

Lives Intertwined: A Primer on the History and Emergence of Minority Serving Institutions

Marybeth Gasman
and Thai-Huy Nguyen
University of Pennsylvania

Clifton F. Conrad
University of Wisconsin, Madison

In this article, we provide an overview—a primer—of the rise of Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) as context for understanding the contemporary place of these institutions in our broader system of higher education. We also demonstrate how the emergence and the evolution of MSIs stem from our nation's struggle to provide equal educational opportunities to minority communities. Throughout the article, we interweave the shared and individual struggles as well as the successes across these 4 major types of MSIs. Woven throughout this narrative, we explore in-depth (a) the role of the federal government in both suppressing and elevating higher education for minorities, and (b) the impact of various groups and individuals on the growth of MSIs. It is through the historical legacy of MSIs that we showcase how these institutions came to represent the voices and concerns of minority communities to take control and manage their own education. We conclude the article with a snapshot of the place of each of the 4 types of MSIs in contemporary higher education and recommendation for future research.

Keywords: Hispanic Serving Institutions, Historically Black College and University, history, minority serving institutions, Tribal College

Ours is a nation of varied and diverse people, brought together by promise, movement, celebration, circumstance, and even cruelty and domination. Our various responses to this enormous diversity have long shaped our colleges and universities, creating opportunity for some while limiting opportunity for others. As the United States is rapidly becoming more diverse, we have an unprecedented occasion and obligation to provide citizens from across racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic differences with the chance to pursue a college education.

We have arrived at this opportunity and obligation in no small measure because of a diverse set of institutions that have long served as a critical point of entry to college for many who were excluded from higher education for much of our history. These institutions, Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs), are most clearly represented by our Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and more recently by Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Asian American, Native American, and Pacific Islander Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs). These institutions were established or shaped as African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders sought out opportunities for higher education that would contribute to the development of their communities and cultures.

In this article, we provide an overview—a primer—of the rise of Minority Serving Institutions as context for understanding the contemporary place of these institutions in our broader

This article was published Online First December 8, 2014.

Marybeth Gasman and Thai-Huy Nguyen, Department of Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania; Clifton F. Conrad, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Marybeth Gasman, Penn Center for Minority Serving Institutions, University of Pennsylvania, 3918 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. E-mail: mgasman@upenn.edu

system of higher education.¹ We also demonstrate how the emergence and the evolution of MSIs stem from our nation's struggle to provide equal educational opportunities to minority communities. Throughout the article, we interweave the shared and individual struggles as well as the successes across these four major types of MSIs. Woven throughout this narrative, we explore in-depth (a) the role of the federal government in both suppressing and elevating higher education for minorities, (b) the impact of various groups and individuals on the growth of MSIs. It is through the historical legacy of MSIs that we showcase how these institutions came to represent the voices and concerns of minority communities to take control and manage their own education. We conclude the article with a snapshot of the place of each of the four types of MSIs in contemporary higher education and recommendation for future research.

More Than Europeans

When European explorers began to arrive on the shores of America in the 16th century, they encountered native peoples with well-established educational practices that had benefited indigenous inhabitants for thousands of years prior to the arrival of Europeans. As early as 1723 the British Colonists attempted to provide higher education to Native Americans to "tie the powerful Indian tribes to them through education and conversion to their various Christian beliefs" (Stein, 1990, p. 1). They opened 'special facilities' for Native American students.

Among the Colonists infiltrating and eventually settling in America were the Spanish. They moved quickly across the continent, settling on both coasts and in the West and Southwest; they occasionally mixed with Native American populations (Pitt & Gutierrez, 1999). Eventually this population would secure ownership of land, cattle, and resources across the West, employing Native Americans without formal education, which constituted an early Latino population in the country. This population was most prevalent in southern California with the settling of the Californios (Pitt & Gutierrez, 1999). By 1846 there would be 10,000 Spanish-speaking Californios living on ranches in family units. Fol-

lowing the Mexican American War and with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildago signed in 1848, the Californios earned full American citizenship and voting rights, and the United States gained control over California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah. (Pitt & Gutierrez, 1999)

The history of Native American higher education can be described as "compulsory Western methods of learning, recurring attempts to eradicate tribal culture, and high dropout rates" (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999, p. 7). One of the first attempts to provide higher education to Native Americans came in 1775 when the Continental Congress allocated funds for Dartmouth College for the purpose of educating Native people (LaCounte, 1987). Although often credited with educating Native American students, the College of William and Mary, Dartmouth College, and Harvard College did little. Most of the outreach to Native students was done in an effort to garner funds from the English Crown and little funding or teaching went the way of Native Americans (Stein, 1990; Thelin, 2011). Even when education did take place, it was a failure. In the words of Native American historian Bobby Wright, "Despite the prevailing literature glorifying these efforts to convert and "civilize" American Natives, close examination of the several schemes to establish colonial Indian Colleges reveals a drama of deception and fraud, in which the major players betrayed motives that were less than honorable" (1988, p. 23). For example, Harvard College created an 'Indian college' in 1654 and attempted to educate 20 students. Two of these students received bachelor's degrees and the rest lost their lives to sickness, change in lifestyle, and loneliness (Guillory & Ward, 2007; Stein, 1990). In the words of higher education researchers Justin Guillory and Kelly Ward:

¹ We want to make clear that this article is a primer and a first attempt at weaving the histories of Minority Serving Institutions together. If one is to do research in this area, it is also important to consult the rich work in each MSI sector. Research on Historically Black Colleges and Universities is particularly rich, and work on Hispanic Serving Institutions and Asian American, Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions is growing rapidly. Unfortunately, there is very little research that currently exists on Tribal Colleges and Universities. However, emerging scholars are beginning to tap this area more fully.

For over 350 years, Native Americans have been encouraged to participate in the ritual of higher education. Indian education was misguided from the beginning because the American higher education system, that Indians would later be coerced into, was modeled after the European system, which meant that it was initially designed by and for White males. The initial motives of the colonists for educating Native Americans were not about the empowerment of Indian people, but rather about cloning Indian versions of themselves. (2007, p. 120)

Thirsting for Learning

Another group of people also had a system of education before they were ripped from the African continent and confined to slavery in America. Often portrayed as lacking a thirst for knowledge or an interest in education, African people had long been exposed to learning and Blacks have always considered education a means to freedom and pursued learning opportunities. They sought out opportunities for learning—such as teaching one another to read—despite laws or informal practices in all southern states forbidding them access to reading and writing. (Williams, 2007)

The thirst for knowledge is evidenced in the North where free Blacks attended college at Cheyney (1837) and Lincoln Universities (1854) in Pennsylvania and Wilberforce University (1856) in Ohio. Abolitionist missionaries of various religious backgrounds created these institutions. In the case of Cheyney, which is considered the oldest Historically Black College and University, Quaker philanthropist Richard Humphries created the school as the African Institute and quickly renamed it the Institute for Colored Youth. John Miller Dickey founded Lincoln University as the Ashmun Institute to educate Black males in the liberal arts. And the Methodist Episcopal Church created Wilberforce University to provide an “intellectual refuge” from slavery (Gasman et al., 2007). Wilberforce also became the first HBCU to have a Black president—Daniel Payne, a minister. It would not be until the 1930s that HBCUs would see an influx of Black presidents taking the reigns of these institutions. (Gasman, 2007)

Opportunity Brings Diversity

During the same time period, the United States experienced an influx of Chinese immi-

grants who came in response to the California Gold Rush of 1848 to 1855. These immigrants stayed and more joined them to work on the Transcontinental Railroad (Kanazawa, 2005). When gold was plentiful, the Chinese workers were welcome, but when times became less fortunate and gold was scarce, the Chinese were vilified and pushed out of the gold mines. They found refuge in large cities in California, such as San Francisco, and worked in laundry facilities and restaurants, making very little income. (Kanazawa, 2005; Miller, 1901)

Many Latinos also entered the country, hoping to reap the benefits of the Gold Rush. More than 25,000 Mexicans as well as people from throughout Latin America immigrated to California (Gonzalez, 2011). Because many of these Latinos were experienced miners, they had considerable success in the Gold Rush. Many achieved prominence in California, which raised concern and jealousy among White prospectors in the area. Some prospectors threatened violence and tried to intimidate Latinos, which led to a growth of institutionalized barriers that constrained their social, political, and economic opportunities. (Gonzalez, 2011)

Government and Religion

With the end of the Civil War in 1865, the federal government, through the Freedman’s Bureau, set out to educate more than four million Blacks who had been released from the shackles of slavery (Anderson, 1988). As early as 1865, the Freedmen’s Bureau began establishing HBCUs, which were made up mostly of male staff and teachers with military backgrounds. During this time, most HBCUs were colleges in name only; these institutions generally provided primary and secondary education, as Blacks needed general exposure to basic education after years of slavery that systemically barred them from learning of any kind.

