ISSUE BRIEF

Minority-Serving Institutions: Doing More with Less

BY ALISA CUNNINGHAM, EUNKYOUNG PARK, AND JENNIFER ENGLE

February 2014

INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY
1825 K Street, N.W., Suite 720
Washington, DC 20006

202 861 8223 TELEPHONE
202 861 9307 FACISIMILE
www.ihep.org WEB

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

There are many people to thank for contributing to this report. We first would like to thank the Institute for Higher Education (IHEP) staff who helped in this effort, including Michelle Asha Copper, president; Christen Cullum Hairston, former research analyst; and Kladé J. Hare, senior project administrator. We especially want to thank Kladé for her excellent work in arranging and supporting the related webinar on this topic, which was the basis for the case stories highlighted in this paper.

We are especially grateful to the four institutions that participated in the webinar and were leaders in the Lumina Minority-Serving Institutions (MSI)-Models of Success program: De Anza College, North Carolina Central University, Salish Kootenai College, and University of Texas at El Paso.

In addition, we express our gratitude to Lumina Foundation for their support for the Models of Success program, this paper series, and the broader conversation about MSIs fostered by this important work.

Lastly, we give special acknowledgement to Tia T. Gordon at TTG+PARTNERS and Widmeyer Communications for their efforts to disseminate the findings and stories from the Lumina MSI-Models of Success program.

Although many have contributed their thoughts and feedback throughout the production of this report, the views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions, the funder, or the communications partners.

Recognizing the Role of MSIs in Raising Attainment

Despite clamoring rhetoric to the contrary, getting a college degree is not only still worth it, but indeed absolutely critical to improving the economic and social well-being of our nation's citizens.[1] This is especially true for those communities that have been persistently underserved by our educational system, namely low-income, first-generation, and minority populations.[2] Efforts to increase the number of people earning credentials in this country must, therefore, focus first and foremost on these populations and the institutions that serve them, with particular attention to Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs).

The potential for raising postsecondary attainment nationally by investing in MSIs clearly exists. From Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) to Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) to Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs), MSIs enroll more than five million undergraduate students, of which about 3.5 million are students of color.[3] That's one in five of all undergraduates and two in five undergraduate students of color. And yet, as the data here show, these institutions receive far fewer resources on average, despite serving students who not only need more academic and financial support to succeed but who could also contribute considerably more to the collective good of the country by earning their college degrees.

This brief provides new and updated data on MSIs, the students they serve, and the fiscal challenges they face in serving those students well. The brief also highlights the efforts of several MSIs to improve the educational experience and outcomes of their students despite funding inequities and inadequacies.[4] This is the final brief in a series to disseminate the activities and findings of the Lumina MSI-Models of Success project (see **BOX 1**), which supported a select group of MSIs to improve degree completion at their institutions.[5]

[1] Baum, S., Ma, J., and Payea, K. 2010. *Education Pays 2010: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society*. Washington, DC: The College Board; Dynarski, S. M., and Turner, S. "Ignore the Hype: College Is a Great Investment," CNN Money, aired on June 12, 2012.

[2] Institute for Higher Education Policy. 2012. *The Investment Payoff: Reassessing and Supporting Efforts to Maximize the Benefits of Higher Education for Underserved Populations.* Washington, DC.

[3] Because Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs) are a relatively new designation and differ from other MSIs in important ways, this brief describes the role of AANAPISIs separately (see **BOX 3**).

[4] Content for this brief is drawn in part from a webinar hosted by IHEP in June 2013. See www.ihep.org/events/event-detail.cfm?id=38 for more information.

[5] Previous briefs have highlighted the role of data in driving program improvements, the development of alternative, complementary measures of success, and changes in developmental education practices at MSIs. Available for download from www.ihep.org.

BOX 1: Lumina MSI-Models of Success Program

Beginning in fall 2009 and concluding in 2013, this program sought to dramatically increase college completion, especially among first-generation students, low-income students, and students of color, by partnering with more than 25 institutions and other organizations around a collective MSI success agenda. The Lumina MSI-Models of Success program had five main objectives:

1. To improve the capacity of MSIs to collect, analyze, and use data to inform decisions that will promote student success.
2. To create a collective voice for policy advocacy on behalf of MSIs.
3. To strengthen policy and practice to improve developmental education.
4. To increase MSIs' commitment to transparency and effectiveness in improving student learning outcomes.
5. To increase the postsecondary completion of traditionally underserved students, especially men of color.

As the key intermediary for the initiative, IHEP provided technical assistance and support for the lead grantees and assisted with the documentation and dissemination of project findings to inform the higher education success policy agenda at the federal, state, and institutional levels.

Participating Institutions and Organizations:

American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Alexandria, Va.

California State University Monterey Bay, Monterey, Calif.
Hartnell College, Salinas, Calif.
Cabrillo College, Aptos, Calif.

Florida International University, Miami, Fla.
Miami Dade College, Miami, Fla.

Jackson State University, Jackson, Miss.
Alcorn State University, Alcorn, Miss.
Dillard University, New Orleans, La.
Hinds Community College, Utica, Miss.
Miles College, Fairfield, Ala.
Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss.

Salish Kootenai College, Pueblo, Mont.
Fort Peck Community College, Poplar, Mont.

Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.

University of North Carolina System, Chapel Hill, N.C.
Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, N.C.
Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, N.C.
North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, N.C.
North Carolina Central University, Durham, N.C.
University of North Carolina-Pembroke, Pembroke, N.C.
Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, N.C.

University of Texas El Paso, El Paso, Texas
El Paso Community College, El Paso, Texas
Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas
Texas A&M International University, Laredo, Texas

Bold indicates a lead institutional or organizational grantee.

BOX 2: Defining MSIs

MSIs have different histories, characteristics, and missions, all under the broad umbrella of educating students of color. Some MSIs, such as HBCUs and TCUs, were established with the mission of serving specific populations and have been designated by statute. For example, many HBCUs were first established after the passage of the second Morrill Act of 1890, which provided funding for land-grant colleges for African-American students in segregated states, and then affirmed in the Higher Education Act of 1965 as a broader set of HBCUs established prior to 1964.[6] TCUs were first formally recognized with the first Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act in 1978, and then with land-grant status for designated TCUs in 1994.

