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It is with great excitement that I share with you the 2016 NASPA Knowledge Community Publication! This publication, which exemplifies the focus of the KC program of creating and sharing knowledge, has been made possible by the many talented authors who took the time to share their vast experiences, knowledge, and insights with us. For their thoughtful and innovative work, I am truly grateful.

The articles within this publication are inspired by the 2016 Annual Conference theme of “Common Purpose: Shaping a vision for higher education.” This year’s theme reflects the ways in which student affairs professionals are uniquely positioned to collaborate with individuals across departments and divisions to advance leadership and shape change within higher education. Reflected within the articles are research updates, emerging trends, and promising practices that will assist all of us in advancing our professional competencies and best serving our institutions and our students.

I am continually impressed by the commitment of so many members across the KCs and the many ways in which they work to support their peers with the ultimate goal of cultivating student learning and success. I am honored to have this opportunity to work with such a talented and gifted group, and I appreciate the incredible job the KCs do, as evidenced within this publication, of creating and sharing knowledge for NASPA.

I also wanted to take a moment to extend my deepest gratitude to the 2016 NASPA KC Publication Committee, led once again by Ellen Meents-DeCaigny, for its incredible investment in creating such a high quality publication.

I hope you are able to find a moment at the 2016 NASPA Annual Conference to engage within the Knowledge Community program, whether it is by attending a sponsored session, visiting us at the Grad Prep and Communities Fair, or participating in one of the KC open business meetings. We truly welcome your involvement!

Thank you for your ongoing support, and I hope that you too are inspired by the pages that follow.

Sincerely,

Pauline Dobrowski
National Director of Knowledge Communities
NASPA Board of Directors
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Questions and problems that arise on a campus are often addressed solely by the first person who is assigned to them. These questions and problems may be due to a crisis, or they are just the result of a policy change that occurs at the state or federal level. On some occasions, we do not ask others on campus for help because we do not want to burden them with additional work. Other times, we wish to control the response, or we do not know who to involve. Yet, in many of these circumstances, we need to connect resources from across a campus to best address the particular situation that has arisen, whether a major crisis or a minor policy change. This is especially true in cases of public policy issues. By connecting resources, student affairs professionals can work toward the positive outcomes of

- accessing subject matter expertise from other areas of campus;
- collecting information, opinions, and input from across an institution in responding to overall public policy issues; and
- Sharing work across functional areas versus managing work only in student affairs.
In addition to emergency events or the daily circumstances of working with students, public policy matters are directed to the student affairs area of a campus in many situations because the policy is centered on students. In fact, NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and its Public Policy Division have recognized this fact in developing the agenda for association members. NASPA’s Public Policy Division’s key priorities are

- student success and completion,
- issues related to undocumented students,
- cost of and funding for higher education, and
- student safety and wellness.

All of these priorities, and many others, while student focused, are not meant to be nor can be solved or addressed by student affairs alone. Rather, these issues can be used to connect a campus across functional boundaries. Student affairs can have a large role in creating these connections and affecting how our institutions respond to these debates.

How can we make these connections happen? When a vice president for student affairs (VPSA) is charged with addressing one of these priorities for a campus, they will often try to connect people to develop a response. As stated above, policies and other priorities that span a multitude of departments and functional areas will not always be limited to student affairs departments for managing the response. In these cases, a VPSA may try to bring together task forces or ad hoc committees to create new policies, determine available resources, and create an institutional approach to address the concern. In connecting across campuses, VPSAs expect that positive outcomes will result. But what happens when it is not necessarily a policy change that demands a response, but a change that can still have an impact on operations and processes across the campus? In times such as these, a broad-based response is even more critical.

Let’s consider the example of the U.S. Department of Education’s College Scorecard (collegescorecard.ed.gov). The website was designed to allow families to “identify which schools provide the biggest bang for your buck” (White House, 2015, para. 1). It provides “reliable data on factors important to prospective students, such as how much graduates earn, and how much debt they have when they graduate” (White House, 2015, para. 1). The instrument is certainly one that affects the entirety of the campus but does not require a response from anyone. When a family or a prospective student uses the tool, they have access to a rich data pool with innumerable ways to sort and access it. However, it is also possible, if they do not delve deeply into the data, that they may make the proverbial comparison of “apples to oranges.” If one of these users were to ask a question about his data sort to a staff member at an open house, an alumni event, or an off-campus event, how would the staff member respond? Could she respond intelligently and appropriately? It is for these kinds of circumstances that a campus-wide group may be of most use.

In situations where data are accumulated and public scrutiny of an institution’s place within those data is likely, a consistent and thorough response by staff members as inquiries arise is critical. Let’s use the example of the College Scorecard’s Annual Cost, an important consideration for many students and their families. How would an employee answer if approached with a question regarding why one institution has a higher cost than another? In bringing together a broad group of people to consider such questions, a systematic review can take place. Topics such as public versus private institution, 4-year versus 2-year college, differing degree programs, and endowment size may all play a part in an answer. When campus leaders such as vice presidents and deans convene committees to address answers for College Scorecard questions, leaders from a variety of areas such as academics, financial aid, career services, and others should be represented at the table. Staff from these areas can then address possible questions such as why one institution is more expensive than a competitor and why an employment rate is lower at one institution than another. Answers should include new programs that have affected more recent data but have not affected the longer 10-year window found in much of what is seen in the College Scorecard. After the group has developed the answers, it can then train other members of the institution to respond to questions and other decisions such as whether broader communication is required with constituents such as current students, alumni, and faculty.

In moving away from a proverbial “silo,” answers such as those noted above can serve many purposes, including

- updating people on new initiatives around a campus,
- building a positive institutional image for the internal and external communities,
- dispelling rumors about and negative images of an institution, and
- allowing community members to be active and enthusiastic representatives of a campus.

When the members of a campus community work together to address an issue such as a poor indicator within the College Scorecard, the institutional community can be educated about important programs and systems it may not be aware of that exist on campus. Armed with this information, institutional community members such as faculty, staff, and current students become empowered to speak on behalf of the institution to those outside the institution. When delivered by people rather than a press release, these messages can have a deeper impact on the listener.
For student affairs professionals, these opportunities present excellent ways to connect with colleagues such as faculty and other administrative areas such as admissions in either developing the policies and information to respond to a change in the law, or accessing the training and information so that they may be better informed. In using the Public Policy Division agenda and staying informed on these public policy topics, student affairs professionals make themselves valuable campus contributors. In maintaining a thorough understanding of new and breaking topics, staff can serve a vital role in a community while also assisting with their own professional development. Public policy issues are always changing and evolving. Keeping up with the latest information is always a challenging proposition, as many resources and professional development opportunities are available. Consider such recent topics as

- state legislation on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues;
- federal legislation on FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) and its impact on conduct and student advising; and
- legislation on internships and fair labor laws.

In all of the cases, the Public Policy Division and NASPA as a whole contributed to the discourse and kept its members up to date and informed (Zippin, 2015; NASPA, 2014; NASPA, 2015). In remaining current on topics such as these, we all have a responsibility to keep both our colleagues and our students up to date with new changes in policy and procedures, especially about the latest changes that can support our students’ pursuit of their education. In sharing public policy information with colleagues from across the campus, we can help them connect the changes in their policies back to our students and make our institutions stronger in the process.
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Student affairs professionals in graduate and professional programs must take a leadership role in ensuring that colleges and universities consider special impacts on graduate and professional students when updating their Title IX policies and procedures. Special attention should be paid to how disclosure questions on professional school and licensing board applications inquiring about past criminal and academic conduct affect their students’ future professional opportunities. Student affairs professionals who work with professional students have a responsibility to work across functional boundaries to shape Title IX policies and procedures that do not place their students at a professional disadvantage.
Careers that flow from professional schools often require a heightened level of professional conduct and behavior. Those who serve as doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, journalists, and religious advisors must exhibit professionalism to protect the public. For instance, the legal profession requires that a lawyer’s conduct justifies the “trust of clients, adversaries, courts, and others with respect to the professional duties owed to them” (National Conference of Bar Examiners and American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, 2015). The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) recommends that medical schools conduct background checks on all applicants “to ascertain the ability of accepted applicants to eventually become licensed physicians in the future, enhance the safety and well-being of patients, and to ensure the public’s continuing trust in the medical profession” (AAMC, 2015).

As a result, many professional schools and professional licensing boards require extensive background investigations. Applications often inquire whether an applicant has ever been formally or informally charged with a crime. Many applications also inquire about past violations of school academic or conduct codes. These questions may be limited in scope, requiring disclosure of matters only where disciplinary action or sanctioning occurred, or the questions could be more broadly construed to include any formal or informal allegation or complaint.

Student affairs professionals who work with professional students should understand that a mere allegation or complaint of a Title IX violation could require disclosure on a professional school or licensing board application. Where an allegation or complaint was unfounded, this disclosure could cause the student unwarranted professional harm. Student affairs professionals should work closely with students, campus partners, and licensing boards to determine when a Title IX complaint or allegation will trigger a disclosure responsibility. Below are three key considerations for student affairs professionals who are contemplating disclosure responsibilities in Title IX proceedings.

1. When do professional school applications require disclosure, and how does that relate to the licensing board application?

The professional school or licensing board application language will govern when an applicant must disclose involvement in a Title IX proceeding. Student affairs professionals can assist applicants to determine whether the questions call for only matters where past disciplinary action or sanctions resulted or, more broadly, for all formal or informal allegations and complaints.

2. How is Title IX structured at their institution?

Some professional schools handle all Title IX procedures within the conduct system of the school. Other schools refer all Title IX inquires to a centralized university process. At some universities, the centralized office conducts the investigation and holds the hearing, but defers sanctioning back to the professional school. Others have the centralized office handle the entire process, and still others have hybrid models (Bennett, 2015, p.1). Some professional schools have scrutinized the centralized model. For instance, Harvard University initiated a university-wide policy, centralized process, and accompanying procedures in summer 2014. The Harvard Law School faculty criticized the university-wide approach, in part citing a long tradition of the individual schools handling the conduct of their students. Harvard Law School now investigates and determines its own Title IX cases with tremendous oversight from trained tenured faculty members (Delwiche & Duehren, 2015, p.1).

3. How does disclosing involvement in a Title IX proceeding impact students professionally, and what effect does that impact have on a campus’s reporting culture?

Students are less willing to bring forward Title IX reports when they believe the accused will automatically have to disclose the matter to licensing boards (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014, p.9). At times, the reporting student wants the school to take action to ensure that the conduct does not occur on campus again, but the reporting student does not want those actions to negatively impact the accused’s future career. Where licensing board applications require disclosure of any formal or informal allegation or complaint, schools must structure their reporting processes in a way that does not inadvertently discourage reporting.

A Title IX process that considers all of its community members—undergraduate, professional, and graduate—benefits when those working closest with each group are part of the process and are involved in developing policies and procedures. When professional schools administer the Title IX process for professional students or, at least, are able to influence the development of centralized structures, Title IX administrators will better consider impacts on professional students and those undergraduate students who may one day hope to pursue professional school. For instance, the University of California (UC) created a task force to identify steps to improve UC’s current processes and develop recommendations for implementing strategies to support excellence in prevention, response, and reporting of sexual violence, harassment, and sexual assault based on evidence-informed solutions and approaches. The task force includes functional representation from across UC’s system, including representatives from the graduate schools and graduate students (UC, 2014, p.3).
Student affairs professionals who work with professional students should consider the following points when thinking of changes to Title IX policy and procedure:

1. Work across functional boundaries and with external licensing boards to propose disclosure requirements that do not require unnecessary disclosures.
   - Licensing boards and professional schools should work together to find a balance between defining the disclosure necessary to protect the profession and protecting the student from having to disclose unwarranted allegations and complaints.

2. However the Title IX process is structured (centralized or within the professional school), involve professional school faculty and professional staff in consideration of Title IX policies and procedures to ensure licensing board disclosures are considered.

3. Understand how your school’s process interacts with the licensing board’s disclosure requirement to counsel students accordingly and create a culture of reporting.

In sum, student affairs professionals should work across boundaries to develop policies and procedures that balance the need of the profession to assess required behavioral standards with protecting students’ opportunities in their future careers. Student affairs professionals should play a lead role in ensuring that disclosure requirements on professional school and licensing board applications reflect what is necessary to protect the profession, protect students from unnecessary disclosures, and are structured in a way that encourages reporting.
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When people think of college students living in the residence halls, going to school full-time, attending ball games and fraternity parties, and maybe working a few hours a week in the summer to bring in some extra money. However, only twenty-seven percent of students met the criteria of traditional students in the 1999-2000 academic year (Carreiro & Kapitulik, 2010). Between 1999-2009, the matriculation rate of traditional age student increased by twenty-seven percent compared with a forty-three percent surge with nontraditional age students during the same time period (Blau & Thomas-Maddox, 2014). The enrollment of nontraditional students is projected to increase by twenty percent between 2007-2018 (Meek, 2013). To ensure increased nontraditional student retention in higher education, universities needs to develop support services and resources, an understanding of their learning style(s), as well as further develop a sense of community for nontraditional students.

In 1984, the average age of college students was thirty years old, in 1997 it increased to thirty-six years old, and the projection for 2025 is an average of forty years old. Cubeta, Travers, and Sheckley (2001) explain that the average age of students in higher education has been increasing steadily. Carreiro and Kapitulik (2010) pointed out that what educators previously referred as the nontraditional student may in fact be the “new traditional student.” Cubeta et al. (2001) has observed that institutions of higher education are searching for additional techniques to identify and address areas that may hinder students’ success.

The topic of student retention first appeared on the higher educational radar screen about forty-five years ago, when it was believed that nontraditional students failed, and the institutions played a small role in their failure. The study of student retention patterns and practices has focused on the barriers and stressors that hinder adult undergraduate students’ participation in the collegiate environment. Some of the barriers may include limited social support systems, lack of peer group classmates, and other life obligations (Schatzel, 2011). Nontraditional students have a great sense of satisfaction with student-professor interactions and involvement compared to traditional students that identify social interactions with peers in the classroom (Blau & Thomas-Maddox, 2014). A nontraditional student might be more persuaded by external and environmental factors than a traditional student who could be more affected by social influences (Blau & Thomas-Maddox, 2014). Researchers have also explored the development of institutional and external partnerships to improve support programs, policies, and services on campus for nontraditional students. Universities began examining reasons behind student departures and implemented uses
of data to improve institutional policies. Administrators should pay close attention to what the ethos is of the college and to how they can improve their viewpoint on nontraditional students (Oseguera & Rhee, 2009).

Participation
Institutions need to have a welcoming environment and ask for feedback to improve the services they offer. Participation continues to be problematic and yet it is important to consider campus climate when supporting nontraditional student needs.

Campuses that understand the time constraints, costs, family responsibilities, class schedule, and employment problems with nontraditional students have created services that accommodate the unique needs of nontraditional students (Schatzel, 2011). Student affairs professionals must be able to effectively support today’s nontraditional students (Wyatt, 2011). In order to provide this support, they need to understand student support services advocating for nontraditional students that may include new student orientation sessions, tutoring, remedial courses, mentoring, support groups, faculty support, and counseling services (Meek, 2013). Support services consisting of academic, career, financial and personal counseling is essential to enhance personal, emotional, and social adjustments of nontraditional students (Meek, 2013).

Learning Experience
Nontraditional students and traditional students link learning experiences differently in the classroom; nontraditional students want to be able to connect their experience to classroom learning. Gilardi and Guglielmetti (2011) highlight that allowing adults to link classroom learning with their past experiences can open up new methods to looking at problems, transform previous understandings, and help them with real-life contexts. Nontraditional students derive connections from their multiple life experiences to integrate new learning, making their college experiences significant to them (Meek, 2013). This involvement allows the student the ability to construct meaningful learning.

Support
Creating partnerships between the institution and external organizations is one of the many strategies for supporting the retention and completion rates of adult learners. Meaningful partnerships can break down barriers that are often experienced by adult learners. Some of the partnerships could include civic and community groups, specialized organizations, and external partnerships for benefitting adult learners with children. Establishing partnerships requires an understanding of adult needs, knowledge of local and national resources, and a willingness to identify common goals. For example, institutional efforts to partner with community agencies in providing services and resources, such as child care services, financial aid, scholarships, and help with the application process, directly affect student achievement (Baldizan & Schreiber, 2014).

While community partnerships are important, academic and external commitment is essential for supporting academic accomplishments. A strong interest in understanding the needs of adult learners and the challenges they face is critical to serving them well. The challenge for universities is to develop programs, policies, and initiatives that best facilitate adults’ transitions. Careful attention to the needs of adult learners will likely lead to a standard for student services that is different from one designed to meet the needs of traditional students. Adult entry courses, physical location, and accessibility to centralized student services are something to consider for how nontraditional students are supported on campuses. Student affairs professionals have a responsibility to understand and advocate for how nontraditional students participate in college, how their learning experiences differ, and how the support they receive affects their retention.
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“If the first woman God ever made was strong enough to turn the world upside down all alone, these women together ought to be able to turn it back, and get it right side up again!”

—Sojourner Truth (1851/1995)

As coverage of the social, political, and economic challenges faced by Black Americans grows, so too does the unending heaviness of social justice fatigue. As a means for gaining renewed strength, a group of Black women participating in the University of Georgia College’s Student Affairs Administration PhD graduate program gathered in a virtual space that allowed them to discover how their knowledges transverse their multiple identities. Patricia Hill-Collins (2000) affirmed that unique knowledge is situated in Black women’s experiences at the intersection of race and gender. Black women connect with other Black women through their shared experience of Black womanhood, while also having individual expressions of and reactions to the experience of being a Black woman.
Connected to our intersubjective and situated knowledge is our engagement with formal and informal mentorship. Black women in graduate programs seek mentorship in nontraditional ways, including non-faculty community members, staff, and friends (Patton, 2009). Peer mentoring is one method Black women can use to encourage and support each other through collective and personal challenges. Black women are encouraged to work collaboratively to bring forth knowledge that empowers them and others (Hill-Collins, 2000; Patton, 2009). Fortunately, our virtual meetings also provide a space for mentor and protégé relationship development as well as peer-to-peer mentorship development.

The significance of the situated knowledge and communal needs of Black women became clear this past summer, when news broke about Rachel Dolezal misrepresenting herself as a Black woman (Patton, 2015). Many of us, as doctoral students, had individual conversations with each other about the incident and how our identities as Black women could be so easily appropriated. The outgrowth of these individual conversations led us to think about how we could share with each other, as Black women in the same student affairs doctoral program, about this and other issues that affected us. After much discussion, we decided to invite a faculty member who is a Black woman to meet virtually with us to discuss the incident and how it affected our individual and collective consciousness as Black women. Because our group included students and a faculty member, the group quickly reconciled the inherent power dynamics and approached the gathering through the lens of social identities rather than positional roles.

