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Welcome from the National Knowledge Community Director

Dear NASPA Colleagues,

I am delighted to share with you the 2018 NASPA Knowledge Community Publication. The following pages highlight the wonderful work of our NASPA colleagues and showcase the ways in which the KC program creates and shares valuable and timely knowledge with our membership. I hope you gain valuable insight from and are inspired by this talented group of authors.

In Philadelphia, we will come together to begin a yearlong celebration honoring the rich history of our Association. The 100th Anniversary gives us an opportunity to reflect on our past, recognize and honor those who came before us, and look forward to the future of the student affairs profession. Given this focus, you will find reflected within these articles reflections, research updates, emerging trends, and promising practices that I hope will assist you in creating innovation and change on your campuses.

I want to take a moment to express my gratitude to the 2018 NASPA KC Publication Committee, led by Tracy Poon Tambascia, for their contributions to this current body of knowledge within higher education. These individuals give selflessly of their time to NASPA in order to support and assist their colleagues across the organization in advancing our professional competencies.

I hope that you find time in Philadelphia to engage within the KC program, whether through attending a sponsored session, visiting the Communities Fair, or joining an open KC business meeting. We encourage and welcome your involvement.

Thank you for supporting the KC program, and I hope you enjoy the pages that follow.

Sincerely,

Ellen Meents-DeCaigny

National Director of Knowledge Communities
NASPA Board of Directors 2017–2019
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
DePaul University
2017–2018

NASPA Knowledge Communities Publication Committee

Tracy Tambascia, Committee Chair
Professor of Clinical Education,
Rossier School of Education
University of Southern California

Christina Brown-Wujick
Admissions Recruiter/Advisor USF Health
University of South Florida-Main Campus

Ellen Meents-DeCaigny
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Doctoral Student
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Tom Fritz
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Amy J. Hauenstein
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Stephanie King
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Kelly Schaefer
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A 2016 report by researchers at Penn State University found heroin and prescription painkiller abuse on the rise due to wider availability of both of these drugs. Across the United States in 2014, 28,647 deaths, or 61% of all drug overdose deaths, were linked to opioid use. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported the opioid overdose rate has tripled since 2000, while deaths from heroin overdose have quadrupled over the past decade (McIntyre, 2016). College and university campuses across the United States are not immune to this scourge, as opioid use and abuse on campus mirrors what is happening off campus.

The challenges around this issue are numerous, as use and abuse usually starts prior to student’s arrival on campus. Additionally, statistics show increasing connection between heroin and opioids.

- In 2014, 21.5 million Americans ages 12 and up had a substance abuse problem. Of those addictions, 1.9 million were to prescription pain medications and 586,000 to heroin.
- Approximately 23% of heroin users develop opioid addiction.
- Drug overdose is the number one cause of accidental deaths nationwide, and opioid overdoses make up the majority. Of the 47,055 lethal drug overdoses in 2014, 18,893 were attributed to prescription pain meds and 10,574 to heroin.
- Of new heroin users, 80% of users start abusing drugs with prescription painkillers (McIntyre, 2016).

A survey of 1,200 college-age adults conducted by the Hazelden Betty Ford Institute for Recovery Advocacy and the Christie Foundation (2015) showed college students are as likely as the general public to abuse narcotics. At an event in Washington, D.C., in 2015, the Hazelden Betty Ford Institute recommended a six-point action plan for college campuses, communities, and policy makers:

- Education for students, faculty, and community members on the dangers of opioids and available resources for help
- Addiction-related curricula in medical, pharmaceutical, and dental schools
- Prudent prescribing of pain medications by student health centers and youth-focused medical professionals; naloxone, the antidote to opioid overdose, readily available to campus police and other first responders and visible to students, with no repercussions for those who call for help
- Student health centers equipped to provide and widely promote screening and intervention services
- Sober housing on every campus
- Student recovery communities on every campus, supported visibly by administration

Many campuses have taken steps to increase their services with these goals in mind. Institutions are including information on opioids in their typical drug and alcohol education programs. In addition, some institutions are increasing counseling and health center staffing by
hiring drug counselors. Campus police forces as well as other departments are being outfitted with naloxone, an overdose-reversal drug (Korn & Kamp, 2017). Although these approaches vary from institution to institution, some states have sought ways to standardize their educational programs.

In Maryland, where over 2,000 people died of drug and alcohol overdoses in 2016 (Roll, 2017), the state government has stepped in to directly address the issue. During the early months of 2017, the Maryland legislature passed the Start Talking Maryland Act, which mandates education programs on the dangers of drugs, for students from elementary school through college. Students must be educated on the dangers of opioids, including heroin, twice in elementary school, once in high school, and once at the college level for incoming full-time students. In addition, the act requires naloxone to be stocked by campus police and public safety officers and for the aforementioned persons to report naloxone uses to the state (Wood, 2017).

Education is very important in this fight, as students consistently report that they do not understand that there is little difference in the addictive properties of “street drugs” and prescription medicines. According to the Hazelden Institute survey (2015), nearly 1 in 6 respondents would consider trying a pain pill not prescribed to them and 11% said they have taken a pill without knowing what is was. Yet only 1 in 20 would take a pill known as a “heroin pill.” In addition, 49.5% said they could get prescription pain pills within 24 hours if asked. Given this information, campuses need to work to stem the tide of use and abuse.

In addition to education, other steps are also important. For example, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College in North Carolina has partnered with a local rehabilitation center to help train faculty on the warning signs of addiction, provide resources to students, and improve understanding of the physiology of addiction. Greenfield Community College in Massachusetts hosts group meetings for students who are in recovery or dealing with affected family members, helps former addicts enroll and succeed in college, and is developing a certificate program in addiction studies. As one administrator said, “[i]t’s not only about job opportunities, it’s about educating students who become lifelong ambassadors to engage the community in understanding the illness of addiction and removing the stigma” (Ashford, 2017). Lorain County Community College in Ohio has created the CARE (Caring Advocates for Recovery Education) Center on campus to provide counseling and other services for students, family members, and the community. Created 2 years ago at the request of three students who were in recovery themselves, the center has seen a jump of over 400% in visits (73 students in 2015–16 to 307 in 2016–17). Center officials hope this reflects that students are becoming both more aware of and more comfortable with seeking help (Ashford, 2017).

No single approach will address the issue of opioid abuse, but various approaches and programs show promise. Colleges and universities are representative of the populations from which they draw students. As this epidemic continues within this country, college administrators and faculty will need to support students in addressing the issues that arise from abuse and addiction. However, ongoing education is needed to support efforts within communities that address opioid abuse both off campus and on campus.
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We frequently hear calls for new ways of conducting student affairs work in the face of changing student and institutional needs. Historical student support delivery models are being disrupted by a host of factors, and degree program formats themselves are being disaggregated, resized, or fast-tracked to meet the needs of increasingly competitive marketplaces. The growing sector of graduate and professional education in particular, with its specific connection to labor markets, exists on the cutting edge of such innovative curricular practices (Gardner & Barker, 2015). In recent years, one significant development has been the emergence of accelerated master’s degree programs. Often one year in length, these programs are designed for students seeking to deepen a specific element of their expertise, change fields, or expand career options. Using the business school context as an example, enrollments in such programs have doubled in the past decade alone (Ghee, 2017).
What is the place for student affairs professionals in such environments? Contemporary professionalized student services work is needed now more than ever.

Students and institutions alike require practitioners who are capable of engineering holistic student experiences that are every bit as innovative and responsive as these new degree formats. There is much progress to be made, as these program formats come at a time when student affairs practice in graduate settings is ripe for renewal and evolution. Students need forward-thinking graduate student administrators who are eager to move beyond the traditional, basic support service delivery model (Pontius & Harper, 2006). However, when historical program formats give way to more compressed student experiences, the challenges can be even greater and the implications for practitioners more pronounced. In this article, we offer examples of the kinds of special considerations that accelerated graduate degree programs require in some key areas of practice.

**New Student Orientation/Transitions**

Effective orientation programming is indispensable in short-term graduate program settings. Although students in these programs are often motivated to quickly begin their programs of study and pursue concrete career goals, they necessitate the same introduction to facilities, policies, and resources as other students. Unfortunately, students and staff alike can underestimate these transition needs for graduate students, assuming that their undergraduate experiences prepared them for what lies ahead (Rosenblatt & Christensen, 1993). The typical graduate student transition considerations certainly apply: a new city, a new institutional setting/type, and new personal responsibilities and levels of autonomy (Tokuno, 2008). However, because such programs often attract students who are exploring new career possibilities, the transition also includes new academic environments, teaching formats, faculty types, and professional contexts. Moreover, all of this is experienced at an accelerated pace. If transition experiences are not intentionally structured with just-in-time information, students can quickly feel displaced and confused as the academic tasks begin to pile up. To that end, effective assessment of transition needs both pre- and postenrollment, as well as empathic program design processes, are key practices for student affairs leaders. With one year programs, older/returning students are not available resources for orientation processes—therefore, professionals can potentially engage alumni when a sense of continuity or peer support is desired.

**Student Success/Retention Initiatives**

In one sense, academic advising questions are somewhat simpler in one year master’s programs, as many such programs are lock-step and cohort-based in curricular format. However, when program life cycles are only one year, any academic stumbles can quickly become obstacles to on-time graduation, and therefore future employment. As always, student retention and success require collaboration with academic affairs. Student affairs practitioners must take a proactive approach to such partnerships by maintaining close relationships and regular communications with instructors. Building these relationships on a common footing of student success and well-being helps provide for more seamless support. Additionally, student affairs practitioners should make every effort to understand these unique curricula and classroom environments. Empowered with such knowledge, systematic supports such as tutoring models and formal academic improvement planning can be implemented proactively. Intentional advising and listening skills can enable professionals to quickly build the levels of trust necessary for the authentic vulnerability that leads to real change and growth.

**Student Engagement Systems**

Astin’s (1984) theory of student involvement has long emphasized students’ active participation in their educational journeys. Meaningful student organization and involvement models at the graduate level can help provide a sense of belonging as well as leadership development opportunities. However, when enrollments turn over entirely each year, institutions lack the benefits of multiyear student leadership transitions and continuities. Student affairs practitioners can provide the foundational elements, mission/scope, role definitions, historical documentation, and a menu of programming ideas to kick-start operations. Although orienting entirely new groups of students each year can present challenges, it also grants opportunities to refocus or reformulate systems as needed. Such involvement opportunities can promote professional socialization and development when focused on the intersection of personal identities and career goals.

In addition to student organizations, practitioners can leverage short-term involvement opportunities to encourage engagement. With intense course loads and shortened terms, some students in accelerated programs shy away from leadership opportunities. However, event-level involvement that culminates with the execution of a specific initiative can offer students the right opportunity to foster a sense of belonging and pride in their institutional affiliation.

**Personal Support**

We already know that practitioners should prepare for increased student stress and anxiety during accelerated programs—the impacts of which are compounded by graduate students' lower levels of self-care and reluctance to seek help (Gardner & Barker, 2015). Therefore, proactively establishing connections to resources and any institutional student support infrastructure is key. Acting as localized case managers, student affairs professionals must seek to educate these partner offices on the unique needs and ongoing concerns of these students. Accelerated programs can begin or end at times of the year
when campus colleagues are unaccustomed to addressing student needs, and student schedules can be compressed with heavier course loads or unique program tasks.

Systematic student intake practices in which staff identify and document specific individual or group needs must occur immediately upon matriculation, if not prior to it—enabling staff to effectively advocate for and respond to these needs. The remarkable diversity of student identities, academic backgrounds, and life stages present in many such programs is a crucial element to consider. Fostering inclusive and affirming educational environments is a baseline requirement if students are to feel a sincere and trusting connection to a school where they may be a student for only a short time.

**Laboratories for Innovation**

As the student affairs profession advances in these new degree program settings, we must tackle some of the unique challenges and opportunities this format entails. Forward-thinking student affairs leaders can leverage the chance to experiment on the margins of our current profession, equipped with practices that have been proven in other educational settings. As higher education more broadly undergoes continued changes in degree program design and delivery, student affairs professionals can extend and articulate the values and core philosophies of our profession into new realms. Rather than playing catch-up to their undergraduate-serving colleagues, administrators in graduate and professional student services can help lead our institutions into the future with new methods designed for evolving program models.

---
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ADULT LEARNERS: THE SINGLE GREATEST RESOURCE YOU MAY BE MISSING ON YOUR CAMPUS

Jared Cook  
Doctoral Student  
University of South Dakota

With traditional student enrollment declining from 2009 to 2014, institutions of higher education have been scrambling to bring prospective students to their universities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Between increased amenities, new buildings, and continual decreases in state funding, institutions of higher education have seen a dramatic rise in the cost not just to maintain services but to continue along a path of providing appealing services to maintain traditional enrollment, giving rise to increases in tuition to help subsidize this cost (U.S. News, 2017). As the general public voices skepticism about higher education cost and worth, employers are also speaking up. In a 2015 study, 58% of employers said, “improvements are needed to prepare students for success in entry-level positions” (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2015, p. 1). The same study found that 91% of employers believed that “thinking critically, communicating clearly, and being able to solve complex problems is more important than candidates undergraduate major” (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2015, p. 1). Institutions of higher education need to lean on one of our most valuable, yet least considered resources: adult learners.

Hailing from multiple backgrounds, positions, and professional levels, adult learners can provide immediate diversity inside the classroom. Research conducted by Wyatt (2011) provided insight on the importance of nontraditional participation and engagement to higher education. Estimates from the most recent census indicate “4 out of 10 undergraduate students are over 24 and enrolled on a part-time basis” (Wyatt, 2011, p. 1). By lending their skills acquired through work, potential links to job opportunities for younger students, and the ability to bring potential donors through work or community resources to a campus, adult learners can positively affect both traditional students and the institution. According to Soares, adult learners “reflect a latent market of up to 80 million students” (2013, p. 2). Despite such a large base of potential students, four-year institutions are not the primary benefactors of the adult learner population. Currently dominating the adult learning arena are community colleges, where adult learners “make up as much as 60 percent of all community college students” (Soares, 2013, p. 6). If institutions of higher education invest in adult learners and provide intentional on-campus resources for them, they gain not only additional enrolled students but also peers who have wisdom and background knowledge to share.

Since 1964, the United States has recognized the potential of adult learners and set itself on a path to support their growth. Starting with the Adult Basic Education program in 1964, the federal government began to pave the way for adult learners (National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium, 1998). With a focus on reading, writing, and computing, this act provided a source of funding for states to assist in the education of their adult population (National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium, 1998). This initial program grew in both breadth and focus with the addition of the Workforce Investment Act in 1998. Increases in grant funding, opportunities for teacher education, and a shift in focus to encourage immigrants, refugees, and students with limited English helped change the face of adult education. Since then, this program has been updated several times, becoming the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014. However, the commitment to adult learners has stayed consistent in this process, expanding its reach through its inclusion of English as a Second Language (ESL), individuals with disabilities, and low-income individuals (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014).
Although institutions of higher education have taken some positive steps toward embracing adult learners, many have chosen to relegate only a small set of resources to them, instead focusing on traditional students. With overall declines in enrollment, adult learners should become more critical to university mission statements, as they bring with them knowledge and diverse experiences. Institutions can promote adult learners on campus in three ways: becoming familiar with and using adult learning theories, implementing adult learning strategies in the classroom, and creating accommodations for enrolled adult or nontraditional students.

Unlike pedagogy and traditional teaching strategies for younger students, adult learners require a much different approach to be successful in the classroom. Malcolm Knowles, a prominent promoter of andragogy, provided the most succinct method for understanding the adult learner. Knowles (1980) argued that adult learners are different than younger students in several areas, notably because of their need and wish to self-direct their own experience, stating they have a “deep psychological need to be generally self-directing” (p. 43) and rely more on their experience to help inform their learning, as they “attach more meaning to learning they gain from experience than those they acquire passively” (p. 44).

Understanding the adult learner’s need for self-directing experiences means the way we treat our adult learners in the classroom and the way we bring their past experiences into the discussion is of paramount importance. Providing adult learners options to help shape their experience in the classroom also helps their readiness to learn. Activities, syllabi, and class content should be focused on “life-application” (Knowles, 1980, p. 44), allowing adult learners the opportunity to bring their knowledge into immediate use in their life. This immediate use helps provide the adult learner an “orientation to learning” (Knowles, 1980, p. 44), which in turn allows “increased competence to achieve their full potential in life.” Guided discussions or assignments revolving around dealing with real-life challenges or case studies regarding the workplace may also be valuable. These practical applications of material can also help traditional students think critically and begin to see some of the ways working professionals deal with challenges.

Even with the knowledge of adult learning theory, institutions should identify the needs of their particular adult learners and create accommodations. Wyatt (2011) explained that adult learners come “prepackaged,” having a “greater sense of maturity, experiences, and values as well as different learning goals and objectives” (p. 13). Prepackaging sets adult learners apart from traditional students, with many balancing their busy lives and managing roles outside of being a student. Wyatt (2011, p. 14) argued that in order for institutions to successfully serve adult learners, creating classes at convenient times, along with convenient locations, will better serve students.

Institutions of higher learning have an opportunity to completely change how we work with adult learners. Between declining enrollments, scrutiny from employers, and people gauging the cost of higher education and its worth, now is a perfect time to implement new mission statements, classroom techniques, and an emphasis on adult learners.
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In February, Black Entertainment Network launched a new television show titled The Quad. The series follows the lives of several students, faculty, and senior-level administrators at a Historically Black College. The show covered one story line that may be of particular interest to stakeholders in higher education, including faculty, administrators, and students, and that was the sexual assault of a female student on campus. Although the topic of sexual assault is not new in higher education discourse, The Quad brought light to a group often on the periphery of these conversations—Black college women (BCW). In addressing this topic, the show provided a glimpse not only into how sexual assault impacts BCW, but into its broader effect on the Black collegiate community. Perhaps unintentionally, this story line also illuminates the lack of attention around sexual assault of marginalized women, especially BCW.

In recent years, sexual assault on college campuses has received widespread attention. In March 2013, President Barak Obama reauthorized the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). One significant component of the VAWA was the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (2013), which included a requirement that colleges collect statistics on acts of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking in their annual crime reports. In 2013, the White House Council on Women and Girls, and the Office of the Vice President, released the report Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action, which documented the steps “the administration has taken to combat rape and sexual assault, and [identified] areas for further action” (United States, 2013, p. 1). Both the reauthorization of the VAWA and the report released by the Office of the Vice President have illuminated the victimization of college women on and off campus.
Lost in the statistics are the experiences of BCW. Although rape, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking among Black women has recently garnered more national attention (Tanis, Odom, & Simmons, 2014), there is a dearth of research examining campus sexual assault among Black collegiate women in the domestic violence and higher education literature. A report by The Black Women’s Blueprint found that 60% of Black girls will have experienced sexual abuse before the age of 18 (Tanis et al., 2014). Many of these women will enter institutions of higher learning already affected by various forms of violence. This article poses critical questions that campus leaders should consider when examining issues of rape, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking among BCW.

**Reporting Sexual Assault within the Black Campus Community**

The prevalence of sexual violence in the Black community has been widely documented (Collins, 2004; Crenshaw, 1991; Krebs et al., 2011; Washington, 2001). According to Donovan and Williams (2002), Black women are more likely to be blamed for their abuse and less likely to report their abuse because of the racial and gendered repercussions from identifying Black men as perpetrators (Wooten, 2016). For Black women, naming Black men as perpetrators is often seen as contributing to the pervasive racist stereotypes endured by Black males. In addition, remaining silent also contributes to rape culture within the Black community. On many traditionally White college campuses, Black students represent a small percentage of the overall student population. Subsequently, the Black campus community is small and represents an environment in which Black students develop racial salience and a sense of belonging on their campuses (e.g., Black Student Union, Black Greek Letter Organizations). In order to better inform Black collegiate women regarding sexual assault, it is imperative that administrators understand the cultural context of Black women’s lived experiences.

**Questions to Consider:**

- In what ways does the Black campus community engage in conversations about sexual assault?
- What support and resources are provided to Black women who report sexual assault?
- Are there campus policies that address retaliation? If so, what are those policies?

