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## Foreword

Despite persistent questions about the purpose of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in contemporary society, we acknowledge that HBCUs remain indispensable to the Black experience in America. This is especially true as it relates to the economic outcomes of the African American community. For more than 77 years, UNCF has been committed to supporting Black students in their efforts to both obtain a degree and climb the socioeconomic ladder. Through those efforts, we have worked diligently with HBCUs to create pathways toward enhanced academic and economic opportunities; in the process, we have cultivated promising practices in service to Black students and the institutions that support them.

This report—HBCUs Transforming Generations: Social Mobility Outcomes for HBCU Alumni-offers an in-depth review of the Move into Middle Class+ mobility rate and its efficiency as a measure of social mobility for Black students at HBCUs. The report includes an overview of the access, success and mobility rates at HBCUs. Additionally, it offers an equity-centered approach to understanding higher education outcomes for underserved students. It underscores that when such an approach to research is taken a clearer picture may be observed of the sheer magnitude of the outcomes produced by HBCUs. This is especially the case as it relates to access to higher education and economic mobility. While we subscribe whole-heartedly to the belief that the above-mentioned rates capture only a singular aspect of institutional success, it is critical to advance and prioritize methods for measuring outcomes that are both comprehensive and equity-informed.

Sincerely,

## Trunal Lidmeny

## Michael L. Lomax, Ph.D.

President and CEO
UNCF


UNCF
Since its inception in 1944, UNCF has dedicated its efforts toward uplifting Black students and equipping HBCUs with the capacity to affect transformational change for their students. UNCF's Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute (FDPRI) is the nation's foremost research organization focusing on the educational status of African Americans from pre-school through college. FDPRI conducts and disseminates research that informs policymakers, educators, philanthropists and the general public on how best to improve the educational outcomes for Black students and other historically marginalized student groups across the education pipeline.
HBCUs
There are 101 accredited Historically Black Colleges and Universities currently operating in 19 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. While they constitute only $3 \%$ of higher education institutions in the country, HBCUs educate $10 \%$ of all Black college students. The HBCU student population is currently over $75 \%$ Black. These institutions account for $19 \%$ of degrees earned by Black students in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) fields (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Additionally, HBCUs account for $80 \%$ of Black judges, $50 \%$ of Black doctors, and $50 \%$ of Black lawyers (The Network Journal, 2010). As a general note, an HBCU graduate working full-time throughout their career can expect to earn $\$ 927,000$ in additional income as opposed to non-college goers and Black students at non-HBCUs because of their college credentials ${ }^{1}$.

HBCUs were founded to both educate Black American students and to equip them with the viable skills necessary to excel in the nation's workforce (Favors, 2019). These institutions are distinctive in their ability to prepare students for their careers while also acknowledging and celebrating their ethnic histories and cultures. As the only higher education institutions with objectives centered on increasing economic and educational opportunities for the Black community, HBCUs are uniquely positioned within the sphere of academia. However, the traditional measures used to quantify their achievements do not consider this important context; therefore, these measures need to be refined.

Social Mobility
UNCF utilized data from Opportunity Insights ${ }^{2}$ to complete this report. The Move into Middle Class+ mobility rate was specifically leveraged to measure the impact of HBCUs. It is also worthy of noting that UNCF was intentional about applying a culturally responsive lens to this work. Foremost, the economic standings of African Americans can be attributed to the years of economic oppression experienced through centuries of slavery, Reconstruction, mass incarceration, segregation, redlining, restrictive covenants, gentrification and more. An evaluation regarding the upward mobility of HBCU alumni must be informed of the systemic and systematic ways this country has sought to disenfranchise them. This intentionality was done to illustrate the necessity of revising the metrics that are commonly used to measure American students' social mobility.

Social mobility has emerged as a primary measure for understanding the return on investment for the families of college students as well as society more broadly (Reber and Sinclair, 2020). It evaluates the movement between defined social
statuses or socioeconomic statuses within society. Understanding the social mobility of students attending HBCUs is particularly important since a significant proportion of the student body at the institutions is economically disenfranchised. The majority of HBCU attendees are Black and Pell-grant eligible. Additionally, nearly $40 \%$ of HBCU students are firstgeneration college students. While there are several formulas used to calculate social mobility, for the purposes of this report, we utilize formulas that are the most useful for capturing shifts between socioeconomic statuses.
${ }^{1}$ This estimate reflects incremental earnings averaged across degree and certificate programs.
${ }^{2}$ Based at Harvard University, Opportunity Insights is a non-partisan, not-for-profit research and policy institute with a central mission to develop solutions that empower families throughout the United States "to rise out of poverty and achieve better life outcomes."