Religious missionary organizations—some affiliated with northern White denominations such as the Baptists and Congregationalists and some with Black churches, such as the African Methodist Episcopal (AME)—were actively working with the Freedmen’s Bureau to support Black education. One of the most prominent missionary organizations was the American Missionary Association, which created HBCUs such as Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee

(1866). Named for General Clinton B. Fisk of the Tennessee Freedmen's Bureau, the school began in a former Army barracks and was established as a teaching institution like many other HBCUs.

Although HBCUs benefited greatly from the benevolence of White missionaries, these individuals often operated with their own interests in mind and with a pejorative attitude toward Blacks. Many established colleges in an attempt to bring Christianity to the freedmen and instill Northeastern Victorian values (Anderson, 1988). White missionaries treated Blacks much like the early Colonists treated Native Americans, as ignorant savages in desperate need for reforming and the inculcation of White values.

Among the colleges founded by Black denominations, specifically the AME Church, were Morris Brown College in Atlanta, Georgia and Paul Quinn College in Dallas, Texas. These institutions are particularly unique among HBCUs as Black churches and mission societies as well as former slaves founded them for Blacks (Anderson, 1988). Because these institutions relied on less support from Whites and more from Black churches, they were able to design their own liberal arts-based curricula and operate with fewer restrictions than those HBCUs supported by White missionaries. However, without White philanthropic support they remained vulnerable to economic instability. Even today, these institutions are shaped by their history, with many struggling to survive because of a lack of relationships with large-scale philanthropy and a reliance on the African Methodist Episcopal Church for security and prosperity.

A few public HBCUs resulted from the 1860 Morrill Act, including Prairie View A&M University, which the State of Texas established in 1876 to avoid mixing the races in its public universities. With the passage of the Second Morrill Act in 1890, the federal government took a more assertive interest in African American education, establishing 17 public, land grant institutions for Blacks throughout the South. This act stipulated that those states practicing segregation in their public colleges and universities would forfeit federal funding unless they established institutions for Blacks (Gasman, 2007). Despite the wording of the Morrill Act, which called for the equitable division of federal funds, these newly founded HBCUs received considerably less funding than White

land grant institutions and as a result, they had inferior facilities and limited curricula. Among the 17 new Black colleges created as a result of the Morrill Act was North Carolina A&T Universities in Greensboro, North Carolina (1891).

Controlling Difference

As African Americans were gaining exposure to various forms of higher education, Asian Americans—namely the Chinese—were feeling intensified discrimination. In 1882, the federal government passed the Chinese Exclusion Act (Lee, 2007; Miller, 1901). The Act prohibited Chinese “skilled and unskilled laborers employed in mining” from entering the country for 10 years under penalty of imprisonment and deportation.” Although those Chinese people living in the country already were protected, they were required to obtain papers to recertify their entry should they remain in the United States. In addition, if a Chinese individual was in the country and was not yet a citizen they were not able to apply for citizenship and were forced to remain a resident alien, which limited their rights (Miller, 1901). The Chinese Exclusion Act was not repealed until 1943.

Native Americans, like the Chinese, were being poked and prodded by the United States government. The federal government saw Native Americans similarly to Blacks, considering them a ‘problem’ and, as a result, formalized the relocation of Indian people onto reservations in an effort to ease conflicts between White settlers and Native Americans (Guillory & Ward, 2007; Stein, 1990). By the late 1800s, the federal government created the Bureau of Indian Affairs and placed it within the Department of the Interior. This organization eventually replaced the early efforts by colleges and universities and missionaries to educate Native Americans. The federal government's strategy through the General Allotment Act (or Dawes Act) resulted in a haphazard “checker boarding” of land—land that the Indians considered sacred, used for hunting, fishing, and on which they enjoyed their traditional ways of life. (Stein, 1990)

An Industrial Focus

Whites in power had similar intentions for both Blacks and Native Americans. Much like the industrial schools for Blacks to be discussed

later in this article, Whites created off-reservation boarding schools that provided both primary and secondary education as well as some higher education. These institutions, established by the federal government, stripped Native American youth of their culture to indoctrinate them into Western ways. For example, at most boarding schools, Native American children had their long hair cut short and were forbidden from speaking their indigenous languages in an effort to assimilate them (Guillory & Ward, 2007). Moreover, these schools—some on reservations and others off-site—did not provide academic curricula, but instead stressed manual labor and practical skills. Of grave concern, these schools did not incorporate any sense of Native American culture into the curricula (Boyer, 1989; Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2006). These children were taken from their families and homes and inserted into a militaristic setting that de-emphasized higher learning and reinforced their inferior status in society.

At the close of the 19th century, while the public HBCUs were beginning to take root, private Black colleges were out of funds. However, a new form of support for HBCUs emerged: philanthropy from White northern industrialists. Among the industry captains who initiated this type of support of Black colleges were Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, Julius Rosenwald, and John Foster Peabody. These industrialists were driven by both Christian ideals and a desire to control industry (Anderson, 1988). The General Education Board (GEB), a group of northern White philanthropists, established by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., but led by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., made the largest contribution to Black colleges, giving \$63 million between 1903 and 1964. Although an impressive donation, it was only a small fraction of what they donated to White colleges and universities (Anderson, 1988). The funding system that the industrialists implemented demonstrated a need to control Black education for their benefit and to produce graduates who possessed industrial skills that served the industrialist's initiatives. (Anderson, 1988)

Above all, the HBCUs supported by the industrial philanthropists supported were careful not to upset the segregationist power structure of the South that was in place by the 1890s. All too often, the principals or presidents of the industri-

ally focused HBCUs hired by the White philanthropists. Black colleges such as Tuskegee and Hampton acted as showcases of industrial education and adopted a militaristic education similar to that being foisted on Native Americans. Students learned how to clean, sew, shoe horses, cook, and make bricks under the leadership of individuals such as Samuel Chapman Armstrong (Hampton) and Booker T. Washington (Tuskegee). The philanthropists' support of industrial education was in direct conflict with those Blacks who promoted a liberal arts curriculum. Institutions such as Fisk, Dillard, and Howard were more focused on the liberal arts favored by W. E. B. Du Bois than on Booker T. Washington's emphasis on advancement through self-sufficiency and work. Although they each championed different approaches, these two educational leaders did share the goal of educating Blacks and empowering them beyond their current positions.