**Culturally Responsive Reporting Mechanism**

Black women are skeptical and critical of individuals and oppressive systems that have a history of marginalization (Amar, 2008; Donavan & Williams, 2002). Washington (2001) made the claim that “in the aftermath of sexual violence Black survivors are generally unlikely to seek assistance from predominately White-run and White-staffed rape crisis agencies or battered women’s shelters” (p. 1257). This is also the case when it comes to individuals who are designated as confidential campus reporters (e.g., health care professionals, religious figures, counselors). Much of this can be attributed to the lack of cultural competency of many faculty and staff on campus. For Black women, trusting a system that has continually demonstrated that their experiences are invalid, and failed to acknowledge their presence within the university, is a real concern in their decision to report the abuse. BCW face isolation, invisibility, stereotypes, and a lack of faculty and staff support throughout college (Banks, 2009; Patton & Catching, 2009; Robinson & Franklin, 2011). To begin transforming institutional practice relating to campus sexual assault, campus leaders must commit to developing trust with their institution’s diverse student body, including Black students, to cultivate an environment that is culturally responsive.

**Questions to Consider:**

- In what ways do specific policies (e.g., time frame of incident resolution, rights and responsibilities of survivors) and practices (e.g., bystander intervention, education, awareness, and prevention) respond to the needs of BCW and the Black campus community?
- How does the campus build trust with Black students?
- How are Black students represented in campus-wide campaigns, including print and online materials, on sexual assault issues?
- Is there diversity among staff and offices designated as campus confidential services?
- What does cultural competency training look like for faculty, staff, and students on your campus?

**Conclusion**

The impact of violence on the lives of Black college women continues to be an unspoken reality, especially as the victims of sexual assault in higher education environments are often represented as White women. Acknowledging and understanding the experiences of Black college women is necessary as colleges and universities begin to reevaluate how women experience rape and sexual assault on campus. The national spotlight on campus sexual assault provides an opportunity for institutions to expand the scope of addressing this issue in the lives of Black college women and other populations left out of the conversation, by providing additional resources beyond university counseling and multicultural student affairs to address their needs. Acknowledging the experiences of Black college women also means including them in the larger university conversation on sexual assault. Students are more likely to seek help for their abuse trauma if they trust their college system and administrators (DeGue et
al., 2014). Black college women need to feel that their experiences matter and that their institutions are genuinely interested in their success. Likewise, stakeholders in higher education must be equipped to create sustainable policy and practice outcomes to address sexual assault in the lives of Black college women. This responsibility cannot be left to the students alone.
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In the past two decades, there has been a growth in the number of institutions that offer living–learning communities (LLCs) for Asian Pacific Islander Desi American (APIDA) students across the country. Similarly, interest in LLCs has grown in the field of higher education and student affairs, where LLCs are defined as "residential communities with a shared academic or thematic focus" (Inkelas, Daver, Vogt, & Leonard, 2007, p. 405). Indeed, the number of research studies and practitioner essays that contributes to this important topic, particularly focusing on how LLCs influence student outcomes, has increased over time (Lum, 2008).

However, a limited amount of research exists about LLCs that are focused on APIDA students. Institutions that provide such resources often discuss the purpose of APIDA LLCs as vehicles to enhance students’ understanding of their own APIDA experience, providing opportunities to connect academic and cocurricular activities in a validating environment (University of California, Berkeley, 2017; Dartmouth, 2017; University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2017). This article will discuss the benefits of APIDA LLCs, the types of curricula and cocurricular activities that successful APIDA LLCs utilize, and the challenges that student affairs professionals face, along with key recommendations for development and implementation.
APIDA Students and APIDA Living–Learning Communities

The APIDA community is arguably the most diverse racial group in the United States (Teranishi & Nguyen, 2011). The U.S. Census reported in 2012 that the APIDA community consists of over 48 different ethnic groups, each with complex and disparate histories, traditions, immigration and refugee patterns, and educational experiences (National Commission on AAPIs Research in Education, 2008; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; Maramba & Hernadez, 2016). APIDA college students are no different, embodying the diversity of the larger APIDA community.

Recognizing the differences in the APIDA student experience, colleges and universities have begun offering APIDA-focused LLCs in order to foster a sense of community for these students; in addition, these LLCs often provide academic and cocurricular activities so that students can engage in a number of topics, including identity development, intersectionality, and history/culture.

Benefits of Living–Learning Communities

There are a host of benefits and positive outcomes for students who participate in LLCs. Empirical studies have demonstrated that institutions with LLCs can ease students’ academic and social transition as they enter a new educational landscape and environment (Stassen, 2003). LLCs intentionally foster these outcomes by housing residents with common interests together. The objective of LLCs is to increase a sense of belonging among peers with common experiences and identities in order to improve academic outcomes as well as “the quality of the undergraduate experience” (Stassen, 2003, p. 581).

Universities can invest resources into LLCs through campus partnerships with faculty members, multicultural center staff, student support services, community-based organizations, and student groups, and through recognition from university leadership. Student affairs professionals influence LLCs by developing resources, fostering partnerships, creating opportunities for student engagement, and advocating for the needs of these communities (Stassen, 2003). Additionally, academic affairs partnerships with LLCs provide opportunities for faculty engagement and representation. Research has shown that residents in LLCs interact with faculty and academic resources more than their counterparts (Parameswaran & Bowers, 2012). With considerable engagement on these fronts, LLCs can offer several positive effects that include higher retention and completion rates, a stronger commitment to diversity and social justice, and intentional actions to spur student development (Stassen, 2003).

Academic and Cocurricular Activities

In order to achieve the benefits outlined in the previous section, colleges and universities have implemented academic and cocurricular activities for APIDA students in LLCs. Rutgers University, Dartmouth College, and University of California, Berkeley provide unique residential environments that offer diverse programming. Asian American studies and ethnic studies courses are typically offered as a part of these LLCs and include the APIDA experience in the United States, APIDA history, and contemporary issues in the APIDA community. These academic courses validate APIDA students’ experiences and histories, while contributing to a positive understanding of their racial identity (Sleeter, 2011).

These institutions also provide a wide variety of options for students to engage in civic and service-learning activities with their LLCs. Students volunteer or conduct community outreach in support of local high school students. They are also able to attend community and policy lectures, socials, or cultural events that are organized in partnership with community-based organizations that serve the local APIDA population. Additionally, APIDA students have numerous leadership opportunities through student-led social and cultural organizations on their campuses.

Other types of projects and opportunities that benefit APIDA students participating in these LLCs include having direct interactions with APIDA faculty and senior administrators, participating in special orientation programs, and organizing special events for the broader campus community.

Challenges, Implications, and Recommendations for Practice

Despite the benefits and scalability of APIDA-focused LLCs, there are several challenges and potential roadblocks to their development and implementation. First, it is important for scholars and practitioners to be mindful of the lack of political will to fund (and support adequate research regarding) coethnic/culture-centered service and support centers. The pervasive model minority myth feeds the belief that APIDA students are well adjusted and culturally assimilated (Museus & Park, 2015), which challenges the necessity of APIDA LLCs and silences their narratives while invalidating the oppression faced by APIDA collegians.

Financial barriers, a critical mass of APIDA students, and buy-in also pose significant barriers to practitioners. With the rising costs of on-campus living, practitioners must be mindful of financial accessibility to students, balanced with the fiduciary responsibility to efficiently spend university resources. Faculty and administrators should contemplate cutting resources set aside for racial/ethnic identity–based initiatives, especially funding allocated to serving the specific needs of APIDA students, faculty, and staff. Furthermore, institutions should truly examine effective ways for staffing and partnership needed to develop and sustain an APIDA LLC. Although residential student buy-in is key, cross-departmental and divisional coordination and leadership from all stakeholder groups is just as essential.
Conclusion
APIDA LLCs are an important campus resource within higher education institutions that can facilitate and contribute to a positive understanding of racial identity for APIDA students. This vast, diverse, and rapidly growing student population experiences many different stages of identity development, including introspection, cultural dissonance, and model minority myth. These issues can sometimes pose feelings of isolation, but APIDA LLCs can help create a sense of belonging and reconcile these concerns. The challenges are apparent, but higher education institutions, along with their student affairs practitioners, faculty, and administrators, should consider APIDA LLCs as a benefit to the development of the APIDA student community.
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As members of NASPA celebrate the upcoming 100th birthday of the organization, it is also a time for the knowledge communities to reflect on our history, which laid the groundwork for our present and our future. NASPA held its first Assessment and Retention Conference in 2004, and the Assessment, Evaluation, and Research (AER) Knowledge Community (KC) was formally established in 2005. The name of the conference was changed to the Assessment and Persistence Conference in 2011 in an intentional shift to address how individual students establish and move toward their own goals, instead of focusing on institutionally defined goals (Henning, 2016). The AER KC has been a long-standing partner with NASPA in the delivery and development of the conference. The ability to understand and process complex data has become a critical competency for student affairs professionals and can be enhanced by a greater partnership with the field of institutional research (IR). We present a brief history of student affairs assessment and a glimpse into future opportunities to deepen our collaboration with IR to advance institutional knowledge about student behavior and performance.
Although the idea of assessment and evaluation within student affairs was included in The Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1937), more formal examples of assessment began gaining institutional momentum in the late 1970s through the early 1990s by researchers who were increasing their focus on different dimensions of the student experience, such as learning and behaviors related to retention. The establishment of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education and the Nine Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning (Astin et al., 1992) formalized the assessment movement in student affairs. This movement became a critical institutional focus in response to the call for accountability that came from both state and federal government during the 1980’s (Bentrim, Henning, & Yousey-Elsner, 2015). In the 1990s, regional accreditation became more influential and intertwined with assessment emphasizing student learning, most of which was focused on the classroom setting.

Institutional research has a long history, which notably began in 1701 by the founders of Yale in the nascence of the institution, and was originally focused on governance. The theme of governance has continued to be a strong element in IR. In 1909, the field broadened with Harvard's study of instruction methods that included focus on class size and amount of time students spent studying outside of the classroom, what we would now term "student engagement" (Rice, Coughlin, & Howard, 2011). With enrollment growth in the late 1940s and 1950s, higher educational institutions grew rapidly. State governance and interstate commissions sprang up and fostered institutional collaboration. The Association of Institutional Research (AIR) was established in 1966 and now supports over 4,000 “higher education professionals in the collection, analysis, interpretation, and communication of data, and the strategic use of information for effective decision making and planning” (AIR, n.d.).

In many ways, student affairs assessment developed as an institutional need to understand students beyond the classroom, by professionals who were interested in supporting students more holistically. Student affairs assessment became a subfield of student affairs practice in the 1990s. The first text on the subject was Upcraft and Schuh’s (1996) Assessment in Student Affairs: A Guide for Practitioners. Assessment is now integrated into the core curriculum within higher education programs and is a competency included with the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators, the joint publication from NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and ACPA—College Student Educators International (2009; 2014). New professionals no longer see assessment as outside their role but as a critical part of it.

Although increasing professionalism within the field of student affairs assessment has solidified, the intersection with IR has become more critical to understand the true value of higher education. It is not enough to understand the student experience in isolation from the institution, nor to focus only on the performance of the institution. These two issues—the value of higher education and the student experience—are intertwined and require different perspectives within the institution to address both meaningfully.

Partnership between student affairs assessment and IR is becoming more critical with the use of “big data” to monitor and predict student behavior. Those in student affairs assessment leadership roles offer much to these conversations in terms of their knowledge of the whole student, not just the student within the classroom. In fact, student affairs assessment professionals contribute significantly to a critical collaboration with IR professionals in the topic of student success. Pickering and Sharpe (2000) noted the following:

The questions about why students were experiencing academic difficulty and why institutions were experiencing increased attrition may be best answered by student affairs and institutional research staff working together to design surveys, interviews, or focus groups. As some of the reasons become evident, student affairs and institutional research staff can continue to collaborate on the development of treatment programs (often in student affairs) and evaluations of those programs (typically an institutional research function). (p. 86)

As assessment continues to be rigorous and employ advanced methodology, the partnership with IR to build robust data sets becomes even more critical in today’s big data environment. Although the use of sophisticated data can support institutional efforts to improve retention and graduation, these techniques must be grounded in student development theory and best practices within student affairs assessment. The intervention strategies gleaned from predictive models must be focused on a growth mindset, not viewed from the deficit lens of students being at risk for noncompletion.

One of the key conversations currently taking place in the AER KC is around definitions: Exactly what is assessment? What is research? How do the two overlap? How does the role of student affairs assessment differ from that of IR? Is assessment somehow viewed as less than research? How can we build better partnerships to support students and the needs of our institutions? This last question is perhaps the most critical given the changing landscape of data management, particularly with the increasing use of big data. As student affairs practitioners, we cannot diminish our knowledge of the student experience because
we have not labeled it research or do not see ourselves as researchers. Some would argue that assessment is a form of research. Using data to address local issues to support students is powerful and demonstrates institutional commitment to support student success (Sriram, 2017). Over the next several years, if not decades, the intersections between student affairs assessment and IR will likely continue to be further refined, with an increasing likelihood that each field calls on the other to improve student outcomes in a collaborative and data-driven manner.
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As we celebrate NASPA’s 100th year, we have had the opportunity to reflect on the history of the organization and the Student Affairs profession. This rich history showcases the many proud accomplishments, innovations, and leaders in the profession over the past century. One aspect of how NASPA and Student Affairs have adapted through history has been the ability to respond in times of hardship and tragedy.

Over the past decade, the NASPA Knowledge Community on Campus Safety has been active in the discussion of crisis management on campuses. This growth and focus has developed from the need of student affairs administrators to respond in unprecedented ways to human and natural tragedies. Although, historically, campuses have always faced unexpected emergencies such as students’ deaths, building fires, and natural disasters, they were often localized in their discussion and impact. Tragedies such as the Charles Whitman shooting at the University of Texas in 1966 or the shooting incident at Kent State in 1970 were seen as tragic, yet isolated incidents.

The past decade has been a trying time for student affairs administrators in regard to discussing, preparing, and planning for possible emergencies that may never happen. Crisis and emergency management, which was once regulated to public safety offices, the counseling unit, residential life, Greek affairs, and dusty, seldom-opened operations manuals, has now become part of the everyday duty responsibilities of student affairs administrators. Preceded in the past decade by national tragedies such as 9/11, Columbine, and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, college campuses became the focus of incidents that gained national attention. Roughly a decade ago, two campus shootings sparked a greater discussion in higher education about campus preparedness.

**Campus Shootings**

Although a shooting death on a college campus is not a new phenomenon, it has historically been categorized as a unique, domestic, or solitary incident. Unfortunately, this changed over a short time period with the tragic shootings at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois.

**Virginia Tech**

On April 16, 2015, 32 people were killed and 17 wounded at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University by Seung Hui Cho, a student at the university (Langman, 2015). Most of the victims in this tragic shooting were chosen completely at random; the only qualification for being shot was going to class that day. The investigation from the shootings included findings that would influence how higher education institutions would operate in the future. These include: (a) different departments and units on campus were aware of the shooter’s behavioral issues but were not in communication with each other; (b) the university did not notify campus constituents of the active shooter and possible danger in a timely manner, thinking the first two victims were an isolated incident; and (c) systems for getting information to the campus, the families, and the community while the crisis unfolded failed.

**Northern Illinois University**

On February 14, 2008, Steven Kazmierczak, a recent graduate from Northern Illinois University and a graduate student at the University of Illinois, drove 3 hours to
his alma mater to kill 5 people and wound 21 others (Ferraro & McHugh, 2010; Langman, 2015). Like the shooting at Virginia Tech, the victims were random with no connection to the shooter and there was evidence of prior psychological issues, generating concerns that higher education needs to be more proactive in the discussion of mental health.

Lessons Learned
Each academic year presents another opportunity or challenge. The anniversaries of these incidents have allowed for reflections on lessons learned, continued efforts, and opportunities to look to the future. In order to avoid repeating similar tragedies, institutions across the nation have learned from their counterparts. Needless to say, as campus threats continue to occur there are always opportunities for improvement.

Lessons learned are often crucial opportunities institutions gain only after a campus safety threat has occurred. In some cases, lessons learned require clarifying policies, closing loopholes, and retraining staff. One lesson learned from the Virginia Tech shooting was the impact of Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as it relates to cross-departmental communication (Chapman, 2009). After the incident, a critical analysis identified FERPA as one barrier for sharing student information, particularly when a student is in distress (Chapman, 2009). In response, behavioral intervention committees have been created to address these concerns. These committees support faculty and staff from several functional areas who interact with students on various levels, to provide qualitative information and proactive steps for follow-up. Another lesson learned from both of these incidents was utilizing campus alert systems. For example, in 2014 Florida State University, with use of a campus alert system, was able to pinpoint the exact location of an active shooter, provide a description, and lock down the library where the shooter was located within seconds of a report (Rossman, 2014).

Continued Efforts
It is important with each crisis for campus administrators to learn from these instances and to review policies, protocols, and physical plans to ensure students, faculty, and staff are safe. The connection of mental health to these incidents emphasizes the need of support offices such as counseling centers, disability services, and victim services. The physical and mental health of the members of a campus community are equally important to consider.

USA Today College reported that after a tragedy, students have an increased level of activism and may experience signs of depression or anxiety (Simon, 2017). It’s important for administrators to take into consideration what role students play in the review process after a campus threat and to not to lose the students’ voice when reviewing current policies and protocols. The University of Missouri struggled to find its footing after several months of student protest in 2016, reporting a dip in enrollment (Hartocollis, 2017). Students must be heard and supported in efforts to enhance policies and protocols.

Looking to the Future
Universities, although in many cases seen as the ivory tower, are not immune to campus safety threats; therefore, it is advantageous for institutions to continuously monitor threats internally. Institutions have the opportunity to combine efforts across departments and incorporate technology into these efforts. For example, predictive analytics support students and allow concerns to be flagged. Technology allows for a customizable student experience and staff interface at varying levels. With limited funding, however, institutions will have to be creative about where and how resources are allocated. It behooves institutions to work to support programs that encourage student success while maintaining their safety.

Conclusion
As administrators in student affairs, we need to remember our past and how it influences where we are today. Tragedy has brought very valuable lessons, and we must continue to learn from history to better prepare ourselves for the future. Continued dialogue and sharing of ideas can help the profession prepare for and prevent future incidents.
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The call for institutions of higher learning to be relevant to the public suggests that the boundaries between campus and community should be, in a certain sense, more porous and fluid. Recent efforts by NASPA campuses to embed civic learning competencies into all areas of student learning highlights a growing trend toward civic-mindedness (Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, 2011). Not only should centers for community engagement be at the forefront of these efforts, but all functional areas within student affairs play a role in preparing our students to be active participants in our democracy. Commenting on the recent tensions in Charlottesville, Virginia, Carol Geary Schneider, former president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, stated strongly that “we also have long-term work to do in the way we educate Americans both as citizens and as co-creators of the ‘more perfect union’ that is heralded in our Constitution” (Schneider, 2017). She also noted that in order “to repair democracy in the United States, educators will need to make equity-minded civic learning central rather than evanescent in any efforts to strengthen educational quality and support student success” (Schneider, 2017). This mandate now cuts across all areas of the institution.

With this context in mind, we attempt to illuminate the importance of using an intersectional and collaborative framework when designing civic learning programs in higher education. In this explorative review we examine some of the best practices of ten Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Knowledge Community (KC) campuses from across the country engaged in civic engagement work. Campus representatives shared efforts grounded in critical partnerships between all areas of student affairs, academic affairs, and surrounding communities in a recent survey conducted by the knowledge community. This work is deeply tied to the missions of these campuses, forging new pathways where core values like diversity and inclusion, experiential learning, and engaged citizenship are scaffolded by civic learning. As engaged partners in efforts to contribute to the common good, these campuses have designed intentional and innovative initiatives that bring together students from multiple affinity groups to generate a new civic-mindedness ready for both the promises and challenges of democratic engagement.

