler et al., Hurtado and colleagues propose that researchers studying diverse learning environment must look at organizational elements such as policies, procedures, decision-making, resource allocation, and curriculum design. Together these two frameworks guided data collection and analysis, with an emphasis on learning more about the organizational structures at NSU. Through inductive and deductive analysis, several organizational elements emerged as essential to the HSI identity. The three main elements discussed in chapter five are those that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission include the curriculum, pedagogy, and programs and services at NSU.

**Curriculum**

In higher education, the core technology used as a means of converting raw materials into finished products includes the curriculum and pedagogy (Chesler et al., 2005). The curriculum is determined and implemented by faculty, which places a large amount of pressure on them to take responsibility for addressing multiculturalism, diversity, and inclusion. Unfortunately, a majority of colleges and universities have failed to incorporate issues of race and racism into the core curriculum (Chesler et al., 2005). The curriculum at HSIs is no different, with only 3% of all courses offered at HSIs in 2002-2003 focusing on the history, experiences, and perspectives of ethnic groups (Cole, 2011). Although Chesler and colleagues and Hurtado and colleagues both advocate for culturally relevant curriculum, neither framework is intended for conducting a deep analysis of the curriculum.

I used a framework developed by James Banks, a well-known scholar for his work on the development and evaluation of multicultural curriculum, to help make sense of the level of cultural relevance in the curriculum at NSU. Banks (2010) proposed four approaches for integrating multicultural content into the curriculum including (1) the contributions approach, (2)
the additive approach, (3) the transformation approach, and (4) the social action approach.

Although the framework is more appropriately used to evaluate a single course as the unit of analysis, I used it to understand the curriculum at a departmental level.

When asked to describe structural elements that reflect a Latina/o-serving mission, nearly all participants named the Chicana/o studies department. Since its inception in the late 1960’s, the department has given a voice to Chicanas/os through the curriculum. Although the institution was coerced to establish a Chicana/o Studies department after students took over the administration building, demanding culturally relevant curriculum, support systems, and faculty of color, it can be considered an enduring aspect of NSU’s identity. In the 50-year history of the institution, Chicana/o Studies department has been in existence for 40 years. The historical commitment to Latina/o students, therefore, is reflected in the curriculum, although the environmental pressures cannot be denied. The Civil Rights Movement, and more specifically the Chicano Movement, had a strong effect on the institutional commitment to Latinas/os. Over the years, however, the Chicana/o studies program has become embedded in the structures, as they now teach two of the four required classes for all students to graduate, including freshmen composition and speech communication. By removing the program from the margins and placing it at the center of the curriculum, a majority of students now take at least one Chicana/o studies course throughout their tenure at NSU, making the Chicana/o studies part of the fabric of the institution. This is a significant indication that the structure and culture are practically and historically Latina/o-serving.

As constructed by members, there is a strong relationship between the Chicana/o studies curriculum and the HSI identity of the institution. It was the most significant structural element mentioned by participants when asked about the ways in which the institution reflects Latina/o
culture. This is important under the current climate, with ethnic studies programs being attacked, most notably in the state of Arizona. Ethnic studies programs, in general, have consistently been found to contribute to the academic achievement, racial identity development, and critical consciousness of racialized groups (Sleeter, 2011), and within this case study to the construction of an organizational identity.

At the same time, it must be noted that the Chicana/o studies offers an isolated cultural experience for students, as many suggested that the Chicana/o studies program is the ONLY place they can get culturally relevant curriculum. This suggests that a culturally relevant curriculum is far from being pervasive at NSU. Aside from the Chicana/o studies department, journalism was mentioned as an emerging department for culturally relevant curriculum. Again, it is very segmented, as only the students in the Spanish-language journalism minor are exposed to the journalism courses that focus on diversity and the interdisciplinary curriculum that is required of the students in the minor. The journalism department also offered a course specifically focused on developing a public relations campaign for HSIs, which was developed by a faculty member who was identified by the provost for creating awareness of the HSI identity.

According to Banks (2010), the transformation approach to the integration of multicultural content “changes the basic assumptions of the curriculum and enables students to view concepts, issues, themes, and problems from several ethnic perspectives and points of view” (p. 250). At a departmental level, both the Chicana/o studies program and the journalism program have changed the curriculum using a transformative approach by redesigning their entire curriculum as opposed to adding one of two courses that focus on racialized and minoritized groups. Although this approach keeps the curriculum segregated, as noted by the
students in the sample, there are also departments that have used the additive approach to curriculum design by including one or two courses that meet the comparative cultural studies requirements. The comparative cultural studies requirement is a distinct aspect of NSU’s identity; however, for a campus to be truly transformed at the organizational level, the curricula across all departments would use a transformative or social action approach. This may be idealistic, but HSIs should at least strive to increase the number of culturally relevant courses being offered. As indicated by members, the curriculum is an important source of connection for Latina/o students.

**Pedagogy**

As the technology of instruction, pedagogy relies heavily on faculty members who have arguably received very little training in teaching, rarely talk about undoing racist teaching practices, and are largely socialized in predominantly White environments (Chesler et al., 2005). A faculty member’s approach to teaching is influenced by a number of factors including social identity, personal style, knowledge and skills, subject matter, institutional support, student identities, classroom dynamics, departmental norms, campus climate, institutional mission, characteristics and norms of the local community, and national policies (Chesler et al., 2005). Some of these characteristics are quite obviously beyond the control of the faculty; however, the overwhelming number of factors does not excuse faculty from attempting to be more culturally relevant, particularly at a HSI.

I used Ladson-Billings’ (1995) theory of culturally relevant pedagogy to better understand the approach to teaching that faculty are using at NSU. Drawing from years of research on culturally relevant teaching and her own work studying elementary school teachers of African American, low income students, she proposed a theory that culturally relevant
teachers help students succeed, help them become culturally competent, and encourage them to be critical. Additionally, the ways in which they do these things differ based on their conceptions of self, social relations, and conceptions of knowledge. Using this as a lens, the pedagogy at NSU is lacking cultural relevance, with very few professors approaching their teaching in this manner. Instead, faculty are either unaware of the need to be culturally relevant or lack the skills necessary to use culturally relevant pedagogy. Some faculty made claims about “good pedagogy being good pedagogy,” with little recognition for the varying needs of students from racially and ethnically different backgrounds.

This color-blind approach to teaching is problematic, as scholars have argued that culturally relevant pedagogy at the postsecondary level is of utmost importance to obtaining inclusive learning environments (Chesler et al., 2005; Hurtado et al., 2012; Tuit, 2003). In particular, faculty at HSIs must address the varying needs of their diverse population.

