Guest Editors

Taryn Ozuna Allen
Texas Christian University

Charles Lu
University of California, San Diego

Emily Calderón Galdeano
Elevate Consulting Group

Editors

Patricia Sánchez
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Antonio J. Camacho
AMAE, Inc.

Associate Editors

Julie L. Figueroa
Sacramento State

Lucila D. Ek
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Managing Editor

Christian Fallas-Escobar
The University of Texas at San Antonio

In a State of Becoming: How Institutions Communicate Asian American and Pacific Islander- and Latinx-Servingness Through Campus Artifacts

Cynthia Maribel Alcantar

University of Nevada, Reno

Blanca E. Rincón

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Kristine Jan Espinoza

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Abstract

This study examines the ways campus artifacts communicate Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI)- and Latinx-servingness at dually designated Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs) and Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). Using critical ethnographic methods, the researchers collected data at three AANAPISI-HSIs regionally concentrated in a western state. Findings from this study reveal that the campus environments of the three institutions were in a state of flux and are captured through two interconnected themes that emerged from the data: striving to become and undermining progress towards becoming. This study has implications for understanding how AANAPISI-HSIs communicate AAPI- and Latinx-servingness through campus artifacts.

Keywords: Minority Serving Institutions, campus artifacts, ethnographic methods

Physical artwork, signage, graffiti, architecture, and digital platforms are examples of artifacts on college campuses; each communicates implicit and explicit messages about the mission, roles, safety, and belonging related to race/ethnicity (Banning et al., 2008). Campus artifacts also communicate messages about racism and whiteness of an institution. For instance, at historically white institutions (HWIs), whiteness is communicated and normalized through naming buildings after white men. By examining campus artifacts, we can better understand how higher education institutions institutionalize their support for racially/ethnically minoritized students. This paper examines campus artifacts at dually designated Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs) and Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)—two types of federally designated Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs).

AANAPISIs and HSIs are institutions that enroll at least 10% and 25% Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) and Latinx students, respectively, of which at least 50% demonstrate financial need, and that take the added step of applying for federal designation through the U.S. Department of Education. Institutions meeting both the AANAPISI and HSI designation requirements can apply for both, hence the name dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs.[1] The federal designation makes them eligible to apply for public and private monies set aside for MSIs.[2] Examining campus artifacts at these institutions is important because most AANAPISIs and HSIs become eligible for these designations after long histories of being predominantly white institutions (PWIs). Certainly, AANAPISIs and HSIs serve AAPIs and Latinxs by providing greater access to college opportunities; AANAPISIs enroll 20% AAPI and 28.7% Latinx undergraduate students, and HSIs enroll 49% Latinxs and 8.3% AAPIs (Espinosa et al., 2019). However, enrolling large proportions of AAPIs and Latinxs and becoming designated as AANAPISIs and HSIs does not mean they change their institutional policies and practices to serve these students, which means that some AANAPISIs and HSIs carry a legacy of whiteness as HWIs. Additionally, considering the relatively low threshold of AAPI and Latinx enrollment required for federal designation, it could very well be that these institutions are still predominantly white. This means that an institution can simultaneously be an AANAPISI, HSI, PWI, and HWI. Moreover, some institutions also meet the eligibility to become dually

---

[1] Designations are listed in alphabetical order so as to not privilege one over the other.
[2] Institutions are eligible for funding through Title III and Title V of the Higher Education Act, but with some restrictions (U.S. Department of Education, 2020).

designated and may choose to pursue one of the designations and/or grant programs, and not the other, or none at all.

To internal and external members of the institution, these choices imply, whether intentionally or not, that an institution is choosing which racial/ethnic group to serve (Yang & Masulit, 2018). "Servingness," as defined by Garcia and Koren (2020), is an institution's ability to "enroll and educate Latinx students through a culturally enhancing approach that centers Latinx ways of knowing and being, with the goal of providing transformative experiences that lead to both academic and nonacademic outcomes" (p. 2). One indicator of servingness is an institution's structures for serving (Garcia et al., 2019). These organizational-level structures for serving include mission statements, diversity plans, HSI grants, compositional diversity, culturally responsive curriculum, programs and services for minoritized students, etc. Garcia et al. (2019) contend that structures for serving are impacted by external forces, such as federal MSI legislation, and impact Latinx student's validating and racialized experiences, and academic and non-academic outcomes. Additionally, Garcia (2019) also recognizes that "becoming" Hispanic-Serving is a process that happens over time. This body of work demonstrates the importance of organizational structures and the process of transformation an institution must go through to go beyond Latinx-enrolling and HSI designated to being Latinx-serving. While Garcia's work is focused on HSIs, other scholars have documented the complexities behind an institution's pursuit and promotion of the AANAPISI designation and its influence on the institution's organizational culture, structures, and practices (Alcantar et al., 2019; Yang & Masulit, 2018).