There have been several social mobility measures conceived using the intergenerational mobility data from Opportunity Insights. Table 1 displays the options that UNCF has identified as notable along with their respective definitions. All of these measures focus on students from low-income backgrounds who have attained higher income levels than they had access to previously.

The access rate of an institution represents the percentage of students whose household is considered low-income based on their parent or guardian's income level (This income level may vary based on the measure being used. See Table 1.).

The success rate of an institution represents the percentage of those students from backgrounds defined as low-income (access rate) who attain a certain higher income level than the income category their household was in prior to the student's admission into college or transition into adulthood (This income level may also vary based on the measure being used. See Table 1.).

The mobility rate of an institution is the product of the access rate and the success rate. Put simply, it is the percentage of students who were raised in what is defined as a low-income household and who earned their way into a higher income category. This determines the rate of movement or shifting that occurs amongst the low-income population of students at a particular school from one income strata to another higher one.

TABLE 1: Notable Mobility Measures

| Measure | Origin | Access Rate | Success Rate | Mobility Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Classic <br> Mobility <br> Rate | Chetty et <br> al. (2017) | Percentage of <br> students coming <br> from the bottom 20\% | Of the students coming from <br> the bottom 20\%, the percentage <br> that end in the top 20\% | Out of all students, the percentage <br> that both come from the bottom <br> $20 \%$ and end in the top 20\% |
| Alternative <br> Mobility <br> Rate | Opportunity <br> Insights | Percentage of <br> students coming <br> from the bottom 20\% | Of the students coming from <br> the bottom 20\%, the percentage <br> that end in the top 60\% | Out of all students, the percentage <br> that both come from the bottom <br> $20 \%$ and end in the top 60\% |
| Extended <br> Mobility <br> Rate | Espinosa et <br> al. (2018) | Percentage of <br> students coming <br> from the bottom 40\% | Of the students coming from <br> the bottom 40\%, the percentage <br> that end in the top 40\% | Out of all students, the percentage <br> that both come from the bottom <br> 40\% and end in the top 40\% |
| Move into <br> Middle <br> Class+ | Nathenson <br> et al. (2019) | Percentage of <br> students coming <br> from the bottom 40\% | Of the students coming from <br> the bottom 40\%, the percentage <br> that end in the top 60\% | Out of all students, the percentage <br> that both come from the bottom <br> $40 \%$ and end in the top 60\% |

For the purposes of this report, we use the Move into Middle Class+ mobility rating because it is most inclusive of students who make any significant upward movement across the socioeconomic strata. By capturing the nuanced income shifts that are attained by some students, their successes are more fully acknowledged; by extension, the impact of the HBCUs they attend are also more fairly assessed. In contrast, competing mobility rate measures fail to account for the persistent systemic oppression of Black Americans by overlooking mobility movements deemed insignificant, though they may have significant impact on life circumstances. Unjustly bypassing the true gains that Black HBCU graduates make loften done when individuals make less than a $40 \%$ leap in the social mobility ladder), however subtle, is detrimental to these institutions and the students they serve in a very real way. While some may argue that such incremental shifts are not "significant," the outcomes are immensely important. For example, even a $10 \%$ shift can translate into life-altering access to health insurance, educational options, and expendable income that may ultimately drive outcomes that are both useful and necessary. Ignoring these incremental shifts risks the improvements to individuals, families and communities that otherwise may be imperiled if hard evidence for why HBCUs exist is brushed aside. Few other institutions can boast such outcomes, and UNCF proposes that one of the factors that masks this extremely impactful work is that the current formulas are unnecessarily narrow.

Methodology
UNCF utilized the "Baseline Cross-Sectional Estimates of Child and Parent Income Distributions by College" data set ${ }^{3}$, which explained intergenerational (involving multiple generations) mobility at American institutions of higher education. This data is based on students born in 1980-1982. 1983-1984 cohort data was used if the preferred 1980-1982 data was incomplete for a particular school. Students were assigned to an institution based on the institution they attended for the majority of their tenure in college. This was captured during the time students were between ages 19 and 22. If a student spent an equal amount of time at multiple institutions, the student was assigned to the first institution. Parental income was measured as the adjusted gross income averaged over the five-year period that the student was between the ages of 15 and 19, and inflation adjusted to 2015 dollars. This income was then compared to the income of other parents with children that fell into the same age categories and was then separated into five sections (or quintiles). Student income was measured as the students' individual labor earnings as of 2014, which was when the students being targeted would be in their early to mid-thirties. Cohort members' income was also compared to others their age and then organized into quintiles.

