© Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, Volume 24, Number 1, p. 17, (2020)
 eISSN 2164-8212

High School–University Collaborations for Latinx Student Success: Navigating the Political Reality

Genia M. Bettencourt, Chrystal A. George Mwangi, Keisha L. Green, and Daniel Morales Morales

Abstract

Latinx students are a growing population in postsecondary education but attain degrees at a pace behind their non-Latinx peers. This research examines a partnership between a research university (RU) and career and technical education (CTE) high school, Hillside Technical High School (HTHS). Through a 2-year ethnographic case study, we found that different logistics and cultural values were primary contributors to the bifurcated pathway between high school and college. These pathways were most successfully connected through strategies such as flexibility, personal relationships, and incorporation of community resources as well as viewing the students as resources. Our study suggests a need to reframe partnerships in recognition of the assets that students bring to these efforts, while also creating opportunities for additional faculty support and community involvement.

Keywords: Latinx youth, career and technical education, high school–university partnerships, LatCrit

Latinx college students have experienced the largest increase in rates of postsecondary education among racial and ethnic groups over the past two decades. However, these students continue to earn bachelor's degrees at lower rates than their peers (Krogstad, 2016). The discrepancy in educational attainment creates what Contreras (2011) refers to as the *brown paradox*, in which Latinx influence is spreading without corresponding levels of educational attainment or economic stability. Research that examines the educational pathway for Latinx student populations is needed to understand how disparities occur across enrollment, retention, and graduation (Solórzano et al., 2005).

The importance of postsecondary attainment emphasizes the need for alignment across high school and college (Brand et al., 2013). However, there is a history of P–12 and postsecondary bifurcation (Kirst & Usdan, 2007) that makes for two systems with little connection between them. This bifurcation can create challenges for Latinx students in navigating from elementary and secondary school into higher education. Scholars emphasize that developing stronger partnerships between these two components of the education pipeline is critical for improving college access and success for minoritized students (Howard et al., 2017; Kirst & Venezia, 2004). In this study, we examine possible ways to foster relationships between high schools and universities to promote student success. This study posed two research questions: (a) What factors impact the development of K–16 partnerships? (b) What strategies do educators use to develop K–16 partnerships? In this study, we examine one such partnership through an ethnographic case study to examine how collaboration can be fostered across K–16 pathways to better support Latinx populations.

Literature Review

In the following study, we use the term Latinx over Latina/o, Latin@, or other designations for those people with Latin American ancestry to align with emerging usage in higher education scholarship that promotes inclusivity and institutional understandings of intersectionality (Salinas & Lozano, 2017). To frame our study, we drew upon two bodies of literature: (a) high school–university partnerships and (b) Latinx education.

High School–University Partnerships

There is a long history of bifurcation between K–12 and postsecondary education systems (Kirst & Usdan, 2007). Fundamentally, engagement with knowledge and ideas is different within high school and university contexts. In high school, education is traditionally seen as the transmission of knowledge (Conley, 2007). Such views align with theoretical models that critique a banking model of education in which students are viewed as empty vessels that receive deposits of information from more knowledgeable instructors (Freire, 1970). In contrast, higher education environments are often described as sites of critical thinking and knowledge generation (Conley, 2007). Although techniques exist to help students prepare for this adjustment, such as senior seminars that introduce the reasoning and critical awareness required in postsecondary contexts (Conley, 2007), the shift is notable. Beyond this core component of learning, high schools are also logistically quite different from the heterogeneous spaces, academic calendars, and daily schedules of universities (Cunningham & Matthews, 2007; Hoffman et al., 2009).

Such discrepancies emphasize the need to align high school requirements with postsecondary expectations in a way that frames all curriculum as college preparatory (Jones, 2007). Researchers have found a need to support students across high school completion and college preparation, enrollment, and persistence (Goldberger, 2007). The term secondary–postsecondary learning options (SPLOs), introduced by the American Youth Policy Forum, provides an inclusive framing for the programs that link high school and college (Lerner & Brand, 2006). These programs span dual enrollment, technical preparation, middle and early college high schools, college access programs, and programs designed for marginalized populations to positively impact college-going (Lerner & Brand, 2006). Eddy (2010) grouped these partnerships within seven categories: (1) education reform, (2) economic development, (3) dual enrollment or student transfer, (4) student learning, (5) resource saving, (6) shared goals and visions, and (7) international joint ventures. Within these partnerships, benefits for students include opportunities to prepare for college-level work (Goldberger, 2007; Nakkula & Foster, 2007) and develop collaborative peer networks (Cunningham & Matthews, 2007).

Many questions exist about the long-term possibility of high school–university partnerships. Prior literature has shown these collaborations to be most successful when they focus on specific issues and common interests rather than structural integration (Farrell & Seifert, 2007; Kirst & Usdan, 2007). However, it is not clear how partnerships can be sustained in perpetuity. For college faculty, participation in collaborative efforts may be at odds with structures of tenure and promotion within higher education (Eddy, 2010). In addition, collaborations may raise short-term costs as state funds cover both secondary and postsecondary expenses during the creation of new initiatives; thus, short-term investment is often seen as a trade-off for long-term benefits (Farrell & Seifert, 2007; Palaich et al., 2007). In this article, we seek to understand one high school–university partnership and what lessons it offers for other such collaborations.

Latinx Education

It has been well documented that Latinx students encounter numerous barriers in their pathways to and through secondary and postsecondary education (Gándara & Contreras, 2009). Latinx are the largest and most rapidly growing minoritized ethnic group in the United States, but they have not experienced a subsequent increase in college graduation rates in three decades (Gándara & Contreras, 2009). Here we use the term "minoritized" because it recognizes the social construction of representation and that individuals are not inherently minorities but are "rendered minorities in particular situations and institutional environments that sustain an overrepresentation of whiteness" (Harper, 2013, p. 207). Madrigal-Garcia and Acevedo-Gil (2016) coined the term "New Juan Crow of

Education" (p. 163) to refer to the inequitable resources and culture of control that hinder the academic preparation of Latinx students. Their examples included deficit labels from school administrators regarding student performance, use of physical locks to keep students in and out of educational spaces, and curriculum and processes designed to limit independent thinking. In other cases, Latinx students have been placed on noncollege tracks in K–12 education systems, received limited information on college preparation, and suffered from a lack of encouragement and support regarding postsecondary options (Gaxiola Serrano, 2017). These barriers suggest a need to look at an opportunity gap rather than an achievement gap to understand the ways in which Latinx students experience marginalization through educational systems (Contreras, 2011). The result of the opportunity gap is a leaky educational pipeline with disparities for Latinx students between 2-year and 4-year enrollments, transfer rates to 4-year institutions, and low retention and graduation rates (Solórzano et al., 2005).