While our initial plan for this discussion was about Rachel Dolezal, our first meeting coincided with the funeral of Reverend Clementa Pinckney, the pastor and South Carolina state senator, who was a victim of the Charleston, South Carolina, church shooting (Kim, 2015). Also by coincidence, we were all watching the funeral live as we began the discussion. We began with a prayer for openness, understanding, and compassion; we also prayed for those affected directly by the Charleston shootings and the loss of loved ones. We shared our perspectives on the attack against Emmanuel AME Church.

Our discussion focused on safety and what it meant to feel safe, particularly as it relates to places of worship. We also identified areas of comfort for us during situations like these. In particular, family, friends, prayer, and individual reflection were the common areas of comfort, as was how we practiced self-care. At the end of the discussion, we proposed meeting every month in order to hold a space of sharing and building sisterhood. Since that initial meeting, we have met again and discussed the death of Sandra Bland and the treatment of Black bodies—in particular, women—in these incidents (Mitroa, 2015). Critical to this discussion was considering the importance of self-care as part of our speaking out and about these issues.

As we collectively make meaning of our experiences and associated coping strategies, we continue to recognize the intersections of our multiple social identities. Our virtual space is not only a space to unpack racially charged incidents, it is also a space to unveil our dominant and subordinate social identities—without judgment or censorship. We continue to provide the virtual space, meeting monthly without any expectations regarding participation. Our goals are constant: we focus on fostering a space that promotes the integration of multiple identities, support the enactment of self-care, and unpack current issues that may influence our worldviews.

Communities of support are vital. We would be remiss if we did not mention the caucusing work that our faculty have been engaged in over the past year with other social identity groups within our various graduate programs. Our programmatic efforts remain ongoing. We encourage faculty and students to work with campus partners or reference caucusing literature to employ this approach in their graduate preparation programs. As we continue with our sisterhood-building efforts as Black women in a virtual space, we look forward to growth and further individual and collective development.
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For years, we have heard about drug abuse, substance dependence, alcohol-related problems, unintended consequences, binge drinking, sexual assault, underage drinking, and so much more. As personnel dedicated to our students, their success, and the quality of academic, social, and cultural pursuits on our campuses, we consider alcohol and drug involvement a top concern. This article highlights recent survey results and the steps that can be taken by any campus professional—a dedicated entry-level hall director, a passionate substance abuse education coordinator, an interested administrator, a grounded treatment specialist, or a committed faculty member—to help move the campus forward. The article refers to two surveys: The College Alcohol Survey reports college-focused efforts based on responses from chief student affairs officers or their designees; the Monitoring the Future Study incorporates data from surveys of traditional age college students nationwide.
College Alcohol Survey Background
The College Alcohol Survey (Anderson & Santos, 2015) is the national longitudinal survey on alcohol, tobacco, drugs, and violence at institutions of higher education and thus serves as the primary source of data for this article. Conducted since 1979, and with no external funding, this triennial survey gathers information on the range of efforts used to address drug and alcohol issues as well as their insights about campus efforts. The 2015 survey was sent to a stratified sample of 324 four-year public and private institutions, and 178 (54.9%) complete responses were received. The overall findings show only modest changes over the last twenty years. If practitioners want to change the culture surrounding drugs and alcohol on campuses, they need to commit themselves to moving more aggressively and methodically.

Student Drug and Alcohol Use Patterns
For most of the survey’s 35 years, a primary area of concern has been higher-risk alcohol use ("binge drinking"). The Monitoring the Future Study (Johnston, O’Malley, Bachman, Schulenberg, & Miech, 2014) documented consumption of five or more drinks, at least once in the past 2 weeks, as hovering near 40% for decades; its current 35.4% rate is a recent drop. Marijuana 30-day use is at 20.8%, up from 14.1% in 1991; other illicit drug use jumped from 4.3% in 1991 to 10.0% in 2014 (Johnston et al 2014). With alcohol, the lack of change in “binge drinking” behavior for decades should raise significant concern; however, the relative stagnation of campus efforts may help to explain why this statistic has not changed until recently. Further, the recent rise in illicit drug use, including marijuana, should serve as a wake-up call for campus leaders.

Drug and Alcohol Consequences
Other campus-based data from The College Alcohol Survey about the extent of alcohol-related consequences, can help campus personnel understand the importance of prevention, policy, and support initiatives (Anderson and Santos, 2015). Alcohol’s involvement with student behaviors, health, and academic performance has seen a minimal reduction for the three decades over which this data has been collected. Alcohol is involved with half of campus policy violations (57%), violent behavior (52%), and residence hall damage (50%); it is involved in 72% of acquaintance rapes, 71% of sexual assaults, 51% of unsafe sex, and 35% of physical injury. Academically, alcohol is cited as a factor with lack of academic success 30% of the time, and with 23% of the cases of student attrition. In short, alcohol alone is believed to be involved with about half of campus problems overall. One implication is clear: We must talk about alcohol’s involvement to better understand and reduce its impact.

Policies and Procedures
From a policy perspective, 81% of colleges and universities allow alcohol to be served or consumed on campus, but the circumstances under which alcohol is allowed continue to improve, with 88% of campuses requiring training for servers, 88% requiring non-alcoholic beverages, and 57% having a policy prohibiting low-price/free drinks or drink specials (Anderson and Santos, 2015). Practitioners have a long way to go. Why do 12% of campuses not require training of servers, and why do 43% of campuses allow drink specials?

Needs Assessment and Evaluation
Today, more campuses conduct surveys on drug and alcohol use, knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions, increasing from 37%-45% in 1979 to 68%-91% today (Anderson and Santos, 2015). However, only 46% collect data on health center contacts resulting from alcohol use. Further, 54% have recently done a formal assessment of the effectiveness of their drug/alcohol program. These gaps in data collection are not just missed opportunities to learn more; a formal assessment is a requirement with the biennial reviews, stipulated with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994. This law specifies that any institution of higher education that receives federal financial aid must implement a program to prevent the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol by students and employees, and must also review these prevention programs every other year.

Prevention and Implementation Efforts
From a prevention perspective, The College Alcohol Survey (Anderson and Santos, 2015) identifies a range of approaches, including awareness periods on alcohol (71%) or drugs (49%), safe-ride programs (55%), and orientation programs (91%). Peers with a primary focus on substance issues are found on more than half (55%) of campuses. The extent to which special attention is paid to the unique needs of subpopulations of students (e.g., persons of color and LGBT students) has been monitored for more than 20 years, with minimal changes found. A comprehensive substance abuse prevention effort requires a range of strategies and approaches, and campus efforts should be expanded to include more. Further, with the various groups of students having unique needs regarding substance issues, campuses should address why current efforts remain stagnant.

The College Alcohol Survey (Anderson and Santos, 2015) also reviews efforts utilized to manage campus initiatives: 91% of campuses have a designated alcohol/substance abuse educator or specialist, whose professional responsibilities include education and awareness (27%), counseling (19%), assessment (11%), task force (9%), training (8%), and research/evaluation (6%). This individual’s time is spent primarily on dealing with alcohol (37%), followed by violence (26%), wellness (20%), drugs (10%), and tobacco (7%). The level of effort averages
1.4 full-time equivalent, and the variety of skills and content areas can be both overwhelming and scattered. A campus task force is reported by 64% of campuses, and a community-based task force is also found among 64% of campuses. Further, roughly half (52%) of campuses report a formalized strategic plan. The implication is for a need for larger staff with various areas of specialization, more organized planning, and enhanced, orchestrated efforts to promote greater focus and cost-effective collaboration.

Support Services
Students with drinking problems can receive assistance primarily from the campus counseling center. Group counseling for problem drinkers is found on 51% of campuses, support groups for those negatively affected by an alcoholic are found on 39%, and organized recovery services are available on 36% (Anderson and Santos, 2015). The need for this support and attention is vital and deserves careful attention.

Conclusion
In summary, these current findings tell us, first, that a tremendous amount of work remains to be done. The numerous policies, programs, and services identified are all valuable for inclusion in a comprehensive approach; many more issues included in the survey are found with overall survey results in the College Alcohol Survey (Anderson & Santos, 2015). Second, we can promote needs-based efforts by conducting an honest self-assessment. The Campus Substance Abuse Strategy Assessment (Anderson, 2013) helps campuses to identify areas of need and comparisons with the survey respondents; CollegeAIM (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2015) provides a tool to organize plans using research-based strategies and resource information. Third, to truly maximize health and safety on our campuses and to promote a setting where students can achieve academically, socially, culturally, and more, it is vital that we address drug and alcohol issues using various available tools. We must identify best practices, learn from the research, be innovative, and persevere. In short, our efforts must be more planned and aggressive, have more support and collaboration, be strategic, and be an investment in the range of services and resources if we are to achieve healthier campuses.
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“Our existence is defined by the interactions and intersections of our social identities” (Accapadi, 2012, p. 77). This article comes from a series of conversations that we, the authors, had on the complexity of navigating a meaningful career in higher education/student affairs with our call to serve our broader communities. Although one of us has followed a more “traditional” student affairs path and one of us has not, we have nonetheless continued to examine our careers using an intersectional lens and have pursued experiences outside of the ivory tower; such examination and pursuits resulted in our becoming more creative educators and, ultimately, better stewards to our students and broader communities. As social justice advocates and critical scholars, we constantly encounter the tension that exists when one takes a traditional career trajectory that does not always include racial or ethnic community engagement in addition to explicit job-related functions. These functions are generally limited outside of the multicultural affairs functional area.

Research on Asian Pacific American leadership development has found that successful leadership development for students requires experience and support from a range of sectors, especially community involvement (Balón, 2003). In fact, the impact of broader involvement in community-based organizations in professional development and preparation for leadership roles is highlighted for both Asian Pacific Islander Desi American (APIDA) professionals (Tingson-Gatuz, 2012) and students (Sedlacek & Sheu, 2013). However, pursuing alternate, but related, involvement is often easier said than done. This may be due to a number of factors, including cultural
capital of organizations that exist outside of traditional student affairs settings, institutional support for alternative professional development opportunities, and access to organizations when many campuses are in geographically isolated areas. This article explores what an intersectional approach to our careers means and which questions remain unanswered, and we offer tangible ways to continue that exploration within and outside of higher education. We encourage an approach to doing “the work” with APIDA populations that reflects the tenets of social justice and community building.

An Intersectional Approach to Our Careers
An intersectional approach to our careers and lives embraces a work–life flow consistent with our values, encourages diversity of experiences, and builds holistic professional development. We recognize the importance that each profession brings to the world. If we are to prepare students to become contributing members of society, then it is important to build skills and experiences in other sectors whenever possible. In short, pursuing experience outside of our higher education roles has allowed us to become better at developing students holistically, which makes the world a better place and prepares them to compete in the market economy.

As practitioners whose roots lie in advocacy for the broader APIDA community, we feel that it is simply not enough to understand the experiences of APIDA students only on traditional 4-year college campuses. For example, we must also be well versed in immigration and affirmative action policy and recognize the role other social identities, such as class and gender, play in our students’ experiences. Viraj, while working in residence life and student activities at a traditional 4-year institution, sought involvement with local organizations—one focused on advocacy for APIDA women and another promoted APIDAs in public service careers. Through involvement with these groups, Viraj developed an understanding of national and local policies that affect APIDA communities, nonprofit careers, and community advocacy. She draws on her experience with these organizations in her work with APIDA students at her current position on a traditional 4-year campus.

Among other contributions, Viraj has increased cultural capital for many first- and second-generation students with regard to health care and immigration resources; has increased their access to financial aid; and has facilitated networking for students interested in learning about alternate sectors traditionally unexplored in APIDA communities. By developing a wide and nuanced network outside of higher education and utilizing these connections to foster mentors and sponsors for students, Viraj has expanded the resources for a traditionally underserved community beyond the physical campus.

Benefit to an Intersectional Approach
By building authentic partnerships with our development colleagues on and off campus, we enhance the resources with which we support the APIDA community. In her experience working at a national APIDA-serving scholarship fund, Jacqueline expanded her constituents to include donors, community members, and legislators; the experience also complicated her decision-making process when it came to supporting students. By working closely with the development team to learn the perspectives of donors interested in supporting APIDA students, and getting to know scholarship recipients with diverse stories that were not always visible at a traditional 4-year institution, Jacqueline designed a professional development support program that had a higher impact on students and resulted in metrics that encourage future sustainability of the program. Returning to a campus, Jacqueline used this skill to connect with the diversity of graduate students and with her development colleagues to discuss external funding opportunities for a transition program and how to tie this program to student success and retention, especially during a time when internal funding is limited.

Another benefit of using an intersectional lens is that it allows us to more deeply examine our intersecting identities with our careers. The challenge in our work of supporting APIDA students and colleagues is recognizing that we are more than our positions and being able to practice what we preach. This highlights the importance of thinking holistically about the experiences APIDA students and colleagues have on and off campus. An underlying theme in this article is how our identities as first-generation APIDA womyn college students who have personal missions about achieving social equity show up in our career paths on and off traditional 4-year campuses.

Implementing an Intersectional Approach
It is important to identify the change we are proposing is different than what we learned about traditional student affairs/higher education career paths. While following a prescribed career path comes with a level of certainty and comfort, the prescribed path does not align with our identities as critically thinking professionals, especially when we push our students to do the same. For example, Jacqueline experienced some negative reactions to her brief step outside of traditional student affairs, even though it was an opportunity to serve her community. Viraj, when in residence life and student activities, struggled to find balance between community and professional work. For example, students often sought identity-based mentorship, but we, as administrators, were reminded by colleagues that the multicultural/social justice work was not the main focus of our jobs. We imagine we will continue exploring and questioning as we move through our careers, and
encourage the following suggestions for consideration:

- Identify a mentor outside of student affairs and higher education.
- If job searching, widen your parameters and consider different industries.
- Use tuition benefits to take a class on the community you are serving.
- Pursue volunteer or engagement opportunities in a community-based organization.

As beneficiaries of an education that supported understanding our communities and histories, we have both divergent and overlapping experiences that speak to our desire to continue complicating the narrative of spaces that were never designed for people like us—APIDA womyn, children of immigrants, first-generation college students in the United States, etc. This includes institutions of higher education, meaningful inclusion of APIDA voices in policy and financial systems, and other spaces. We hope to build a network of professionals who are also leading career paths that navigate the complexity of identity- and community-based advocacy, in order to develop and share best practices for an interdisciplinary and intersectional approach to our work.

References


Disruptive innovations are reshaping higher education, and as they take hold, the core functions of institutions may shift in response. Rather than seeing this change as something to overcome, it is important to understand how change can create new opportunities for student affairs to contribute to student success. Disruptive innovations are ones that bring about social change and require major breakthroughs in how people do their work (Christensen, Baumann, Ruggles, & Sadtler, 2006). The innovations in higher education that will have the most impact on student affairs assessment practice are: (a) data analytics, (b) competency-based education, (c) common degree learning outcomes, and (d) comprehensive student records.

A consistent theme across these innovations is that they will demand that professionals use evidence to make decisions about their work, engage students in learning experiences toward their degrees, assess learning, and use data to intervene with students and increase college completion. As a result, student affairs professionals must be prepared to make assessment a part of their daily work. For those who lead student affairs assessment efforts, it will be a critical time to establish division infrastructure—such as new policies and processes—so division staff can work in concert to produce evidence of learning and data points that contribute to institutional retention efforts.
Data Analytics
Assessment can help campuses understand who students are, disaggregated by demographics, and sharpen the focus on the experiences that best meet student needs. Many campuses are now warehousing large amounts of data, mining data systems, and integrating data from across the campus to create data sets that can then model which student behaviors and activities lead to the highest rate of graduation. If institutions are able to use data to analyze patterns of student performance, persistence, and completion, then predictive modeling can outline the practices that contribute to student success. Data disaggregation allows these patterns to be broken down by student characteristics, such as gender, race, major, financial aid types, course attendance, campus activities attendance, and use of services such as advising, counseling or a recreation center.

This type of analysis enables practitioners to be advocates for students and to assist in or coordinate efforts where achievement gaps exist. Furthermore, instead of reactively working with students after they are too far behind, the analytic modeling can be used to create early alert systems if students are not on a path that should result in retention. These early alert systems allow professionals to understand where intensive staff support may be needed. To automate contact with students, technology solutions exist that tie these alerts to text message and email reminders for immediate feedback, encouraging students to follow up on their own.

Another way this type of data analytics can be used is by identifying where programs or services are not contributing to student success. If the program or service does not show up in the analytic modeling as a key factor in retention, this is valuable information for budget and staff allocations. Practitioners will need to create a “stop doing” list based on evidence, so that resources can be directed to those practices that make the most difference for students.

Competency-based Education
Competency-based education (CBE) is quickly expanding in higher education and is supported by a cohort of institutions in the Competency-Based Education Network (www.cbenetwork.org). CBE is a flexible teaching model in which students are directly assessed for competencies, or learning outcomes, rather than using a proxy of learning, such as a grade or course credit hours. In a CBE program, learning experiences are more personalized to students as they move at their own pace, and blur traditional lines of education by integrating learning from multiple environments to meet degree learning outcomes.

For student affairs assessment, CBE provides additional opportunities for cocurricular learning to be assessed, because all learning “counts” and is assessed regardless of whether it was learned in a course, in the workplace, or in a cocurricular activity. Most CBE institutions use common degree learning outcomes frameworks to understand what learning outcomes students must meet in order to earn a degree. While this directly aligns with student affairs professional values about holistic education, this type of education reinforces the need for practitioners to use tools like curriculum mapping to be clear about program outcomes and be prepared to assess student learning in valid and reliable ways.

Common Learning Outcomes
Understanding the knowledge and skills that students should have after earning a degree is important to employers as well as to students. As a result, industry and higher education are focused on defining the learning outcomes for degrees rather than using proxies like credit hours or grades. Common learning outcomes frameworks that define the knowledge and skills associated with degrees are emerging. For example, the Essential Learning Outcomes (visit www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes) were introduced by the Association of American Colleges and Universities in 2005. Several years later, the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP, degreeprofile.org) was developed to define the learning outcomes for associate, bachelor’s, and master’s degrees regardless of major.

With clearly defined degree outcomes, institutions can use the DQP to create and align curricular and cocurricular learning experiences. The impact for student affairs professionals is that they should be familiar with, intentionally incorporate, and assess learning that contributes to a student’s degree outcomes in appropriate programs, services, and interventions. This is not only important in order to be seen as an equal partner in student learning; it also ensures that all student learning is assessed and included on student records.