This study extends Garcia et al.'s (2019) conceptualization of "servingness" by examining the physical and digital campus structures of serving and applying this framework to dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs. More specifically, this study examines AAPI- and Latinx-servingness through the following research questions: *What do campus artifacts at AANAPISI-HSIs communicate about serving AAPI and Latinx students? In what ways is AAPI- and Latinx-servingness communicated differently through campus artifacts?*

Conceptual Framework

To extend Garcia et al.'s (2019) framework for serving, particularly the structures of serving, to include campus artifacts, this study utilizes Banning et al.'s (2008) equity climate framework. Banning et al.'s (2008) framework is part of a line of inquiry that examines the

impact of physical campus settings on student development. The equity climate framework examines how campus artifacts communicate implicit and explicit messages about equity and diversity. It "is composed of four dimensions: (a) the type of artifact, (b) the equity parameters relevant to groups within the organization, (c) the content of the message [particularly belonging, safety, equality, and roles], and (d) the equity approach level of the message" (p. 42). These dimensions are used to evaluate campus artifacts. Campus artifacts include artwork (e.g., murals, statuary), signage (i.e., building names), graffiti, and architecture (e.g., buildings; Banning et al., 2008). The authors expand the conception of campus artifacts by including digital platforms (Torres & Zerquera, 2012) and a campus' geography (Alcantar et al., 2020).

The level of equity that a campus artifact communicates is assessed at four levels: negative, null, contributions/additive, and transformational/social action. Negative implies the presence of a discriminatory artifact, while null means no campus artifact communicates equity; the artifact, therefore, normalizes the dominant environment (e.g., centers whiteness). The contribution/additive level denotes the presence of positive artifacts, but without an intentional equity approach. The transformational/social action level combines equity-focused artifacts and a demonstrated commitment to equity. Taken together, campus artifacts and their locations communicate organizational culture, values, and priorities about equity. Campus artifacts influence institutional members' meaning-making, perceptions, and actions towards others, impacting decision-making, policies, and practices that affect racially/ethnically minoritized students, staff, and faculty.

The literature on campus artifacts has documented their positive *and* negative impacts on student learning, academic and social engagement, and success (Banning et al., 2008). Research has found that for racially/ethnically minoritized students, campus artifacts are particularly important for social integration, racial/ethnic identity development, and a sense of belonging (Andrade, 2018; Lozano, 2010; Patton, 2006). Most research on campus artifacts has focused on racially/ethnically minoritized students' perspectives at PWIs. The limited literature on campus artifacts at MSIs has highlighted their importance for racially/ethnically minoritized students. A case study focused on the reduced sense of belonging felt by Joy, a Diné (Navajo) woman enrolled at an HSI, in response to her university's seal depicting a frontiersman and Spanish conquistador, and artwork negatively portraying Indigenous people (Desai & Abeita, 2017). The authors highlight that these campus artifacts are "a daily reminder of historical

trauma and erasure" (p. 285) that contribute to Native students' marginalization. Another study highlighted institutional agents' critical role in developing campus artifacts for AAPIs at AANAPISIs (Alcantar et al., 2020). Our study extends this literature by locating this phenomenon within dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs.

As conceptual frameworks, Banning et al. (2008) provide a mechanism for identifying and categorizing campus artifacts with an eye towards equity, while Garcia et al. (2019) surface how these artifacts demonstrate an institution's commitment to serving AAPI and Latinx students. Notably, while Banning et al.'s (2008) framework is equity-centered, it lacks a focus on race/ethnicity, which Garcia et al. (2019) provide. For example, at one level, the researchers identified the type of artifact and its equity messaging. At another level, the researchers inferred whether the artifact highlighted a particular race/ethnicity through its messaging.

