

CHAPTER 12

**FILIPINO AMERICAN ACCESS TO  
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN  
CALIFORNIA AND HAWAI'I**

**Jonathan Y. Okamura** *University of Hawai'i, Manoa*

In 1998, Filipino American students were party to a class-action federal lawsuit (*Rios et al. v. Regents of the University of California*), which charged that the admissions policies of the University of California (UC), Berkeley violated federal antidiscrimination laws. The suit was submitted in March of that year before the substantial declines in African American and Latino freshmen became apparent in the fall as a result of the prohibition of race-based affirmative action in UC admissions through the passage of Proposition 209. The suit was filed by the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund on behalf of African American and Latino students besides Filipino Americans.<sup>1</sup> These organizations maintained that Berkeley's admissions process discriminated against and violated the civil rights of Filipino American, Latino, and Afri-

*The  
"Oili  
er"*

can American past and future applicants in several ways, including giving “unjustified preferential consideration to applicants who have taken certain courses [Advanced Placement] that are less accessible in high schools attended largely by African American, Latino, and Pilipino American students” and placing “undue and unjustified reliance upon standardized test scores to make judgments based on educationally insignificant differences in test scores” (as cited in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2000). While some of the reasons for the lawsuit still remain valid, during the years since it was filed in 1998, Filipino Americans (and Latinos) have diverged from African Americans in their increased admissions and enrollment at UC Berkeley and (with Latinos) have significantly expanded their representation in the UC system.

In this chapter, I focus on access to public higher education of Filipino Americans in California and Hawai'i, the states in which they have their greatest number and percentage of the population, respectively. An analysis of the enrollment in college of Filipino American undergraduates in those two states may have relevance for them in other states where they represent a significant proportion of the population, such as Washington, New York, and Illinois. My concern is with how state policies in higher education have impacted Filipino American access and enrollment, particularly the elimination of race-based affirmative action in California and the implementation of substantial tuition hikes in Hawai'i, both of which occurred in 1996. For California, I focus on the University of California system, particularly UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC Irvine, because the two former campuses are the most academically selective of the nine undergraduate UC institutions,<sup>2</sup> and the latter has the highest number and percentage of Filipino Americans in the UC system. For Hawai'i, my concern is with the University of Hawai'i system, especially UH Manoa, its flagship doctoral-degree granting campus that has the largest number of Filipino American undergraduates.<sup>3</sup> It might be argued that these universities are not readily comparable since the UC institutions have higher admission standards than those at UH Manoa, but the latter is the premier public university in Hawai'i as are UC Berkeley and UCLA in California.

As I discuss below, the access and enrollment in public higher education of Filipino Americans in California and Hawai'i during the 12-year period from 1997 to 2009 are quite divergent, with much more positive outcomes in the former state than in the latter. This finding seems somewhat anomalous given the much greater proportion of the population and political power of Filipino Americans in Hawai'i than in California. In both states, I compare the representation of Filipino American undergraduates with that of other ethnic and racial groups, including Asian Americans, African Americans, and Latinos in the latter state, and Native Hawaiians and Whites

in the former, in order to have an understanding of how their enrollment status and trends compare to both majority and minority groups.

### **POST-AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

In 1995, the UC Board of Regents passed the SP-1 resolution that eliminated race-based affirmative action in university admissions.<sup>4</sup> The next year, California voters approved Proposition 209, the so-called Civil Rights Initiative, which prohibited race and gender-based affirmative action in college admissions and in hiring and contracting by public institutions.<sup>5</sup> Since the end of affirmative action, Filipino Americans have significantly increased their enrollment in the UC system and at the Berkeley and Irvine campuses but not at UCLA. Since 1997, the year before the ban on affirmative action became effective in undergraduate admissions, Filipino American enrollment in the UC system expanded by more than 39%, or more than 2,200 students, from that year (5,700) to fall 2009 (7,900).<sup>6</sup> During this same period, their representation among UC undergraduates remained at 4.4%, one reason being UC enrollment increased by nearly 38% to almost 178,000 students. Compared to their proportion of California public high school graduates (3.3%) and of the California state population (3.3%), Filipino Americans thus are slightly overrepresented in the UC system (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010d). At an annual average of about 5% between 1997 and 2009, Filipino Americans are also somewhat overrepresented among first-time freshmen enrolling in the UC system (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010e). Besides entering a UC campus as freshmen, Filipino Americans also enroll as community college transfers and comprised less than 3% of such transfer students from 1997 to 2009 (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010a). More than four times as many Filipino Americans are admitted each year as first-time freshmen than as community college transfer students, which enhances their persistence and graduation from a UC institution.

At UC Berkeley, Filipino Americans increased by 62%, or more than 300 students between fall 1997 (500) and fall 2009 (800), thus comprising 3.3% of undergraduates. Contrary to expectations, their numbers steadily grew immediately after the prohibition on affirmative action took effect, perhaps an early indicator that their enrollment experiences would be more like those of other Asian American students than those of African Americans and Latinos. Contributing to the growth in Filipino American undergraduates has been their progressive increase in the number of first-time freshmen admitted at Berkeley between fall 1997 (86) and fall 2006 (143). These enrollment gains reversed the previous downswing of nearly 200 students

among Berkeley undergraduates between the late 1980s and 1996, which was due to their elimination from affirmative action recruitment and admissions programs in 1980, their being negatively affected by changes in admissions policies initiated in 1991, and their lower retention rate compared to other student groups (Okamura & Agbayani, 1997, p. 190).