Kiasatpour and Lasley (2008) found that faculty teaching at HSI faced different challenges in the classroom than those at non-HSIs, particularly in regard to reading comprehension, writing skills, and speaking skills (Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008). Although faculty at HSIs are slow to adapt their teaching, there is evidence of this happening at HSIs in both Texas and California, whether it be through the inclusion of civic learning activities (Kiasatpour & Lasley, 2008), personal storytelling and journal reflections (Simms, 2006), or by connecting students’ strengths to course-based learning objectives (Bridges et al., 2008).

There were, however, incidents of faculty at NSU using culturally relevant pedagogy. Driven primarily by the race of the faculty and disciplinary background, participants talked about the ways in which the pedagogy is reflective of the Latina/o student population. Participants talked about the ways that Latina/o faculty, in particular, go out of their way to ensure students
success, even when it is beyond the realm of their discipline. Latina/o faculty also connect with their students in culturally relevant ways, telling stories about their upbringing or about their participation in the Chicano Movement. Some non-Latina/o faculty also said they find ways to become culturally competent, recognizing the need to understand the current sociocultural context. Students talked about the importance of sitting circles in class, which helped to validate them as well as keep them engaged. They also mentioned that faculty in the Chicana/o studies department are particularly good at encouraging the development of critical consciousness as they talk about current topics, such as tuition increases and issues facing undocumented students, and often encouraging students to become activists in the movements addressing these very issues on campus.

Faculty and students cited numerous examples of the ways that pedagogy is culturally relevant and connected to the HSI identity at a deeper level within the institutional structures. As such, faculty stressed that they would use critically relevant approaches to teaching, regardless of their designation as a HSI. The HSI designation, however, has an important effect on pedagogy at NSU as one of the HSI grants is specifically addressing the topic. The grant is being used to develop faculty learning communities that include workshops on developing culturally relevant pedagogical practices and a faculty mentoring program. Although faculty must self-select into the program, there are a number of White faculty who have participated and realized the benefits of addressing the issue. One faculty member talked about the lack of awareness she had before participating, recognizing that she and others are facing a learning curve when it comes to teaching students from diverse backgrounds.
Programs and Services

The third structural element that participants talked about as being reflective of the Latina/o population was the support programs and services on campus. Co-curricular activities can be an important source for enhancing diverse learning environments. As such, campuses have approached diversity and multiculturalism in a number of ways, either by supporting student organizations catering to specific groups, or by developing programs such as diversity workshops, multicultural programming in residence halls, community service learning, and intergroup dialogues (Chesler et al., 2005). The benefits of these co-curricular experiences have been studied extensively with a number of positive outcomes being related to programming including increased civic engagement, positive cross-racial interactions, and enhanced critical thinking skills (for a review see Bowman, 2010; Denson, 2009; Denson & Chang, 2009).

In order to understand the way these elements reflected a diverse population, I used Hurtado et al.’s (2012) MMDLE with an emphasis on the historical, compositional, and structural components. In the late 1960’s, students stormed the administration building at NSU demanding culturally relevant curriculum, support programs, and faculty. For the last 40 years, NSU has worked towards establishing one of the nation’s largest and most recognized Chicana/o studies programs as well as one of the strongest EOP programs. Historically, student activism has been a driving force behind NSU’s path to becoming a HSI. Although I will not argue that NSU has historically been free of racism and discrimination, analyzing the structures from a historical perspective provides evidence that it has rapidly progressed towards inclusivity. Although subtle forms of institutional racism, including reliance on standardized testing for admissions and the lack of Latina/o faculty, will continue to plaque the structures of NSU, a comparison to the oldest campus in the State University system provides some insight into its
progress. The oldest campus was established nearly 100 years before NSU and has yet to become a HSI, despite the fact that it is located in a metropolitan area with similar demographics in the surrounding region. NSU is young, only recently celebrating its semi-centennial (50 year) anniversary, and reached HSI status within 40 years of its founding. Historically, there is something unique about NSU that has allowed it to progress towards compositional diversity. Evidence from chapter five suggests that the structural elements are inclusive, albeit in segregated ways.

EOP was highly touted as being reflective of a Latina/o-serving mission, although it must be noted that EOP cannot possibly serve all the Latinas/os at NSU. EOP has been institutionalized in a way that makes it a significant part of the fabric of the institution, with eight satellite EOP offices operating out of each of the eight academic colleges. These EOP satellites provide advising to all incoming freshmen, whether they are EOP eligible or not. In essence, the campus has developed its advising model based on the practices of EOP, a program that has traditionally served underrepresented communities. This is significant because EOP has been historically attacked during hard economic times. NSU, however, has made an institutional commitment to the program, which is symbolically powerful, sending a message about its commitment to serving low-income students, who are often Latina/o and Black.

For those Latina/o students who do not meet the EOP requirements, some have found a sense of belonging through student organizations. When asked to describe the ways in which the campus makes them feel welcomed, students most immediately referred to their student organizations. Many of them are involved in ethnically-based student organizations that they described as essential to their sense of belonging on campus. Although Hurtado et al. (2012) and Chesler et al. (2005) do not focus on student organizations as a primary asset to diverse learning
environments, scholars contend that Latina/o student organizations enhance Latina/o students’
adjustment to campus, sense of belonging, and ethnic identity development (i.e., Guardia &
Evans, 2008; Hurtado, 1994; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Montelongo, 2003). Although
involvement was not thoroughly analyzed for this study, there is evidence to suggest that
involvement in Latina/o groups is related to member’s construction of their organizational
identity.

Organizational Membership

A final organizational structure that I have addressed throughout the findings chapters is
related to what Hurtado et al. (2012) call the compositional diversity of the faculty, staff, and
administration, and what Chesler et al. (2005) call the organizational membership. Without a
significant number of faculty, staff, and administrators of color, it is difficult for an institution of
higher education to transform into a multicultural organization (Chesler et al., 2005). Recruiting
and retaining faculty, staff, and administrators of color is challenging as it is often connected to
the historical mission of exclusion, the organization’s legacy of racial discrimination in hiring,
and internal politics of the institution (Chesler et al., 2005).

In this case study, the social identities of key organizational members were found to be at
the root of most of the culturally relevant practices (curriculum, pedagogy, and programs) at
NSU, suggesting a strong correlation between the HSI identity and the racial and ethnic
background of faculty, staff, and administrators. Having faculty, staff, and administrators with
similar cultural backgrounds has been found to contribute to Latina/o student success at HSI, not
only because of the personal connections and personal relationships formed (Dayton et al., 2004)
but because these individuals can serve as institutional agents who have the positional power and
networks to make systemic changes that support racialized students (Stanton-Salazar et al.,
2010). Unfortunately, there is also strong evidence to suggest that Latinas/os are still underrepresented in faculty, staff, and administrator positions at NSU. Even more disturbing was that participant’s lacked concern for this disparity, often blaming Latinas/os by suggesting that they are simply missing from the eligible candidate pool. Over twenty years ago, Olivas (1988) advocated for a change in the racist practices that have kept Latina/o at the margins of the university, with less than 2% of all tenured faculty being Latina/o, but little has changed in over two decades. Throughout this case study, there is evidence that the identity of Latina/o faculty, staff, and administrators is important in constructing the HSI identity. For example, social identity was connected to the likelihood of recognizing the need for culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy and even more intertwined with professor’s ability to utilize these practices. As a Latina who studies HSIs, attended a HSI, and worked at a HSI, I would argue that the federal government needs to think more about these enduring disparities, suggesting that in order to qualify for HSI status institutions must provide evidence of their commitment to addressing these disparities, as well as those related to other inequities within the institution.