**Theoretical Lenses**

Much civic engagement work on our campuses is grounded in the Social Change Model of Leadership (Astin & Astin, 1996), in which colleagues are designing programs to move students into the role of citizen leaders prepared with skills to work toward systemic change in their communities. CLDE campuses also noted the following conceptual resources as foundational to their work:

- Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1981) Stages of Moral Development
- Jane Fried’s (2012) Transformative Learning Through Engagement: Student Affairs Practice as Experiential Pedagogy
• Byron White’s (2009) Navigating the Power Dynamics Between Institutions and Their Communities.
• David Kolb’s (2014) Experiential Learning Theory
• The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement’s (2012) A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future

Partnerships
Most of the civic engagement work on campuses is housed within centralized centers for civic engagement, community service, public service, and service learning. However, our review indicates that in student affairs, partnerships between these centers and other offices cultivate rich, intersectional work that bridges together affinity groups in projects to confront social injustices. Campuses reported partnerships with offices of student leadership, international student services, career development, wellness, Greek life, diversity, and social justice.

Partnerships with academic affairs were also essential to the success of many campus programs. For example, at Northeastern Illinois University, Chavez Day focuses student engagement on agriculture, the environment, socioeconomic class, and immigrant rights. This initiative depends on the participation of seven long-term community partners, as well as faculty members from the departments of justice studies, social work, environmental science, Latino studies, and environmental studies. The College of Brockport “Brocked the vote” by taking voter registration into classrooms, where it promoted open dialogue about the 2016 national election and gave students time to fill out their registration forms. At Otterbein University, student-led service organizations host volunteer opportunities at elementary and middle schools, a senior center, the campus food pantry, an animal shelter, and a community garden to provide experiential landscapes for academic service-learning courses across the curriculum. Otterbein also offers a student leadership development course, “Serve the City,” in the student affairs division to provide course-based, civic apprenticeships grounded in theories of social inequality, nonprofit management, and sociology.

Innovative Practices
Each of the reporting KC member institutions has developed civic pedagogies to prepare our students for democratic participation. These pedagogies fall into six main categories:

Dialogue
To develop civic-mindedness, students are engaged in dialogue and critical conversations about social inequality. In classrooms, at debates, and during informal discussions, students are encouraged to talk with others whose opinions may differ from their own.

Reflection
Throughout their civic engagement, students reflect on their experiences in the community in journals, blogs, social media, and sometimes organized conversations during their ride home from the service site. For example, after participating in Chavez Day, students at Northeastern Illinois University are asked to consider how they will contribute to their own communities in the future.

Affinity Groups
Most campuses listed partnerships with centers and offices, as well as specific affinity group programs promoting civic engagement, such as those for undocumented students, veteran students, LGBTQIA students, and students organized around race, socioeconomic class, and gender.

Training
At Fort Hays State University a partnership between the offices of transition and student conduct, international student services, and the Center for Civic Leadership educates students about civic engagement, community service, and volunteering, prior to engaging in a service project. One unique training strategy at Otterbein University has been the use of simulations (e.g., poverty, immigration, hunger), to help students understand the complexities of social inequalities before they begin service in the community.

Mapping to the Curriculum
Students on KC campuses are also engaged in programs with direct connections to academic coursework, through service learning, community-based research, and initiatives hosted by both academic and student affairs. Worcester State University’s weeklong service trips to the Caribbean and Latin American countries emphasize professionalism, community impact, creativity, and environmental stewardship with “creative linkages” between classroom learning and real-world experiences. Northeastern Illinois University’s Reimagining Food Project was a collaboration between student affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences to “connect learning in and out of the classroom around the common theme of food,” culminating in increased staffing for a student food pantry.

Civic Immersion
Realizing that drop-in, short-term service projects can often be mis-educative and reinforce stereotypes, several campuses offer week- and sometimes semester-long immersive experiences in civic learning locally and globally. For example, at California State University, students participate in inquiry-guided learning focused on eco-tourism and cultural preservation in Peru, affecting student development in three key areas: cognitive development (head), reflection/meaning making (heart), and acts/engagement (hands). Students in Otterbein’s three-week civic apprenticeship in Malawi work with a local school and orphanage to develop curricula and rebuild learning landscapes with community partners.
Learning Outcomes

One of the key learning outcomes grounding the work on CLDE member campuses is problem solving. Many programs ask students to think critically about the complexities of systemic social issues and design sophisticated solutions. Uniting all the programs is an urgency to “develop future leaders,” “engaged scholars,” “activists,” and “change agents” who will change cultures, build community, and increase equity. The stated learning outcomes of many member campuses can also be mapped to a variety of programmatic and academic homes on campus, intersecting with other educational efforts. Additional learning outcomes shared by institutions include the following:

- Defining social inequality and systemic issues
- Developing civic competencies and attitudes
- Understanding the role of a leader in addressing social issues
- Cultivating humanitarian values
- Developing cross-cultural competencies
- Using social justice language
- Understanding personal and social responsibility
- Developing leadership skills necessary to act as positive social change agents
- Developing group and conflict management skills
- Understanding the dimensions of difference in communities
- Appreciating civic duty
- Gaining knowledge about new cultures and the natural world

Moving Forward

Campuses are engaged in civic work that sits at the crossroads of our knowledge communities, inextricably linked to both student identities and communities where struggles for equality are persistent and relentless. As a representative from Iowa State University noted, where affinity groups, leadership, and civic engagement intersect, we can “open conversations that have remained stagnant” and work together to make meaningful change to solve much greater problems emerging both locally and globally. In a time when higher education is concerned about access, resources, and opportunity, intersectional collaborations for civic learning create an efficient and meaningful landscape where we can pool resources, share our expertise, and move our students into more complex relationships with each other and our communities.
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As Grossman and Smith (2015) noted, ensuring the success of students with disabilities should be a campuswide initiative. However, research indicates that students of color with disabilities face systemic challenges in gaining access to higher education. They have limited access to college preparatory coursework due to being removed from the mainstream classroom and contending with lower expectations. They also experience cultural biases from family and educators that limit their advancement into and through higher education, while also negatively impacting their self-image and self-efficacy (Ball-Brown & Frank, 1993; Connor, 2006; Petersen, 2006). Research regarding students with disabilities often utilizes a narrow lens, emphasizing that society views people with disabilities as incomplete; Ball-Brown and Frank (1993) stressed a need to consider people with disabilities from an intersectional perspective in order to effectively empower this population.

Current literature demonstrates that this student population is persistent in the pursuit of higher education, and data point to increasing numbers of students of color with disabilities enrolling into higher education institutions (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). These data were well represented by Stapleton’s (2015) study of d/Deaf women of color within college environments. Stapleton found that although d/Deaf student enrollment is increasing, d/Deaf identity has been “essentialized, fixed, or stereotyped” as White, erasing the intersectional identities of many d/Deaf students of color.
Existing research about students with disabilities focuses heavily on compliance and academic access without considering that college and graduate school is a time for holistic development. For this paper, we aim to shed light on the college life experiences of students of color with disabilities by examining their social and personal development.

Methods
For this preliminary study, a pool of eight students from public and private institutions participated in qualitative research. We used their personal networks to recruit participants. All interviewees were recent graduates of undergraduate or master's programs and were of Black, Asian, Latinx, or multiracial backgrounds. They also represented a variety of disabilities, with seven out of eight identifying as having an invisible disability. For the sake of this paper, we chose to utilize gender-neutral pronouns to refer to our participants, as all did not disclose their gender identities. The survey portion of the research consisted of 11 questions, all of which were intentionally designed to gather data regarding demographics of the participants. The interview section had eight core questions focused on gathering in-depth information about the participants' individual college life experiences. Each of us conducted four of the eight in-depth interviews; each interview lasted anywhere from 45 minutes to over an hour.

Findings
The interview and survey findings revealed three major themes: (1) Students of color with disabilities feel the need to overcompensate in order to disprove stereotypes, (2) they struggle to navigate such a complex intersection of identities, and (3) they continue to feel a lack of support from faculty and staff related to accommodations and campus climate.

The Need to Overcompensate
Survey data showed that six out of the eight participants were involved as student leaders on executive boards; members of cultural clubs, organizations, honor societies, or governing bodies; student employees; or a combination of these roles. Participants thoroughly enjoyed their leadership positions, but also felt obligated to be visible on their campuses. Many felt the need to prove their capabilities to peers, college administrators, and society overall. One participant stated, "I didn't want to see . . . my disability as a handicap. I wanted people to see me for who I really was." Further statements, such as "I had internalized that my opinion didn’t matter . . . so being in a leadership position was really uncomfortable for me," conveyed prime examples of the negative self-images prevalent in the population. Such statements also reiterate that, despite how involved they were on campus, these students still felt the need to prove their value to themselves and to their peers, staff, and faculty; overextending themselves as leaders seemed to be the only avenue to be perceived as "normal."

Navigating Complex Identities
Participants highlighted a lack of understanding and support from families and friends due to cultural biases combined with able-bodied privilege. One participant described their mother as a "very . . . typical parent of a kid with a disability . . . want[ing] to overprotect me, but that turned into disempowerment." Another participant expressed that they often felt inferior due to the negative messages they received about their intersecting identities: "I always questioned my intelligence . . . I felt like being diagnosed with a learning difference . . . confirmed the stereotype that Black people are not intelligent enough."

Additionally, survey results indicated seven out of eight participants felt that social and educational programs they attended did not represent or celebrate their intersecting identities. These responses were later confirmed during the interviews when one participant commented, "Unless students themselves . . . creat[ed] these spaces . . . then it wouldn’t happen. I was really lucky because the [centers I went to] . . . did do programming that was representative for [my] intersections but also . . . the people who were staffed there . . . putting on that programming . . . also reflected those identities."

Lack of Faculty and Staff Support
Although survey results showed that five of eight participants successfully found mentors in college, half expressed dissatisfaction with their respective disability resource centers. They also revealed that faculty were not supportive, lacked understanding, or outright denied them their accommodations. One participant shared, "I’ve had situations in which faculty denied me of my accommodations . . . being a person of color and being disabled at the same time just added to the stigma. I don’t think they believe us when it comes to our disabilities and the accommodations we need." Half of the participants also felt their campuses did not affirm their identities and that this was due to lack of representation within administrators and faculty. They did not see enough professionals or professors who shared their experiences as people of color with disabilities. This was evident when a participant mentioned, "The director of disability services...was blind, but she was also White...and so there was also this disconnect because she couldn’t quite understand my experience."

Recommendations
Student affairs professionals and faculty members should consider cultural competencies in order to implement holistic development in all aspects of programming and academic departments. Practitioners must go beyond institutional policies, mandates, universal design, and access. Our study has shown that, although access is provided, the culture of how disability and race are viewed, addressed, and included isn’t changing rapidly enough to support this student population. The following are a few recommendations to improve campus culture
regarding this particular intersection of identities: (a) Conduct outreach to students of color with disabilities to counteract negative messaging they receive about their capabilities. (b) Take proactive measures to include these identities in cultural, social, and academic programs that genuinely celebrate intersectionality. In order to make programming inclusive, ensure that individuals with these identities are part of the planning process. (c) Develop faculty and staff support. It is important to hire and retain individuals who have shared experiences with this student population.
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As NASPA celebrates its 100th national conference, it is appropriate to recognize the metamorphosis that has taken place in student affairs as the field has redefined its role in academe to meet the needs of today’s students.

**Historical Roots**

Early in its history student affairs played an in loco parentis role (Carlisle, 2017). Education was left to classroom academics and student affairs staff primarily served a support function. As generations of students graduated, the role of student affairs morphed to meet changing needs. Foundational to those changes were the impact of the GI Bill, 1960s activism, the AIDS epidemic, and more recently the impact of costs of attending college and an influx of students from more diverse environments.

Education styles have shifted from traditional campus-based approaches to encompass distance learning, study abroad, internships, undergraduate research, entrepreneurship, and other contemporary modalities (Anderson, Boyles, & Rainie, 2012). Student affairs paradigms have shifted to include developmental and theoretical models designed to understand and support students from a variety of circumstances (Long, 2012).

**The Art and Science of Enrollment Management**

Only recently has enrollment management been viewed as an important component of a student affairs professional’s portfolio and as including the expectation that student affairs takes leadership in attracting students to the institution and engaging them through graduation. For example, it is commonplace for admissions, financial aid, tutoring, and registrar functions to report through student affairs. At a minimum, student affairs is expected to support enrollment management initiatives being led by academic partners (Scannell, 2013).

Student affairs has had a longstanding reputation as a bridge builder and communicator to students and other stakeholders, and student affairs professionals have become proficient in the “art” of student success. Until recently the qualitative aspects associated with student success were sufficient. Within student affairs the “science” of enrollment management was relegated to a smaller minority of professionals interested in exploring this area. Thirty years ago the science of student success was not foundational to student affairs or enrollment management. That paradigm has shifted. Outcomes, intentionality, and assessment are now primary components of student affairs programs (Henning & Roberts, 2016) and are expected to be a continued focus for student affairs, including enrollment management. Today the art and the science of enrollment management are converging, sometimes being pushed by external prompts.

**External Influences Affecting the Student Affairs Role**

Some factors outside of academe now drive the prominence of enrollment management and are shifting the role student affairs plays in success and deliverable outcomes.

**Economics and Return on Investment**

Higher education is increasingly seen as a business. Whether it is Kiplinger’s Personal Finance, Money Magazine, or other rankings mechanisms, cost and return on investment are at the forefront of campus discussions (Carlson, 2013). Retention rates, graduation rates, graduate school and job placement rates, and starting salaries are now quantified and considered success indicators. Efficiency and effectiveness discussions are now held on many campuses—the ability to manage resources and establish new funding sources is integral to the higher education business model, and student affairs is expected to assume the role of efficiency expert and revenue generator. These internal and external financial pressures, challenging as they are, offer opportunities for student affairs to lead in shaping the future of higher education.
Student, Parent, Family, and Consumer Expectations
Many students and family members view their relationship with their institution through a consumer-focused lens. Students perceive themselves as purchasing an educational product and experience. Whether prompted by an awkward automated phone-messaging system, staff offering incorrect information, students being told to self-advocate, or unsatisfactory experiences, students will leave an institution if they feel dissatisfied. Although challenging a student might be the most developmentally appropriate approach to take, this can come at a cost to the institution if the student decides to leave (Immerwahr, 2000). It takes skillful student affairs professionals to navigate these interactions.

Legislative Fiats
Aligned with economics are legislative fiats. Through financial aid disbursement, direct investment, and federal and state legislation, government entities are placing greater pressures on higher education to show quantifiable "value-added" outcomes (McLendon & Hearn, 2013). Enrollment metrics are now part of a typical audit, and student affairs is expected to help institutions succeed in this area.

Accreditation
National, regional, and statewide agencies expect institutions to quantify their enrollment metrics. In some cases institutions are sanctioned or closed as a result of poor enrollment outcomes. Enrollment management is now viewed as integral to the academic and student affairs mission of an institution, and agencies are looking more closely at this function in making accreditation decisions.

At the National Level
The National Association of College and University Business Officers devotes significant resources to educating its constituency on the economic impact of enrollment management. Similarly, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers serves as a clearinghouse for best practices in enrollment management. Many student affairs-based national organizations, including the Association of College and University Housing Officers - International, the International Association of Counseling Services, Inc., and the National Association of Colleges and Employers, promote principles associated with good enrollment management. It is important for student affairs professionals to be familiar with and use these resources when interacting with colleagues across campus.

What’s Next for the Enrollment Management Knowledge Community?
Student affairs has a primary place in enrollment management conversations both within its division and across the institution. Student affairs departments must communicate and collaborate to ensure that student success is at the center of conversations regarding enrollment management.

At the institutional level, enrollment management teams are active on almost every campus and student affairs must be fully engaged. The ability for staff to work in cross-institutional systems is critical to student success. Student affairs plays an important leadership role on these teams. Managing difficult situations, overcoming institutional inertia, serving as a catalyst, and understanding multiple perspectives places student affairs professionals as leaders in supporting enrollment management and student success.

As a NASPA professional, consider joining the Enrollment Management Knowledge Community, share best practices, and serve as an advocate in supporting student success.
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College drinking has been identified as one of the most serious problems on college campuses, and Greek organizations, specifically fraternities, are often identified as groups with particularly excessive alcohol use (O’Brien et al., 2013). The peer influence of brothers in fraternities has been identified as the greatest influence on drinking behaviors for members of those organizations (Borsari & Carey, 2003). Shaped by assumptions about what it means to be masculine, boys and men will conform to the expectations of their peers by engaging in behaviors and expressing attitudes that are contradictory to their beliefs in order to be accepted (Pollack, 2000). Thus, a better understanding of how social norms play a role in fraternity members’ drinking behaviors is important for universities, prevention specialists, and student affairs practitioners to address excessive and binge drinking.

The following research questions were central to this qualitative study:

1. How do members in one fraternity at a mid-west institution perceive the influence other members have on drinking behaviors within the fraternity? How do these perceptions influence their own drinking behavior?
2. What role does masculinity play in their drinking behaviors?

National media reports and research studies on excessive alcohol use among fraternity men coupled with issues of hypermasculinity have informed the importance of this research study, revealing a gap in the literature regarding social norms and hypermasculinity in fraternities and its influences on excessive and binge drinking. Research has found that traditional prevention methods involving educational programming have been only moderately successful in increasing college student awareness regarding alcohol use; thus, alternative methods of intervention are recommended (Martens et al., 2006). By exploring other influential factors, such as social norms coupled with hypermasculinity, new interventions may emerge that will lead to greater success in educational programming.

Summary of the Literature

Due to the unique environment of fraternities, multiple factors can influence the drinking behavior of members, such as the influence of older members, leaders, and other Greek organizations (Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998). Several theories propose that there is a greater influence on individual behavior if the individual is a member of a group, particularly a group with a close bond (Borsari & Carey, 2003). The quality of peer relationships in terms of level of intimacy, stability, and perceived support appears to be important in determining the magnitude and direction of peer influences on drinking (Borsari & Carey, 2003). Studies have found that greater identification with a given group moderates associations between perceived drinking norms for that group and one’s own drinking (Neighbors, Larimer, Geisner, & Knee, 2004). In analyses of drinking behavior among college students, men outnumber women in virtually every category of comparison, from consumption to frequency of drinking and incidence of problem drinking (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986; Harper & Harris, 2011). The numbers are even higher if the men are members of a fraternity (Harper & Harris, 2011).

Further, the peer influence in fraternities has been identified as a strong reference group (Borsari & Carey, 2003). In fact, these reference groups hold the greatest
influence on drinking behaviors for members of those organizations (Borsari & Carey, 2003). Fraternity men in particular are at risk of replicating perceived drinking behaviors of their male peers (Harper & Harris, 2011). Male peers also have profound influence on gender performance, even more than parental influence (Pollack, 2000).

The theoretical frameworks used throughout this study are theories of social norms (Berkowitz, 2004; Perkins, 2003) and masculinities (Connell, 2005; Harper & Harris, 2011; Kimmel & Messner, 2007; Laker & Davis, 2011).

Methodology
Social norming theory and theories of men and masculinities informed the study of one fraternity at a mid-west institution. Twelve students from one fraternity, representing all pledge classes, were recruited through purposeful sampling and participated in a focus group and an individual follow-up interview.

Themes
From the focus group and interviews, four overarching themes developed: (1) to be a brother, (2) competition, (3) liquid bonding, and (4) what it means to be a man. Within the context of the study, implications for practice and recommendations for additional research were included.

Theme One: To Be a Brother
Upperclassmen played a paramount role in the assimilation of the new members. Upperclassmen were key in facilitating members’ socialization with alcohol in particular. Many participants reflected on the social pressures of the fraternity coupled with adjusting to college life in general. They described the desire to belong and the pressures they felt in order to fit in with others in the fraternity. For example, one participant described the rhythm of alcohol that became part of the fraternity routine. New members were expected to learn the rhythm in order to be seen as a legitimate part of the fraternity—to be a brother. The participant shared that being part of the rhythm was a big factor for him to feel a sense of belonging among the brothers.

Theme Two: Competition
Competition emerged as an integral part of participants’ experiences in the fraternity. The competition was felt within the organization, rather than with other fraternities, especially regarding alcohol. During the focus groups, many of the male consumption narrative commonly called a “drinking story” (Giles, 1999). Several men discussed playing a drinking game call "shot gun" in which the overall objective was to see who could chug a can of beer the fastest in order to stand out among other members of the fraternity. Competition was important and potentially a way to prove oneself.