In contrast, the expanded enrollment of Filipino Americans at UC Berkeley after 1997 can be attributed especially to the concerted recruitment and retention efforts by Filipino American student organizations because UC campuses have transferred these functions to such groups after affirmative action was eliminated (Horn & Flores, 2003, p. 54). One of these organizations at Berkeley is PASS, or Pilipino Academic Student Services, which is entirely student-operated, primarily through voluntary efforts. Fortunately, perhaps in response to the enormous reductions in African American and Latino admissions in the UC system resulting from the ban on affirmative action, in 1999, California voters passed Proposition 3, which allows for a portion of the annual fees (\$6 per student) paid by students to be used to support student-organized racial and ethnic minority recruitment and retention programs such as PASS.<sup>7</sup> In terms of recruitment activities, PASS students conduct outreach visits to high schools and community colleges with significant numbers of Filipino Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California to provide them with information on preparing for or transferring to a university. Each fall, they hold Filipino Empowerment Day, which brings Bay Area Filipino American high school students to the Berkeley campus, where they meet with representatives of area community colleges and universities to learn about college life and receive assistance with the application process. PASS students also offer day-long or overnight campus visits, which include information workshops and tours for high school and community college students, including newly admitted high school seniors. As for retention services, PASS organizes activities for transfer students to become acquainted with one another and campus life. Similar student-directed Filipino American recruitment and retention programs at UCLA, UC Davis, UC San Diego, and other campuses have contributed to increasing their enrollment at their respective institutions. Buenavista (2007) conducted her doctoral dissertation research with "1.5" generation Filipino American student "activists" involved in such a program, which she called the "Pilipino Recruitment and Retention Center," at a large, academically selective university in California. She found that students initiated "culturally affirming educational experiences," such as discussions on family issues concerned with college choice, multilingual activities, and a graduation ceremony for Filipino American students. Given the relative scarcity of Filipino American faculty and staff in the UC system, such student organizations must be recognized as highly significant resources in recruiting and retaining Filipino American students. They also

serve as models for other universities in expanding Filipino American and other minority student enrollment.

UCLA had a different Filipino American enrollment experience than at UC Berkeley insofar as enrollment slightly declined between fall 1997 (1,100) and fall 2009 (1,050), when Filipino Americans comprised 3.9% of students, with a low of 951 students as recently as 2006. This decrease reversed the trend of their growing numbers during the 1990s of more than 200 students. The University of California, Irvine is well known (at least in its home state) for its majority Asian American undergraduate population, perhaps the only major university in the nation with this distinction. Perhaps as a result, Filipino Americans have their highest absolute (1,700) and proportional representation (7.6%) in the UC system at Irvine. Their number grew by 52%, or nearly 600 students, between fall 1997 (1,100) and fall 2009 (1,700), which continued a progressive trend that began in the 1980s. A possible contributing factor to this gain was that during the same 12-year period, undergraduate enrollment at UC Irvine expanded dramatically by 57%, or more than 8,000 students, thus creating greater opportunities for Filipino American students.

Another possible reason for the increase in Filipino American enrollment in the UC system may be the Eligibility in Local Context (ELC) program that was initiated with the fall 2001 freshman class, following the prohibition of affirmative action. Through the ELC program, the top 4% of graduates (as determined by cumulative grade point average in the tenth and eleventh grades) of each comprehensive public and private high school in California are guaranteed admission to a UC campus (Horn & Flores, 2003, p. 17).<sup>8</sup> Such "percentage plans" for college admissions were also established in Texas and Florida in the aftermath of the elimination of race-based affirmative action in those states. Under the California program, students are not granted admission to the UC institution of their choice, and this has resulted in the criticism that it channels racial minority students to the less selective UC campuses (Selingo, 1999, as cited in Horn & Flores, 2003, p. 17). In a critical report, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (2000) contends that "The percentage plans are experimental responses to the attacks on affirmative action. But they are no substitute for strong race-conscious affirmative action in higher education." Other critics of the ELC program maintain that it should be expanded to between 6% and 9% of each high school class in order to foster "both UC's democratic and meritocratic ideals" (Hayashi & Kidder, 2004). Another reason for expanding the program is that, while it has increased the access of African American and Latino students, they still remain greatly underrepresented in the UC system (see below).

The steady gains in Filipino American undergraduate enrollment in the UC system, and particularly at UC Berkeley and UC Irvine between 1997

and 2009, can be correlated with the overall undergraduate growth at those institutions, especially at Irvine. Such expansion appears to have created admission spaces for Filipino Americans that may seem a matter of common sense, but enrollment increases at UCLA and UH Manoa (see below) did not result in corresponding gains for Filipino American students. Conversely, the cap on UC admissions in fall 2004 (because of budget cutbacks) resulted in decreases in Filipino American enrollment at all UC campuses. These outcomes indicate the direct impact on Filipino American (and other) students from state policies in higher education, including those concerning termination of affirmative action, tuition hikes, enrollment limits or increases, and 4% admissions programs. However, at least some of these policies may have greater negative consequences for Filipino Americans because of their racialized minority status. To address the loss of more than \$800 million in state funding since 2008, the UC Board of Regents raised tuition (or “fees,” as it is called in the UC system) by 32% in two installments, with the first beginning in January 2010, which was met by student protests and demonstrations at several UC campuses. It remains to be seen if this huge increase will reduce Filipino American enrollment. Like UH Manoa a decade earlier (see below), the University of California in 2010 began to increase its recruitment and admission of out-of-state students (who pay \$23,000 more than state residents for annual tuition) as another means to generate revenues. More than 8% of the projected 37,200 UC freshmen enrolling in fall 2010 were expected to be nonresidents, up from 6% in the previous year, with UC Berkeley and UCLA having the greatest gains (Gordon, 2010a). In 2010, for the first time ever, UCLA admissions officers went to 10 U.S. cities, including Honolulu, Boston, and Chicago, as well as to China, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore, to recruit nonresident students, while UC Davis, Irvine, and Santa Barbara also initiated “serious” out-of-state recruitment efforts for the first time (Gordon, 2010b). According to Thomas Lifka, UCLA associate vice chancellor of student academic services, the university planned to increase its proportion of nonresident undergraduates from 11% to 18% during the next 3 to 5 years without decreasing the number of students from California (Gordon, 2010b).