Despite the fact the NSU has made progress is regard to challenging the structural racism (Chesler et al., 2005) or perhaps the White Institutional Presence (Gusa, 2010) embedded within the institution, the lack of equality in student outcomes and faculty composition indicates that not only does NSU have to keep working towards becoming Latina/o serving, but society as a whole must continue to challenge the idea of meritocracy. By this I mean that although institutions of higher education, and particularly those enrolling a large number of Latina/o students, must work harder to dismantle the long-term effects of inequality and racism within their structures, we must also recognize that Latina/o students have faced discrimination and oppression throughout their educational trajectory. To truly become Latina/o serving, the institution must accept this
and not only work to make compositional and structural changes but also challenge the less obvious White ascendancy (sense of White superiority and entitlement), monoculturalism (White view is dominant within technology), White blindness (idea that race is not an important consideration in institutional decision making and policy development), and White estrangement (the separation of Whites from people of color) (Gusa, 2010).

**Organizational Processes**

Although it was originally conceived to be enduring over time, organizational identity is arguably dynamic. In this case study, the tensions between the way various organizational members construct their organizational identity as a HSI substantiates this claim, as participants make sense of the identity in different ways based on organizational context and social identities. Retrospectively, participants talked about their own stages of understanding and meaning making attached to the HSI identity. As an enrollment driven identity, it is not expected that members will immediately make sense of the HSI identity, as it was not part of the founders’ conception of NSU. Through a series of processes, however, NSU has advanced towards becoming a HSI. Participants unanimously agreed that NSU is far from actualizing its identity as a HSI, but most confirmed that they are undergoing an evolution in this regard.

A number of processes were evident throughout chapters four and five, many of which were connected to the mission, culture, power, membership, climate, and technology of the institution Chesler et al. (2005). In connection to these structural elements, participants indicated that a number of NSU’s processes are occurring despite the HSI identity, as most people recognize the need to address the changing population at NSU. The HSI designation, however, has led to an increase in activities in the past few years. In chapter six, I highlighted three main processes that are specifically related to the construction of a HSI identity.
In particular, there is an effort to increase awareness of the HSI identity, as many recognize that without recognition, there will be little progress towards embracing the Latina/o-serving mission. Participants exhibited three levels of awareness of the HSI identity, which contributed to their identity construction in different ways. For those unaware of the HSI identity, they were surprised to learn about this designation. Although one staff member said that it feels like a HSI, despite her lack of awareness about the official designation, students contradicted her, indicating that the campus feels more like a diverse serving institution, with little recognition and celebration of the Latina/o culture outside of the Chicana/o studies department. A second level demonstrates that despite awareness, the HSI identity lacked meaning. For these participants, HSI is just a label, with several of them expressing criticism of this and expressing their desire for a deeper level of understanding. Latina/o participants and staff members were more likely to possess this level of awareness. At a third level, those most closely connected with the HSI grants attached a meaning to the HSI designation and are working towards creating campus wide awareness. Administrators and faculty members were more likely to be closely connected to the deeper meaning making of a HSI identity, as they take pride in this identity and see it as an opportunity for all members of the campus community. The awareness process is temporal while the meaning making is progressive over time. Similar to findings by Corley and Gioia (2004), there is evidence to suggest that although members do not fully reject the HSI identity, they do not attach meaning to it until there is a stimulus that creates a context for meaning making.

There is also a level of advocacy going on, with a number of people supporting Latina/o students, despite of the HSI designation, and others seizing the role of HSI champions. Advocates for Latina/o students assist them at different levels, either through direct assistance or
by challenging the racist structures in place. Faculty cited the provost as an administrator who advocates for underprepared students, fights for the inclusion of underrepresented groups, and supports faculty in their efforts to assist students of color. His positional power affords him the capital necessary to make a change in the structures and culture of the institution.

HSI champions are advocating for Latina/o students by promoting the HSI identity and empowering others to define what it means to be a HSI. The provost, in conjunction with several others academic administrators, has found a way to generate excitement among faculty members interested in applying for HSI grants and doing the work necessary to support Latina/o students and strengthen the regional Latina/o community. By encouraging faculty members to apply for HSI grants, these HSI champions have created a high level of enthusiasm for developing programs that reflect and enhance the Latina/o-serving mission of the institution.

Applying for grants is also specifically related to the construction of the HSI identity. Through the process of grant writing and acquisition, these faculty members have begun to shape the HSI identity, from the rhetoric used in the proposal to the allocation of resources to various activities and programs. It goes without saying, however, that the federal government has a strong influence in shaping the way institutions construct their HSI identity, as they are determining which activities are valued and which programs are funded. At the campus level, however, the project directors have a strong influence on the construction of the HSI identity, as they determine the goals and objectives of the grant. At NSU, the programs being developed through HSI grants, including a faculty learning community, a peer mentoring program, career counseling, and community outreach programs, are shaping the HSI identity. As suggested by Chesler et al. (2005), one way to challenge racist structures is by training faculty, staff, and administrators to be more sensitive and proactive in serving students of color. The faculty
training program sponsored by the Title V grant, therefore, is a step towards changing the culture at NSU, albeit a small step, as only a selective few have participated.

By recognizing the processes that are shaping the HSI identity, there is recognition for the human agency that is present within organizations. There is no doubt that the external environment has an effect on the way institutions identify, particularly when thinking about the organizational identity process from a neo-institutional lens. The social actor perspective of organizational identity is based on the ideas of early institutional theories, suggesting that organizations determine central and distinct features of their organization by comparing themselves to others like them. The social constructionist perspective, however, proposes that organizations undergo a process of meaning making that is independent of the environment. Organizational members at NSU have constructed their identity as a result of changing demographics in the student population as well as normative expectations developing amongst the population of HSIs and regulatory policies set for by the federal government. Various processes, including creating awareness of the HSI designation, championing the HSI identity, and applying for grants that enhance the institution’s capacity to serve Latina/o students have an unquestionable influence on the HSI identity that cannot be ignored.

