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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Collaboration

Leah Marisa Rico and Gloria Teresa Rodriguez-Rooks collaborated equally in all phases of this research project that included identification of the research problem, review of the literature, and collection and analysis of the data.

Background of the Problem

Since the late 1850s, educational practitioners have recognized social barriers in public education that continue to prevent economically and educationally disadvantaged students from pursuing higher educational opportunities (Karabel, 2005). These economically disadvantaged and educationally disadvantaged students are also more likely enrolled in low performing secondary schools that do not adequately provide the informational resources necessary to meet the college entrance requirements in a timely manner (Betts, Rueben, and Danenberg, 2000; Haycock, 2001; McDonough, 2004). Yet, current enrollment trends in higher education reflect that California will have a deficit in the college educated workforce needed by the year 2025 if access to first-generation and low-income students continues. Regardless, too few Latino/a students enroll into postsecondary institutions after high school graduation (Griffin, Allen, Kimura-Walsh, & Yamamura, 2007; Roderick, Nagaoka & Coca, 2009).

Latino/a high school students are less likely to have academic and social services that promote a quality life and the full potential of each student. High schools with a low academic performance index (API), as defined by the California’s Department of
Education, are more likely to lack the resources necessary in preparing these students for admission to four-year postsecondary institutions (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2006; Nevarez & Rico, 2007). More specifically, educationally disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged students in low performing schools are less likely to receive college readiness resources at a higher rate than more affluent students in the same setting (Betts et al., 2000).

According to the California Department of Education (2010), schools with a lower API score are more likely populated with economically disadvantaged and first-generation college prospects. Access to college preparatory courses that meet admission requirements, guidance, and support are lacking in the communities with a large Latino population (Griffin et al. 2007; Haveman & Smeeding, 2006). Aside from the academic support, Latino/a high school students face a number of challenges that may include familial support, language barriers, limited financial resources, a lack of instructional support from faculty, and a limitation to potential outreach programs. Consequently, these predispositions existing in the Latino/a community promote a negative view of self-identity that discourages postsecondary aspiration amongst its students (Kaplan, Turner, Piotrkowski, and Silber, 2009).

While there are other factors that influence the decision to go to college, recent evidence has demonstrated that there are certain elements in student-centered outreach services that contribute to a student’s college-going rate. Coupled with the social services students receive, student-centered outreach programs increase the likelihood of disadvantaged secondary school students to enroll in postsecondary institutions.
According to Kaplan et al., (2009) activities that promote mentoring between undergraduates and high school students improve a student’s attitudinal views of higher education and career goals. Furthermore, additional evidence demonstrate that academic advising and activities that promote college knowledge further support a student’s likelihood to enroll into higher educational system within six-months of high school graduation (Rico, 2007).

**Statement of the Problem**

For the purpose of this study the researchers will analyze Latino/a the Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) participants and compare program data with factors that may influence the success rates of the Latino/a participants success in attaining higher education. The factors that will be analyzed for the purpose of this study are the participation number of hours that the participants attend programs facilitated by EAOP staff members, parent’s educational level, family income, family size, primary language spoken in home and finally the student’s ‘a – g’ course completion. This study will define the measure of success for participants as program completion by fulfilling graduation requirements for California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) eligibility. EAOP’s standards focus on four core strategies to support students with meeting their educational needs and goals. The purposes of these strategies are to assist students achieving postsecondary access and success, and increasing UC, CSU, and Community College (CC) attendance for more students. The four core strategies are academic advisory, academic enrichment, college entrance exams, and college knowledge. This study will attempt to measure Latino/a participants with the
independent factors noted above and their level of success in attaining UC, CSU or CC admissions eligibility after completion of the EAOP program.

**Rationale**

The number of Latino/as in the United States is a growing population and makes up a majority of the minorities in the Nation. Although the population continues to grow, the number of high school students seeking and obtaining college or university-level education is not comparable. Many communities continue to repeat the cycle of minimum education and individuals remain in low-paying jobs. In turn, the communities fall victim to high levels of crime, poverty, and unhealthy living conditions.

Some of the barriers that Latino/a students face can include language, socio-economic status, quality of support systems, low expectations and self perceptions, and higher educational exposure. Programs aware of the obstacles provide few and unreliable resources as a result of a lack of funding from the educational community. All these factors in combination require a comprehensive approach as a course of action that, academic preparation programs must take to meet the level of need for the Latino/a community. Continuous and adequate sources of funding are crucial to the ongoing development of trustworthiness between the Latino/a community and the higher education system. Academic preparation programs play an instrumental role in educating Latino/a youth and families. Academic preparation programs intend to improve a participant’s academic endeavors, but are used to supplement a youth’s academic curriculum (Betts et al., 2000).
Theoretical Framework

Two of the theories that can be used to address the research topic and purpose include ecological theory and systems theory (Greene, 2008). Additionally, the researchers will use Swail’s (2003) integrated model of student success to apply ecological and systems theoretical analysis to a student’s success.

The ecological theory emphasizes the significance between an individual and the environment in which they are a part of. These two entities cannot be separated and must be treated in respect to one another. This theory fits the research topic and purpose because when working with an individual, understanding the culture from which they originated will be paramount to the direction of change that must be formed. In order to create the most effective form of intervention, a holistic view of the inter-connected relationships that the students have within their community will be vital to the success of the student. Developing and creating a program that addresses and respects the many difficulties of the student will yield a higher success rate amongst the individual goals.

Systems theory acknowledges an individual’s belonging to many groups and the relationships between the individual and the many groups that he/she is a part of. The relationships are interconnected and any change with the individual or a system creates a change in other systems that the individual is a part of, whether they are positive or negative. The change may happen on the many levels that influence an individual. These areas include the larger systemic influences, also known as the macro level, the relationships and interpersonal relationships or the mezzo level, and the individual’s micro level. The individual may be influenced by any one system, but as a whole will
attempt to maintain a balance amongst the systems for the purpose of the individual. This theory relates to the topic and purpose because ultimately the setting in which the student will be immersed will be undergoing some form of change when embarking in higher education. This change must be adapted to and accepted for the success of the learner and the disruption of the current state.

Swail’s integrated model of student success is an analysis focused model based on the geometric model of persistence and achievement (Swail, 1995). The model of student success notes that the student experience is the result of an interaction of cognitive, social, and institutional factors which are similar to the micro, mezzo, and macro levels of systems theory. In review of the literature, success in college begins in middle school when parents and children begin to aspire and plan for college. Latino/a students may start to aspire for college later when they are first generation students. Further research is necessary to determine when aspirations begin for those Latino/a students are motivated to aspire for postsecondary education. With relevance to this study, the researchers would like to account for cognitive factors such as: postsecondary planning, academic preparation, college knowledge, and academic integration; social factors such as: family encouragement, aspirations, social integration, and development of students. Finally, institutional or systemic factors such as: K-16 coordination, outreach program, climate and diversity, financial aid, and facilities and services that contribute to students’ academic outcomes. (See Appendix A)
Definition of Terms

Terms used throughout the study are in accordance to the Early Academic Outreach Program (2010) definitions and will be adopted and used for all intents and purposes by the researchers several times throughout the study. Each key term has a unique definition and relevance for the researchers to incorporate within this study. The following key terms provide the reader with a greater understanding of the EAOP program and the activities provided to the participants throughout the academic school year. The following key terms will also be used to provide a greater knowledge base for the requirements used by University of California or a California State University for applying freshman. The researchers will use the participant’s grade point average and fulfillment of the eligibility requirements for the California public colleges as a measurement of the participant’s advancement to higher education after high school.

*Latino/a:* Will include Latino/a, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano/a. Participants will be selected who identify themselves as identifying with either of these ethnicities. With relevance to this study, Yolo County EAOP participants whom self-identify as either of these identities will be classified as Latino/a and will be included in the collection of data.

*Educationally and economically disadvantaged:* Educationally disadvantaged means that neither one of the applicant’s parents/guardians has graduated from a four year institution in the United States. Economically disadvantaged means the applicant’s family is eligible for the Free or Reduced Lunch Program in accordance to Federal guidelines. With respect to this study, the EAOP participants are defined as educationally and/or
economically disadvantaged as a factor for consideration to be accepted into the EAOP program.

*Academic preparation programs:*

Academic preparation programs are defined as those programs operated by private or public postsecondary institutions that target individual students in which supplemental services are provided. Academic advising, counseling, mentoring, and academic enrichment activities are deliverable services made available to EAOP participants in middle school and high school (Rico, 2007). EAOP is defined as an academic preparation program and for the purpose of this study all of the participants will be EAOP participants.

