



Migrant students and College Assistance Migrant Programs: A promising pathway to higher education success

Robert Garcia, David Gonzalez Nieto

Abstract

Migrant students continue to face challenging obstacles to complete their post-secondary education and their needs and successes are still widely unknown. The present article compares the results, in terms of retention and graduation, of migrant students in a CAMP program to other students in similar institutions. Using a series of independent samples T-tests, the outcomes of students are compared and potential characteristics of successful students are also identified. The results reveal a promising positive outcome in favor of CAMP programs. These results may have implications for institutions serving migrant students, and others labeled first generation, low SES, ethnic minorities.

Keywords: *Migrant education; Multicultural education; Education policy*

Introduction

Migrant education may be one of the least familiar areas of early elementary to post-secondary education. Even though the migrant education program started in the 1960s, after Edward Murrow's (1960) documentary 'Harvest of Shame' drew attention to the living conditions of seasonal and farm workers, the needs and talents of migrant students go largely unrecognized. In fact, these students have been defined as "invisible" (Nuñez, 2009; Ramirez, 2012) and, to this day, they have the lowest performance group as measured by standardized tests, the highest dropout rate (Green, 2003; Ramirez, 2012), and the least likelihood of attending college (Garza et al., 2004).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)(2015), under Title I part C, and the Higher Education Act (HEA), under Subpart 5, Special Programs for Students Whose Families Are Engaged in Migrant and Seasonal Farm work, designed programs with the attempt to serve migrant students. Often confused with immigrant

students, migrant students are defined as students that have moved within a given time frame, across state or school district lines with or to join a migrant parent or guardian who is seeking to obtain qualifying temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture, fishing, or dairy. These are the defining terms of a migrant student as described in both ESSA and HEA.

Today, the Migrant Education Program (MEP), in K-12 education, serves over 500,000 children in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia (DC). Although the program was established in the 1960s, there have not been many significant changes other than definitions, priority of services, and funding allocations. These allocation changes are basically focused on the distribution of payments for both educational and health services provided to migrant students by school districts on a supplemental basis. MEP's goal, as outlined in ESSA, is to ensure that migrant students receive a high-



quality and comprehensive education that minimizes the potential negative effects of the life-conditions of migrant families that move frequently between or within states.

Given the lack of successful transition of migrant students to higher education, in 1967 the HEA authorized the provision of funds for High Equivalency Programs (HEP) to assist qualifying, current and former migrant students to obtain a secondary school diploma. In 1972, the College Assistance Migrant Programs (CAMP) were created to ensure the placement, persistence and retention of migrant students in post-secondary education (US Department of Education [USDE], 2020).

The establishment of these federally funded CAMP grants proved to be necessary. The challenges and disadvantages of migrant students have been well documented. Included among these barriers are the constant adjustment to new environments, cultural differences, language skills not supported or valued at schools, low income, and lack of integration in the communities in which migrant students temporarily reside (Ramirez, 2012; Zalaquett et al., 2007). These same challenges persist, or are exacerbated, in post-secondary education. Migrant students share some of the characteristics of students considered most vulnerable. They are identified as low socio-economic status students, emerging bilinguals, and first-generation students and they face additional challenges including lack of college preparatory coursework and low college access tests' scores (Garza et al., 2004; Ramirez, 2012). This combination of barriers makes them invisible to most of the higher education world.

CAMP is a grant program developed to mitigate the disadvantages migrant students have and ensure the success of this population in their higher education journey. Today, approximately 2,000 migrant students

receive services from this program annually which include counseling, tutoring, academic skills² workshops, financial aid stipends, health services, and housing assistance to eligible students during their first year of college (USDE, 2018). There are currently 54 CAMPs at IHEs across the United States including Puerto Rico (HEP CAMP Association, 2020).