**Contributions to Research**

**Higher Education Research**

This study makes an empirical contribution to various bodies of research across multiple disciplines including higher education, organizational behavior, and sociology. In this section I will talk about these contributions and highlight areas for future research. Organizational theory has been used extensively to understand institutions of higher education, both empirically and practically. In fact, understanding colleges and universities as organizational systems is so essential that virtually every higher education graduate program in the U.S. has a core course that
focuses on organizational theory. Institutions of higher education have also been seminal in
shaping organizational theory, as some of the foundational work in this area was developed by
studying colleges and universities (i.e., “garbage can” theory of organizational decision making,
“loose coupling” of organizations) (Bastedo, 2012).

Bastedo (2010) argues that despite its significance to higher education, the use of
organizational theory in research on postsecondary institutions has been on a decline, “owing
largely to a lack of perceived connection between organization theory and major contemporary
concerns in higher education, such as student access, cost escalation, and social justice.” (p. 5).
Using organizational theory to frame issues of access, equity, diversity, and social justice,
however, is critical and necessary. Rather than using the student as the unit of analysis, focusing
on the organizational level takes an anti-deficit approach to understanding how institutions can
take responsibility for increasing access, creating inclusive environments, and enhancing
equitable outcomes for all students. By using organizational theory to frame this study and by
collecting and analyzing the data using a perspective in which Latinidad was placed at the center
of the analysis, this study makes an important contribution to the higher education research that
is focused on issues of equity and diversity.

This study also makes a unique contribution to the current research on HSIs. Scholars
examining HSIs have primarily looked at the way people experience the campus climate at HSIs,
with an emphasis on students’ experiences with culture, language, and sense of belonging.
Others have looked at the factors that contribute to persistence, retention, and graduation at HSIs.
Fewer studies have examined HSIs using an organizational lens. From an organizational
perspective, this study provides information about the way people co-construct their
organizational identity (an understudied concept in higher education), both through sensemaking
and sensegiving processes, and about the organizational structures and practices that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission.

Evidence about the way people co-construct their organizational identity was guided by previous theory. Yin (2009) contends that case studies seek to provide analytic generalization, rather than statistical generalization, by using a previously developed theory to compare empirical results from the case. This case study was guided by a theory developed by Ravasi and Schultz (2006) and provides analytic generalization for the theory. Specifically, it provides evidence of the sensegiving and sensemaking processes that happen during the co-construction of an organizational identity. They argue that when faced with an external threat to their identity, members attempt to make sense of their identity by reflecting on cultural practices and construing external images. They will then revise their formal identity claims and use sensegiving processes to project their desired image and embed claims back into the culture. This leads to a revised understanding of who they are as an organization. These processes occur over time, which is difficult to assess with one time point, but this case provides some verification for the theory. Ravasi and Schultz (2006) refer to the importance of image in the construction of an organizational, which is the way members think outsiders view them as an organization. Image, however, was not a formidable part of the sensemaking process for participants. Culture, however, was essential, with a majority of their sensemaking being embedded within their shared assumptions, values, and symbols.

In addition to analytic verification, this case study allowed for explanation building. As suggested by Yin (2009), “to ‘explain’ a phenomenon is to stipulate a presumed set of causal links about it, or ‘how’ or ‘why’ something happened,” (p. 141). Yin (2009), however, posits that the best explanation building is guided by previous theories about the phenomenon. This
study was guided by two theories (Chesler et al., 2005; Hurtado et al., 2012) that helped determine the cultural practices that are reflective of a Latina/o-serving mission. By examining the deeply held assumptions and embedded practices of the institution, I found evidence that the HSI label can be more than just a federal designation. Furthermore, these findings help to explain the links between organizational values, structures, and processes in constructing the HSI identity.

To date, researchers have not theorized about the specific construction of a HSI identity. This study, therefore, informs the creation of a framework (Figure 7.1) that can be used by researchers attempting to study the construction of a HSI identity. This framework includes the three core elements (organizational values, organizational structures, and organizational processes) that members used to make sense of the HSI identity at an ontological level. Future studies should attempt to test this framework in order to determine if these relationships are statistically significant. Future research should also focus on other institutional types that identify as HSIs (i.e., community colleges, private institutions, research institutions) to see if the framework is applicable across all institutional types. Perhaps this framework is only applicable to public, master’s granting, comprehensive institutions, but future research must confirm this.

Future research should also focus more specifically on certain aspects of the framework, with an emphasis on areas that could not be answered in this study. For example, there should be a closer look at the grant application process in order to determine the motivation behind applying for federally funded HSI grants. Since the grants are so closely aligned with the HSI identity, understanding the motivation behind the development of these proposals is important. Additionally, the Chicana/o studies curriculum arose as an important indicator of a Latina/o-serving institution and should be further examined. To date, most studies that look at the effects
of taking an ethnic studies course have been conducted at the individual level. Future research should also attempt to understand, at a deeper level, the historical significance of the founding of both the Chicana/o studies program and EOP and its relation to the HSI identity. Research should also continue to untangle the paradox of having a critical mass of Latina/o students on campus that continue to achieve in inequitable numbers.

**Organizational Behavior Research**

Organizational identity has been extensively theorized in order to better understand how these identities influence decision-making and the way organizations respond to turbulent environments. Institutions of higher education are currently dealing with declining fiscal support from the state government, changes in financial aid policies, threats to the use of race-based admissions, and changing policies regarding undocumented immigrants’ access to public education. Understanding “who we are as an organization” is imperative for postsecondary institutions in order to respond to these changes in the environment. As a field, organizational identity is arguably in a stage of adolescence, with extensive literature focusing on the theory of organizational identity. These theories, however, have been largely untested or challenged. This study contributes to the organizational identity literature by empirically testing Ravasi and Schultz’s (2006) model. They argue that both sensegiving and sensemaking process are essential to the construction of an organizational identity. This case provides evidence for both processes. Future studies should continue to focus on both processes during identity construction.

Additionally, Ran and Golden (2011) suggest that a third process be considered, sense-exchanging, which is “how organizational stakeholders’ perception and interpretation further construct and contribute to the identity consensus” (p. 421). Sense-exchanging should also be examined more closely.
Sociology of Organizations

Studies focused on understanding organizational identities and categories are also emerging with the field of sociology. A clear distinction between the organizational behaviorist perspective and the sociological perspective is that sociologists view identities as dictated by the external environment more so than the organizational behaviorists who place a lot of emphasis on internal stakeholders. The ideas attached to organizational identities within sociology, therefore, are largely based on the evolution of other organizational theories including population ecology (which looks at the reasons why organizations are born and die within well established population forms), neo-institutionalism (which looks at the ways that organizations change to be more like others within the same form), and social movement theory (which uses the idea of framing in comparison to other organizations). From this perspective, the population of organizations is important to the identity formation process.