Methodology

In line with our conceptual frameworks, this study draws on data collected from a larger critical ethnographic research study of dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs and their campus environments. Critical ethnographies seek to uncover power inequities embedded within social institutions (Carspecken, 1996), in this case, institutions of higher education. Further, ethnographic designs are ideal for studying institutional cultures and environments (Spradley, 1980). As such, the researchers relied on critical ethnographic methods to understand how campus artifacts located at AANAPISI-HSIs reflect an institution's commitment to, and institutionalization of, diversity and equity.

This study was conducted at three AANAPISI-HSIs, regionally concentrated[3] in the west: Desert Community College (DCC), Desert State College (DSC), and Desert University (DU) (pseudonyms). Focusing on AAPI- and Latinx-servingness through campus artifacts at regionally-concentrated AANAPISI-HSIs is important because it helps us understand how public colleges serve two of the fastest-growing and largest populations in this geographical region. Latinxs are the second-largest racial/ethnic group in this region at 29% (U.S. Census, 2020). Although AAPIs are only 10% of the region's population, they are the fastest growing and one of the largest in the U.S. mainland (U.S. Census, 2020). Additionally, over a third of the county speaks a language other than English, with Spanish and Tagalog being the top languages. These

---

[3] The region is masked to maintain the anonymity of the institutions.

institutions were selected because they strategically pursued and received AANAPISI-HSI federal designations and grants within the last five years. We provide a brief profile of each institution below.

DCC, a large, public, multi-campus community college, serves a large, urban, metropolitan area. It enrolls approximately 30,000 undergraduates, about one-tenth and one-third of whom identify as AAPI and Latinx, respectively. DCC primarily awards associate degrees but offers several four-year degree options. DSC is a small, public institution located in the county's outskirts, serving rural-suburban and large-urban metropolitan areas. As a four-year institution, it enrolls approximately 4,000, mostly part-time undergraduate students. About one-tenth of DSC's students identify as AAPI and one-third as Latinx. DU is a large, public, research-intensive, doctorate-granting university serving a large, urban, metropolitan area. DU enrolls approximately 25,000 undergraduates, the majority attending full-time. About one-tenth of its students identify as AAPI and one-third as Latinx.

Data Sources and Procedures

In line with ethnographic approaches, and to better understand each institution's campus environment, observation methods were employed to gather various data sources: observation notes, photographs, and documents (e.g., campus maps) available online through the institution's websites. These multiple data sources allowed for triangulation during data analysis. Formal observations were conducted in-person and online via institutional websites for each campus, during the spring and summer of 2020. To ensure trustworthiness, multiple researchers visited each campus. Upon the closing of campuses in late spring due to the global pandemic, only online observations were collected. Researchers utilized an observation protocol to aid in the systematic observation of campus artifacts. The protocol prompted observers to describe the architecture, location of buildings, signage, and artwork, among other things. The protocol also prompted observers to infer the messaging of the campus artifacts, such as how the artifact is reflective of AAPI and Latinx students. During observations, the researchers also collected photographs of campus artifacts that communicated "servingness." Collectively, researchers conducted approximately 17 hours of observations and obtained over 270 photographs.

Data Analysis

To begin our analysis, we reviewed the observation notes, photographs, and documents. Then, we developed a codebook to aid in analyzing the data. Utilizing Banning et al.'s (2008) equity taxonomy for visual data, we developed initial codes related to each dimension: type of artifact, equity group parameters, message type, and equity approach. In the first coding cycle, two research team members independently hand-coded the various data sources using the codebook. Then, we met to discuss discrepancies and revisit the codebook before returning to the data. During the second coding cycle, we engaged in axial coding to uncover patterns and relationships across codes. Throughout this process, we wrote analytic memos to aid in developing new codes, documenting patterns, and uncovering themes (Saldaña, 2016).

Researchers' Positionalities

This 12-member research team held a variety of roles within and outside of the three institutions. Some researchers involved in data collection were members of the community the institution served but had no direct ties to the institutions ("outsiders"), while others held a variety of roles (students, staff, faculty) within the institution ("insiders"). Three-fourths of the research team identified as a member of a racially minoritized group. The three members involved in this sub-study identify as Latinx and Asian American and have scholarly interests in equity and justice in higher education. As such, we drew on our collective knowledge and expertise to gain a unique insight into how institutional environments communicate AAPI and Latinx "servingness" through campus artifacts.