*UC Davis EAOP School Districts served:* Center Unified, Dixon Unified, Sacramento City Unified, Elk Grove Unified, Twin Rivers Unified, Esparto Unified, Washington Unified, Galt Joint Union, Natomas Unified, Woodland Joint Unified. The researchers of this study will only collect data from Yolo County partnering high schools. The high schools included in the study are River City High School, Esparto High School, Woodland High School, and Pioneer High School.

*EAOP program activities:* Include academic advising, college knowledge, academic enrichment, and college entrance exams.

*Academic Advising:* EAOP specializes in individual and group academic advising that help students stay motivated and on track to complete the ‘a – g’ college-preparatory courses unique to each high school and required for UC and CSU admissions.
**College Knowledge:** College Knowledge activities provide accurate and timely information for students, their families, and educators about the value of a college education the steps needed to prepare, and deadlines important for completion of the admissions application. EAOP provides workshops and campus tour opportunities to help students and their families navigate the college preparation, application and enrollment process. Workshops include an overview of California’s postsecondary education options, how to fill out college applications, and how to apply for financial aid and scholarships. Family engagement support students at becoming prepared and eligible for the college application process. EAOP activities are in place to increase college knowledge for EAOP participants, thus, for the purpose of this study, the researchers would view an increase in college knowledge by measuring an increase in those participants that meet the eligibility requirements to apply for college after high school.

**Academic Enrichment:** Through academic enrichment, EAOP students participate in supplemental learning opportunities that advance their mastery of academic subjects and offer the exposure to engage in the intellectual life of higher education. Through UC Davis EAOP, students can participate in: University Research Opportunities, Summer Institutes, Writing Academies, and Math Academies. The level of availability and opportunities for participation in these programs can vary by grade level and by school.

**College Entrance Exams:** College entrance exams are an important component to the university application process. Eligibility for selective colleges and universities, like the University of California, require the completion of college entrance exams such as the ACT, SAT Reasoning test, and SAT Subject Exams. EAOP provides test preparation
workshops and test practice sessions to prepare students for taking and succeeding on the required college entrance exams. With relevance to this study, the researchers will use the EAOP activities listed above as those which EAOP facilitators would have used to increase college knowledge and the college going rate. These activities are held in order to increase the appointment of underrepresented participants who could attend college.

*Student’s Motivation:* The researchers measure the level of student motivation by using the number of contact hours attended by EAOP participants on their prospective high school campuses. Participation will include the number of hours spent in the activities described above.

*Eligibility requirements for a public four-year institution:* Minimum eligibility requirements for admissions into public four-year institutions require applicants to successfully complete the fifteen unit Subject Requirement also known as the ‘a – g’ requirements, obtain a minimal grade point average (GPA) of 2.00 in the Subject Requirements, and obtain a minimum admission test score correlating with the overall ‘a – g’ GPA. The correlating table is also known as the eligibility index at the CSU system and UC system. With relevance to this study the researchers will use the eligibility index requirements to measure eligibility to UC and CSU acceptance.

*Assumptions*

One of the assumptions made by the researchers in this study is that because EAOP is in the mentioned Yolo County schools, all the students who want enrollment into the program are accepted and captured in services. It is accepted that because EAOP serves these particular high schools that there is a continuous need and request for
services. It is accepted also that students joining the program are doing so because they want to achieve a higher education and go on to postsecondary institutions, specifically UC or CSU schools. Parents are included in the assumption that they understand the requirements for services and they want their child(ren) to attend institutions of higher educations. The researchers will assume that because there continues to be an outreach program in the participating schools, there continues to be a level of need for academic outreach.

**Justification**

The resource of education is an additional piece of services that can be included in the support of a family which must be considered by social workers. There are few studies including education as an objective in case plan development although it is referenced to in theory. Both in the areas of social work and education are there mentions of collaboration and providing an inclusive approach to benefiting the success of an individual and their family. Application of this method has not been implemented in a universal way. Neither educational providers nor social workers are bridging the gap between these vital agencies and the role they can play for students’ academic success.

A benefit from this study will be the merging of two professional systems, education and social services, and the wraparound services they can provide for a struggling family. Unifying both areas of service will expose the possible resources within one another and provide an avenue of long-term achievement.
Limitations

A limitation of this study includes the discretion of the researchers to not impose a strict definition for “Latino/a”. For the purpose of this study the definition of “Latino/a” was adopted by the manner in which it was used in data collection procedures established by EAOP application options. In an attempt to capture and include the best picture of the population served, the term “Latino/a” acknowledges the ethnic and cultural identities of those students who also consider themselves Mexican/Mexican-American or Chicano/a. Due to this liberty of the term, the data gathered is limited to the reflection of the youth and their developing cultural and ethnic identities. These identities may be greatly influenced also by their respected family and their views of the terms.
Chapter 2  

LITERATURE REVIEW  

Introduction  

To compensate for the inequalities facing California’s diverse changing demographics, the Regents of University of California, with the support of state legislation in 1974, endorsed that “undergraduate admissions should reflect the general ethnic, sexual, and economic composition of California high school graduates” as part of their system wide policies (Timar, Ogawa, & Orillion, 2004). Student-centered outreach began in direct response to California legislation and was implemented as a result of a public need for educational equality. As Betts et al. (2000) states, in the recent history of California, students who are economically and educationally disadvantaged are represented under such terms as used in current research. In Federal policy, such students are known as disadvantaged or underserved. Latino/a students in California are considered to be a population that is underrepresented in attaining postsecondary degrees. The State of California responded to the need of increasing the college entrance rate for underrepresented youth, including Latino/a youth. The researchers have found obstacles that Latino/a youth face as themes that have emerged during the review of the literature (Rico, 2007). The researchers intend to further analyze the social factors that plague the Latino youth to reach postsecondary attainment at a lesser rate than their White counterparts.
The themes that have arisen in the reviewed literature include social factors that Latino/a students face that can be agreed to as being obstacles such as relationships with the many groups with whom they interact, accessibility to college, and the positive correlation/affect outreach and the positive influence outreach programs make in their educational endeavors. The researchers intend on exploring the many areas that influence a young Latino/a student and their experiences in a deductive manner. The first influences to be discussed will be the larger institutional and systemic influences located at the macro level. Among these will be included outreach programs, financial considerations, and services available for the student’s and their families. Next the mezzo level of social and interpersonal relationships of a youth. Discussion will include the youth’s aspirations for seeking higher education, family encouragement, and influences of social relationships. Finally the individual micro level of cognitive factors will be looked at, which will include the individual’s planning, academic preparation, college knowledge, and level of participation with EAOP activities.

**Macro Level Institutional and Systemic Influences**

There are institutional and systemic influences that may affect a student’s worldview of their educational attainment and thus, eligibility and access to postsecondary education. For Latino/a students the multiple impacts such as living in poverty, discrimination, immigration, and lack of education, can infringe on the educational development of the Latino/a student (Schriver, 2004). The researchers have chosen to research the larger Macro systemic factors that may affect the student’s academic progress. The areas of research are the California Department of Education and
the individual high schools participating in the study, academic outreach programs, academic advising, financial constraints, collaboration, and components of success.

**California Department of Education.** This study will incorporate those Yolo County High Schools that participate in EAOP activities throughout the course of the academic school year. The high schools used in this study are Woodland High School, Pioneer High School, River city High School, and Esparto High School. All participate in EAOP activities and all are located within Yolo County region. The researchers chose to study Yolo County EAOP participants because they have a high Latino/a student population and the prospective high school campuses all have Academic Performance Indexes (API) under seven hundred (700). The researchers will use the School Accountability Report Card for all four high schools to provide the reader with a more comprehensive background of the individual campuses and their statistical demographics for information ranging from the 2005 graduating class through the 2009 academic school years. The researchers will also use the Academic Performance Index (API) scores as an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of the schools in California. API scores can range from 200 to 1,000 with a statewide target of 800. The higher the API score the more resources a school may have. Every year schools try to improve in this area and is a marked way to measure their improvement over the years. More detailed information about the API is posted on-line and updated on a continual basis by the California Department of Education (Department of Education, 2010). The final areas of demographical statistics that will be reviewed are the courses for University
Esparto high school. According to the Yolo County Department of Education (2010), Esparto High School (EHS) stands as a small, rural, agricultural district in Yolo County. The campus of Esparto High School is the central point of many community and school activities. The ethnic make-up of EHS is 54.5 percent Hispanic. Among the significant sub-groups at EHS, there are currently 35.6 percent socioeconomically disadvantaged and eight percent English Learners. The API score was 600 for the academic year of 2008. 68 percent of students were enrolled in courses required for UC/CSU admission. 36 percent of those graduates who completed all courses required for UC/CSU admission eligibility requirements. EHS is a participant of the EAOP program and houses monthly EAOP activities for EHS participants that include academic preparation workshops, financial aid workshops, test preparation workshops and visits to college campuses. EHS has a designated EAOP staff member that is a regional outreach assistant director who is assigned to their particular high school.