The other MSIs—HSIs, PBIs, and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs)—have evolved due to large numbers of students of color in their student bodies and have been defined by demographic characteristics (i.e., the proportion of students of color served by the institution). For example, the rapid growth of HSIs led to a federal designation through the Higher Education Act in 1992[7] and, with a more than 40 percent increase in the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) population over the past decade,[8] AANAPISIs were designated in 2008.[9]

In addition to the above definitions, to officially receive an MSI designation for purposes of receiving federal funds, colleges and universities must *apply* for eligibility for Title III/V programs, which includes demonstrating a certain level of institutional need, based on a high proportion of low-income students or relatively low expenditures per student.[10] Thus, there are a number of ways to define these institutions, from a broad perspective of understanding which institutions are serving students of color and how they integrate historical and cultural traditions to a more focused look at institutions that serve students of color with the most need.[11]

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)

HBCUs in the United States date back to 1837—all were founded before 1964—and pioneered today's concept of the MSI. While these institutions were founded primarily for the education of African Americans, their charters were not exclusionary. Today, most of the 106 HBCUs[12] are four-year public or private institutions, though several are two-year institutions. Most are located in the South or Southeast.

[6] Called "Part B" institutions, referring to a section in Title III of the HEA. Note that the number and composition of HBCUs has changed slightly over time, with closures or mergers of some institutions.

[7] Also amended in 1998. Designated under Title V.

[8] White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. 2013. "The AAPI Community: Demographics, Infographic." Available at: web.cof.org/2013Annual/docs/AC13_SessionMaterial_FindingThePerfectMatch_Demographics.pdf.

[9] Established by Congress in 2007 as part of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act and expanded in 2008 under the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

[10] For more information about definitions and eligibility, see the U.S. Department of Education's website for the Title III/V programs (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/idues/index.html). Generally, the eligibility requirements of Title III/V are that an institution must have at least 50 percent of its degree-seeking students receiving need-based assistance under Title IV of the Higher Education Act, or have a substantial number of enrolled students receiving Pell grants, and have low educational and general expenditures. Each year, the U.S. Department of Education publishes a list of eligible institutions.

[11] When referring to MSIs designated as serving students with the most need in this brief, we use the 2012 Title III/V eligibility list, available at www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/idues/t3t5-eligibles-2012.pdf. Note that other MSIs may be similarly in need but did not apply for the designation.

[12] One hundred institutions are currently identified as HBCUs in the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), including three graduate-only institutions and one recently accredited institution that are not included in the analysis. There are six additional HBCUs in the White House Initiative list (www.ed.gov/edblogs/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/), of which four are not included in the analysis, due to their accreditation status in IPEDS. The analyses in this report, thus, include 98 HBCUs in total.

BOX 2: Defining MSIs (continued)

Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs)

The Navajo Nation created the first Tribal College (now known as Diné College) in 1968 in Arizona to provide affordable and culturally specific education to American Indians. There are currently 36 TCUs according to the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC)[13]—with 78 campuses in more than 15 states and representing more than 250 federally recognized tribes. TCUs are predominantly public two-year institutions and traditionally are located on reservations or other tribally-controlled lands, many of which are in extremely rural areas.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)

HSIs are defined here as accredited degree-granting colleges and universities with Hispanic students accounting for 25 percent or more of full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollment.[14] Hence, with only a few exceptions, they are not institutions formed for the specific purpose of educating Hispanic students. Currently, there are 356 HSIs, the majority of which are community colleges located in California, Florida, New Mexico, and Texas.[15] In 2012, 244 HSIs were eligible for Title III/V aid, according to the U.S. Department of Education, which means they met both demographic and financial need requirements.

Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs)

PBIs are defined here as institutions that have undergraduate enrollment of at least 40 percent African-American students, but are not HBCUs.[16] There are currently 156 PBIs, primarily public two-year institutions or small private nonprofits concentrated in the Southeast. In 2012, 53 PBIs were on the list of eligibility for Title III/V aid.

Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs)

AANAPISIs are the most recent MSI designation, first recognized in 2008. They are defined here as having at least 10 percent of undergraduate enrollment as AAPI students.[17] There are currently 307 AANAPISIs in the United States with a population of students that encompasses more than 48 different ethnicities. AANAPISIs tend to be four- and two-year public institutions located on either the East or West Coast. Almost 100 AANAPISIs were serving AAPI students in need as evidenced by inclusion on the 2012 Title III/V list. However, since the beginning of the program in 2008, only 21 institutions have received funding.[18] Because AANAPISIs are a relatively new designation and differ from other MSIs in important ways, this brief describes AANAPISIs separately (see **BOX 3**).

[13] Our analyses include the 33 TCUs that are currently included in IPEDS.

[14] Based on the federal definition outlined for the Title V program, where an HSI has an enrollment of undergraduate full-time equivalent (FTE) students that is at least 25 percent Hispanic students at the end of the award year immediately preceding the date of application.

[15] Analyses based on fall 2011 IPEDS data using FTE undergraduate enrollment, similar to the methodology used by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and *Excelencia* in Education. Two institutions were excluded from our analysis due to degree-granting status.

[16] This definition is similar to the demographic criteria for Title III eligibility, which states that at least 40 percent of enrolled undergraduate students are African American. The other criteria for the program (which are not used here due to data availability) are that the institutions have at least 1,000 undergraduate students, of which not less than 50 percent are low-income individuals or first-generation college students, and of which not less than 50 percent of the undergraduate students are enrolled in an educational program leading to a bachelor's or associate's degree.

[17] This definition matches the demographic part of the federal eligibility requirement for the Title III program, which states that at least 10 percent of an institution's enrolled undergraduate students are Native American or Asian American and Pacific Islander.

[18] National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education. 2013. *Partnership for Equity in Education through Research (PEER): Findings from the First Year of Research on AANAPISIs.* New York City, NY.