Another recent development that may affect the access of Filipino Americans to the UC system is the proposed change in admissions policy that will eliminate SAT subject tests on which Asian Americans tend to “excel” (Krieger, 2009). Adopted by the UC Regents in 2009 following a faculty study, this change is scheduled to take effect for freshmen entering in fall 2012 and is intended to make UC more accessible to low-income students, a laudable goal that is contradicted by the enormous tuition hike in 2010. According to an analysis by the UC Office of the President based on freshman admissions in 2007, the admissions policy change will result in a potential decline in Asian American freshmen from 36% to approximately

29%, while increasing White admissions from 34% to approximately 44%. Not surprisingly, the proposed change has been strongly criticized by Asian American educators and community leaders, including retired UC Berkeley ethnic studies professor Ling-chi Wang, who remarked, “It’s affirmative action for whites. I’m really outraged and profoundly disappointed with the institution” (as cited in Krieger, 2009). Under the new admissions policy, the two most underrepresented racial minorities in the UC system, African Americans and Latinos, which both have substantial proportions of low-income families, nonetheless, are estimated to augment their freshmen minimally: from 4% to approximately 5% for the former group and from 19% to approximately 22% for the latter. These projected results have led to the strong suspicion in the Asian American community that the real intent behind the admissions policy change is to reduce the number of Asian Americans for the benefit of Whites. Such a deliberate reduction occurred in the mid-1980s through changes in admissions policy that disadvantaged Asian American applicants at UC Berkeley, UCLA, and other academically highly selective universities on both the East and West Coasts (Takagi, 1993). Insofar as Filipino Americans have expanded their representation in the UC system, like other Asian American students following the termination of affirmative action, they may be similarly negatively impacted by the proposed admissions policy change.

The rise in Filipino American undergraduate enrollment in the UC system is consistent with the hefty addition of more than 23,000 Asian American students since affirmative action ended. In the UC system, Asian American undergraduates grew from 37% in fall 1997 to 40% in fall 2009; they thus greatly exceed their percentage of the California population (13%). At 37%, they constitute the largest racial group in UC freshman admissions and are almost one-half (46%) of Berkeley freshmen (Krieger, 2009). In 2002, Asian Americans became the largest group among UC undergraduates when they exceeded Whites for the first time, even though Whites have also gained nearly 7,000 students in the UC system since 1997. Nonetheless, the proportion of White students has been steadily dropping since 2000 and is currently less than one third of UC undergraduates. Thus, with the exception of those at UCLA, the post-affirmative action enrollment experiences of Filipino Americans in the UC system is more comparable to that of Asian Americans than of disadvantaged racial minorities such as African Americans (see below). As had been predicted before the elimination of race-based affirmative action, Blacks have suffered huge enrollment depletions at Berkeley and UCLA, while Asian Americans and Whites have gained the most. In contrast, as will be discussed below, the enrollment experiences of Filipino Americans at UH Manoa during approximately the same 12-year period were those of a marginalized minority rather than of model minority Asian Americans.

Beyond the UC system, Filipino Americans have their greatest absolute and proportional undergraduate representation at San Francisco State University. In fall 2009, some 2,141 Filipino Americans comprised almost 10% of students and ranked second to Chinese Americans (13%) among Asian Americans (Office of University and Budget Planning, 2010). Their considerable numbers can be attributed to the significant Filipino American communities in San Francisco, nearby Daly City, and the San Francisco Bay area in general. In addition, following the 5-month long student strike in 1968-1969 at what was then San Francisco State College, it was the first university to offer courses in Asian American studies, beginning in 1969, through the new Ethnic Studies Department. San Francisco State currently provides courses in Filipino American studies in its Department of Asian American Studies, which includes three Filipino American faculty. Clearly, having sufficient numbers of Filipino American faculty who can develop and offer courses on Filipino American history, literature, and contemporary culture and community, and serve as advocates and role models for students, is another important means to advance Filipino American representation.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, Filipino Americans in California have relatively high rates of college completion among persons 25 years and older, as evident from the percentages of both females (44%) and males (37%) with a bachelor's degree or higher (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2003). These figures are somewhat higher than those for White women (27%) and men (33%) in the state. The Filipino American percentages are very comparable to those for the more highly educated Asian American groups in California, such as Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans; however, to a significant extent, they can be attributed to the immigration of Filipinos with college degrees rather than to educational mobility over the generations. Nonetheless, Filipino American females (55%) and males (50%) have quite high levels of college or graduate school enrollment among persons 18 to 24 years old, which are considerably greater than those for White women (41%) and men (33%). The above percentages for college completion and enrollment of Filipino Americans in California are also much higher than for their counterparts in Hawai'i (see below).

In marked contrast to Filipino Americans and Asian Americans in general, African Americans have experienced minimal gains in their undergraduate enrollment in the UC system since affirmative action was prohibited, with the exceptions of UC Berkeley and UCLA. At the UC campuses, Black enrollment increased by 1,100 students between fall 1997 (5,000) and fall 2009 (6,100), such that they constituted only 3.4% of UC undergraduates in the latter year, far less than their 7% proportion of California public high school graduates (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010d). Beginning in 1998, their UC total underwent four consecutive

years of losses of about 550 students before starting to increase in 2002, possibly due to the implementation of the ELC program the previous year. The recovery in African American representation can be correlated with their growing presence at UC Riverside, where they have nearly tripled in number by almost 800 students since 1997, their greatest addition at any of the UC campuses. This substantial gain may be due to the channeling of racial minority students under the ELC program to the less prestigious UC campuses such as Riverside and Santa Cruz.<sup>9</sup>

Quite differently, at UC Berkeley, African American undergraduate numbers steadily dropped by nearly 27% between fall 1997 (1,300) and fall 2009 (900) and, while they seem to have gained since 2006, they have not yet reversed their overall decline. A major factor in their enrollment loss was the sharp decrease in Black freshmen entering Berkeley between 1997 (257) and 2006 (152), with a low of 108 as recently as 2004 (Office of Student Research, 2007). Similarly, at UCLA, the number of African American undergraduates plummeted by 30% between fall 1997 (1,400) and fall 2009 (1,000) but has been increasing since 2007. This decline also can be attributed to a continuing decrease in Black freshmen enrolling each fall. In fall 1997, they comprised 5.6% of freshmen but within 3 years of the end of affirmative action, had dropped to 3.4% in fall 2001, while the freshman class expanded by 400 students during this period (Horn & Flores, 2003, p. 49). Thus, the post-affirmative action admissions of Filipino American students in the UC system have been much more positive than that of African Americans.