For each institution, the data illuminates the percentage of students who come from each income quintile, which also translates into the income quintile of a student's household. We refer to the lowest income quintile as 1 and the highest income quintile as 5 . For each income quintile the data reveals where students from that quintile end up reaching. Based on the percentage of students that fall into certain pathways (e.g. income quintile 1 to income quintile 4), we can measure intergenerational mobility for each institution in the dataset. Different measures of mobility will consider varying combinations of starting and ending income quintiles.

Sample
For our analysis, we chose to focus on four-year public and private institutions that are considered not-for-profit organizations ( $N=1,285$ ). There were 50 HBCUs within the 1,285 schools assessed, which represented over half of the 90 currently operating four-year HBCUs. We analyzed individual HBCUs, HBCU subgroups, how HBCUs compared nationally, and how HBCUs compared to "Ivy Plus" institutions". It is also worth noting that there were a substantial number of HBCU students who were non-local. $38 \%$ of HBCU freshmen identified as coming from out-of-state ${ }^{5}$.

We compared HBCUs' access, success and mobility rates with those of the Ivy Plus institutions due to the prestige they hold in society at-large, with the assumption that a degree from these Ivy Plus institutions equates social mobility for its graduates. We chose to use the various institution types (HBCUs and Ivy Plus institutions) and nationwide averages and averages of non-college goers to illustrate the broad outcomes of American institutions and the broad outcomes for their students.

Mobility Rate $=$ Access Rate $\times$ Success Rate
${ }^{3}$ Data set available at https://opportunityinsights.org/data/.
${ }^{4}$ Ivy Plus includes the eight Ivy League institutions as well as Stanford University, Duke University, University of Chicago, and MIT.
${ }^{5}$ Among first-time, full-time, degree-seeking, undergraduate students at four-year HBCUs in 2018. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS.

## HBCUs Provide Access to Higher Education

A college's access rate is the percentage of students who come from the bottom two income quintiles, which is also referred to as the bottom $40 \%$ ( $\$ 46,000$ and below in parental household earnings) of the income distribution.

When compared to other institutional types, HBCUs' average access rate is more than twice that of all institutions nationwide and five times that of Ivy Plus institutions.

These access rates are a reflection of the fact that over 70\% of HBCU students are Pell-grant eligible ${ }^{6}$, and 39\% are first-generation college students ${ }^{7}$.

TABLE 2: Comparison of Average Access Rates

| Institution | Average Access Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| HBCU | $51.3 \%$ |
| Nationwide | $22.5 \%$ |
| Ivy Plus | $9.3 \%$ |
| Non-College Goers |  |
|  |  |

Even though HBCUs only comprise 3\% of all four-year nonprofit colleges and universities, four of the top 10 universities with the highest access rates in the nation are HBCUs.

TABLE 3: Top 10 Access Rates Nationwide (HBCUs Highlighted)

| Institution | Access Rate | HBCU |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| South Texas College | $79.1 \%$ |  |
| Mississippi Valley State University | $75.0 \%$ | Yes |
| Saint Augustine College (Illinois) | $74.6 \%$ |  |
| University of Texas at Brownsville | $74.0 \%$ |  |
| Boricua College | $73.7 \%$ |  |
| Wright Career College | $73.6 \%$ |  |
| United Talmudical Seminary | $72.8 \%$ |  |
| Rust College | $72.0 \%$ | Yes |
| Philander Smith College | $69.1 \%$ | Yes |
| Southern University at New Orleans | $66.6 \%$ | Yes |



[^0]TABLE 4: Top 10 Highest HBCU Access Rates

| Institution | Access Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| Mississippi Valley State University | $75.0 \%$ |
| Rust College | $72.0 \%$ |
| Philander Smith College | $69.1 \%$ |
| Southern University at New Orleans | $66.6 \%$ |
| Florida Memorial University | $65.0 \%$ |
| Claflin University | $64.3 \%$ |
| Grambling State University | $64.2 \%$ |
| University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff | $62.8 \%$ |
| Shaw University | $61.9 \%$ |
| Texas Southern University | $61.7 \%$ |

## 46 <br> Institutions with high success rates are the most successful at moving students from the lowest socioeconomic tiers to a higher tier.
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## HBCUs Closing Gaps

The success rate we use in our Move into Middle Class+ mobility rate is defined as the fraction of students from the bottom two quintiles that earn their way into the top three quintiles, which is also referred to as the top $60 \%$ of the income distribution. Institutions with high success rates are the most successful at moving students from the lowest socioeconomic tiers to a higher tier. One may observe that while HBCUs provide access to higher education for low-income students at more than double the average U.S. institution (Table 1), their success rate is just below the national average (Table 4). This demonstrates HBCUs outsized impact on underserved communities. HBCUs serve more economically disenfranchised students than most U.S. institutions while also facilitating the upward mobility of the majority of their students.