Research has shown that school support networks (Gándara & Moreno, 2002), meaningful teacher–student relationships (Garza, 2009), and relationships with school personnel and college-bound peers (Stanton-Salazar, 2001) provide students with the encouragement and tools to succeed in high school and be better prepared to apply for and enroll in college. Services such as academic and career guidance, class scheduling, information regarding college, and campus visits are some of the elements that contribute to a college-going culture (Corwin et al., 2004). Additionally, Castillo and colleagues (2010) found that school counselors, in addition to parents and guardians, play a significant role in contributing to a procollege culture. Adapting organizational cultures to students' cultures is also necessary for improving student outcomes (Banks & Banks, 2009; De Jesús & Antrop-González, 2006). For such cultural change, teachers and adults need to learn about their students' interests, aspirations, and ecological surroundings to know how to communicate a genuine sense of care and create conditions that support academic success (De Jesús & Antrop-González, 2006; Valenzuela, 1999).

Although many high school–university partnerships exist, they "rarely attempt to destabilize racist structures while prioritizing the needs of marginalized communities, nor do they infuse equity and social justice work in sustainable and comprehensive ways" (Delgado Bernal & Alemán, 2017, p. 6). In contrast, programs that specifically work with Latinx youth often seek to prepare all students to enroll and succeed in college by integrating higher education into school experiences and establishing a college-going culture (Delgado Bernal & Alemán, 2017). Successful programs incorporate counseling, academic enrichment, personal and cultural support, mentoring, and scholarships. Programs that bridge the two educational systems provide important opportunities for students to gain familiarity with postsecondary environments, and often remain an important source of support and guidance even after graduation (Gándara & Contreras, 2009).

Researcher Worldview

As a research team, we strove to situate this project, pedagogy, and research within a critical lens to challenge current inequitable distributions of power that frame our systems of education. In using this lens, we drew upon critical race theory (CRT) and Latinx critical race theory (LatCrit). The framework of CRT emerged from legal discourse that framed racism as a tool to maintain inequity through curriculum, instruction, assessment, school funding, and desegregation (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Scholars have described CRT as composed of five tenets: (1) centrality and intersectionality of race and racism; (2) challenge to dominant ideology; (3) commitment to social justice; (4) centrality of experiential knowledge; and (5) interdisciplinary perspective (Solórzano, 1997; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a). In using CRT as both a theoretical framework and a methodology, researchers challenge deficit perspectives by providing liberatory or transformative methods (Solórzano, 1997; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001b).

LatCrit serves as a specific emphasis within CRT as a "framework that can be used to theorize and examine the ways in which race and racism explicitly and implicitly impact on the educational structures, processes, and discourses that affect People of Color generally and Latinas/os specifically" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a, p. 479). Here, we used LatCrit as a reflexive tool throughout the formation, implementation, data collec-

tion, and analysis of our high school–university partnership to inform our approach and center the voices of Latinx students. LatCrit provides an important framework to understand the experiences of Latinx students in education (Davila & de Bradley, 2010; Huber, 2010) and to share counter-stories that challenge stereotypes and essentialization (Elenes, 1997; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a). This lens illuminates the ways in which current education pathways deter Latinx students from success through inadequate preparation, poor schooling conditions, and lack of support (Solórzano et al., 2005). In our study, a systemic lack of resources framed the educational context that our students navigated.

Using LatCrit and CRT emphasizes the ways that racism is embedded throughout education systems and acknowledges the multiplicity of realities (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). CRT in education can provide ways to challenge racism by defining, analyzing, and looking at examples of race and racism and transforming education for minoritized students (Solórzano, 1997). Such approaches provide transformational resistance that "allows one to look at resistance among Students of Color that is political, collective, conscious, and motivated by a sense that individual and social change is possible" (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001, p. 320). Many traditional interventions in education reify societal inequities or emphasize ideas of multiculturalism without a focus on true social justice (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Instead, using a critical lens can center the attributes of marginalized communities, such as the model of community cultural wealth posed by Yosso (2005) that outlines six forms of capital (aspirational, familial, social, linguistic, resistant, navigational) utilized by communities of color. Here, LatCrit and CRT framed our goals and motivations in approaching the educational partnership, our engagement with the high school teachers and staff, and our relationships with one another.

Theoretical Framework

In their discussion of organizational theory, Bolman and Deal (2013) conceptualize four approaches that illuminate how groups approach issues, distribute resources, and make decisions. Our study is informed by their political frame, which defines politics as "the realistic process of making decisions and allocating resources in a context of scarcity and divergent interests" (p. 183). Assumptions embedded within this frame highlight the ways that coalitions comprise individuals with unique values and beliefs, that conflict is a daily by-product of scarce resources, and that power (defined as "the capacity to make things happen" [p. 190]) is the most important asset. Coalitions form when members are interdependent and prioritize collaboration, and goals evolve through negotiation and bargaining. In this frame, leaders are less likely to issue edicts around priorities than to build support and bring together groups in working relationships.