At the same time the industrial philanthropists were getting deeply involved in private HBCUs, the federal government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, working with several Christian denominations, made attempts to establish religious schools on Indian reservations. The Bureau established a few schools including Carlisle, Haskell, and also created an Indian school at historically Black Hampton Institute. Haskell is the only one of these institutions that continues to educate Native Americans today. (Stein, 1990)

Shifting Focus

From 1915 to the 1920s, Black and Native American higher education underwent new changes as greater support—by philanthropists and new federal legislation—widened educational opportunities and services. The industrial philanthropists shifted their interests and monies, turning their attention to those HBCUs that focused on a liberal arts curriculum. Realizing that industrial education could exist in tandem with more academic curricula, the philanthropists decided to spread their funds (and therefore their influence) throughout the Black college system (Anderson, 1988). The influence of industrial philanthropy in the early 20th century created a conservative environment on Black college campuses, resulting in the squashing of student rights. But attention from the industrial philanthropists was not necessarily welcomed

by institutions such as Fisk University, where rebellions ensued against autocratic leaders who were assumed to be puppets of the philanthropists by students. (Anderson, 1988)

As African Americans were gaining more access to liberal education, some movement also took place in the 1920s for Native American higher education. The 1921 Snyder Act, which gave American Indians full citizenship, allowed the Bureau of Indian Affairs to improve the educational and environmental conditions of Native American communities. But much like the situation for Blacks, this amounted to little in terms of autonomy for Native Americans. (LaCounte, 1987)

Restricting Movement

Concurrently, life for Asians in the United States became nearly intolerable. With the Immigration Act of 1924, the federal government restricted immigration even further than it had with the Chinese Exclusion Act and extended the restrictions to other Asian immigrant groups as well. The federal government attempted to control 'undesirable' immigration by setting quotas for various groups, most prominently those from the Asian Pacific. Specifically, immigrants from Japan, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Singapore, Cambodia, Korea, Indonesia, China, Malaysia, and India were heavily restricted. In addition to immigration quotas, those hailing from Asian countries were also limited in terms of opportunities and movement throughout the United States, resulting in the 'Chinatowns,' or ethnic-specific enclaves that offered and supported a wide network of economic opportunities. (Kanazawa, 2005)

The limitations that the U.S. government placed on the movement and livelihood of minorities were not limited to one group. These limitations sometimes drew the attention of outside organizations, resulting in substantive changes. In 1928, the Meriam Report caused a stir in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and throughout the federal government. The report, written by Lewis Meriam, sponsored by the Brookings Institute (Institute for Government Research), and funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, included deep criticism of the government's boarding school education and its other Indian education programs, noting that all of these

initiatives lacked the intellectual input of Indians (Guillory & Ward, 2007; Meriam, 1928). The Meriam Report is still viewed as a turning point in Indian education. It was the impetus for subsequent legislation, which brought more autonomy to American Indians and the end of the General Allotment Act (Bolt, 1987). It was not until the mid-1930s that federal policy pertaining to Indian self-determination began to change substantively. John Collier, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, introduced legislation in Congress, which became the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. The Act enabled tribal communities to reorganize their tribal governments and bolster their community resources and, no less significant, ended the allotment of Indian land, which had ripped the control of Indian territories out of the hands of Native Americans. Still, without resources, tribally controlled Native American higher education remained nearly nonexistent and would for several decades (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999). Interestingly, the Rockefeller Foundation was trying to curtail the voices of 'self-determined' Blacks at the same time that they expressed concern over Native American participation in their own education.

In 1941, when Japan bombed Pearl Harbor in an effort to keep U.S. fleets from interfering in their military action, fear and prejudice reared their head in many Americans and at the federal level. Within the year, roughly 110,000 Japanese Americans, new Japanese immigrants, and other Asians mistaken to be of Japanese descent living along the Pacific coast and in Hawaii were interned in war relocation campuses. President Roosevelt, after having expanded the rights of Native Americans, signed this prejudicial treatment of the Japanese into law in 1942 by Executive Order. The conditions in the internment camps were sparse with no plumbing or cooking facilities. The camps were not shut down until 1945 (Drinnon, 1989). Of note, many of the Japanese internment camps were located on Indian reservations, placing people considered 'aliens in their own country' or 'perpetual foreigners' together. Among the interned citizens were Japanese college students. As a result of the work of the National Student Council Relocation Program, an arm of the American Friends Service Committee, many of these college students were allowed

to leave the camps and attend colleges and universities that were willing to enroll students of Japanese ancestry. At first there were only a small number of students able to take advantage of this exception, but by 1943 more than 2,250 participated in the program.

Self-Funding = Agency

African American students were also attending college in increasing numbers by the 1940s. However, the HBCUs most prominent funding source—the U.S. Department of Education—turned their attention elsewhere during this time, providing only minimal funding to HBCUs. HBCU presidents scurried around seeking additional monies to support their institutions. In response, Frederick D. Patterson, then president of Tuskegee Institute, suggested that the nation's private HBCUs collaborate in their fundraising efforts. As a result, in 1944, the presidents of 29 private HBCUs created the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). The UNCF began solely as a fund raising organization but eventually took on advocacy and educational roles (Gasman, 2007). The organization also served as an example for other racial and ethnic minorities wanting to establish organizations to support their students and causes (e.g., Thurgood Marshall College Fund, American Indian College Fund, Hispanic Scholarship Fund, and the Asian & Pacific Islander American College Fund.)

The Era of Desegregation

Until the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954, both public and private Black colleges in the South remained segregated by law and were the only viable, with a few exceptions, educational option for African Americans. Although most colleges and universities did not experience the same violent fallout from the *Brown* decision as southern public schools, they were greatly affected by the ruling. The Supreme Court's landmark determination meant that HBCUs would be placed in competition with White institutions in their efforts to recruit Black students and this has had a significant impact on HBCUs in the current day. With the triumph of the idea of integration, many began to call HBCUs into question and labeled them vestiges of segregation (Gasman, 2007).

However, desegregation proved slow, with many public HBCUs maintaining their racial make-up well into the current day.

After the *Brown* decision, HBCUs, which have always been willing to accept students from all backgrounds if the law would allow, struggled to defend issues of quality in an atmosphere that labeled anything all-Black inferior (Gasman, 2007). Many Black colleges also suffered from "brain drain" as majority institutions in the North made efforts to attract high-achieving Black students once racial diversity became a measure of achievement. (Gasman, 2007)

Much like the 1930s, the federal policy toward American Indians changed in the 1940s and 1950s—a period known as the termination period. A good deal of this change was on the heels of *Brown v. Board* and the Supreme Court's blow to legal segregation. Rather than tribal separatism, the federal government advocated for assimilation for and integration of Native communities. Politicians moved to terminate many of the tribes along with their special federal status. Nearly 100 tribes were dismantled, and those that remained suffered from constant government oversight (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999). In addition, the federal funding for schooling that came with the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was cut, leaving tribal communities in dire situations.

Change Brewing

Meanwhile, as the 1960s approached, HBCUs were a much different place than those of the 1920s. Because Blacks had more control over funding, a result of HBCU leadership switching from White to Black, there was greater tolerance for dissent and Black self-determination among the student population. On many public and private Black college campuses throughout the South, students were protesting and organizing sit-ins against segregation and its manifestations in the region. Most prominent were the four students from North Carolina A&T University who integrated a segregated Woolworth lunch counter on February 1, 1960. According to many historians, this event was the spark that started the Civil Rights Movement in full. (Chafe, 1981)

The year 1960 was a troubling year for Native American students, with nine of every 10 Indian students dropping out of college. In 1961, only 66 Indians graduated from 4-year colleges (Guillory & Ward, 2007). However, several events came to fruition in the 1960s that led to changes in both Black and Native American higher education. The combination of John F. Kennedy's message of helping others and taking care of one another as a nation, the Civil Rights Movement, and Lyndon B. Johnson's war on poverty, changed the atmosphere in many areas of the country. For Native Americans in particular, veterans of World War II who had exposure to worlds outside of the reservation were gaining seats on tribal councils, changing the center of power in tribal communities and between the U.S. government. In addition, young Native Americans were becoming more assertive in their quest for the "American Dream," taking on leadership roles in their communities and speaking out nationally on the treatment of Indians (Stein, 1990). As a response to these changes, individuals in power at the federal level began to see the potential of community colleges on Indian reservations and worked to support their development. (Stein, 1990)