Student affairs divisions will need a common understanding of the core outcomes provided across the cocurriculum, and assessment professionals can be most influential in helping divisions accomplish this work. Once learning outcomes are defined, work will need to be done to align outcomes with learning activities. Curriculum maps—or, specifically, student affairs cocurriculum maps—could be used to understand where intentional programming across the division provides learning that is mapped to degree learning outcomes (Ewell, 2013).

Comprehensive Student Records
As assessment of student learning in the curriculum and cocurriculum becomes more widespread, new student records are emerging that include all learning that contributes to degree outcomes. This also supports students’ and employers’ requests for records that better represent the actual learning that students accumulate, rather than a list of courses and grades. Extending the transcript into a more comprehensive record is another way for student affairs to further fulfill our mission and commitment to students by providing validation of the holistic learning students engage in outside the classroom.

This will require divisions to develop robust and
comprehensive systems and protocols to capture the assessment that professionals give to students from cocurricular learning so that it can be added to the comprehensive student record. These are most often coordinated by a student affairs division leader who uses technology; that way, staff can easily upload or share student learning data that can be compiled and sent to the registrar. Specific models to inform these systems are currently being developed in a project facilitated by NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and AACRAO: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (Fain, 2015).

Some institutions are also using comprehensive student records as a tool to provide clearer guidance to students about gaps in knowledge and skills needed to fulfill degree outcomes and where they can find learning experiences that will get them closer to their degree. Practitioners will need to be prepared to use these records to facilitate more intentional learning conversations with students and to partner with academic advisors and faculty in this endeavor.

Conclusion
Emerging innovations provide great opportunities for student affairs to be involved in student learning and to advocate for student success. Assessment is a core function that will ensure these opportunities are turned into a reality, by utilizing data to proactively intervene with students, create competency-based programs, and contribute to degree learning outcomes that can then be documented on comprehensive student records.
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Student affairs professionals working in higher education help students to succeed by blending inside- and outside-the-classroom learning. As our positions in student affairs span several different functional areas, we should also “foster and promote” these learning opportunities while “encouraging an understanding and respect for diversity,” valuing one another’s worth as individuals, and helping to meet the needs of our students (NASPA, 2015). That said, the increase in sexual misconduct and other violent incidents on campus have made facilitating the educational mission of the field a daunting balancing act.

Continued exposure to violent incidents may increase a professional’s likelihood of experiencing vicarious traumatization. In counseling, this exposure is described as vicarious trauma: the cumulative and gradual transformation that results from empathic engagement of traumatized individuals after working with them. Vicarious trauma creates affective distress and shifts in cognitive schemas following the secondary exposure to traumatic material (Harrison & Westwood, 2009, p. 203). The emotional costs of vicarious trauma can include low job satisfaction, decreased confidence in the organization, and a high degree of job-related tension.
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Personal and Ethical Foundations
Why Is This Important?
As student affairs professionals are assisting students with a number of student concerns, professionals could become bombarded by the stories students share. It is important to note that not everyone who is exposed vicariously to a traumatic event will develop symptoms. However, over the past several years, the atmosphere and conversations that surround student affairs have begun to change due to a number of factors. One conversation student affairs administrators are having more frequently is about the response to traumatic events that are occurring on American campuses. A 2015 article in Inside Higher Education—"The Dean of Sexual Assault," by Lee Burdette Williams—includes an example of a fundamental change in the student affairs profession. Williams describes this change as a shift: instead of focusing on students, she was tasked with handling crisis after crisis or assigning staff members to address the aftermath of a crisis. A review of The Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool shows a steady increase of violent crimes, which supports Williams’ description of a shift in focus on crisis management rather than on student development (Office of Postsecondary Education, n.d.). Table 1 depicts the number of violent incidents reported on our college campuses during 2010-2013, as required by the Clery Act.

Table 1: Clery1 Aggregated Data for Calendar Years 2011–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Sex Offenses</td>
<td>4,198</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>6,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forcible Sex Offenses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>4,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>10,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data adapted from http://ope.ed.gov/security

In addition to the Clery Act-reported data, an increased number of mental health concerns add to the complexity of students’ lives. The American College Health Association (ACHA) lists suicide as the “second most common cause of death among college students,” and the rate has tripled since the 1950s (Henriques, 2014, p. 6). Furthermore, since the 1990s, there has been an increase in “levels of stress, depression, and anxiety” (Henriques, 2014, p. 5). Ninety-five percent of counseling center directors on college campuses have reported a growing number of students on their campuses with “significant psychological problems,” and this growth does not appear to be slowing down (Henriques, 2014, para. 2). Table 2 presents the primary diagnoses of students enrolled in college who have been diagnosed with a mental health condition:

Table 2: Primary Diagnosis of Enrolled College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Condition</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Disorder</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from National Alliance on Mental Health, 2012, p. 7. Other diagnoses include: borderline personality disorder, dysthymia, eating disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorders, schizoaffective disorder, and autism spectrum disorder.

Student affairs professionals are not only assisting students during their transitions into and through college, they are also helping students to navigate after a serious incident has occurred, such as sexual assault. Doing so can trigger concerns for the mental health of the professionals.

There are several recommendations for addressing professionals’ exposure to vicarious trauma. The first recommendation would be to acknowledge that vicarious trauma occurs in higher education. This acknowledgment will require an open, supportive environment. Because vicarious trauma is a complex occurrence, thoughtful consideration of personal trauma histories or trigger events will be needed in order for the campus community to discuss the impact of vicarious trauma on student affairs professionals. Consequently, an open and supportive environment allows for administrators to fully contemplate the impact to the campus community.

Second, it is important that student affairs professionals discuss the nature of a traumatic event with immediate supervisors, a trusted colleague, or mental health professionals (Aparicio, Michalopoulos, & Unick, 2013). A supervisor should not assume that a professional is equipped to handle all situations, even if they have had training in this area.

Third, while training is a key strategy to address campus crises, it also can provide staff with the tools to recognize elements of vicarious trauma. Training could include best practices to respond to violent incidents or national trends in campus crimes. Aparicio, Michalopoulos, and Unick (2013) recommended training as a two-prong approach, examining supervisees’ and supervisors’ exposure to vicarious trauma. Supervisors should be equipped to identify attributes of vicarious trauma, and supervisees should have a level of self-awareness to see changes in their own behavior. The Headington Institute provides online workshops that specifically address trauma workers.

Why Is This Important?
Lastly, the work environment must establish a safety net that strongly encourages and supports self-care and creates support networks for professionals. The support network could take various forms but should encourage debriefing and processing of incidents that invoke stress (Harrison & Westwood, 2009).

Student affairs’ domain is no longer “just” student development; rather, it includes a complex arena of response agents. These changing interactions with students place professionals at an increased risk of vicarious trauma. Not identifying early vicarious trauma has the potential for adverse and long-term effects on mental health, relationships, and work performance (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). Student affairs as a profession has been able to adjust with each student population and trend; our current climate should be no different, but there is a crucial need for more open discussions to support colleagues in order to avoid a mass exodus from the field.
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Disability resources offices in higher education play a multipart, vital role that goes beyond the provision of reasonable accommodations. The mission of disability resources described in the CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2015) has three parts:

- Provide institution wide advisement, consultation, and training on disability-related topics, including legal and regulatory compliance, universal design, and disability scholarship.
- Collaborate with partners to identify and remove barriers to foster an all-inclusive campus.
- Provide individual services and facilitate accommodations for students with disabilities.
This three-part mission requires collaboration with virtually every unit on campus, regardless of the staffing of a disability resources office and how many students are receiving direct support for accommodations. Disability resources offices on U.S. campuses serve anywhere from under 100 students to over 3,000. According to Huger (2011), “A disability-friendly institutional climate increases all students’ exposure to and interaction with peers with disabilities” (p. 6). Therefore, disability resources staff need to establish collaborative relationships with campus partners who increasingly incorporate accessibility as part of their planning. Examples of successful, collaborative relationships are cited below.

William R. Harper College is a large, suburban community college outside Chicago, with an enrollment of 25,000, including 1,400 students with disabilities. Staff in the Access and Disability Services office built strong, collaborative relationships with Information Technology and the Center for Innovative Instruction, the faculty development unit. These relationships, developed over a 10-year period, resulted in the following positive outcomes:

1. Creation and expansion of an assistive technology lab with an e-text production center and captioning support. An information technology manager is available as an ongoing consultant. A Faculty Fellows program in Universal Design for Learning was also created: “Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework to improve and optimize teaching and learning for all people based upon scientific insights into how humans learn” (Retrieved from www.cast.org/our-work/about-udl.html#VpA32vkRM8).

2. Collaborative sponsorship for numerous training sessions on accessible technology and web design, including hosting regional sessions for other colleges in Illinois.

3. Incorporation of accessible document creation, Web accessibility, and universal design into the trainings offered through faculty development.

4. Demonstrated proficiency in the following Technology competency outcomes as outlined in the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators (ACPA—College Student Educators International & NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015):
   - Ensure compliance with accessible technology laws and policies.
   - Model and promote equitable and inclusive practices by ensuring all participants in educational endeavors can access and utilize the necessary tools for success.

As another example of successful collaborations, Radford University is a comprehensive, public university in Virginia with an enrollment of approximately 10,000, including 648 students with disabilities. Disability resources office staff have worked diligently, forging partnerships to create a “military friendly” campus. They have taken a “united front” approach to serve and support veterans returning to civilian life who are seeking an equal education. This task required full institutional buy-in and adoption of a quality-first, person-centered approach. No department on the campus has gone untouched by the needs of a veteran with a disability, but some departments can and should offer a deeper level of support. Madaus (2009) stated, “In regards to disclosure, documentation, and understanding the need for accommodations, veterans face different issues than traditional students” (p. 2).

A key indicator of veteran student success is how integrated they feel while engaging in student life on campus. This goal is related directly to the ACPA and NASPA (2015) Student Learning and Development professional competency area outcome to “build and support inclusive, socially just and welcoming campus communities that promote deep learning and student success” (p. 32). The Disability Resources Office at Radford has worked closely with campus departments to create a stronger sense of belonging and to facilitate disability-related accommodations that support students’ persistence and success. Examples of successful collaborations include the following:

1. A strong working relationship between the Military Resource Center and the Disability Resources Office.

2. Working with Housing and Residential Life to secure accessible, inclusive on-campus housing, including housing with peer veterans, developing support groups, and developing opportunities off campus for commuting students.

3. Partnering with the Registrar’s Office to use priority registration for veterans, enabling them to schedule their lives around college, jobs, family, and other obligations.

4. Working with Information Technology to assist the Disability Resources Office with training and support in the use of assistive technology.

For many veterans, their classroom attendance is often affected by physical or mental conditions, such as missing limbs, chronic pain, traumatic brain injuries, and posttraumatic stress disorder. Procedural accommodations, including such modifications as flexibility with attendance and extended deadlines for assignments, have also been implemented at Radford to ensure that student veterans with disabilities can remain engaged and persist toward their goals.
As a final example, American University is a private, research-oriented university in Washington, DC, with an enrollment of 12,165, including 800 students with disabilities. Academic Support and Access Center staff collaborated with an instructional course designer and teaching faculty to ensure that learning objectives embedded in courses are not compromised by the provision of academic accommodations or modifications. Specifically, the staff addressed issues related to class attendance and participation. Individuals with chronic illnesses, psychological conditions, or mobility impairments may miss course sessions or experience decreased participation due to the current effects of a health condition.

One of the key factors in determining an attendance accommodation is a clear accommodation plan developed by the Disability Services Office in conjunction with the student. After accommodations are determined, faculty notification is essential. Faculty cannot accommodate if they are not informed of the need. The next step can be the hardest for both students and faculty because it relies on communication. Students must be prepared and willing to discuss their attendance accommodation, and this can be intimidating and challenging for most students. While other accommodations, such as extended time or a quiet area for taking a test, have become commonplace, attendance accommodations are relatively new and require the student and faculty member to specify when attendance is essential.

Clear expectations are necessary. Faculty are not required to alter any essential functions of the course or lower academic rigor. By working collaboratively with the student and the Disability Services Office, a plan that meets the student’s need and retains the fundamental objectives of the course is possible.

At American University, the disability resources staff and an instructional designer collaborated to determine if a specific class meeting was essential, meaning that the student must attend. The following questions were developed to guide faculty through the decision-making process:

- Are students’ contributions a significant component of the learning process? Does the course involve improvisational acting, interactive counseling or teaching techniques, public speaking, a lab where materials are altered or destroyed, or comparable pedagogical strategies?
- Does the fundamental nature of the course rely on student participation or discussion as an essential method of learning?

Faculty are also encouraged to use rubrics and other tools to identify in their syllabus which class sessions are nonnegotiable, how participation points are earned, and what student interactions are essential. Personnel at American University have clearly outlined when and how students learn and how assessment happens, helping all students to understand the importance of attendance and participation—an application of universal design for learning.

These examples from three different campuses illustrate the vital importance of the lesser-known parts of the mission of disability resources: providing institution-wide advisement and consultation and collaborating with partners to remove barriers. Student affairs professionals are natural allies who can connect disability resources staff with others and who can learn to plan, design, and implement accessible events, facilities, programs, and services.
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In a 2014 article in *The Atlantic*, journalist Caitlin Flanagan argues that the college fraternity landscape is beset by a myriad of deep problems stemming from the bad behavior and judgment of its members, resulting in a risk-management nightmare for campuses (2014). In contrast, many fraternities claim that membership in their organization actually buoys character development, citing intentional programs for members, particularly new members, that are meant to foster good character and personal growth. But to what extent do these programs work? Does fraternity membership, especially new member pledge programs, foster prosocial values such as moral judgment and reasoning? Or, is it possible that joining a fraternity could actually contribute to regression in moral judgment and reasoning among new members?

These questions drove a quantitative, quasi-experimental study I conducted examining the development of moral judgment and reasoning among two cohorts of new fraternity men—whom I will refer to as Alpha Alpha and Beta Beta—in their first semester of college. In this study, the terms *moral judgment* and *reasoning* refer to the conscious, deliberate mental activity of processing information about persons or situations in order to evaluate and reach a conclusion about what is right or wrong (Rest, Thoma, & Edwards, 1997). I used the *Defining Issues Test* (Rest et al, 1999), a moral judgment research instrument informed by the work of Lawrence Kohlberg (1981), to conduct a pre-/post-test survey in order to investigate whether the men of Alpha Alpha (AA) had higher moral judgment growth rates over time than the
men of Beta Beta (BB) as a result of participating in AA's non-traditional, no-pledging, intentional, character-building approach to fraternity membership. BB's program for new members, in contrast, was typical of traditional pledgeship, which included a one-semester probationary period within a tiered membership system that required new members to understand chapter identity and history, leadership principles, scholarship ideals, and community service. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) uses participant responses to moral dilemmas to determine the relative sophistication of moral judgment schemas used to assess right or wrong in a situation.

One finding, among others, is worthy of consideration: mean moral judgment scores for both groups decreased from the time of receiving a membership bid to the end of the new member period several months later, with BB decreasing at a significantly greater rate than AA. The effect of AA's new member program was a mitigating one. It seemed to slow what might otherwise have been a significant regression in moral judgment and reasoning. What could explain the fact that both groups regressed in their moral judgment and reasoning scores, and one group (BB) regressed significantly? An explanation may coalesce around two insights.

First, Pascarella (2001) noted that Greek affiliation had negative cognitive effects for first-year college men on measures such as critical thinking, reading comprehension, and mathematics, as compared to unaffiliated men. Pascarella's research is noteworthy because cognitive growth is highly correlated with growth in moral judgment scores on the DIT (Rest et al, 1999). In other words, a first-to-second-year lag in cognitive and moral growth for fraternity men is perhaps not surprising.

Second, Thoma and colleagues (1993), using the DIT, found that moral growth was particularly strong among students who had friendship networks that Thoma and colleagues refer to as "low-density" networks, which they describe as a diverse network of multiple independent friendship groups. Their research suggests that students with higher moral judgment scores view the diversity of college populations positively, are more open to forming a range of supportive friendships, and are more likely to enter into a range of activities on campus.

Derryberry and Thoma (2000) note that fraternity members tend to be more isolated than their unaffiliated peers, tend to surround themselves with those unlikely to challenge their views of the world, and tend to naturally develop an "us-versus-them" disposition toward those outside the group. These qualities characterize a highly dense, insular network. While these group characteristics are not necessarily inevitable, they are likely to develop in the absence of a profound effort to the contrary. In my research, I found the culture of BB to be more insular than that of AA insofar as AA's new member education went well beyond the traditional focus on chapter identity and history to connect men to sources of meaning, identity, and support outside the tribe. Further, AA models egalitarian values through a no-tiered, "flat" membership structure. According to Kohlberg (1984), egalitarian values and actions are seen as evidence of post-conventional moral thinking. AA's egalitarian commitments demonstrate respect for the autonomy of members and lower the density of the group. Even still, the moral judgment scores of AA decreased slightly.

What seems clear is that first-semester college fraternity men are destabilized by the combination of a powerful group experience on the one hand, and the challenge of transitioning into college on the other. In response to this experience, regression can occur in attempting to stabilize oneself in the midst of changes. Piaget called this process equilibration (1985). The temptation in such times is to (re)attach to what is comfortable and familiar. The problem, however, is that when previous sources of stability are simply reified in the face of new experiences and challenges, development does not occur. This tendency is exacerbated by immersion in a highly dense, insular network where members have few meaningful connections outside the group. But it doesn't have to be this way.

Those who work directly with fraternities, particularly new members, and are concerned with moral development should at least start with the following suggestions: (1) recognize the profound influence of the group to shape identity and judgment at a time of instability, and in turn (2) encourage those groups to do something counterintuitive—connect their new members to sources of meaning, identity, and support outside the group. On a related note, deferred fraternity recruitment would help. First semester recruitment encourages a too-quick group attachment that is likely to ease disorientation by reifying previously held values and, thus, tending to delay maturation even further.

Men need and deserve fraternity experiences that connect them, not cloister them. If fraternities are genuinely interested in character-building and promoting the moral development of the men in their ranks, they would do well to take seriously the power of their influence over the youngest among them and revisit the ways those men are enculturated into the group. Moral growth for college men happens when they diversify their social networks, not drill down as deeply as possible into a single network. There is no reason to believe that deep connections and friendships within the group and group cohesion itself are necessarily compromised by a more open and less insular approach to fraternity life. The benefits of belonging will naturally occur anyway by virtue of living arrangements, shared organizational commitments and responsibilities, the rituals of brotherhood, and social functions, among others. By encouraging commitments and connections outside the group for new members, fraternities would help...
mitigate the negative effects of the kind of group insularity that generates problem behavior in members and puts the group’s reputation at risk. Even better, intentionally lowering group density would create the conditions for moral development to occur.
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The body of research about the experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) students and faculty on college campuses continues to grow, yet there continues to be little research examining the experiences of LGBTQ professional staff or administrators on campus. Cullen and Smart (1991) offered the first such article, a brief overview of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) staff concerns on college campuses in which they highlighted the fear, anxiety, and discrimination experienced by LGB professionals. In the first empirical study on LGB university staff, Croteau and von Destinon (1994) found that the more open lesbian, gay, and bisexual professionals were about their sexual orientation, the more they reported discrimination in their job searches.