Theme Three: Liquid Bonding
The participants in the focus groups and the individual interviews discussed the bonds and connections that alcohol helped facilitate. Alcohol was a way for brothers to bond and a mechanism for social connectedness. All of the participants reflected on the importance of alcohol as a social lubricant and unanimously agreed that alcohol provided opportunities for deeper, more meaningful engagements with their brothers.

Theme Four: What It Means to Be a Man
Although their experiences with alcohol were easy for the participants to discuss, talking about their masculinity appeared to be challenging. A handful of participants had previously reflected on how masculinity has influenced their lives. However, it was the first time for many to talk about it. In the end, participants described experiences within the fraternity that exemplified what it meant for them to be a man in general, and a man within the fraternity in particular.

Discussion of Findings
The first research question asked, “How do members in one fraternity at a mid-west institution perceive the influence other members have on drinking behaviors within the fraternity?” and in turn, “How do these perceptions influence their own drinking behavior?” For the participants, three factors were most salient in shaping their drinking behaviors as part of their fraternity experience: (1) normative social influence, (2) integration into the fraternity, and (3) social desirability as a new member. According to Trockel, Wall, Williams, and Reis (2008), fraternity expectations of alcohol use are closely predictive of the actual consumption behavior of the new members, suggesting a strong social desirability orientation of new members.

The second research question asked, “What role does masculinity play in their drinking behaviors?” For the participants, masculinity was largely a part of their identity about which they had thought little. Their reactions when asked to think specifically about masculinity are not unexpected for men who are coming of age with no road maps, blueprints, or primers to explain what a man is or how to become one (Kimmel & Messner, 2007). The men were not taught about masculinity and the role it can play in the fraternity culture.

Closing
This study supports previous research that has examined how Greek chapter culture, as it relates to social norms and masculinity, can contribute to high-risk drinking among fraternity members (Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000; Higher Ed Center, 2008; Park, Sher, Wood, & Krull, 2009). The research has revealed the issues related to men and alcohol use and the role social norming has on the fraternal
culture; however, many institutions have done very little in the way of creating programmatic interventions aimed specifically at connecting alcohol use and masculinity. As noted by Lemke, Casper, and More (2011), "The lack of active programming for men is one of the most neglected areas in higher education. . . . And the real challenge for the profession is to fully accept vulnerable college men are a special group that need our help and support" (p. 46). The profession has the opportunity to develop initiatives to address how fraternity men understand their masculinity and how fraternities can be successful organizations in better educating and empowering their members to become healthier and more critically self-aware individuals.
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Those living at the intersection of identities, such as queer and transgender people of color (QTPOC) individuals, experience struggles because of their racial/ethnic identity, sexuality, and/or gender identity. People of color (POC) and queer individuals experience greater stressors than those who do not identify with a minoritized identity (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011). QTPOC folks face sexual racism within the queer and trans communities as well as homophobia and transphobia within racial communities, which includes systemic erasure, violence, exoticization, and lack of representation (Baptista & Himmel, 2016; Chu, 2017; O'Donnell, Meyer, & Schwartz, 2011; Weitz, 2015). POC experience emotional and psychological trauma that can include shock, denial, anger, and shame (Banks, 2016). POC can experience what bell hooks (1992) coined "[W]hite people fatigue syndrome," which results from having put in emotional and mental labor while working with White people toward becoming allies, as they justify to themselves and other POC that they are not racist, or in continued conversations about the experiences of POC ("White People Fatigue Syndrome," 2013). POC can also experience a kind of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) if there are repeated forms of trauma, -isms, or phobia (Banks, 2016). PTSD can be triggered as a result of social media posts, the broadcasting of violence in the media, or aggression experienced within social circles. These experiences impact the overall well-being of POC (Banks, 2016).

Queer folks have a higher prevalence of mental disorders, including “substance use disorders, affective disorders, and suicide ideation and attempts,” compared with heterosexuals, which may be brought on by factors related to an “environment rife with stigma, prejudice, and discrimination” (Banks, 2016, p. 340). QTPOC can experience both internalized heterosexism and racism, with the former leading to higher psychological distress (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011). QTPOC may face isolation because of their sexual or gender identity, the low number of community members with shared lived experiences, and community-endorsed homophobia, leading them to be unable to reconcile their racial identity with their queerness, or vice versa (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011).

QTPOC regularly “experienced external and internal pressures, limited social support, poor boundaries and lack of self-care . . . burnout, compassion fatigue and in some cases suicide ideation” (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011, p. 340). As a result of these lived experiences, they must learn to develop resilience, strength, and coping strategies in order to persevere and survive (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011). QTPOC folks need social support that validates and values their emotional and lived experiences and also provides space for emotional, mental, and physical healing to develop these strategies for resilience and strength (Chu, 2017; Vaccaro & Mena, 2011). This requires them to seek spaces and platonic relationships with other QTPOC folks based
on their shared salient identities and needs, (re)evaluate limits and boundaries, and prioritize self-care, which may all may be uniquely individualized. QTPOC folks use social media as a platform to come together "in an effort to 'decolonize' their mindsets and unlearn internalized racism" (Chu, 2017, para. 3). This self-care may include awareness of situational involvement in addressing social inequities or identity-based social issues, seeking medical or therapeutic support, and reducing workload or organizational involvement.

Exploring Healing Spaces for QTPOC Professionals

Although there is a dearth of research on healing spaces within student affairs contexts, much can be learned from other academic arenas and professional disciplines regarding healing practices for QTPOC professionals. Within the academic context, Berila (2016) purported that one critical aspect to a mindful healing space is the practice of unlearning internalized oppression, which is often imposed by the trauma of living daily within socially and institutionally oppressive environments and the internalization of negative messages about one’s value as a queer person or person of color. Thus, in spaces that support mindful queer pedagogy, an important step is to state that internalized oppression can exist, which then allows QTPOC professionals to "replace those harmful messages with more empowering ones, both individually and collectively" (Berila, 2016, p. 8).

Newman’s Own Foundation, along with the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, recently created a grant opportunity for colleges and universities to establish Truth, Racial Healing, & Transformation Campus Centers in order to engage campuses to break down systems, create a positive narrative about race, and empower community members to live and prosper in a civil society while promoting full inclusion for everyone (“Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation Campus Centers,” 2017). Healing spaces that allow for diverse forms of expression can also be beneficial to QTPOC professionals. Examples can include the use of music, dance, writing, and spoken word (Abustan, 2017; Henry, 2016) to allow QTPOC folks to connect emotionally with one another and to see a positive display of unapologetic authenticity.

QTPOC student affairs educators experience challenges and barriers when seeing their experiences at the intersections of their identities. The ongoing experiences of microaggressions, along with the burden of both advocating for marginalized students and providing support to other marginalized staff, create barriers to success and have an overall negative impact on professional and personal well-being (Aguilar & Johnson, 2017). QTPOC professionals deserve the opportunity not only to access spaces in which they can rebuild and rejuvenate themselves from the often unpaid labor that they take on in their work but also to exist in space where they can find joy and positivity in their wholeness.
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We offer this legacy piece as a response to the recent passing of a Diné Elder, Larry Emerson, who was instrumental in our understanding of the timelessness of Indigenous knowledge and its relationship to the personal and ethical foundations of teaching, learning, and leading in higher education. As a way to recalibrate ourselves from the imbalance his physical absence has caused, we have chosen to reconcile our grief with memories of love, hope, and possibilities culled from years of dialogue and collective engagement.

Impact on Our Understanding of the Profession

His indefatigable spirit masked a gentle and calm personality; he witnessed transformations of consciousness within countless people by awakening them to their human agency. What follows are brief vignettes that recall our respective connections to this Diné Elder and the manner in which he shaped our purpose in the field.

Stephanie J. Waterman

When my colleagues spoke of Dr. Emerson, I was envious. His teachings had so profoundly impacted and validated my colleagues as humans, and as Indigenous scholars and practitioners. I wanted to take classes with him. I wanted to hear him speak. I wanted that experience, too. When Dr. Emerson passed, I knew we had to share his impact on our Knowledge Community.

Charlotte E. Davidson

As I tearfully compose these words, I grapple with the reality that Shicheii, my maternal grandfather, Larry Emerson, is now an ancestor. I still hear the nurturing tone in his voice, “Sitsóí [my maternal granddaughter], always stand up for harmony, always defend it.” This instruction, first uttered 11 years ago, called on me to critically inquire, plan, and speak from a Diné sensibility of beatitude, balance, and peace; a vulnerable act in non-Diné educational settings.
The struggle for harmony, known as Hózhó to Diné, is a fundamental value, and is our historical task as Diné. Shicheii’s critical awareness of this historical process of struggle is what distinguished his moccasined steps from the strides of most people. His persistent and uncompromising commitment to create conditions of liberation and justice for all people, regardless of their history and context, was firmly rooted in these understandings.

Thank you, Shicheii, for awakening me to the politic of harmony and for nurturing my capacity to be an agent of Hózhó.

Jennifer McCann
Miigwech (thank you), my older brother, for modeling ways and teaching us skills to work with faculty, students, administrators, our families, and ourselves by engaging Indigenous ways of knowing and being. When I think of collective lessons, I am drawn to your own words, which create a space to explore these questions and grow as Indigenous researchers, people, and practitioners. Countless times you have been the gentle strong voice, encouraging and welcoming people from all roles and communities, even into your home and family at Tsedaak’aan, Diné Nation (New Mexico), 8 miles east of Shiprock—a space to engage in dialogues around just a few of these collective themes:

- How do we situate traditional knowledge within modern frameworks, Indigeneity, and Indigenous knowledge?
- How do we develop a community of practice?
- How do we develop or evolve a sense of partnership or collaboration in research?
- How do we define the researcher as activist—research as a form of self-governance and cultural self-determination or tribal sovereignty?
- How do we engage tribal stories and knowledge as a form of research when oral scholarship is not typically recognized as a legitimate form of scholarship?
- If Native communities are to own and drive their own research, they need local, regional, national, and international Indigenous research protocols.
- If partnerships between modern world institutions and the Native communities are to evolve, we need to resolve the issue relating to the question, “What is an Indigenous scholar?”
- Tsodzhin bee ya’ahoot’eh doo. It is with prayer that thinking will get better with clarity and insight.

It is in these ways I remember your gentle voice: “Cause no harm. Be nonjudgmental. Cultivate courage. Leave ego out so you can be receptive to all life has to offer; whatever that may be. Ádahóólya—take care and be mindful of yourself beginning with Mother Earth and upward to sky—always think of and remember your children, grandchildren, parents, and grandparents.”

Jamie M. Singson
People cross the paths of our lives but few have profound influence on how we see the world in collective and caring ways. Dear mentor, you are one such person. Though you will be missed, the lessons imparted are timeless and universal. We were taught the importance of process and protocol as foundational for building meaningful connections in both spatial and communally interactive ways. The age-old Indigenous lessons and ways of seeing the world I learned helped me realize possibility in modern higher educational systems. I cherish the lessons taught that heightened group consciousness through collaboratively shared experience.

Today’s students have the ability to find meaning within themselves, but sometimes collective support is needed for them to nurture belief and trust in themselves. When this happens, then they can heighten capacity for empathy in seeing others as part of their shared story. Thank you for sharing how story is about motion and intentionality, circularly emanating outward in a way that is of beauty and regeneration.

Gerardo Diaz
Dear mentor, relative, Elder, and grandfather, I honor the many good deeds, sacrifices, life lessons, teachings, and wisdom you have offered in my development as a male, son, partner, father, researcher, colleague, and practitioner. Your mentorship was inspired by selflessness, love, caring, vulnerability, and the struggle to incorporate traditional knowledge into everything we engage; this is forever imprinted into the heart and spirit that I embody as I carry on with all my present relations. Thank you for flicking us in the ear and reminding us of the importance of unconditional love, collective unity, decolonization, and of the centrality in keeping in mind the future generations in all that we conceptualize and act on as scholars and practitioners in higher education. A lasting lesson is that, as researchers and practitioners, we are the medium, the hollow bones that enact traditional teachings into motion. All that is worthy of contemplation must be infused with the capacity to pollinate and regenerate those it touches—first the self and then trickling down as good medicine to our extended families, which include the students we serve and teach.

Asma-na-hi Antoine
Larry Emerson’s teachings and guidance have been a strong influence on who I am and how my traditional lens deepens my understanding of the world. His spirit and teachings have guided me to remember to honor and respect a traditional pedagogical approach that can change educational outcomes. I feel gratitude for the conscious awareness and decolonizing methodologies that revitalize
my cultural and traditional lenses. Larry has inspired me in a way that impacts my writing, the way I view research, and the way I live. Larry’s integrity, wisdom and humility taught me how to be a true role model, how to walk beside someone, and how to share traditional knowledge with others. Larry has taught me to follow intuition and lead with a strong heart and mind by listening to the ancestors’ messages. Larry’s teachings continue to influence who I am and how I engage with family and community. I will continue to work, live, and learn by remembering these teachings.

Judith Estrada
Gracias, querido Abuelo (grandfather). Your sensibility and vulnerability inside and outside the classroom created a sense of belonging for those of us who struggled to “belong” in higher education. You reminded us to laugh, to sing, and to be intuitive, as these were signs of strength and being grounded. After an intense dialogue about Indigenous epistemologies, family traumas, language, and so forth, your humor and charisma always arrived at the right moment. With your guidance and patience, I began to peel the layers of my traumas away and understand how these traumas were generational and interconnected with others. I learned to forgive, to embrace, to be. Your teachings will continue to guide me, as they are part of my fabric.

Conclusion
For many Indigenous student affairs professionals, cross-pollinating ancestral thought with our university administrative roles is a daily task. Indigenously crafting our practice has become more profound as we continue the unfinished work of a man who deepened our once simple understandings of harmony (Charlotte), role modeling (Jennifer), collective knowledge (Jamie), transformation (Asma), struggle (Gerardo), and trauma (Judith)—understandings that are wittingly or unwittingly marginalized owing to their orality. Toward this end, we offer an important lesson for colleagues of Indigenous student affairs professionals to consider. Bundling the cultural offerings of the profession with the cultural offerings of Elders, like Larry Emerson, is integral to how we navigate higher education. And so, how can institutions of higher education, as well as the profession, provide opportunities toward that end? Because as Indigenous student affairs professionals, we do not know how to do this work any other way.
Cultural considerations can influence interactions between foreign educators and local students, families, campus stakeholders, and the broader community. Building cultural competence and proficiency strengthens one's ability to be an effective practitioner in an international setting (Landa, 2011). However, this article highlights the experiences of higher education professionals from the United States (non-dominant group) culturally immersed in Middle Eastern higher education and serving students from the United Arab Emirates (UAE—dominant cultural group). Cultural clashes center on issues of gender, religion, values, and education level, and notions of privacy rights.

Jerome Hanley (1999) defined cultural competence as "the ability to work effectively across cultures in a way that acknowledges and respects the culture of the person or organization being served" (p. 1). Culturally responsive educators require the ability to instill in students the importance of a diverse and multicultural environment, to effectively address student needs holistically, and to appropriately expose students to a plethora of culturally relevant institutional resources. Hanley described cultural competence development through a five-stage continuum: cultural destructiveness, cultural incapacity, cultural blindness, cultural precompetence, and cultural competence as represented in Figure 1 – Six Stages of Cultural Competence. Lindsey, Roberts, and Campbell-Jones (2013) later added a sixth stage, cultural proficiency, to the continuum in relation to educators. The following examples elucidate the Six Stages of Cultural Competence and Proficiency (Lindsey et al., 2013).
Cultural Destructiveness
Cultural destructiveness refers to individuals and environments that foster attitudes and practices that are destructive to cultures (Hanley, 1999, p. 4). On this end of the continuum, individuals display behaviors and hold perspectives that seek to damage, deny, or eliminate cultures that differ from their own culture.

Example:
Ethnocentrism: Viewing one’s culture as superior. In the case of a U.S. higher education professional imposing Western perspectives in a class discussion and dismissing students’ Middle Eastern Islamic perspectives.

I tried to teach my class about real gender equality, but these students don’t understand the concept of feminism.

Cultural Incapacity
According to Hanley (1999), with cultural incapacity “the system or agency does not intentionally seek to be culturally destructive but rather lacks the capacity to help minority clients or communities” (p. 5). The destruction is not deliberate, but rather unacknowledged. This includes student services and educational offerings that do not meet the needs of the population served.

Example:
Promoting an atmosphere that indirectly lacks respect for cultural relevance and support of cultural norms. In Middle Eastern culture, it is inappropriate to take pictures of students without their permission.

We really want to display student profiles and show them interacting in the university for our upcoming campaign. Be sure to invite the photographer, and don’t worry about getting permission from students.

Cultural Blindness
Cultural blindness is a conveyed method of thinking and behavior that focuses on treating individuals with equality and without bias. Hanley (1999, p. 5) contended that these individuals and systems champion the melting pot concept, which asserts that an organization/system is a homogenous entity void of designators that differentiate one individual over another.

Example:
Advising students with complete disregard to cultural norms that dictate rules of engagement and interactions among individuals based on identified descriptors.

I find it rude when the female students don’t extend a handshake when meeting with me, and I allow my frustrations to show.

Cultural Precompetence
On the continuum of cultural competence, precompetence is an acknowledgment of an individual’s strengths and weaknesses in reference to their culturally diversity (Goode & Harrison, 2004). The delivery and promotion of programs and services are led by individuals from diverse cultures to foster representation.

Example:
Providing relevant course materials and culturally relevant/appropriate examples.

The Arab female students in class are much more receptive to the materials when examples given are easily recognized for their familiar local influence.
Cultural Competence

Individuals and systems with cultural competence respect and acknowledge the cultural differences that exist within their environment. These individuals and organizations practice continuous assessment of their cultural competence as a means to promote cultural exchange and thrive as dynamic, inclusive entities (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989).

Example:
Hosting diversity appreciation socials that highlight and appreciate the various nationalities that make up university faculty, staff, and student bodies in an effort to foster an inclusive environment that is representative of stakeholder profiles.

You’re invited to a celebration of the cultures that make up our diverse faculty and students. Bring a dish to share and/or wear traditional attire that represents your country of origin.

Cultural Proficiency

Cultural proficiency recognizes the value-added benefits of diversity within and outside of an organization. The mission, vision, and values of the organization are guided by an appreciation for diversity and cultural awareness (Cross et al., 1989). The organization continues to add to its own cultural knowledge base and cultural awareness.

Example:
Educators getting involved beyond curricular and cocurricular activities by immersing themselves in local community events, and getting to know students and their extended support networks personally.

I really had the opportunity to get to know my advisees beyond our interactions during office hours. By extending the “olive branch” they welcomed me into their communities and it has deepened my understanding and appreciation of the local culture and community resources. It has made me a better advisor.

Developing Cultural Competence

It is important that advisors and other student affairs professionals possess the skills to create a culturally competent environment and to address the cultural, academic, and developmental needs of students. Effective practices utilized by the authors of this article for acquiring and demonstrating cultural competence include the following:

- Reflection: Reflection requires individuals to draw from past experiences and attach new meaning as new perspectives are gained and experiences are broadened.
- Communication: Much consideration must be put into the materials, but more importantly the instructional methods (classroom/workshop formats, assignments and activities, and meaningful experiences), when creating a multicultural environment and developing one’s cultural diversity awareness/sensitivity.
- Collaborative action and accountability: Creating a safe, welcoming, caring, appreciative, and accepting environment on campus requires ongoing participation at all levels and among all stakeholders.
- Ongoing education: Continuously striving to build on one’s cultural awareness is key to transitioning to the stage of being culturally proficient.

Conclusion

Cultural competence is built on the foundation of being responsive to diverse individuals. The promotion of diversity and proliferation of an environment that is culturally competent allows for the dissolution of stressful environments, the appreciation of others, and the inclusion of cross-cultural interactions. Progressing through the continuum of cultural competence and proficiency is an ongoing journey. It is important that individuals develop their cultural competence toward proficiency in order to better practice inclusivity and create a more holistically supportive environment.
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The population of Latinx students in the United States is rapidly growing; however, large discrepancies exist between Latinx student enrollments versus degree completion rates, which raises questions about the efficacy of higher education in serving its student populations (Excelencia in Education, 2015). Latinx students are disproportionately enrolled in community colleges, making this institutional context particularly important to understand. In 2012, almost half of all Latinx students in higher education were enrolled in community colleges (NCES, Digest of Education Statistics, 2012, Table 306.20). This concentration calls for further research to understand this trend, especially within the institutional context that most predominantly serves Latinx students. Focusing on Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and the leadership that is responsible for ensuring Latinx student success, this study seeks to understand how vice presidents of student affairs (VPSAs) make sense of and apply their understanding of what it means to be an HSI into their vision, mission, policies, and practices.