In contrast to African Americans, Latinos gained more than 12,300 undergraduates in the UC system between fall 1997 (17,200) and fall 2009 (29,500), a huge upsurge of 72%, such that they comprised 17% of undergraduates. While these additions are impressive, Latinos are still greatly underrepresented in the UC system compared to their proportion of California public high school graduates (38%) (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010f). As predicted, the termination of affirmative action resulted in initial declines beginning in 1998, but the numbers have steadily expanded since then. At Berkeley, Latinos increased by nearly 280 students between fall 1997 (2,800) and fall 2009 (3,000), and their enrollment has been on the upswing since 2002 after 4 consecutive years of losses. At UCLA, Latinos also gained almost 160 students between fall 1997 (3,900) and fall 2009 (4,100) after initially declining for 3 consecutive years; however, their enrollment has been expanding since then. Similar to African Americans, Latino undergraduates have their greatest number and representation (25%) in the UC system at Riverside, which also may be due to their being directed to that university under the ELC program, although they also have a significant presence at the Santa Barbara, Davis, and Irvine campuses. Since the ELC program began in 2001, Latinos have increased

their annual number of first-time freshmen entering the UC system by 45% to more than 6,200 students in fall 2009 (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2010c). Projected figures for fall 2010 for first-time freshmen from California enrolling in the UC system indicate that Latinos (23%) follow closely behind Whites (26%) and thus, besides Asian Americans, may constitute another reason why UC administrators have proposed changing admissions policies (Gordon, 2010a).<sup>10</sup>

Given their considerable gains, the post-affirmative action admissions and enrollment of Filipino Americans in the UC system can be considered highly positive, especially at UC Irvine and UC Berkeley. As noted above, at the latter campus in 1998, they had joined African American and Latino students in their class-action lawsuit, charging the university with racial discrimination, but have since reversed their previous declining numbers. Filipino Americans have been very much part of the overall escalation in Asian American students in the UC system following the end of affirmative action rather than advancing only minimally like African Americans. Filipino American enrollment expansion can be attributed to the recruitment and retention efforts of their own student associations at the various UC campuses, which have organized activities and services targeting Filipino American high school and community college students.

#### **POST-TUITION HIKES, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII<sup>11</sup>**

In the 1990s, the University of Hawai'i at Manoa attained national distinction as the only public university to undergo 7 consecutive years of budget cuts. According to a report by the UH Office on Planning and Policy, state funding for the university decreased by 19% during that decade (as cited in Altonn, 1999). Those budget reductions can be directly attributed to the recession in Hawai'i during most of the 1990s, particularly in the dominant tourism industry, which resulted in less tax revenue from the state legislature for the university's budget allocation. To compensate for the budget cuts, the UH Board of Regents raised resident and nonresident tuition at all campuses in 1996 and 1997. These hikes were the largest at UH Manoa: a whopping 50% in the first year, followed by another 23% the next year for resident undergraduate students. Consequently, UH Manoa enrollment dropped from 19,800 in 1995 to 17,000 students in three years, and UH system enrollment, including at the less costly community colleges, plummeted from nearly 50,000 to 45,000 students during the same 3-year period (Institutional Research Office, 1999a).

All ethnic groups in the UH system were impacted negatively by the tuition increases, but ethnic minorities, particularly Filipino Americans, were hurt to a much greater extent than other groups. As a socioeconomically

disadvantaged minority, Filipino Americans generally lacked the financial resources to meet the drastically raised tuition compared to the more privileged ethnic groups, and so their enrollment dropped. In contrast, starting in the 1980s, Filipino Americans had been making steady gains throughout the UH system, although they continued to be represented below their percentage of public school students. This ongoing progress continued to the early 1990s, when they became the largest ethnic group in the seven UH community colleges at about 20% of students and the largest group at a few campuses near Filipino American communities. At UH Manoa, Filipino Americans achieved their highest-ever total of students in 1995 (1,900), including both undergraduate and graduate students (Institutional Research Office, 1995b, p. 15). Supported by these gains, Filipino Americans attained their all-time greatest number in the UH system in 1994 (7,600) and comprised 15% of the total enrollment (Institutional Research Office, 1994, p. 13). While they still were underrepresented in comparison to their proportion of public school students at that time (19%), continued enrollment expansion appeared very likely in the immediate future.

However, the tuition hikes in 1996 and 1997 brought an abrupt end to hard-won Filipino American advancement in public higher education. At UH Manoa, their undergraduate enrollment dropped six consecutive years between 1995 (1,600) and 2001 (1,200), when the downward spiral finally came to an end (Institutional Research Office, 2001b). Since then, their number increased to nearly 1,400 students in fall 2009 but still was about 200 fewer than what it was before tuition was raised (Institutional Research Office, 2010b). Furthermore, at 10% of Manoa undergraduates, Filipino Americans constitute less than half of their proportion of Hawai'i public high school students (21%). In the UH system, Filipino American enrollment declined 20% over 6 consecutive years from 1995 (7,500) to 2001 (6,000), before finally starting to rebound the following year (Institutional Research Office, 2001a). The last time their total number in the UH system was that low was in 1990; thus, the tuition hikes had eliminated a decade of progressive growth. As of fall 2009, Filipino Americans had regained their 1995 total in the UH system, but it took almost 15 years and a worldwide economic crisis to do so (Institutional Research Office, 2010a).

One of the major factors in the recovery of Filipino American enrollment in the UH system is the substantial escalation of community college enrollment beginning in 2007 as a result of the global recession. Filipino Americans and other Hawai'i residents who had lost their jobs entered the community colleges to retrain or to resume their education, which resulted in record highs in overall UH enrollment from 2008 through 2010, when it exceeded 60,000 students for the first time ever. Since 2006, Filipino Americans in the UH community colleges (5,300) have risen by almost 800 and comprise 17% of the students (Institutional Research Office, 2010b). The

only UH campus that has not gained in students is UH Manoa, where enrollment has shrunk since 2005, the year before a 6-year cycle of tuition hikes began (see below). If not for the global economic downturn and the consequent increases in their community college students, Filipino Americans still might be below their 1995 total in the UH system.

Native Hawaiians are another underrepresented minority at UH Manoa that underwent initial enrollment decreases as a result of the 1996 and 1997 tuition hikes, although to a lesser extent than Filipino Americans. The reason for their different experience is because Native Hawaiian students have access to financial assistance through a scholarship foundation of the privately financed Kamehameha Schools, the federal Native Hawaiian Higher Education Act, and UH tuition waivers for Native Hawaiians. In

1995, the approximately 6,400 Native Hawaiian students in the UH system initially declined over the next 3 years, but their number had expanded by 63% by fall 2009 (10,400) (Institutional Research Office, 2010a). Like Filipino Americans, they have had huge gains in their community college enrollment (7,200 in 2009) due to the recession. Another possible reason for their increase is that starting in 2005, applicants were asked on the UH admissions application form to indicate if any of their ancestors were Hawaiian, in addition to being asked their "race." The data subsequently reported by the university on Native Hawaiian enrollment is an aggregate number of those who indicated Hawaiian ancestry (who may not necessarily claim Native Hawaiian as their identity) or who selected Native Hawaiian as their "race." At UH Manoa, unlike Filipino Americans, Native Hawaiian undergraduate enrollment rose between 1995 (1,200) and fall 2009 (1,500) (Institutional Research Office, 2010b).