An Era of Civil Rights

President Kennedy fought vehemently to pass the Civil Rights Act, and after his death in 1963, President Lyndon Johnson pushed to make Kennedy's dream come to fruition, noting "No memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought so long" (Golway & Krantz, 2010, p. 284). On July 2, 1964, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act, which made various forms of discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities as well as women and religious minorities illegal. Moreover, the Act ended the unequal application of voter registration rules and segregation in the workplace, in schools and in any facilities used by the government. Interestingly, 1964 was also the last year that HBCUs could be established, as African Americans were beginning to attend Historically White Institutions (HWIs) in greater numbers (Gasman, 2007). At the same time, Native Americans were entering an era of

self-determination in which they had a "renewed sense of purpose" and the goal of erasing "the atrocities of the past" and creating their "own version of Indian education—a version defined by Indians, for Indians" (Guillory & Ward, 2007, p. 123).

Furthering the diversity of the United States was the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. Also supported by President Kennedy and signed into law by President Johnson, the act replaced the immigrant quota system present in the country with an immigration policy focused on skills and family relationships with U.S. citizens. Before the passing of the 1965 Act, the law privileged immigrants from northern and western Europe by welcoming their entry into the United States and excluded most Asians, Africans, and some South and Latin Americans (especially Mexicans) (Massey, Durane, & Malone, 2003). Among the Latino immigrants that entered the nation, there was a quick realization that Latinos did not have access to the same opportunities, services, and education that Whites had. Various groups of Latinos started movements to gain access to education and fight discrimination in order to raise themselves out of poverty (Massey, Durane, & Malone, 2003). These movements included that of the Chicanos (Mexicans), mainly in California and Texas, and Puerto Ricans in New York. Through combined protests among high school students and college students as well as the larger community, Latinos pushed for greater access to higher education and equality on college campuses. (Massey, Durane, & Malone, 2003)

The Power of Legislation

In addition to pushing the Civil Rights Act through Congress, and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, President Johnson worked to pass the 1965 Higher Education Act, which sought "to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education." With the Higher Education Act, the federal government took a greater interest in Black colleges. In an attempt to provide clarity, the Act defined a Black college as "any . . . college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of black Americans" (Higher Education Act, 1965). The rec-

ognition of the uniqueness of Black colleges implied in this definition has led to increased federal funding for these institutions. Although HBCUs were allotted funding through the “developing institutions” clause of the Higher Education Act, it would not be until 1986 that a special section on HBCUs would be added to the Act – “Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities.” This special designation was aimed at ensuring that funding was allotted specifically for HBCUs as they tended to be pushed out of funding opportunities on technicalities when the Higher Education Act was first implemented. HBCUs were singled out in an attempt to remedy past injustices and to acknowledge that they did the lion’s share of work to educate Blacks during difficult and discriminatory times.

Future iterations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 also authorized the support and designation of Hispanic-Serving institutions (HSIs) in 1992. In many ways, this designation was different from the federal government’s relationship and support of other MSIs, such as HBCUs and Tribal colleges, because it was not based on a compensatory rationale, but instead a demographic increase and shift (Park & Teranishi, 2007). As a result, some members of the HBCU community were resistant to federal funding of HSIs. They were worried that funding for HSIs would mean less funding for HBCUs. Henry Ponder, who at the time was the president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity (NAFEO), spoke out against the funding of HSIs. In his words:

They can get everything they want under the current structure. They don’t need a separate part of the law. I know Hispanics have had an unfavorable history in terms of discrimination, but it in no way compares to what has happened to African Americans. (Fletcher, 1998, p. A10)

Others in the HBCU community tried to quell efforts to build a wall between Blacks and Latinos. For example, William Blakely, who served as legal counsel for the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), defended his support of HBCUs but also noted that his position did not mean that he wanted to prevent HSIs from obtaining funding through the federal government. He was particularly concerned about the media’s pitting of Blacks and Latinos against each other (Park & Teranishi, 2007). HSIs were

eventually folded into Title III of the Higher Education Act and defined as any nonprofit college or university with at least 25% Hispanic undergraduate student enrollment. Moreover, the HSIs had to provide assurances that no less than 50% of its Hispanic students were low-income individuals and first-generation college students, demonstrating, for the first time, a race *and* socioeconomic criteria in justifying the existence of a federally designated institution (Benitez, 1998). Of note, some HSI advocates felt that these institutions were shortchanged compared with HBCUs as they received less money per institution and had to participate in a competitive process for funding. (Benitez, 1998)

Although Title III was important to HSIs’ development, Title IV was much more meaningful. Title IV, also put into action in 1965, established the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG), which later became the Pell Grant and provided funding for guaranteed student loans and college work study (Benitez, 1998). A combination of federal student grants and loans and a push toward open admissions at many institutions opened up the doors of college to a larger group of Latinos. According to a study by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, before the 1960s, higher education in the United States was, for the most part, segregated into Black and White institutions (Benitez, 1998). The study also noted that even up till the fall of 1970, roughly 87% of the college students in the nation were White. Interestingly, the report made no mention of Latinos despite their representing 6.9 million Americans living in the continental United States. Although these individuals may have been counted as White due to Census requirements, they were not counted in ways that were meaningful to Latino communities and that could inform research in substantial ways.

The majority of HSIs were not founded as Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Shifts resulting from immigration and birthrates have changed the demographics in the nation, especially as they relate to Latinos. Not being established for the purpose of educating Latinos, HSIs have important implications for these students. Basically, an institution can be designated an HSI but have no established commitment to educating Latinos. This inconsistency has led some scholars to differentiate between Hispanic-

serving and Hispanic-enrolling institutions (Gasman, Baez, & Sotello Viernes, 2007). There are three institutions that were established expressly for the purpose of educating Latinos. They are Hostos Community College (established 1968), Boricua College (established 1974), both in New York City, and National Hispanic University (established 1981), in San Jose, California.

The growth in HSIs is the result of four important factors in American society (Laden, 2001). First, the Civil Rights Movement and corresponding activism opened up higher education to more than just Whites. Second, in the decade leading up to the designation of HSIs, the Latino population grew immensely—a full 3.9 million person increase in the early 1960s alone, with a birthrate that was 2 to 1 compared with other immigrants (Massey, Durane, & Malone, 2003). Latinos made up 4% of the overall U.S. population. Third, the Latino population was moving to larger urban areas, forming clusters throughout the nation in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, New York, and Florida (Massey, Durane, & Malone, 2003). And fourth, Latinos, seeking cultural support and closeness to family, tended to enroll in colleges and universities that already had significant populations of Latinos, increasing the number of institutions qualified for the HSI designation. Today, most HSIs are located on the periphery of the United States, most prominently the Pacific Northwest, the Southwest, and Puerto Rico. HSIs are located in 12 states, with California (70% of Latinos live in California), Texas, New Mexico, and the territory of Puerto Rico having the most HSIs (De Los Santos & De Los Santos, 2003; Gasman, Baez, & Sotello Viernes, 2007; Laden, 2001).

A ‘Model Minority’?