Although this study is limited in its ability to inform a population perspective, as it is only focused on one institution, there are a number of future research studies that can take a more population approach to studying HSIs. Rather than seeing them as individual entities, future studies should look at the way they develop as organizational forms. One way to do this is to duplicate this study in multiple institutions that identify as a HSI. In doing this, we can begin to see the similarities and differences in the way HSIs make sense of their identity. There should also be an attempt to better understand the federal government’s role in the identity construction, as I indicate that they legitimate the HSI identity by determining which HSI grants will be funded. Viewing HSIs from the population level will help to determine which institutions are likely to thrive as HSIs and which are likely to be unsuccessful after a few years of trying to become a HSI.
Implications for Practice and Policy

Institutional Practice

This research has a number of practical implications, both at the institutional and national level. At the institutional level, this case study highlights an exemplar HSI that is striving for legitimacy as a HSI. As an exemplar, this case provides practical information and best practices for institutions that want to better serve Latina/o and other students of color. Like the institution introduced earlier, Notre Dame de Namur University, there are a number of emerging HSIs that are actively engaging in the process of becoming a HSI that would find great value in the findings of this study. Institutions may use the framework of HSI identity construction presented here in order to assess their current level of identification and determine areas that they should address even further.

Institutions may first look at their mission and values and evaluate them for some of the same characteristics seen here (regional serving, committed to the community, dedicated to access, diverse serving). For example, Notre Dame de Namur University’s president stated, “The mission that we get from the sisters of Notre Dame de Namur is really about providing access to education” (Schnoebelen, 2013, p. 1), indicating that they are dedicated to access. Additionally, they are located in a state where one third of the population in Latina/o (Schnoebelen, 2013). By recognizing this, they chose to focus more directly on the local community in their recruitment efforts (Schnoebelen, 2013). The Schnoebelen article does not provide enough information about the institution to know about its commitment to the community or to what extent it sees itself as serving a diverse population but an assumption can be made it also possesses these values. Arguably, this case study sets a new standard for institutions and their actors to emphasize in terms of these commitments.
After reviewing their mission and values, institutions may begin to look at their organizational structures to determine the extent to which being Latina/o-serving is embedded within their culture. This research suggests that culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy are important aspects of technology for achieving the outcomes of serving Latina/os. Although an institution may find that their values align with the integrated identities of a HSI as suggested by this research, they may not have the structures yet in place to become truly Latina/o-serving. For example, in reviewing their curricular offerings, they may find that they are lacking courses that are culturally reflective of the Latina/o population. Additionally, they may not have an established Chicana/o Studies program (or perhaps Mexican American Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, Boricua Studies, etc.). These curricular offerings were vital to the construction of a HSI identity at NSU, demonstrating their importance in the framework for constructing a HSI identity. The institution may also review the pedagogical practices of their faculty, looking for indications of cultural relevance. Support programs are also important in the framework, suggesting that an institution should assess its programs for cultural relevance. Even without an established EOP program, an institution may have other programmatic offerings that are culturally relevant. In assessing its structures, this study also suggests that an institution evaluate its historical commitment to serving Latina/o students as well as its compositional diversity of staff, faculty, and administrators.

The third element that an institution striving to become a HSI can evaluate is its processes related to HSI activities. To begin with, the institution should think about the level of awareness that people at the institution have, and develop a way to create better awareness of the HSI identity. Beyond awareness, however, this study demonstrates that it is more important for people to attach meaning to the HSI label, therefore, there should be a plan for helping people to
identify with the label at a deeper level of meaning making. An institution can also determine if there are currently institutional agents seeking social justice and equality for Latina/o students. If so, it can tap into the resources that these people offer and utilize them to help create awareness while empowering others to become more involved with the institution’s efforts to become more Latina/o-serving. Finally, the grant activities are essential to an institution’s efforts to becoming a HSI. In developing proposals, this study provides useful information about areas that an institution can address in its grant activities. For example, in their assessment, an institution may find that they are lacking the structural elements that indicate a Latina/o-serving mission. In this case, addressing their structural deficiencies may be an important place to concentrate their grant efforts.

**National Policy**

At the national level, this research also has a number of implications. To begin with, there is evidence to support the need for continued federal financial support of HSIs. Federal initiatives set national priorities, and it is significant that institutions are supported to create transformation to aid a growing Latina/o population. This case proves that the HSI identity is closely connected to the HSI grants and the activities that develop through grant funding. The people who made the most meaning of the HSI identity were those working on the various grant projects across NSU. The grants often take people from the stage of awareness of the HSI identity to meaning making attached to the identity. As more people on campus not only become aware of the HSI label but make meaning of it as an identity, more synergy will begin to happen in regard to addressing some of the inequities and disparities in outcomes for Latina/o college students. Despite reaching a critical mass, Latina/o students have yet to reach an equitable level of graduation, graduate school enrollment, and career placement. Until these outcomes are equal
with their White counterparts, there is a need for HSIs to not only identify as Latina/o-serving but to make progress towards becoming more Latina/o-serving.

This case also provides ideas for assessing who qualifies for HSI grants as well as increasing accountability for the outcomes related to these grants. First and foremost, I have suggested that the HSI identity is related to an institution’s commitment to access for Latina/o students, dedication to serving the local community, and obligation to connecting with the local region. At the same time, a thematic analysis of three grant proposals submitted by NSU to federal agencies revealed that there was little connection to these goals, particularly those related to access. In determining who will qualify for the increasingly competitive HSI grants, an institution should be required to provide evidence for their level of commitment to these values.

Although it is difficult to accurately measure the effect of institutional level capacity building grants on individual outcomes, this study demonstrates that the HSI identity is a social construction, which means is can be measured through meaning making and qualitative assessment. As it currently stands, recipients of DOE Title V grants complete an annual report based on a standardized template, with little regard for alternative ways of defining success and institutional progress. Additionally, the goals set forth in grants are often related to outcomes that are difficult to measure on an annual basis. For example, NSU has a goal of increasing its six-year graduation rate, which is impossible to determine in one year. The standard template can very well discourage institutions from reporting details as the message sent by the DOE is that progress is only quantifiable in a limited number of ways and often unassociated with the actual goals set forth by the institution. Instead of requiring institutions to report numbers that have little meaning to them, the DOE (and other funding agencies) can require HSIs to develop qualitative forms of progress that encourage institutional actors to think more critically about
what it means to be a HSI. For example, institutions can be expected to develop a mission statement dedicated to becoming more serving of Latina/o and other underserved communities. Or even further, they can be required to develop an annual plan for addressing pervasive disparities between Latinas/os and other groups on campus. Project directors can remain actively involved in the process that principal investigators undertake when writing their initial proposals for funding, which includes a reflection of who they believe the institution is in regard to serving Latina/o students.