River City high school. According to Yolo County Department of Education, River City High School (RCHS) serves a diverse population including families with a wide range of educational, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. RCHS is located in West Sacramento, California. There are approximately 1700 students in grades ninth through twelfth. This large student population produces over 30 languages spoken on campus. The two second largest languages spoken, other than English, are the Russian and Spanish languages. 35.7 percent of the students at RCHS are identified as
being Hispanic or Latino/a. Of the larger student population, 55 percent is identified as socio-economically disadvantaged and of the population, 15 percent are identified as English learners. In 2008, RCHS scored an API score of 718 and due to this close proximity to the cutoff, RCHS was included in the study. From the 2007-2008 academic school year, 80 percent of students completed a career technical education program and earned a high school diploma. 23 percent of graduates completed all courses required for University of California or California State University admission. RCHS is a participant of the EAOP program and houses monthly EAOP activities for RCHS participants that include academic preparation workshops, financial aid workshops, test preparation workshops and visits to college campuses. RCHS has a designated EAOP staff member that is a regional outreach assistant director that is assigned to their particular high school.

**Woodland High School.** According to Yolo County Department of Education, Woodland High School (WHS) also stands in a rural school district. For the academic school year of 2008-2009 the percentage of students enrollment in courses required for UC/CSU admission eligibility was 68%. The percentage of graduates who completed all courses required for UC/CSU admission requirements was 18.6%. Hispanic or Latino/a students make up 53 percent of the total student body population for WHS. With relevance to the Academic Performance Index (API) score Hispanic or Latino students have an API score of 634. WHS is a participant of the EAOP program, and houses monthly EAOP activities for WHS participants that include academic preparation workshops, financial aid workshops, test preparation workshops and visits to college
Pioneer High School. According to the Yolo County Department of Education, Pioneer High School (PHS) is located in Woodland, California; it also stands in a rural school district. The most current School Accountability Report Card is from 2006-2007 school year. The ethnicity of student body population is 50 percent Hispanic or Latino/a. For the school year of 2007 the Academic Index Results are 625 for Hispanic or Latino/a students. 52.4 percent of the total student population graduate with UC/CSU required courses. 68 percent of the total student population starts off being in UC/CSU course enrollment. PHS is a participant of the EAOP program, and houses monthly EAOP activities for PHS participants that include academic preparation workshops, financial aid workshops, test preparation workshops and visits to college campuses. PHS has a designated EAOP staff member that is a regional outreach assistant director that is assigned to their particular high school.

Academic Outreach Programs. Academic outreach programs that are available to individual students provide academic and social support services for students have proven to be successful when working with students and their families. Students that engage in academic preparation program receive a greater amount of academic preparation and academic support services to strengthen their educational attainment. The strength and quality of the interpersonal relationships that students have with parents, peers, and education staff are critical for overall academic success. Social capital, as defined by Perna (2005), “the social support networks and institutional connections that
are required in order for individuals to acquire the opportunities and resources that are controlled by the dominant group, and facilitate college enrollment” (p. 119). When the student is able to make positive academic connections that support their educational attainment, their education can be affected positively. In addition to these support systems, programs that are designed specifically for mentorship have shown great success when encouraging students to seek continuing education (Kaplan, 2009). In order for these programs to be successful, they must work in partnership with community partnerships. Academic preparation programs, in working with students, families, and school support staff, can prove to be a positive educational community for the student to reach academic success. The schools and districts must be treated as the experts in the area and are the sources for the needs of the community in which they are located (Dumka, Mauricio, & Gonzales, 2007).

According to Tierney, Corwin, & Colyar (2004), there are nine propositions to effective outreach and their positive effects on the academic success of the outreach participants. One of the most influential areas emphasized was the timing of outreach programs, such as EAOP. The need to engage students no later than the ninth grade is crucial for adequately engaging the student. The earlier involvement possible prepared a student for course selection and academic attainment. The authors also note that in order for academic outreach to be successful in increasing the college going rate of its participants, the individual campuses need to have college prep curriculum and all students need to have access to such courses. Academic outreach programs need to be available to students at school campuses that have low Academic Performance Indexes,
which can identify schools who have low student academic success rates. The school campuses need more support for their students and include extending support services available to help their learner. According to National Survey of outreach programs’ evaluations, academic outreach programs similar to EAOP are designed to aid underserved students in planning and preparing participants for postsecondary education in the State of California and throughout the United States (College Board, 2001). Those high school campuses with a large population of educationally disadvantaged students from low socioeconomic backgrounds are at a greater need of academic outreach support services for their student population.

**Academic Advising.** According to Navarez & Rico (2007), Latino/a students need to be exposed to adequate academic advising throughout their high school career. Latino/a students should have the opportunities to be eligible to attend a four-year university after high school graduation. Building partnerships with academic preparation programs, high schools, colleges and community service agencies ensure a seamless support system for students as they move from one level of education to another. These programs provide academic and social support services that facilitate the educational attainment of students into higher education. Federal and state-funded programs have demonstrated effective techniques that encourage Latino/a students to enroll in postsecondary education such as University of California, California State University and Community Colleges. According to EAOP (2010), these programs provide an array of services such as academic advising, financial aid, tutoring, mentorship, and a network of support that serve students well in their efforts toward completion. Academic advising
can prove beneficial by providing academic and social support services for students that are in need of additional assistance. Academic advising services can promote educational support and enrichment for the student, the family, and the community that the school campus is located in. Academic advising includes academic and social support, yet it can also increase information and insight to financial assistance that is available for the student and their families to be able afford postsecondary education.

**Financial Constraints.** For many students financial constraint is a binding factor that inhibits their access to postsecondary education. Furthermore, a student’s inability to pay for their educational expenses is a restriction when considering college attendance. Financial availability and knowledge of assistance programs is not well known for parents who have not attended college or are new to the costs of college (Haveman & Smeeding, 2006). When students had control over their own college savings account, they were more likely to attend college because they had a sense of power over their financial stability (Elliott, 2009). Attendance of college became more of a realization for these students who did not have to rely on other sources of payment.

Besides a student’s personal feeling of financial constraint, the families’ financial stability and contributions are influential. Swail, Cabrera, & Lee (2004) noted that half of Latino/a students who participated in their study came from households whose incomes were less than twenty five thousand dollars annually. The authors also noted that Latinos have more risk factors than any other student group besides African American students.
According to Lumina Foundation for Education Inc. (2003), a majority of children who are living at or below the poverty level belong to families who are using the assistance of social services. Parents who lack higher education is directly linked to a lower annual income, therefore their children are less likely to apply and enroll in college. The attainment gap in education is described as the decreased rate at which students from different income levels apply and complete college. According to Tierney, Colyar, & Corwin (2003), students who come from a lower socioeconomic background and are first generation American born lack a solid preparation for postsecondary attainment. The authors note that it is highly important for low-income students and parents to understand how they can afford access to postsecondary education.

**Collaboration.** One of the institutional regards that aids in the success of any client served is the collaboration between community agencies. The communication and the level of interaction between these entities are crucial for the betterment of the situation for the families served. Keys to the successful use of the programs by families include the trust developed between offices, understanding of services provided, and ability to address the needs of the group they are working with (Rivera, 2002). The partnership between agencies can lead to positive outcomes for the student and family including a united front, taking full advantage of educational opportunities, and navigating through confusing and new information (California Post-Secondary Education Committee, 1996). Educational programs are encouraged to reach out to other service provider agencies in an effort to remain student-centered. The collaboration between the
student, their family and the high school can engage the student to start thinking about postsecondary advancement.

The communication between the numerous groups in families’ lives allows for better delivery of service and can keep one another informed of the goings-on in the home. Lawson (2003) reports the relationship between parents and students may also be affected when there is an increase in collaboration. As the student engages in academic enrichment and their learning attainment increases, there is a healthier academic development and in turn a higher level of academic eligibility for postsecondary education. Through assistance between those involved in the partnership and the student and their family and the academic preparation program, the student will have a greater knowledge base and increase their interpersonal relationships with those providing services.

A key component when analyzing the many areas of influence of a student’s life is the support they receive from their community. The relationship that is created, fostered, and supported between the youth and their varying service providers can add to the level of enrichment attained from participating in programs. One of the common areas that academic outreach programs share with child welfare service agencies is the process of building collaborations within the community they are serving. Specifically, when working with the diverse Latino community, Rivera (2002) highlights key components in the development of successful relationships between Child Welfare Service Agencies and community partners. These identified areas can be applied to a
variety of servicing agencies and include identifying community resources, building trust between agencies and the community, and having an open level of communication.