As Latinos were growing in terms of their student enrollment, so were Asian Americans and as a result they became the subject of much interest. In 1966, William Peterson penned an article for *The New York Times* that described Asian Americans as minorities that have overcome their circumstances through hard work; he labeled them the “model minority.” Peterson implied that Asian Americans were exemplars and their story served as a model for other minorities that were less successful. In so doing,

he ignored the specific circumstances of the diverse racial and ethnic groups in the United States and also disregarded the fact that many Asian Americans were not succeeding. According to Jennifer Park and Robert Teranishi (2007), “The timing of the label was no accident; its emergence in the mid-1960s highlighted the supposed self-reliant achievements of Asian Americans while implicitly denigrating the agitation for racial justice led by other minority groups” (Park & Teranishi, 2007, p. 144). In essence, the message from the model minority myth is that Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians do not value education nor work hard, whereas Asian Americans “stand as a beacon of the American Dream” (Park & Teranishi, 2007, p. 144). The image of success associated with Asian communities demonstrated a false sense of social progress in America. It made society believe that the struggles—poverty and poor educational achievement and health—encountered by Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians were a product of their own volition as opposed to the structural inequality that ran through the veins of our nation’s political and economic system.

Indian Determination

By 1968, Congress realized that its previous policies of Indian determination were a failure. Rather than assimilate, Native Americans had maintained their individual cultures and religious traditions. And, among those Native Americans who attended majority institutions, many came back to their tribal communities with stories of discrimination rather than degrees. They felt isolated, struggled financially, and did not find that their cultural traditions were not affirmed (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2006). The Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 gave more power to the tribal communities. Soon after, the Navajo nation created the first tribally controlled college in 1968. Although many at the federal level thought the college as well as the primary and secondary schools started by the Navajos would fail, this institution—originally named Navajo Community College but now called Diné College—served as an impetus for the growth of more tribal colleges across the West. Much different from HSIs that were not established for the purpose of educating a particular racial and

ethnic group, these institutions offered curricula from a Native American perspective, including tribal languages and history of tribal communities. Likewise, tribal elders and what could be viewed as nontraditional faculty with local and practical experience taught classes ([American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999](#)). These institutions served as learning centers for all those in their surrounding communities, providing library and archival services to local tribes. And in addition to education, these new tribal communities actively sought to boast local economies with their small business development centers. From their beginnings, tribal colleges have sought to break the “destructive cycle of poverty” present on most reservations throughout the country ([Stein, 1990](#)).

Under President Richard Nixon’s leadership Indian self-determination became official U.S. policy. The president issued a message related to Indian policy in which he stated the following:

It is long past time that the Indian policies of the Federal government began to recognize and build upon the capacities and insights of the Indian people. Both as a matter of Justice and as a matter of enlightened social policy, we must begin to act on the basis of what the Indians themselves have long been telling us. The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions. ([Nixon, 1970](#))

Between 1971 and 1975, tribal colleges, all founded by tribal governments, sprang up across the Western United States (including Sinte Gleska University, Oglala Lakota College, Turtle Mountain Community College, Sitting Bull College, Fort Yates College, and Degawidah-Quetzalcoatl University), providing substantially more educational opportunities for Native Americans. Unfortunately, other than Diné College (Navajo Community College at the time), none of the new tribal colleges had stable sources of income. The birth of the tribal college movement was quite difficult, and many of the institutions were almost unrecognizable in terms of what was viewed as a traditional college. According to Justin Guillory and Kelly Ward (2007), “the first tribal colleges were set up in abandoned houses, trailers, old storefronts, condemned building, barracks, and warehouses, or any structure where students and teachers could gather for class” ([Guillory & Ward, 2007](#), p. 124). In many ways, tribal col-

leges have similar origins to HBCUs—beginning in barracks and basements—but during a much different time.

In 1972, the presidents of the country’s first six tribal colleges formed the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC). Interestingly, and a reflection of its Native American origins, AIHEC is governed jointly by each of its member institutions, which include 31 colleges ([American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999](#)). One of the goals of AIHEC was and continues to be advocating for the passage and funding of legislation that supports tribal colleges ([Stein, 1990](#)).

After much lobbying by Indian interest groups, in 1975, Congress passed the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act. According to Wayne J. Stein, “the states in which the tribal colleges were located felt no financial obligation to them and thus gave no fiscal support toward their operations” (1990, p. 2). The majority of tribal college funding came from the federal government, including the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Indian Act of 1972, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Comprehensive Employment Training Act. During this time as well as in the current day, many tribal colleges had to struggle to keep their doors open.

AIHEC was also instrumental in getting Congress to pass the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978. And, between 1979 and 1983, this act helped to stabilize existing and build additional tribal colleges. In fact, the number of tribal colleges grew to 24 after the passing of the act ([Guillory & Ward, 2007](#)). Many experts within Native communities and at the federal level believe that without the Act most tribal colleges would have failed—thereby continuing the cycle of failure in terms of education on Indian reservations ([Stein, 1990](#)). Even after the passing of this historic legislation, tribal colleges and Indian leaders continued to fight for funding. They faced a leader in Ronald Reagan who asserted that education was not a responsibility of the federal government. But through careful politicking, AIHEC was able to gain Reagan’s support for tribal college funding. Ironically, one of the greatest oppositions to the tribal college movement was the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At one point, the Bureau actively testified before

Congress that there was no need for tribal colleges (Stein, 1990).

Since the 1970s, tribal colleges and Native American higher education organizations have worked closely with liberal-leaning foundations such as the Ford and MacArthur Foundations to secure funding (Boyer, 1989). However, these foundations have supported only a select few tribal colleges in the same way that they have only supported a small number of more prestigious HBCUs (Gasman, 2007). In 1994, Congress awarded Land Grant status to tribal colleges, allowing for more equitable funding, access to agricultural research programs, and infrastructure grants through federal agencies. And in 1996, President Clinton pushed for additional federal support by passing an Executive Order that compelled the various government agencies to create relationships with tribal colleges. President Bush renewed the Executive Order, as did President Obama during his first term.

Fighting Against Myths

Much like Native Americans, Asian American students were often left out of academic conversations around minority issues—all too often policymakers bought into the model minority myth. In 1986, Congressmen Robert Matsui and Norman Mineta objected to Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) students being ignored in discussions concerning which colleges and universities in the U.S. were MSIs. But despite their efforts to bring light to the educational struggles encountered by Asians, they were not successful in convincing fellow legislators that AAPI students faced similar issues to other minorities in education (Park & Teranishi, 2007). Data on Asian American students were lumped together by researchers and as a result the successes of the strongest AAPI groups overshadowed the needs of the weakest groups such as the Hmong, Laotians, Vietnamese, and Pacific Islanders.

Coalition Building

As Asian Americans were clamoring for attention, in 1986 Latinos were coming together in an effort to support, advocate for, and better understand the growing number of HSIs throughout the nation. They formed the His-

panic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). Hispanic business education and business leaders established the organization with a mission to “improve educational access and raise the quality of college opportunities for Hispanics” (Laden, 2001, p. 75). HACU set up offices in San Antonio, Texas as well as side by side with policymakers in Washington D.C. The organization has been quite successful, eventually getting HSIs included in Title V of the Higher Education Act, along with HBCUs and tribal colleges, and making HSIs eligible for larger federal allocations (Laden, 2001). HACU was also instrumental in the development of the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. Under the leadership of President Clinton, the Initiative formed in 1994 through an Executive Order. The Initiative serves as a conduit between HSIs and the various federal agencies, ensuring that the mission, activities, and contributions of HSIs were in the forefront of the minds of policymakers and the federal government.

In 1989, Native Americans followed the lead of HBCUs’ establishment of the United Negro College Fund and created the American Indian College Fund. Much like the UNCF, this organization focuses on raising funds for the scholarships and operating costs of the member institutions. It works with all 36 tribal colleges, representing more than 250 tribal communities in both the United States and Canada. Both the United Negro College Fund and the American Indian College Fund are unique compared with other race-based scholarship organizations in that they support institutions in addition to student scholarships. In contrast, the Hispanic Scholarship Fund, established in 1975, and the newly established Asian & Pacific Islander American Scholarship Fund focus only on scholarships.