A number of qualitative studies have explored the experiences of migrant students at CAMP programs, but there is not much quantitative evidence of the results of the programs in terms of retention and college program completion. Previous research has shown that attending a 4-year institution increases the likelihood of completing a postsecondary degree, however, migrant students have a higher representation in community colleges (Nuñez, 2009). Given this context, the present study addresses the following overarching question: Are students in CAMP more likely to graduate compared to other students attending community colleges? To answer this question, data has been collected for over 10 years at a community college CAMP known as BUENO CAMP. These data are used to answer the follow research questions:

- a) Are there statistically significant differences on BUENO CAMP student graduation rates compared to all Acre Community College students, and statewide Community Colleges' students?
- b) How are BUENO CAMP migrant students doing in higher education in comparison to other populations in the state?
- c) What are the preponderant characteristics of successful students in the CAMP program?

This study tracks and compares the results, in terms of degree completion, of migrant students to the results of non-migrant students in community colleges in



the same state. The results reveal a surprising outcome in favor of migrant students. But, before delving into the details of the present research, we will discuss the historical and socio-political context of migrant education in higher education and the findings from previous literature about the characteristics and success of migrant students in higher education.

Historical and Policy Perspectives of Migrant Education in Higher Education

The CAMP is a federally funded grant program created in 1972 to assist students of families who work in migratory or seasonal farmworkers to enroll in their first year of undergraduate studies at an Institution of Higher Education (IHE). These were a non-competing program until 1982 when they were transferred to the United States Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education and offered as competitive grants to states and their funding was increased (Quezada et al., 2017). Even though each CAMP has their own goals and objectives and they their own unique implementation plan to meeting those objectives, eligibility for CAMP services remains the same across the country.

A qualified applicant must meet one of the following criteria established by the Office of Migrant Education. The applicant or their immediate family members must have engaged in migrant or seasonal farm work for 75 days within the last 24 months or; they have participated or been eligible to participate in the Title 1C Migrant Education program or; they have qualified for the Workforce Investment Act 167 (HEP CAMP Association, 2020). Finally, each applicant must be a US citizen or a Permanent Resident to qualify for CAMP services. If the applicant meets these criteria they would be eligible to participate but each CAMP has their own means of determining merit for their eligible applicants that they choose to accept in the program. It is

encouraged by the Office of Migrant Education that each CAMP “develop and implement a plan for identifying, informing, and recruiting eligible participants who are most in need of the academic and supporting services and financial assistance provided by the project” (Education Department General Administrative Regulations, Section 206.20).

As with other federal programs, CAMP is subject to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993. The current GPRA measures and targets set for all CAMPs are (1) 86% of CAMP participants complete the first academic year of their postsecondary program, and (2) 90% of CAMP participants continue their postsecondary education beyond their first year (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). The CAMP program was not changed significantly in the comprehensive reauthorization of the HEA in 2008. The changes in HEA have been limited to minor modifications and refinements and there has not been extensive reform of the program since it was approved in 1972. The work of CAMP programs is considered essential in order to facilitate the access of migrant students to higher education.

Literature review

Who are our migrant students in CAMP programs?

According to the most recent data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (2018), the percentage of hired farmworkers from Mexican origin is 57% and the total from Latinx background is 64%. For crop laborers, those percentages are even higher as only 25% are reported to be White or non-Hispanic. Crop laborers have also the lowest level of educational attainment, as 52% lack a high school diploma (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2018). There is no official record to ascertain the demographic characteristics of CAMP students. In order to qualify for the CAMP program,



applicants or their immediate family members must have engaged in migrant or seasonal farm-work. The demographics of these students must be similar, except for the educational attainment. In fact, Willison and Jang (2009) argued that, because of the lack of credible data on the enrollment of MSFW students in post-secondary education, it was beneficial to acknowledge that they are a subgroup of the students identified as Latinx. Those students who are documented as permanent residents or US citizens that were enrolled in the Migrant Education Program K-12 are also eligible for CAMP.

Approximately 90% of K-12 migrant students are identified as Latinx and 34% as Emerging Bilinguals (EBs). Therefore, these characteristics must be present among CAMP students as well. However, we cannot argue that migrant students are a monolithic racial, cultural, or ethnic group, but they have been defined as “a unique cultural community” (Jaramillo & Nuñez, 2009, p. 97).