Findings

Findings from this study revealed that these three institutions' campus environments were in a state of flux, or what Garcia (2019) describes as "becoming," and are captured through two interconnected themes: striving to become and undermining progress towards becoming. While some institutions in our study made strides towards distancing themselves from their Eurocentric and racist beginnings, the vestiges of racism at these institutions highlight the tension between simultaneously being minority-serving and historically white.

Striving to Become

We observed similar campus artifacts across all three institutions. However, how institutions mobilized these artifacts for serving AAPI and Latinx students varied in important ways: transformative rebranding, additive targeting, and liminal inclusion. To demonstrate these differences, we present our first theme by institution.

Desert University Transforms by Rebranding

Our observations of campus artifacts at DU suggest that they are in a state of transformational transition, through rebranding and by leaning into its compositional student diversity. DU made efforts to visibly celebrate the institution's diversity-related efforts, creating and relocating student support services, and increasing AAPI and Latinx imagery. Signage displaying institutional slogans and catchphrases were one way institutions signaled that all students belonged. These words were often prominently displayed across campus buildings and banners hanging from light posts. A wall in DU's student union proudly displayed the words, "We are [DU]." In DU's digital space, the "diversity" webpage was one click away from its homepage. This webpage contained hyperlinks showcasing how the institution incorporated diversity in the curriculum, supported diversity through campus services and programming (e.g., themed housing), and made meaning of their AANAPISI-HSI designations.

In addition to visual artifacts, researchers documented how DU increasingly designated central space for diversity efforts. Researchers (via insider knowledge) described how within the last five years, DU shifted from housing diversity programs and services in a campus "building" on the periphery to centrally locating them in the student union. Further, these efforts were now housed under a new department for social justice and diversity, which hired two coordinators for AAPI and Latinx student programming, and support.

In-person and online observations (e.g., exhibition archives) of DU's art museum suggested a shift towards more culturally relevant art exhibits. One researcher described how the past few years witnessed "an increase in Latinx and AAPI artists, including locals" being featured in museum exhibits. A review of the museum's website also supported this commitment to "diversity" through a permanent art collection that reflects the surrounding community, as well as "Pre-Columbian Mesoamerica" and "indigenous traditions" collections. This "shift" seemed to coincide with the institution's AANAPISI-HSI designations. On the other

side of campus, in a university courtyard, a statue of DU's mascot, a frontiersman symbolizing the rebels who "ventured into uncharted" paths, has prominently stood for over a decade. Institutional documents reflected several efforts to remove the controversial mascot, including a commissioned study that reported that the majority of DU constituents did not see a need to take "action" after learning that others might find the mascot offensive. During our writing of this manuscript, and amidst the Black Lives Matter protests, DU has removed the statue. The inclusion, visibility, and removal of these campus artifacts seem to align with Banning et al.'s (2008) transformational level of equity, combining artifacts with a commitment to equity or social action.

Desert Community College Additive by Targeting

Our observations of DCC suggest that there were additive artifacts in the campus spaces. While positive, these artifacts were sparse, targeted, and somewhat inconspicuous. For example, DCC used the phrase "I am [DCC]" on small plaques recognizing staff members, mostly of Color, working on campus. In their digital space, DCC had a single webpage for "diversity and multicultural affairs," which could be located after navigating several pages past the homepage. The webpage described the purpose of the multicultural centers, its resources, and contact information for listed committees, including the AAPI and Latinx Faculty and Staff Committees. A reference to DCC's AANAPISI-HSI designations was hidden in a dropdown menu at the bottom of this webpage.

Like DU, DCC also reallocated campus space to support diversity initiatives. At one DCC campus located in a predominantly Black and Latinx community, buildings and spaces were increasingly named after prominent Black community leaders, including the newly constructed student union named after a Black assemblyman. However, no buildings or spaces at any of the campuses were named for AAPI or Latinx individuals. Within newly constructed and centrally located student unions, two DCC campuses dedicated space for multicultural centers to support diversity services and programming. Notably, the DCC campus, situated in a predominantly white community, decided to forego space for a multicultural center in their student union. While, at first glance, these moves seem to be in line with transformative efforts towards institutional equity, the fragmentation and targeting of diversity efforts across the three DCC campuses demonstrate how these efforts are additive.