In an effort to join forces and counter the voices trying to pit minorities and the various types of MSIs against each other, a group of higher education leaders from various MSIs and policy leaders formed the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education in 1998. In part, the Alliance formed as a way to calm the backlash during the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Specifically, the Alliance focused on playing a “central role in supporting cultural values and traditions, reinforcing community and civic responsibility, and producing citizens who are

more attuned to the diverse nation in which we live” (Gasman et al., 2007, p. 1). Because AAPI institutions were not in existence, Asian Americans were not included in the Alliance.

Congressional Movement

The model minority myth persisted and frustrated Asian American and Pacific Islander leaders trying to draw attention to low income, underprepared students in their communities. A setback took place in 1999 for AAPI students when the College Board published an influential, national report entitled “Reaching the Top, the College Board’s National Task Force on Minority High Achievement.” The report grouped AAPI students with White students, ignoring the historical experiences, needs, and potential discrimination that many AAPI students face. However, AAPI policymakers were able to use the report to make a convincing argument to their counterparts in Congress, explaining that there was a lack of understanding of AAPI subcultures such as Southeast Asians and Pacific Islanders and the social ills that plagued these communities (Park & Teranishi, 2007).

In 2001, an organization called the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC) sponsored a symposium focused on the misperceptions around AAPIs in higher education. And in another effort to change the national dialogue around AAPI students and the model minority myth, in 2001 CAPAC came together with the Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC) to organize a national summit on the status of Pacific Islanders and Southeast Asians in higher education (Park & Teranishi, 2007). In the same year, the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders recommended that a new college and university federal designation be given to institutions that have significant percentages of AAPI students. The White House Initiative hoped that the designation would serve as the impetus for new ventures between the federal government, AAPI serving institutions, and local communities (Park & Teranishi, 2007).

Congressman Robert Underwood introduced H.R. 4825, an amendment to Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in 2002. Title III funds Minority Serving Institutions, including HSIs, HBCUs, Tribal colleges, Alaskan Native

and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions.² The funding of institutions included in Title III “has been largely compensatory, given the history of federal and state-sponsored discrimination against Blacks and Native Americans in education, a shift occurred with the 1992 inclusion of HIS federal designation and funding” (Park & Teranishi, 2007). Unlike their Tribal College and HBCU counterparts, HSIs were included in the government funding formula based, not on historical discrimination, but the percentage of low-income Latinos students.

In 2003, Congressman David Wu introduced a bill into Congress focused on AAPI serving institutions and he did so again in 2005. During the same year (2005), Senators Daniel Akaka and Barbara Boxer introduced a Senate companion bill: Asian American and Pacific Islander Serving Institutions Act (Park & Teranishi, 2007). The legislation proposed that AAPI serving institutions have at least 10% AAPI enrollment and that 50% of these students receive federal financial aid or that the Pell Grant eligibility of the students be at the national median. Much like the other funds designated under the Higher Education Act of 1965, AAPI serving institutions could be used for operating costs such as student success programs, community partnerships, research on AAPI students, labs, and library facilities (Park & Teranishi, 2007). One of the most important aspects of the legislation supporting AAPI Serving Institutions (H.R. 2616) is that it rejects efforts to align AAPI students with Whites and those claiming that AAPI students are victims of reverse racism and affirmative action. The legislation points out the great diversity among AAPI groups, showing that although AAPIs overall have the highest rate of degree attainment, when broken down by subgroups many AAPI groups have much lower degree attainment rates. In particular, Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, Hmong, and Pacific Islanders struggle with very low rates of attainment from

² HSIs were originally introduced into Title III but are now funded through Title V. Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions represents the federal government’s recognition of institutions that were committed to serving Alaskan Natives and Native Hawaiians. These institutions would later be subsumed by the Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Institutions (AANAPISIs) designation.

5.1 to 13.8% (Park & Teranishi, 2007). According to Robert Teranishi's 2011 CARE Report, the federal program supporting AAPI Serving Institutions is important for at least three reasons:

First, it acknowledges the unique challenges facing AAPI students in college access and completion. Second, the [federal] designation represents a significant commitment of much-needed resources to improving the postsecondary completion rates between AAPI and low-income students. Third, it acknowledges how campus settings can be mutable points of intervention—sites of possibilities for responding for the impediments AAPI students encounter. (Teranishi, 2011, p. 12)

Population Growth and MSIs Today

Although the Asian Americans and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions are growing at a rapid pace, the fastest growing MSIs by far are the HSIs. This fact mirrors the population growth among Latinos and especially Latino college students. The latest U.S. Census reported that the Latino population in the U.S. grew by 9.7% in the first decade of the 21st century. As a result of this growth, Latinos now make up 16.3% of the country's population. And, of interest to colleges and universities is the fact that Latino children under 5 made up 19% of the U.S. population of children 10 years ago. This means that these children will be entering higher education in the coming years. It is imperative that we as a nation ensure the success of these Latino children for two reasons. First, it is the right thing to do in terms of our care for humankind and second, our economy and our nation's future depends on the success of the larger percentage of the nation. As these children move into their college years, there will be sharp increase in the number of Hispanic Serving Institutions throughout the country. Earlier in this article, we identified the states with larger numbers of Latino students (i.e., California, Texas, New Mexico, Florida), however, in the future, there will be large percentages of Latinos (over 15% of the state's population will be college-aged) in Arkansas, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Tribal Colleges and Universities

Our nation's 34 TCUs are spread across 12 states and include nine 4-year and 24 2-year

colleges (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999). With more than 180,000 students enrolled in 2010, TCUs have grown significantly since the first tribal college, Diné College in Arizona, opened its doors over four decades ago (Boyer, 1997).³ Predominantly public institutions (over 75%), TCUs vary in enrollments from under 100 to nearly 2,500 students.⁴ Most TCUs are located on reservations: among the 34 TCUs are four urban or suburban campuses, three campuses located in distant or remote towns, and 27 rural campuses (16 of which are classified as remote). Established for Native American students and communities, TCUs are "community" colleges and centers that offer accredited degree programs and also hosting cultural events and house critical social services and often functioning as business incubators.⁵ TCU students are older and are more likely to be financially independent and have dependent children, and among the poorest American college students, often coming to college from challenging social settings and often have family obligations that take priority over their personal academic progress. (American Indian Higher Education, Consortium, 1999)

Findings from research on TCUs suggests that these institutions are defined by sensitivity to students' varied levels of preparation and time constraints, relevant degree programs and teaching, support for developmental education, and highly supportive faculty (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999; Macahmer, 1999; O'Donnell, 2003). As such, these colleges and universities retain students otherwise unlikely to remain in higher education and bring resources to marginalized communities while sustaining tribal-related knowledge and

³ Between 1996 and 2006, Native Americans had sharper gains in the number of degrees earned than Whites and the share of Native American students enrolled in 4-year institutions increased by 10%. TCUs enroll almost 10% of Native American undergraduates and continue to struggle to have sufficient space to serve all students seeking degrees (Boyer, 1997).

⁴ Keweenaw Bay Ojibwa Community College was granted Title IV status in December of 2010, and hence this college is not counted in our analysis of fall 2010 degree-granting institutions.

⁵ TCUs also reflect their communities through the presence of high numbers of tribal administrators and students and a higher proportion of tribal faculty than are typical in colleges and universities in the United States (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 1999).

practices (Boyer, 2002; Cunningham & Hiesland, 2007; Guillory & Ward, 2007; Phillips, 2003). And not least, TCUs continue to experiment with ways to make the concerns of minority groups part of the mainstream conversation about development: shared authority, shared accountability, collaborations, alternative programs and credentials, and education for self-determination.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions

In the absence of an official list of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), the HSI designation refers to institutions that meet the federal institutional and enrollment criterion for eligibility to receive funds under Title V of the Higher Education Act: 25% or more total undergraduate Hispanic full-time equivalent student enrollment. Based on these criteria, 311 institutions in the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia qualified as HSIs in 2011 (Santiago & Andrade, 2010). Scattered across 15 states and all institutional sectors, these 254 institutions—just over 6% of all degree-granting institutions—enroll almost 4 million undergraduates, including one quarter of all minority undergraduates in higher education in the United States, and nearly one half of Hispanic undergraduates. These institutions are predominantly public and 2-year, urban, and significantly underresourced.