Considering MSIs in a National Context

In 2011–12, the 634 MSIs included in this analysis—HBCUs, TCUs, HSIs, and PBIs—comprised 14 percent of all degree-granting, undergraduate-serving institutions.[19] They are concentrated primarily in cities (50 percent) or large suburbs (21 percent) and in the Southeast (32 percent), Far West (19 percent), and Southwest (18 percent), but are located across the country. The majority of MSIs are public institutions—21 percent are four-year institutions and 41 percent are community colleges—but about a third (31 percent) are four-year private nonprofit institutions and another 6 percent are private two-year colleges.

Together, these MSIs enrolled about 5.3 million undergraduates in 2011–12, 22 percent of all undergraduate enrollment and 39 percent of all undergraduate students of color.[20] Each type of MSI also educates a significant proportion of its target population. For example:

- HBCUs comprise only 2 percent of all degree-granting, undergraduate-serving colleges and universities, but enroll 8 percent of all Black undergraduate students. PBIs make up 3 percent of institutions but enroll 11 percent of Black students.
- The small number of TCUs enroll approximately 10 percent of all American Indian students.
- HSIs represent about 8 percent of institutions, but 51 percent of Hispanic enrollment.

MSIs tend to serve students who have been historically disadvantaged in their access to and success in postsecondary education, including low-income and first-generation college students. For example, 44 percent of undergraduates at MSIs received a Pell grant in 2011–12 compared with 38 percent of undergraduates in non-MSIs. Two-thirds of students at HBCUs receive Pell grants. More than half of MSIs have an open admissions policy and as a result admit students who may require developmental education.[21]

Due in part to these factors, students enrolled at MSIs often face barriers to graduating on a timely basis. On average, retention and graduation rates at four-year Minority-Serving Institutions are lower than those of other four-year institutions. For example:

- The six-year graduation rate for bachelor's degree–seeking students is lower at four-year MSIs compared with non-MSIs: 38 percent versus 61 percent, respectively.[22]

[19] Unless cited otherwise, data in this section come from IPEDS surveys in the 2011–12 academic year, the most recently available at the time of analysis. For this section, we included 4,544 degree-granting, undergraduate-serving institutions (public, private, and for-profit), including 634 MSIs and 3,910 non-MSIs, in our analysis. Because we describe AANAPISIs separately, they are excluded from our definition of MSIs, but are included as non-MSIs. Also, some MSIs have more than one designation (e.g., HSI and PBI). These institutions are unduplicated in analyses that aggregate MSIs, but are duplicated in analyses that disaggregate by MSI type.

[20] Based on 12-month unduplicated enrollment, in degree-granting, undergraduate-serving institutions.

[21] Bustillos, L.T. 2012. *Rethinking Remedial Education: The Role of MSIs in Serving Under-Prepared Students in the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

[22] Using the bachelor's or equivalent sub-cohort (four-year institutions) and completers of bachelor's or equivalent degrees within 150 percent of normal time.

TABLE 1.

MSIs Enroll and Graduate Significant Proportions of Minority Undergraduates Nationwide

	INSTITUTIONS		ENROLLMENT		DEGREES	
	# OF INSTITUTIONS	% OF ALL INSTITUTIONS	# OF TARGET POPULATION	% OF TARGET POPULATION	# OF TARGET POPULATION	% OF TARGET POPULATION
HBCUs	98	2%	271,433	8%	31,730	8%
HSIs	354	8%	1,885,457	51%	159,369	40%
PBIs	156	3%	407,028	11%	49,846	13%
TCUs	33	1%	22,128	10%	2,092	8%

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, INTEGRATED POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM (IPEDS) 12-MONTH ENROLLMENT AND COMPLETIONS SURVEYS, 2011–12

NOTES: ENROLLMENT IS 12-MONTH HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATES. UNDERGRADUATE CREDENTIALS INCLUDE BACHELOR'S DEGREES, ASSOCIATE'S DEGREES, AND UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATES. THE SUM OF HBCUs, HSIs, PBIs, AND TCUs (N=641) IS MORE THAN THE NUMBER OF MSIs (N=634) BECAUSE SIX MSI INSTITUTIONS ARE BOTH HBCUs AND HSIs AND ONE MSI INSTITUTION IS BOTH AN HSI AND PBI.

- The three-year graduation rate[23] at two-year MSIs is also lower compared with two-year non-MSIs: 21 percent versus 35 percent (although the higher rate at non-MSIs is partly driven by high certificate completion rates at two-year for-profits).

Despite these lower rates, MSIs are a key part of postsecondary degree production in the United States, especially for students of color, and could produce more with more support. Together, MSIs awarded more than 540,000 undergraduate degrees and certificates in 2011–12, almost 16 percent of all undergraduate completions in that year and 32 percent of all credentials awarded to undergraduate students of color. Each type of MSI confers a substantial proportion, if not the majority, of degrees and certificates to their targeted minority populations as well. For example:

- HBCUs awarded 31,730 degrees and certificates to African-American undergraduates, 8 percent of the total awarded to African-American undergraduates by all institutions. PBIs awarded an additional 49,846 or 13 percent.
- TCUs awarded 2,092 credentials to American Indian students, 8 percent of the total.
- HSIs made 159,369 awards to Hispanic students, 40 percent of the total.

The fact that MSIs both enroll and graduate large numbers of students of color underscores the importance of encouraging and supporting these institutions to help even more of their students complete degrees, which could have a substantial impact on higher education attainment in this country. Institutions such as those involved in the Lumina MSI-Models of Success program accepted the challenge to substantially improve outcomes for their students. And yet, they did so with substantially fewer resources in an era of fiscal instability for all colleges and universities.

[23] Using degree/certificate-seeking students (two-year institutions) and completions within 150 percent of normal time.