In a related study, Croteau and Lark (1995) found that discrimination appeared to be a frequent occurrence in the daily work lives of LGB professionals. There continues to be very limited research on gender expression and sexual identity minority staff experiences on college campuses. One recent work is a 2-year ethnographic study at a single institution conducted by Vaccaro (2012), who highlighted how the climate for LGBT staff often varies based on their campus work unit. Smith (2013) studied the career trajectory of 15 director-level student affairs professionals, mainly in residence life, in the California state system. Smith found this group had not experienced outright discrimination, but many had experienced a “chilling effect.”
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These studies speak to a continued need to explore and understand the climate that GSM professional staff encounter on a daily basis. Climate studies can be a powerful force for understanding current realities and exploring attitudes and behaviors over time (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010). Indeed, such climate studies can highlight the way that the same campus might engender different behaviors and experiences among different constituent groups. Vaccaro’s (2012) study illuminated the problem of looking at climate as only an organization-level phenomenon. As such, our study seeks to build on emerging research by looking at both macro- and micro-level issues facing LGBTQ-identified student affairs staff across institutions, thereby answering Ackelsberg, Hart, Miller, Queeny, and Van Dyne’s (2009) call to attend to “the diverse range of microclimates that constitute the health of the academy” (p. 100). Understanding the diverse range of experiences for professional staff can illuminate the ways that campuses can initiate organization-level programs, policies, and services that support all professionals.

Methodology

Using an interpretivist qualitative paradigm (Morehouse, 2012; O’Donoghue, 2007), we sought to understand the professional lives of our GSM participants. According to Morehouse, “interpretivist inquiry is defined by agency, action, and the interpretation of meaning within complex relationships” (p. 3). This approach allowed us to explore the various experiences, the meanings associated with those experiences, and the ways in which individuals shaped or were shaped by those experiences. Employing this perspective, we drew on 22 participants’ stories to examine how they made sense of their professional experiences.

Using purposeful sampling, we recruited individuals through announcements posted on various Facebook groups and through electronic mailing lists affiliated with multiple affinity or constituent groups from ACPA–College Student Educators International and NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. The primary criteria to participate included currently working on a college or university campus in student affairs or a related area, a minimum of 3 years of professional work experience, and identifying as a gender expression or sexual identity minority. Our 22 participants claimed a variety of identities, including gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, and trans¹. Sixteen participants were White, 5 identified as African American, and 1 was biracial (White/Hispanic); 8 females, 13 males, and 1 trans² individual participated. Twenty U.S. institutions were represented: Two institutions were private and religiously affiliated, 4 were private and secular, and the remaining 14 were public universities. The participants had a range of 3 to 15 years of work experience within numerous functional areas, including residence life, judicial affairs, academic advising, admissions, student activities, Greek affairs, and LGBTQ and women’s centers.

Based on the initial analysis of our interviews, it is clear that many institutions still have microclimates (and, to some extent, macroclimates) that are unsupportive for gender and sexual minority (GSM) staff. The GSM student affairs professionals in our study had to navigate a complex mix of personal, sexual, social, interpersonal, and intrapersonal issues as they establish, develop, and maintain their careers. In our analysis, two major overarching themes were prevalent: (a) access and inclusion; and (b) managing identities, perceptions, and acceptance.

Access and Inclusion. Participants in the study offered a series of descriptions detailing events in the workplace related to access and inclusion. These descriptions were grouped into three main categories: (a) social networks, (b) professional networks, and (c) job activities.

Managing Identity, Perceptions, and Acceptance. Participants discussed strategies to manage their LGBTQ identity and the degree to which they felt able to be “out” as GSM individuals. The need to manage their sexual or gender identity and “outness” occurred at both the macro level and in more discreet, micro spaces. Furthermore, the manner in which our participants managed their identities affected their relationships at work as well as their success at work.

All of our participants explicitly discussed how their personal and professional identities have been affected by the campus milieu (including policies; procedures; interactions with students, peers, and administrators; and teaching and research activities), and how they make meaning of their experiences. GSM-identified administrators faced challenges in the workplace that their heterosexual peers may not. When working to balance personal and professional identities, GSM-identified administrators had concerns about safety, rejection, isolation, and career development. While progress continues in higher education and society in general for the protection of GSM rights, issues still exist regarding career path goals for GSM administrators. Many GSM-identified administrators in this study experienced a lack of mentorship in the profession. And, because of a lack of visible out professionals in upper-level positions, many study participants struggle over the kinds of opportunities or routes actually available for advancement to out professionals.

Conclusion

Improving theory and research methods is important, but the study of higher education is an applied field, and improving practice is one of its goals. Studies exploring the experiences of GSM staff and administrators remain a key tool in the work of what Mayo (2007) described as “attempting to make those institutions more accountable to LGBT members” (p. 80). Statistics from the most recent national higher education climate report for LGBTQ individuals (Rankin et al., 2010) suggested that gay, lesbian,
bisexual, and especially transgender staff continue to face discrimination, harassment, and violence despite the slow shift in state and federal laws that might serve to protect GSM individuals. The 22 narratives of the participants in this study help to bring a personal dimension to the raw numbers. Some of the stories are positive and affirming, and give us hope. Most told tales of battling against the norms that privilege an identity that they did not claim. Despite the perception that the student affairs profession is “welcoming and affirming,” we found most GSM individuals in this study to experience bias, discrimination, or retaliation in the workplace. Uncovering and explicating the lived experiences of GSM professional staff and administrators in various microclimates continues to be a necessary endeavor to enable colleges and universities to develop and implement policies and practices aimed at attracting, supporting, mentoring, and retaining employees so that all members of the university thrive, not merely survive. We believe this study can be useful in helping administrators develop interventions to support GSM employee success in the workplace.

1 In early literature, researchers primarily studied only those identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (LGB). Soon researchers began to include trans*(T) individuals in their participant pool, followed by including queer (Q) participants. In our review of individual studies, we identify the particular group of participants for that study, which may not be as inclusive as we would have them be today.

2 To acknowledge the full continuum of identities and experiences, and to allow for the intersectional, fluid, and dynamic nature of identities, in our proposal and in our paper we use the term gender expression/sexual identity minority (GSM) rather than the traditional LGBTQ acronym. The exception is when the LGB, LGBT, or LGBTQ label is used by other authors and researchers, as noted above.
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The relationship between education and aboriginal people in Canada is a complicated one. Historically, education was used as a tool to assimilate Indigenous people. The Canadian government partnered with religious entities and removed all Indigenous children from their homes and communities and placed them in church- and government-run schools. The outcome of these policies is negative and ongoing (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015).

As a result of this relationship—and the historical abuses and inequities aboriginal peoples in Canada have experienced—the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established. It carried out hearings and published the findings. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Call for Action Report outlined 94 recommendations for the federal government to take in order to redress the legacy of residential schools. Such recommendations would advance the process of Canadian reconciliation in a number of different areas that include child welfare, language and culture, health, and education (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015).

The report prompted a response by Universities Canada. According to its website, Universities Canada is “a membership organization providing university presidents with a unified voice for higher education, research and innovation in Canada. Universities Canada advances the mission of their 97 member institutions to transform lives, strengthen communities and find solutions to the most pressing challenges facing our world” (Retrieved on Nov. 1, 2015: www.univcan.ca/about-us/).

This response included the creation of commitments. Universities Canada’s board of directors and member universities made a commitment to develop 13 principles that outline their shared commitment to enhance educational opportunities for Indigenous students and to foster reconciliation across Canada (Murphy, 2015).
These principles are:

1. Ensure institutional commitment at every level to develop opportunities for indigenous students.
2. Be student-centered: focus on the learners, learning outcomes, and learning abilities, and create opportunities that promote student success.
3. Recognize the importance of indigenization of curricula through responsive academic programming, support programs, orientations, and pedagogies.
4. Recognize the importance of indigenous education leadership through representation at the governance level and within faculty, professional, and administrative staff.
5. Continue to build welcoming and respectful learning environments on campuses through the implementation of academic programs, services, support mechanisms, and spaces dedicated to indigenous students.
6. Continue to develop resources, spaces, and approaches that promote dialogue between indigenous and non-indigenous students.
7. Continue to develop accessible learning environments off-campus.
8. Recognize the value of promoting partnerships among educational and local indigenous communities, and continue to maintain a collaborative and consultative process on the specific needs of indigenous students.
9. Build on successful experiences and initiatives already in place at universities across the country to share and learn from promising practices, while recognizing the differences in jurisdictional and institutional mission.
10. Recognize the importance of sharing information within the institution, and beyond, to inform current and prospective indigenous students of the array of services, programs, and supports available to them on campus.
11. Recognize the importance of providing greater exposure and knowledge for non-indigenous students on the realities, histories, cultures, and beliefs of indigenous people in Canada.
12. Recognize the importance of fostering intercultural engagement among indigenous and non-indigenous students, faculty, and staff.
13. Recognize the role of institutions in creating and enabling a supportive environment for a successful and high-quality K–12 experience for aboriginal youth. (Universities Canada, 2015)

Universities Canada also recognized that other stakeholders have a role to play—including governments, businesses, and indigenous organizations. University leaders also committed to the following actions to bring these principles to life:

- Raise awareness within institutions about the importance of facilitating access and success for indigenous students on campus.
- Raise awareness among government partners and stakeholders of these commitments on the importance of investing in sustainable initiatives that advance higher education opportunities for indigenous youth.
- Raise awareness in public discourse of positive indigenous students' experience in university and their contributions to Canadian society.
- Develop partnerships with the private sector to foster opportunities for indigenous people.
- Continue to listen to and collaborate with indigenous communities (Universities Canada, 2015).

Canada’s postsecondary institutions understand that they have a responsibility, and they are taking action to contribute to reconciliation. They are assisting and supporting indigenous students in achieving their education and career development goals by, among other things, helping in the transition to postsecondary learning environments. As institutions begin to build appropriate interventions, indigenous students and their communities will witness reconciliation at an institutional level, and this will allow them to feel valued, supported, and culturally safe.

This work in building a connection to indigenous education is also called “Indigenizing the Academy” (Mihesuah & Wilson, 2004). Not unlike the concept of “internationalizing” the university by embracing a global perspective in academic life, this means, according to Alfred (2004), that we are working so that universities “become places where the values, principles, and mode of organization and behavior of our [indigenous] people are respected in, and hopefully even integrated into, the larger system of structures and processes that make up the university itself” (p. 88).

NASPA’s Indigenous Peoples Knowledge Community (IPKCC) is a group of student affairs professionals and students identifying as Native American, First Nations (Status, Non-Status, Treaty, Metis, Inuit), Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian heritage, including international indigenous nations, and any persons with a shared concern for indigenous students in higher education (NASPA, 2015). The IPKCC membership has an interest in understanding the above principles and considering their implications for a U.S. context. While there are differences between the U.S. and Canadian contexts, many traditional territories span
the borders between the two countries. Additionally, many U.S. tribes have a shared experience with their Canadian cousins, and the interventions to address the historical and current consequences in the United States are needed (Barnhardt, 1994; Brown, 1993; Crosby, 2011; Dodd, Garcia, Meccage, & Nelson, 1995). Perhaps the work that is beginning in Canada can stimulate similar activity in U.S. postsecondary sectors?
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Whether a student chooses a career in the corporate sector, academia, government, or any other industry, global competency is imperative for them to be successful in the 21st century. How can we as educators prepare students, while on campus, to learn from and work with people from all parts of the world? Integrating global learning, which includes incorporating intercultural communication skills, collaborative problem solving, and adaptability into a student’s undergraduate experience, is a necessity. For maximum impact, this learning must occur both inside and outside the classroom, and must also be student centered and largely student led (Kuh, 2008).

The VCU Globe Model
The Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Globe program is a high-impact, interdisciplinary, global education-focused living–learning program at VCU. It features a 12-hour curriculum that leads to a certificate in global education. The program is comprised of three key elements: learning, living, and engagement.

Beginning in the second semester of their freshman year, undergraduates enroll in specialized courses that, combined, create a globally-themed curriculum. Course topics range from global leadership seminars to...
The synergy of these three key elements provides a unique and transformative educational opportunity for the students who participate. This holistic, interdisciplinary approach to global education serves as a case study for integrated global learning at the undergraduate level. Providing an immersive intercultural environment through which students can learn is especially critical for advancing the Student Learning and Development foundational outcome to “articulate how race, ethnicity, nationality, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, dis/ability, and religious belief can influence development during the college years” as outlined in the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators (ACPA—College Student Educators International, & NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015. p.32).

**Faculty Engagement**

The program’s faculty fellows teach three-credit seminar courses designed to develop students’ abilities to navigate cultural and personal borders. In particular, these seminars address students’ professional goals, expose them to a broad range of individuals, and give them meaningful contact with worldviews different from their own. The seminars also foster awareness of the skills required of a global citizen within relevant professional fields and allow students to explore topics from a global perspective. Recent seminar topics have included global health care, the anthropology of global cuisine, and global attitudes as they relate to money.

**Leadership Development**

VCU Globe also provides opportunities for students to become leaders within the university community and beyond. Students lead workshops, serve as conversation partners for international students, and assist with International Student Orientation and in English as a Second Language classrooms. Last year, the program’s new initiative, VCU Globe Native Speakers Connection, gave 37 native speakers of languages other than English an opportunity to share their expertise with a VCU Globe student and allowed the students to improve foreign language proficiency and cultural knowledge.

Additionally, VCU Globe students study global leadership as part of the curriculum and have opportunities to take courses abroad. A recent study abroad program at VCU’s campus in Doha, Qatar, allowed students to study leadership in another culture. Students met with Foreign Service officers from the U.S. Embassy in Doha as well as student affairs administrators in an effort to understand their approach to leadership.

**Community Linkages**

The program is designed to strengthen the partnership between VCU and the Richmond community. One mechanism for this is the development of partnerships between VCU Globe and several community organizations, including Sacred Heart Center, which functions as the hub for the local Latino community; Richmond-area public schools; and CrossOver Clinic, a low-cost health clinic. At Sacred Heart and the public schools, VCU Globe students assist with English language classes, child care, and computer literacy courses. At CrossOver Clinic, students assist with checking in patients. These sustainable partnerships enhance the educational, economic, and cultural vitality of both the VCU and Richmond communities.

In addition to larger projects, the impact of students’ service is measured by the number of hours students volunteer in the community and on campus. In fall 2014, VCU Globe students donated 877 service hours to the Richmond community and 912 to VCU through engagement with international students, scholars, and visitors, and these numbers increase each semester.

**Global Learning**

VCU Globe has generated new opportunities for student learning, including three exclusive faculty-led study abroad programs to Mexico, Japan, and Qatar. Each program has a different focus: service learning (Mexico), intercultural communication (Japan), and intercultural competency and global leadership (Qatar). These programs help advance the Values, Philosophy, and History professional competency area (ACPA & NASPA, 2015) by “expand[ing] personal and professional opportunities for civic and global engagement” (p. 19).
The impact of these programs has been great, as 43 students have participated in these opportunities since 2014. Of the students enrolled in the Qatar program, 73% were first-time study abroad participants; in its pilot year, 50% of participants in the Mexico program were African American (Blondin & Losapio, 2015). These statistics demonstrate the ability of an on-campus program to mobilize underrepresented students to study abroad. In “Global Learning: Aligning Student Learning Outcomes With Study Abroad,” Hovland (2010) discussed the way in which study abroad increases learning through the integration of specific learning outcomes with the student’s course of study, which is an integral part of the VCU Globe program.

Through the program’s participants, the impact of VCU Globe has permeated the campus community and beyond. Through common courses, cocurricular opportunities, global engagement, and service activities, as well as their vibrant, shared residential experience, students expand their knowledge, identity, and impact as global citizens by developing intercultural competencies and leadership skills in global education and their academic majors. The collaborative spirit and support of numerous departments and units on campus also contribute to student success.

This global education community serves as a case study for how living–learning programs can provide value-added, high-impact opportunities for undergraduate students in all disciplines to gain the knowledge, skills, and experiences needed to succeed as culture brokers in an increasingly globalized society.
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Although enrollment of Latino males in higher education has steadily increased in recent years (Santiago, Calderón Galdeano, & Taylor, 2015), the majority of those men are served by community colleges. Data indicate that nearly 47% of Latino male collegians are enrolled at public, 2-year institutions, compared with 25.3% who are enrolled at public 4-year campuses (U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). This illustrates the critical role that community colleges play in supporting the pathway for Latino males toward degree completion.

Nationally recognized initiatives, such as My Brother’s Keeper and the American Graduation Initiative, have fueled the urgency to address the vanishing Latino male crisis (Sáenz & Ponjuan, 2009) by indirectly calling on community colleges to increase degree completion rates. Such momentum has encouraged both community college practitioners and scholars to address issues of student success and equity, particularly for male students of color. In fact, the American Association of Community Colleges’ (AACC, 2015) national database of Minority Male Student Success Programs lists more than 80 minority male initiatives that are targeted at supporting primarily African American and Latino men.

As the literature on Latino men in community college continues to develop, it is critical that as scholars we be mindful of the ways in which our research can be utilized to inform and advance educational practice. For example, scholars have noted that Latino men are often characterized as an “at-risk” population who face challenges associated with remedial education (Wood, Harris, & White, 2015), are more likely to report apprehension to engage in class due to hostile climates (Gardenhire-Crooks, Collado, Martin, & Castro, 2010), and have poor relationships with faculty (Palacios et al., 2015).

Although such research is important, it is critical that future scholarship transcends these and other deficit-oriented perspectives, which perpetuate negative stereotypes of Latino males rather than celebrate their achievements as they navigate the educational pipeline. Furthermore, student affairs professionals at community colleges play instrumental roles as “institutional agents” (Stanton-Salazar, 1997) who support Latino students in their academic, personal, and professional endeavors.

Guided by Harper’s (2010) anti-deficit achievement framework, the following research challenged approaches to studying male students of color, particularly Latino men, by prioritizing patterns of engagement and achievement. Additionally, student narratives provided insight into the ways that community college student affairs professionals (i.e., institutional agents) redirected their pathways toward baccalaureate degree completion and beyond.