This level of support between agencies working together support the youth and create an atmosphere of positive encouragement. Developing a working relationship between child welfare service agencies and the myriad of support services only improves the level of support for the student to succeed. Including community partnership as the student’s natural support system allows service programs to acknowledge an integral part of the child’s reality. Considering this part of their life culture and including it in service plans leads to their success in overcoming difficult situations (Delgado & Humm-Delgado, 1982; Tierney & Jun, 2001). Ultimately, using these suggestions will help attain the shared goal of working together with the Latino/a youth within the community and meeting educational needs as well as welfare needs and vice versa.

**Components of Success.** As mentioned before, consideration of the many areas of a person and the many levels of interactions with different systems allows a better understanding and opportunity for successful influence. Tierney et al., (2004) highlight nine components of success that greatly influence a youth in an encompassing manner. They include academic preparation, guiding advice, co-curricular activities, culture, family and community engagement, peer support, mentoring, timing of interventions, and funding priorities. These individual areas collectively and directly influence the college-going rate of students participating in college prep programs. If there is higher success in any of these areas, the probability that a student will go on to postsecondary education increases. Academic preparation programs can increase the success of academic
attainment, thus it may increase the eligibility of the student for UC, CSU, and/or CC campuses. The literature repeatedly suggests that academic outreach programs are not alone in the outcomes of a student’s college-going rate, but merely a piece of influence. Even when key assets are identified, the approach may not be the same for each student. Many specifics must be considered and one framework cannot be applied to all students.

Some of these components are on a larger scale influence which is beyond the youth’s control and are at the institutional level such as academic curriculum, college and career counseling, and funding priorities. Youth who are in economically disadvantaged families tend to enroll in courses that are not as challenging therefore stay on a course that does not prepare them for postsecondary education. The amount of interaction and support school counselors have with their students also plays a large role in the outcome of a student. The level of support a student receives in these areas highly influences the decision they will make regarding whether to enroll in institutions of higher education (Tierney et al., 2004). Financial support is an area that is prominent in a student’s educational journey. The more money that is available for each student, the higher the quality and availability of services that will be delivered.

The authors again support the influential possibility of the components taken as an entirety. Components on the community level which influence the youth and their respective surroundings include family and community engagement, peer support, and co-curricular activities. The amount of activities the student is involved in also positively impacts the youth’s opportunities for higher education. Having a social outlet and engaging in actions outside of the home and school allow the child to grow socially and
develop encouraging relationships. The involvement of the family in the preparation for the youth’s continued educational goals is another key to the pursuit of higher education (Lawson, 2003). The peers a youth chooses to surround themselves with will also be a determining factor in the consecutive courses they will take in school. These groups can be a source of support, encouragement, and further knowledge and would increase the youth’s creation of a long-term educational plan (Kaplan et al., 2009).

Lastly, areas which personally influence an individual include groups relating to the youth. These include mentoring, incorporation of the students’ culture, and the timing of intervention for the youth. Having an individual who shows interest in a person’s choices, outcomes, and success aid in the support a youth has when encountering difficult situations and tumultuous life events. This is an area that can be satisfied by not only one person or group, but can be fulfilled by a number of representatives from within the community. Considering a student’s background and complimenting the services provided enhance the level of engagement by the person. Sustaining a pride in who they are and where they come from is fostered and encouraged and will further promote advancement. Earlier interest shown in the academic accomplishments of the student allows for more time to be spent with them, more information can be disseminated, and community agencies can have a greater opportunity to work with the individual. Furthermore, it should be noted that numerous social factors may negatively influence the components of success noted above. For some students, larger systemic social factors can prove to be too overwhelming to their academic
achievement. Ultimately, each student must also participate in the available services, but to do so the services must be made available.

**Mezzo Level Social Influences**

While the Macro level of a student’s worldview can provide systemic social factors that will affect the student’s academic attainment and academic success. The Mezzo level, also known as the community arena, may prove to contribute to the student’s lack of academic success at the community based level. Interpersonal relationships and connections with others can prove influential to the individual’s motivation to access and attain academic success. At the mezzo level there are various components, or subsystems, that can persuade the individual student (Schriver, 2004). For the purpose of this study the researchers will study, with relevance to the Latino/a students; family composition and other cultural considerations that will provide further knowledge for social workers and teachers to use with Latino/a students in being culturally competent while working with Latino/a youth and their families.

**Family Composition.** When examining the influencing factors in a young Latino/a student’s academic attainment researchers have found that thematic causes appear to influence academic success. These influences comprise of the parent’s educational legacy, the youth’s level of acculturation, primary language, and educational aspirations of the individual student. In a study by Swail et al., (2004) the researchers found that the educational legacy left by the parents to their children, those students who had one or both parents attend college were more likely to attend a postsecondary institution themselves. It was also reported that Latino/a students were less likely to have
a parent that earned an educational credential than their White counterpart. By this study it may be inferred that Latino/a students are less prone to gain access and achieve postsecondary educational attainment if their parents have not followed a similar educational path.

When studying the effects of a mentoring program on a group of Latinas, Kaplan et al., (2009) found that the success in school relied on the girl’s ability to adapt to the mainstream American lifestyle while retaining and developing their cultural heritage. Many of the girls who participated in the study had very low outlooks of themselves and the environment that they were growing up in. The study also recognized that many barriers facing Latino/a youth include the alarming drop-out rate and what an influence that has on other students. Similarly, Zambrana and Zoppi (2002) also identify drop-out rates amongst Latino/as as the highest in the nation. The study also pointed out that difficulties included language as a contributor, but not a sole factor. They support that a child’s self-image plays a hindering role in scholastic achievement if not supported or encouraged by surrounding associations.

The quality of relationships between the student and their social groups has a large impact on the pursuit of higher education. According to Kaplan et al., (2009) the involvement of the parent’s was crucial. In this study it did not matter that the parents themselves had not attended college, but the support they offered their daughters was crucial for the improvement in attitude towards college. Griffin et al., (2007) also found that what parents were unable to give their students in first-hand information on college resources, they gave in support. These relationships encouraged the student to continue
the pursuit of higher education and without them would have been more difficult, as was seen in their classmate counterparts.

The relationships that the student’s had with one another were influential also in regards to educational pursuit. Students turned to one another for information regarding college information and used one another as resources (Griffin et al., 2007). Students who did not attend a college preparatory high school were not able to have these conversations because the information was unknown. The students lacked these resources from their classmates because they also lacked the means. As described by Lin (1999), “the extensity of strong ties that represent commitment, trust, obligation, and motivation can help mobilize and make resources readily available for college eligibility attainment” (Lin, 1999, p. 467).

In a study of determinants of student achievement conducted by Betts, Zau, & Rice (2003), three main findings were supported that affect student academic achievement. The first was the teacher’s level of education and experience and overall mastery of subject can affect the student’s outcomes on exams. Secondly, individual student’s rates of learning appear to be strongly and positively influenced by the initial achievement of students in his or her grade. Thus API scores for the entire school can prove to be a determining factor to the individual student’s academic success. Thirdly noted was the achievement gap between students. A student’s household income and socio-economic status can influence the student’s academic success.

Another determining or deterring relationship was discovered between the students and their teachers. The support provided, or lack thereof, had a lasting impact
on the students of their class. Students reported high levels of satisfaction with their teachers if they were supportive of their college aspirations and provided information in the search for information (Griffin et al., 2007). Teachers’ low expectations were a major drawback for Latino/as continuing to higher education and influenced a student’s self-esteem greatly (Padilla, 2007 as cited in Kaplan et al., 2009).

**Cultural Considerations.** There are several cultural considerations that need to be addressed when working with Latino/a students in the realm of educational progress. Cultural competency is highly advocated to social work professionals to better assess and address the short and long term needs of a child. The same is true in the field of education; the student’s culture is respected cultural influences, attitudes and outlooks of a student are incorporated into the educational strategies in working with the students needs (Tierney & Jun, 2001). If the student feels that they are being supported in the development of their cultural identity and not scrutinized or criticized by a teacher they are reported to do better in school. If the student feels as if their culture is a negative characteristic judged by school staff they reportedly are performing poorly in their subject matters. For many Latino/a families, they value familial support and the domestic activities that aid in the familial household’s day to day stability. Historically Latinas have been valued by their in-home domestic support skill for the family as a whole. For example, caring for their younger siblings and cooking and cleaning for their family, while their parents earn gainful employment. Furthermore, their male counterparts are valued by the family for their monetary contributions to the familial household. For the
current generation of Latino/a students they may be the first in their families to aspire for postsecondary educational attainment.

**First generation college students.** When students apply for college, those who are first generation college students do not receive the level of assistance from their parents that they would, had their parents attended college (Navarez & Rico, 2007). By disseminating information to parents and families in regards to the college application process and requirements, the parents and the families are enabled to support their child and their quest for higher education.