Since tuition was raised in 1996 and 1997, Whites have gained the most numerically in the UH system although, like the other groups, they had an initial loss. The 9,700 White students in the UH system in 1995 dropped to less than 8,100 by 1998, but they began an upswing in 1999 and had more than recovered by fall 2009 (11,400) when Whites were 20% of the total UH enrollment (Institutional Research Office, 1995a, 2010a). As a result of these advances, Whites became the largest ethnic group in the UH system in 1999 and at UH Manoa in 2002, a distinction they probably last held sometime during World War II, before Japanese American veterans began enrolling in large numbers using their "GI Bill" educational benefits (Institutional Research Office 1999b, 2002).

The enrollment expansion of White students beginning in the late 1990s is due to UH Manoa recruiting and admitting greater numbers of undergraduates from the continental United States, because as nonresidents their annual tuition is almost three times higher (\$21,024 in 2010-2011) than that paid by state residents. At UH Manoa, the percentage of White undergraduates increased from about 14% in 1995 to more than 21% in

fall 2009, and during this period, their numbers expanded by 60% to 2,900 (Institutional Research Office, 2010b). This growing number of Whites has been particularly evident among first-time freshmen at UH Manoa, where their proportion has almost tripled from 8.8% in 1998, to 17% in 2000, and to 25% in 2003, when they became the largest group among freshmen, exceeding Japanese Americans for the first time in several decades (Institutional Research Office, 2003b). However, White enrollment has been declining since 2007, very likely because of the considerable proportion of them who pay nonresident tuition, which has dramatically risen beginning the previous year. This downturn, which is part of the recent decrease in out-of-state students, is significant insofar as, in justifying the tuition hikes, UH administrators stated that a portion of the additional tuition revenues would be used to provide financial assistance to needy students such as Filipino Americans. However, declining enrollment at UH Manoa makes the planned provision of such assistance questionable. The larger issue is that in the process of admitting more White and other students from the continental United States to UH Manoa, the percentage of first-time freshmen who are Hawai'i residents plummeted from 88% in 1998 to 69% in 2003, thus further reducing the opportunity for Filipino American and other local ethnic minority students to receive a college education.

The university policy to increase the recruitment and enrollment of nonresident students because they pay higher tuition marginalizes ethnic minority students from Hawai'i, particularly Filipino Americans, who have become less of a policy priority to recruit and admit. Consequently, Filipino Americans continue to be grossly underrepresented at UH Manoa, as they have been for decades, despite being the second-largest group in Hawai'i's public schools. Furthermore, in pursuing out-of-state students, UH Manoa has violated UH Board of Regents policy established in 2002, which caps their enrollment at 30%, when it exceeded that limit in 2003 (Gima, 2007). As is evident, Filipino Americans (and other ethnic minority students from Hawai'i) have become the sacrificial victims of the university's initiative to address its budget cutbacks by focusing on the recruitment and admission of nonresident students.

Despite the previous enrollment losses after tuition was raised drastically, in 2005 the UH Board of Regents unanimously approved substantial tuition increases at all UH campuses from 2006 through 2011. One of the principal reasons advanced by university administrators for the tuition hikes was that they would double annual tuition revenues to \$198 million during a period of stagnating appropriations from the state legislature (Vorsino 2005). At UH Manoa, tuition for resident undergraduates increased by 140% (\$816) each academic year for 6 consecutive years. While the tuition hikes apply to everyone, Filipino Americans are being denied equal educational opportunity because, being socioeconomically disadvantaged, they have less finan

cial means to pay the higher tuition and thus are differentially impacted by it. Raising tuition thus clearly contradicts the “mission” of the university as stated in its *University of Hawai'i System Strategic Plan* to “Provide all qualified people in Hawai'i with equal opportunity for high quality college and university education and training” (University of Hawai'i, 2002, p. 4).

From the above discussion, it can be seen that during periods of fiscal crisis, the university administration responds in the same way as the Hawai'i state government, that is, by seeking to attract transient outsiders to the islands as a major means to alleviate their common problem of declining revenues. The university recruits and accepts more students from the continental United States, while the state seeks to attract greater numbers of tourists from the same locale and abroad; in both cases, the people of Hawai'i ultimately are marginalized. More nonresident students mean fewer places for chronically underrepresented ethnic minorities from Hawai'i who will continue to be denied equal access to public higher education. More tourists mean the continued dependency on the highly undependable tourism industry as the mainstay of the economy and the continued underfunding of public higher education, let alone the perpetuation of low-wage and low-mobility service and sales jobs.

Besides lesser access to UH Manoa, Filipino Americans also have lower graduation rates from the university. A longitudinal study of first-time freshman cohorts from fall 1990 to fall 2007 as of 2008 reported that the average graduation rate after 6 years for Filipino Americans (52%) was lower than for Chinese Americans (71%) and Japanese Americans (65%), although it was higher than for Native Hawaiians (42%) (Institutional Research Office, 2009). The lower Filipino American graduation rate from UH Manoa is evident in their lesser percentage of persons 25 years and older with a bachelor's degree or higher (15%) in Hawai'i (Okamura, 2008, p. 87). According to the 2000 U.S. Census, this figure was considerably lower than for Whites (31%), Japanese Americans (30%), and Chinese Americans (27%), but higher than for Native Hawaiians (13%). Previous U.S. censuses from 1970 to 1990 in Hawai'i have shown that Filipino Americans had much lower levels of college completion and enrollment than for Whites, Japanese Americans, and Chinese Americans (Okamura, 1982, 1990, 1998).