**Methodology**

This study—as part of a broader research effort by the Minority Male Community College Collaborative (M2C3) at San Diego State University—focused on understanding how male students of color in community college navigated critical moments in their educational journeys.

The purpose of the study was to understand the meanings that Latino men ascribed to their lived experiences and success in navigating pathways from community college to 4-year institutions. Participants were invited to construct...
Data analysis included the use of grounded theory strategies (Charmaz, 2006), which entailed line-by-line coding of each narrative (initial coding), clustering of initial codes into fluid categories based on the shared properties and relationships to the central phenomenon, and axial coding to explore the relationships between categories and to identify emerging themes.

**Key Findings**

Although there were several salient factors that students credited to their success (e.g., being proactive, engaging with faculty, seeking out campus resources, getting involved in school activities), each participant acknowledged the role of a supportive counselor, advisor, or staff member as they navigated the community college. As first-generation college students, the Latino men in this study shared reflections of having felt lost or overwhelmed at some point along their community college journey. However, they also provided powerful testaments that underscored the role of critical agents, who imparted college knowledge, words of encouragement, mentorship, and guidance.

**Participants shared the following remarks:**

- “I had been feeling out of place and was completely lost. . . . Ms. H not only helped me pick out courses so that I would make efficient use of my time at [college], but she also helped me pick classes that would help me think critically and prepare me for university-level work.”

- “My Puente counselor recommended that we visit a counselor at least once a semester. I heeded his advice, and I often would visit him twice a semester, which kept me on track to transfer. His counseling advice provided me with the academic and emotional support to continue on my path.”

- “Although the programs and student organizations were very important in my journey through the community college, the people and mentors who have supported me along the way have been the difference in my persistence in earning a higher education.”

As these findings illustrate, student affairs professionals play an instrumental role as “institutional agents” (Stanton-Salazar, 1997) who support Latino men in their academic, personal, and professional endeavors. The last student quote aligns with what Wood et al. (2015) emphasized as being key to facilitating successful outcomes for men of color in community college. These scholars assert that people, not programs, make a difference. The results do not diminish the efforts and activities of such programs. Instead, they underscore the role that student affairs professionals who staff the programs had on students’ success.

The interactions and relationships described by Latino male participants with institutional agents led us to three simple recommendations:

1. Remember students’ names: Participants expressed that being called by their first names made them feel that people on campus cared.

2. Acknowledge students outside of class: Participants stated that a simple nod or a smile from faculty and staff disrupted their perceptions of authority and put them at ease.

3. Connect students to people, not just programs: Participants expressed gratitude to staff and faculty who took time to physically walk them or personally introduce them to another person.
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Few would argue that the dominant narrative of masculinity in the United States today is problematic. On college campuses, men are less likely to engage academically (Sax, 2008). They are less likely to persist beyond the first year, and if they persist, are less likely to graduate (Ross et al., 2012). Additionally, men are overrepresented in the campus conduct system (Harper, Harris, & Mmjeje, 2010).

The dominant narrative of masculinity on college campuses emphasizes restricted emotional display, fear of femininity, and competitive behavior to prove one’s worth relative to other men. This narrative is hegemonic, as it is “a system of beliefs and practices that essentially harm [men], while working to uphold the interests of others who have power over [other men]” (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 9). Edwards (2012) described hegemonic masculinity as the Man Box, as it restricts the behaviors, emotions, and expressions of a man’s full self. The Man Box manifests itself on campus in destructive behavior, fighting, binge drinking, homophobia, misogyny, and racism, among other negative consequences.

It is important to recognize that the Man Box benefits far fewer men than it damages. Hegemonic masculinity is a social construct, and it is reinforced through a very strict code of behavior that is “taught by peers, media, parents, teachers, coaches—just about everywhere and from everyone” (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 7). If a member of the group is acting in a way that is deemed as not “manly” enough, such as expressing emotions beyond what is considered appropriate, he will be either policed to conform or ostracized from the group. As Edwards and Jones (2009) described it, hegemonic masculinity “serves to oppress women, marginalize some men, and limit all men” (p. 211).

If all men are limited by hegemonic masculinity, then why is there not a revolution to break out of the Man Box? The answer is found in the construction of the box itself. It would stand to reason that if a man examines how hegemonic masculinity harms those around him, inhibits his ability to build meaningful relationships with other men, and damages his own humanity, then he would demand a different masculine narrative for himself and his fellow
men. Unfortunately, that type of examination requires a man to be vulnerable, and being vulnerable is a primary violation of the Man Box. Davis (2002) found that college men generally did not examine their own identity as men.

To combat the narrative of hegemonic masculinity, we need to explore alternate narratives. Several authors (see, e.g., Harper & Harris, 2010; Edwards & Jones, 2009; Davis & Laker, 2011) have illustrated that, until recently, studies of college men did not view them as gendered beings but as students, inadvertently reinforcing male privilege. The struggle to engage straight White college men is particularly problematic. Educators lament that they are not engaged in diversity and social justice issues, while these men often indicate that they feel excluded and demonized in the conversation (Svoboda & Vianden, 2015).

When there is a discussion on most college campuses about gender identity and expression, masculinity is rarely mentioned in a positive light. When men are mentioned, it is generally as the perpetrators of homophbic and misogynistic acts, both subtle and violent. In essence, men—particularly, straight White college men—are seen as the problem. Little time and space is given to how men are also harmed by traditional expressions of masculinity or how men are not encouraged or welcomed when they do attempt to enter social justice work (McCarroll, 2014), and even less attention is given to how to change the narrative.

Given this context, it may be to the common benefit of all to acknowledge masculinity as a gender identity rather than to ignore masculinity and reinforce its privilege. The dominant narrative cannot change unless and until a compelling and authentic narrative of positive masculinity is championed, one that embraces all of its intersectionalities, including the straight White male. If college men are encouraged to participate in social justice work rather than be shamed, they may recognize and use their privilege as a catalyst for changing the narrative.

As student affairs professionals, we have the ability, and the responsibility, to provide an alternative narrative to hegemonic masculinity. Kimmel and Davis (2011) suggested four practical interventions, including discussion and activism against the cultural messages of the Man Box, mentoring and peer discussion groups that allow young men to be vulnerable in order to examine authentic masculinity, creating new rituals to promote a rite of passage into positive masculinity, and encouraging individual transformation. Svoboda and Vianden (2015) suggested that straight White college men are beginning to show an interest in engaging in this work, but face challenges due to their lack of exposure to diversity and reflection of their privilege. They posited that student affairs professionals should challenge college men from majority groups in a manner that is compassionate, respectful, and educational (Svoboda & Vianden, 2015).

College men are not simply men, but they can identify in myriad ways. Race, sexual orientation, gender identity, religious affiliation, academic field of interest, and cocurricular involvements are just a few of the many ways that men identify themselves on campus. Within those intersectionalities, there are many ways to express masculinity. As a profession, we must support and reinforce the narrative that each of these masculine identities is valid as long as it respects the humanity, dignity, and worth of other identities. We should strive to promote a tapestry of authentic and positive masculinities as the dominant narrative.
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In recent history, the MultiRacial population has received increased national attention. From changes to the 2000 census (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.) to the “controversy” of the Cheerios commercial featuring an interracial family (Goyette, 2013), to National Geographic’s “Changing Face of America” article (Funderburg, 2013), to the outrage and confusion over Rachel Dolezal (Moore, 2015), it is clear just how sensitive and controversial the subject of race—and MultiRacial identities, specifically—has been, and still is, in the United States. These types of conversations around MultiRacial identities will likely endure, given that the number of self-identifying MultiRacial people is projected to more than triple by 2060 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012).
In the review of existing literature on MultiRacial identities, there are four particularly relevant and important facts:

1. The "one-drop rule" still persists today, meaning that individuals with White and non-White ancestry are often solely perceived as and identified with their non-White ancestry, even, for example, when their racial ancestry is three-quarters White and one-quarter Asian (Ho, Sidanius, Levin, & Banaji, 2011).

2. MultiRacial people who are half-White are seen as less of a minority and less eligible for or deserving of affirmative action benefits than their monoracial and MultiRacial non-White peers (Good, Sanchez, & Chavez, 2013; Sanchez & Bonam, 2009).

3. When MultiRacial individuals perceive themselves as similar (socially and physically) to a particular minority in-group, they tend to self-categorize as that minority, which often leads to perceived eligibility for affirmative action benefits (Good et al., 2010).

4. Graduate students with one White parent and one parent of color self-identified as racial minorities but did not pursue minority-based campus resources at their graduate schools largely because they felt their experiences with racism, discrimination, and prejudice were not "as bad" or as severe in comparison to monoracial people of color (Franco, in press).

What was missing from the literature, particularly in the quantitative studies, was the perspective of half-White, MultiRacial individuals themselves. Expanding on previous research (Franco, in press), my dissertation study explores the minority resource eligibility of half-White undergraduate students using a mixed-methods approach. The most significant finding emerging from the qualitative portion of this study was that monoracial, affinity-/identity-based student spaces (e.g., Filipino Ugnayan Students Organization, Black Student Center, Multicultural Center), while providing some support around racial identity, often silenced or devalued half-White MultiRacial experiences.

Several factors support this finding. First, in my coding process, the two codes that co-occurred most often were monoracial and affinity-/identity-based spaces, meaning that participants talked about these spaces almost exclusively in monoracial terms. This may be in part due to the little room that existed to discuss their mixed racial heritage. Even when discussions did take place, students' half-White MultiRaciality was framed as privileged and less valued in comparison to the experiences of students who came from two parents of color.

Second, almost all participants reported that they did not resemble people of their own minority ancestry, and, later in their interviews, qualified the extent to which they were racial minorities, saying they did not experience racial discrimination and racism in the same way as their monoracial non-White peer groups did. Thus, they were not as much of a minority or were another kind of minority, which affected their pursuit of and access to campus resources designed for racial minorities. Most interesting is that the experiences participants did share regarding racial discrimination and racism aligned with legal definitions of race-based discrimination.

As stated previously, students are increasingly identifying as more than one race, and studies have shown that the needs of MultiRacial people are different than those of their monoracial peers. However, few resources have been explicitly designated for these students. Participants in my study ultimately had to make decisions about their own appropriateness in accessing and using resources meant to assist racial minorities; in most cases, they deemed themselves inappropriate for a variety of reasons, including physical appearance and lack of significant racial discrimination. Even though identity-based student centers and groups were helpful in some ways to these participants, it is apparent that students in these centers need continued assistance in expanding their ability to discuss race in complex ways. This will help honor and recognize the spectrum of experiences contained under and between each socially constructed racial identity, so the needs of all racial minorities— including MultiRacial minorities—are met.

When considering the context of minority resource eligibility and the ever-increasing number of self-identifying MultiRacial students, this study raises ongoing questions about the purpose, framework, and utility of minority-based or race-based student groups and centers on college and university campuses. How are students supported and advised when it comes to discussing race and racial identity development? What tools or guideposts are advisors, staff, faculty, and students given to navigate the complexity of experiences that can fall under and between the socially constructed categories of race? With current social justice movements, how are student affairs professionals helping each other and their students to navigate race conversations going forward? Future research opportunities might explore these questions in the context of MultiRacial college students with two or more non-White racial backgrounds.
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ACPA–College Student Educators International and NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (2015) clearly outline 10 professional competency areas for student affairs educators. To progress within these competency areas, professionals should find congruence between personal ethics and values and the purpose, principles, and values of the profession (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). This interaction requires the demonstration of professionalism through the construction of professional identity, which may be conveyed through professional attire. The process of constructing a professional identity through clothing is complicated by the flexible standards of workplace attire for student affairs professionals. This article will explore the specific challenges of conveying professionalism through attire by new professionals within the field of student affairs by addressing unwritten standards for professionalism, implications of workplace attire, and standards of professional dress.

Professionalism in student affairs requires the demonstration of knowledge and competency in a variety of domains (Carpenter & Stimpson, 2007). In addition to the competencies outlined by professional organizations, unwritten standards for professionalism exist within the field. Learning to comply with these covert expectations plays a role in the development of student affairs educators’ professional identities and may pose a unique challenge for new employees who may be transitioning between institutions and acclimating to a new campus culture (Scholar, 2013). Such unwritten standards vary by institution and functional area (Scholar, 2013).

One area in which the aforementioned unwritten standards are demonstrated is that of professional dress. In fields where there is flexible, acceptable workplace attire, dressing professionally may be a particular challenge for new professionals due to the significant implications of dress on perceptions of professional identity (Cardon & Okoro, 2009; Evetts, 2011; Furnham, Chan, & Wilson, 2013). Appropriate professional dress may establish legitimacy, convey unity, express institutional culture, and signify the purpose and significance of the profession (Evetts, 2011). Personal appearance and dress also influence perceptions of performance and ability, affect the likelihood of career advancement, assist in the formation of positive impressions on colleagues and students, and identify individuals as members of a specific profession (Cardon & Okoro, 2009; Furnham et al., 2013). Dressing for work each morning takes on greater importance when one considers the impact such choices have on career advancement and relationships with colleagues and students (Cardon & Okoro, 2009; Evetts, 2011; Furnham et al., 2013). How, then, should student affairs professionals dress for work?

The cliché suggestion to “dress for success,” coupled with the lack of an explicit dress code, confuses new professionals (Cardon & Okoro, 2009). Appropriate dress should:

- be professional, yet not so formal as to create barriers between professionals and students;
- not emphasize economic differences between the educators and students;
allow educators to complete all practical aspects of their position;

demonstrate core professional values; and

not draw attention to the individual as a sexual object. (Scholar, 2013, p. 337)

Formal clothing, defined as a suit and tie for men and a suit for women, conveys credibility, intelligence, competence, organization, and preparation, while less formal clothing suggests friendliness, flexibility, fairness, enthusiasm, likeability, and approachability (Carr, Lavin, & Davies, 2010; Furnham et al., 2013). Professional dress also influences student perception of, satisfaction with, and respect for faculty (Carr et al., 2010). For example, young professionals and graduate students may prefer to dress in formal attire in order to establish boundaries and command respect from students; formal attire may establish young professionals as administrators and authority figures rather than peers. Students report higher opinions of faculty and their educational experiences when faculty dress in professional or business casual attire as opposed to casual attire (Carr et al., 2010). Business casual, or “smart dressing style,” attire consists of a shirt and trousers, with or without a tie, for men, and a blouse with a skirt or trousers for women; casual attire consists of jeans and a T-shirt for both men and women (Furnham et al., 2013). Although such descriptions of formal, business casual, and casual attire provide some additional clarity, they also fail to present explicit descriptions of appropriate dress for individuals whose gender identity does not adhere to the gender binary.

The construction of professional identity through workplace dress may pose a greater challenge for individuals who do not identify as men, such as women and those whose gender identities do not adhere to the gender binary. In fields characterized by binary concepts of professional dress and those traditionally dominated by men, there is a demonstrated preference for male professionals over female professionals when both are dressed with equal formality (Furnham et al., 2013). These preferences are reflected in the greater confidence expressed in male professionals and the perception that male professionals are friendlier and easier to talk to (Furnham et al., 2013). These findings have implications for student affairs, as academia is a formerly male-dominated field that continues to place a majority of men in senior positions (De Welde & Stepnick, 2015). As previously stated, individuals whose gender identity does not adhere to the gender binary face challenges when constructing a professional identity through workplace attire due to a lack of explicit and inclusive descriptions of appropriate nonbinary professional dress. Female professionals also face additional challenges, including the management of representations of sexuality through clothing, to establish themselves as professionals rather than sexual beings (Scholar, 2013).

Although there are no universal or explicit guidelines for professional attire within the field of student affairs, professionals should consider how the students with whom they interact, their colleagues, and their supervisors might perceive their professional attire while also factoring in campus and office culture. Consideration for the implications of professional dress is of particular importance for new professionals establishing a professional identity and reputation within a young and interconnected profession (Carpenter & Stimpson, 2007, p. 268). By considering the impact of professional dress, of varying formality, on the presentation of professional identity, new student affairs professionals and graduate students may enhance their mastery of both the Personal and Ethical Foundations and the Values, Philosophy, and History competency areas (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). Professionals should engage in self-reflection and discussion with mentors, supervisors, and peers to determine the appropriate level of formal attire for themselves as individuals and professionals. The flexibility of workplace attire in student affairs allows for individuals to use clothing to express personal and professional identity, so it is essential that professionals engage in thoughtful consideration of what their clothing communicates to those with whom they interact.
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It is widely recognized that parents and families play an important role in the educational endeavors of their college students. Families help their students select institutions, complete the appropriate applications, pack for move-in day, and so much more. But parental and familial involvement should not end the moment the car is unpacked. Parents and families continue to look for involvement opportunities in their students’ education. In response to this desire, colleges and universities have created offices designed to build, foster, and further develop family–institution relationships. Although these offices focus on events such as parent orientation and family weekend, there are other opportunities for institutions to find common ground with parents and families that have not yet been fully explored. Some of these topics include Title IX education and developing ability allies.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice (2000), Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 provides protection from gender discrimination to individuals in educational programs or activities that receive federally funded financial assistance. Title IX is commonly misconceived as relating only to athletic programs. However, the law governs all university activities—on- and off-campus departments, activities, and programs, in addition to employment, must be in compliance with the law. Each institution must designate at least one employee to coordinate Title IX efforts effectively and respond efficiently to complaints of sexual discrimination, harassment, sexual and domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Universities are required to ensure that every student receives an equal education as much as possible (Cantu, 1997).

As of spring 2015, more than 100 universities were being investigated by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights for Title IX compliance in their handling of sexual violence on campus (Thomason, 2015). Although university employees should have a basic understanding of Title IX in order to help victims find justice and closure when injustices occur, a key constituency may be missing in the mix: parents and families.

Due to the sensitive nature of events that may need to be adjudicated in a Title IX environment on campus, students may choose to not inform their families about their on-campus Title IX case. However, as in so many other cases on campus, parents and families can often be
partners in providing education, support, and resolution to both the victim and the accused. Parents can work with university officials by encouraging student reporting and providing support to the victim and the accused. Parents and guardians are often put in the position of counselor when events in their student’s life become troublesome. Universities should make it easy for families and victims to find information on how to report incidents where students need help. Whether it is an easy-to-identify webpage, an annual letter to all parents, or other communication strategies, students and their families should know how to report incidents of hazing or bullying, sexual harassment, dating violence, or stalking.

Bard College, in New York, has created a Web page that provides advice for friends and families of both those who have been assaulted and those who have been accused. The Web page includes suggestions for coping with the feelings family members may have and recommendations on actions family members may take to successfully support their loved one (Bard College, 2015). This is a great example of how to provide excellent service to parents and families in an accessible way.