Trends in higher education suggest an increased need for partnerships within the preschool through bachelor's degree (P–16) trajectories, particularly to pool resources (Eddy, 2010). Such resources can include academic enrichment for students, postsecondary transitional support and exposure, and additional trained teachers. Although university–school partnerships can span school partners across K–12 education, we focus on high school–university collaborations and use the political frame to understand how two distinct education systems approach common issues. In these collaborations, high schools and universities have unique agendas, necessitating clear communication and acknowledgement of differences across goals and approaches (Farrell & Seifert, 2007). As Eddy (2010) noted, "these ventures may vary in motivations for members to join, rationales for cooperating, and ability to sustain" (p. 3). For example, faculty members may struggle to prioritize such involvement within a rewards system that primarily values research. At an institutional level, collaborations between high schools and universities require shared consensus, including defining and operationalizing ideas of college readiness and preparation (Farrell & Seifert, 2007). We interpret this theoretical framework through a LatCrit and CRT lens to recognize the racial context that frames political agendas, coalitions, and resources.

Methodology and Methods

This article stems from a larger 2-year ethnographic case study that took place at a career and technical education (CTE) high school, here given the pseudonym Hillside Technical High School (HTHS). Ethnographic case studies combine case

study techniques with ethnographic interpretation (Simons, 2009) to give "a sociocultural analysis and interpretation of the unit of study" (Merriam, 1988, p. 23). Although we use some ethnographic techniques such as participant observation and directive and nondirective interviewing, ethnographic case studies are not limited by the data collection and analysis techniques found in traditional ethnography (Simons, 2009).

This article focuses on one component of the study, the partnership between administration at HTHS and faculty from an institution of higher education given the pseudonym Research University (RU), a large public research institution in New England. The partnership was developed as part of an urban education initiative at RU focused on community engagement with Hillside. The project was led by a four-member university teaching team: two tenure-track faculty (lead instructors) and two doctoral students (teaching assistants) affiliated with RU. As part of that partnership, HTHS administrators agreed to have the teaching team instruct an 11th grade English language arts (ELA) course at the high school for 1 year. The course focused on developing students' research skills, increasing academic and critical literacy, promoting critical thinking, and incorporating Puerto Rican diasporic literature. There was also a youth participatory action research project within the course that students elected to focus on the school-to-prison pipeline. After the first year of the project, the high school's administration allowed the teaching team to continue working with HTHS students for a second year. At HTHS, the project reinforced district goals of improving literacy, graduation rates, and the overall educational trajectory and college access of primarily Latinx youth.

Research Site and Access

HTHS is located in the urban community of Hillside in the northeastern United States, selected for involvement in this study because of its physical proximity to RU, its lack of resources (most demonstrable through a designation as "failing" by the state), and its lack of preexisting connections with RU. Approximately 24% of Hillside residents age 18 or older do not have a high school diploma or equivalent certification. HTHS is a career and technical education (CTE) high school, and 90% of students identify as Latinx. The student population is predominantly Puerto Rican, and the Latinx diaspora within the study also encompassed students with Mexican and Dominican heritage. It is important to note that our study did not exclusively involve Latinx students. Two of our 15 student participants identified as white or biracial.

Research Participants

Our study consisted of engagement with multiple individuals from HTHS and RU. At HTHS, this included senior administrators, specifically the principal, associate principal, guidance counselor, and deans of students. We also engaged with several teachers at the high school, specifically two teachers who were assigned by HTHS leadership to "host" the teaching team's ELA course. The host teacher allowed us to use their classroom, occasionally observed our teaching, and served as a resource for HTHS information. The HTHS senior leadership selected the 15 students that participated in the class. Because our teaching team did not recruit members of the HTHS community into our project (instead, they were asked or volunteered by HTHS leadership to do so), we developed an informed consent/assent process to ensure that individuals had the option to participate in the class without having to participate in the empirical research project. In addition to the HTHS participants, this study noted the ways in which the four members of the teaching team navigated the two institutions of RU and HTHS.

Data Collection

During the first year of the project, we spent approximately 2 to 2.5 hours at the research site every other day over the course of an academic school year (a total of 114 contact hours). Approximately 90 minutes were spent on classroom instruction and 30 to 60 minutes engaging with HTHS staff, course planning, and course debriefing. During Year 2 of the project, we spent approximately 1 to 1.5 hours every other week (60 minutes with students, 30 with staff) engaging in college and career planning for a total of approximately 60 hours.

We collected multiple forms of data throughout the study, which is reflective of an ethnographic case study approach that utilizes several sources of information in data collection to provide in-depth description and explanation of the case (Simons,

2009). After obtaining institutional review board (IRB) approval, we engaged in participant observations, individual student interviews, and student focus groups, as well as reviewing students' photographs, written narratives, and reflections. Team members captured researcher notes and memos after class sessions; we also used email communication to share classroom reflections and engage in course planning. For this study, we focused predominantly on the data provided by the internal team documents represented by these observation notes, emails, and course lessons, as well as interviews with students during each year of the program.

Data Analysis

While our larger study reflected an ethnographic case study focused on the high school class the teaching team taught, the analysis presented within this article reflects only one part of that larger study. The purpose of this article (high school–university partnerships) emerged inductively as a theme in our initial data analysis. In our initial analysis, there was a strong emphasis on how the processes and individuals at RU and HTHS, as well as the partnership between the two, impacted the ability of the teaching team to work with the HTHS students. Although this topic was not the focus of the original study, the prominence of the theme warranted additional targeted analysis.

We sought to further understand and analyze this theme by developing research questions centered on it, engaging in inductive analysis as a team, and drawing upon the frameworks we present in this article (deductive analysis). To begin this analysis, the lead author read through all data collected through the project to identify the evidence most relevant to answering the research questions. All four members then reviewed the data points and developed memos to record initial reflections and potential themes and patterns within the case data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Simons, 2009). These memos allowed the team to engage in constant comparative coding by engaging first in open coding for interesting and important data and then axial coding to compare and connect ideas into categories (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Such codes included cultural relevancy in curriculum design, administrative instability, and student agency. We complemented inductive codes with deductive codes generated from our theoretical framework. Using Bolman and Deal (2013) and literature on high school–university partnerships, we created a codebook of concepts such as power, resource distribution, relationships, and negotiation (Simons, 2009). In developing our codes, we frequently discussed as a group how these themes were contextualized by race and racism, incorporating principles of LatCrit theory (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a).