TABLE 5: Comparison of Average Success Rates

| Institution Group | Average Success Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| HBCU | $67.6 \%$ |
| Nationwide | $72.3 \%$ |
| Ivy Plus | $80.3 \%$ |
| Non-College Goers | $33.4 \%$ |

TABLE 6: Highest HBCU Success Rates-HBCUs with Success Rates Above the National Average

| Institution | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| Xavier University of Louisiana | $78.9 \%$ |
| Spelman College | $78.1 \%$ |
| Hampton University | $76.7 \%$ |
| Tennessee State University | $75.2 \%$ |
| Winston-Salem State University | $75.2 \%$ |
| Florida Agricultural \& Mechanical University | $75.0 \%$ |
| Dillard University | $74.1 \%$ |
| Howard University | $73.8 \%$ |
| South Carolina State University | $73.3 \%$ |
| Elizabeth City State University | $73.0 \%$ |
| North Carolina Agricultural \& Technical State University | $72.4 \%$ |

## HBCUs Fueling the Middle Class

The mobility rate is defined as the fraction of a college's students who come from the bottom $40 \%$ and transition into the top $60 \%$.

On average and across institution type, when it comes to mobility rates HBCUs outperform all other categories and boast mobility rates more than double the national average. Additionally, it is worth emphasizing that the evidence suggests that HBCUs support nearly five times more students than Ivy Plus ranked institutions in facilitating students' movement from the bottom $40 \%$ in household income to the top $60 \%$.

TABLE 7: Comparison of Average Mobility Rates

| Institution Group | Average Mobility Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| HBCU | $34.3 \%$ |
| Nationwide | $15.8 \%$ |
| Ivy Plus | $7.4 \%$ |
| Non-College Goers | $20.4 \%$ |




TABLE 8: Highest HBCU Mobility Rates

| Institution | Mobility <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| Claflin University | $45.5 \%$ |
| Rust College | $44.1 \%$ |
| Grambling State University | $43.7 \%$ |
| Florida Memorial University | $43.2 \%$ |
| Southern University at New Orleans | $42.7 \%$ |
| Jackson State University | $42.2 \%$ |
| Elizabeth City State University | $41.5 \%$ |
| Mississippi Valley State University | $40.9 \%$ |
| South Carolina State University | $40.6 \%$ |
| Southern University and A\&M College at Baton Rouge | $40.4 \%$ |

Figure 1 below displays the access rates and success rates of HBCUs (blue dots), all schools (grey dots), and comparison group averages (indicated with shapes). The red curves represent mobility rate percentiles. Please note that the mobility rate is the product of both the access rate and success rate. This explains how a similar mobility rate may be yielded for a school even if a low access or success rate is observed for an institution because a lower value in one category can be balanced out by a higher value in another category.

Figure 1: Access, Success, and Mobility Rates of HBCUs and Comparison Group Averages${ }^{9}$
 On average and across institution type,
when it comes to mobility rates HBCUs
outperform all other categories and
double the national average. 77

[^1]Key HBCU Mobility Outcomes
When ranking the 1,285 institutions based on their Move into Middle Class+ mobility rate, we found that:

- Over half ( $52 \%$ ) of all institutions above the 95 th percentile are HBCUs.
- All but six ( $88 \%$ ) HBCUs are above the 90th percentile. Those six schools are included in the subgroups marked by $A$ and $B$.
- HBCUs have an access rate two times that of the national average and over five times that of Ivy Plus institutions.
- Of the HBCUs with the highest access rate included in this study, 50\% are located in rural communities ${ }^{10}$.