It is important to provide support to both the victim and the accused in all Title IX cases. If students choose to inform their family about their situation, universities can provide information about student safety procedures, available resources that may include counseling or health services, and how to support their student through any transitional efforts that may be needed after the case has been investigated. It is important for all parties to know their rights and responsibilities, and ultimately to know that they are not alone—they have the support of their university family and their immediate family. This support for students by their university family extends not only to Title IX but also to students with disabilities.

As institutions of higher education strive to provide an equally accessible experience for all students, colleges and universities should do everything within their power to provide a universally accessible learning environment. Parents and families can assist universities in accomplishing this goal by identifying and reporting barriers imposed by antiquated policies and practices and encouraging their students to do the same. Families and universities should work together to inform students that accommodation for people of different abilities is just one part of finding common ground to support students.

Many efforts to assist college students with disabilities focus on the “deficit” of the individual. This results in universities making accommodations so that those students can fit into an already established environment (Vance, Lipsitz, & Parks, 2014). Instead, universities should focus on integrating different approaches to improve the experience for students with varying abilities. Recently, colleges have renewed their focus on faculty training. In a recent study, university faculty who had prior disability-focused training were generally more willing to make accommodations, were seen to be more fair and sensitive to student needs, and were more willing to personally invest in student success (Murray, Lombardi, Wren, & Keys, 2009).

Colleges are also finding unique ways to provide funding for students with disabilities. Harper College has been cited for its collaboration between its disabilities services office (DSO) and an educational foundation to provide support access for students. The DSO provides small “cases for support” that outline potential areas or projects that require funding. The foundation uses these documents when reaching out to potential donors, and it has secured over $5,000,000 in state and federal grants, and $500,000 in grants and gifts (Vance et al., 2014, p. 128). These gifts help to provide access for students who otherwise could not afford the cost of higher education. Creating a more inclusive learning environment has opened the door for parents to assist universities by encouraging their students to advocate for their needs, partnering to inform the university of special accommodation requests, and encouraging universal design in higher education.

Every institution should work with students, parents, and families to go beyond the minimum requirements outlined by the government and work to develop new, innovative, and mutually beneficial partnerships. Doing so will enhance the college experience for students, strengthen programs and learning environments, and make institutions more inclusive for everyone.
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Research documents the challenges faced by working-class students in higher education (Hurst, 2010; Stuber, 2011). Working-class students who later become faculty, known as working-class academics, also write about feeling invisible, ashamed of their background at work, and unable to speak of their newfound class privilege at home (Adair & Dahlberg, 2003; Welsch, 2005). Students and academics alike frequently discuss a “straddler” experience of being between communities rather than ever fully being included in any community. Many describe ambivalence about “moving up,” experiencing guilt about being “smart enough to escape the working class” and also shame at not quite fitting in—being “a working-class bull in the university china shop” (Overall, 1998, p. 119).

Existing research, while useful, does not speak to the experiences of student affairs educators, who themselves occupy a racialized, classed, and gendered space in higher education. Student affairs educators’ experiences are missing from the literature on class in higher education, and class experiences are largely absent from student affairs professional literature. This study explored how working-class origins shape the experiences of White female student affairs professionals in higher education.
Methods
In this study, I defined student affairs professionals as those with a master’s degree in college student personnel or at least 5 years’ professional experience in student affairs. Working class included first-generation college students whose families did not work in a professional field (per the Standard Occupational Classification system, see www.bls.gov/soc) and who qualified for free or reduced lunches or Pell Grants. Participants identified as and were seen by others as White cisgender women. Through interviews and essays, 25 participants from the Midwest shared how class surfaced during formative years and how it played a role in their careers in student affairs. Recurring themes emerged at both a macro level (e.g., how institution type, graduate preparation programs, and professional associations reinforce class distinctions) and a micro level (e.g., how class incongruities cause both privileges and stresses).

Findings
Most participants claimed a working-class origin, though some preferred to use labels like blue-collar, poor, or farm kid. A few currently identified as working class or, at the other end of the spectrum, as solidly in the middle or upper class. The vast majority of participants saw themselves as having a more fluid identity, not an either/or but a both/and. Hurst (2010) found most working-class students identified as either renegades (those that pursued social mobility) or loyalists (those who stayed closer to their roots), with a few double agents who navigated both worlds. In this study, the opposite effect was observed, with most participants functioning as double agents.

Embodied Class
Participants found it difficult to place a singular label on their current class identity, saying, “I’m a blue-collar girl in a white-collar job,” or, “In my bones, I am working class—but the skin I’m in now is upper class.” One participant said she now identifies as an educated, professional woman, stating that she “fits much more in that class culture now than where I originated. I wear that skin with a little more ease now.” Another participant shared, “In my blood I am a lower-socioeconomic-class person—that’s the blood that runs through my body, even though now I live a more upper-middle-class life. I’m constantly in a dichotomy as I walk through life and I feel that in a variety of different places.”

Zmroczek and Mahony (1999) suggested individuals experience class as “deeply imprinted, rooted and retained through life” (p. 4). They encouraged understanding class as something embodied rather than as a group that people leave behind as part of class mobility. Participants shared how their class of origin was embedded in their bones, their blood, and their skin. It was more than residual or a faint memory. They carried an imprint of their class of origin, even if they no longer appeared to be working class. Many talked about how student affairs demanded a very middle-class or upper-class way of being, but what they went home to at night looked entirely different.

Structured Patterns
Participants identified clear structural patterns that groomed them into upward mobility (or not). Grounding structural patterns kept participants close to their working-class roots and included being a transfer or commuter student, working full time as an undergraduate student or prior to enrolling in a master’s program, pursuing an online master’s degree, working at a two year or for-profit institution, having a significant other from a working-class background, and having children. Those who rejected assimilation, holding on to the value of the practical over the theoretical, remained at the margins in the academy but experienced fewer tensions at home.

Lifting structural patterns, those that enhanced career advancement, included being identified as gifted while young, attending selective 4-year institutions at least 100 miles from home, attending and presenting at national student affairs professional conferences, and having a significant other from the upper or middle class. Those who embraced upper-class values, such as an appreciation for the liberal arts or a commitment to educationally enriching curricular activities (Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012), were less likely to experience class incongruities. Still, most participants attempted to negotiate a space in the middle, and found their class of origin was a source of power and a possible limitation in their career.

Privilege and Power
A working-class background instilled a hard work ethic, a sense of pride, an appreciation for humility, and a heightened awareness of social justice issues. These traits serve one well in student affairs, a field that requires long hours, great listening skills, and a commitment to social justice. As White women in a field dominated by White women, participants also “passed” for middle class, which gave them access to spaces they might not otherwise see. They were not, as many women-of-color colleagues report, “presumed incompetent” (Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, González, & Harris, 2012). They used their privilege in positive ways, to create greater inclusion, and felt a significant sense of responsibility to do so.

Working hard, keeping your nose down, and avoiding being noticed were lessons many participants learned in their younger days, and those traits are rarely helpful for career advancement. The class-based assets quickly turned into liabilities when participants overworked to compensate for “cushy” desk jobs, felt ashamed or guilty for what they had achieved, questioned their worth, experienced imposter syndrome, or used their class background as an “out” from paying attention to the benefits they receive due to White privilege.
Implications
Student affairs practitioners can elevate conversations about class in our professional associations as well as interrogate our policies and practices to see how we may be unintentionally reinforcing class inequalities. This begins with examining who obtains undergraduate leadership positions, which are commonly identified as the first step into the field. We must be willing to let go of cherished norms and try new patterns to get different results. For example, do we pay as much attention to students in work-study positions as we do those who assume volunteer leadership positions in campus clubs and organizations? And when we recruit diverse undergraduate leaders, do we demand conformity to professional class norms (Rios, 2015)?

If graduate programs and professional associations transmit cultural capital (Winkle-Wagner, 2010), which can advance or limit one’s career progression, as was found in this study, what does that mean for how student affairs educators can be more inclusive? Can we unpack the extent to which social or career mobility should even be seen as desirable? Can we be honest about how online graduate programs may serve more diverse students (in terms of race, gender, and economics), but can also function to limit career choices by those who see such programs as less significant?

Future research can be done to tease out and problematize the ways in which institutions of higher education in general, and the field of student affairs in particular, reflect the interests of the ruling class, even while we claim to be democratic and inclusive spaces. Without more careful attention to how we reproduce inequality, we may unwittingly re-create the very class divisions we aim to disrupt.
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Fundraising is a means of effectively maintaining and implementing new student affairs services. External funds are necessary due to scarcity of resources, decreases in federal and state funding, rising student costs, and increased expectation for delivering outcomes (Arminio, Clinton, & Harpster, 2010; De Sawal & Maxwell, 2014; Miller, 2010; Morgan & Policello, 2010). Morgan and Policello (2010) explained, “Student affairs organizations must deal with the reality that if offering high-quality and innovative programs for students is a priority, then identifying and soliciting outside funding sources is essential” (p. 9). Accordingly, this article offers tools to advance student affairs fundraising strategies.

**Strategy and Training**

Sargeant (2001) discussed two approaches to raise funds, first noting transactional approaches as a means to meet immediate organizational needs without a robust strategy. In contrast, the strategic approach is framed within the context of an organizational plan designed...
to maintain donor relationships through long-term and sustained fundraising (Sargeant, 2001). To effectuate a lasting model, increase capacity to deliver programs, and improve service quality, student affairs fundraising requires more than one-time transactions. Preparing well-developed materials to demonstrate needs and delineate a measurable strategic plan is critical (Pettey, 2008). For student affairs organizations, strategy-based fundraising is more apt to meet long-term needs and create lasting donor relationships.

Student affairs professionals and campus collaborators must therefore engage in substantive training. Arminio et al. (2010) advised all student affairs organizational members to participate in training. Advancement professionals can benefit from training that offers more familiarity with the value of student affairs services and clarity of student needs (Arminio et al., 2010). Including all stakeholders in training can help establish priorities and define roles within the fundraising process.

Preparing to Make the Ask
Before soliciting donations, professionals must undertake a rigorous assessment of student needs within the context of the university’s mission and values, and the student affairs strategic plan. Miller (2010) postulated:

Those responsible must research the needs of students and of the division of student affairs and determine what new programs or program expansions, services for students, building or other capital projects, or educational initiatives might appeal to prospective donors. (p. 5)

Pettey (2008) discussed donor interest in understanding the scope of programming and the measurable impact of their gifts. Student affairs professionals should anticipate donor needs by providing pertinent information such as student needs, program and service designs, methods to ask questions, and expected frequency of outcomes reporting. Such proactive communication can enhance donor relationships (Pettey, 2008).

Collaboration with the university’s advancement office is essential to gift prospecting. Such a partnership allows synchronized messaging and reduction of communication overlap (Arminio et al., 2010; Miller, 2010). By working in tandem with advancement colleagues, student affairs fundraisers can adequately prepare to mitigate challenges and provide sufficient information to meet donor expectations during cultivation and when requesting funds.

Restricting Gifts to Student Affairs
Since some gifts may be restricted for student affairs programs, Pettey (2008) suggested reviewing conditions with stakeholders as “the organization’s accounting/business operation will also need to ensure that funds are treated as restricted and are accounted for separately from unrestricted and general operating funds” (p. 50). According to De Sawal and Maxwell (2014), foundation officers may place greater priority on other campus campaigns. Direct collaboration may prevent such a challenge. For example, the vice president for student affairs or appropriate designee should be involved in discussions about restricted gifts. Such involvement can help fundraisers mitigate challenges outside the division, such as foundation rules, business practices, or political factors that are retrograde to student affairs fundraising.

Pursuing Grant Writing
Securing grants is a viable resource in student affairs fundraising. However, professionals interested in grant writing may face early career limitations. Describing perceptions of grant writing among recent graduates and their supervisors, Cuyjet, Longwell-Grice, and Molina (2009) found that “both parties saw this area as being unimportant to their current job” (p. 110). Still, there is value in pursuing grant writing to supplement reduced resources (Arminio et al., 2010; Cuyjet et al., 2009; De Sawal & Maxwell, 2014; Morgan & Policello, 2010). Seeking grant awards is also an opportunity for faculty collaboration. Arminio et al. (2010) suggested greater likelihood of securing funding through student affairs and academic affairs collaboration. Expounding on grant writing, Cuyjet et al. (2009) noted:

In the changing context of higher education, student affairs professionals are now expected, or soon will be expected, to seek grants for the purpose of funding campus programs, especially educational programs addressing campus issues, such as alcohol and drug abuse, sex education, and crime prevention, to name just a few areas. (p. 112)

Curate Future Donors in Current Students and Young Alumni
Arminio et al. (2010) explained that it is valuable “for students to be educated about their obligation to support the institution beyond their graduation and throughout their lifetime” (p. 40). De Sawal and Maxwell (2014) described value in engaging students by teaching direct and indirect giving models, which can yield alumni donors. Former members and leaders of student organizations or student employees are viable fundraising prospects as alumni (Morgan & Policello, 2010). De Sawal and Maxwell (2014) advised:

Keeping track of how former students were involved while they were attending the institution provides the initial connection in developing the donor relationship for a possible gift. Encouraging alumni to volunteer at events and programs is another way to engage and market future initiatives. (p. 49)
Gift Management and Gratitude

Proper stewardship of gifts can yield a positive and trust-filled relationship with donors (Pettey, 2008). Pettey (2008) described the need for a centralized filing system, information sharing, project implementation strategy, and communication plan with the donor or granting agency. Pettey (2008) postulated, “Regular reporting back to the contributors should be scheduled. This can take many forms, including phone calls, customized stewardship reports, and an annual donor report for all supporters” (p. 112).

Tangible expression of appreciation is valuable to sustaining fundraising relationships. Pettey (2008) explained the value of expressing donor gratitude, noting:

They deserve the right to be thanked, be it a post card, receipt, letter, telephone call, or email message. Being thanked is less about the form than the act itself. . . . How soon the donor receives it can make all the difference in building a respectful and trusting relationship for the future with each donor. (p. 20)

Conclusion

Fundraising in student affairs requires the same level of strategy and resource support as any other student service initiative. To make a meaningful and lasting impact, a fundraising model that is rooted in trust, transparency, and accountability can lead to success in yielding gifts and, most important, enhanced opportunities for student perpetuity.
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The 2016 NASPA Annual Conference theme, “Common Purpose: Shaping a Vision for Higher Education,” focuses on the role that student affairs plays in higher education, shaping a vision around diversity, affordability, accessibility, and engagement. Furthermore, through establishing partnerships, student affairs professionals and faculty are better equipped to address concerns outside the classroom, which illustrates the conference subtheme, “Inspire.” By decompressing silos that exist on campus between academic affairs and student affairs, student affairs practitioners offer inclusive information sharing such as student success metrics and student learning outcomes to the broader campus community. Through the integration of best practices, student affairs practitioners can encourage a seamless learning environment, which enhances student learning and personal development. By setting true curricular goals and outcomes with student experiences outside the classroom, we build connections that help practitioners prepare students for a global society.
The presence of silos communicates to a student that a hierarchy exists at the institution in which student learning and success is not the focus. The removal of silos requires coordination and collaboration, which are the two key components of academic and student affairs partnerships. Coordination refers to the establishment of concrete roles within a working unit, whereas collaboration refers to the cohesive marrying of those roles to accomplish a unified goal (Guthrie, 2012). With both, we are able to build a seamless campus learning environment that promotes holistic student learning and development. The Student Learning and Development competency area, as outlined in the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators ACPE—College Student Educators International, & NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015) recognizes that programs and services that are rooted in theoretical learning and development can shape students’ developmental journey, spurred by their involvement in cocurricular immersive experiences with student affairs and academic affairs.

An example of seamless learning was first introduced by Kuh (1996) through the establishment of cohesive educational practices that promote student learning and development and address student needs. This definition acknowledges that the campus environment is comprised of professionals with different foci. Kuh also outlines six guiding principles for this collaboration:

- Generate enthusiasm for institutional renewal.
- Create a common vision of learning.
- Develop a common language.
- Foster collaboration through cross-functional dialogue.
- Examine the influence of student cultures on student learning.
- Focus on systemic change.

Student affairs-based learning opportunities promote the development of key attributes such as critical thinking, as well as interpersonal and organizational skills, which are all essential to learning in and out of the classroom. However, if we go back to Kuh's (1996) definition and guiding principles, we find that developing learning opportunities only in the silo of student affairs is not adequate for students’ holistic development. Cocurricular learning opportunities should be complementary to students’ learning opportunities in the classroom.

Practitioners can look to exemplary practices grounded in theory and research, such as Kuh’s (2008) 10 high-impact educational practices, to spur cross-divisional partnerships. By participating in collaborative assignments and projects offered through these exemplary practices, students develop leadership and research skills that meet their expectation to amass intellectual and professional skills they will use throughout their lives (Pew Research Center, 2011). Leadership initiatives—one at Florida State University (FSU) and the other at Indiana University–Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC)—illustrate the principles and practices of partnership in ways that emphasize seamless learning and stand out as exemplary practices that increase collaboration.

At FSU, students have the opportunity to integrate academic and cocurricular experiences in pursuit of the Leadership Studies Certificate. Offered through The Center for Leadership and Social Change, the program consists of five core classes grounded in leadership theory. Students delve into topics—such as service to the community, organizational and interpersonal skills, and the process of change—relevant to leadership skills applicable to any field of study. The students explore how leadership theory applies to their current student leadership roles and how professionals in their academic discipline apply them to their own work. An important component of the certificate includes the completion of two courses: one from the student’s academic major in which the student applies leadership theory and principles, and another in which these theories and principles are applied to a cocurricular experience, such as an internship in a community organization. These two aspects of the program would not be successful if Kuh’s (1996) principles for collaboration were not applied. When applied in this context, the principles support institutional priorities to prepare informed and insightful students to be primed for success in any discipline they enter.

In fall 2014, IUPUC launched the Inaugural Student Leadership Conference. During this 2-day conference, students engaged with practitioners and faculty to develop leadership skills. Students engaged in a series of interactive sessions and presentations that nurtured exclusive partnerships in collaborations geared toward clubs and organizations on topics such as multicultural and social justice, burnout, and communication techniques. Further, faculty united with student affairs professionals by facilitating sessions and asking student attendees to write reflection statements on what they learned. Students who opted to participate in this conference also were assessed with pretests and posttests to ensure learning that demonstrated:

- leadership competence,
- interpersonal skills,
- personal growth and development, and
- student empowerment to think and act with innovation and creativity.