As noted by Warburton, Bugarin, Nunez, and the National Center for Education Statistics (2001), first generation students were less likely to enroll in four year academic institutions, even if academically qualified for college. Parent’s levels of education were found to be associated with rates of student’s retention and persistence in college. The authors noted that the profile of a first generation student is low income, high school locations, low academic performance index (API) scores, lower advanced placement (AP) entrance exams accessibility.

**Micro Level Cognitive Factors**

Two major areas have been discussed that are significant to an individual and which should be referred to when addressing postsecondary attainment. The third level which will be presented is the personal level. The individual can account for their own cognitive influences that may affect academic attainment and academic success. The student’s overall motivation and perseverance to successfully complete high school and attend a postsecondary institution is a large factor which must be accounted for. The
researchers will measure the level of participation in EAOP activities and academic preparation as motivating factors that influence that individual student’s motivation to attain academic success. One way in which this can be accounted for could include the amount of time an individual spent participating in any given program.

**Level of Participation in EAOP activities.** Further research has continued to draw attention to other areas that are debilitating to Latino/a academic success. An area that was found to infringe on the educational attainment of Latino/a youth in terms of educational success was the notion of the attainment gap. The attainment gap suggests that individual student’s academic aspirations do not coincide with the student’s academic attainment. In the article by Roderick et al., (2009) the findings discussed show the large disparity between the aspirations of students and the number of students not attending college. This gap is supported by Elliott’s (2009) study which also recognized that student’s aspirations, which are taught through socialization, are strong and present for children, but their expectations of attending college change with the influences of social and economic pressures. In the journal of Latinos and Education (2005), an analyses of student application revealed that the participants must have aspirations for college bound careers. In the study, students viewed institutions, family members, and school personnel as resources to achieving their goals, yet students also saw institutions and relationships as obstacles, especially depending on their level of support. Program participation was motivated by both social and academic goals and whether students viewed themselves as resources.
For the purpose of this research study, the researchers will use a similar college qualification index to measure the EAOP participant’s eligibility to attend a University of California or a California State University. EAOP participants from Yolo County partnering high schools will be measured by using their level of participation in EAOP qualifying activities and their hours of participation with those EAOP activities.

**Academic Preparation.** Another area of pivotal importance for Latino/a’s attainment of college was the quality of education provided in high school. Students who were enrolled in charter schools that focused on college preparatory classes had a higher exposure to college-like classes and atmosphere and had more options to choose from. The high level of opportunity influenced the student’s appreciation of the classes offered and their outlook was one of expectance. Students whose schools did not offer as many courses viewed the opportunity as exceptional and were grateful of the prospect (Griffin et al., 2007). The amount of courses available between schools is dependent on the school district and the amount of resources that are available by the institutions.

This lack of availability however, influences the student’s exposure to college-level coursework and provides little stimulation for students that are interested in learning more (Roderick et al., 2009). Students who have a negative outlook on the opportunities provided by their school influences their attitude towards their school and continuing their education (Sinha, 2007). According to the procedural, cultural and political factors in college preparation programs for urban and minority youth, college preparation programs are working to bridge both racial and economic gaps in college admittance, attendance and graduation rates. The authors noted that there are factors that impact the
efforts that student make to strive and achieve higher education (Warburton et al., 2001). Academic preparation programs provide guidance for the family and the individual student by providing co-curricular activities and guidance.

**Conclusion**

There are many social factors that influence the success of a student’s successful attainment in reaching higher education. They exist on the macro level in the form of larger institutions and systems, on the mezzo level where interpersonal relationships among many different groups are experienced, and on the micro level within the cognitive development of the student. Latino/a students can be negatively affected in particular due to the overwhelming levels of added stressors which may be factors in their educational achievement and intentions of seeking higher education.

Reviewing self-disclosed data for an outreach program may shed some light to services that can be better provided and catered to a Latino/a student’s needs. The researcher’s purpose in collecting the data are to gain further knowledge of the social factors that may affect Latino/a students in becoming educationally eligible for CSU, UC and CC postsecondary attainment. The researchers will use specific methodology to review the secondary data provided by UC Davis’ Early Academic Outreach Program.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The Latino population is the largest growing minority group in the state of California, yet there is a decrease in the rate of college bound Latino/a students. Thus, academic preparation programs, like the Early Academic Outreach Program are funded to increase the college going rate for underrepresented youth. To sustain funding, EAOP needs to demonstrate that the academic preparation program merits funding and is effectively and efficiently serving underrepresented youth such as Latino/a students. Data is collected to support evidence-based practices, studying service delivery to its participants, and measuring how many participants are admitted to University of California, California State University, or Community College after high school graduation.

Study Design

The researchers will use a deductive study design of existing data provided by the EAOP director. This extant data was collected from program’s participants’ application forms and will include such variables as ethnicity, high schools attended, and the school year of projected graduation. Other demographic factors will include factors that may contribute or delineate from their qualifications for higher learning institutions such as academic statistics. There will not be any human subjects participating directly in this study as secondary data-analysis of extant data will be performed.
Participants

The University of California, Davis houses an EAOP office which provides services to a majority of the high schools in Yolo County. For the purpose of this study, applications will be selected to include Esparto High School, Woodland High School, Pioneer High School, and River City High School. The study size will include four high schools, with a study population size estimated at forty participants. The subjects included in the study indicated on their application their ethnicity to be Latino/a, Mexican-American, Chicano, Hispanic, or Mexican. The participants meet the EAOP requirements of being either economically or educationally disadvantaged students. This is further defined by the specification of having one parent who may have received a bachelor’s degree; however, generally the participant would be the first member of their family to meet the requirements of a four-year state educational institution.

This study will analyze EAOP participants from the above high schools between the school year 2004-2005 and school year 2008-2009.

Data Gathering Procedure

Each participant of EAOP must go through an application process for admittance to the program. Applicants must complete an application which includes a number of vital statistics including demographic information and family background information (See Appendix B). Included in the application package, the students and their parents are informed during submission of this application that the information may be used for academic research purposes. Once these applications are completed and submitted they are entered into a program database which is kept for analysis, funding reports, and
documentation. Applications generally remain the same over the years, although the application may undergo minor statistical changes or additional categories are added. Applications are collected at the onset of the school year and eligibility is determined by EAOP personnel.

The program director will oversee the delivery of this data while adhering in conjunction with federal guidelines of upholding participant confidentiality. As stated in these guidelines, student information will not be provided which would compromise the individual’s identity or that of which could lead to the identification of the student with information provided on the application. For example, a student’s address, full name, social security number, and student identification number given by the program will be excluded. The director of the program will instruct a programmer of the data to assign students a new student identification number. After the applications are reviewed to meet the primary criteria are given a unique identifier will be assigned in the form of a number to follow numeric sequence but will not coincide with the student’s program number. The selected student’s information will be provided to the researchers in a numeric template. An analytical study will be conducted of the social factors that may influence a student’s pursuit of higher education. Analysis will include reviewing the forms of applications completed between the stated school years.

Other information that will be provided will include the number of hours participated in the program, family size, primary language spoken in the home, parent’s educational level and income level, grade point average, and ‘a – g’ courses attempted and completed, and finally the schools applied and accepted to. The latter information
provided will represent the independent variables which will serve for analysis. The information will be collected on a mass storage unit, such as a thumb drive, and encrypted by the EAOP director to provide complete protection of the participants. The researchers will safeguard the data and will ensure the protection of encrypted information by creating passwords on computers and destroying data after it has served its purpose.

**Data Analysis Approach**

The statistical software SPSS 17.0 for Windows Grad Pack is used for the analysis of the data. No additional instruments will be used in the analysis of EAOP extant data. Data will be collected and entered into SPSS programming and a table will be developed using the stated dependent and independent variables. The researchers of this study will make all efforts and precautions with produced data to safeguard against unintended misuse of information.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

The Protocol for the Protection of Human Subjects was submitted and approved by the Division of Social Work as exempt research. Informed consent does not apply to this exempt research because only existing data will be reviewed and new participants will not be recruited. In the collection of data, the researchers will not involve any live human subjects.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS

Introduction

In the following section, descriptive statistics will be used to provide a general perspective of the data collected. The process would test the assumption that the data demonstrates a normal distribution of the independent and dependent variables. After testing for normal distribution of the variables, correlation analysis will be used to demonstrate a relationship between the independent and dependent variables, while assessing for multicollinearity.