Considerations

- HBCUs are remarkably successful at supporting social mobility among their students. In comparison to the national average, HBCUs have strikingly higher access rates. However, despite offering admission to a significant number of underserved students, our findings demonstrate that over half of all institutions included in this study above the 95th percentile of the Move into Middle Class+ mobility rate are HBCUs.
- The mobility rate used to measure the social mobility of HBCU alumni plays a significant role in the story that is presented about the success of HBCUs. A more inclusive mobility rate accounts for the compounding effects of racism on Black Americans by acknowledging the impact that such oppression has on the income level students are in when they enter college. Additionally, it continues to influence students even once they attain their degree and are well into their field of choice. Promoting the use of a measure that takes a more accurate and comprehensive approach to the data is imperative to ensure all institutions are being assessed on just and equitable grounds. In doing so, such a measure provides a more precise and honest depiction of exactly how successful HBCUs are at facilitating students' upward mobility.
- These findings demonstrate that investment in HBCUs means sowing into institutions that are primary drivers of success for historically marginalized people. Contributing to the advancement of an HBCU directly influences the continued improvement of economic outcomes for Black Americans and by extension society at-large.

The mobility rate used to measure the social mobility of HBCU alumni plays a significant role in the story that is presented about the success of HBCUs. 17
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## Appendix

TABLE 9: Top Access Rates for HBCUs and Ivy Plus Institutions

| Rank | HBCU | Access <br> Rate | Ivy Plus Institution | Access <br> Rate |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Mississippi Valley State <br> University | $75.0 \%$ | Cornell University | $12.2 \%$ |
| 2 | Rust College | $72.0 \%$ | Massachusetts Institute of <br> Technology | $11.9 \%$ |
| 3 | Philander Smith College | $69.1 \%$ | University of Chicago | $11.3 \%$ |
| 4 | Southern University at <br> New Orleans | $66.6 \%$ | Columbia University in the <br> City of New York | $11.1 \%$ |
| 5 | Florida Memorial University | $65.0 \%$ | Stanford University | $9.4 \%$ |
| 6 | Claflin University | $64.3 \%$ | University of Pennsylvania | $9.0 \%$ |
| 7 | Grambling State University | $64.1 \%$ | Yale University | $8.4 \%$ |
| 8 | University of Arkansas at <br> Pine Bluff | $62.8 \%$ | Harvard University | $8.4 \%$ |
| 9 | Shaw University | $61.9 \%$ | Duke University | $8.3 \%$ |
| 10 | Texas Southern University | $61.7 \%$ | Dartmouth College | $7.9 \%$ |
|  |  | Brown University | $7.2 \%$ |  |
|  |  | Princeton University | $6.2 \%$ |  |

Note: All the top 10 HBCUs have a higher access rate than those who never attended college (61.2\% access rate).



TABLE 10: Top Success Rates for HBCUs and Ivy Plus Institutions

| Rank | HBCU | Success <br> Rate | Ivy Plus Institution | Success <br> Rate |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Xavier University of <br> Louisiana | $78.9 \%$ | Princeton University | $84.8 \%$ |
| 2 | Spelman College | $78.1 \%$ | Massachusetts Institute of <br> Technology | $84.2 \%$ |
| 3 | Hampton University | $76.7 \%$ | Stanford University | $83.8 \%$ |
| 4 | Winston-Salem State <br> University | $75.2 \%$ | University of Pennsylvania | $81.6 \%$ |
| 5 | Tennessee State University | $75.2 \%$ | Brown University | $81.6 \%$ |
| 6 |  <br> Mechanical University | $75.0 \%$ | Cornell University | $81.2 \%$ |
| 7 | Dillard University | $74.1 \%$ | Dartmouth College | $80.6 \%$ |
| 8 | Howard University | $73.8 \%$ | Yale University | $79.1 \%$ |
| 9 | South Carolina State <br> University | $73.3 \%$ | Columbia University in the City <br> of New York | $79.1 \%$ |
| 10 | Elizabeth City State <br> University | $73.0 \%$ | Harvard University | $77.0 \%$ |
|  |  | University of Chicago | $75.3 \%$ |  |
|  |  | Duke University | $75.2 \%$ |  |

Note: All the top 10 HBCUs have a success rate above the national average ( $72.3 \%$ success rate), although the success rates are lower than the Ivy Plus average ( $80.3 \%$ success rate).
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[^0]:    ${ }^{6}$ Average percentage of undergraduate students awarded Pell grants at four-year HBCUs in 2018-19. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS.
    ${ }^{7}$ Average percentage of first-generation students at four-year HBCUs in 2016-17. U.S. Department of Education, College Scorecard.
    ${ }^{8}$ Defined as students who never attended college up to and including 2013.

[^1]:    ${ }^{9}$ These two HBCU subgroups (indicated with an A and B in Figure 1) and how they compare to other HBCUs demonstrate how the access rates are most often the driving factor in the differences observed among HBCU mobility rates. The range of access rates among HBCUs are about 50 points, while the range of success rates are less than 30 points.