Seamless learning can occur in any campus environment. The examples highlighted provide conceptual illustrations of partnership practices conducted at FSU and IUPUC. In particular, the focus has yielded successful partnerships in
academic affairs and student affairs, encouraging others to use these mechanisms. Continued practices such as developing directed collaborations between faculty and student affairs and integrating academic and student affairs principles are essential to building these campus cultures. Student affairs professionals should seek to apply theory to practice, develop meaningful relationships with faculty, and co-construct curricular and cocurricular learning opportunities when establishing seamless learning initiatives on campus.
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Popular culture is rich with stereotypes about student-athletes, who are often portrayed as privileged athletes rather than as humble students. Yet, those who work with student-athletes know that many of them struggle to develop positive identities as both athletes and students (Mamerow & Navarro, 2014). Such challenges have driven athletics departments to design special programs that support these competitive and hard-working individuals, but at times, they create separate cultures on campus.

Programs do not always support rounded student-athlete development, academics, or meaningful career preparation. Instead, they focus on academic eligibility and athletic outcomes (Navarro, 2014). In this article we describe an innovative approach, rooted in student development theory, that helps campuses support athletes’ distinctive needs and student-athletes balance their dual roles on campus.
Who Are Student-Athletes?

While certain sports draw more attention than others in the media, student-athletes’ successes—and failures—play a critical role in shaping campus culture. Irrespective of the stereotypes, such responsibilities influence how student-athletes develop in academic, athletic, and social spheres. Student-athletes tend to be driven, dedicated, competitive, smart, and organized. They have to be in order to find success in sport and academics. Beyond their academic responsibilities, student-athletes must manage time demands of competition and practices, with the latter often beginning before dawn. Many regularly put in 12- to 16-hour days, besides travel expectations. As a result, student-athletes must make what are often difficult choices about their academic plans. Despite these demands, many student-athletes maintain healthy social lives and manage to be highly engaged on campus (Jolly, 2008; Petitpas & Champagne, 1988).

Student-athletes also play a critical role in the recruitment strategies, enrollment, and financial health of the institution, especially at smaller schools. At Heidelberg University, more than half of the student body participates in at least one sport; for many of these students, athletic opportunities greatly influenced their college decision (Heidelberg University, 2014). Athletic programs are a powerful recruiting tool for many schools, and at institutions with numerous athletes, the programs affect how institutions operate—from recruitment to graduation. In recognition, many institutions have increasingly come to consider the distinctive challenges and needs of student-athletes as critical to institutional, not just student-athlete, success.

Student-Athlete Support Programs

Today, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) champions a need to provide holistic support for health and wellness throughout a student-athlete’s academic career (NCAA, 2015). For example, the NCAA focuses intently on providing campus level mental health and student-athlete welfare programming for contemporary student-athletes via the Sport Science Institute (NCAA Sport Science Institute, 2015).

Bridging the cultures of athletics and academics, however, continues to prove difficult on many campuses, especially Division I schools. By definition, Division I schools are able to give student-athletes scholarships for participation in intercollegiate athletics. Further, while Division I athletics departments often have academic advisors internal to athletics, Division II and III administrators and coaches often work in both athletics and academics arenas. In turn, their support programs must be more integrative due to staffing and budgetary constraints. Faculty participation is encouraged; usually, it is essential.

Innovative programs encourage student-athletes to venture outside the athletics bubble to engage in major exploration and specific mentorship programs. The University of Wisconsin (UW)-Whitewater Department of Athletics developed a leadership academy model—the Warhawk Leadership Academy—that builds from a student-athlete’s first to final year, all in preparation for careers and life after athletics. It has become a central programmatic hub for curriculum delivery.

The vast majority of student-athletes across UW-Whitewater’s 20 sports do not become professional athletes, so the program stresses intentional career exploration, major choice, and academic preparation, with special attention to identity development. The program centers on developing leadership skillsets to serve as a positive ambassador for both the UW-Whitewater and Warhawk brand as student-athletes are highly visible figures within the student body and institution (see Figure 1).

During the second year, the program focuses on leading by example by incorporating campus and community outreach in an initiative called Warhawks Give Back. The program streamlines scheduling for student-athlete community appearances through the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). The initiative continues into the third year and further diversifies experiences, bringing together athletes from across sport programs rather than maintaining individual team initiatives. Mike Salm, a third-year soccer player, noted:

It really helps us to think about how we can more intentionally and efficiently engage as student-athletes on campus, in the classroom, and in the community. We are all focused on pursuing athletics excellence, team by team, but this helps us come together under the common thread of being a part of Warhawk athletics, engaging with the student body and community as students and athletes (M. Salm, personal communication, October 15, 2015).
Salm, the 2015–2016 SAAC president, plans to focus his administration on enhancing buy-in among stakeholders.

Beyond SAAC participation and the Warhawks Give Back program, upperclassmen can also participate in the Veteran Warhawks program. The experience continues and extends career and leadership development. Participants practice leading while investing in the development of future Warhawk leaders. The program takes a pay-it-forward approach by asking veteran student-athletes to mentor new recruits as they navigate the transition processes and help first-year students to understand the importance of campus engagement and holistic development. This third- and fourth-year initiative is facilitated through partnership with the campus’s Peer Mentorship Program and Career and Leadership Development Office. Joe Worth, a fourth-year football player, reflected, “We typically spend several hours with our specific teams across campus, and this model helps us to feel like we are not only a part of athletics, but the campus as a whole.” (J. Worth, personal communication, October 15, 2015).

Rather than operating in isolation, the program partners with the Center for Career and Leadership Development, First-Year Experience Office, Peer Mentorship, Freshmen Orientation, and Learning Communities programs. Coaches utilize the academy model in recruiting, and collaboration enhances what is commonly called the “Warhawk Powered by Tradition” culture. Taken together, the programs help student-athletes foster relationships across campus and the community, and it intentionally prepares them for life after athletics in career fields.

**Final Reflections**

Student-athletes are a dynamic population that often struggles with identity development and transition more than non-athletes. Although their support programs are continually evolving at the campus and national levels, several important development considerations are missing. From our perspective, which is rooted in campus practice, professionals can continue to improve how we support this distinctive group by listening to their voices and responding to their needs. Efforts to assist student-athletes should continually refocus on practices that consider national standards while enabling autonomy and innovation at the campus level.
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The United States is diversifying rapidly. It is estimated that people of color will comprise more than 57% of the U.S. population by the year 2060 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Accordingly, few would deny that institutions of higher education have a responsibility not only to produce graduates who are prepared to lead but also to foster the development of leaders who are equipped to serve increasingly diverse cultural communities throughout the nation and world.

Absence of Culture in Leadership Development Discourse

Despite the realities discussed above, cultural diversity is often not meaningfully included in conversations about leadership development. Researchers have offered several leadership models to help educators better understand and facilitate leadership development (e.g., Higher Education Research Institute, 1996; Posner, 2004). These models have made significant contributions to student leadership programming and understanding of leadership.
The absence of culturally diverse perspectives in leadership discourse is problematic for at least two reasons. First, research suggests that programs that are relevant to students’ cultural backgrounds and identities are more likely to strengthen those individuals’ connections to their institutions, increase their engagement in learning activities, and maximize their likelihood of success (Museus, 2014). Thus, it could be argued that leadership programs must engage their students’ diverse cultural backgrounds and identities if they seek to maximize positive outcomes among them. This point is especially important for educators serving students from minoritized ethnic populations whose voices are often not reflected in mainstream curricula and programs (Jayakumar & Museus, 2012).

Second, common sense suggests that individuals who hope to be leaders and effectively advocate for their own cultural communities must exhibit an understanding of them. Therefore, campuses aiming to equip students to be effective leaders for their own communities must offer those students opportunities to develop general leadership skills (e.g., collaboration skills, civic responsibility, ability to work toward common goals) and learn how such skills can be used for the betterment of their communities. To facilitate the latter, leadership programs must provide students with opportunities to understand how history and culture shape experiences within their communities, gain an awareness of the most urgent social and political problems affecting these communities, and acquire skills that equip students to address these problems. Indeed, scholars have documented the value of programs that infuse cultural relevance into (co)curricula to prepare diverse students to advance their own communities (Conrad & Gasman, 2015; Museus, Lam, Huang, Kem, & Tan, 2012).

Toward a More Culturally Relevant Leadership Development Discourse

The Culturally Engaging Campus Environment (CECE) Model of College Success can be used to demonstrate how the concept of cultural relevance can contribute to leadership discourse that reflects the diversity of today’s college students (Museus, 2014, p. 210). The CECE Model is based on three decades of research and outlines the nine elements of environments that allow diverse populations to thrive in college by facilitating a variety of positive outcomes, such as learning and development. The indicators can be divided into two subcategories of cultural relevance and cultural responsiveness. Herein, we focus on the five indicators of cultural relevance, which describe the ways that environments (e.g., curricula, spaces, programs, and practices) can be constructed so that they are relevant to the cultural backgrounds and communities of diverse students:

- **Cultural familiarity** is the extent to which college students have opportunities to physically connect with faculty, staff, and peers who share and understand their backgrounds and experiences.
- **Culturally relevant knowledge** refers to opportunities for students to learn and exchange knowledge about their own cultures and cultural communities.
- **Cultural community service** refers to the extent to which students have opportunities to engage in projects and activities to give back to and positively transform their cultural communities.
- **Meaningful cross-cultural engagement** involves students’ access to opportunities to engage with peers from diverse backgrounds in interactions that are focused on solving real-world social and political problems.
- **Culturally validating environments** refer to environments that validate students’ cultural knowledge, backgrounds, and identities.

Although not common in mainstream programming, examples of how such culturally relevant concepts are embedded in leadership opportunities do exist on college campuses:

- The Center for Black Cultural and Student Affairs (http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/black_cultural_center/about_us_services.shtml) at the University of Southern California provides several culturally relevant programs that can serve as critical leadership opportunities. These include programs that allow students to spend time at partner historically Black colleges and universities to explore diversity within the Black community, participate in think tanks to analyze issues in the Black community from various disciplinary perspectives, and engage in several community service and outreach opportunities to positively impact their communities.
- Supported by the American Indian College Fund, several tribal colleges and universities around the nation provide Native American women’s leadership development programs (http://www.collegefund.org/students_and_alumni/content/leadership) that offer students opportunities to be validated as critical members of their local cultural communities, strengthen their connections with leaders within their communities, learn about problems within their communities, and learn and apply leadership skills to address these problems.
• Student affairs professionals also organize multicampus culturally relevant leadership initiatives. College educators who realized the need for culturally relevant leadership programming for Pacific Islander students created Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC) (http://empoweredpi.org)—a coalition of professionals across multiple postsecondary institutions—to address this need. EPIC offers a weeklong leadership program that includes workshops on Pacific Islander history, networking sessions with Pacific Islander professionals and community elders, and spaces for students to share their own personal narratives and reflect on their developmental journeys.

While such leadership opportunities are invaluable, they are often isolated in ethnic enclaves and have the capacity to serve a limited number of students on college campuses. Consequently, many students from minoritized ethnic backgrounds never have the opportunity to access curricula or programs that intentionally underscore the relevance of their communities (Jayakumar & Museus, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Thus, it is also critical for student affairs educators constructing mainstream leadership programs to consider how they might make their own programs more culturally relevant if they seek to maximize the engagement and nurture the passions of future leaders for a diverse society.
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Sustainability has always been a priority for the University of California, Merced (UC Merced), the first American research university to be built in the 21st century. As often as we have had to be innovative, we have had to think in terms of sustainability. Resources for higher education are at a premium, and just as we try to maximize our potential from the limited materials with which we can work, we want students to get the most out of their ingenuity.

Sustainability is about using resources efficiently and to their best potential, which can foster collaboration. In the classroom, we can help students collaborate by assigning work they must complete in groups, not in isolation. As we have learned in the era of “Big Data,” the most informed analyses aggregate information with local stakeholders rather than rely on individual, often isolated, accounts. The result of collaboration can be better information, stronger arguments, and more purposeful community engagement—across the campus, the city, the county, and the state.
The Social Change Model of Leadership Development can serve as a theoretical background for building collaboration and common purpose. The model emphasizes these topics to make positive social change. By developing a plan to engage the entire campus and community in a common effort that focuses on shared values and goals, campuses can move forward on sustainability initiatives (Astin, Astin, & Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). The following six suggestions, using UC Merced as a case study, can help in the endeavor of creating a sustainable campus.

1. Educate Incoming Students
As students are introduced to the campus through their orientation experiences, a commitment to sustainable practices must be instilled. The students’ impact on a university’s ability to reduce energy consumption and waste production is significant just from the sheer size of the population. Education can be integrated into the summer orientation program, annual welcome week activities, and orientation in the residence hall communities. The earlier students are engaged in discussions about water conservation, recycling, and long-term sustainability plans, the more likely they will be active collaborators in this aspect of the community.

2. Incorporate Environmental Literacy Into the Curriculum
It is necessary to address environmental literacy in multiple disciplines while providing students the ability to use their knowledge in other areas. Reynolds (2010) stated:

> With its strong emphasis on environment, society, and economy, environmental literacy is decidedly multi- and interdisciplinary…Detailed expertise in all disciplines is certainly an unrealistic academic goal for an individual; thus critical thinking skills are key to ongoing assessment of emerging information and contexts. (p. 18)

In UC Merced’s integrated Core 1: The World at Home general education course, students apply interdisciplinary concepts to real-world sustainability issues. To address prevailing informational impasses that have complicated California’s response to drought, students collaboratively complete a water conservation plan assignment that includes a targeted 2-year policy for distributing currently available water while balancing the needs of humans with those of the environment. With each other as both authors and audience, students pool their intellectual resources to produce informed responses to sustainable practice.

3. Incorporate Sustainability Practices Into Student Programs
Through campus programming, students can apply what they learned during orientation and in the classroom. Additionally, by using sustainable practices or planning environmentally focused programs, students can demonstrate their commitment to the common purpose of creating a sustainable campus.

The Refill not Landfill program is an example of one such practice that includes campus departments, student government, and other student leadership in making collaborative, sustainable changes at the university. The Refill not Landfill initiative includes the distribution of over 1,000 branded reusable water bottles, the hydration station retrofit of a main academic classroom building, and the implementation of a monetary incentive program for using the water bottles at the campus cafe.

4. Expand Collaboration Across Campus
Sustainability efforts within the curriculum and cocurriculum require coordination at the systemic level and should reflect the institution’s commitment to sustainable practice. At UC Merced, the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Sustainability gathers personnel from across the university to encourage an open exchange of ideas and initiatives. The committee adheres to the charge of fostering the campus as a living laboratory in a teachable landscape and guides cocurricular initiatives such as the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Lab, where students, faculty, and staff work to certify designated buildings according to LEED’s criteria for sustainable design and maintenance. Such cross-institution collaboration is representative of the sustainability committee’s promotion and documentation of sustainability efforts in areas such as dining, purchasing, facilities, housing, and, of course, curriculum. Without centralized coordination, the university would lack an efficient, unified means of dedicating resources and thus of meeting the needs of the community.

5. Build Sustainability Expectations Into Campus Infrastructure
As a campus grows, “Creating a sustainable institution requires long-term thinking. Hence, for decision making to be sustainable at a university level, it should be guided by the question: What is in the best long-term interest of the entire university?” (Pearce & Uhl, 2003, p. 59). At UC Merced, infrastructure sustainability practices have been incorporated into the Long Range Development Plan. For example, within proposals, development firms must “adhere to principles of sustainable environmental stewardship, conservation, and habitat protection in planning, design and construction, of the campus and individual projects adopting an approach of continuous improvement in the sustainability of campus development, operations and management” (UC Merced, 2009, p. 110). This statement, along with a commitment to, at a minimum, achieve U.S. Green Building Council LEED Gold Certification in all buildings, demonstrates an infrastructure commitment that aligns with the campus’s common purpose in sustainability.
6. Connect Sustainable Practices to the Community
Thomashow (2014) stated:

*Sustainability initiatives are more likely to succeed when they are linked to regional and national networks. Community partnerships . . . allow a campus to share its expertise, justify its efforts, view its work in a broader perspective, participate in collaborative research projects, gain visibility for its sustainability initiatives, and cultivate potential donors. (p. 88)*

The UC Merced partnership with Yosemite National Park exemplifies this practice. On campus, a 2-year leadership development program is led in partnership between both organizations in addition to a wilderness education desk run by the park service. Off campus, students hold summer internships in the park in a variety of educational roles. Students then return to campus ready to educate additional stakeholders.

In sum, sustainability is not just the responsibility of a few “green” individuals on the college campus. It is critical that we leverage the opportunities for collaboration across the campus and surrounding community toward a common purpose of a more sustainable world. The six suggestions above and the examples of practice from UC Merced might guide you toward building a sustainable campus of your own.
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Would you upvote or downvote this sentiment: Student affairs educators should unite around the common purpose of having substantive dialogue regarding social media’s impact on our professional lives. In many respects, the student affairs profession is actively embracing the digital revolution. Recent years have seen Technology added to the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators (ACPA—College Student Educators International, & NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015); the increasing use of digital tools for networking, information sharing, and discussion on critical issues; and blogs, webcasts, podcasts, and wikis. Across the profession, digital tools are being embraced for their educational potential.
As professionals, we often focus on college students. Yet, attendees of the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference were confronted with the realities of how social media can change the landscape of professional conferences. Although Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram have become integrated into many conference-goers experiences—sharing pictures, information, promoting sessions with official conference hashtags—the controversial use of Yik Yak by some conference attendees in New Orleans raised questions about social media use.

Yik Yak is an anonymous geosocial application. Like Twitter, users post short messages. But unlike Twitter, those who post remain anonymous, and posts can be viewed only from within a 5-mile radius. A post remains active for as long as it is upvoted, a form of liking what another user posts. Downvoted posts disappear off a feed after they receive a net of five negative votes.

At the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference, many attendees actively engaged through Yik Yak. While most comments were benign, controversy arose around posts from conference attendees who revealed a different side of our profession: negative comments about others’ dress, looks, and social background; admission of skipping sessions altogether to enjoy the city or engage in behaviors such as drinking or sex; and threats of violence or vitriolic rants regarding sessions and conference presenters. The Chronicle of Higher Education (Thomason, 2015) swiftly posted a story, prompting an official response from NASPA as well as the addition of an educational session on the final day of the conference to discuss what was framed as inappropriate and worrying use of Yik Yak by conference attendees.

The situation raised the following critical questions for our profession: What are the possibilities and limitations of anonymity in digital social media spaces? What is “responsible digital communication” (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 33)? How can we view controversial postings in social media as real-time climate assessments and gateways toward educationally relevant dialogue on our own campuses and within our profession? What did a Yik Yak feed produced by a gathering of higher education professionals teach us about the diversity of perspectives and lived experiences among college student educators? Most importantly, what might Yik Yak teach us about being purposeful, poised, and thoughtful in response to similar situations that might arise at future conferences or on our campuses?