Research has found that HSIs serve an important role in providing access to college for diverse students. HSI students have historically been less likely to complete degrees than students at non-HSIs, in part because HSIs enroll students—many of whom are Hispanic students—who have nontraditional enrollment patterns and strong ties to communities away from campus and at the same time who receive less aid and are less prepared (Santiago, 2007).⁶ Hispanic students at HSIs who make it to senior status experience the same levels of satisfaction and engagement and also gains in development as similar Hispanic students at majority institutions (Flores & Morfin, 2008; Nelson Laird et al., 2007; Santiago, 2007). Serving diverse students has led HSIs—as individual institutions and through the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities—to advocate for additional resources and to cultivate organizational cultures and degree programs that are relevant to Hispanic students in particular and needy

students in general (Dayton et al., 2004; Santiago & Andrade, 2010). HSIs include in their numbers some of the most diverse institutions in the United States. Many of these institutions are experiments in minority–majority education and often serve as desperately needed points of access to technology, information, and public space for communities with few such resources (Flores & Morfin, 2008; Santiago & Andrade, 2010).

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Spread across 20 states largely in the South, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, the 105 HBCUs are nonprofit institutions, roughly split between public and private, and predominantly 4-year institutions (nearly 90%). In 2010, HBCUs made up roughly 2% of the degree-granting Title IV institutions and enrolled nearly 290,000 students—including 1.6% of all undergraduate students in the United States, 3.7% of total minority undergraduates, 0.3% of White undergraduates, and 11% of Black undergraduates (IPEDS, 2011). Overall, the 105 HBCUs are predominantly Black institutions—in 2012 more than 75% of the undergraduates served by these institutions were Black—with students who have similar profiles to Black undergraduates enrolled in institutions other than HBCUs (Freeman, 1999). Though Black undergraduates as a national cohort attended relatively poor high schools that were in many instances urban and predominantly Black, they continue to improve their graduation rates and reap the benefits of a college education (Aud, Fox, Ramani, 2010). In 2001, these insti-

⁶ Hispanic students increased their participation in college six-fold between 1976 and 2008, but their experience with education in the United States for many Hispanics continues to be affected by poverty, poor quality of elementary and secondary education, limited interaction with college faculty, few college-educated role models, relatively low commitment to their educational goals, and limited information about college, including financial information. Many enroll in institutions where they find a critical mass of Hispanic students, staff, and faculty who can offer validation and support that Hispanic families are often unable to offer because of lack of experience with higher education in the United States. This preference corresponds with above average enrollment in public institutions and two-year colleges (especially public two-year), though as a group they are showing increasing enrollment in four-year. (see Santiago, 2008)

tutions conferred 2.2% of all bachelor's degrees and 21.5% of those earned by Black students (Provasnik & Shafer, 2005); in 2008, HBCUs made up less than three percent of all degree-granting postsecondary institutions but accounted for nearly 18% of bachelor's degrees awarded to Black students.

A growing body of research on HBCUs has shown that although for some students an HBCU is a local and cost-effective path to a desired degree, many students choose HBCUs because they offer a supportive environment in which they feel they belong and at which they believe they will find cultural support, a sense of belonging, and a feeling of pride, as well as an opportunity to develop a racial identity. These institutions are distinguished by close relationships between students and faculty among students (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Davis & Markham, 1991; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002). These colleges pay explicit attention to race as a factor in development and cultivate faculty cultures that are focused on teaching and helping students be successful (Minor, 2004; Palmer & Gasman, 2008). Black students tend to be more engaged, satisfied, and better adjusted than their peers at majority institutions (Nasim et al., 2005; Palmer, Davis, & Maramba, 2010). HBCUs stand out in the "system" of colleges and universities in the United States that is now almost 30% for-profit and 40% 2-year (Mercer & Stedman, 2008). Distinctive in institutional type, they are also distinctive as champions for access to higher education for under resourced and under-prepared students, notwithstanding the challenges this mission creates with respect to enrollment management, finances, and the recruitment of faculty.

Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions

In response to substantial growth in the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) population and a subsequent increased presence of the AAPI population on college campuses across the nation, a small group of institutions are now identifying—through a federal designation and funding program—as Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs; Teranishi, 2011). At these 116 institutions, 10% of undergraduate students are low-income Asian Americans or Pacific Is-

landers. Scattered across the country, with most on the west coast, these institutions serve a diverse group of AAPI students—48 different ethnic groups that speak 300 different languages. Although these groups do not have a common language or culture, their share the history of immigrant groups⁷; many have needs that are similar to those of other underrepresented racial and ethnic populations.

A still emerging body of research suggests that like HSIs, AANAPISIs are evolving as they and their communities come to terms with demographic shifts in student bodies. As they become aware that many low-income AAPI students arrive on college campuses unprepared to pursue college level work, AANAPISIs have implemented programs focused on developmental skills and academic success to serve their needs. Some AANAPISIs are infusing their curricula with AAPI history and culture so as to empower students and build their self-esteem in terms of their development and identity and also working to increase the presence of AAPI faculty on their campuses while they conduct professional development workshops with existing faculty to help these individuals better understand the complexities of the AAPI student population (Park & Teranishi, 2007; Teranishi, 2010).

Concluding Thoughts

Throughout this article, we have explored the rise of Minority Serving Institutions, including how changing demographics have shaped our colleges and universities and the way they operate. But more importantly we have illuminated the importance of providing educational opportunities to address our nation's history of marginalizing minorities' role in determining their own education. Through a combination of religious missionaries, philanthropists, the federal and state governments, and individual contributions, Minority Serving Institutions have survived and in many cases thrived over the course of their existence. Although operating with fewer resources than majority institutions and often considered "on the margins" of higher

⁷ For groups who came as political or economic refugees, this experience often includes poverty: in 2010, 39% of Hmong, 20% of Samoans, and 6% of Filipinos lived below the poverty line.

education, MSIs have taken on a major role in educating the nation's rapidly growing and increasingly diverse population.

Although MSIs are distinct and have distinctive issues depending on sector, size, region, and selectivity, research shows us that they have many commonalities both historically and in the current day. We hope the researchers interested in exploring the contributions and challenges faced by Minority Serving Institutions will consider the rich and diverse, yet intermingled histories of MSIs as well as the histories that focus entirely on one sector of MSIs. For too long MSIs, and their histories, have operated in siloes and although this allows for depth, it also fails to demonstrate the connections across racial and ethnic groups. Future research can examine themes that cut across MSIs, including legislative action, coalition building, funding, student success initiatives, performance-based evaluation, and leadership issues. This kind of research will assist in building coalitions within research, among researchers, and perhaps across practice and institutions as MSI-related research is routinely used by MSIs to demonstrate their contributions to students. Lastly, intermingled research on MSIs has the potential to more fully inform future conversations about our diverse nation of students and the institutions that serve them.