Descriptive Statistics

Data of Latino high school graduates in EAOP from the Class of 2005 to the Class of 2009 was collected from four Yolo county high schools: Esparto High, Pioneer High, River City High and Woodland High (Table 1). Also, the aggregated data reflects 323 (69.2%) female and 144 (30.8%) male participants.
Table 1

*EAOP Distribution of Latino Graduates by School, 2005 – 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>High School Graduating Class</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esparto H.S.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer H.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River City H.S.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland H.S.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 467\) respondents

The parental educational level of each respondent was combined to create a variable known as *household education level*. Each respondent was classified into one of the three classification tiers: *most educationally disadvantaged*, *moderately educationally disadvantaged*, and *least educationally disadvantaged*. The aggregated data reflect that 91.9% are highly educationally disadvantaged, 5.8% are moderately educationally disadvantaged, and 2.4% are least educationally disadvantaged. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the household education level for the respondents from 2005 through 2009. With the exception of the Class of 2007, the distribution of highly educationally disadvantaged is very close for each graduating cohort.
In regards to primary language spoken by the participant and the primary language spoken at home, misalignment between the two conditions may affect a participant’s parental involvement in their education. From the data, 306 (65.5%) participants indicated that their primary language is English and 158 (33.8%) participants indicated their primary language is Spanish. Only 0.4% indicated a language other than English or Spanish. Similarly, 316 (67.7%) of the participant’s primary home language is English while 149 (31.9%) of the participant’s primary home language is Spanish. Alignment between the two variables exist for 422 (90.4%) of the participants. Table 2
shows the cross tabulation of the participant’s primary language and the participant’s household language.

Table 2

**Cross-tabulation of Participant’s Primary and Household Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Primary Language</th>
<th>Primary Household Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triangulation is used to verify the participant’s level of economically disadvantaged. The free or reduced lunch is compared to participant’s household income and the household dependents. Analysis of the data demonstrates a discrepancy between those who are low-income but who are not a participant of the school’s free reduced lunch program. The data showed a frequency of 169 (36.2%) participated in the free or reduced lunch program at their school. To the contrary, in comparison to the federal TRiO income variable reported by participants, 276 (59.1%) met the poverty thresholds used by the free or reduced lunch program guidelines. Evidently, the household adjusted income and dependents are more reliable variables than the participant’s reporting of their participation in the free-reduced lunch program. For the purpose of the analysis, the
TRiO income variable will be used instead of the reported free or reduced lunch variable in the correlation and regression analysis.

Approximately, three quarters (73.7%) of the EAOP participants enrolled into an institution of higher education. From the 344 participants who enrolled into a postsecondary institution, 41.8% of the participants enrolled into a two-year institution and 31.7% enrolled into a four-year institution. Furthermore, of the participants who enroll in higher education upon high school graduation, a ratio of three females to every one male is reflected among schools.

The rate of females who did not enroll into an institution, who enrolled into a two-year institution, and who enrolled at a four-year institution is 25.4%, 43.7%, and 31.0%, respectively. In addition, the rate of males who did not enroll into an institution, who enrolled into a two-year institution, and who enrolled at a four-year institution is 28.5%, 38.2%, and 33.3%, respectively. Table 3 shows males EAOP participants at Pioneer H.S. have a greater percentage of postsecondary enrollments than the other schools, while Esparto H.S. had the lowest postsecondary enrollment for females. The data in table 3 is similar to research found about school APIs.
Table 3

Postsecondary Enrollment Status of High School Graduates by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Not Enrolled (%)</th>
<th>Total Not Enrolled (%)</th>
<th>Enrolled (%)</th>
<th>Total Enrollment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esparto H.S.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer H.S.</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River City H.S.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland H.S.</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although over a quarter of the Latino participants do not enroll into higher education, assessing for normal distribution of the overall ‘a – g’ GPA and ‘a – g’ pass variable is vital. The descriptive analysis of the data demonstrates that each of the variables experiences a kurtosis within the ± 5.0 and the skewness falls within the ±1.0 ranges. The kurtosis and skewness of the overall ‘a – g’ GPA is 0.108 and -0.701, respectively. However, the kurtosis and skewness for the ‘a – g’ pass variable is also in the appropriate ranges, the histogram demonstrates two peaks in the distribution. When redistributing the ‘a – g’ pass variable by the variable active, the two distributions become apparent. Therefore, the ‘a – g’ pass variable accounts for two normal distributions of the population: individuals who left the program prior to graduation and individuals who completed the program. The ‘a –g’ pass variable’s kurtosis and skewness is -0.910 and -0.597, respectively. A kurtosis closest to 0 reflects a normal
distribution. Figure 2 and 3 demonstrate the histogram of the two variables. Figure 4 and 5 distinguish the normal distribution of ‘a – g’ pass courses for active and inactive participants, respectively.

![Histogram of overall 'a - g' GPA distribution of courses attempted.](image)

**Figure 2.** Overall ‘a – g’ GPA distribution of courses attempted.

Note. Sample of n = 441 with mean of 2.59, median of 2.71, a mode of 3.00, a skewness of -0.701 and kurtosis 0.108.

It is important to point out that the skewness of the inactive participants based on the ‘a – g’ passed courses is a result early withdrawal from program services. Yet, the data demonstrates a normal distribution ‘a – g’ passed courses in phase of the program’s implementation phase.

When reviewing the data for ‘a – g’ units passed and attempted, the researchers discovered a double bell curve and a separate analysis was conducted to explain the
discrepancies amongst the statistics. The statistics show that a total of 442 students attempted some number of ‘a – g’ units, whether they passed with a grade of C- or better. There were 25 students who had data missing for their attempts, which meant that 25 participants of EAOP neither attempted nor passed courses of ‘a – g’ units. Subsequently, the researchers discovered that the bell curve which was skewed left was the result of the number of students who had become inactive with the program. However, 120 of the students attempted ‘a – g’ unit courses, but had a lower frequency of passing the courses. The 322 active students produced a bell curve that was skewed right for the number of units passed compared to the number of ‘a – g’ units attempted. The data also showed that of the active participants the maximum number of courses attempted by any student was 52 units compared to the inactive participant’s maximum number of courses attempted which were 35 units.

The contact service hours included a student’s participation in seminars, meeting with advisors, and other qualified activities among the program standards. After reviewing the numbers, the researchers discovered a range with a minimum of zero hours and a maximum of 336 hours of participation. Aside from the anomaly of the maximum, the next closest maximum was 47.5 hours of participation. Therefore, to reduce the impact this anomaly would have on the average of contact hours, the researchers decided to excluded the participant and run the statistics on the remaining 466 students. The resulting distribution was skewed to the left as a result of a 102 participants who have less than 1 hour of service in the program.
Figure 3. Distribution of contact service hours of participants.

Note. Sample of n = 466 with mean of 9.46, median of 7.83, a mode of 0.00, a skewness of 1.00 and kurtosis 1.187.

Correlation Analysis

Table 4 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the independent variables by providing the minimum value, the maximum value, the mean and standard deviation of the variables. The correlation coefficients are calculated between the independent variables and the dependent variable of participant in the study (n=466).
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘a – g’ Passed</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Service Hours</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Ed Level</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics from Table 4 summarizes the ranges of the continuous variable ‘a – g’ Passed Courses and Contact Service Hours, the ordinal variables of the household education level and low income, and the nominal variable, sex. Further analysis of the kurtosis of the household education level demonstrates most of values are in the tails of the distribution than the mean (kurtosis > 5.0). Since the program targets low-income participants as one of its primary targets, the results align with the anticipated outcomes in the analysis. Therefore, the data from the descriptive analysis establishes that the Pearson product-moment correlation (r) is not the appropriate value for analysis since the assumptions of normality are violated. Alternatively, the Spearman correlation will be used.

Table 5 shows the correlation matrix for the independent variables in relation to the dependent variable, overall ‘a – g’ GPA and postsecondary enrollment.
### Table 5

**Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Household Ed Level</th>
<th>Low Income Level</th>
<th>Postsecondary Enrollment</th>
<th>'a-g' passed courses</th>
<th>Overall 'a-g' GPA</th>
<th>Contact Service Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Ed Level</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.185**</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.160**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Level</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.185**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.182**</td>
<td>-0.171**</td>
<td>-0.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Enrollment</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>-0.182**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>0.356**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'a-g' Passed Courses</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>-0.171**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.754**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall 'a-g' GPA</td>
<td>-0.107*</td>
<td>0.160**</td>
<td>-0.190**</td>
<td>0.356**</td>
<td>0.754**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Service Hours</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.542**</td>
<td>0.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

A correlation (r) of equal to +1 is notation that a perfect positive relationship exists between two variables as one variable increases, the other variable increases too. Alternatively, a correlation of -1 denotes that the as one variable increases, the other variable decreases. Regardless, a relationship exists between the two but which variable
impacts the other is known. In other words, correlation does not indicate causation between the two variables but influence each other.