Previous research has documented that migrant students belong in a category with these salient characteristics: low SES and high levels of poverty, lack of content and language support, non-valued cultural and social capital, limited knowledge of the US educational system, limited and/or interrupted K-12 schooling experiences, frequent school mobility, and cultural marginalization (California Department of Education [CADE], 2007; Garza et al., 2004; Gibson & Hidalgo, 2009; Lopez et al., 2001; Zalaquett et al., 2007). We will discuss the barriers that these students have faced and the factors associated with their academic success as identified by previous literature.

Barriers to the education of migrant seasonal farm working students

Considering the context in which they and their families establish their livelihood, migrant students face

myriad obstacles since the onset of their educational careers. These barriers often continue throughout their academic life into higher education. It may be argued that migrant students’ needs are greater than those of non-migrant students, low-income students, and ethnically diverse students, even those that fall in more than one of these categories (Quezada et al., 2017). In fact, not much is known about the college experiences of migrant students (Mendez & Bauman, 2018) and they may be considered the most underrepresented group of students on college campuses.

A deeper look at the barriers MSFW students face reveals the dismal educational reality of this population. The socio-economic disadvantages of this population combined with the migratory nature of the seasonal farm work, represents outstanding hurdles for the education needs of migrant students (Quezada et al., 2017; Salinas & Franquiz, 2004). In fact, migrant workers have been identified as having the lowest levels of educational attainment of any educational group (Zalaquett et al., 2007). In Kandel’s (2008) Profile of Hired Farmworkers Report, it is revealed that only 28% of MSFWs graduate high school, only 20.7% have some college education, and 30% have less than a ninth-grade education. The Association of Farmworker Opportunity Program (2014) found that children of MSFWs have a 50% high school dropout rate. In their study, Garza, Reyes, and Trueba (2004) conclude that MSFW students have the lowest graduation rates compared to any other population attending public school. Other factors including lack of health care, food insecurity, as well as language and cultural barriers all contribute to the accumulation of obstacles to their educational attainment (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996; Willison & Jang, 2009). Migrant students continue to face these barriers during their college experience as well.



From the previous factors, we can argue that many CAMP students arrive in college without having participated in rigorous college preparatory coursework and they do not have knowledge about their options in post-secondary education. They will also be taught by professors who may not possess the cultural competence to understand the unique needs of this population.

Factors associated with college success

Due to the lack of previous research on MSFW students in higher education and because of the similar issues that first-generation Latinx students face in higher education, we have compiled the characteristics and nature of the factors that contribute to the college success of Latinx students.

Demographic characteristics: Latinas earn more than 60% of all associate and bachelor's degrees achieved by Latinx students. They also have a higher percentage of college enrollment and are significantly less likely to drop out of college (Mendez & Bauman, 2018).

Language is another factor associated with the successful college results. For Latinx students whose first language is English, high-school GPA is a predictor of first-year college success, but not so for Latinx whose first language was Spanish. Therefore, the language barrier seems to persist beyond K-12 education (Zwick & Sklar, 2005).

A majority of Latinx students in higher education attend 2-year public institutions. Twenty-eight percent attend public, four-year institutions. Latinx students are also more likely to be enrolled for six years after initial enrollment and have a significantly lower completion rate, both in two and four-year institutions, compared to White and Asian students at 47% and 63% (Excelencia in Education, 2019).

Latinx students have the second lowest persistence and retention rate. In a report by the NSC Research Center (2020), of all Latinx students enrolled for the first time in 2017, only 59.5% returned to their IHE as compared to 72.7% of Asian students. The authors of this study defined retention as continued enrollment or degree completion within the same higher education institution in the fall terms of a student's first and second year. Persistence was defined as continued enrollment at any higher education institution, including one different from the institution of initial enrollment, in the fall terms of a student's first and second year (NSC Research Center, 2020).