Box 3: AANAPISIs

AANAPISIs are a relatively recent designation of MSIs, but play an important role in educating AAPI students. They enrolled 54 percent of AAPI undergraduates and conferred half (52 percent) of all undergraduate degrees and certificates awarded to AAPI students in 2011–12. Although AANAPISIs collectively enroll a large proportion of AAPI students nationally, on average the proportion of AAPI students on these campuses is significantly smaller than at other types of MSIs. In addition, AAPI students are highly diverse academically and financially, and AANAPISIs that serve high proportions of AAPI students most in need may be quite different than those that do not. Therefore, AANAPISIs are described separately here with respect to the successes and challenges they face.[24]

Most AANAPISIs are located in the Far West (52 percent) and in cities (63 percent). Two-thirds are four-year institutions, and only slightly more than a third have an open admissions policy. AANAPISIs tend to have significantly lower proportions of Pell grant recipients (29 percent) and of older students (30 percent) than other MSIs (44 percent and 40 percent, respectively). On average, these institutions have more resources than other MSIs, with higher revenues and expenditures per student, on average, at four-year institutions. On the other hand, AANAPISIs that serve the students most in need[25] are more likely to be public two-year institutions and to have lower tuition and fees than AANAPISIs as a whole. They also have substantially fewer resources than all AANAPISIs, and look more similar to other MSIs in terms of their lower revenues and expenditures per student. These variations within AANAPISIs, and differences between all AANAPISIs and other MSIs, are important to keep in mind with respect to funding and performance.

[24] For more information about AANAPISIs, also see the National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education. 2013. *Partnership for Equity in Education through Research (PEER): Findings from the First Year of Research on AANAPISIs.*

[25] Defined as those institutions that were eligible for Title III/V funding.

Facing Financial Challenges in MSIs

Given the populations that they serve, many MSIs try to hold tuition to levels that are relatively affordable. In 2012–13, for example, published tuition and fees were nearly twice as high at non-MSIs as they were at MSIs. Total cost of attendance is also considerably lower at MSIs (see **TABLE 2**). Yet despite the lower price tag, students attending MSIs do rely heavily on financial aid. As previously noted, almost half of undergraduates at MSIs receive Pell grants, although they are less likely to use federal student loan aid (22 percent versus 44 percent for non-MSIs). And, the amount of aid received is not meeting all the financial need of students at MSIs. The average net price after all sources of grant aid for students with family incomes below $30,000[26] was $10,548 at four-year MSIs and $6,532 at two-year MSIs, which is lower than at non-MSIs but still substantial given the economic circumstances of most MSI students. Unfortunately, it may be difficult for many MSIs to make up for students' remaining financial need given their own, comparatively limited resources.

Virtually all colleges and universities have been dealing with cuts in funding—whether from annual state appropriations, federal cuts to financial aid and other higher education programs, or volatility in investments and endowment earnings—and have increased tuition revenues or reallocated resources on campus as a result.[27] But even beyond economy-wide trends, there is evidence to suggest that MSIs are under-resourced compared with other institutions and consequently spend relatively less per student, which may impact their ability to provide a full range of academic offerings and supports to underserved students.

[26] Among students receiving Title IV aid.

[27] See, for example, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association's annual report on state higher education finance, available at: www.sheeo.org/resources/publications/shef-%E2%80%94-state-higher-educationfinance-fy12; Kirshstein, R. J., and Hurlburt, S. 2012. *Revenues: Where Does the Money Come From? A Delta Data Update, 2000–2010.* Washington, DC: Delta Cost Project at the American Institutes for Research; Desrochers, D.M., and Kirshstein, R. J. 2012. *College Spending in a Turbulent Decade: Findings From the Delta Cost Project, A Delta Data Update, 2000–2010.* Washington, DC: Delta Cost Project at the American Institutes for Research.

TABLE 2.

Prices Are Lower at MSIs, Yet Students Still Face Considerable Unmet Need

	PUBLISHED IN-STATE TUITION AND FEES (2012-13)	TOTAL PRICE FOR IN-STATE STUDENTS LIVING ON CAMPUS (2012-13)	AVERAGE NET PRICE FOR STUDENTS WITH INCOMES OF $30,000 OR LESS (2010-11)
MSI			
4-year	$10,161	$24,152	$10,548
2-year	$3,874	$13,088	$6,532
Non-MSI			
4-year	$18,267	$33,593	$15,735
2-year	$8,118	$16,401	$12,127

NOTE: INCLUDES PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS. TOTAL PRICE FOR IN-STATE STUDENTS INCLUDES ONLY INSTITUTIONS THAT REPORTED FOR STUDENTS LIVING ON CAMPUS. AVERAGE NET PRICES ARE FOR STUDENTS RECEIVING TITLE IV STUDENT AID. PRICES ARE FOR 2012–13, WHILE AVERAGE NET PRICES ARE FOR 2010–11 BASED ON DATA AVAILABILITY AT THE TIME OF ANALYSIS.

BOX 4: FALTERING FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR MSIs

Like many colleges and universities today, MSIs have been impacted by the decreases in state appropriations, changes in student aid programs, and other funding trends that have come with the recent economic recession. To some extent, MSIs have been more negatively impacted than other institutions by these funding challenges, particularly with respect to federal sources of support.

As mentioned, several funding streams are available to MSIs from the federal government to help ameliorate (although not eliminate) the persistent fiscal constraints experienced by these institutions. Among them, the various Title III/V programs provide funding for select MSIs to "improve and strengthen the academic quality, institutional management, and fiscal stability of eligible institutions" through activities such as faculty development, establishment of endowment funds, administrative management, and the development and improvement of academic programs. Unfortunately, in recent years, funding for Title III/V programs has remained flat or decreased.[28] For example, funding for Title III aid for institutional development programs declined from $651 million appropriated in FY 2010 to $567 million in FY 2013.[29] Title V aid for HSIs had $210 million appropriated in FY 2013, down from $239 million in FY 2010.[30] In many cases, the number of institutions receiving new awards through these programs is down considerably. For instance, seven new Title V individual development awards were made to HSIs in FY 2012, compared with 23 in FY 2008.[31]

TCUs represent a special case. They receive little or no funding from state governments, due to their location on federal trust territory; this status also prevents the levying of local property taxes to support higher education—an important source of revenue for most other community colleges. As a result, the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 was created, with funding mandated by Indian Student Count (ISC). However, as noted by AIHEC, funding has yet to meet authorized levels and in fact the level per ISC has recently decreased because funding has not kept pace with enrollment increases.[32]

Other programs, while not specifically targeted toward MSIs, have a substantial impact on their students, especially need-based aid. Although funding for the Pell Grant program increased substantially between 2009–10 and 2011–12,[33] more recently legislation has led to changes such as elimination of summer Pell, reduction of the maximum award time from 18 to 12 semesters, and reduction of the zero-EFC threshold,[34] which may hinder the ability of MSI students to enroll or remain enrolled. In addition, changes to the criteria for the Parent PLUS Loan program resulted in the loss of many parents' ability to secure full funding. At HBCUs alone, this resulted in the loss of more than 6,000 students.[35]

The federal government has long made a commitment to providing the opportunity for MSIs to compete for funding that can help build capacity and improve rates of success at these institutions. Given their importance in increasing the educational attainment of students of color, these types of funding efforts address a worthy goal. In a slowly improving economy that has impacted state budgets and other support, that federal commitment is as important as ever.