This case demonstrates that the process of HSI identification is not only connected to the way member’s verbally make sense of this identity but also to the way principal investigators and project directors place value on the activities developed and enhanced as a result of federal grants. The goals and objectives laid out by principal investigators, however, are highly correlated with the agency’s goals for their HSI programs. The RFP process, therefore, can be changed in order to elicit different outcomes for HSIs. For example, culturally relevant educational practices were related to the HSI identity of NSU, suggesting that HSIs should be thinking more critically about these practices. The RFPs set forth by federal agencies, however, rarely address this concern. Although the federal government is not in the game of dictating curriculum, they can in fact provide the resources necessary for institution’s to enhance their capacity to be more culturally relevant. For example, NSU’s grant that focused on enhancing the library’s Chicana/o and Latina/o relevant holdings is a good example of a way that an institution can develop its ability to support the culturally relevant educational practices of a HSI. The important thing to note, however, is that HSI grants are strongly correlated with the priorities of the federal government, which means agencies have the ability to make changes to their
guidelines that will dictate change in the way institutions enact their educational process for Latina/o students.

The federal agencies can also dictate activities that would address some of the disparities suggested by this case, including the lack of representation of Latina/o faculty and administrators in HSIs. Rather than calling for institutions to increase six-year graduation rates, perhaps the federal agencies place value on increasing the number of Latina/o tenure track hires over the life of the grant. Although it seems like small progress, hiring two Latina/o tenure track faculty members in one year is not only quantifiable but can have significant long-term effects on the success of Latina/o students. As suggested by this study, the social identities of faculty, staff, and administrators are essential to the development of culturally relevant educational practices and the HSI identity; however, institutions are sometimes resistant to recruiting, retaining, and promoting faculty, staff, and administrators of color. If the federal government develops RFPs that call for an increased focus on this area of HSI identification and development, they can have a significant effect on this seemingly slow moving process. Institutions may need additional incentive for developing programs and policies that focus on the intentional recruitment and retention of people of color. The federal government has the ability to enforce Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) hiring and prevent discrimination and should strongly consider this. As institutions that depend on resources from the federal government, HSIs are more likely to respond to policy pressures set at the national level. Currently, the state policy has not been explicit in its support of HSIs, and declining state funding naturally leads institutions to become more dependent on other sources of revenues. It will be important to investigate in the future how state policies influence HSI organizational development or decline in their capacities to serve Latina/os.
Summary

In conclusion, this study has provided useful information about the process of co-constructing an organizational identity, with both theoretical and practical implications. As the youngest, fastest growing population in the U.S., Latinas/os are entering postsecondary institutions in substantial numbers while HSIs continue to burgeon. Empirical studies focused on better understanding HSIs are essential as these institutions are becoming more critical to the access, success, and overall social mobility of Latinas/os. As important contributors to democratic principles and social good, HSIs are in need of support from the federal government and society as a whole. This study is pivotal because it contributes to a greater understanding of the ways in which HSIs actually serve Latinas/os. Not only are they providing access to a traditionally underserved population, but they are also educating regions of the country heavily populated by diverse communities while engaging with the community in order to enhance the long-term health and wellness of these populations. Additionally, HSIs have the ability to offer Latina/o students a culturally relevant education that will enable them to become critically conscious and socially aware of the structures that continue to oppress them in a nation that is far from being postracial. For higher education researchers, this study is critical because it provides a theoretical framework that can be tested and further enhanced in order to understand the social construction of a HSI identity. At a practical level, this research furnishes postsecondary institutions designated as HSIs with information that can be used for enhancing the meaning they attach to their organizational identity. This is important in order to progress as institutions with equitable access and outcomes for Latina/o and other underrepresented groups. Finally, this study is crucial for federal policy makers, offering suggestions for better ways to hold HSIs accountable for challenging their deeply held racist practices and assumptions in order to become truly Latina/o-serving.
Appendix A: Multi-contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments
Appendix B: Interview Protocol for Administrators

Introduction
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. I know your time is valuable and I appreciate you giving me a chance to talk to you about organizational culture and practices at NSU. I am interested in your knowledge of the organization’s identity and culture as it pertains to being a Hispanic Serving Institution. I am going to ask you a series of questions. When possible, please provide concrete examples and context. As stated in the consent form, I will be recording the interview and taking notes. With that, I want to assure you that everything you say will remain confidential and will only be used for research purposes. If for any reason you need to discontinue the interview or state something off the record, please feel free to ask me to stop the recorder.

1. To start, please clearly state the pseudonym that you indicated on your participant information form, your position, and tell me about your duties at NSU?
2. In making your decision to work at NSU, what attracted you to the campus?
   a. Probes: diversity, culture, special programs, HSI status, students

Organizational Identity/Culture & External Environment (RQ1, 1a)
First I am going to ask you some general questions about NSU as an organization.

3. In addressing faculty, staff, and students, how would you answer the question, “Who are we as an organization?”
4. How would you describe the culture of NSU to an outside constituent?
   a. Probes: embedded practices, leadership, membership
5. How would you describe the students at NSU to an outside constituent?
6. In what ways is NSU unique when compared to other campuses in the SU system?
7. How do you think outside constituents would describe NSU?
8. In what ways do you think external factors have affected NSU’s ability to admit, enroll, and educate a diverse student population?
   a. Probes: declining state budget, changes in the federal government’s support of postsecondary education, changes in affirmative action laws, Chancellor’s office

HSI Identity (RQ1, 1a)
Next I am going to ask you a series of questions about Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). As you may or may not know, a HSI is typically defined by enrollment of 25% Latina/o students. With this study, I am interested in how institutions may or may not be changing as a result of this enrollment.

9. What do you think it means to be “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
10. If you were leading the HSI campus wide committee, what would you do to make NSU more of a HSI?
11. How would you define organizational success as a HSI?
12. Is there anybody on campus that you would identify as an institutional agent of change for Latina/o students?
   a. Probes: what do they do?
13. In what ways does being a HSI hinder your ability to serve other diverse groups on campus?
14. In what ways has the Title V funding from the Department of Education facilitated NSU’s ability to become more “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
Campus Climate/Organizational Structures (RQ1a, 1b)
Next I am going to ask you more specific questions about the diversity of NSU.

15. In what ways are Latinas/os represented on this campus?
   a. Probes: within the faculty, within the academic administration
   b. Probes: campus symbols and campus rituals

16. (For Latina/o administrator) In what ways do you see yourself represented on this campus?
   a. Probes: within the student population; within faculty; within the administration

17. In what ways does NSU make Latinas/os feel like they are part of the campus community?
   a. Probes: cultural connections; race/ethnicity; language; other social identities

18. In what ways does your race/ethnicity help or hinder your ability to make connections with Latina/o students on campus?

19. In what ways have campus programs and policies been implemented in order to help Latina/o students succeed?

20. In what ways has the curriculum and course offerings been altered in order to reflect the increase in Latina/o enrollment?