Family support and social networks: Other factors that have been identified by previous literature is the role of the family in terms of the success of Latinx students. Those students whose families are supportive and serve as a source of motivation are more likely to succeed in higher education (Lopez, 2001). In 2004, Treviño documented that families of migrant students that are engaged in their children's education programs ultimately encouraged academic achievement, minimized school interruptions, made extensive use of learning resources in the community, and advocated for their children in school. All these actions are positively correlated with school academic engagement and outcomes. Additionally, such family practices build a sense of connection to school, which leads to positive academic results.

Institutional factors: The role of institutions in terms of the engagement and outcomes of migrant students still need to be properly addressed. There are studies that focus on the individual characteristics of the students, including their emotional attachment to their institutions or the sense of belonging and validation (Nora et al., 2011; Oseguera et al., 2009), but the



specific institutional practices that enhance that sense of connection among all students in general and among migrant students in particular has not been fully determined yet. Quezada, et al. (2017) highlight the need for K-12 school districts to adopt a culturally proficient approach in benefit of the academic success of migrant student. In this regard, there is a need to understand, how institutions of higher education facilitate the representation of students' identities on campus life and what mechanisms are in place to ensure students have access to information and resources in non-stigmatizing, but effective ways.

Conceptual framework

As previous research has made clear, there are specific factors that may signal the likelihood of success of students in higher education. Socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, gender, and language, mainly. There are also institutional characteristics that may contribute to said success, such as the size of the institution, and its geographical location, and the desire or motivation to serve students as expressed in their mission statements (Lau, 2003). Because we will be comparing the success, as measured by retention and graduation rates, of CAMP students, we need to include in the analysis the characteristics of similar institutions. Therefore, we decided to analyze data only from community colleges. These institutions are similar in the total number of students, the characteristics of the students served, and their missions.

Methods

Context and Participants

The participants in the present study are located in a community college, "Acre Community College" that hosts a CAMP, known as BUENO CAMP, in a state in the Southwest of the United States. We will compare the

results of the students participating in BUENO CAMP to the results obtained by the rest of the students in the Community College. Then we will compare the overall results of the CAMP students to the rest of the students in community colleges in the same state.

Acre Community College is a small community college that serves approximately 9,000 students, approximately 60% of which are identified as White or unknown and 40% as "underrepresented minority." It is situated in a rural area within the state, and it is mainly attended by students that live in the surrounding area. Although in its mission, the institution generally acknowledges the goal of providing knowledge and skills to advance the quality of life and success of the diverse community they serve, they also adopted a more specific diversity statement in which they claim the institution must nurture and respect differences. It should be noted that there is no specific mention of any minoritized group.

Data and Data Sources

The data used in the present study was collected from the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center and from the State Department Higher Education's website. We collected aggregated data as reported by community colleges for completion rates. We also compared the completion rates according to following characteristics:

- Race/ethnicity
- Gender
- Nationality/Country of origin
- Bilingualism/Biliteracy

For CAMP students, these are the descriptive statistics for the variables used:



Table 1: Descriptive statistics (n=360 observations)

Variable (logs)	Mean	SD
<i>Female</i>	234	70.51
<i>Male</i>	126	57.94
<i>Latinx</i>	352	97.78
<i>White</i>	7	0.02
<i>African America</i>	1	<0.01
<i>United States</i>	160	44.44
<i>Mexico</i>	197	54.72
<i>other</i>	3	0.83
<i>Bilingual</i>	336	67.26
<i>Monolingual</i>	23	56.52

Procedure

For the quantitative data, an independent samples *t*-test was used to determine if the completion means between the students in BUENO CAMP v. students in community college were equal.

The *t*-test is one of the most reliable statistical procedures to determine if the variance of the means between groups is statistically significant (Agresti, 2007). The independent *t*-test is an inferential test designed to compare the means of a given variable between two groups. The *t*-test helps to determine whether the difference between the means of the two groups is due to the effect of the sample, random factors, or to an underlying true difference between the populations. A 5% level of significance was used to determine statistical significance and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to run the analyses.