Each member of the teaching team then coded for and wrote one section of the findings, using the data itself (e.g., participant narratives) as evidence of their interpretations and analysis (Guest & MacQueen, 2008). Finally, we used NVIVO software to analyze the data using multiple tools to identify patterns and themes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The findings were then reviewed by all team members for consistency and a collaborative understanding of the data (Guest & MacQueen, 2008).

Positionality and Trustworthiness

As a teaching team, we brought our positionality to the course. The two lead instructors in the course were tenure-track assistant professors who identified as Black women (George Mwangi and Green). The two teaching assistants identified as a white woman (Bettencourt) and Latinx man (Morales). As both teachers and researchers, we sought to recognize the ways that our identities shaped our interactions with the project, frequently using peer debriefing and reflexive strategies through meetings and emails. This awareness was congruent with principles of CRT that advocate for constant reflection to avoid perpetuating social inequalities through education (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). In addition to our social identities, we brought a range of experience working across the educational pipeline. Although two members of our teaching team directly focused on postsecondary education and two on K–12 systems, we all had experience working with students in both contexts prior to the ELA course. Thus, we brought an emic perspective to our work. Additional techniques for engaging research trustworthiness include incorporating methodological triangulation through multiple forms of data collection (documents, interviews, observations) and data triangulation through engaging multiple data sources (e.g., students, staff, ourselves;

Patton, 2002).

Findings

Our research questions asked (a) What factors impact the development of K–16 partnerships? and (b) What strategies do educators use to develop K–16 partnerships? Our findings illuminated two primary areas. The two themes that emerged regarding the first question emphasized bridging the bifurcated systems between HTHS and RU that resulted in separate educational worldviews and administrative procedures. Regarding the second question, analysis showed that the teaching team developed strategies to address constant change and drew upon the students as resources to sustain the partnership.

Different Educational Worldviews

The difference in educational worldviews, exemplified across behavioral management and pedagogy, was a key factor impacting the partnership between the teaching team and the broader culture of HTHS. In the conceptual phases of the program, the teaching team attempted to center the Latinx student experience within lessons. The course was conceptualized by the faculty as "a literary arts course that would cultivate critical literacy skills; academic writing/college-level writing skills; heritage knowledge." In the course, students were expected to be critical thinkers and engaged in complex conversations about racism and power. One teaching team member saw this as "balancing that out with things that may not be considered as valuable in schools, but that we see as valuable to students' learning."

As a result, the students in the ELA class saw the course as a place where they learned not only academic content, but about what was going on in the world. One student referred to the course as his "activist course." Laura, a student studying health care, described the course as preparing her for the broader world, noting, "I want to know about everything that's happening in the world. That's exactly what we're doing." Such an approach challenged traditional banking approaches to education, in which students were expected merely to remember and repeat information (Freire, 1970). In this way, the course aligned with CRT by engaging in social justice, experiential learning, and minoritized perspectives (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a). Students often described other teachers at HTHS as not as engaged in student learning or critical thinking. Laura contrasted her experience with the ELA course with her overall experience at HTHS, noting that "I feel like some [teachers] don't care about us, what we do, and what makes us want to learn. If we don't want to learn they'll be like, 'Okay. You don't need to learn. Go home.'"

These differences in pedagogy aligned with the differences across the two institutions, where HTHS was primarily focused on preparing students for a career and the RU teaching team prioritized critical thinking aligned with college coursework. In this case, the worldview of HTHS was also informed by larger structural limitations like the impact of the state receivership imposed due to low test scores, continual change in leadership, and limited resources. The instability of resources limited the ability of the teaching team to engage in holistic planning as systems were often changing or information was unclear. Moreover, HTHS staff and teachers felt immense pressure to focus on state testing to stabilize the position of the school. The scarcity of resources and diverse interests at times created disconnect across divergent goals (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Expectations of and strategies related to behavioral management served as a second area reflecting the tension between educational worldviews. The teaching team articulated a community-based strategy rooted in a collegiate approach that asked students to establish group norms and hold themselves accountable. During the first class session, the teaching team asked the students to generate "ROPES," a shared set of expectations that used each letter in the word to generate key terms (e.g., R = responsibility or respect, O = openness or on-time). The team then attempted to revisit these principles during the course to remind students of the mutually agreed-upon expectations.

Ultimately, ROPES did not have the desired impact. Rather than inform a community agreement, the group listed various terms (e.g., polite, organized) without a clear consensus of their goal and how to hold one another accountable. The team later revisited the exercise by creating a collective contract that outlined the shared expectations for students and teachers. One of the teaching assistants described this process:

> I put pieces of paper around the room that read "Expectations of Students," "Expectations of Instructors," and "Failing to Meet Expectations." The students got a marker each and wrote things on each piece of paper. Most students seemed to take the exercise seriously.

The approach of asking students to hold themselves accountable was different from the culture of the school in which students rarely shaped or had input in policies. Participants in the ELA course shared examples such as a no cell phone policy, the expectation to always carry their ID cards, and the shortened lunch period (approximately 20 minutes). One student, Juan, described the behavioral management at HTHS as a business rather than an educational institution. He shared an example of a student who was injured as the bystander of a fight and received suspension, describing how the student "was treated as if she was just any person outside on the street who stole someone's money or something."

Misaligned Logistics

A second factor was the logistical misalignment between K–12 and postsecondary education (Cunningham & Matthews, 2007; Hoffman et al., 2009). HTHS and RU had completely different academic calendars. The start and end dates differed (August and June for HTHS; September and April for RU), a dichotomy that was amplified by varying schedules for closures related to holidays, professional development, and inclement weather. Given the physical HTHS space and limited number of university members on the project, it was more practical to work within the HTHS calendar, rather than use the RU calendar or a hybrid. The commitment to the HTHS precedent required the teaching team to work outside our contracted employment schedule and to forgo breaks during the academic year because of limited overlap in break schedules. In discussing how to teach the HTHS class while the university was closed for winter break, one team member explained, "Figuring out December will be tricky, but . . . we just need to map our time out on the calendar and see who will be here and then we can work around any holes." The misaligned schedules led to feelings of burnout for the teaching team.