Besides graduation, Filipino Americans (35%, 27%, females first) have lower college or graduate school enrollment among persons 18 to 25 years old in Hawai'i according to 2000 census data (Okamura, 2008, pp. 87-88). Filipino American representation in college or graduate education was less than for Japanese Americans (51%, 45%, respectively) and Chinese Americans (44%, 37%, respectively) but higher than for Whites (34%, 22%, respectively) and Native Hawaiians (30%, 22%, respectively). The seemingly anomalous relatively low enrollment status of Whites is due to 18 to 24 year

olds associated with the U.S. military as enlisted personnel or their dependents because a high proportion of them are not in college.

Through a discussion of the access and enrollment of Filipino Americans at UH Manoa, I have demonstrated how they participate and benefit unequally in public higher education in Hawai'i. I also have argued that the consequent disparities in the educational attainment of Filipino Americans are primarily the result of discriminatory policies and practices against them. These policies and practices include the long-term underfunding by the state government of both the University of Hawai'i system and the public schools as well as the nonimplementation by the university of its equal educational opportunity, nondiscrimination, and affirmative action policies, which have much greater detrimental consequences for ethnic minorities such as Filipino Americans than for the socioeconomically advantaged ethnic groups. At UH Manoa, budget cutbacks by the state legislature through most of the 1990s gave rise to huge tuition hikes in 1996 and 1997 and to a recruitment initiative directed at nonresident students in the continental United States, which severely reduced Filipino American admissions and enrollment. The tuition increases of 140% from 2006 through 2011 also have limited Filipino American enrollment from regaining its 1995 level at UH Manoa. Clearly, public higher education does not provide equal opportunity for Filipino Americans and in fact contributes to their lower educational status by restricting their access to a college degree.

## DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I have sought to compare the access and enrollment of Filipino Americans in the University of California system following the prohibition of race-based affirmative action in college admissions with that of their counterparts in the University of Hawai'i system since the implementation of substantial tuition hikes, both of these major policy changes occurring in 1996. As evident from the above, these policy decisions in public higher education had very different consequences for Filipino American undergraduates in the two university systems during the ensuing 12-year period to 2009. In the UC system, after the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996, Filipino Americans have increased their overall numbers, especially at UC Berkeley and UC Irvine, and can be said to be overrepresented in comparison to their proportion of California public high school graduates. Thus, an argument could be made that their post-affirmative action experiences have generally been positive, at least in terms of admissions and enrollment, and more like those of Asian Americans in general than those of aggrieved racial minorities such as African Americans, who have suffered considerable enrollment declines at Berkeley and UCLA. These advances

in higher education are noteworthy since there is a common perception that Filipino Americans, unlike Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, and Korean Americans, do not generally conform to the model minority stereotype of Asian Americans as academically high achieving students (see below). Nonetheless, their advances in the UC system should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Filipino Americans continue to encounter problems in gaining admission and persisting in college.

Thus, while I have reported some positive outcomes in enrollment in the UC system, other scholars emphasize the continued marginalization of Filipino American students in higher education. Summarizing the work of other researchers on the barriers faced by Filipino Americans, higher education scholar Tracy Lachica Buenavista (2010, p. 117) notes that Filipino immigrant and second-generation youth face high “push-out” rates in secondary education, have lower levels of retention and participation in postsecondary education, and enroll in less selective colleges if they pursue higher education. Applying critical race theory (CRT) to the educational experiences of Filipino Americans, she contends that the intersection among race, immigration, and socioeconomic status particularly structures the obstacles to postsecondary education they encounter insofar as they are a non-White, primarily immigrant community of low socioeconomic status (p. 123).

Also employing a CRT framework, Buenavista, Jayakumar, and Misa-Cscalante (2009, p. 78) maintain that, as a result of being racially categorized as Asian American by universities and colleges, Filipino Americans are racialized as “liminal and invisible” minorities in higher education. They occupy a liminal, or in-between, status because while their experiences in college are similar to those of underrepresented racial minorities, as Asian Americans they are stereotyped as model minority students and thus not in need of targeted outreach and retention services. Filipino American students and their specific issues and problems in college hence become invisible to higher education institutions insofar as they are obscured by their racialization as high achieving Asian Americans, and colleges “consequently fail to provide the recognition and invest the resources to address their concerns” (Buenavista et al., 2009, p. 77). Nonetheless, Buenavista (2010, p. 123) remarks that Filipinos also have been viewed as distinct from other Asian American groups as an “outlier” to the model minority stereotype, particularly in areas where they comprise a concentrated population. In such locales, Filipino American youth are racialized as gang members, criminals, and social deviants (Alsaybar, 2002; Teranishi, 2002; Tintiangco-Cubales, 2007; as cited in Buenavista 2010, p. 121), which results in their not being perceived and treated as concerned with education by their teachers and counselors.

Based on her qualitative research study of Filipina American undergraduates at a public research university in southern California, Maramba (2008, p. 344) found that three “themes” were most significant in understanding their college experiences: family and parental influence, home obligations and gender differences, and maintaining and negotiating their Filipina American identity within the context of their home and college environments. To address these themes, Maramba (p. 347) argues that university administrators, faculty, and student affairs staff need to have an understanding of the Filipino American student experience so that they can develop both cultural and gender-appropriate programs and services to foster their recruitment and retention.

Focused on the social relationships, especially family ties, of Filipino American students, these issues certainly also affect their enrollment and persistence in college in addition to those pertaining to institutionalized policies and practices discussed in this chapter and by Buenavista and her colleagues.

In the UH system, after tuition was drastically raised in 1996 and 1997, Filipino American enrollment plummeted, particularly at UH Manoa. It took nearly 15 years for enrollment to reach its previous levels, but it is still down at Manoa. In 2005, substantial tuition hikes were again authorized for 2006 through 2011, despite three Filipino Americans serving on the UH Board of Regents, who voted with the other nine board members for their unanimous approval. Thus, somewhat paradoxically, the arguably greater political power of Filipino Americans in Hawai'i compared to their counterparts in California, with their much lower percentage of the state population, does not necessarily translate into an ability to protect themselves from the negative consequences of state policies, at least in public higher education. This situation can be explained by the relatively lower socioeconomic status of Filipino Americans in Hawai'i, which results in their financial inability to meet the higher cost of tuition and thus their numerical decreases at UH Manoa. Another major factor that constrains their enrollment in the UH system is Hawai'i's chronically underfunded K-12 public school system, in which Filipino Americans are the second-largest ethnic group (after Native Hawaiians) and hence suffer the disadvantages of the inadequate education being provided (Okamura, 2008, p. 70). As a notable recent example, a severe state budget deficit caused by declining tax revenues (due to declining numbers of tourist arrivals) forced the public schools of Hawai'i, which has the only statewide school district in the nation, to close for 17 days during the 2009-2010 school year. This incredible situation resulted in Hawai'i having the shortest school year (163 days) in the United States, if not in the developed world.<sup>12</sup>