The data used meets all the assumptions required in order for the *t*-test to be considered valid and reliable:

- a. Continuous dependent variable
- b. Binomial/categorical independent variable
- c. The observations are independent for each group

- d. There are no significant outliers
- e. The data are approximately normally distributed— we performed a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality and all variables are close to a normal distribution.
- f. Variances are homogeneous— we performed a Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances.

Next, we will present the findings of our statistical analysis.

Results

For the research question “is there a statistically significant difference on CAMP student graduation rates compared to all Acre Community College students,” a *t*-test was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different from all Acre Community College students. Assumptions were checked and one was violated: the groups are different in size. Thus, the results should be interpreted with caution. The experiment group are the CAMP students (N = 360), and the control group for this test are Acre students (N = 2595), which represents students entering the college from the years 2006 to 2012 and ending in the years 2009 to 2015. The graduates represented in the control group are based on three-year graduation rates.

Table 2 shows that students who were in CAMP graduated at a significantly higher rate from those who were Acre Community College Students, $t(2953) = -15.21, p<.001$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for CAMP students ($M = 66.11$) is significantly higher than the score ($M = 27.59$) for those Acre Community College Students. The effect size d is .82, which is a large effect size, which indicates there is a strong magnitude of difference between the two variables.



Table 2

Comparison of CAMP student graduation rates and Acre Community College student graduations rates (n = 360 CAMP students and 2595 = Acre Community College students)

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Graduation Rates					
CAMP	66.11	0.47	-15.21	2953	<.001
Acre Student	27.59	0.45			

Table 2 shows that students who were in CAMP graduated at a significantly higher rate from those who were Acre Community College Students, $t(49733) = 19.761, p < .001$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for CAMP students ($M = 66.11$) is significantly higher than the score ($M = 22.44$) for the Community College Students in the state. The effect size d is .99, which is a very large effect size, which indicates there is a strong magnitude of difference between the two variables.

For the research question, is there a statistically significant difference on CAMP student graduation rates compared to all State Community College students, a second Independent t test was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different from all Community College, two-year public institution students in the state. The size assumption was violated in this case as well. The experiment group are the CAMP students ($n = 360$), and the control group for this test are Colorado community college students ($N = 49,376$), which represents students entering the college from the years 2006 to 2012 and ending in the years 2009 to 2015. The graduates represented in the control group are based on three-year graduation rates.

Table 3

Comparison of CAMP student graduation rates and Colorado Community College student graduations rates (n = 360 CAMP students and 49,736 = Colorado Community College students)

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Graduation Rates					
CAMP	66.11	0.47	-19.761	49733	<.001
Co C.C. Student	22.44	0.42			

For our third research question, we attempt to determine the characteristics of a successful CAMP student. Therefore, we decided to check if there is a statistically significant difference on CAMP student graduation rates based on whether they were monolingual, English speakers or bilingual speakers?

A t test was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different when comparing those who are monolingual English speakers ($N = 23$) and those who are bilingual ($N = 336$). Assumptions were checked and one was violated: the groups are different in size. Thus, the results should be interpreted with caution.

Table 4 shows that bilingual CAMP students graduated at a higher rate but not a significantly higher rate from those who were monolingual CAMP students, $t(360) = -.910, p = .363$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for bilingual CAMP students ($M = 67.26$) is significantly higher than the score ($M = 56.52$) for those monolingual CAMP students.

Table 4

Comparison of bilingual CAMP student graduation rates and monolingual, English speaking CAMP student graduation rates (n = 336 bilingual CAMP students and 23 = monolingual, English speaking CAMP students)



<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Graduation Rates					
Bilingual	67.26	0.51	-.910	358	.363
Monolingual (English)	56.52	0.48			

Given the fact that an overwhelming majority of our students identify as Latinx, we also checked if there is a statistically significant difference on CAMP student graduation rates based on ethnicity. A *t-test* was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different when comparing the ethnicity of the participants. Because only one of the 360 students [in this study] does not identify as Latinx or White, this evaluation will only include the Latinx CAMP students (N = 352) and White CAMP students (N = 7). Assumptions were checked and one was violated: the groups are different in size. Thus, the results should be interpreted with caution. Further investigation would be necessary to make a claim of significance given the violation of this assumption.