Communication was another logistical issue. Although HTHS staff were typically responsive to email inquiries and the teaching team utilized in-person communication where possible, it was challenging to receive up-to-date information. In one example, teaching team members were told by HTHS administration that the school had implemented a new website to post updates and communication throughout the year. However, the website was often out of date. For HTHS teachers who were on the campus daily, other forms of communication supplemented the online presence. For the RU team, the lack of information available online created confusion. In trying to use the website to complete required field trip paperwork, one team member emailed the group to explain, "There used to be a link to it from [the website], but I don't see it there anymore. . . . maybe [HTHS] aren't using it anymore." Teaching team members were not on official staff electronic mailing lists or privy to other forms of communication, as they were not considered HTHS staff. Therefore, team members did not have a formal mechanism for receiving real-time information about the school (e.g., schedule changes, new initiatives, staff turnover) and, at times, made decisions about the project using outdated or inaccurate information. The misinformation reflects the conflicting priorities around which resources were most important (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

The misaligned calendars and communication also made it challenging for RU team members and HTHS partners to meet and engage collaboratively, a challenge amplified by differences in roles and level of commitment/responsibility to the project. The RU team was responsible for coordinating the project, whereas HTHS staff served in support roles, causing much of the communication to occur through requests to the administration rather than direct collaboration with teachers. For both parties, there were challenges in making the collaboration a priority due to competing obligations and times to sit down in person (Bolman & Deal, 2013). For example, in an email to the school administrators to request a meeting at the end of Year 1, one RU team member asked,

> [We] are reaching out to see if you have any interest in meeting before the end of the school year to share what accomplished during

> the school year, and/or to hear your thoughts about the year or to answer any questions. We are also interested in knowing more about the schedules for the students in our class, toward a possibility of continuing to work with these students through graduation.

Unfortunately, this meeting was never scheduled. Across the project, team members were unable to find times to reflect together and to make mutually beneficial adjustments that supported all stakeholders. While the project was conducted, these logistical misalignments created difficulty in developing a clear partnership.

Navigating Across Change

Given the challenges of two very different educational systems, the teaching team drew upon several strategies to create partnerships. During the 2 years of the ELA project, the host teacher and key administrators (e.g., principal, associate principal, dean of students) all left HTHS and were replaced by new individuals. HTHS was placed under a receivership by the state due to low test scores. RU also underwent substantial changes during the project, resulting in turnover for multiple key leadership positions on campus and creating challenges to sustaining the partnership (Eddy, 2010). To navigate these changing circumstances, the teaching team used individual relationships, flexibility in design, and community resources.

The teaching team collaborated with members of the HTHS staff and administration to support the efforts of the course, building individual relationships to obtain resources and information. In one example, one team member discovered an unexpected connection in that "the new Dean of Students is my old neighbor." She leveraged her prior familiarity to open a communication channel, which she used to get administrative buy-in at HTHS for field trips and activities with students. In a second example, the teaching team supported the HTHS host teacher during Year 1 by helping to cover additional class sessions when a time conflict arose, providing a space to process concerns, and even celebrating his retirement. During the students' senior year, the teaching team built connections with the guidance counselor and new ELA host teacher to facilitate opportunities related to college and career planning. In an email to establish a plan for the year, one member noted that "we are looking forward to continuing our relationship with the students and the school this year. We are committed to seeing everyone graduate, and hopefully transition to a post-secondary pathway or opportunity." Without a formal system, building individual relationships provided support and assistance. These relationships allowed the teaching team to offer their expertise and assistance to HTHS staff in return for insider knowledge of the school and students (Bolman & Deal, 2013). As a result, HTHS and teaching team members were able to form a loose coalition related to mutual benefit.

Flexibility in design occurred as the HTHS schedule was constantly evolving or shifting due to state testing, CTE curriculum, and changing needs of students. During the last semester of the project, the students were unavailable during the previously established time. In addition, both faculty members were on parental leave during the semester. To accommodate the new schedule and the smaller team, one of the teaching assistants proposed a plan where "at least two [teaching team members will] be able to keep doing some small group/1:1 attention as students work on applications, scholarships, and job applications." When these concerns were no longer salient with students, who largely had plans after high school, the team moved to an individualized support model. In this way, the teaching team renegotiated relationships and resources not only externally, but within their own practice as well (Bolman & Deal, 2013). As one of the research assistants described,

> It seems like, our group is ready to be off on their way and isn't engaging as much in [group] planning for next steps at this point. We've made sure that they have our contact information so that we can help individually.

In addition to the course and physical meetings, engagement in virtual spaces such as Facebook, Google chat, and texting also allowed for communication across teachers and students.

The flexibility also occurred in the ability to respond to the high school climate. When one student, Juan, was involved in a physical altercation at HTHS, the teaching

team wrote a letter to the administration to advocate for a developmental process rather than a suspension:

> We see in him an immense capacity that can continue to grow with continued support, encouragement, and opportunities to stimulate his intellect and creativity. As educators, we believe the school environment is one of the primary contexts in which this can happen and thus ask that he not be removed.

In this case, the fact that the faculty had the expertise and credentialing of college professors also bolstered the intervention of the teaching team on behalf of the student. It was an attempt to utilize the power that the RU team had accumulated through the project to advocate for an alternative disciplinary outcome (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Although Juan was still ultimately suspended, the letter gave Juan's family a tool to draw upon in meetings with administration.

The final subtheme focused on the ways in which the ELA class incorporated local and community resources beyond HTHS. One of the faculty members was well-connected with both national scholars and local activists performing social justice and racial equity work and used her connections to bring prominent individuals to HTHS. In an email, she stated,

> We are hoping to expose students to programming at [the Hillside Community College], students (Latinx and/or activist groups), faculty who work on education and incarceration issues, or perhaps sit in on a [college] class.