References

- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., & Haniff, N. Z. (1991). *College in Black and White: African American students in predominantly White and in Historically Black public universities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- American Indian Higher Education Consortium. (1999). *Tribal Colleges: An introduction*. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the south, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5149/unccp/9780807842218>
- Aud, S., Fox, M., & KewalRamani, A. (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic Groups* (NCES 2010–2015). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Benitez, M. (1998). Hispanic Serving Institutions: Challenges and opportunities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 102, 57–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he.10205>
- Bolt, C. (1987). *American Indian policy and American reform: Case studies of the campaign to assimilate American Indians*. London, UK: Allen and Unwin.
- Boyer, P. (1989). *Tribal colleges: Shaping the future of Native America*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, P. (1997). *Native American colleges: Progress and prospects. An Ernest L. Boyer Project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, P. (2002). Defying the odds: Tribal colleges conquer skepticism but still face persistent challenges. *Tribal College Journal* (2), 12–19.
- Chafe, W. (1981). *Civilities and civil rights: Greensboro, NC, and the Black struggle for freedom*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cunningham, A. F., & Hiestand, R. (2007). *The Path of many journeys: The benefits of higher education for Native people and communities*. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Davis, J. J., & Markham, P. L. (1991). Student attitudes toward foreign language study at Historically and Predominantly Black Institutions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 227–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00467.x>
- Dayton, B., Gonzalez-Vasquez, N., Martinez, C. R., & Plum, C. (2004). Hispanic-Serving Institutions through the eyes of students and administrators. *New Directions for Student Services*, 105, 29–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ss.114>
- De Los Santos, A., Jr., & De Los Santos, G. (2003). Hispanic Serving Institutions in the 21st century: Overview, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2, 377–391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1538192703256734>
- Drinnon, R. (1989). *Keeper of the concentration camps: Dillon S. Meyer and American racism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fletcher, M. (1998). White House backs plan to aid Hispanic Serving Colleges. *Washington Post*, p. A10.
- Flores, S. M., & Morfin, O. J. (2008). Another side of the percent plan story: Latino enrollment in the Hispanic-serving institutions sector in California and Texas. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Sotello Viernes (Eds.), *Understanding minority serving Institutions* (pp. 141–155). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Freeman, K. (1999). HBCs or PWIs? African American high school students' consideration of higher education institution types. *Review of Higher Education*, 23, 91–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1999.0022>
- Fries-Britt, S. L., & Turner, B. (2002). Uneven stories: Successful Black collegians at a Black and a

- White campus. *Review of Higher Education*, 25, 315–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0012>
- Gasman, M. (2007). *Envisioning Black Colleges: A history of the United Negro College Fund*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gasman, M., Baez, B., & Sotello Viernes, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Understanding minority serving institutions*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Golway, T., & Krantz, L. (2010). *Day by day*. New York, NY: Running Press.
- Gonzalez, J. (2011). *Harvest of empire: A history of Latinos in America*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Guillory, J., & Ward, K. (2007). American Tribal Colleges and Universities. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Sotello Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority serving institutions*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Institute for Higher Education Policy. (2006). *Championing success: A report on the progress of tribal college and university alumni*. Washington, DC: American Indian College Fund.
- Kanazawa, M. (2005). Immigration, exclusion, and taxation: Anti-Chinese legislation Gold Rush in California. *The Journal of Economic History*, 64, 779–805.
- LaCounte, D. (1987). American Indiana students in college. In D. J. Wright (Ed.), *Responding to the needs of today's minority students* (pp. 65–79). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laden, B. V. (2001). Hispanic Serving Institutions: Myths and realities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76, 73–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327930PJE7601_05
- Lee, E. (2007). *At America's gates: Chinese immigrants during the Exclusion Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Macahmer, A. M. (1989). Tribally controlled community colleges: An assessment of student satisfaction. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 13, 119–128.
- Massey, D., Durane, J., & Malone, N. (2003). *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an era of economic integration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mercer, C. J., & Stedman, J. B. (2008). Minority-serving institutions: Selected institutional and student characteristics. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Sotello Viernes (Eds.), *Understanding minority serving institutions* (pp. 28–42). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Meriam, L. (1928). *The problem of Indian administration*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miller, J. (1901). The Chinese and the Exclusion Act. *The North American Review*, 173, 782–789.
- Minor, J. T. (2004). Decision making in historically Black colleges and universities: Defining the governance context. *Journal of Negro Education*, 73, 40–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3211258>
- Nasim, A., Roberts, A., Harrell, J. P., & Young, H. (2005). Non-cognitive predictors of academic achievement for African Americans across cultural contexts. *Journal of Negro Education*, 74, 344–358.
- National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2011, HBCU Enrollment Rates component.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Bridges, B. K., Morelon-Quainoo, C. L., Williams, J. M., & Holmes, M. S. (2007). African American and Hispanic student engagement at minority serving and predominantly white institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 39–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0005>
- Nixon, R. M. (1970). *Message from the President of the United States transmitting recommendations for Indian Policy*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- O'Donnell, M. (2003). Information technology and tribal colleges and universities: Moving into the 21st century. In M. Kape'ahiokalani Padeken & W. J. Stein (Eds.), *The renaissance of American Indian higher education: Capturing the dream* (pp. 257–272). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Palmer, R. T., Davis, R. J., & Maramba, D. C. (2010). Role of an HBCU in supporting academic success for underprepared Black males. *Negro Educational Review*, 61, 85–106.
- Palmer, R., & Gasman, M. (2008). It takes a village to raise a child: The role of social capital in promoting academic success for African American men at a Black college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49, 52–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2008.0002>
- Park, J., & Teranishi, R. (2007). Asian American and Pacific Islander Serving Institutions. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C. Sotello Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority serving institutions*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Phillips, J. L. (2003). A Tribal College Land Grant perspective: Changing the conversation. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 42, 22–35.
- Pitt, L., & Gutierrez, R. (1999). *Decline of the Californios: A social history of the Spanish-speaking Californios, 1846–1890*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Provasnik, S., & Shafer, L. L. (2005). Historically Black Colleges and Universities, 1976 to 2001. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 6, 91–99.
- Santiago, D. A. (2007). *Choosing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs): A closer look at Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.

- Santiago, D. A. (2008). *Modeling Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs): Campus practices that work for Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Santiago, D. A., & Andrade, S. J. (2010). *Emerging Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs): Serving Latino students*. Washington, DC: Excelencia in Education.
- Stein, W. (1990). Founding of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium. *Tribal College Journal*, 2, 1–5.
- Teranishi, R. (2011). *National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education Report*. New York, NY: New York University.
- Thelin, J. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, J. (2007). *Self taught: African American education in slavery and freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5149/uncp/9780807858219>

Received November 29, 2013

Revision received August 6, 2014

Accepted September 15, 2014 ■

Members of Underrepresented Groups: Reviewers for Journal Manuscripts Wanted

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for APA journals, the APA Publications and Communications Board would like to invite your participation. Manuscript reviewers are vital to the publications process. As a reviewer, you would gain valuable experience in publishing. The P&C Board is particularly interested in encouraging members of underrepresented groups to participate more in this process.

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts, please write APA Journals at Reviewers@apa.org. Please note the following important points:

- To be selected as a reviewer, you must have published articles in peer-reviewed journals. The experience of publishing provides a reviewer with the basis for preparing a thorough, objective review.
- To be selected, it is critical to be a regular reader of the five to six empirical journals that are most central to the area or journal for which you would like to review. Current knowledge of recently published research provides a reviewer with the knowledge base to evaluate a new submission within the context of existing research.
- To select the appropriate reviewers for each manuscript, the editor needs detailed information. Please include with your letter your vita. In the letter, please identify which APA journal(s) you are interested in, and describe your area of expertise. Be as specific as possible. For example, “social psychology” is not sufficient—you would need to specify “social cognition” or “attitude change” as well.
- Reviewing a manuscript takes time (1–4 hours per manuscript reviewed). If you are selected to review a manuscript, be prepared to invest the necessary time to evaluate the manuscript thoroughly.

APA now has an online video course that provides guidance in reviewing manuscripts. To learn more about the course and to access the video, visit <http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/review-manuscript-ce-video.aspx>.