The divergent experiences in public higher education of Filipino Americans in California and Hawai'i can also be considered anomalous in terms of the larger political and educational context for them in their

respective states. Since the mid-1990s, California has led the nation in the anti-affirmative action and anti-immigrant movements, including another voter-approved proposition (Proposition 227), which eliminated bilingual education in its public schools in 1998. In contrast, Hawai'i had a Filipino American governor from 1994 to 2002, a period in which their numbers in the UH system dropped precipitously, and there are far more Filipino American university regents and state legislators in Hawai'i than in California, including the president of the state Senate between 1998 and 2006. Furthermore, UH Manoa has courses on Filipino Americans in ethnic studies and American studies, provides instruction in two Philippine languages (Ilokano and Tagalog), offers the only bachelor's degree in Philippine languages and literature in the nation, offered the first degree in Philippine studies, and had the first student service program designated for Filipino Americans (Operation Manong, started in 1972). Nonetheless, these seemingly advantageous political and educational contexts were not sufficient to protect Filipino Americans from the harmful impact of UH policies and practices, such as raising tuition drastically and recruiting out-of-state students.

#### POST-GLOBAL RECESSION ACCESS TO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Since the onset of the global recession in 2008, both the UC and UH systems have faced enormous budget cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars. They, along with many other public universities across the country, have seen their appropriations from state legislatures dwindle in the past two decades. Thus, confronted with the same financial problems, it should hardly be surprising that the University of California has responded in the same way that the University of Hawai'i did earlier, that is, by admitting more nonresident students and hiking tuition substantially. It is too early to determine the consequences for Filipino American enrollment in the UC system of these policies. However, based on the Hawai'i experience, they may well derail the progressive advances that Filipino Americans have been making since the end of race-based affirmative action. Another problem they face is the proposed change in UC admissions policies that will eliminate SAT subject tests on which Asian Americans, including Filipino Americans, perform well. It is extremely unfortunate that as Filipino Americans, often through their own efforts, such as student-directed recruitment and retention programs, attain a measure of success and equality, institutionalized means are initiated that restrict them from gaining greater access to public higher education.

#### NOTES

1. The lawsuit was later renamed *Castaneda et al. v. the Regents of the University of California* and was filed on behalf of more than 750 African American, Latino, and Filipino American students (Nieves, 1999). Those students included three high school organizations, including the Kababayan Alliance. The suit was submitted by the same three organizations as in the previous suit, together with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California. Those organizations settled out of court with UC Berkeley after several changes in admissions policies were made, including a "comprehensive review" of the entire file of every applicant, including personal statements and extracurricular activities, and less emphasis given to SAT scores and AP courses (American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, 2003).
2. In addition to those at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Irvine, the nine UC campuses that serve undergraduates are at Davis, Merced (opened in 2006), Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. The University of California, San Francisco is primarily for medical students.
3. Besides UH Manoa, the UH system consists of seven community colleges and two other institutions, both with fewer than 4,100 students, which offer primarily bachelor's degrees.
4. Very likely as a result of their racial categorization as Asian American, Filipino Americans were removed in 1986 from eligibility for student affirmative action programs at UC Berkeley, even though they were not as well represented as other Asian American groups.
5. The proposition stated, "The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting."
6. The data on student enrollment by race and ethnicity in this section are from the Statistical Summary of Students and SIA/T published each spring by Information Resources and Communications, University of California (2008) at <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/>
7. PASS is one of five racial minority recruitment and retention centers organized by students who formed a coalition called "Bridges" in 1996. Besides PASS, these centers include the Black Recruitment and Retention Center, the Native American Recruitment and Retention Center, the Raza Recruitment and Retention Center (for Latino students), and the Asian/Pacific Islander Recruitment and Retention Center. According to its website (<http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~bridges/>), Bridges was established by a group of student leaders who wanted to "work together in solidarity across lines of race and ethnicity."
8. See Horn and Flores (2003, p. 20) for detailed information on the specific requirements and procedures for determining the top 4% of a high school's graduating class.
9. Except for UC Merced, which opened in 2006, the Riverside and Santa Cruz campuses receive the least number of applications for freshman admission,

while UCLA, at more than 60,000, ranks among the highest U.S. universities in number of applicants.

10. Asian Americans were projected to represent 41% of entering freshmen in fall 2010, while African Americans would be only 3.9% (Gordon, 2010b).
11. Some of the material in this section is from Chapter 4 on “Educational Inequality and Ethnicity” in my book *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i* (2008), but I have updated it to include more recent data and developments in the UH system.
12. This problem was eventually resolved for the next school year by the state legislature in April 2010, shortly before the end of its session, by appropriating monies that were always available from a state “emergency fund” without having to raise taxes or borrow money. But the long delay in dealing with this issue clearly indicates the low policy priority that public education has in Hawai'i.