Table 5 shows that Latinx CAMP students graduated at a higher rate from those who were White CAMP students but not significantly, $t(359) = -1.251$, $p = .212$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for Latinx CAMP students (M = 65.63) is not significantly higher than the score (M = 42.86) for those White CAMP students.

Table 5
Comparison of Latinx CAMP student graduation rates and White CAMP student graduation student graduations rates (n = 352 Latinx and 7 = White students)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Graduation Rates					
Latinx	65.63	0.54	-1.251	357	.212
White	42.86	0.48			

It is also important to understand if gender had any major effect the students' graduation rates. To answer this a *t test* was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different when comparing female CAMP students (N = 234) and male CAMP students (N = 126). Assumptions were checked and none were violated.

Table 6 shows that female CAMP students graduated at a significantly higher rate from male CAMP students, $t(360) = -2.417$, $p = .016$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for female CAMP students (M = 70.51) is significantly higher than the score (M = 57.94) for those male CAMP students. The effect size *d* is .28, which is a small to medium effect size, which indicates there is some magnitude of difference between the two variables.

Table 6
Comparison of female CAMP student graduation rates and male CAMP student graduations rates (n = 234 female CAMP students and 126 male CAMP students).

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Graduation Rates					
Female	70.51	0.50	-2.417	358	.016
Male	57.94	0.46			

Finally, a *t test* was computed to investigate whether the CAMP student graduation rate is significantly different when comparing those CAMP students who were born in the US (N = 160) and those who born outside of the US (N = 200). All assumptions were met this time.

Table 7 shows that CAMP students who were born outside the US graduated at a higher rate from those US Born CAMP students, $t(360) = -.845$, $p = .399$. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average graduation rate for CAMP students born abroad



($M = 68.00$) is not statistically significantly higher than the score ($M = 63.75$) for those US born CAMP students.

Table 7
Comparison of foreign-born CAMP student graduation rates and U.S. born CAMP student graduation rates ($n = 200$ foreign-born CAMP students and $160 =$ U.S. born CAMP students)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Graduation Rates					
Foreign-born	68.00	0.48	-.845	358	.399
U.S. born	63.75	0.47			

Discussion

Taking into account the limitations of the data and the statistical test performed, the results point in an optimistic direction with regard to the success of CAMP programs. This success is even more important as CAMP programs serve students categorized as marginalized and at high risk of attrition. These are students whom research has found highly likely to leave college in their first year of attendance. For instance, previous research has found that college students who identify as Latinx, first-generation, and from low socio-economic background students are much less likely to graduate than their White peers (Becerra, 2010). However, the results in this study indicate that Latinx, first-generation, low-income, CAMP students actually have completion rates above those of White students in similar community colleges. Although there is a need for more refined data, this is an initial remarkable outcome of this study to reveal that CAMP students are the exception to many rules and norms commonly known of higher education students.

Due to the limitations in the results of the study, we cannot assert that CAMP students are, in general,

more likely to graduate. However, our results indicate that female, CAMP students have higher graduation rates at 71% versus 58% male graduation rates. Graduation rates for CAMP students born outside of the United States are 68% versus 63%. CAMP bilingual students graduate at 67% versus 57% of their monolingual peers. Finally, CAMP students who identify as Latinx graduate at a rate of 66% versus 43% to their non-Latinx peers. Therefore, as a preliminary finding, it can be argued that the profile of a successful CAMP student is a Latinx, bilingual, female, student who was born-abroad. Some of these characteristics are not statistically significant and we need more data to corroborate these initial findings, but the higher rate of success is noteworthy.