Examining the fundamental role of VPSAs in enacting the vision and mission of the institution is particularly important given their responsibility to develop and lead institutional policies to make sure institutions meet students’ needs (Hernandez & Hernandez, 2014). The lack of scholarship on the role of senior student affairs officers in HSIs motivates this investigation to observe how VPSAs make sense of and apply their understanding of what it means to be an HSI into their vision, mission, policies, and practices, a concept defined by Bensimon and Malcom-Piqueux (2014) as “Hispanic-servingness.” Learning from VPSAs, who serve as senior student affairs officers of HSIs in the Central Valley, provides insight into how leaders can embed Hispanic-servingness within their organizations to address the growing Latinx student population.

Understanding Hispanic-Servingness
Hispanic-servingness, a concept introduced by Bensimon & Malcom-Piqueux (2014), refers to an HSI’s institutional performance by examining what practices and tools are used to embed equity, effectiveness, and excellence into institutional culture in order to facilitate Latino student success. Currently, the designation Hispanic-serving is based solely on enrollment and not outcomes (Bensimon & Malcom-Piqueux, 2014). HSIs’ effectiveness in assessing equity and excellence in Latino outcomes, supporting the institution and HSI mission, and developing and executing HSI-focused competencies is crucial to understanding how educational daily practice relates to Latino student outcomes (Bensimon & Malcom-Piqueux, 2014; Malcom-Piqueux & Bensimon, 2015). HSIs need to demonstrate how to be more effective in achieving excellence and equity among Latino students other than solely through enrollment (Malcom-Piqueux et al., 2012, Malcom-Piqueux, Bensimon, & Davila, 2010).

Hispanic-Serving Community Colleges in California
There are approximately 370 HSIs in the United States, of which 48% are community colleges (Excelencia in Education, 2015). HSIs represent only 11% of all nonprofit degree-granting institutions, yet 59% of all undergraduate Latinos attend HSIs (Excelencia in Education, 2015). In 2012, Latinx students were more likely to enroll in community colleges compared with other ethnic groups, with 46% of Latinx students enrolled in community colleges compared with 34% of African American students, 32% of Asian students, and 31% of White students in higher education (Excelencia in Education, 2015). Malcom-Piqueux et al. (2012) showed that 72% of 342,000 Latino students enrolled full time are concentrated in California community colleges. Community colleges play a key role in Latinos’ academic journey because they tend to serve as gateways for a postsecondary education. Just in
California, approximately 114 community colleges serve over 2 million students in an academic year (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2017). Of those 114 community colleges, 13 are located in California's Central Valley, and among these 11 are designated as HSIs (Excelencia in Education, 2017).

**Study Design**

The purpose of this study is to examine how Hispanic-servingness is embedded within HSI community colleges in California’s Central Valley to more effectively support and facilitate Latinx student success. This study is part of a larger collaborative research effort examining the role of Hispanic-serving community colleges and professionals and administrators within the division of student affairs. There are 11 community colleges designated as HSIs in California's Central Valley. All 11 institutions were invited to participate and four VPSAs from the 11 institutions agreed to participate in the study. Focusing on the role of senior student affairs officers, specifically individuals who hold VPSA positions, provides an important perspective on how HSI imperatives are embedded and implemented throughout institutions beyond simply accounting for the enrollment of Latinx students.

The study adopted Tierney's (2008) organizational culture framework as the lens through which to examine how VPSAs embed Hispanic-servingness into organizational culture of the division of student affairs. To understand how Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAO) embed Hispanic-servingness into structures, policies, and practices, it is important to understand the organizational culture of an institution. An organization’s culture is reflected through the process of decision making, who is involved in the process, and how key decisions are implemented (Tierney, 2008). Tierney’s (1988) framework of organizational culture consists of six terms that are essential in defining the culture of institutions: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership.

**Selected Key Findings**

Two selected findings suggest that community colleges in this study: One, do not share a common understanding of how they became HSIs; and two, the open-access mission outplays the Hispanic-serving designation. Even with the large minority majority student population enrolled in community colleges, Hispanic-servingness is left without a clear definition or the ability to influence the colleges' mission.

Each VPSA described how the HSI designation was not central to socializing new members into the organizational environment. Moreover, a colorblind interpretation of the environment and mission were used by the VPSAs as rationale for not emphasizing the HSI designation in how new students and new staff members were welcomed to the college.

**Implications for Practice**

There is an opportunity for institutional leaders to reflect on the intentionality of their institution's HSI designation and how this informs their professional practice. How the student affairs organization defines its environment is critical in explicitly recognizing the historical context of the HSI designation. VPSAs can lead efforts to examine the HSI designation and the implications it has for serving Latinx students. Discussions of HSI status can take place at new faculty and staff orientations as well as initiatives related to student success.

VPSAs must remain cognizant of the intersections between geographic location and federal HSI designation when trying to support Latinx students. This poses an opportunity for SSAOs and other institutional leaders to reflect on whether their institution is Hispanic enrolling or Hispanic serving.
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Is higher education—specifically the student affairs profession—failing in our promise of success for all students when it comes to serving men on our campuses? The 2010 report of NASPA's and the American College Personnel Association's Task Force on the Future of Student Affairs stated that the "most important factor in student success—more important than incoming student characteristics—is student engagement, i.e., students' investment of time and effort in educationally purposeful activities" (p. 8). Yet, men are less likely to persist past the first year, are less likely to graduate, and are generally less engaged on campus than women (Sax, 2008). Further, Wang and Parker (2011) found that women are more likely than men to view college as useful in helping them grow intellectually (81% vs. 67%) or grow and mature as a person (73% vs. 64%). Svoboda and Vianden (2015) reported that educators also find it difficult to engage college men in social justice and diversity work, which could indicate that men are not connecting to the broader idea of citizenship in a global society.

Struggles that college men encounter are rooted in the dominant narrative of masculinity in the United States, which is hegemonic in nature. Hegemonic masculinity has been described as "the virtually unattainable model of living life as a man" (Harris & Barone, 2011, p. 50). It is deeply embedded in culture, and is socially constructed and perpetuated by people acting individually and systematically (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 9). Hegemonic masculinity produces a restrictive framework for how men are supposed to act and feel, which includes restrictive emotional display ("men don't cry"); objectification of women; and using alcohol, violence, and competitive heterosexual sex to prove manhood. Hegemonic masculinity limits men from being their authentic selves (Edwards & Jones, 2009).

This hegemonic construct may contribute to the lack of specific programming for men on college campuses. Additionally, O'Neil and Crapser (2011) cited a lack of knowledge of men's issues and gender role development, false assumptions about boys and men (e.g., "boys will be boys"), and a lack of curricula on men's development—factors perpetuated by hegemonic masculinity—as impediments to the development of men's programming on campus.
Evidence strongly suggests that men’s programming is needed on college campuses. Harper, Harris, and Mmjeje (2010) found that the majority of campus conduct violations are perpetrated by men, while O’Neil & Crapser (2011) linked the relationship of alcohol abuse, sexual violence, and academic issues to college men’s gender role conflict. These problems are faced by people on college campuses because of the societal influence of hegemonic masculinity rather than being problems with men (Harris and Barone, 2011). The destructive behaviors caused in the name of hegemonic masculinity can be reduced through the development of authentic masculine narratives. Far from being irrelevant or tangential, paying attention to men and masculinities work is “a central responsibility of any institution committed to educating the whole person” (O’Neil & Crapser, 2011, p. 19).

As we look forward to NASPA’s second century, it is important to realize that working to help college men develop authentic narratives while breaking down the influence of hegemonic masculinity can have a positive impact for all, and should be an imperative for the profession. Far too often, men are “bad dogged”—a term coined by Laker (2003, p. 2) to describe punitive outcomes for poor behavior rather than reinforcement of positive behaviors. Harris and Barone (2011, p. 53) maintained that positive reinforcement must be accompanied by high expectations of authentic engagement.

The challenge to student affairs professionals is to examine their role in changing the narrative of men and masculinities. Fortunately, there is a way for student affairs professionals—regardless of gender identity and expression—to affect this change. Kimmel and Davis (2011) offered four interventions: leading public discourse on the impact of hegemonic narratives and promoting authentic masculine expressions, creating space for college men (including faculty and staff) to be vulnerable and to discover their own authentic narrative through mentorship and group work, creating new rituals (or rites of passage) that are guided by mentors that promote masculinities through a shared set of values or common purpose, and encouraging college men to step away from the influence of hegemonic masculinity and seek individual transformation. However, on many college campuses no one has the specific responsibility for shepherding change. It is vitally important that student affairs divisions shift men and masculinities as being a “passion project” of a staff member to something that is part of a staff member’s job description—with goals, expected outcomes, and resources—in order to promote lasting change. It is slow work to shift a cultural narrative that has been embedded in students’ socialization from their earliest memories, but the benefits can be long lasting and influence the entire campus community.

Today’s college men need guidance from student affairs professionals, perhaps more than ever. Young men are looking for different ways to define what it means to be a man, and they are looking for help in dismantling the roles and expectations that hegemonic masculinity has given them as their only options. They strive to be authentic in their portrayal of masculinity, and that quest may help expand how society constructs gender. As a profession, we should take up that challenge to positively influence more authentic expressions of masculinities.
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College is a time for self-discovery and personal growth in all students, and a time in which a student's intersectionality develops. Being an adopted college student adds another layer to that identity development as intersectionality comprises “multiple dimensions of identity [that depict] a core sense of self or one’s personal identity” (Jones & McEwen, 2000, p. 405). The two intersecting circles of one’s identity comprise identity dimensions, such as race, and contextual influences, such as family background and life experiences (Jones & McEwen, 2000). A transracial adoptee, someone who is adopted into a family of a different race (Baden, 2002), might struggle with his or her own identity development during college as he or she grapples with the unknown of both these intersecting circles: his or her race and his or her biological familial background (Burrow & Finley, 2004).

Most adoptees have a lifelong search for their self-identity because the “struggle to understand who you are, where you fit in, and how you feel about yourself is universal” (Brodzinsky, Henig, & Schechter, 1992, p. 3). Marginality theory describes “when persons are viewed as relatively different from the norm or as cast out to varying degrees from the societal ‘center’ to the periphery” (Brocious, 2014, p. 849). The theory of mattering and marginality relates to transracial adoptees because they often feel a sense of belonging and not belonging in a group at the same time: belonging because they grew up around the ethnicity, but not belonging because they are a different race (Brocious, 2014). This sense of marginality leads about 15% of adoptees to search for their biological families, even though “[every] adoptee carries on an intrapsychic search, involving fantasies and curiosity about their birth parents and the reasons for [their] relinquishment” (Brodzinsky et al., 1992, p. 140).

Although most adoptees are curious about their background, college can be the first time a traditional-aged adoptee can search for his or her biological family, because “[age] 18 marks a variety of legal transitions,” like being able to search for one’s birth family if one is in a closed adoption (Arnett, 2000, p. 476). Jeffrey Arnett (2000) wrote that emerging adulthood is a period of life that encompasses identity exploration and occurs between the ages of 18 and 25. According to Jones and McEwen (2000), the center of one’s identity is one’s core sense of self. For a transracially adopted college student, this identity exploration could focus on his or her racial identity as well as his or her biological identity.
Adoptees within emerging adulthood have a strong desire to know about their personal adoption history as well as “a strong desire to know the health and medical histories of their birth relatives” (Wrobel, Grotevant, Samek, & Korff, 2013, p. 441). Research on adolescent adoptees shows that, as adoptees get older and reach emerging adulthood, they become more curious about their birth parents; adolescent females “were more curious about their birth mothers, whereas males were equally curious about their birth mothers and fathers” (Wrobel et al., 2013). Perhaps this is because adolescent females are becoming of childbearing age and might be similar in age to when their biological mother placed them up for adoption. As college students grow into adulthood and begin to create families of their own, some adoptees will seek information about their biological families in order to close the information gap about their medical history, if not for themselves, for their future children (Wrobel et al., 2013).

As some adopted college students begin this search process for their biological families, it is important for higher education professionals to support those students as they embark on this life-changing journey. In order to reduce marginality and increase mattering, it is important for staff and faculty to employ several strategies that help adoptees feel welcome and included within their higher education setting. One recommendation to support these students is to encourage them to start a club for transracially adopted college students to feel connected to each other and their campus. This club could be open for any adopted student, any student who wants to adopt, or any student who has adopted friends or family who might need help and support (Brodzinsky et al., 1992). Another way to support adopted college students is to promote openness from faculty and staff members who have a connection with adoption.

Although adoption can be a very sensitive and personal subject, the more open faculty and staff are about their own stories, the more adopted college students might feel comfortable coming to them if they need the support. Openness could be as simple as faculty or staff having a sticker or picture on their door that says, “I’m adopted!” or “Ask me about my connection to adoption!” if they are adoptive parents or have adopted siblings. This simple sign could create a connection to campus that might improve adopted students’ “positive racial/ethnic identity development [...] by attending [a] racially diverse [school and] having role models of their own race/ethnicity” (Brocious, 2014, p. 848). College campuses could incorporate transracial adoption into a diversity series by holding a Facebook Live event that has a panel of transracially adopted college students, faculty, or staff and/or transracially adoptive parents to share their stories. Higher education professionals should use inclusive language with adopted college students by asking questions like, “Tell me about yourself” or “What’s your story?” instead of “What are you?” or “Where are you from?” or using the phrase “real parents.” Inclusive language can make a difference to a transracial adoptee who is struggling internally with his or her identity because it allows him or her to guide the conversation.

Another way to incorporate transracial adoptees into higher education is to include them in the populations that the multicultural/diversity offices work with on campus. Transracial adoptees do not necessarily have an office or a department on college campuses that is dedicated to supporting their needs and development. Having a place where they can hold adopted student meetings and meet other transracially adopted students who might be struggling with their own identity development (racial, ethnic, medical, etc.) could be the starting point of the help and support transracial adoptees need on a college campus.

Transracially adopted college students do not necessarily check a box on their college application that says they are adopted. No one looks like they are adopted (unless the individual is with his or her adoptive family). There is not an office on campus dedicated to transracial adoptees. However, through inclusive language, recognition that there are transracially adopted college students on all college campuses, and support of adopted college students who are searching for their biological family, higher education professionals can make a marginalized adopted college student matter.
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In student affairs training, we study various student-focused theories and apply them in our work; we can become deeply engaged in testing them for class assignments, practicums, or dissertations. However, as practitioners in our first full-time positions, we often focus more on learning how to do the job, pushing our personal academic exploration aside. Our hope is that this article will help you return to the world of research, finding meaningful engagement with scholarship to help you provide qualified support for students.

Cooper, Mitchell, Eckerle, and Martin (2016) identified deficiencies perceived by faculty and supervisors in the research skills of recent graduates from master’s-level student affairs programs. Research was expected in most programs; however, the authors found that engagement, through curriculum design and emphasis placed by faculty and practicum supervisors on its value, was often inadequate.

ACPA/NASPA Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Competencies

In a joint effort, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and NASPA (2015) identified examples of expected engagement with assessment, evaluation, and research (AER) showing clear growth as student affairs professionals gain experience. These examples were supplemented in 2016 with the release of the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competency Rubrics to allow professionals to monitor their own development through these stages. Table 1 on the following page shows some examples of outcomes we believe are key for graduate students and new professional.
student affairs office could involve faculty in their areas of expertise (e.g., inviting professors from an ethnic studies department to assist in ensuring intercultural programming meets stated learning objectives).

To ensure we meet institutional goals and learning objectives, the most important piece to conducting AER as practitioner–scholars is defining the purpose of our research. This can be ensured through the creation of a strong research question, which guides the design and analysis of the AER. Taking extra time and care with this step will provide a sturdy foundation to return to if you begin to question the utility of your inquiry. Creating a research question is another meaningful area in which faculty expertise could be tapped.

Once you conduct your assessment or program evaluation, share the results. This can be on a smaller scale within your home department, interdepartmentally at your institution, or at national conferences. As Brigman and Hanson (2000) noted, “although we are obligated to share our findings within our immediate academic community, our job is not complete until we also communicate to the rest of the world how our institution has changed” (p. 60). Presenting at regional and national conferences can have myriad benefits, including an opportunity to network with colleagues from institutions all over the world. In fact, many large-scale research projects begin at annual conferences.

Despite the belief that funding is necessary to conduct meaningful research, this is not always true. Funding can help, but in many cases it is necessary to first provide empirical evidence of the value of a program which may be needed to gain funding for further research. If the research question is small in scope, meaningful assessment without funding can provide a base for future research. Additionally, if your research design is sound (i.e., convictions and research questions are clearly stated), you can make a strong case for the necessity of your AER to those who make the funding decisions, whether at your own university, a professional organization, or another interest group.

The Future
As outlined in a comparison study of senior student affairs officer and student affairs preparatory program faculty expectations of entry-level professionals’ competencies, seventy-six percent of senior student affairs officers and faculty NASPA members felt that knowledge of research methods in higher education was necessary for new professionals, yet only half felt conducting research was a desired skill (Dickerson et al., 2011). This inconsistency may indicate doubt or uncertainty about the value of scholarship from new professionals. The only way to begin to change these perspectives is to be active in research and assessment; this is not easy, or even always expected. However, more often than not, appraising our work with a
critical eye is useful, from helping justify a student program to ensuring existing programs meet institutional learning objectives. The first step to becoming a practitioner–scholar is knowing your context. As you transition from student to professional, try to stay engaged with campus life by listening, talking, and getting involved—find your research topic and contribute to the field.
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Despite over three decades of research focusing on Latina/o college-going (Ceja, 2004; Cerna, Pérez, & Sáenz, 2006; Gándara, 1995; Pérez & Ceja, 2015; Pérez & McDonough, 2008; Pérez Cortés, Ramos, & Coronado, 2010; Pérez Huber, Huidor, Malagón, Sánchez, & Solórzano, 2006; Sanchez, Reyes, & Singh, 2006), scholars’ and practitioners’ understanding of the emotional aspect of the college-going process (CGP) remains limited. Over the span of 12 months and 105 interviews I listened to Latina/o students and parents describe their experience as they planned and navigated their way to college. The experiences they recounted exposed the emotional roller coaster felt by families, especially for families whose students were part of the first generation to attend college.

College-going typically elicits an emotional response from parents and students alike. What is unique about the experiences of Latina/o first-generation families versus that of Latina/o non-first-generation families are the varying ways each group confronts the emotions felt during the CGP. For Latina/o first-generation families
that are unfamiliar with the U.S. higher education (USHE) system, are confused by the CGP, feel uncomfortable accessing their social networks, or have not yet fully acquired the necessary navigational capital (Yosso, 2005) to successfully maneuver through the CGP, anxiety and stress can be magnified, and in some cases cause students to reconsider their college-going decisions. For example, members of one family in the study described their experience, particularly focusing on the stress felt throughout the CGP. The mother shared the following:

I didn’t go to college. So I saw that [the CGP] was a strenuous process. [...] I spoke to him and would tell him, “You know, son, do this, do that.” It was a process that made me nervous. Very nervous, lots of stress, in just wondering if we’d be able to help him, if we’d be able to pay.

Another parent in the study shared similar sentiment:

I told my sons, “As a family, you, don’t have a choice. You have to go to college. There is no alternative.” I told them we’d do everything in our power to make it happen. It was difficult, and the process wasn’t easy because we didn’t know about it. We didn’t know what to do. . . . The burden is on the student. He has to be the one to do everything, so that’s why I pushed so that he’d give it his all. And it was difficult, and sometimes I feel I pushed him too hard. Sometimes he was so stressed, and I saw him very stressed, and I stopped myself. I told him I’d do everything in my power to get him to college, so that he’d have his opportunity to go to college.