In the immediacy of the conference, response to the use of Yik Yak by attendees appeared both negative and reactionary. Negativity arose around the anonymous nature of Yik Yak posting. Reactionary sentiment—by which we mean a general shaming of other professionals who might be anonymously posting comments that can be viewed as inappropriate and incendiary—spread in response to media attention from The Chronicle of Higher Education (Thomason, 2015). This prompted the official NASPA response that a “few disappointing anonymous posts” (Thomason, 2015, para. 5) should not reflect the majority of student affairs professionals, and that we must continue to serve as “role models” (Thomason, 2015, para. 5). We would like to address each of these issues in a thoughtful way.

The rise of social media platforms such as Yik Yak is representative of a pendulum swing in the social media landscape. Early Web-based platforms and communities often thrived on user anonymity through the creation of avatars; many gaming and Web-based social communities continue to harness anonymity (boyd, 2014; Junco, 2014; Turkle, 2011). One might view Yik Yak and its current popularity as a response to a social media market saturated by “real-identity” platforms: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest, or Snapchat.

The anonymity of professionals posting on Yik Yak at least partially contributed to the negative reactions at the conference. Our own research (Eaton, 2015; Gismondi, 2015) confirmed the importance of anonymity in social media spaces for college students’ understanding of identity and subjectivity, and for enhancing the “safety” of digital spaces for complicated, difficult dialogue. There is no reason to believe such benefits would not extend to student affairs professionals.

Aside from the potentially beneficial aspects of anonymity or semi-anonymity in terms of personal learning, development, and growth, such platforms as Yik Yak also provide a pulse on climate—a sort of real-time campus climate survey (Eaton, 2015; Gismondi, 2015). There are educational benefits to such anonymity on our campuses and—we would argue—from the use of Yik Yak by professionals at conferences.

As student affairs professionals, our job is to educate students, to respond to their needs and concerns, and to ensure that the climate of our campuses is supportive of learning, success, health, and wellness. The same should be true on our “professional campuses” (i.e., professional conferences). Controversial social media postings can be harnessed as real-time climate assessments of the profession. As educators, we should role-model appropriate responses. A few ideas follow.

- Rather than taking an overtly negative attitude toward those professionals who post what we view as incendiary comments, unite in the common purpose of harnessing digital tools to provide resources, support, or educationally relevant information to conference attendees.
• Counter Yaks about binge drinking with a social media campaign and study about the substance abuse behaviors of professionals.
• Engage Yaks about sex by promoting safe sexual behavior, access to sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing, and information on the prevention and spread of STIs.
• Address Yaks that threaten violence or speak to the need for utilizing conferences as vacation time with on-site professional counseling, greater access and promotion of health and wellness activities during conferences (such as exercising, meditation, massage, or yoga), and increased research on reducing stress levels among professionals.
• Redirect Yaks that demean others based on age, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, appearance, ability, size, or other social perceptions to the complicated conversations of social justice and inclusion within our own ranks.

These are just a few ways in which student affairs professionals can model appropriate responses and behavior on and through social media. Ongoing work remains in addressing the challenges we face concurrently on our professional campuses and at our respective institutions. We must abandon the idea that social media mores are constant and unwavering; instead, we must embrace the notion that these platforms provide us a stream of new information to be parsed and considered regularly.

We should unite around the common purpose that social media can provide a window into the real-time lived experiences of both students and student affairs professionals. Our decisions around engaging and using social media—and our ability to respond appropriately, as called for in the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators (ACPA & NASPA, 2015)—means that we retain realistic perspectives. Data, research, student, and professional voices are all vital in this pursuit.
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Veterans are attending higher education in increasing numbers, making use of their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits (Cate, 2014). While there has been a great deal of conversation about, and research on, engaging veterans through student affairs programs, much-needed attention should be placed on how veterans are being supported through their academic persistence to graduation and subsequent employment. As we continue to promote the idea of veteran-friendly campuses and the value of higher education as a supportive place for veterans reentering civilian life, we also need to offer strategies to positively affect campus efforts toward the retention and graduation of student veterans. Knowing and understanding the unique student veteran population of one’s institution can provide great insight into how to develop and implement programmatic strategies to enhance veteran academic persistence and transition success.

Unlike their traditional student counterparts, student veterans approach higher education as nontraditional adult learners engaging in education for career transition (Minnis, 2014; Vacchi 2014). Rather than attending college to gain life experience for the first time away from home and family, student veterans view their collegiate experience as an opportunity to add new information and skills to their prior work experience so they can pursue new employment opportunities in the civilian sector. With effective support services and programmatic resources, institutions can increase student veterans’ potential for academic persistence and retention. As such, it is incumbent on us, in higher education, to better understand the unique needs of the student veteran population on our campuses so that we can provide appropriate and much-needed programmatic support.

While research has been undertaken at the national level to study veterans’ completion in higher education, researchers have used incomplete data and flawed analysis, which confound the findings and recommendations. In its 2014 report “Million Records Project: Research from Student Veterans of America,” (Cate) Student Veterans of America drew on data from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the National Student Clearinghouse as well as approximations and assumptions about completion rates. Based on this research, it reported that 51.7% of student veterans were persisting to graduation. Because full and accurate data have not been available for study, it was not possible to achieve a comprehensive and correct representation of student veteran postsecondary outcomes. Such national studies also cannot account for the variability of characteristics in student veteran populations by institution. As such, with limited reliable data and a high need for student impact, it is both necessary and prudent for institutions of higher education to assess their own student veterans and examine the rates at which they are persisting, completing their education, and moving on to postgraduate employment. Gathering and analyzing student veteran metrics by institution also empowers institutional staff to better understand and advocate for their population’s needs (Minnis, 2015; Perkins, 2014).

The University of Utah collects data to identify needs, develop programming, and justify resources for veterans on its campus (Perkins, 2014). In addition to name and benefit type used, if any, it is also important to capture such data as program of study, anticipated term of completion, financial aid use, and service branch. Other metrics gathered may vary depending on the institution and population and should serve the purpose of being used to identify, develop, and promote programs to support student veterans’
transition to civilian life and academic success. The following are some of the data points an institution should collect:

- Name
- Service branch and military job
- ID and contact information
- Major(s)/program of study
- Classification/level
- Grades
- Veterans benefits or financial aid used
- Assistive/supportive services used

Identifying the student veterans attending an institution can be a challenging and piecemeal process requiring creativity and diligence for data collection. Not all veterans engaged in higher education use GI Bill or other veteran education benefits. Counting only those identified by the school’s certifying official for GI Bill benefits may mean overlooking part of the population and misunderstanding the impact of support services on the student veteran population (Minnis, 2014; Vacchi, 2013; Vacchi & Berger, 2014). Perkins (2014) suggested a variety of staff- and student-led methods for identifying student veterans. From taking attendance at events to surveying those using student veteran lounges or other gathering spaces, Perkins engaged a variety of practices to find and identify student veterans on campus. Methods for collecting data include the following:

- School certifying official—readily available and historical data
- Admissions records—self-identification of veteran status
- Institutional records/research office
- Student veteran surveys
- Headcount at events and gathering places

The NASPA Veterans Knowledge Community has undertaken a project to design a standardized method for collecting and reporting data on student veterans in higher education that could serve as a guide for those programs not currently gathering student veteran data. Those veterans programs already collecting data should seek to institutionalize their processes to allow for long-term comparisons and greater understanding of student veterans’ ongoing needs. Collected data can be used to identify student veterans’ graduation rates, retention and attrition, financial aid use, and scholarship eligibility, and use of student support programs through such resources as disability services and counseling. Metrics can also be used to advocate for additional funding and support programs for student veterans as the needs demonstrate. For example, resources such as specialized academic advising, remedial courses, and tutoring may be useful if metrics suggest student veterans are not persisting due to academic challenges. Likewise, demonstrated increased use of accessibility resources through disability services by student veterans may offer staff greater opportunity to advocate for additional funding to increase programs.

Serving the student veteran population effectively from application to postgraduate employment takes strong partnership between veteran services staff and their colleagues in student affairs and academic affairs. Without the data to demonstrate the need for resources and support, those serving student veterans in higher education are left guessing about their population’s needs, academic persistence, and transition success. Because we, in higher education, will continue to see veterans arriving at our institutions to undertake studies for career change and advancement, we must be prepared to provide them the best support and opportunities for achievement that our resources will allow. Taking the time to gather data about the current student veteran population will enable those working with student veteran programs to better understand their student veterans’ persistence to graduation and employment. Implementing a long-term data collection strategy will also enable them to represent and advocate for student veterans as well as predict and plan for future student veterans’ needs. Doing so will make institutions more veteran friendly and prepared to positively affect campus efforts toward the retention and graduation of student veterans.
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The landscape of higher education has changed significantly over the past decade, with an increased focus on student finances, including students’ ability to pay for their education and the expected return for this education. This focus is supported, even more so recently, by the metrics in the 2015 U.S. Department of Education College Scorecard. Additionally, the media has been quick to remind the higher education community in the United States that we continue to produce “the most indebted class ever” (Sparshott, 2015, para. 1).

Furthermore, there is an intense focus on the effect of students’ collegiate financial decisions on their long-term health and well-being. The Gallup Well-Being Study goes as far as to link debt of $50,000 or more to decreased long-term well-being in alumni studied over time (Dugan & Kafka, 2014). This provides an interesting framework for colleges and universities to address, especially as the positioning of the holistic value of a degree (beyond monetary return) is an increasingly important focus in the value of higher education argument (Blumenstyk, 2015). Another question that deserves exploration is: What is the role of finances as they relate to student stress, and what is the institutional responsibility to address these concerns?
The Ohio State University (OSU) recently closed the National Student Financial Wellness Study, which collected responses from 18,795 students at 52 institutions (including 4-year public, 4-year private, and 2-year public institutions; Center for the Study of Student Life, 2015). These data have provided a few initial observations related to student finances. The first is that issues related to student finances are a large cause of financial stress across institution types.

The findings suggest that most students (72.8%) agree that they feel stressed about their personal finances. A larger percentage of students at 2-year public institutions (76.1%) say they feel stress compared with students at 4-year institutions (72.1%). Nearly 60% of all students agree that they worry about having enough money to pay for school. The amount of money that students owe has caused 29.2% of students to reduce their course load, 41.1% of students to consider taking a break from their institution (16% report doing so), and 28.5% of students to consider dropping out (5.7% report doing so and 13.2% report transferring).

Despite these findings, many high schools and postsecondary institutions do not provide financial education or financial coaching support to their students, which implies that the education system does not offer the tools necessary for students to have a strong financial wellness foundation. In line with this implication, only a moderate proportion of students have participated in personal finance courses or events. While 30.6% of students report attending a class or workshop in high school, just 22.9% report the same when in college.

Additionally, few students are meeting with campus-based professionals, which presents concern around the ability of institutions to assist students in managing finances, both proactively and reactively. Only 29.2% of students have met with a financial aid counselor during college and only 9.3% have met with a peer financial counselor.

These data support other research conducted at OSU that is beginning to show the linkage between financial stress and other wellness behaviors. Student affairs professionals have access to students, understand the lenses through which to engage students, and have an infrastructure that supports peer education and other emerging practices in the field (Kruger, 2015). These qualities make student affairs professionals uniquely positioned to assist students in managing their finances.

However, it is also important to recognize the campus-wide nature of this issue. Just as wellness and health promotion efforts cannot occur in a vacuum, a campus-wide, environmental approach is necessary to help students achieve true financial wellness. These collaborations with units such as academic affairs and financial aid are imperative to the success of true financial wellness efforts. The environmental approach, commonly used in the public health sphere, has been a staple of the alcohol prevention world for years (DeJong & Langford, 2002). These principles rely on a coordinated and sustained effort across the campus and the community, including the review of policies related to student finances, such as financial aid policies, tuition payment policies, and emergency loan and grant policies.

Since 2001, OSU has uniquely positioned its financial education and financial literacy efforts within the Office of Student Life. OSU student life staff and faculty innovatively created Scarlet and Gray Financial, a program that assists thousands of students each year in managing their finances. Scarlet and Gray Financial is a peer education–based approach to financial literacy, housed within the Office of Student Life’s Student Wellness Center at OSU. The program promotes financial literacy and holistic financial wellness through a variety of mediums, including one-on-one coaching sessions, large group presentations, financial education research, and professional development opportunities.

Scarlet and Gray Financial also provides proactive planning support to assist students with understanding their financial situation and a base of financial knowledge, and works to support students who may be in financial crisis. Students who participate in the Second Year Transformational Experience Program, a co-curricular program centered on student success in their second year, are required to complete a two-part financial wellness intervention (an online module followed by an in-person appointment). We see this as a very proactive opportunity to help expose students to financial decision making, including their current and future borrowing levels, and assist in making any behavior changes that they may want to make during their time at OSU. On the crisis support side, we work with individuals who are applying for institutional emergency loans to provide financial coaching as part of the application process for that aid. These opportunities help us to not only address problems before they arise, but also to support students in financial crisis.

There is a growing trend in the field to address student financial wellness, as shown through the 200-plus in attendance at the National Summit on Collegiate Wellness in 2015 and participation in the National Student Financial Wellness Study. Student affairs must continue to assume a leadership role in assisting students with this important issue—an issue that affects students far beyond their years on our campuses. We have an opportunity to help students learn about their finances and manage their money as they engage in one of the biggest financial decisions they will make in their life. Even more important, we have an opportunity to truly help to provide individuals with “Education for Citizenship.”
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The discipline of leadership studies throughout history has focused on male leaders and authors, building the foundation of the field on the thoughts and experiences of one segment of the population. In the past, books and articles dedicated to women and leadership have focused on concepts such as gender differences in leadership and how women lead. The discipline of leadership studies can be traced back to the study of psychology, a domain traditionally dominated by male voices and perspectives. Ball (2012) pointed out in her analysis of the history of psychology that Thomas Carlyle’s Great Man theory of leadership, arguably one foundational theory of the discipline, refers to the historicizing of an individual, typically a man, who is revered for the significance of his contributions with the assumption that great leaders are born, not made. Through Ball’s (2012) exploration of the foundations of psychology, she asserts that this theory rendered female and minority leaders invisible, undermining their accomplishments by focusing on the achievements of the majority. Her argument suggests that the impact of the Great Man theory and hero worship, the excessive admiration of a leader, continues to influence practitioners. Ball (2012) found that:

Scientists at any point in their careers can read biographies and see in themselves the types of characters portrayed, as well as their struggles, their failures, and their achievements. Scientists can thereby come to better understand themselves and others in their field through these life stories. In short, history creates a sense of community among members of a discipline. (p. 74)
Ball's observations hold true in other disciplines as well, particularly in education and the study of leadership. It is clear the stories of leaders who are (and are not) chosen to be highlighted influence the types of leaders produced. Taking Ball's argument one step further, when aspiring women leaders have the opportunity to learn from women in the field and analyze theory from their perspectives, they may feel a greater sense of empowerment. In short, they are more likely to see themselves in the role of female scholars in education.

Where have women in leadership traditionally fit in the discipline of leadership studies? The scholarship tends to focus on gender roles in leadership and the interpretation of theory. In their research on gender differences in leadership, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found few reliable differences in leadership style between men and women leaders in both interpersonal and task styles, though their research identified a slight difference between gender and leadership approach. This finding served as a contrast to prevailing literature on the topic, which supports the idea that gender-stereotypical leadership styles exist, with a "masculine mode" of leadership characterized by competitiveness, hierarchical authority, and control, while a "feminine mode" focuses on cooperation, collaboration, and problem solving based on intuition and empathy (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 233).

In recent years, those who conduct research on women in leadership roles are moving beyond investigating gender differences in leadership, instead researching new ways of interpreting existing theory and positing their own leadership theories and approaches, independent of traditional research on the subject. This is due in part to a shift in the discipline, with contemporary research studies being more open to additional interpretation and perspectives. While the majority of traditional leadership theories were promulgated by men over the course of the 20th century, a shift from the Great Man theory to approaches that are more dynamic and transformative, rather than power focused, have provided an opportunity for women to reimagine leadership and lend their own perspectives to traditional models. This can be seen when considering the theories of servant-leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) and transformational leadership (Bass, 1990). Both theories have been reexamined by women, building on the foundations of leadership theory to include additional interpretations, takeaways, and practical steps for carrying out each leadership approach.

Greenleaf’s (1977) theory of servant-leadership defines leadership as a service, with a strong focus on considering others' needs first, that supports and challenges the development of each group member. According to Greenleaf (1977), the servant-leader exercises shared power and an ethic of care that goes beyond traditional leadership models. Umlas’s (2012) work on grateful leadership builds on the tenets of servant-leadership, providing a framework for emerging leaders to translate theory into practice. Grateful leadership, Umlas (2012) posited, is an approach that focuses on authentic acknowledgment, communication of gratitude, and supporting individual group members while working toward achieving the goals of the collective. Meanwhile, Greenleaf’s (1977) theory of servant-leadership focuses on similar principles, including service and promoting holistic personal development. Both Umlas’s and Greenleaf’s approaches are centered on a specific mindset designed to be uplifting and collaborative, which is not determined by a leader’s gender. The perceived differences between how men and women interpret servant-leadership and grateful leadership are not mentioned in either text; rather, the focus is on holistic leadership development.

Bass (1990) categorized transformational leadership as “superior leadership performance” (p. 21), a practice that broadens and elevates the interests of those who are being served, inspires a shared vision among the group, and challenges each group member to go beyond their own interests and focus on the good of the group. Astin and Astin (2000) built on the transformational leadership model by reimagining it through the lens of values-based leadership and community, developing the social change model. Komives et al. (2007) moves the model one step further by providing a practical framework for implementing transformational leadership in higher education. The tenets of relational leadership, such as challenging the process and enabling others to act, have served as building blocks for popular leadership approaches in student affairs.

The work of Komives et al. (2007) and Umlas (2012) provides two examples of women practitioners who have reframed the traditional study of leadership to fit their perspectives and experiences, serving as models for women in the field. These models provide an avenue on which to reflect while challenging traditional, dichotomized leadership models that emphasize power and entitlement over values, community, and collaboration—historically feminine characteristics that have been reimagined as enlightened leadership. Further research on the theories of servant-leadership and grateful leadership and how they apply specifically to student affairs would be useful, as well as research studies that build on and verify existing approaches posited by female scholars. The study of leadership and intersecting identities such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability would contribute immensely to this topic, particularly how scholars reframe and re-envision leadership theory in
terms of their identities and experiences. In addition, research that goes beyond binary gender identities may provide a greater understanding of the role of gender in leadership and provide avenues to further challenge traditional models of leadership frameworks, expanding the traditional scholarship on gender differences in the practice of leadership.
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