Campus artwork, including paintings, posters, and statuary, also reflected institutional commitments to AAPI- and Latinx-servingness, and diversity-at-large. In particular, observations detailed the installation of a series of wood pallet-framed, street-style canvas artwork in each of DCC's student unions. Photographed images of the artwork included skull paintings reminiscent of Día de Los Muertos, their mascot wearing a charro outfit, and an indigenous Mesoamerican man adorned in feathered headgear. Observers noted that culturally relevant art pieces appeared to be confined to student unions. Although the existence of these campus artifacts positively reflects AAPI, Latinx, or other communities of Color, their confinement in specific buildings or obscure locations in the digital space speaks to their additive nature.

Desert State College Liminal Inclusion

The campus artifacts of DSC communicate an attempt to create an environment that reflects its diverse students. At DSC, the phrase "Be state" displayed a unifying message of belonging. DSC's website also promoted diversity efforts through its Community Engagement and Diversity Initiatives Office and "diversity and inclusion task forces." However, details about each task force were not available. In fact, nowhere on DSC's website do they acknowledge their dual designations. The inclusion of information related to the task forces with no information about what they do represent additive equity efforts.

Simultaneously, DSC's artwork reflects intentional support for local artists. This includes a permanent collection of "94 works by 54 local artists," with select Latinx, Native American, and Filipino artists. This artwork was showcased campus-wide and not confined to a single location. One such piece is captured in a photograph depicting a large steel sculpture of DSC's mascot by a prominent local Latinx artist, adorning an outdoor courtyard. As part of DSC's permanent collection, the inclusion of these artifacts suggests a level of equity that is transformational in representing its diverse community.

Undermining Progress Towards Becoming

Institutional efforts to showcase AAPI- and Latinx-servingness through campus artifacts often stood in stark contrast with artifacts reflecting the beginnings of these institutions, including statues, murals, and building names. These artifacts communicated standards of inclusion and exclusion through the persisting whiteness in English-only communication,

manifestations of racism, and campus policing. As these three themes emerged and converged across the campuses, we organize these findings thematically.

English-Only Communication

In all three campuses, the efforts to communicate their commitment to diversity through campus artifacts were undermined through the predominance of English-only communication. All slogans, building names, and the majority of flyers were displayed in English. Researchers noted the few instances in which campus artifacts included other languages. At DSC, this included the title of two art pieces by a Latinx photographer. At DU, another researcher observed a small LCD screen in the corner of the student union that displayed the words "we are" in several languages, including Spanish and Mandarin. At one DCC campus, an observer indicated several instances of bilingual flyers and signs; however, the photographs that accompanied these observations overwhelmingly depicted flyers with program information, scholarships, and student services solely in English. Only two flyers depicted English-Spanish communication, both outlining nondiscrimination policies. DCC was the only campus to have a webpage dedicated to prospective Spanish-speaking students.

Manifestations of Racism

Although all three institutions displayed artwork representing AAPI and Latinx students, only DU had overtly racist artwork on campus. DU even had a webpage on the evolution of the campus mascot, which described how DU had long embraced the "rebel" spirit of the confederacy against its northern rival—a comparison that reinforces the negative messaging of the physical artifact. This webpage also located where images of the retired mascot can be found on campus today, including the DU art museum. While the museum's website denounced the racist imagery that decorates the hardwood floor of the main exhibit hall, it also conceded that the mural served as a "reminder" of DU's racial progress. This active display of a negative campus artifact communicates a recognition and rejection of racism while also paying homage to a racist history.

In a subtler display of institutional racism, at DCC, individually framed photographs of members of the Board of Regents (BOR) were prominently placed on the walls of each student union and other campus buildings. The BOR photographs, a predominantly white and male governing body, were often juxtaposed with nearby "I am [DCC]" plaques featuring DCC staff,

primarily Women of Color. While the photographs provided a sharp contrast between campus demographics and white power structures, other normalized displays of white dominance were communicated through building names. The majority of buildings across all three institutions were named after white philanthropists who donated to support campus infrastructure, student scholarships, and other initiatives.