[28] The Title III budget line is referred to as "aid for institutional development" and includes the programs for TCUs, AANAPISIs, PBIs, and HBCUs, which together make up the bulk of the funding for MSIs. The Title V budget line is referred to as "aid for Hispanic-Serving Institutions." Figures taken from budget tables on the U.S. Department of Education's website, available at www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/tables.html?src=ct and www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/history/index.html.

[29] Ibid. Includes both mandatory and discretionary funding, post-sequester.

[30] Ibid. Includes both mandatory and discretionary funding, post-sequester. According to the U.S. Department of Education, "for FY 2013 the Education Department made the decision to fund down the FY 2012 slate, in lieu of holding a grant competition, due to the limited funding available in FY 2013," and there were very few new awards. See www2.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/awards.html.

[31] See www2.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3a/funding.html and www2.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/awards.html.

[32] See www.aihec.org/resources/documents/FY13/FY13Approps_2012.pdf.

[33] Baum, S., and Payea, K. 2012. *Trends in Student Aid 2012.* Washington, DC: The College Board.

[34] See, for example, McCann, C. 2012. *Pell Grant Eligibility Changes Bring Savings for the Program.* Washington, DC: New America Foundation; Kingkade, T. "Pell Grant Changes Hurt Southern College Students, University of Alabama Study Finds." *Huffington Post.* Posted on Feb. 14, 2013 at www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/14/pell-grant-changes_n_2680898.html.

[35] Nelson, L. "Cracking Down on PLUS Loans." *Inside Higher Ed.* Posted on Oct. 12, 2012 at www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/12/standards-tightening-federal-plus-loans; Brewster, S. "PLUS Loans Program Changes By Education Department Could Help Thousands Pay For College." *Huffington Post.* Posted on Aug. 14, 2013 at www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/14/plus-loans-educationdepartment_n_3758213.html.

Comparing Revenues and Expenditures at MSIs versus Non-MSIs[36,37]

In fiscal year (FY) 2010, total revenue per FTE student[38] was about $16,648 at four-year MSIs, substantially lower than the $29,833 at non-MSIs. At two-year institutions, total revenue per FTE student was similar to non-MSIs, $10,192 compared with $10,341, but both groups had far fewer resources than four-year institutions (see **TABLE 3**).

Four- and two-year MSIs receive slightly higher levels of funding per student from state and local appropriations than non-MSIs, but both rely much more heavily on this funding as a proportion of their revenue compared to non-MSIs. Four-year MSIs actually receive less federal funding per student than non-MSIs despite the targeted programs aimed at supporting these institutions. In fact, four-year non-MSIs receive more than double the amount of federal appropriations, grants, and contracts[39] than MSIs, which is likely driven by research funding from federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.[40]

MSIs also are much less likely to receive funds from other sources. Together, private gifts, grants, and contracts, investment return, and revenue from affiliated entities made up only 5 percent of total revenue at four-year MSIs, compared with 22 percent at non-MSIs. This is reflected in significantly lower revenue per student from these sources compared with four-year non-MSIs ($863 versus $6,586). As noted previously, MSIs receive considerably less revenue from tuition than non-MSIs, yet they depend heavily upon it, especially at four-year MSIs. Net tuition and fee revenue[41] made up about 42 percent of total revenue at four-year MSIs and 22 percent at two-year MSIs. Thus, the additional revenue that MSIs receive from state and local sources and the targeted federal funds allocated for them, while critical to their operation, are not sufficient to close the funding gap.

[36] The finance data in this section are from the Delta Cost Project for public and private-nonprofit, degree-granting undergraduate-serving institutions (533 MSIs and 2,244 non-MSIs) in FY 2010, the most recent available. For-profit institutions were excluded because the data are considered less reliable and not comparable to those for public and private nonprofit institutions by the Delta Cost Project. The sample in this section differs from the IPEDS sample of MSIs and non-MSIs in the previous section as a result. We used data from the Delta Cost Project for this analysis because it makes adjustments and imputations to IPEDS data to provide more comparable financial data across accounting standards for different institution types. There are several limitations, however. A number of institutions did not report data in 2010 and are not included in this analysis. Also, for institutions (i.e., parent institutions) with branch campuses or other affiliated institutions (i.e., child institutions), the Delta Cost Project groups them and provides aggregated data for parent/child institutions. As a result, 168 child institutions are not included separately in this analysis (45 MSIs and 123 non-MSIs). Of the 45 MSI child institutions, 14 institutions are grouped under MSI parent institutions (and thereby counted with MSIs), while 31 MSI child institutions are grouped under non-MSI parent institutions (and not counted as MSIs). Also, among non-MSI child institutions, 119 institutions were under non-MSI parent institutions, whereas four institutions were under MSI parent institutions. Given the relatively small number of institutions affected, we included all parent/child institutions in the analyses. For more information, see nces.ed.gov/ipeds/deltacostproject/.

[37] Since two-year institutions generally receive lower levels of funding than four-year institutions, we analyzed institutional revenues and expenditures separately by level. Among four-year institutions, levels of funding also vary by type (e.g., Carnegie classification), and there are differences between MSIs and non-MSIs in terms of the mix of institutions by type. For instance, only 8 percent of MSIs are research universities compared to 15 percent of non-MSIs, and research universities tend to have higher levels of funding. However, even when we disaggregated by Carnegie classification, we still found that MSIs receive less and spend less per FTE compared to non-MSIs, so the results are aggregated here for ease of presentation.