In another example, one of the doctoral students frequently passed along opportunities to participate in local events and activities of interest. Perhaps the clearest example was a field trip in which the teaching team took students to a conference on the school-to-prison pipeline hosted by an Ivy League university. The field trip provided students with exposure to higher education beyond their immediate environment, connected them with outside peers, and offered them new research skills. These supplemental opportunities helped provide resources and opportunities not present within the turbulent environment of HTHS, demonstrating the ability of the RU team to integrate resources beyond the immediate partnership to bolster their work (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Students as Resources

In many traditional educational contexts, young people are not viewed as knowledgeable assets. At times, HTHS fell into a similar pattern of treating students as receivers of information and services. In this high school–university partnership, however, students were assets and experts with whom the teaching team partnered to receive information and learn. As outsiders and newcomers, the teaching team benefited from information that the students provided about the historical and contemporary contexts of HTHS. This navigational capital (Yosso, 2005) was invaluable. Given the differences within the high school standard operating procedures, schedules, routines, policies, and cultural norms, students served as a main point of contact enabling the teaching team to decode HTHS. For example, the school operated on an "A" and "B" day rotation, which related to when students went to certain academic classes or their "shops" or vocational tracks. This schedule was disrupted by snow days, holidays, or testing days, changing the rotation. One such schedule change happened at the beginning of the year, as described by one of the faculty members:

> Early in the school year, we showed up at the school and there was no class; we had come on the wrong day. One of the students had actually tried to tell [us] the week prior, but we didn't listen, and thought we had the schedule correct.

These logistical pieces of information also took the form of information about school policies or staffing changes, including the departure of the dean of students and the retirement of the host teacher during Year 1.

Similarly, the teaching team gained insight into the contentious dynamic between HTHS and Hillside High School (HHS), the two high schools in the area, through the students. According to ELA students, HTHS had been a "credible" option for those interested in a trade, with many of the students' parents having been alumni. During our project, however, HTHS carried a stigma felt by the students and was viewed as not as academically rigorous as HHS. From the students, the teaching team learned that the "students do not have a lot of school pride,"

"the school does not care about students, or does not show much care," and that "disrespectful students and staff" were perceived as part of HTHS culture. Students shared information on the reputation of particular Hillside neighborhoods, the relationship between the two high schools, and the ways their Puerto Rican identities were framed in the broader Hillside context. In this way, the students were also able to offer counterstories that challenged the stereotypes given to the Hillside community (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a).

In addition to their knowledge of the context of Hillside, students served as key partners in shaping curricular choices. Prior to the school year, the two lead instructors collaborated to create a skeleton curriculum. Without input from the students or information about their academic skills or interests, the lesson plans were outlined with the understanding they might need to change after meeting the students. This pedagogical approach meant remaining flexible and viewing student input as an asset. For example, at the beginning of the school year, one of the faculty members began introductions and mentioned that the class would use the HTHS online platform. Students voiced concerns that the platform had not worked well during the prior year, often failing to update their grades. Additionally, the instructor suggested using Twitter for the class, which also was met with mixed reactions from students. One student remarked that "education should not be on social media," but another student offered the opinion that Twitter would be good "because it allows other people to see what we are doing in class." Ultimately, the teaching team decided to forgo using the HTHS system and Twitter, opting for simply emailing, texting, or calling the students based on the responses they provided. We eventually created a Facebook page for the class as a popular platform among students. In the ELA class, students were also treated as holding power and were individuals with whom we as a teaching team had to collaborate and negotiate to build a coalition for our shared educational goals (Bettencourt, 2018; Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Discussion

In this study, we attempt to reconcile the political frame of Bolman and Deal (2013) with the tenets of LatCrit theory (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a), which center Latinx student voices. Our study emphasizes the fluid nature of political relationships. In order to "make things happen" (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 190), the faculty and teaching assistants were challenged to be constantly flexible to create working relationships that often changed in the context of the school. However, the use of LatCrit theory allowed the teaching team to center an important resource often overlooked within such collaborations—the students themselves. By viewing students as resources, we also drew on asset-based frameworks such as community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005) that challenge deficit views applied to marginalized communities.

In particular, the navigational capital of students was crucial to create the collaboration and understand the culture of HTHS (Yosso, 2005). Navigational capital is described as the "skills of maneuvering through social institutions" (Yosso, 2005, p. 80). Indeed, it was the students' navigation abilities that helped to bridge the bifurcated pathway. This was particularly important as none of the four members of the teaching team identified as Puerto Rican or as staff at HTHS. The insider knowledge was crucial to bridging the divergent interests at HTHS and RU. The students provided pragmatic support in helping to manage the different logistical systems of the two institutions. Importantly, they also helped to illuminate the hidden curriculum (Anyon, 1980) of HTHS that dictated how students were expected to learn and act.

Our participants also engaged in resistant capital that challenged the deficit views within the high school, Hillside, and the larger geographical community that they were less capable than other students or that pursuing CTE was less valuable than traditional curriculum. Yosso (2005) described resistant capital as "knowledges and skills fostered through oppositional behavior that challenges inequality" (p. 80). Although participants experienced inequity daily, the ELA course helped students to position their experiences within larger national discourse. They connected their experiences with key ideas and terminology, and they situated their experience within a national landscape of racial injustice that included the election of Donald Trump, the Black Lives Matter movement, and school discipline policies (Morales et al., 2017). Resistant capital helped the students navigate through the racism, classism, and

violence that pervaded their daily lives. In this way, our participants directly embodied key tenets of CRT such as challenges to dominant ideology, commitment to social justice, and the importance of experiential knowledge (Solórzano, 1997; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001a).

Thus, our study expands the political framework (Bolman & Deal, 2013) to examine how traditionally marginalized communities wield power in partnerships. Rather than viewing Latinx students as passive entities to whom these partnerships happen, our study illuminates the agency of our participants and the community. Moreover, LatCrit served as a social justice tool to link theory with our own teaching practice, scholarship with teaching, and the academy with the broader community. Like prior studies, this research shows that students and teachers can partner to adapt curriculum and take advantage of limited resources (Madrigal-Garcia & Acevedo-Gil, 2016).