A student also described the CGP as frustrating, citing that not knowing the correct information regarding the CGP added to the stress of the process. These feelings intensified for students who did not fulfill their goal of enrolling in a 4-year institution, as one student described:

[The CGP was] frustrating. Very frustrating. And in a way stressful and disappointing. I think it was just frustrating that I wouldn’t hear back from the schools on time and then I would call and they wouldn’t respond to me and then when they would finally respond to me way past the date, it was to tell me that I didn’t get in. In a way it brought stress, because I felt like I’m not going to get into anywhere and I’m going to be stuck to [the local community college]. But I know I can push myself through [it].

The CGP experience is considerably different for Latina/o non-first-generation families, however. Parents who know what to expect in the CGP due to their own college familiarity describe the CGP as a positive experience. Interestingly, parents with USHE knowledge report that the CGP went smoothly for their child in part because they, as parents, took on a large portion of the responsibility in the process. Non-first-generation students also report the CGP as an overall positive experience during which their concerns focus on “fit” as opposed to the feasibility of college, and worries and concerns were mitigated by their confidence in finding a solution. This experience is exemplified by one student in the study who felt that any financial concerns would be met with a solution:

I could go to school all four years; my parents have told me they have money saved up and not a lot of people can do that. It’s just that it’s really expensive and stuff. [...] I know we can do it and pay for it, and [by] whatever means necessary . . . we’ll just have to get loans and stuff even though that’s not always what people want but you just [have] to do it.

Once this student had received admission into an out-of-state university, he revealed that he maintained hope that he could find an on-campus job, earn money, and get involved on-campus due to his father’s connection with a high-ranking administrator at that same university.

The Latina/o non-first-generation families in this study feel comfortable contacting people in their networks who are familiar with the system, and have the ability to counteract any fears and anxieties they may have by offering strategies, solutions, or reassurance. Even though all students and parents feel an array of emotions during the CGP, those who understand college-going and know what to expect are able to avoid being consumed by concerns in the same way that their counterparts are.

Implications
The findings of this study challenge scholars and practitioners to envision innovative interventions that will lead to higher numbers of Latina/o student enrollment in colleges and universities, including rethinking college-going as a family process as opposed to a student-centered one. To address the anxiety over the “unknown” of going to college, especially for first-generation families, higher education institutions can establish student and parent symposia and talking circles where alumni and their parents facilitate conversations on the issues associated with the CGP. The symposia do not have to be on the college campus. In fact, they could occur as events sponsored by local alumni or satellite campuses. Higher education institutions can also develop programming that targets prospective first-generation college students and include the student and parent symposia as part of their agenda. Student and parent sleepover weekends are also a great way for parents to experience a morsel of the college environment and hopefully diminish any concerns about their child’s safety.

Regardless of the type of programming offered by higher education institutions, administrators must find a way to create a personal connection with parents. Administrators must assure parents that the institution will take care of their child, and they must do so in the language most comfortable to families, especially those of first-generation college-goers. This reassurance goes a long way in making
families feel at ease with sending their child to college.

**Conclusion**
The emotional journey of students and parents is an important component of the CGP. The array of emotions felt during the CGP—including happiness, frustration, and accomplishment—are a reflection of families' comfort with the CGP. In addition, these findings support the notion that understanding the emotional roller coaster that occurs during the CGP is crucial in our work with families to ensure a more successful and healthier CGP—regardless of a family's knowledge or experience with U.S. higher education.
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The Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention and Response Knowledge Community provides a space for the wide range of student affairs professionals whose work involves managing relationship violence, stalking, and sexual assault on campus. This knowledge community creates opportunities for members to provide one another support and to learn from others who are working in the field. In addition, the knowledge community aims to be a repository of expertise on such topics through analyzing changing legislation and identifying best practices. This year, a new administration and changes to subregulatory guidance have generated significant uncertainty for advocates and educators. At the same time, schools and community organizations have continued to develop and implement programs intended to prevent sexual and relationship violence. Our hope is that this publication supports the Assessment, Evaluation, and Research NASPA professional competency through advancing best practices for institutional efforts. Additionally, we hope that the publication supports the Law, Policy, and Governance competency through a brief analysis of current legislative trends.

Prevention Efforts
To date, much of the efforts on campus to address sexual and relationship violence have focused specifically on compliance and response. However, there are noteworthy signs of progress in prevention efforts on college campuses across the country. For example, colleges overwhelmingly report that they now deliver primary prevention education to all their incoming students, staff, and faculty. The recent Association of American University Campus Activities Report (2017) indicated that all of the schools responding to the survey had planned or made changes to their training efforts. This population-level education sets the foundation for institutions to build on with additional prevention efforts that reinforce the initial messaging. A recent analysis of prevention programming data from 68 colleges and universities across the country showed that over two thirds of institutions (69%) are reaching undergraduate students at least once a semester with prevention programming and nearly half of institutions (44%) report that they deliver prevention programming to their undergraduate students at least one to two times a month (Rider-Milkovich, 2017).

However, significant gaps remain. Although nearly all campuses are successfully reaching first-year students, far fewer are reaching specific student population subsets at increased risk for experiencing harm. As institutional campus climate surveys across the country have confirmed, students who identify as LGBT and students of color are at increased risk for violence or face additional hardships after experiencing violence while on campus (Crenshaw, 1991; Todahl, Linville, Bustin, Wheeler, & Gau, 2009). Nevertheless, research is limited regarding targeted prevention efforts for these populations. Campus-based prevention professionals must develop culturally appropriate programming to support these students.

Campuses are also increasing their focus on training faculty and staff. Due to complex institutional factors, many senior administrators are reluctant to mandate training for faculty, even if they do so for staff and students. This training is sorely needed. Indeed, as recent research has revealed, unwanted sexual contact committed by faculty is far more widespread than previously believed, and increasing faculty bystander intervention skills is an important component to a comprehensive prevention strategy on campus (Cantalupo & Kidder, 2017).
Response Efforts
In September, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos announced a plan to revise how institutions address sexual misconduct. First, DeVos announced a “Notice and Comment” period during which the general public will be able to comment on Title IX guidance put out by the Department of Education (DoED). Second, DeVos announced the withdrawal of the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) and the 2014 questions and answers (Q&A) guidance related to Title IX. In their place, the DOE issued a new DCL and Q&A guidance. Departures from the previous guidance include that schools may use a higher evidentiary standard, may use a longer time frame, and must provide more detailed notice to respondents during sexual misconduct investigations. Although schools may be tempted to change their policies, the Notice and Comment period signals that additional guidance may be forthcoming. More information regarding the guidance can be found in the DoED documents and statements issued by organizations such as Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) and NASPA.

During this flurry of federal changes, colleges have continued to develop best practices that are responsive to students. First, researchers have sought to understand how to tailor their sexual violence response efforts to meet the needs of international students (DeGue, 2014; Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). Solutions include peer education programs, sessions during international student orientation, and targeted programmatic efforts. Second, state laws and advocacy organizations have called for schools to implement sexual violence institutional task forces or join a regional task force (Barry, 2009). Task forces that involve community organizations and institutional partners create opportunities for input and foster institutional and community buy-in. Third, institutions have continued to develop their practices to be increasingly equitable to respondents. Schools have ensured that resources such as counseling, access to an advisor, and a similar appeal process to student conduct cases are also made available to respondents.

A final consideration is the long-accepted understanding that faculty are considered “responsible employees” and are required to report sexual misconduct to the school’s Title IX coordinator. The University of Oregon has developed a “tier” system that exempts certain employees, including faculty, from Title IX reporting responsibilities. This will relieve some faculty who have expressed discomfort about disclosing information that they believe was shared with them in confidence. On the other hand, will it be clear to students that faculty will not be able to offer assistance or notify someone more equipped to do so? The upcoming academic years will illuminate the benefits and challenges of these changes and crystallize the DOED’s strategies for enforcing Title IX compliance.
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Many years ago, I started my career in student affairs as an academic advisor. At my first campus wide training on how to support low-income students another advisor asked the presenters, “But how would we know if a student is first-generation or low-income? Low test scores? Poor grades? No family support?” I whipped my head toward her, presumably looking like a cartoon character with smoke coming out of my ears, as I felt like she had just insulted me. How dare she make such assumptions or have such low expectations? I was first-generation and low-income, and she seemed to be acting like I wasn’t in the room. I expected others in the room to show dismay, but they all looked at the presenter seeming to nod with sympathy or pity. That’s when I realized academic advisors, at least at that time and on that campus, were not “my people.” It seemed like poor students would be seen only as potential failures, and either other advisors didn’t come from poor working-class backgrounds, or, if they did, the connection was broken or otherwise silenced. hooks (2000) described a moment from her graduate career that perfectly captured what I was thinking and feeling:

> Slowly I began understanding fully that there was no place in academe for folks from working-class backgrounds who did not wish to leave the past behind. That was the price of the ticket. Poor students would be welcomed at the best institutions of higher learning only if they were willing to surrender memory, to forget the past and claim the assimilate present as the only worthwhile and meaningful reality. (pp. 36–37)

To be fair, I should not have been surprised by what appeared to be the non-reaction of my peers. Researchers have found that low-income first-generation college students are disadvantaged by inequitable resource distribution (Klugman, 2012), may enter college with different values/expectations (Hurst, 2012), and experience additional stressors while in college (Soria, 2015). Using the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) 2016 Student Survey, Eismann (2016) discovered that first-generation students lagged behind their continuing-generation peers in every aspect of the job search process (applications, interviews, offers). No wonder advisors are concerned about low-income first-generation students’ experiences.

Still, over the past few decades advising research and practice have evolved significantly. Professional associations like NASPA, NACE, NACADA (The Global Community for Academic Advising) and NODA (Association for Orientation, Transition, and Retention in Higher Education) have communities focused on social class and/or first-generation students. We are now encouraged to demonstrate culturally responsive and equity-minded advising practice. But what if I told you that we, well-intentioned advisors, are also part of the problem? That some of our traditional academic or career advising practices may cause additional stressors for first-generation low-income students?

Here are my top four tips for transforming advising practices, hoping we can look toward fixing our own practices rather than trying to fix or save low-income students:

1. **Rethink “professionalism.”** Whenever I see a poster in a career services office showing how a “professional” is supposed to dress and, conversely, showing what is inappropriate, I pause. Whose professions are we talking about, exactly? Using “professional” to describe only one style of attire implies that those who wear uniforms, work boots, and jeans are not also professionals. “Professionalism,” when used to prescribe attire or language or other habits, is elitist, and can also be experienced as sexist, racist, and transphobic (Rios, 2015).
2. **Reframe “etiquette” as “cultural norms.”** Etiquette dinners would be better if they covered norms from different communities, including international dining etiquette. I don’t think it is offensive to say that a certain dress, language, or manner is valued in a certain context. I just wish we didn’t pretend that a corporate context is the only one that matters. Reframing “professional” expectations to broader “cultural norms” can open the door to further exploration about why some norms are valued over others, and who might be disadvantaged when norms at school or work don’t align with norms at home.

3. **Reframe “networking” as “community building.”** I grew up being told that networking is what rich people do to advance their careers at the expense of others, and the ticket to getting ahead was working hard. I know now that working hard isn’t enough, and relationships do matter. But networking is easier for me to embrace when reframed as community building. See Stephens et al. (2012) for more examples of how independent versus interdependent norms create unseen disadvantage for first-generation students.

4. **Reframe “do what you love—forget what your parents want” as “discover what you love and still attend to your community needs.”** This is hard for institutions that seek to promote the value of a liberal arts degree. Goldrick-Rab (2017) reminds us that “the expected benefits of attending college are increasingly outweighed by both the perceived and real costs, especially over the short-term. For people from fragile economic circumstances, the short term is the only future they know they have” (Chapter 1, para. 24). People have legitimate concerns about the extent to which college degrees pay off. Assuming everyone can do what they love and trust their basic needs will be met is idealistic, and, frankly, a bit cruel. See McCoy (2015) for cogent advice on how to acknowledge classed experiences in higher education. I’m lucky to have a fulfilling job that I love, but some of what I love I do in my spare time now that I’m not working several jobs to pay off my loans.

Low-income first-generation college students are not potential failures or statistics, nor should we be asked to give up who we are in order to make it in college or in our careers. Academic and career advisors can better serve low-income first-generation students by carefully considering how our traditional practices may alienate students, and reframing our practices to be more inclusive of diverse social class identities.

---

**References**


Inspired by NASPA’s centennial celebration, NASPA’s Spirituality and Religion in Higher Education Knowledge Community brought together a group of four scholar-practitioners—Reverend Janet M. Cooper Nelson (chaplain of the university, Brown University), Bob Smith (director, Center for Spiritual and Ethical Development, Pennsylvania State University), J. T. Snipes, PhD (assessment & research manager, Interfaith Youth Core), and Imam Adeel Zeb (chaplain of the Claremont Colleges and president of the National Association of College & University Chaplains)—to discuss how spiritual, secular, and religious work on college and university campuses has evolved over the past 100 years and what the emerging challenges and opportunities might be for student affairs professionals, faculty members, and religious and spiritual life practitioners. In the form of a curated conversation, this dialogue between experts examines how educators have addressed and continue to address issues related to secularism, spirituality, and religion on campus and the increasingly diverse traditions that have fought for a greater voice in higher education.

Where We’ve Been: Critical Moments Over the Past 100 Years for Spirituality and Religion in Higher Education

Smith began the conversation by reflecting on the historical arc of the field, pointing to the reality that “early American colleges were typically under the leadership of a religious figure serving as president or dean . . . the result was college students receiving moral and character education from a religious perspective.” This period, Smith argued, then gave way to the post-WWII era characterized by public institutions “moving away from religion on campus” and a “decline, or even void, of religious engagement” (personal communication, September 25, 2017). This phenomenon did not go unchallenged. In discussing the rise and fall of the college YMCA (Young Men’s Christian Association) movement, Snipes acknowledged that, “[i]n the beginning of the twentieth century a war was being waged for the soul of the university . . . [with the college YMCA] protecting institutions against a greater movement of secularization” (personal communication, October 10, 2017). During the latter part of the 20th century, Smith observed, “more legal challenges and precedents affecting public institutions [resulted in] the expectation that all religious [and] spiritual traditions were to be recognized and treated equally (at least at public schools)” (personal communication, September 25, 2017).

In addition to the evolving role of spirituality and religion in postsecondary education, the past century also witnessed important progress regarding religious diversity. Cooper Nelson noted, “institutions [had] to re-imagine themselves entirely including the place and the content of spirituality and religion.” She continued, “Bible and theology courses and their related departments morphed into departments of Religious Studies. . . . Required Chapel ended; and, student bodies and faculties that were predominantly White and culturally Protestant established new norms to transform themselves to become racially, culturally, and religiously inclusive” (personal communication, October 3, 2017). As Zeb highlighted, these drastic demographic shifts were later reflected in the leadership of educational programs and professional associations for religious and spiritual life. Drawing attention to the hiring of Sharon
Kugler as the first Catholic, laywoman, university chaplain at Yale University or Varun Soni as the first Hindu dean of spiritual life at the University of Southern California, as well as his own election as the first Muslim president of the National Association of College & University Chaplains. Zeb argued that these moments "[open] the doors for non-Abrahamic traditions" (personal communication, October 2, 2017).

**Where We Are: Current Challenges Related to Spirituality and Religion Work in Higher Education**

Although greater worldview diversity has changed the fabric of colleges and universities, these changes were not always welcomed. Smith attributed this in part to a lack of religious, secular, and spiritual literacy. Although he and his colleagues at the Pennsylvania State University work to provide more inclusive learning environments, Smith shared that he is "frequently challenged over recognizing and providing space to an atheist student organization; Pagan and Wiccan groups are often accused of being practitioners of devil worship and black magic; [and] Muslims are often viewed with suspicion" (personal communication, September 25, 2017). Snipes argued that some view such inclusion as "an assault on traditional values" (personal communication, October 10, 2017). Zeb observed that, in part, this coincides with the challenges of incorporating religious, secular, and spiritual diversity alongside other diversity initiatives such as race, gender, and sexual orientation.

Turning more specifically to present challenges faced by those who engage in, support, and promote this work, the scholar-practitioners spoke about the ways spirituality, secularism, and religion are (mis)understood by students, faculty, and administrators. Zeb acknowledged that one ongoing challenge in higher education is articulating the "evolving role of the chaplain and its relevance in our current times to the administrations that we work for" (personal communication, October 2, 2017). The relevance of religion on campus is further complicated in the context of public colleges and universities. Smith argued that although there is a decrease in those who participate in organized religion, "many college students... are very interested in spiritual health." At the Pennsylvania State University, Smith has witnessed an "increase in the number of students, student groups, and programs that are spiritually based"; for example, "meditation [and] prayer... are all becoming more accepted as ways for student to manage their health and well-being" (personal communication, September 25, 2017).

**Where We're Going: Identifying Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Professionals Related to Secularism, Spirituality, and Religion**

Each of the scholar-practitioners in this conversation believed there is still work to do in order to keep up with the changing landscape of religious, spiritual, and secular identities on campus. As Zeb said, "The emerging challenges are how to keep our work relevant and how to find the various intersections with our work and the work of others" (personal communication, October 2, 2017). Similarly, Smith suggested, "We need to advocate for the recognition of religious and spiritual identities as equally important as race, gender, sexual orientation, and other areas that need consideration" (personal communication, September 25, 2017).

Despite the evolving challenges, Snipes and Cooper Nelson remain hopeful about the potential of this work. Snipes said he is most excited about the ways that "new scholars and practitioners are working to forge a way forward in which civic pluralism is a means of societal transformation" (personal communication, October 10, 2017). Cooper Nelson added, "This is new work and deserves serious attention while we continue to nourish the ancient contours of spiritual formation and a holy commitment to social justice. Truly diverse teams of professional experts who are effective and credible on campus while also being committed to creating and to modeling cooperative leadership is imperative" (personal communication, October 3, 2017).

As NASPA celebrates its centennial, the need to reflect—and act—regarding religious, secular, and spiritual issues in higher education is as important as ever. From a lack of religious and spiritual literacy of diverse traditions and identities, to a misunderstanding of chaplaincy professionals on campus, to violence and hostility toward marginalized religious groups on campus, there are many challenges currently facing college campuses. In order to meet these emerging challenges, and to respond to a religious landscape that has changed significantly, campus professionals must bring issues of religion, secularism, and spirituality into the fold of their work. According to Cooper Nelson, Smith, Snipes, and Zeb, incorporating religion and spirituality more into the social justice conversations on campus, finding areas where this work intersects with the work of others, and advocating for trained experts to help lead this work on campus are a few ways to start.
The Student Affairs Partnering With Academic Affairs Knowledge Community (SAPAA) Knowledge Community is proud to celebrate the NASPA centennial. This celebration is a joyous and inspiring one as SAPAA was founded on the principles of expanding the knowledge and research of student affairs professionals by providing avenues and access to collaborative measures, all in pursuit of increasing the knowledge, research, and professional development to inform the practice. As noted within the principles of NASPA, the community and members of SAPAA work diligently to promote and engage beyond the Knowledge Community, including working with new professionals and graduate students.

The growth and continuous development of Knowledge Communities (KCs) such as SAPAA are due to the foundation and history of NASPA. From its inspiring origins, there are various milestones in NASPA’s history. The following are a few of note:

- **1967** – First permanent NASPA office is created in Detroit, Michigan
- **1989** – NASPA Networks (later to be known as Knowledge Communities) formed
- **2005** – International representation reaches 30 members
The SAPAA KC was founded on the principles of fostering partnerships and professional collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs. Since its inception, SAPAA KC has worked diligently on furthering involvement opportunities and lifelong learning. Through our work, we connect with NASPA KCs on potential collaborative efforts and engage academic affairs in our work, generate and disseminate scholarships related to furthering research and knowledge, and recognize best practices in innovative partnerships.

A recent report from the Pullias Center for Higher Education emphasized that collaboration between existing academic affairs and student affairs programs is necessary to prepare interventions for struggling students (Kezar & Holcombe, 2016). The report provided several recommendations to further the collaborative measures of student and academic affairs, including revising institutional policies that discourage collaboration, supporting and encouraging faculty engagement, using data to inform program design and revision, and enhancing and restructuring existing collaborative resources that support sustainable partnership. The collaboration of student and academic affairs is necessary to ensure the adaptation of the best strategies and allocation of resources for student engagement and pursuit.