[38] Total revenue per FTE student is defined as net tuition; state and local appropriations; state and local contracts; federal appropriations, grants, and contracts net of Pell Grants; private gifts; grants and contracts; and investment return and revenue from affiliated entities. It excludes auxiliaries, hospital, independent operations, and other sources.

[39] The federal funding amounts are net of Pell grants, consistent with Delta Cost Project's definition (Pell grants were excluded if they were reported as federal grants). This category includes revenue received through acts of a federal legislative body, such as direct funds to specific institutions. It also includes revenue from federal governmental agencies for training, research, or public service activities.

[40] The mix of institutions in the MSI and non-MSI groups is different as noted above, with non-MSIs having more research institutions than MSIs. Also, while some MSIs receive substantial federal funding, others do not, especially given that most Title III/V programs have competitive grants and that funding for these programs are limited and have declined in recent years. See **BOX 4**.

[41] Net tuition revenues include all revenues from tuition and fees after tuition discounts.

TABLE 3.

Four-Year MSIs Receive Less Revenue Per Student from Most Sources Compared with Non-MSIs; Two-Year Institutions—MSI and Non-MSI—Receive Less than Four-Year Institutions

	FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS		TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	
	MSI	Non-MSI	MSI	Non-MSI
Total revenue (excluding auxiliaries and other) per FTE	$16,648	$29,833	$10,192	$10,341
Net tuition per FTE	$6,984	$11,391	$2,248	$3,562
Percent of total	42%	38%	22%	34%
State and local appropriations per FTE	$5,446	$4,989	$6,142	$5,077
Percent of total	33%	17%	60%	49%
State and local grants and contracts	$1,107	$1,896	$732	$747
Percent of total	7%	6%	7%	7%
Federal appropriations, grants and contracts per FTE (net Pell)	$2,249	$4,971	$899	$802
Percent of total	14%	17%	9%	8%
Private gifts and investment return	$863	$6,586	$171	$154
Percent of total	5%	22%	2%	1%

SOURCE: IPEDS ANALYTICS: DELTA COST PROJECT DATABASE, 1987–2010, AVAILABLE AT NCES.ED.GOV/IPEDS/DELTACOSTPROJECT/

NOTES: A NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS DID NOT REPORT DATA IN FY 2010 AND ARE NOT INCLUDED. IN TOTAL, 533 MSIs AND 2,244 NON-MSIs, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, WERE INCLUDED IN THIS ANALYSIS; PRIVATE FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WERE EXCLUDED. THE PERCENTAGES IN THIS TABLE MAY NOT ADD TO 100 DUE TO ROUNDING. AVERAGE REVENUES PER FTE STUDENT WERE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING AGGREGATE SUMS ACROSS MSIs AND NON-MSIs. REVENUES DO NOT EQUATE DIRECTLY TO EXPENDITURES DUE TO VARIATIONS IN DATA REPORTING.

Given lower revenues, it is not surprising that MSIs spend significantly less per student than non-MSIs, especially at the four-year level (see **TABLE 4**).[42] In FY 2010, both MSIs and non-MSIs spent upward of one-third of their budgets on instruction. On a per-student basis, though, four-year MSIs spent significantly lower amounts than four-year non-MSIs ($6,275 and $11,222, respectively) on instruction. At two-year institutions, MSIs on average spent slightly less than non-MSIs, $4,152 versus $4,647.

For underserved populations that often have substantial needs, academic and social supports become essential. Although the proportion of funds spent on these supports was slightly higher at MSIs, the actual expenditures per student on student services and academic and institutional support were substantially lower at four-year MSIs ($5,750) compared with non-MSIs ($8,399). At two-year MSIs, spending on these supports was about the same as at non-MSIs, but much lower than at four-year institutions.

Overall, these figures demonstrate that MSIs tend to have fewer resources compared with non-MSIs and, as a result, spend considerably less per student on instruction and other education-related expenses that support student learning. This is a situation we certainly cannot afford to let continue if we are to improve attainment levels in this country. Instead, there is a strong case for investing more in the students and the institutions that can contribute most to our collective aims in terms of the number of underrepresented students served.

[42] Education and general expenditures include instruction, research, public service, student services, academic support, institutional support, grants, and operations and maintenance. They exclude auxiliaries, hospital, independent operations, and other expenses.

TABLE 4.

Reflecting Lower Revenues, MSIs Spend Less Per Student than Non-MSIs

	FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS		TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	
	MSI	Non-MSI	MSI	Non-MSI
Total E&G expenditures per FTE	$16,743	$28,806	$10,592	$10,667
Instruction per FTE	$6,275	$11,222	$4,152	$4,647
Percent of total	37%	39%	39%	44%
Student services, academic support, and institutional support per FTE	$5,750	$8,399	$3,629	$3,528
Percent of total	34%	29%	34%	33%
Research and public service per FTE	$1,638	$6,202	$153	$210
Percent of total	10%	22%	1%	2%
Operations and maintenance per FTE	$1,482	$2,024	$963	$960
Percent of total	9%	7%	9%	9%
Scholarships and fellowships per FTE	$1,599	$959	$1,696	$1,323
Percent of total	10%	3%	16%	12%

SOURCE: IPEDS ANALYTICS: DELTA COST PROJECT DATABASE, 1987–2010, AVAILABLE AT NCES.ED.GOV/IPEDS/DELTACOSTPROJECT/

NOTES: A NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS DID NOT REPORT DATA IN FY 2010 AND ARE NOT INCLUDED. IN TOTAL, 533 MSIs AND 2,244 NON-MSIs, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, WERE INCLUDED IN THIS ANALYSIS; PRIVATE FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WERE EXCLUDED. THE PERCENTAGES IN THIS TABLE MAY NOT ADD TO 100 DUE TO ROUNDING. AVERAGE REVENUES PER FTE STUDENT WERE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING AGGREGATE SUMS ACROSS MSIs AND NON-MSIs.

Doing More With Less at MSIs

Despite the challenges created by chronic underfunding amid an unstable economic climate, some MSIs have charged ahead with trying to improve outcomes for their students. Why? Because the cost of not doing so is just too high—for the students, for the institutions, and for the country.