Similarly to what is found in research, the correlation \( r = -0.185, p < 0.001 \) between low-income level variable and household education level show that as degree attainment affects poverty levels. Likewise, the positive correlation between postsecondary enrollment and household education level \( r = 0.103, p < 0.005 \) is similar as to what research demonstrates about the parent degree attainment affects the enrollment of student. In addition, the correlation between postsecondary enrollment and the low-income variable \( r = -0.182, p < 0.001 \) also aligns with research that income is inversely related to postsecondary enrollment. Furthermore, the overall ‘a – g’ GPA and ‘a – g’ completion variables have a positive relationship to household education level and a negative relation to low-income variable. Lastly, and most importantly, the contact hours variable demonstrates the strongest positive relations among all the variables, postsecondary enrollment \( r = 0.186, p < 0.001 \), ‘a – g’ passed courses \( r = 0.542, p < 0.001 \), and overall ‘a – g’ GPA \( r = 0.386, p < 0.001 \). Since all contact hours delivered to participants occur prior to the postsecondary enrollment of participants, courses attempted and passed, and the final overall GPA, it is conclusive that the program activities impact these outcomes.

In the next section, a summary of the findings is displayed. The researchers also will provide recommendations based on the analysis of the historical data of EAOP and its outcomes. Moreover, as an attempt to gather further insight for social workers and educational personnel, to become aware of the social factors that are affecting
educational attainment and success for Latino/a students. The researchers provide recommendations as to how to improve the techniques used to increase knowledge to effectively serve Latino/a students to enroll into postsecondary institutions. In addition, the need for collaboration between social workers and educational personnel will be noted in the next chapter.
In review of the data the researchers of this study discovered an array of results that supported the reviewed literature, challenged assumptions, and presented new areas for research. Social factors which were supported by the UC Davis’ EAOP Latino/a student cohort of the graduating school years of 2005 to 2009 were the ratios of females to males, amount of contact hours related to coursework attainment, and the majority of students who were participating in EAOP services were first generation students seeking postsecondary education. Assumptions that were challenged by this study comprised of the ratio of females to males who went on to postsecondary institutions, the percentage of families receiving social service assistance, and the primary language spoken in the home versus the student’s self-disclosed primary language.

According to the data collected, there was a ratio of three females to one male who enrolled into the outreach program. Over the five years of information reviewed, about seventy percent of the students were Latinas and a little fewer than thirty percent were male. The part that was perplexing was that of the initial ratio, the percentage of students applying and attending two or four-year educational institutions were equal at the time of graduation; about seventy percent of each gender. Moreover, there was a higher percentage of Latinas attending two-year institutions than four-year colleges and amongst Latinos it was split in half. Overall, it was deduced that almost seventy-five
percent of EAOP participants enrolled in some form of postsecondary education, which included the UC, CSU, or CC systems.

Amongst these students were an overwhelming majority of first generation students. For the intentions of this study, these students were defined as Latino/as who’s neither parent received a postsecondary education. These households were termed most educationally disadvantaged and in the analysis of the data, the researchers found that almost ninety two percent of the students in the study came from most educationally disadvantaged households. The researchers anticipated the numbers of first generational students to be high because that is who the outreach program highly supports, but the number of participants in accordance to the school demographics is surprising.

Another variable that was maintained by the literature review is that the more contact hours a student participated in the higher the likelihood of enrolling in and passing ‘a – g’ coursework. The number of contact hours that participants spent attending EAOP events, increased the participants number of units passed in ‘a – g’ coursework and also increased the participant’s overall ‘a – g’ grade point average. Coincidentally, the students who had begun with EAOP services, but became inactive, went through their high school years and attempted taking fewer ‘a – g’ and also passed fewer courses.

Another interesting finding that was discovered and challenged by the review of data was that only a quarter of the total participants reported they participated in the free or reduced lunch program at school. This value did not coincide with the information gathered from the demographics of the schools reviewed. After closer analysis of family
size and federal guidelines it was calculated that in actuality, more than half of the total number of participants met the poverty thresholds to participate in this social service assistance program. What was supported by the literature was report of household incomes from participants who stated that either one or both parents attended some form of postsecondary education and a higher household income than those participants whose neither parent did not obtain a postsecondary education.

Lastly, for a majority of the students reporting their primary language as either English or Spanish, the language coincided as the primary language spoken in the household. However, for about ten percent of the youth, the primary language reported was different than the primary language at home. In other words, if the students reported their primary language as English or Spanish the primary language spoken at home was the opposite. In addition, there were a greater number of youth who considered their primary language as Spanish and their home language English than the reverse. This misalignment in the languages spoken may affect a participant’s parental involvement or level of contribution in the educational success of the student. The conflict in language support by the household may have caused an impact for those student’s and their participation in the program and their studies.

Limitations. It would have been a benefit to the study to have been able to obtain the dropout rate of the students and whether that had an influence on the data. Another area that could have been done differently would have been to have contacted the students who participated in the program and asked for their perspective on their participation in the outreach program and if any of those students had the involvement of
a social worker in their lives and what kind of impact they had. Overall, the researchers of this study are greatly satisfied with the end result of the study and the information which evolved from the collection of the data.

Conclusion

The Latino population is increasing in the State of California at a rapid rate, yet the rate of those attending postsecondary institutions is not. The researchers wanted to examine the social factors that could possible infringe on Latino/a’s youth educational attainment as well as factors that might influence the student’s achievement of postsecondary education enrollment and preparation. By reviewing the existing literature and applying Social Work theories and perspectives to the realm of educational theory, the researchers of this study looked at the many areas suggested by systems theory. These parts included the Macro levels of society, the Mezzo fields of community, and the Micro part of the individual.

In the literature reviewed for the purpose of this study, there are theories that guide educational professionals that are similar to the guiding principles of social workers. Using the systems theory with an ecological perspective, can prove to be beneficial when working with Latino/a students on the macro, mezzo, and micro levels. Accounting for the integrated systems that effect a student’s educational attainment in combination with social influences may aid practitioners to better serve the students. By recognizing these similarities and exposing them an approach can be created which is based on a unified foundation to best serve the student. The researchers of this study found that more research needs to be done to include the potential productive
collaboration and professional relationship on a macro level between social workers and professionals within the educational field. The many integrated systems that are involved in a person’s life path could be made stronger if communications are established between professionals, on the mezzo level, who are working within the same client system. It seems the best plan for children in the Child Welfare System (CWS), would be to also include the micro level of the child and their development.

**Implications**

Social workers are guaranteed to work with the educational system and it is sensible to understand the pressures that youth undergo. It is an opportunity for social workers to play a positive role in the development, attainment, and achievement in a child’s educational journey. Their school setting is a prime example of an entity where social workers have the possibility to make a life altering difference for a child who is in the Child Welfare System. It is the duty of social workers to have a basic understanding of this complicated system in addition to the Welfare and Institutions Code because it is a system that will be present in the life of a child.

The researchers of this study strongly encourage every social worker to learn about the educational resources in their respective school districts. With the findings of this study it is the ultimate hope of the researchers that each CWS social worker would coordinate with educational preparation programs located in their school districts. Creating referral protocols to such programs in light of the positive influence they have on the success of students to continue to engage in educational opportunities would be beneficial. Despite the efforts of outreach programs to prepare students, there are social
influences which must be addressed by community service agencies. Social workers are key figures who could assist with the challenge and can integrate educational attainment into direct practice with their clients.

Future research is left to be done on the topic of educational outreach programs and a relationship with social workers. Other studies would be encouraged to collect qualitative data that would interview CWS social worker’s and their views on outreach programs, value on educational attainment for the children on their caseload, and how the relationships are fostered between social workers and outreach program staff. These collaborations could be a positive building block in the development of a multitude of encompassing services for the holistic development of a student. A new area being developed by EAOP staff is a including a section on the application for foster youth to mark that they are a foster child. This could open up further research to include the development of a study design to focus on these youth and what needs arise, how they are being supported compared to their counterparts, and how EAOP staff and social workers are addressing the unique situation of these students.

It would be the anticipation of the researchers that policy would be created or initiated to include referrals to local educational outreach programs as mandates for social workers who may have children who are most educationally disadvantaged. To include this in the family’s or child’s case plan would produce a better possible outcome for the children who have so many other obstacles to overcome. Education can be turned to as a positive outlet of expression and release for students as well as the development of a
comprehensive team of allies for a child. To include social workers and educational advocates on that team would be a great benefit and stepping stone for that child.

The importance of creating a link between the many systems in a child’s life will only make those systems stronger. Working together and developing positive, reinforcing, and complimentary services and relationships will also create a stronger support system for youth during a critical period of educational development. The demand on CWS social workers is exhaustive, yet by creating a supportive relationship between advocates who also work with children on a consistent basis will produce another entity of support.
APPENDIX A

The Geometric Model of Student Persistence and Achievement
APPENDIX B

EAOP Application 2008-2009

CHOOSE THE DIRECTION OF YOUR FUTURE.