21. To what extent have campus resources been allocated to programs and services that cater to Latina/o students?
Appendix C: Interview Protocol for Faculty

Introduction
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. For this study, I am interested in your experiences with diversity at NSU and your knowledge of the organizational culture and practices. I am going to ask you a series of questions. When possible, please provide concrete examples and context. As stated in the consent form, I will be recording the interview and taking notes. With that, I want to assure you that everything you say will remain confidential and will not affect your employment status. If for any reason you need to discontinue the interview or state something off the record, please feel free to ask me to stop the recorder. Any questions?

1. To start, please clearly state the pseudonym that you indicated on your participant information form. Then tell me your current faculty rank, department, field of study, and when you started working at NSU.
2. In making your decision to work at NSU, what attracted you to the campus?
   a. Probes: diversity, culture, special programs, HSI status, students

Organizational Identity/Culture & External Environment (RQ1, 1a)
First I am going to ask you some general questions about NSU as an organization.

3. If you were asked by central administration, “Who are we as an organization?” how would you answer that question?
4. How would you describe the culture of NSU to an outside constituent?
   a. Probes: embedded practices, leadership, membership
5. How would you describe the students at NSU to an outside constituent?
6. In what ways is NSU unique when compared to other campuses in the SU system?
7. How do you think outside constituents would describe NSU?
8. In what ways do you think external factors have affected NSU’s ability to admit, enroll, and educate a diverse student population?
   b. Probes: declining state budget, changes in the federal government’s support of postsecondary education, changes in affirmative action laws, Chancellor’s office

HSI Identity (RQ1, 1a)
Next I am going to ask you a series of questions about Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). As you may or may not know, a HSI is typically defined by enrollment of 25% Latina/o students. With this study, I am interested in how institutions may or may not be changing as a result of this enrollment.

9. What do you think it means to be “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
10. If you were in charge of the HSI campus wide committee, what would you do to make NSU more of a HSI?
11. How would you define organizational success as a HSI?
12. Is there anybody on campus that you would identify as an institutional agent of change for Latina/o students?
   a. Probes: what do they do?
13. In what ways does being a HSI hinder your ability to serve other diverse groups on campus?
14. In what ways has the Title V funding from the Department of Education facilitated NSU’s ability to become more “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
Campus Climate/Organizational Structures (RQ1a, 1b)
Next I am going to ask you more specific questions about the diversity of NSU.

15. **In what ways are Latinas/os represented on this campus?**
   a. Probes: within the faculty, within the academic administration
   b. Probes: campus symbols and campus rituals
16. (For Latina/o faculty) **In what ways do you see yourself represented on this campus?**
   a. Probes: within the student population; within faculty; within the administration
17. **In what ways does NSU make Latinas/os feel like they are part of the campus community?**
   a. Probes: cultural connections; race/ethnicity; language; other social identities
18. In what ways does your race/ethnicity help or hinder your ability to make connections with Latina/o students on campus?
19. **In what ways are Latina/o students represented in the curriculum at NSU?**
   a. Probes: differences between diversity-specific and traditional courses
20. **In what ways are your pedagogical practices reflective of the Latina/o population at NSU?**
   a. Probes: culturally relevant pedagogical practices
   b. Probes: difference in the ways diverse students learn
21. In thinking about the diversity within academic affairs, do you feel like diversity, and particularly Latina/o diversity, is evenly distributed throughout each academic department?
   a. Probes: What is the diversity of the faculty vs. students
   b. Probes: Lack of diversity in some departments vs. more diversity in other department
Appendix D: Interview Protocol for Student Affairs Staff

Introduction
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. For this study, I am interested in your experiences with diversity at NSU and your knowledge of the organizational culture and practices. I am going to ask you a series of questions. When possible, please provide concrete examples and context. As stated in the consent form, I will be recording the interview and taking notes. With that, I want to assure you that everything you say will remain confidential and will not affect your employment status. If for any reason you need to discontinue the interview or state something off the record, please feel free to ask me to stop the recorder. Any questions?

1. To start, please clearly state the pseudonym that you indicated on your participant information form. Then tell me about your current position, department on campus, and how long you have worked here.
   a. Probes: diversity, culture, special programs, HSI status, students

Organizational Identity/Culture & External Environment (RQ1, 1a)
First I am going to ask you some general questions about NSU as an organization.

   22. If you were asked by central administration, “Who are we as an organization?” how would you answer that question?
   23. How would you describe the culture of NSU to an outside constituent?
      a. Probes: embedded practices, leadership, membership
   24. How would you describe the students at NSU to an outside constituent?

25. In what ways is NSU unique when compared to other campuses in the SU system?
26. How do you think outside constituents would describe NSU?
27. In what ways do you think external factors have affected NSU’s ability to admit, enroll, and educate a diverse student population?
   c. Probes: declining state budget, changes in the federal government’s support of postsecondary education, changes in affirmative action laws, Chancellor’s office

HSI Identity (RQ1, 1a)
Next I am going to ask you a series of questions about Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). As you may or may not know, a HSI is typically defined by enrollment of 25% Latina/o students. With this study, I am interested in how institutions may or may not be changing as a result of this enrollment.

   28. What do you think it means to be “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
   29. If you were on the HSI campus wide committee, what would you do to make NSU more of a HSI?
   30. How would you define organizational success as a HSI?
   31. Is there anybody on campus that you would identify as an institutional agent of change for Latina/o students?
      a. Probes: what do they do?
   32. In what ways does being a HSI hinder your ability to serve other diverse groups on campus?
   33. In what ways has the Title V funding from the Department of Education facilitated NSU’s ability to become more “Hispanic/Latina/o Serving?”
Campus Climate/Organizational Structures (RQ1a, 1b)

Next I am going to ask you more specific questions about the diversity of NSU.

34. In what ways are Latinas/os represented on this campus?
   a. Probes: within the faculty, within the academic administration
   b. Probes: campus symbols and campus rituals

35. (For Latina/o staff) In what ways do you see yourself represented on this campus?
   a. Probes: within the student population; within faculty; within the administration

36. In what ways does NSU make Latinas/os feel like they are part of the campus community?
   a. Probes: cultural connections; race/ethnicity; language; other social identities

37. In what ways does your race/ethnicity help or hinder your ability to make connections with Latina/o students on campus?

38. In what ways do programs and services on campus serve Latina/o students?
   a. Probes: Summer Bridge, HSI Title V grant cohort program
   b. Probes: resources available for programs targeting diversity

39. To what extent are you aware of special programs, or services for Latina/o students?
   a. Probes: “Safe Space” programs for undocumented students; scholarship programs, HSI Title V cohort program

40. In thinking about the diversity within the division of student affairs, do you feel like diversity is evenly distributed throughout the each department?
   a. Probes: What is the diversity of the staff vs. the students utilizing the service?
   b. Probes: Lack of diversity in some spaces vs. lots of diversity in others
Appendix E: Interview Protocol for Student Focus Groups

Introduction
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this focus group. For this study, I am interested in your experiences with diversity at NSU and your overall perceptions of the university. I am going to ask you a series of questions. When possible, please provide concrete examples and context. Feel free to answer in any order and if you do not have an opinion on the question asked, please feel free to pass. As stated in the consent form, I will be recording the interview and taking notes. With that, I want to assure you that everything you say will remain confidential and will not affect your status as a student at NSU. If for any reason you need to discontinue the interview, please feel free to exit the group without any repercussions to you.