Here we share profiles of four institutions that participated in the Lumina MSI-Models of Success program,[43] each of which describes how they leveraged the modest financial and technical assistance support from the initiative and other sources to implement policies and programs aimed at helping more of their students successfully earn their degrees. While each institution continues to work toward that goal, their stories are instructive for other colleges and universities willing to accept the challenge, especially Minority-Serving Institutions.

Doing More with Less Using Data-Driven Decision-Making: University of Texas at El Paso

The long-time mission of the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) has been to provide high-quality educational opportunities to the students of its region and UTEP is well on the way toward becoming one of the first national research universities in the United States with a 21st-century student demographic. The vast majority of UTEP's entering students grow up in El Paso, and Hispanic students make up more than 80 percent of the nearly 20,000 undergraduates in attendance.[44] While El Paso is a community with historically high rates of poverty and low rates of educational attainment, enrollment is currently increasing fastest from the poorest neighborhoods in the city and more than half of graduating students are among the first in their families to earn a college degree.[45] This year, UTEP was ranked first for promoting social mobility by *Washington Monthly* and seventh overall among national universities.[46]

Although UTEP is relatively affordable for students—boasting one of the lowest net prices among research universities at $5,164 per year[47]—the institution itself, like most public institutions, faces challenging financial circumstances. Over the past decade, state appropriations have risen only 13 percent, while total operating expenses have increased by 73 percent.[48] According to Donna Ekal, associate provost in the Office for Undergraduate Studies, "Doing more with less has simply become our mantra." To make the

[43] These institutions participated in June 2013 through the Lumina MSI-Models of Success Initiative Webinar: "Doing More with Less, How Minority-Serving Institutions Can Maximize Resources and Implement Cost-Effective Strategies," to share their strategies with a broader audience. More information is available at: www.ihep.org/events/event-detail.cfm?id=38.

[44] See www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.

[45] Data provided by UTEP.

[46] See www.washingtonmonthly.com/college_guide/rankings_2013/national_university_social_mobility.php.

[47] See www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.

[48] Data provided by UTEP.

most of their limited resources, university officials have deliberately deployed their own data to develop programs and policies that align with their students' academic progress, persistence, and success.

Despite the national recognition it has already received, UTEP is striving hard to improve the retention and graduation rates of its students. Currently, 38 percent of first-time, full-time students complete their bachelor's degrees within six years at UTEP,[49] which is below the national average, but better than average for schools with similar student bodies.[50] Because a significant portion of students attend part time or are transfer students—more than 70 percent of students who are awarded degrees at UTEP are not captured by traditional completion measures such as those reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System)—the institution is also focusing on improving degrees awarded as a measure of student success. Total undergraduate degrees awarded increased by 79 percent between 2000 and 2012, while undergraduate enrollment grew by only 26 percent.[51] UTEP attributes much of their success in reaching this goal from their use of campus data "to develop a more robust understanding of our students that does not rely on national studies to tell us about the students on our campus," says Ekal.

What UTEP discovered was that while performance in the first term of studies matters a lot, "student success is a longitudinal process." Students need different supports at different times to continue making progress toward their degrees. To that end, UTEP's Center for Institutional Evaluation Research and Planning (CIERP) created a web-based tool for deans to track students' term-to-term enrollment status, which allows, for instance, advisors to contact students who do not re-enroll, and help them get back on track. Additionally, UTEP found that most major risk factors associated with non-degree completion for first-time students were mitigated by the time they became seniors, so CIERP also created a tool that analyzes the course load and course-taking patterns of seniors in order to provide more accurate advising to move those students along to graduation.

Ekal notes that these data tools were developed with internal staff and without expensive investment in software or vendors. However, she notes that grants from foundations and other external funding sources UTEP received through this and other programs have had a "transformational" impact on building the infrastructure to increase success, and that UTEP has realized a "powerful multiplier effect for these investments" since the tools and analyses they have developed now address almost every aspect of the institutional enterprise. Most importantly, she concludes: "We now have a knowledge infrastructure to develop a culture of data-informed decision-making that has a direct impact on our students' success."

Doing More with Less Through Strategic Planning and Alignment of Resources: North Carolina Central University

North Carolina Central University (NCCU), an HBCU established in 1910, was the nation's first public liberal arts institution founded for African-American students. Today, the majority of the nearly 6,700 undergraduates enrolled are African American, but almost one-fifth are students from other racial/ethnic backgrounds. About 90 percent of students come from North Carolina and many come from low-income families. Just over two in five students (43 percent) who begin as first-time, full-time freshmen earn their bachelor's degree within six years at NCCU.[52] As such, the first priority for the institution according to university leaders is raising its retention and graduation rates.

Doing more with less requires an institution to be strategic with its resources, according to Bernice Duffy Johnson, associate provost and associate vice chancellor for academic affairs at NCCU. To that end, NCCU undertook a comprehensive strategic planning process. Since there were no new funds likely to be available in the

[49] See www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.
[50] See www.collegeresults.org.
[51] Data provided by UTEP.
[52] See www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.

near future, the institution had to determine how best to reallocate existing funds toward their new priorities. As a result, NCCU set up a commission "to identify low productivity programs, non-functioning programs, and waste and inefficiencies in programs, processes, and procedures." Eleven academic programs were eliminated, four departments were merged into two, and the College of Science and Technology and College of Liberal Arts were merged into the College of Arts and Sciences. When all of the changes are fully implemented, Johnson reports that the institution will save about $2 million dollars in the short term and more in the long term.

The savings from the commission have been targeted toward a number of student success efforts at NCCU. Summer bridge, mentoring, and intrusive advising programs implemented as a result of this process have all shown improved retention rates for participants compared to overall rates at the university. In addition, learning communities developed *for faculty* have increased their awareness of new teaching methods and strategies to improve student success in the classroom. As a result, DFW (student grades of D, F, or withdrawal) rates have dropped significantly at NCCU, particularly in introductory STEM courses like biology and math.[53]

These early successes are examples of how articulating the priorities of the institution—and aligning resources along with them—can lead to improved results, even amid budget constraints. As Johnson notes, "Focusing on the strategic priorities of the university caused us to closely examine what we had done in the past and the results of those actions on student success at NCCU. Our students deserve the very best and must not have their dreams deferred because of budget cuts."