Make college a part of your plans after high school.

The UC Davis Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) can help you take the right steps to make college an option after high school. EAOP is a part of a bigger effort from the University of California (UC) to increase the number of students who are eligible to go to college. EAOP works with families, UC Davis, different schools and the surrounding community to provide support for student success.

UC Davis EAOP serves over 2,500 students in twelve school districts! And here’s the best part: this program is FREE!

Once you enroll in the program, here’s what will happen:

- EAOP will follow your progress through high school by meeting with you, reviewing your transcript twice a year, and helping you choose classes that will keep you on track to meet college eligibility requirements, whether you’d like to attend a UC, California State University (CSU), or other campus.
- EAOP will help you research your college choices, what you’d like to study, and career options.
- EAOP will give you information about how to pay for college through scholarships, grants, and loans.
- You will have the opportunity to visit college campuses and speak with college students to find out what they think about college.
- Your coordinator will help you complete your college applications and give you tips about how to write a strong personal statement.
- You may have the opportunity to attend special enrichment programs, such as math, writing, health profession academies, and programs to help you prepare and do well on two important college entrance exams: the SAT and ACT.
- You will get information about strategies on how to improve important skills that will be key to your success, such as time management.

What are you waiting for? Turn this application in to your counselor today!
**Enrollment Application**

---

**Student Information**

Last Name: ___________________________ First Name: ___________________________ Middle Initial: __________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________ 

City: ___________________________ Zip Code: __________

Home Phone: (______) ___________ Social Security Number: ________

Cell phone: (______) ___________ Are you eligible for the free or reduced lunch program? Yes No

School Name: ___________________________ Student ID: ___________________________ Grade Level: __________ High School Graduation Year: __________

E-mail Address: ___________________________

Would you like to receive program updates through e-mail? Yes No

Are you a member of any of the following programs? ___________________________

- AVID
- Cal-SOAP
- ETS
- GEAR-Up
- MESA
- Other

Ethnicity: ___________________________

- African/African American/Black
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Caucasian/White
- Chinese/Chinese-American
- East Indian/Pakistani
- Filipino/Filipino-American
- Japanese/Japanese-American
- Hmong
- Korean/Korean-American
- Latino
- Latinx/Hispanic
- Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano(a)
- Middle Eastern
- Pacific Islander
- Russian
- Vietnamese/Vietnamese-American
- Ukrainian
- Other Asian: (Please specify)
- Other: (Please specify)
- Decline to state

---

**Parent/Family Information**

Father/Legal Guardian’s Name: ___________________________

Work/Day Phone No: (______) ___________

Occupation/Job Title: ___________________________

Mother/Legal Guardian’s Name: ___________________________

Work/Day Phone No: (______) ___________

Occupation/Job Title: ___________________________

Family Size (including student): ___________________________

Family Income: (1) $15,600 or less (2) $15,601 - $21,000 (3) $21,001 - $26,400 (4) $26,401 - $31,800 (5) $31,801 - $37,200 (6) $37,201 - $42,600 (7) $42,601 - $48,000 (8) $48,001 - $53,400 (9) $53,400 or greater

---

Student’s primary speaking language: ___________________________

- English
- Men
- Ukrainian
- Vietnamese
- Others: ___________________________

Language(s) spoken in the student’s home (select all that apply): ___________________________

- English
- Men
- Ukrainian
- Vietnamese
- Others: ___________________________

- Hmong
- Russian
- Spanish
- Others: ___________________________

- Korean/Korean-American
- Latino
- Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano(a)
- Other Asian: (Please specify)
- Other: (Please specify)
- Decline to state

---

is the household a single parent home? Yes No

---

**Highest Level of Education Completed:**

- Unknown or not available
- Never Attended School
- Attended Six Years or less
- Attended Junior High School
- Attended High School
- Attended Some College or University
- Associates of Arts (AA, AS, etc.)
- Bachelor’s Degree (BS, BA, AB, etc.)
- Master’s Degree (MA, MBA, MS, etc.)
- Doctorate (PhD, MD, ED, etc.)
- College degree obtained outside U.S.? Yes No

If degree obtained outside U.S., country acquired: ___________________________

---

Office Use Only: Yes No PROGRAM ADMIT? Yes No TRANSCRIPT? Yes No Data Entry Initialed: ___________________________

Outreach Coordinator Initialed: ___________________________ Review Date: __________ ID Key: ___________________________

Version Updated on 07/03/2008.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
ACADEMIC PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Early Academic Outreach Program

Parent/Guardian Authorization

I, ____________________________, parent or legal guardian of ____________________________, hereby give permission for my child to participate in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Activities and Projects conducted by the University of California at Davis. I understand that the primary objective of the program is to encourage students to enroll in college preparatory courses, to participate in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) academic development services, and to become eligible for admission to the University of California. I also understand that such Activities may be available until he/she enrolls at a college or university campus.

Authorization

I hereby authorize Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) directors, staff, and their assistants to engage in the following:

1. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child’s academic school records through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used solely to: a) monitor my child’s academic progress; and b) determine when academic support services are needed.

2. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child’s standardized test records, including tests taken under the auspices of the Educational Testing Service (ETS), through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used only for the purposes of assessing student performance and advising students and not for recruitment purposes.

3. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child’s academic school records and standardized test records contained in electronic databases and warehouses, including but not limited to the UC Gateways data warehouse, through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these electronic records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used solely to: a) monitor my child’s academic progress; and b) determine when academic support services are needed.

4. To disclose information from my child’s academic school records to designated representatives of colleges and universities so that they may determine my child’s eligibility for admission at their institutions, his/her need for special services and for general use in planning outreach and recruitment activities. These records will be maintained by the University of California consistent with the Federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, applicable state laws and University policies.

5. To allow my child to attend field trips to colleges and universities, sponsored and coordinated by the Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP). I understand that my child will have adult supervision while on these field trips.

6. To reproduce any original materials submitted by, and any image of, participants in the Early Academic Outreach Program. I understand that participants’ compositions or likenesses may be reproduced in part or in whole for the purpose of ongoing program promotion and evaluation. I release the University of California of any obligation to compensate me, my children, or any party acting on my behalf, for the use of the above mentioned media.

I am the parent or legal guardian of the minor ____________________________________________, and I am signing this Parent Authorization on behalf of said minor.

______________________________  ________________________________
Signature of Parent/Guardian of Minor  Date  Signature of Participant  Date
Waiver: In consideration of being permitted to participate in any way in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Activities and Projects, herein after called the “Activity” or “Project”, I, for myself, my heirs, personal representatives or assigns, do hereby release, waive, discharge, and covenant not to sue The Regents of the University of California, its officers, employees, and agents from liability from any and all claims including the negligence of The Regents of the University of California, its officers, employees and agents, resulting in personal injury, accidents or illnesses (including death), and property loss arising from, but not limited to, participation in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Activities and Projects.

Assumption of Risks: Participation in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Activities and Projects carries with it certain inherent risks that cannot be eliminated regardless of the care taken to avoid injuries. The specific risks vary from one activity to another, but the risks range from 1) minor injuries such as scratches, bruises, and sprains 2) major injuries such as eye injury or loss of sight, joint or back injuries, heart attacks, and concussions 3) catastrophic injuries including paralysis and death.

I have read the previous paragraphs and I know, understand and appreciate these and other risks that are inherent in EAOP Activities. I hereby assert that my participation is voluntary and that I knowingly assume all such risks.

Indemnification and Hold Harmless: I also agree to INDEMNIFY AND HOLD The Regents of the University of California HARMLESS from any and all claims, actions, suits, procedures, costs, expenses, damages and liabilities, including attorney’s fees brought as a result of my involvement in Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Activities and Projects and to reimburse them for any such expenses incurred.

Severability: The undersigned further expressly agrees that the foregoing waiver and assumption of risks agreement is intended to be as broad and inclusive as is permitted by the law of the State of California and that if any portion thereof is held invalid, it is agreed that the balance shall, notwithstanding, continue in full legal force and effect.

Acknowledgment of Understanding: I have read this waiver of liability, assumption of risk and indemnity agreement, fully understand its terms, and understand that I am giving up substantial rights, including my right to sue. I acknowledge that I am signing the agreement freely and voluntarily, and intend by my signature to be a complete and unconditional release of all liability to the greatest extent allowed by law.

Participant’s Name __________________________  Please print

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
ACADEMIC PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Early Academic Outreach Program

Waiver of Liability, Assumption of Risk, and Indemnity Agreement

X
Signature of Parent/Guardian of Minor Date

X
Signature of Participant Date

Participant’s Age (if minor) ________
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