Regardless of the lack of statistical significance in the disparity in graduation rates among these students, we can argue that the strategies and services provided in CAMP programs are effective for all students and that they contribute to the positive outcomes in higher education of student populations that have been traditionally regarded as the most underrepresented community in higher education (García, 2011). According to these figures, CAMP students are defying the odds with their success in higher education.

Another important note to consider is that when reviewing this sample of CAMP students, 150 of these students are still enrolled in college at the time this data was collected. Of these 150 students enrolled, 82 of whom were categorized as non-graduates, so simply stating the graduation rate of the CAMP program is 66%, does not tell the entire story. Of the 33% or 123 students who have not graduated, 67% or 82 of them are still enrolled and could be graduates at some point in time in the future. In other words, it cannot be assumed with a 66% graduation rate, that the other 33% have dropped out. In fact, only 11% of the total participants in this study could be considered drop outs, and 89% have either graduated, or are still enrolled.



Implications

We would like to conclude by pointing out some potential implications of the results of the present study. Knowing BUENO CAMP’s success rate is significantly higher than community college students in the Southwest, it could be a worthwhile effort to scale the program’s services to assist with retention practices in all higher education institutions. This is especially true for colleges and universities whose priority is to improve the success of their diverse populations. Institutions serving traditionally marginalized and minoritized populations should adopt some of the practices implemented in BUENO CAMP. This leaves practitioners with a couple of looming questions to consider. How do we scale a program like BUENO CAMP to serve a broader portion of the college-going population? If this is unreasonable, what are the key components of BUENO CAMP that attribute to the positive outcomes they produce? A qualitative look at the program’s services is now necessary, investigating the most poignant and effective practices of BUENO CAMP that lead to their students’ success. Further research is necessary to document the practices being implemented in BUENO CAMP. A greater analysis of the students’ perception of their experience in the program may prove to be beneficial to identify the specific services BUENO CAMP provides that lead to their success. This next level of inquiry is necessary considering the level of success BUENO CAMP students achieve.

In addition to the charge for further study, more can be said about the importance of a program like BUENO CAMP regarding its implications for historically marginalized populations currently in higher education or wishing to pursue post-secondary education. The success of BUENO CAMP further strengthens the necessity to support funding for programs that target underserved populations in college. CAMP programs across the country need to a higher

level of financial support as they only serve a limited number of students. The need for the services programs like BUENO CAMP provides is paramount considering the fact that the participants in BUENO CAMP represent populations that face a nexus of college-going barriers. These populations include first-generation college students, language minority students, ethnic minority students, low-income, mobile, migrant students. In the face of the barriers that these populations are presented with, BUENO CAMP students are realizing success in the form of college completion. The mandate should now be to turn this phenomenon into a norm, rather than the exception to the rule.



References

- Agresti, A. (2007). *An introduction to categorical data analysis*. Wiley.
- Auerbach, S. (2004). Engaging Latino parents in supporting college pathways: Lessons from a college access program. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 3*(2), 125–145.
- Becerra, D. (2010). Differences in perceptions of barriers to college enrollment and the completion of a degree among Latinos in the United States. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 9*, 187-201.
- California Department of Education. (2012). California migrant education program state service delivery plan. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/me/mt/statesrvcdelivrypln.asp>
- Castellanos, J., & Gloria, A. M. (2007). Research considerations and theoretical application for best practices in higher education: Latina/os achieving success. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 6*(4), 378–396.
- Education Department General Administrative Regulations* (2014, December 19), Section 206.20. Retrieved March 26, 2021, from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html>
- Escamilla, A., & Trevino, N. G. (2014). An investigation of the factors contributing to successful completion of undergraduate degrees by the students enrolled in the college assistance migrant program. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 13*(3), 158–176.
- Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA)(2015). Public Law No. 114-95, S.1177, 114th Cong. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>
- Excelencia in education. (2019). Latinos in higher education: Compilation of fast facts. <https://www.edexcelencia.org/research/publications/latinos-higher-education-compilation-fast-facts>.
- García, R. (2011)*Fracturing Opportunity: Mexican Migrant Students and College-Going Literacy*, by Ryan E. Gildersleeve,*Bilingual Research Journal, 34*(3), 352-353, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2011.622831.
- Garza, E., Reyes, P., & Trueba, E. T. (2004). *Resiliency and success: Migrant children in the U.S.* Paradigm Publishers.
- Gibson, M. A., & Hidalgo, N. D. (2009). Bridges to success in high school for migrant youth. *Teachers College Record, 111*(3), 683-711.
- Green, P.E. (2003). The undocumented: Educating the children of migrant workers in America. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1), 51-71.
- HEP CAMP Association. (2020). CAMP Projects. <https://hepcampassociation.org/about/camp-project/>