Doing More with Less by Leveraging Collaboration and Partnerships: De Anza College

De Anza College, founded in 1967 as part of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, serves more than 23,000 students per term—a diverse population with about two-thirds of students identifying as having Asian American and Pacific Islander, African, or Latino ancestry. Although 85 percent of incoming students who take the exams place into developmental English or math,[54] three-year completion rates are well above the national average at De Anza College, at 61 percent.[55] However, according to Rowena Tomaneng, associate vice president of instruction, "Our efforts have been challenged by budget reductions due to California's fiscal crisis and damaging cuts to public education." Budget levels have decreased by more than $4 million in the past four years,[56] across the campus and in specific programs, and they have lost administrators, support staff, and faculty positions as a result. Despite these cuts, the college has managed to "mobilize and maximize" resources to address budget and staffing shortfalls in part by fostering both internal partnerships between campus programs and external partnerships between the college and the community.

Because many of the programs affected by budget reductions relate to basic skills and underserved students, the college created a task force to coordinate the allocation of several grants[57] to better support developmental and readiness functions at De Anza College. The task force, which includes faculty, administrators, staff, and students, agreed to share labor and other financial resources across these grants in order to ensure that the funds were effectively and efficiently used, especially during this economic crunch time. The federal Title III AANAPISI grant, in particular, has been leveraged by De Anza College to develop strong internal and external collaborations through their IMPACT AAPI program.

More than one-third of students at De Anza College self-identify as being of Asian American and Pacific Islander ancestry. However, disaggregated data show wide differences in college success rates, with Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students exceeding the

[53] Data provided by NCCU.

[54] Data provided by De Anza College.

[55] See www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.

[56] Data provided by De Anza College.

[57] For more information, see the college's website (www.deanza.edu/grants/). According to the website, De Anza College was awarded a five-year grant Title III grant in 2007 to assist students at the developmental level. The Basic Skills Initiative is a collaborative statewide effort to address the needs of academically under-prepared students. Another Title III grant, specific to the AANAPISI program, allowed the creation of the five-year IMPACT AAPI program.

college's average rates while Filipino, Pacific Islander, and Southeast Asian students experience lower rates.[58] Previously, there were few student services or learning cohorts that specifically targeted these populations at De Anza College. Rather than create new programs, the grant builds on existing academic and students services at De Anza College while infusing materials from AAPI studies into all grant components, including learning communities, academic and personal advising, and faculty and staff development.

The rates of success for AAPI students targeted through grant activities have increased, with course success rates in grant-supported sections now well above those overall at the college and with higher persistence rates for participating AAPI students.[59] Tomaneng credits the success of their IMPACT AAPI activities to "using the existing infrastructure of student services and academic initiatives" to institutionalize the effort, rather than spending scarce grant funds at the margins, thereby improving sustainability.

Doing More with Less by Improving Systems Rather than Adding Programs: Salish Kootenai College

Salish Kootenai College (SKC) is the tribal college of the Flathead Indian reservation, with American Indian students from more than 60 tribes comprising 76 percent of the college's population of about 906 students. Fifty-five percent of SKC students are nontraditional-age students, and 70 percent are first-generation college attendees. Unemployment rates are high on the reservation, and more than 80 percent of students are eligible for Pell grants.[60] Salish Kootenai is an open access institution, with 65 percent of students starting in developmental education.[61] According to Stacey Sherwin, director of institutional effectiveness, "All of this adds up to a student population that requires a great deal of support in order to achieve academic success." Completion rates vary from 25 percent to 65 percent depending on the population.[62]

SKC has historically relied on short-term grants to fund particular support programs for particular groups of students. Unfortunately, when the grants went away, so did the programs. In recent years, the college has begun focusing on the system as a whole—institution, faculty/staff, and students—instead of programs. Besides the funding shortfalls inherent in a program-by-program approach, it is also short-sighted such that it engenders a focus on student deficits, says Sherwin. Now, she continues, "we realize that many of the issues that impact student success occur at an institutional level."

Since so many SKC students start in developmental education, the college decided to focus first on the experiences of academically underprepared students. An analysis of the persistence paths of students in development education identified a number of institutional barriers, particularly a lack of coordination of services. Courses were sometimes scheduled at overlapping times, and students might not have been advised into the appropriate coursework. As a result, the college established the Department of Academic Success to serve as a "home base" to coordinate developmental education courses taught by various departments and co-advise all developmental education students along with major advisors.

The college also created interdisciplinary faculty teams to examine student success data then determine the appropriate interventions, such as providing opportunities for faculty members to develop their skills in teaching underprepared learners, which further institutionalized their efforts to improve outcomes for students at Salish Kootenai College.

[58] Data provided by De Anza College.
[59] Data provided by De Anza College.
[60] Institutional characteristics data drawn both from Salish Kootenai College and www.nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator.
[61] Data provided by Salish Kootenai College.
[62] Data provided by Salish Kootenai College.

Conclusion

MSIs are an important part of the higher education landscape as institutions that have graduated millions of students of color, significant proportions of whom come from economically disadvantaged communities where most have never attended college or earned a degree or credential. And yet, MSIs often lack adequate resources to put structures in place to graduate even more of these students.

The colleges and universities profiled in this brief suggest that additional funding from external sources—along with reallocation of existing funding within the institution to support strategic priorities, and targeted use of student academic and support systems—can go a long way toward helping MSIs and their students achieve success. But not all MSIs have access to the support they need to make these types of changes. If these MSIs can do this much more with less, consider how much more they could do—for their students and the country—with *more*.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization committed to promoting access to and success in higher education for all students. Based in Washington, D.C., IHEP develops innovative policy- and practice-oriented research to guide policymakers and education leaders, who develop high-impact policies that will address our nation's most pressing education challenges.

IHEP

INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY
1825 K Street, N.W., Suite 720
Washington, DC 20006

202 861 8223 TELEPHONE
202 861 9307 FACISIMILE
www.ihep.org WEB