The HTHS and RU partnership also suggests a need to recenter communities as part of this collaboration. Given the administrative changes at both HTHS and RU, the local community college, museums, and organizations provided key resources that would have otherwise been unavailable. Taken with the last point, our research suggests a need to create an infrastructure for these partnerships that involves students, families, and community organizations in addition to colleges and universities. Since most successful partnerships are largely rooted in organic creation (Delgado Bernal & Alemán, 2017) instead of government-mandated efforts (Farrell & Seifert, 2007), a best practice may be to regularly convene meetings of such collaborators to examine the broader trends and needs in the community and create strategies for successfully addressing them.

Although this study provides significant considerations for partnerships, it is important to note that HTHS was a highly surveilled school that was deemed failing by the state, and was even perceived as a deficit by the local community when compared to the other local high school. This partnership was also unique based on the limited resources and particular circumstances of HTHS and the time period in which our course took place, during the transition to and imposition of a state receivership. Our collaboration probably would have looked very different at a highly resourced institution or in another context.

In addition, HTHS was a CTE school. Prior research has found that the high school outcomes for CTE students often are different; students are more likely to attend community colleges and pursue shorter term career interests or delay their educational goals (Laird et al., 2006). Literature around partnerships between research universities and CTE schools is exceedingly rare. However, it is possible that for some students in CTE schools, college-going may not be an immediate goal. Or, more specifically, college-going at a school such as RU may not be the goal. In these cases, it may be crucial for stakeholders to decide earlier on what the goal of these collaborations is. As a research team, we attempted to center student agency over traditional student success metrics. However, such a view requires that colleges and universities more holistically grapple with their role in local communities beyond the goal of enrollment. This question is one that other scholars have also grappled with, and the partnership here echoes those considerations:

> To the extent that these students are arriving at the university underprepared for the rigors of college-level work, leaders of these institutions believe it to be in their self-interest to help strengthen the public schools. At another level, the involvement of public colleges and universities stems in part from a growing perception by taxpayers that the university holds some responsibility for the state of American education, and that some of its resources should be put to the task of improving public schooling. (Gándara & Contreras, 2009, p. 277)

Limitations

The partnership that we analyzed within this article demonstrates the complex dynamics that can emerge in high school–university collaborations. Nonetheless, our study also reflects limitations that should be considered when interpreting our findings. Primarily, our study was not intentionally designed to study the partnership herein described. Instead, our study was intended to focus on the teaching team's work with HTHS students and engagement in the 11th grade ELA course. Therefore, the partner-

ship was not selected for being a model or for other targeted characteristics. Although the partnership topic emerged as a major theme within the study, we recommend future researchers working in similar partnerships intentionally capture their partnership's structure and engagement through their research design, rather than a sole focus on the outcomes.

Implications

College education is increasingly important given the nation's focus on a global knowledge economy, the collapse of blue-collar labor positions, and the scarcity of social resources (Carnevale, 2007). Although Latinx college-going rates may be increasing, gaps around degree achievement persist (Krogstad, 2016). To support students, further efforts are necessary to help manage student expectations prior to enrollment, to prepare college faculty, and to develop more structural resources (Kanny, 2015).

Our study illuminates potential challenges and opportunities to building high school–university partnerships. By establishing educational pathways, institutions can move from expecting students to be college ready to being student ready for the populations that arrive on campus. This student-ready mind-set requires that institutions create climates that involve K–12 and higher education stakeholders in a process of challenging the deficit labels and biases that frame minoritized students as lesser and instead seek to be more proactive and innovative in providing support (McNair et al., 2016). In this case, there is a direct need to prepare faculty members to engage in these types of research and partnerships. These topics could include how to develop these partnerships, ongoing support, and introductions within the local community.

A key priority moving forward for these partnerships is to identify areas of interest convergence. If peer-refereed journal articles are the metric of success for faculty members (Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004; Webber, 2011), collaborations between high schools and colleges may provide unique opportunities to engage in research with a variety of participants. The P–12 sector provides rich sample sites for scholars to engage with participants and to collaboratively investigate pedagogy, youth development, and postgraduation trajectories. However, these partnerships also challenge traditional conceptions of merit. Community-engaged research may involve different pedagogies and products that are not traditionally recognized within academia, suggesting a need for senior faculty and administrators to proactively emphasize their value (Fine, 2008). National organizations can also support this trend. For example, in 2018 the Association for the Study of Higher Education, one of the main postsecondary research organizations in the United States, added a section to its annual program on community-engaged research. There is a pressing need to address the issue of K–12, higher education, and Latinx community partnerships because Latinx students represent an untapped resource in the academic production of knowledge. We need to highlight the importance of educational partnerships that support and sustain Latinx youth in the educational system.

About the Authors

Genia M. Bettencourt *is a postdoctoral research associate with the Center for Student Success Research at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Her research focuses on college access and equity for marginalized student populations, with a particular focus on issues of social class. She received her Ph.D. in higher education from the University of Massachusetts Amherst.*

Chrystal A. George Mwangi *is an associate professor of higher education in the Department of Educational Policy, Research, and Administration at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Her research broadly centers on structures of opportunity, access, and educational attainment for racially minoritized college students; internationalization and the impact of globalization and migration on higher education; and African and African Diaspora populations in higher education. She received her Ph.D. in higher education administration from the University of Maryland, College Park.*

Keisha Green *is an assistant professor in the Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Her research focuses on English education,*

youth literacy practices, critical literacy and critical pedagogy. She received her Ph.D. in educational studies from Emory University.

***Daniel Morales Morales** is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. His research interests include college access, critical pedagogy and social justice education. He received his M.A. in intercultural communication from the University of Maryland Baltimore County.*

References

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162*(1), 67–92.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Bettencourt, G. M. (2018). Embracing problems, processes, and contact zones: Using youth participatory action research to challenge adultism. *Action Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750318789475

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Brand, B., Valent, A., & Browning, A. (2013). *How career and technical education can help students be college and career ready: A primer*. American Institutes for Research. http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/CCRS%20Primer%20Brief.pdf

Carnevale, A. P. (2007). Confessions of an education fundamentalist: Why grade 12 is not the right end point for anyone. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 15–26). Harvard Education Press.

Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., Cepeda, L. M., Ivy, K. K., & Archuleta, D. J. (2010). Mexican American adolescents' perceptions of a pro-college culture. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 9*(1), 61–72.