SAPAA KC has created various goals in order to fulfill the needs of students and also to provide professional development for practitioners. Our success is rooted in our efforts to learn from one another. Maintaining a collaborative relationship between student affairs and academic affairs; ensures a seamless connection between inside- and outside-the-classroom experiences, cocurricular experiences that complement and enhance the curriculum, holistic support and full development of the student, increased resources and support resulting in academic and personal success, and increased satisfaction with the overall university experience (Pedersen, 2015). Our collaboration strengthens resources and programming aimed to improve student engagement, retention, and success.

SAPAA KC seeks to further the engagement strategies for student affairs professionals serving in an academic unit within their institutions and/or those who are interested in fostering opportunities to explore future collaborations. We continue to expand our sphere of influence through concentrated professional initiatives. Some of these initiatives of networking include our signature working groups on academic advising, career services, living–learning communities, and service learning and civic engagement, and committee efforts in member support, social media, communications, scholarship, and technology.

The working groups are designed to provide opportunities to engage in conversations and gather resources that focus on the partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs in the following niche areas:

- The Academic Advising Working Group is a dedicated space for academic advisors to connect, share best practices, stay current on academic advising trends and issues, seek out support, and become empowered to enact change at respective institutions. This group has expanded its goals to include fostering communication among academic advisors, supporting professional development opportunities for academic advisors of all career levels, creating a national network for information sharing, and collaborating with other Knowledge Communities in developing innovative programs.

- The Living–Learning Communities Working Group is an opportunity for new professionals seeking avenues to learn and experienced professionals seeking avenues to share, and for all student affairs professionals seeking support from others working in living–learning communities. The group strives to promote growth and sustainability of these communities by fostering an understanding of development strategies, collaborative partnerships, assessment processes, and best practices.

- The Service Learning and Civic Engagement Working Group fosters dialogue and knowledge sharing among professionals passionate (or curious) about practices of service learning and civic engagement, their relationship to the various educational missions and professional goals across higher education, and ways that practices transform institutions and students.

Through our working groups and collaboration, we continue to develop strategies and initiatives designed to address the issues surrounding student engagement and retention. Providing opportunities for the principles of the working groups to develop into learning communities follows the strategies of a leading expert on student retention, Vincent Tinto (Chivukula, 2017). Tinto noted learning communities are successful when they involve and engage students, faculty members, and staff in shared learning activities (Chivukula, 2017). Through this experiential approach of learning, we can promote further collaboration between departments while creating additional avenues for future operations and direction. While SAPAA continues to prepare for the future and develop through collaborations with its members and other knowledge communities, SAPAA is also strategizing ways to add additional voices and best practices to the current model of departmental collaboration on campuses.
As we celebrate the NASPA centennial, our knowledge community reflects on the alignment of our strategic plan with the goals of NASPA:

- Foster engaging leadership and involvement opportunities that meet the needs and interests of SAPAA members.
- Grow the membership of the SAPAA KC to maximize the audience with whom SAPAA communicates and provides engagement opportunities.
- Proactively connect with other NASPA KCs on potential collaborative efforts that support mutual goals.
- Engage faculty/academic affairs more fully in SAPAA work.
- Generate and disseminate scholarship related to effective student and academic affairs partnerships.
- Recognize best practices and innovative partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs by facilitating a robust SAPAA Promising Practices Award selection process and broadly recognizing honorees and the work of their home institutions.
- Facilitate electronic resources for SAPAA members in the form of website and e-learning opportunities.

We congratulate NASPA on 100 years of service to the field of student affairs, and are reminded of its contributions to the evolving profession and the continuous development of resources in the field. Through SAPAA’s efforts and collaborations, we too strive to expand strategic alignments and foster dialogue in order to maximize new initiatives and develop timely resources for the advancement of the field. SAPAA will also continue to recognize outstanding professionals in our field through the Adult Learners and Students with Children Research Grant and Promising Practices Award, and offer scholarly contributions to the annual Civic Learning & Democratic Engagement Meeting and the Assessment & Persistence Conference.
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University career services offices teach students how to best articulate their collegiate experiences to potential employers or graduate schools. However, career services offices typically do not engage students in the same way as their professors, student group advisers, or internship supervisors. Rather, career services offices support students as they reflect on and articulate the academic, co-curricular, and internship experiences that they complete during college. The student learning and skill development that occurs within these environments is demonstrated through academic classes and projects, leadership in campus activities, and internship responsibilities. Ideally, this learning and development is integrated across all three domains (Keeling, 2004).

Over the past decade, the formal connection between student affairs and career services has diminished. According to a recent survey, the percentage of career services offices housed within a student affairs division declined from 68.3% in 2008 to 51.6% in 2016. The same survey noted increases in career services departments reporting to academic affairs, enrollment management, and development and alumni relations (“Career Services,” 2017). Although reporting structure is only one factor in measuring the connection between student affairs and career services, a scan of conference presentations at organizations like the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) in the past several years, shows many sessions that discuss building partnerships with alumni relations, academic departments, or academic advisers, but few, if any, that connect career services to student affairs. Because career services departments are less likely to be a part of student affairs divisions, it must view its relationship with student affairs as being as vital as those with other key partners.

Before talking about the need for a connection between career services and student affairs, it is important to examine some of the root causes that might be contributing to their distancing. Because of rising tuition costs and higher parental expectations, career services offices often face the pressure of demonstrating the value of a college education (Marklein, 2014). Increasingly, and sometimes inappropriately, career service offices are the sole focal point for the success of students and the justification of enrollment. In spite of additional parent, student, and institutional expectations and in some cases higher enrollments, staffing and operations funding for career services declined between 2007 and 2014 (Koc & Tsang, 2015). Few chief student affairs officers have a background in career services or college recruiting. Until the very recent creation of a knowledge community within NASPA, there was little conference content around career services, creating a knowledge gap between career services and student affairs professionals. Given the increase in expectations, lack of budget support, and this knowledge gap, it is not surprising that career services offices are turning toward other parts of the university for support (“Career Services,” 2017).

Student learning that occurs within student affairs is critical to the success of students. According to a 2017 NACE survey, the top attributes that employers seek on a resume for entry-level opportunities are the ability to work on a team, problem-solving skills, written and verbal communication skills, and a strong work ethic. Over 70% of employers rated these skills as desirable (NACE, 2017). Employers also reported that these broader skills, in addition to field-specific knowledge, are necessary for the long-term career success. (Hart Research Associates, 2013). The average college student is likely to develop these skills in a wide range of activities, including academic and co-curricular experiences. NACE and other professional organizations have created career readiness/competency initiatives to focus colleges and universities on teaching students to both develop and articulate these skills.
Yet as colleges and universities embrace career readiness, they sometimes focus on learning occurring in an academic setting while ignoring the acquisition and enhancement of these competencies in the co-curricular environment. Curricular and co-curricular skill development is complementary, not in opposition. A deep and integrated relationship between career services, student affairs, and academic departments supports both the development and articulation of these abilities provided adequate resources are available for each department to complete its mission. Such relationships can exist with or without formal reporting structures—the collaboration between these areas promotes student learning (Keeling, 2004).

Skill development through co-curricular experiences has a few advantages, such as the ability to take risks that traditional academic classes do not. According to the 2017 NACE survey, 70% of employers screen resumes based on GPA. More important, this screening often occurs before other attributes are assessed (NACE, 2017). This emphasis on academic performance reinforces the notion that students should keep their GPA as high as they can. Although this does not restrict major choice, it can lead students to take fewer academic risks and take courses for which they expect to receive higher grades. Through co-curricular activities, students can take additional risks, possibly fail, and persevere without the repercussions of lower GPAs. Thus, in the development of skills like teamwork or response to failure, co-curricular experiences may be better avenues for risk and exploration than academic courses.

Academics and faculty play a vital role in student development. Student affairs programs and services contribute to preparing the student for life after college. The combination of skill development across academic and co-curricular domains allows students multiple opportunities to learn abilities necessary for their long-term career success. Career services must support students as they integrate their learning across these domains and promote programmatic connections between academic and student affairs professionals.

Increased integration between student affairs and career services begins with the following conversations and recommendations:

- Many staff in student affairs report serving as mentors and unofficial career advisers for students. Student affairs professionals can and should have regular conversations about a student’s impact on an organization, coaching a student on how to talk about their success. This reflection on a student’s successes, abilities, and failures provides an opportunity for the student to reflect on their performance and to prepare for interviews. In addition, the ability of a student to track data and quantify success around student organization activities is vital to strong resumes and good behavioral interview answers. Student affairs professionals are uniquely positioned to have a better window into a student’s performance than a career adviser, coach, or counselor.

- Senior leadership within student affairs, including the chief student affairs officer, must continue to enhance their knowledge of career services regardless of whether career services is housed within the division. Career service offices are responsible for student success, yet student affairs programs provide opportunities to develop skills employers are seeking. A close partnership between the two can yield increased resources for both.

- Student affairs collectively as a division and individually as specific departments should partner with career services to tell the whole story of the student experience. By collaborating on collecting and analyzing data, student affairs and career services can create an arc that spans from admissions to beyond graduation and includes participation in programming, skill articulation, and post-graduate success. Such a story complements the academic success of students and ultimately aids in establishing alumni affinity to their alma mater.

Colleges and universities should strive toward holistic student development emphasizing skill acquisition and learning across academics, experiential education, and co-curricular experiences. A strong, integrated relationship between student affairs and career services promotes both student learning and student success after graduation. Regardless of organizational structure, student affairs and career services must continue to collaborate for the benefit of our students.
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As NASPA, also known as Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education, prepares to enter its second century as an organization, the landscape of higher education continues to diversify. As of fall 2017, four Generation Z classes have joined college and university campuses across the country. A variety of traits are associated with members of this generation, but one of the most important is that learning processes have adapted due to access to technology their entire lives, which impacts how educators provide learning opportunities. Corey Seemiller and Meghan Grace (2017) studied Generation Z and found that, as learners, its members use information from observing others and need to understand the applicability of learning outside of a specific example in the classroom. Understanding that Generation Z was born with the Internet and that its members learn differently should impact how educators construct curricula, facilitate programs, and address social justice, leadership development, and other concepts on campus.

Organizations in higher education must respond with flexibility to meet the needs of Generation Z and those generations that will follow. Pope and Thomas (2000) stated that organizations err in viewing culture “as an organizational concept with limited reference to the underlying cultural assumptions of race, ethnicity, gender, and class” (p. 118). The concept of leadership, which is an integral part of student development, is ingrained in the culture of our campuses. However, as the student body diversifies, it is critical that our understanding of leadership, supporting student leadership development, and developing competency around issues of social justice and inclusion (SJI) in programs on campus also diversify. SJI is a competency of NASPA and ACPA, also known as College Student Educators International, and is a reminder that our responsibility is to develop programs and processes that support participation of all members of our communities (NASPA & ACPA, 2015). This article emphasizes the importance of how identity, leadership, and social justice are connected.

Leadership and Social Identity
Social identity and leadership are two aspects of an individual’s identity. Leaders bring their identities, their lived experiences, and their biases into interactions, which requires educators to critically examine leadership and identity as interconnected concepts. Steffens et al. (2014) stated that leadership is a “multi-dimensional process that centers on leaders’ capacities to represent, advance, create, and embed a shared sense of social identity for...
group members” (p. 2). Leadership is not solely about who leads a group, but also about developing an understanding of self and the individuals one leads. As a result, it is critical that leadership programs on campus integrate concepts of intersectionality, identity, power, privilege, and oppression. In “Exploring the Gender Performance of Men Student Affairs Professionals,” Voyles and McKinnon-Crowley (2017) provided examples of pitfalls that men fall into as part of their professional career. Whether it is men espousing a social justice framework and benefiting from their male privilege, or switching focus to another aspect of their identity as a “defense mechanism for [them] to alleviate stress of competing internalized discourses on masculinity,” the authors demonstrated the importance of understanding how leadership and identity impacts how individuals operate in personal and professional spaces (p. 41). Voyles and McKinnon-Crowley’s article focused on men in student affairs, yet the concept applies to many of the men involved in leadership development programs. Both individuals who have privileged identities and those marginalized by social systems develop an understanding of the complicated social systems that influence people.

The variety of theories discussed on campus provide a breadth of ways to frame leadership. The social identity theory of leadership views leadership "as a group process that pivots on identity dynamics," as leaders are often responsible for groups of individuals who have “their own self-defined social identities” (Hogg, Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012, p. 290). The theory provides ways to observe and construct an understanding of leadership as a theory and as a practice. In developing leadership programs, using this theoretical framework supports students and professionals in understanding how their identities inform how they are viewed as leaders, and subsequently using their understanding of self to advocate for more inclusive processes and programs.

**Resources for Professionals**

In 1996, Ingrid Grieger provided a resource called the Multicultural Organization Development Checklist to assess an organization’s development and practices; the checklist provides a variety of transferable ideas that apply to our work. The section of the checklist titled “Student Activities and Services” provides tracking support and prompts to reflect on, such as interactions between populations (Grieger, 1996). Leadership educators and other professionals can utilize this resource to assess how our programs and services address the needs of our diverse organizations. This checklist represents one resource, but as programs develop on campus, it is important to explore the specific needs of a student population and adapt to meet them.

**Final Thoughts**

The greatest challenge for the future of leadership education is adaptation. Research allows us to consider how the changing dynamics and demands of our campus populations require that our leadership programs change. The diversity of our student population, trends related to Generation Z, and growing demands on leadership educators will continue to influence programs. Leadership on our campuses and in the workforce is diversifying; as educators we should commit to create programs, experiences, and services that ensure our programs meet the needs of our students.
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Near the start of the 2017 college football season, six college football players disclosed to their teams—and to the world—that they are gay. These six players are not alone; there are several other openly identified LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) student athletes in other collegiate sports. What makes the six football players so noteworthy is that this occurred in a sport that is a marker of brute masculinity. These out college football players are merely part of an exciting trend occurring at the intersection of LGBTQ identities and athletics. For example, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) adopted an enumerated nondiscrimination policy that protects LGBTQ college athletes and released a guide on LGBTQ athletes for college athletic departments, Champions of Respect (Griffin & Taylor, 2013).
Despite these advances, however, studies suggest that the collegiate sport context continues to be an unwelcoming environment for LGBTQ student-athletes (Atteberry-Ash, Woodford, & Center, 2017; Toomey, McGeorge, & Carlson, in press). Thus, it is critical that we understand how to cultivate safe contexts for LGBTQ student-athletes, including how to foster and sustain allied behaviors by heterosexual and cisgender student-athletes, coaches, administrators, athletic department staff, and the campus as a whole. The term ally has been defined as a member of the “dominant or majority group who works to end oppression in his or her personal and professional life through support of, and as an advocate for, the oppressed population” (Washington & Evans, 1991, p. 195). Taylor (2015) argued that student-athlete allies should be acting in ways that reduce oppression related to sexual orientation and gender diversity.

The authors collected data from 159 college student-athletes at two public NCAA Division I universities in order to assess heterosexual student athletes’ perceptions of the sports climate for LGBTQ players. The findings from our studies (Toomey et al., 2016, in press), although preliminary, do provide some important recommendations for student affairs professionals. In particular, the following recommendations may help create a more welcoming and affirmative campus climate for LGBTQ student-athletes: (a) implement LGBTQ-inclusive policies, (b) provide trainings focused on being an ally to LGBTQ-identified student-athletes, and (c) create engagement opportunities with the LGBTQ community.

**LGBTQ-Inclusive Policies**

LGBTQ students feel safer in environments when there are inclusive antibullying, nondiscrimination, and antiharassment policies; that is, when the policies enumerate actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity and expression (Russell, Horn, Kosciw, & Saewyc, 2010). These policies are thought to be effective because they set the climate (i.e., what is and what is not tolerated behavior) and are enforceable if unsanctioned behaviors take place. Student affairs professionals working with student-athletes may advocate for such policies to be implemented and enforced as a fundamental step in creating more affirmative campus climates for LGBTQ student athletes. The Champions of Respect guide provides several templates for model policies and related practices (Griffin & Taylor, 2013).

**LGBTQ-Affirmative Trainings**

A second step in creating supportive campus climates for LGBTQ student-athletes involves developing trainings for both student affairs professionals and student-athletes and coaches. LGBTQ-affirmative trainings might include information on constructs that are relevant to being an ally to the LGBTQ community, self-reflection activities to raise awareness and decrease the influence of prejudicial beliefs and biases, and preventative actions and bystander intervention strategies (Toomey et al., 2016). Based on the existing research, some of the constructs that are essential to include in these trainings are sexual and gender minority prejudice, institutional heterosexism, heterosexual privilege, and implicit bias (Carlson, McGeorge, & Toomey, 2013). Examples of preventative actions that could be taught within these trainings include how to create policies and team rules that promote positive and inclusive behaviors and language use as well as how to talk to teammates about the importance of being supportive of the LGBTQ community (Griffin & Taylor, 2013). Training on bystander intervention strategies could help coaches, athletes, and student affairs professionals effectively intervene when they witness anti-LGBTQ behaviors and language (Toomey et al., in press).

Coaches have a significant influence on the behaviors of their players (Anderson & Bullingham, 2015); thus, they should be directed to attend these trainings to help model intervention behaviors related to LGBTQ prejudice. Similarly, student-athletes who hold significant social power, such as team leaders or captains, also must be intentionally invited to attend these trainings, given that interventions appear to be more effective when the persons in a social network who hold the most power are directly involved (Dearing, 2009).

**Engagement With LGBTQ Communities**

In addition to offering trainings, student affairs professionals could create engagement opportunities with the LGBTQ community for heterosexual student-athletes and coaches. These engagement opportunities could facilitate the humanizing of the LGBTQ community, as existing research suggests that having meaningful interactions with individuals who society marginalizes decreases biases and increases compassion and understanding (Toomey et al., 2016). These engagement opportunities could involve student affairs professionals facilitating athletic teams attending LGBTQ community events, rallies for LGBTQ rights, and LGBTQ educational events (e.g., speakers in the community or on campus, film festivals). In addition, student affairs professionals could create campus events associated with Coming Out Week or Transgender Awareness Week and invite members from the local LGBTQ community to participate in or be involved in the planning and execution of these events. For example, athletic departments could work with student affairs professionals to make a video about LGBTQ inclusion that is played at all sporting events (e.g., You Can Play Project). Moreover, student affairs professionals could facilitate opportunities for LGBTQ student organizations to socialize with student-athletes and coaches by creating meaningful events that both groups are invited to attend.
Conclusion
Given that the existing research suggests that LGBTQ-related bias is still prevalent in the sports context, our hope is that student affairs professionals will use the below resources to implement LGBTQ-inclusive policies, create trainings focused on being an ally to LGBTQ-identified student-athletes, and establish engagement opportunities to facilitate interactions with their local LGBTQ community.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Athlete Ally: www.athleteally.org
Campus Pride: www.campuspride.org
Gay Games: www.gaygames.org
Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network’s Sports Project: www.sports.glsen.org
Go! Athletes: www.goathletes.org
NCAA Champions of Respect Guide: www.ncaa.org/about/resources/inclusion
Straight for Equality: www.straightforequality.org
You Can Play Project: www.youcanplayproject.org
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By the time this article is published, September 2017 will be a distant memory for some, but a monumental sequence of events for others. Beginning in August 2017, the United States, as well as surrounding nations of the South Pacific and Mesoamerica, fell victim to a series of natural disasters that carried truly devastating effects. South Texas and Florida, along with countries in the Caribbean, were heavily impacted by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma. The state of Oregon was ravaged by wildfire and the country of Mexico experienced an earthquake that left its population scrambling. Meanwhile, the rest of the world was left wondering if this rapid succession of life-threatening disasters was either interconnected or a mere coincidence.