1. To start, please clearly state the pseudonym that you indicated on your participant information form. Then tell me your: major and year at NSU.
2. In making your decision to go to college, what attracted you to NSU?
   a. Probes: location, cost/affordability, special programs, diversity, majors offered
   b. Probes: Information available including brochures, faculty/staff assistance, older siblings, friends, special programs (i.e., Upward Bound/TRIO)

Organizational Identity/Culture & External Environment (RQ1, 1a)
First I am going to ask you some general questions about NSU.

3. How would you describe the culture of NSU? (To your parents or non-NSU friend?)
   a. Probes: embedded practices, campus community, rituals
4. From what you know about other State Universities, is there anything that you think makes NSU unique when compared to other SU’s?

Campus Climate/Diversity (RQ1b)
Next I am going to ask you a series of questions about diversity at NSU.

5. What does diversity look like at NSU?
   a. Probes: race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, social class
   b. Probes: in classes vs. out-of-class/co-curricular involvement
   c. Probes: difference between students and faculty, staff, administrators

6. In what ways does NSU make you feel like you are part of the campus community?
   a. Probes: cultural connections; race/ethnicity; language; other social identities
   b. Probes: sense of belonging; isolation

7. In what ways do you see diversity represented within the faculty, staff, and administration?

8. In what ways do you see diversity represented within the curriculum?

9. In what ways do you see diversity represented in the classroom? In the way your faculty teach?
   c. Probes: innovative vs. traditional vs. culturally relevant pedagogy
10. To what extent have you participated in or are you aware of special programs or services for specific groups, including racial groups, gender groups, groups based on religion, etc.?
    a. Probes: Summer Bridge, EOP, HSI Title V grant cohort program, Disabled Student Services; race-based student organizations
HSI Identity (RQ1)
We are going to switch gears a little. I am going to ask you a series of questions about Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). But first let me define what a HSI is: a postsecondary institution that enrolls a minimum of 25% Latina/o students.

11. Are you aware of NSU’s designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)?
   a. If so, how did you become aware of this designation?

12. What do you think it means to be “Hispanic-serving?”
    a. Probe: What types of curriculum and programs should a HSI offer for students?
    b. Probe: What should be the goals and mission of a HSI?
    c. Probes: What should it feel like?

13. In what ways has NSU been intentional about serving Latina/o students?

14. If you were the student representation on the HSI campus wide committee, what would you suggest to the committee to make NSU more of a HSI?
Appendix F: Observation Guide

Date/Time of Observation: _______________________

Location of Observation: ______________________________________

Participants Involved in Observation: ______________________________________________

Purpose of Observation: _________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Descriptive Notes:

1. **Physical Space.** Describe the setting.

2. **Participants.** Who are they? What are their perceived racial/ethnic identities? What are their roles? What are they doing? How do people interact?

3. **Activities.** What activities are going on? Who is involved?

4. **Conversations.** What is the content of conversations going on? Who speaks to whom?

5. **Subtle Factors.** What symbols are apparent? Are there indicators of the institution as a HSI? Are there indicators of racial/ethnic identity within the environment? Does the environment feel “safe” for diverse individuals?

6. **My Behavior.** How do I react to the environment?
Appendix G: List of Documents Reviewed

1. State University System’s Mission and Values
2. NSU’s Mission, Values, and Vision
3. NSU’s History
4. NSU’s Website
   a. Academic Departments
   b. Student Services
   c. Administration
5. NSU’s Facebook Page
6. Institutional Fact Sheet
7. Institutional Research
   a. Characteristics of Students
   b. Characteristics of Faculty
8. Schedule of Classes
9. Campus Library Archives
   a. History of Chicana/o Studies
   b. History of Educational Opportunity Program
   c. Student Movements at NSU (1960s-1970s)
10. Campus Newspaper Archives
    a. Stories about Chicana/o Studies
    b. Stories about Educational Opportunity Program
    c. Stories about the Chicana/o House
11. HSI grant abstracts
    a. HUD HSIAC FY 2000
    b. HUD HSIAC FY 2002
    c. HUD HSIAC FY 2010
    d. USDA HSI Program FY 2010
    e. DOE Title V Developing Institutions FY 2002
    f. DOE Title V Developing Institutions FY 2010
    g. DOE Title V Developing Institutions FY 2011
12. HSI grant applications
    a. HUD HSIAC FY 2010
    b. DOE Title V Developing Institutions FY 2002
    c. DOE Title V Developing Institutions FY 2010


### Appendix H: Data Matrix Sample

#### Integrated Identities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who are we as an institution?</th>
<th>What does it mean to be a HSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America Vida (committed to</td>
<td>But I think now, I, and especially with the work that I do, working with the population that I do, I really do feel that we’re an institution that offers opportunity to our community….I could see that the students really do go out there and we offer that opportunity for students to be able to reach their potential and take students from this community and bridge them out to other communities and offer that possibility for them.</td>
<td>I think it means a Hispanic Serving Institution is there to help foster the relationships that Hispanics have, not only in the university and help them succeed through the university, but also foster the relationships within the Hispanic neighborhood that the students are coming from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Barrera (dedicated</td>
<td>...I think that's really where the purpose of what [State Universities] are. You know, public institutions meant to serve the public and create access for the community. So I think it’s really, for the Valley [region where NSU is located], a place where people from [the] surrounding community have a place of higher institution.</td>
<td>So, in terms of answering like the Hispanic-serving [question]...I do think it is about, you know, the leadership on the campus still really saying, “Hey, we are going to work for access, and we are not going to declare impaction and we are going to allow for students who need remediation to come to our campus.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dedicated to access)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eva Ortega (diverse</td>
<td>Uh, we are a Latino Serving Institution, largely just because of the numbers. I think, and I didn't look at the most recent data, but we're like, Latino students are like 33% of the population, just by sheer numbers we are Latino serving. How well we do it, I don't know but we are. And I think we are an institution that also attracts, as do a lot of [State University campuses], a lot of immigrant children, or children of immigrants. A lot of working class students. And of course some middle, you know working-middle class students. So, um, that's how I would define us.</td>
<td>Right, right, Latino-serving, working class-serving, immigrant-serving, whoever it would serve, because, although we are Latino-serving...I don’t see myself just serving Latinos. I see myself serving immigrant students -- and we get a lot of immigrants from other parts, from Armenia, from Korea, and Vietnam -- so we get a lot of immigrant students from all parts of the world and I see myself as committed to them as I am [to Latinas/os], and all working class students, I find myself committed to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serving)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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