Campus Policing

Although institutions are (re)dedicating physical space, observations of campus artifacts suggest that these spaces are highly policed. DSC's website proudly touted the presence of security "24 hours a day and 7 days a week." However, nowhere was policing more prevalent than at DCC, where researchers observed a regular police presence and informal and formal signage limiting students' use of space. Multiple police cars were seen parked in college parking lots or on-campus walkways and often in front of the main building entrances, including the student services building. One observer described how campus security often wandered about campus buildings. Policing was also prominent through signage limiting the use of campus space at DCC. For example, a researcher observed a large black piano in the student union covered by a brown cloth, fenced-off on all sides, and containing multiple signs in black and red lettering that read, "do not play/touch." Another researcher observed a white dry-erase board in the student union with a hand-drawn image of the campus mascot and the words "please do not write or erase anything on this board."

Discussion

This study revealed that AANAPISI-HSIs enact and communicate "servingness" through campus artifacts at different levels of equity (Banning et al., 2008). The varying levels of equity aligned with Garcia et al.'s (2019) conceptualization of "servingness" and represent a spectrum of "becoming" minority-serving (Garcia, 2019), particularly through transformative rebranding, additive targeting, and liminal inclusion. "Becoming" rather than "being" AAPI- and Latinx-serving is reflected in the institutions' focus on diversity and multiculturalism, rather than unapologetically serving AAPI and Latinx students. Specifically, while artifacts such as art collections, lists of diversity committees, and multicultural centers support or contribute to equity efforts, they lack equity-centric positions (Banning et al., 2008). This is demonstrated through posted slogans and multicultural offices, and undermined by English-only

communication, manifestations of racism, and campus policing. Only DU's social justice and diversity unit move beyond celebrating multiculturalism to a purposeful action that speaks to institutional transformation.

Further, efforts towards AAPI- and Latinx-servingness were primarily displayed through additive commitments to diversity and inclusion. For instance, many of the campus artifacts that would be considered permanent physical artifacts, such as campus buildings, did not communicate AAPI- and Latinx-serving; instead, they mostly displayed names of white donors. Additionally, one campus made no reference to their AANAPISI-HSI designation. Even the two campuses that did articulate their dual designation on their digital platforms often couched their designation under diversity initiatives or folded under different hyperlinks, instead of prominently displaying it as part of their main webpages. These findings are consistent with literature that focuses on public communication, or more importantly, lack thereof, of HSI designations (Contreras et al., 2008; Torres & Zerquera, 2012). Additionally, the varying levels of equity being communicated through campus artifacts differed by racial and ethnic groups. More campus artifacts communicated Latinx- than AAPI-servingness, demonstrating an imbalance of the dual AANAPISI-HSI designation.

The present results are also consistent with previous literature that emphasizes the multifaceted and complicated nature of higher education organizational identities, especially at HSIs (Garcia, 2019; Torres & Zerquera, 2012) and AANAPISIs (Alcantar et al., 2019; Yang & Masulit, 2018). As demonstrated by our findings, AANAPISI-HSIs must contend with simultaneously being minority-serving and historically white. The juxtaposition between campus artifacts that communicate AAPI- and Latinx-servingness and dominance of whiteness thwart the institution's efforts towards being transformative and truly fulfilling an AANAPISI-HSI mission.

Recommendations for Research and Practice

The present study presents the first attempt to examine servingness through campus artifacts at dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs. More research is needed on campus artifacts at MSIs and dually designated institutions. This could include the examination of campus artifacts that privilege specific AAPI and Latinx subgroups. Future research could also examine campus artifacts from institutional agents' perspectives and how they grapple with these dual

designations. Additionally, future research should examine how campus artifacts at MSIs change over time. Furthermore, researchers could examine the impetus and decision-making about applying for federal MSI grants to support physical and virtual infrastructures.

In terms of practice, we urge institutional agents to think creatively and strategically about how they communicate their commitment to equity and servingness to AAPI and Latinx students, through campus artifacts built into short- and long-term institutional strategic plans. For example, as an immediate action, institutions can commit to displaying AAPI and Latinx student artwork. They can also incorporate signage that welcomes and shares information in various languages. In the long term, institutions can commission campus murals that depict influential figures in AAPI and Latinx communities. They should also aim to have a multilingual web presence. At a minimum, institutions could engage in self-study to evaluate their campus artifacts using Banning et al.'s (2008) equity climate framework, and remove negative artifacts.