Conley, D. (2007). Challenges in the transition from high school to college. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 93–103). Harvard Education Press.

Contreras, F. (2011). *Achieving equity for Latino students: Expanding the pathway to higher education through public policy*. Teachers College Press.

Corwin, Z. B., Venegas, K. M., Oliverez, P. M., & Colyar, J. E. (2004). School counsel: How appropriate guidance affects educational equity. *Urban Education, 39*(4), 442–457.

Cunningham, C., & Matthews, R. S. (2007). Lessons from the field: A tale of two early college high schools. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 123–131). Harvard Education Press.

Davila, E. R., & de Bradley, A. A. (2010). Examining education for Latinas/os in Chicago: A CRT/LatCrit approach. *Educational Foundations, 24*(1/2), 39–58.

De Jesús, A., & Antrop-González, R. (2006). Instrumental relationships and high expectations: Exploring critical care in two Latino community-based schools. *Intercultural Education, 17*(3), 281–299.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Alemán, E., Jr. (2017). *Transforming educational pathways for Chicana/o students: A critical race feminist praxis*. Teachers College Press.

Eddy, P. L. (2010). Partnerships and collaborations in higher education [Special issue]. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.3602

Elenes, C. A. (1997). Reclaiming the borderlands: Chicana/o identity, difference, and critical pedagogy. *Educational Theory, 47*(3), 359–375.

Farrell, P. L., & Seifert, K. A. (2007). Lessons learned from a dual-enrollment partnership. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2007*(139), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.294

Fine, M. (2008). An epilogue, of sorts. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 213–234). Routledge.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Gándara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Harvard University Press.

Gándara, P., & Moreno, J. F. (2002). Introduction: The Puente Project: Issues and perspectives on preparing Latino youth for higher education. *Educational Policy, 16*(4), 463–473.

Garza, R. (2009). Latino and White high school students' perceptions of caring behaviors: Are we culturally responsive to our students? *Urban Education, 44*(3), 297–321.

Gaxiola Serrano, T. J. (2017). "Wait, what do you mean by college?" A critical race analysis of Latina/o students and their pathways to community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 41*(4–5), 239–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2016.1251362

Goldberger, S. (2007). Doing the math: What it means to double the number of low-income college graduates. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 27–41). Harvard Education Press.

Guest, G., & MacQueen, K. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook for team-based qualitative research*. Altamira Press.

Harper, S. R. (2013). Am I my brother's teacher? Black undergraduates, racial socialization, and peer pedagogies in predominantly White postsecondary contexts. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 183–211. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12471300

Hoffman, N., Vargas, J., & Santos, J. (2009). New directions for dual enrollment: Creating stronger pathways from high school through college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2009*(145), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.354

Howard, T. C., Tunstall, J., & Flennaugh, T. K. (Eds.). (2016). *Expanding college access for urban youth: What schools and colleges can do*. Teachers College Press.

Huber, L. P. (2010). Using Latina/o critical race theory (LatCrit) and racist nativism to explore intersectionality in the educational experiences of undocumented Chicana college students. *The Journal of Educational Foundations, 24*(1/2), 77–96.

Jones, S. (2007). Raising expectations for academic achievement. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 73–91). Harvard Education Press.

Kanny, M. A. (2015). Dual enrollment participation from the student perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2016*(169), 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20133

Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (2007). The history of the separation of K–12 and postsecondary education. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 55–64). Harvard Education Press.

Kirst, M. W., & Venezia, A. (Eds.). (2004). *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education*. Jossey-Bass.

Krogstad, J. M. (2016, July 28). *5 facts about Latinos and education*. Pew Research Center. http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/28/5-facts-about-latinos-and-education/

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47–68.

Laird, J., Chen, Z., Levesque, K., & Owings, J. (2006). *The postsecondary educational experiences of high school career and technical education concentrators*. National Center for Educational Statistics.

Lerner, J. B., & Brand, B. (2006). *The college ladder: Linking secondary and postsecondary education for success for all students*. American Youth Policy Forum. https://www.aypf.org/resource/thecollegeladder/

Madrigal-Garcia, Y. I., & Acevedo-Gil, N. (2016). The new Juan Crow in education: Revealing panoptic measures and the inequitable resources that hinder Latina/o postsecondary pathways. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 15*(2), 154–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192716629192

McNair, T. B., Albertine, S., Cooper, M. A., McDonald, N., & Major, T., Jr. (2016). *Becoming a student-ready college: A new culture of leadership for student success*. Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Morales, D. M., Bettencourt, G. M., Green, K., & George Mwangi, C. A. (2017). "I want to know about everything that's happening in the world": Enhancing critical awareness through youth participatory action research with Latinx youths. *The Educational Forum, 81*(4), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2017.1350236

Nakkula, M. J., & Foster, K. C. (2007). Academic identity development: Student experiences in two early college high schools. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 151–164). Harvard Education Press.

Palaich, R., Augenblick, J., & Maloney, M. (2007). Return on investment analysis of integrating grades 9–14. In N. Hoffman, J. Vargas, A. Venezia, & M. S. Miller (Eds.), *Minding the gap: Why integrating high school with college makes sense and how to do it* (pp. 183–189). Harvard Education Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Salinas, C., Jr., & Lozano, A. (2017). Mapping and recontextualizing the evolution of the term Latinx: An environmental scanning in higher education. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 18*(4), 302–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2017.1390464

Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. SAGE Publications.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoads, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. John Hopkins University Press.

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*(3), 5–19.

Solórzano, D. G., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in the urban context. *Urban Education, 36*(3), 308–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002

Solórzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 272–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192705276550

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001a). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(4), 471–495. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110063365

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001b). Maintaining social justice hopes within academic realities: A Freirean approach to critical race/LatCrit pedagogy. *Denver University Law Review, 78*(4), 595–622.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing hope and despair: The school and kin support networks of US–Mexican youth*. Teachers College Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US–Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. SUNY Press.

Webber, K. L. (2011). Factors related to faculty research productivity and implications for academic planners. *Planning for Higher Education, 39*(4), 32–43.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.