## REFERENCES

- Alsaybar, B. D. (2002). Deconstructing deviance: Filipino American youth gangs, “party culture,” and ethnic identity in Los Angeles. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Second generation: Ethnic identity among Asian Americans* (pp. 129-152). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Allonn, H. (1999, April 22). Years of neglect cripple UH-Manoa. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, pp. A1, A8.
- American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California. (2003, June 17). Settlement reached in suit over discriminatory admissions process at UC Berkeley [Press release]. Retrieved from [http://www.aclunc.org/news/prcss\\_releases/settle\\_mcn\\_t\\_reached\\_in\\_suit\\_ovcr\\_discriminatory](http://www.aclunc.org/news/prcss_releases/settle_mcn_t_reached_in_suit_ovcr_discriminatory)
- Buenavista, T. L. (2007). *Movement from the middle: Pilipina/o 1.5-generation college student access, retention, and resistance*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Buenavista, T. L. (2010). Issues affecting U.S. Filipino student access to postsecondary education: A critical race theory perspective, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 2.5(1), 114-126.
- Buenavista, T. L., Jayakumar, U. M., & Misa-Escalante, K. (2009). Contextualizing Asian American education through critical race theory: An example of U.S. Filipino college student experiences. In S. D. Museus (Ed.), *Conducting research on Asian Americans in higher education: New directions for institutional research* (no. 142, pp. 69-81). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010a). *Community college transfers: Filipino as a percent of total, 1995-2009* [table]. Retrieved from <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp>
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010b). *First-time freshmen: Filipino as a percent of total, 1995-2009* [table]. Retrieved from <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp>
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010c). *First-time freshmen: Latino as a percent of total, 1995-2009* [table]. Retrieved from [http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp?Eth=4&Rpt=FTF\\_UC](http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp?Eth=4&Rpt=FTF_UC)
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010d). *High school graduates: Black as a percent of total, 1994-2008* [table]. Retrieved from [http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp?Eth=2&Rpt=Grad\\_HS](http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp?Eth=2&Rpt=Grad_HS)
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010c). *High school graduates: Filipino as a percent of total, 1994-2008* [table]. Retrieved from <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp>
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (2010f). *High school graduates: Latino as a percent of total, 1994-2008* [table]. Retrieved from <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/EthSnapshotGraph.asp>
- Gima, C. (2007, June 7). UH-Manoa and Hilo breaking caps on enrollment. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, p. A1.
- Gordon, L. (2010a, July 15). Out of state? Come to UC. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/15/local/la-mc-uc-cn-roll-20100715>
- Gordon, L. (2010b, November 15). UC campuses move to recruit more out-of-state students. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-mc-ucrcruit-20101115,0,4096476.story>
- Hayashi, P., & Kidder, W. (2004, July 18). Level UC's unequal playing field. Guest Commentary, *Contra Costa Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.equaljusticccsociety.org/press\\_2004july\\_19\\_cttimes.html](http://www.equaljusticccsociety.org/press_2004july_19_cttimes.html)
- Horn, C. L., & Flores, S. M. (2003). *Percent plans in college admissions: A comparative analysis of three states' experiences*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.
- Information Resources and Communications. (2008). *Statistical summary of students and staff. University of California*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucop.edu/ticophone/uwnews/stat/>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (1994). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 1994*.
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (1995a). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 1995*.
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (1995b). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, fall 1995*.
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (1999a). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 1998*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?scuhl98.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (1999b). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 1998*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?seuhf99.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2001a). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 2001*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?seuhn1.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2001b). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, fall 2001*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/mapsPscmaR1.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2002). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, fall 2002*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/mapsPscmaf02.pdf>

- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2003a). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 2002*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/niaps/seu/hf02.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2003b). *Fall 2003 preliminary classified first-time freshmen highlights*. University of Hawai'i. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/niaps/lilm>.
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2009). *Graduation and retention rates, peer and benchmark group comparisons, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, fall 1990 to fall 2007 cohorts as of 2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?gcma08cxierenal.pdf>.
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2010a). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i, fall 2009*. University of Hawai'i Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps/Pscuh109.pdf>
- Institutional Research Office, University of Hawai'i. (2010b). *Fall enrollment report, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, fall 2009*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?semafW9.pdf>
- Krieger, L. M. (2009). New UC admissions policy gives While students a better chance, angers Asian-American community. *The Mercury News*. Retrieved from [http://www.mercurynews.com/ci\\_12014954](http://www.mercurynews.com/ci_12014954)
- Maramba, D. C. (2008). Immigrant families and the college experience: Perspectives of Filipina Americans, *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 336-350.
- Nieves, E. (1999, February 3). Civil rights groups suing Berkeley over admissions policy. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/02/03/us/civil-rights-groups-suing-berkeley-over-admissions-policy.html>
- Office of Student Research. (2007). *New freshman registrants by ethnicity, fall 1996-fall 2006*. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved from <http://www.osr2.berkeley.edu/newfreshlrcnd.html>
- Office of University and Budget Planning. (2010). *Fall 2009 ethnicity report—Undergraduate enrollment*. San Francisco State University. Retrieved from <http://www.sfsu.edu/~ubp/clickmap/elhlev/clh064.pdf>
- Okamura, J. Y. (1982). Ethnicity and ethnic relations in Hawaii. In D. Y. H. Wu (Ed.), *Ethnicity and interpersonal interaction in pluralistic societies: A cross-cultural study* (pp. 213-235). Singapore: Maruxcn Asia.
- Okamura, J. Y. (1990). Ethnicity and stratification in Hawai'i. *Operation Manong Resource Papers, No. 1*. Operation Manong Program, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Okamura, J. Y. (1998). Social stratification. In M. Haas (Ed.), *Multicultural Hawai'i: The fabric of a multiethnic society* (pp. 185-204). New York, NY: Garland.
- Okamura, J. Y. (2008). *Ethnicity and inequality in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Okamura, J. Y., & Agbayani, A. (1997). Pamantasan: Filipino Americans in higher education. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Filipino Americans: Transformation and identity* (pp. 183-197). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Takagi, D. (1993). *The retreat from race: Asian American admissions and racial politics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Teranishi, R. T. (2002). Asian Pacific Americans and critical race theory: An examination of school racial climate. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35, 144-154.

- Tinliangco-Cubales, A. (2007). For a while now, I've been feeling neglected...: A preliminary study on urban Filipina/o American high school students. In A. Tinliangco-Cubales (Ed.), *Pin@y educational partnerships: A Filipina/o American studies sourcebook series* (pp. 29-41). Santa Clara, CA: Phoenix.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2003). *Summary file 4 of the 2000 U.S. Census*. Retrieved from [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/Data?\\_lang=en&\\_ss=1&\\_ds=1&\\_tid=1001&\\_all\\_geo\\_types=N](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/Data?_lang=en&_ss=1&_ds=1&_tid=1001&_all_geo_types=N)
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2000). *Toward an understanding of percentage plans in higher education: Are they effective substitutes for affirmative action?* Retrieved from <http://www.usccr.gov/piib.s/perccnt/sinim.htm>
- University of Hawai'i. (2002). *University of Hawai'i system strategic plan: Entering the university's second century, 2002-2010*. University of Hawai'i.
- Vorsino, M. (2005, January 22). UH tuition might rise by 123%. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, p. A1.