Conclusion

This study explored campus artifacts at dually designated AANAPISI-HSIs. It demonstrates the complexities of communicating AAPI- and Latinx-servingness through campus artifacts, particularly for HWIs with multiple, competing missions, and limited capacities to shift from becoming to being MSIs. It is important to note that AANAPISIs and HSIs continue to be an underfunded and underresourced sector of higher education. Thus, these institutions may not have the financial means to invest in permanent campus artifacts to communicate AAPI- and Latinx-servingness and may depend on gifts from primarily white donors to support infrastructure. Examining AANAPISI-HSI campus artifacts is important to demonstrate *if* and *how* they communicate servingness and highlight the need for increased funding to help them progress toward being rather than becoming MSIs. Equity-focused artifacts are an important indicator of AAPI- and Latinx-servingness; AANAPISI-HSIs have a responsibility to implement culturally responsive campus artifacts to serve AAPI and Latinx students.

Acknowledgments

References

Andrade, L. M. (2018). Latina/o transfer students' selective integration and spatial awareness of university spaces. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 17*(4), 347-374. doi:10.1177/1538192717701252

Alcantar, C. M., Bordoloi-Pazich, L., & Teranishi, R. T. (2019). Meaning-making about becoming a Minority Serving Institution: A case study of Asian-serving community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education, 45*(5), 309-335. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0054

Alcantar, C. M., Kim, V., Hafoka, I., & Teranishi, R. T. (2020). Space and place at Asian American and Pacific Islander–serving community colleges: The geography of campus student support for Asian American and Pacific Islander students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000281

Banning, J. H., Middleton, V., & Deniston, T. L. (2008). Using photographs to assess equity climate: A taxonomy. *Multicultural Perspectives, 10*(1), 41-46. doi:10.1080/15210960701869611

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide.* Routledge.

Contreras, F. E., Malcom, L. E., & Bensimon, E. M. (2008). Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Closeted identity and the production of equitable outcomes for Latino/a students. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C.S.V. Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority-serving institutions* (pp. 71-110). State University of New York Press.

Desai, S. R., & Abeita, A. (2017). Institutional microaggressions at a Hispanic serving institution: A Diné (Navajo) woman utilizing tribal critical race theory through student activism. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 50*(3), 275-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2017.1336498

Espinosa, L. L., Turk, J. M., Taylor, M., & Chessman, H. M. (2019). *Race and ethnicity in higher education: A status report.* American Council on Education.

Garcia, G. A. (2019). *Becoming Hispanic-serving institutions: Opportunities for colleges and universities.* John Hopkins University Press.

Garcia, G. A., & Koren, E. R. (2020). Connecting research, practice, and policy to define "servingness" at Hispanic serving institutions. In G. A. Garcia (Ed.), *Hispanic serving institutions (HSIs) in practice: Defining "servingness" at HSIs* (pp. 1-20). IAP.

Garcia, G. A., Núñez, A.-M., & Sansone, V. A. (2019). Toward a multidimensional conceptual framework for understanding "servingness" in Hispanic-serving institutions: A synthesis of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 89*(5), 745-784. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319864591

Lozano, A. (2010). Latina/o culture centers: Providing a sense of belonging and promoting student success. In L. D. Patton (Ed.), *Cultural centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice* (pp. 3-22). Stylus.

Patton, L. D. (2006). The voice of reason: A qualitative examination of Black student perceptions of Black culture centers. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(6), 628-646. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2006.0068

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Torres, V., & Zerquera, S. (2012). Hispanic-serving institutions: Patterns, predictions, and

implications for informing policy discussion. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 11*(3), 259-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192712441371

U.S. Census (2020). *QuickFacts.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/

U.S. Department of Education (2020). *Programs: Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions program.* Retrieved on October 20, 2020 from https://www2.ed.gov/programs/aanapi/faq.html#q10

Yang, J. & Masulit, M. (2018). The problematic challenges faced by dual designation at California State Universities. In M. Gasman, A. Castro Samayoa, W.C. Boland, & P. Esmieu (Eds.), *Educational challenges at minority serving institutions* (pp. 52-63). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203701980-4