- Jaramillo, N.E., & Nuñez, A-M. (2009). The impact of being “migrant”: Demographics of inequality and outcomes of possibility, *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(1), 94-106.
- Kandel, W. (July, 2008). Profile of hired farmworkers, A 2008 update (Economic Research Report No. 60). Washington, DC: Economic Research Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Lau, L. (2003). Institutional factors affecting student retention. *Education*, 124(1), 126-136.
- Lopez, G. R. (2001a). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an (im)migrant household. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), 416.
- Lopez, G. R., Scribner, J. D., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001b). Redefining parental involvement: Lessons from high-performing migrant-impacted schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 253–288.
- Lopez, M. H. (2009) Latinos and education: Explaining the attainment gap (A Pew research center project). Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Mendez, J.J., & Bauman, S. (2018). From migrant farmworkers to first generation Latina/o students: Factors predicting college outcomes for students participating in the college assistance migrant program. *The Review of Higher Education*, 1, 173-208.
- Murrow, E. (1960). CBS reports. Harvest of shame. United States: CBS Television.
- Nora, A., Urick, A., & Quijada Cerecer, P.D. (2011). Validating students: A conceptualization and overview of its impact on student experiences and outcomes. *Enrollment Management Journal*, 5(2), 34-52.
- Nuñez, A-M. (2009). Migrant students' college access: Emerging evidence from the migrant student leadership institute, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(3), 181-198.
- Oseguera, L., Locks, A. M. & Vega, I. I. (2009). Increasing Latino/a students' baccalaureate attainment: A focus on retention. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 8(1), 23-53.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R.G. (1996). *Immigrant America, a portrait (2nd Ed.)*. University of California Press.
- Quezada, R., Rodriguez-Valls, F., Lindsey, R., (2016). *Teaching and Supporting migrant children in our schools: A culturally proficient approach*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Quezada, R., Rodriguez-Valls, F., Lindsey, R., (2017). *Helping educators connect with migrant students and families-A culturally proficient approach*. Rutledge.
- Ramirez, A. (2012). The impact of the college assistance migrant program on migrant student academic achievement in the California State University system. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 11(1), 3-13.
- Salinas, C., & Franquiz, M. (Eds.) (2004). *Scholars from the field: The challenges of migrant education*. AEL.



- Treviño, R. (2004). *Against All Odds: Lessons from Parents of Migrant High-Achievers*. Scholars in the Field: The Challenge of Migrant Education. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2018). Size and composition of the U.S. agricultural workforce. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/farm-economy/farm-labor/>
- U.S. Department of Education: Office of Migrant Education. (2016). *HEP CAMP FY 2016 Report to Congress*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/hep/2016hcreporttocongress.pdf>
- Willison, S., & Jang, B. (2009). Are federal dollars bearing fruit? An analysis of the College Assistance Migrant Program. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 8, 247-262.
- Zalaquett, C. P., McHatton, P. A., & Cranston-Gringas, A. (2007). Characteristics of Latina/o migrant farmworker students attending a large metropolitan university. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6(2), 135-156.
- Zwick, R., & Sklar, J. (2005). Predicting college grades and degree completion using high school grades and SAT scores: The role of student ethnicity and first language. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(3), 439-464.