In many ways, the common denominator of many recent environmental tragedies is an all too familiar foe, one that has more of a social impact than many individuals realize. The scientific community suggests that “human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed [climate] warming since the mid-20th century” (Stocker, 2014, p. 17). Higher temperatures and irregular rainfall have yielded an increased likelihood for natural disasters like hurricanes, earthquakes, wildfires, and typhoons to occur (McGuire, 2012). Although these concepts and causes have been widely debated over the past few decades, there is one collateral impact that is often overlooked: How do these natural disasters place an unequal strain on developing nations and marginalized communities?

It is widely known that developed areas contribute heavily to our planet’s carbon emissions, and research shows that communities that pollute the least are those hit hardest by resulting natural disasters or environmental hazards (Boden, Marland, & Andres, 2017; United Nations, 2016). Low-income areas and communities largely populated by people of color are inequitably exposed not only to natural disasters but to health risks such as polluted air and water, radiation, and disease (United Nations, 2016). Figure 1 below can illustrate how the aforementioned factors, along with a community’s economic mobility, often dictate the risk of being affected by natural disasters and the ability to recover or escape from damage, loss, and risk (Reese & Schmidt, 2008).

As student affairs practitioners, it is important to know that climate change impacts all communities; however, it is most important to understand how to facilitate conversations with students, of every identity, to help them understand that these issues are just as much about social justice as they are about environmental justice. It is essential to ask the following question: How can one’s interactions shape behavior to minimize the disproportionate impact on our marginalized populations?
The impact of a changing climate is rarely tangible and often unseen, which creates a challenge for educators. Although nothing can counteract the horrific impacts of environmental disasters, whether these are sudden tragedies or chronic living conditions, there are teachable moments embedded in many of these situations. Showing a student the reality of evacuations at institutions like the University of Houston or the health concerns of residents in Flint, Michigan, will ideally lead to an increased awareness of the social impact that comes with these environmental issues (LaPook, 2016; Roll, 2017). Many students have begun to understand how social justice impacts our communities in various complex ways, but students may struggle in creating the same connections for environmental justice. Much can be gained from explaining to students the similarities between these critical issues in society, and higher education institutions are the perfect place to start or continue these conversations. To make this connection, it may help to compare a natural disaster, such as a hurricane, to other forms of oppression, such as sexism or racism (J. Jones, personal communication, September 14, 2017). Although their causes and impacts may differ from each other, pointing out the similarities between environmental disasters and other forms of oppression can assist with engaging students in dialogue surrounding the topic of environmental justice. Examples of such similarities include the following:

1. Many victims experience a sense of hopelessness.
2. The impacts felt are stronger in certain populations and many do not understand the source of the threats.
3. Educators can play a crucial role in shifting the behaviors or narratives surrounding these issues.
4. Society cannot ignore their presence and severity then expect the oppressive systems to go away.

Bringing environmental justice issues into conversations is a great start, but should not be the only course of action. Educators must be able to leverage these teachable moments to provoke conscious behavior and social activism. The first step in helping students may be to help them understand or articulate how these phenomena impact them. For example, if there are students on campus with family who live in South Texas or with friends who go to the University of Miami, one could ask those students to imagine being in the same position or describe the kind of fear they would have leaving their home, not knowing if it will be standing upon their return. The next step is connecting these tangible threats to the elements of climate change—helping students realize that everyday actions, like driving a car or certain eating habits, can directly and indirectly lead to warming oceans, rising sea levels, and atmospheric changes that contribute to the dangerous realities of natural disasters and hazardous living conditions. Last, to provide realistic hope and necessary optimism, it is crucial to describe to students how they can help. Ask students what actions they can take tomorrow to minimize their impact on the climate and to influence others. That list of simple solutions could easily take another article to describe, but the short list includes civic engagement, donations, meatless Mondays, striving to take shorter showers, and riding a bike when possible. One can pair these behaviors with the ability to influence others to make similar changes in their lives. If individuals are successful in making these changes, it will be the first necessary step toward a population that promotes healthy lifestyles and positively impacts the health of all communities, particularly those of marginalized populations.
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Technological advances, particularly social networks and mobile technology, have profoundly influenced the landscape of higher education. Students' use of these platforms plays an important role in their civic engagement, interpersonal development, understanding of diverse cultures, leadership development, and learning (Kruger, 2013). Additionally, students continue to turn to social media for creative expression of identity and meaningful discourse with peers (Rowan-Kenyon et al., 2016).

Impact on Students
The array of technologies, particularly the proliferation of networked and mobile technologies, has shaped the experiences and expectations of students entering college in the 21st century. Younger students in particular are arriving on campus with a different understanding of a connected world. For better or worse, these students often incorporate technology into all aspects of their lives and utilize social media as a primary communication tool (Trowbridge, 2016). However, students entering our institutions are more diverse than previous generations and bring with them multiple identities and perspectives (U.S. Department of Education, 2016), including different experiences with and access to technology. Despite their differing levels of access to technology, many students have had an opportunity to broaden their viewpoints and share their identities prior to enrollment.

The evolution of technology is influencing the psychosocial development of students today. Technology has added a significant layer to the profession's hallmark student development theories. Technology has changed how students understand, develop, and share their identities, challenging traditional models of identity development (e.g., Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Erikson, 1968). Technology has also expanded traditional understandings of social environments (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979) by providing more opportunities for interaction with social networks on both a small and large scale—both on and off campus (Heiberger & Harper, 2008; Heiberger & Junco, 2011). For example, Ahlquist (2014) has made significant changes to traditional theoretical models of student development as a result of social networking use, which is perhaps the most defining characteristic of how many college students leverage technology to enhance their college experience.
Impact on Student Affairs Professionals

Networking and mobile technologies have also had a significant impact on student affairs professionals. The proliferation of social media throughout all levels of society, now coupled with quick and efficient access to information on mobile devices, has made social networking technologies particularly suitable for the wider educational community (Rowan-Kenyon et al., 2016). Many student affairs departments have incorporated social media into their operations to encourage community development, assess campus needs, and promote networking (Junco, 2014; Rowan-Kenyon et al., 2016). Social media platforms have helped student affairs professionals connect, support, and engage with students in ways that facilitate professional and interpersonal connections (Cabellon & Junco, 2015).

Scholars have called on student affairs professionals to incorporate social media into their work, asserting that those who can embrace these technologies demonstrate digital leadership in the field of higher education (Ahlquist, 2016; Cabellon & Junco, 2015; Junco, 2014). To leverage these benefits, educators must develop the mindset, fluency, and skills necessary to embrace social media and mobile technology (Cabellon & Junco, 2015). Student affairs professionals need to explore their own digital presence on social media platforms to become knowledgeable about the ever-changing digital landscape as well as how they can connect this understanding back to students (Ahlquist, 2016). As more of the collegiate experience is lived out online, educators will need to be intentional in conversations with students to help them think through their online decisions and the potential lifelong implications of these decisions (Ahlquist, 2016; Cabellon, 2011).

Recommendations

Student affairs administrators’ innovative technology use grounds future innovations for the profession. Cabellon’s (2016) technology implementation model provides one framework specific to student affairs. As you reflect on your own technology adoption throughout your career, consider the following recommendations for new, midlevel, and senior professionals.

Senior-Level Professionals. Catalyze change by having important conversations with student affairs staff about their professional and personal use of technology. Encourage staff and students to think critically about how they communicate online and how this represents the university. Create opportunities for staff and students to regularly disconnect from electronic communication, and model this behavior to present congruent leadership behavior.

Midlevel Professionals. Augment engagement by bringing together colleagues to develop a technology-related community of practice. This group may also serve as a divisional technology project review board to ensure a wide audience is engaged in division technology projects.

New Professionals. Assess your department’s engagement efforts through technology use, particularly video. For example, add web cameras to older computers to provide video chat options, record professional development offerings and post videos publicly (but ensure you are meeting basic accessibility standards by captioning all your videos), and stream events via Facebook Live or YouTube Live.
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Although hostile and anti-immigrant climates are not new to undocumented immigrant populations in the United States, the 2016 presidential election and the current political climate have exposed undocumented communities to more overt forms of racism and discrimination (Muñoz, 2017). On college campuses, undocumented students have also become a group targeted by White supremacists who promote xenophobic and hateful messages. For example, on April 2017, undocumented students at the University of Maryland College Park found chalking outside the student union with messages that said, “Deport dreamers” and “Build the wall” (Berkowitz, 2017). Similar messages were found at the University of California San Diego (Baker, 2016) and at Rutgers University (Nieto-Muñoz, 2016) a few months prior to the 2016 presidential elections.

With the surge of anti-immigrant sentiment on college campuses across the nation, an increasing number of higher education administrators are wondering about the steps they can take to better support undocumented students. When the Trump administration announced its plans to rescind Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) (U.S. Citizenship and Immigrations Services, 2017), many statements of support were released at different colleges and universities, but these statements can be perceived as merely symbolic when they are not met with concrete actions. We provide recommendations below, which have been developed by members of the undocumented student community that can help guide higher education administrators on the steps they can take to support undocumented students on their college campuses.
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Supporting and Advising

Undocumented Immigrants and Allies Knowledge Community
MORE ACTIONS, FEWER STATEMENTS: RECOMMENDATIONS TO SUPPORT UNDOCUMENTED COLLEGE STUDENTS
Make Financial Investments

- Universities should create a full-time position that works directly with undocumented students to demonstrate their commitment to this community. This position should be provided with ample financial and campus resources that allow for the speedy implementation of programs and services. When hiring full-time staff members, it is critical to examine the institution hiring practices to ensure that this role is fulfilled by someone who has a direct connection with the issues or has clearly demonstrated a commitment to undocumented students.
- Institutional development and alumni relations teams should establish endowment scholarships for undocumented immigrants.
- Colleges and universities should have emergency funds available to undocumented students and their families. Applying for these funds should not involve a lengthy application and bureaucratic process that could discourage people from submitting a request.
- Institutions should bring to their campuses paid trainers who can teach faculty, staff, and students about the needs of undocumented communities and share promising practices that can enhance undocumented students' experiences in higher education and beyond. Too often, undocumented students are the ones organizing and educating the community without compensation, while also juggling their academic, family, and work responsibilities.

Provide On-Campus Resources

- Universities should establish cohesive, funded programs for and with undocumented students. These programs should strive to empower undocumented students in addition to providing assistance with legal fees, social support, and academic resources.
- Various departments on college campuses can start their own scholarships, emergency funding accounts, and book-sharing programs for undocumented students to foster their retention.
- Career centers should create workshop series that help undocumented students develop short- and long-term career and employment plans, as well as prepare these students to advocate for their compensation so organizations do not take advantage of their labor. This could allow students to have a sense of financial stability and emotional well-being.
- Career centers should help employers understand more about hiring options for undocumented students, whether those are via direct employment or via contracts that may require the establishment of Limited Liability Companies (LLCs) by students.
- Counseling centers should specialize in offering support groups to undocumented students and their families, and individual counseling sessions at no cost.

Establish a Sense of Safety and Respect

- Administrators must avoid cooperating with Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents. This includes declaring that campus police will not be associated with ICE and that ICE agents will not be allowed to enter campus grounds. In addition, institutions should not invite ICE to career fairs to recruit students as potential employees.
- Colleges and universities must take into account the requests of undocumented students and involve them in the decision-making processes that will affect their experiences on campus.
- Institutions should avoid classifying undocumented students as international students across university systems because it places them in vulnerable situations and disregards their unique experiences. When undocumented students are classified as international students, they will typically be asked by admissions or registrar’s offices to provide proof of their visas (F1 student visa), which they are not eligible for. In addition, these students may be required to pay tuition as an international student and may sometimes be denied opportunities to apply for scholarships, work opportunities, or programs that are available only to domestic students. This can be especially problematic for students who are DACA recipients and are eligible for on-campus employment and scholarships.
- Universities should delve into deeper discussions of the politics of migration and the colonial legacies that drive displacement and mobility. Fostering these discussions can change the rhetoric of the good immigrant/bad immigrant and the Dreamer narrative that implies that only hardworking and high-achieving undocumented immigrants deserve to be here. Undocumented student centers and general programming can encourage this dialogue through events, while faculty and staff can support these conversations through their coursework, staff meetings, and other campus wide professional development workshops.

Move Beyond Allyship

- Staff and faculty must become accomplices to undocumented communities and enact change on campus despite contentions that may arise with the university administration. Higher education is not accessible to most working-class people, and this
lack of access is further compounded for people who are Indigenous, Black, Latinx, Asian, Pacific Islander, Desi, queer, or undocumented. As accomplices, administrators must recognize this larger picture and understand the multiple identities that undocumented students may embody. Therefore, as accomplice's administrators should work alongside their students to push for change more effectively.

- College and university administrators should be personally vocal about their support at their institutions, in their local communities, and on the state and national levels. It is key for administrators to speak about undocumented immigrants in contexts beyond higher education.
- Colleges and universities should lobby against the criminalization of immigrants, against detention centers, and for the expansion of in-state and financial aid policies, as well as for broader immigration reforms.

Universities as a whole must think critically about how their actions endanger, expose, and tokenize undocumented students and their families. Often, the presence of undocumented students on college campuses is used and displayed as evidence of inclusivity and accessibility. This perpetuates the “Dreamer” narrative, which only recognizes certain undocumented people, particularly undocumented students and youth, as worthy and productive to American society. This narrative creates hierarchies within the undocumented community and leaves the majority of undocumented people excluded. University administrators should divorce themselves from the idea that they are giving "voice" to undocumented students by providing them with programs that are underfunded and unsustainable. As accomplices, colleges and universities must meet their statements with actions and provide undocumented students the platform to speak for themselves and voice their needs. It is time for higher education institutions to acknowledge the humanity of undocumented students and the communities they are a part of, and not use their presence in the university to uplift the institution's visions of diversity and multiculturalism.
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Summary of Veterans Affairs Education Benefit Changes
The Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017, also known as the Colmery GI Bill, is the newest version of education benefits for veterans. In order to earn Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits, military personnel must spend 90 days or more on active duty. Under this act, a series of mandates for institutions of higher education and changes to eligibility will be rolled out over the next several years. This bill counts time National Guardsmen or reservists have spent receiving medical care for active duty injuries toward that 90-day active duty requirement (Student Veterans of America, 2017). There are also additional extensions for certain reservists or National Guard members who served after September 11, 2001, such as those who have been awarded a Purple Heart but did not have enough active duty time to qualify for 100% of education benefits through the Veterans Administration (VA) and Yellow Ribbon Program benefits. Additionally, the Yellow Ribbon Program has been expanded by the act to include veterans who are enrolled in education programs on a part-time basis (Student Veterans of America, 2017). Other updates include new calculations for the Basic Allowance for Housing, benefits for taking certification or licensure tests, and additional time and financial support for qualifying individuals to pursue a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) degrees.
Potential Impacts on Institutions of Higher Education

The Colmery GI Bill includes expansions of Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits and it also contains new regulations on how schools will interact with the Veterans Administration (VA). There are critics of the bill, such as Karen Gross in The Evolllution (2017), because it does not address predatory practices aimed at student veterans. Other critiques of the bill include that it does not go into effect immediately, which may delay some veterans’ entry into an academic program (Gross, 2017), or may cause a financial burden for currently enrolled veterans.

Limiting Reporting Fees

Section 304 of the bill dictates how reporting fees—fees currently paid to any institution by the VA to support certifying official training and veteran-related activities—can be used by the institution. According to the newest legislation, as of August 1, 2018, the reporting fees are to be used only for supporting student veterans, and cannot be merged with general funds. Currently, the reporting fees can be used to pay school certifying officials (SCOs) or cover their travel or training costs (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2017).

Certifying Official Training

Section 305 in the Colmery GI Bill states that beginning in academic year 2018-2019 there will be training requirements for SCOs, and that if schools do not comply with the training requirement the VA may “disapprove any course of education offered by such educational institution." The bill does not reference what this training may entail nor who will fund the training. Because some schools have one main SCO, with one or more secondary SCOs, this may impact them more significantly if the financial burden falls onto institutions instead of being funded by the federal government.

High Technology Pilot Program

Section 116 in the Colmery GI Bill describes a pilot program, called “high technology courses” for veterans to enroll in. These can include programs like coding boot camps or IT certifications (Student Veterans of America, 2017). Section 116 specifically defines a provider as an entity other than an institution of higher education, and a program as one that is not a degree program. Any program that meets the following qualifications is eligible to be awarded a High Technology Pilot Program contract: The school or company must be in operation for at least 2 years and the contracted program must be offered for at least 1 year. Additional qualifications are still undecided but approval criteria will be created by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Any program contracted would be paid on a sliding scale, and would not receive full payment for a student’s enrollment until that student gained employment after completion of the program.

Students enrolled, or being recruited to enroll, in a pilot program will not be protected against benefit loss or program changes. There is also no protection against predatory employer training programs that do not promise long-term gainful employment. Success of the pilot program will be assessed and reported on after 3 years. Students enrolled in this pilot program will be seeking specific career and certifications goals and might not engage in degree granting programs.

On-Campus Counseling

According to Section 307 of the bill, the Department of Veterans Affairs will select some institutions of higher education to house educational and vocational counseling for eligible veterans. The VA will select these locations to benefit the most veterans possible, and the chosen institutions will need to provide a space where services can be offered. Although this section has not yet been enacted, it has the potential to impact campuses in high-population areas. Campuses, along with their veterans, career, and counseling resource centers, should be ready to answer the call.

Priority Enrollment

Institutions will now need to report to the federal government if they offer priority course enrollment to student veterans. This does not mean that priority enrollment is mandatory, but it should be an item to review by institutional leadership as to how priority enrollment could potentially benefit their student veteran population.

Conclusion

Enhanced regulations at the federal level, and on-going regulations from the states, may place a heavy burden on campuses and institutions that have not already invested in veteran’s services. College and universities need to review the Colmery GI Bill carefully and note when each regulation goes into effect. Institutions should be increasingly aware of the pilot program for ‘high technology’ programs. These programs can give institutions an opportunity to review how previous experiences and education are counted toward degree programs. Institutions should also look at creating accessible STEM degrees to contribute to the long-term employability of student veterans and to complement their certificates or trainings.

As the VA rolls out more regulations related to benefit usage and institutional accountability, campuses should review current programs, policies, and procedures impacting the student veteran population, and when necessary seek to allocate additional resources to support student veterans. Postsecondary institutions can play an important role in preparing military-connected students for employment in the civilian or government sectors. Research suggests that investment in resources
for student veterans increases their enrollment (Military Family Research Institute at Purdue University, 2015), and that student veterans have a persistence rate of about 72%, higher than other student populations (Cate, Lyon, Schmeling, & Bogue, 2017). Institutions have a responsibility to support the military-connected population on their campus in their transitional needs and to stay informed of the ever-evolving federal and state legislation impacting continued enrollment, graduation, and student veteran success in the workplace.
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In so many ways, this is my love letter to women of color, both in the past and in the present, who continue to challenge the field of student affairs. It is dedicated to the women of color who yearn for change and who remain undaunted even in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

Women of Color and the Power of Intersectionality

As higher education becomes more diverse, the opportunities for and the importance of leadership by talented women of color in student affairs continue to grow. Women of color in student affairs bring with them unique perspectives that enable them to serve as intersectionality experts, intimately familiar with the convergence of personal and group identities, power dynamics, and sources of knowledge.

The concept of intersectionality asserts that an individual's position within the world is simultaneously classed, gendered, and raced, which results in unique experiences (Collins, 2009; Crenshaw, 1991; hooks, 1992). Intersectionality considers the micro understandings of individual identity as well as the macro-level systems of social domination and inequality (Collins, 2009; Crenshaw, 1991). On a micro level, women of color may personally experience such forms of oppression as classism, racism, and sexism as a result of their multiple, intersecting identities. On a macro level, women of color may experience structural forms of oppression that further marginalize and diminish opportunity for this group. Rather than fall victim to these challenges, however, women of color have resisted against oppression and become agents of social change.

Women of color have been at the forefront of change, speaking out against inequities, challenging the status quo, and ensuring sustainable change. Unlike quick fixes, encouraging sustainable change calls on individuals to become architects of reform. Sustainable change requires a thorough understanding of the complexities associated with inciting change within higher education. As such, women of color within student affairs can play a dynamic role in the development of our students, staff, and leaders. Moving toward the goal of a more equitable society, women of color are uniquely positioned to analyze complex issues from multiple perspectives and draw on multiple forms of knowing in order to determine ways of pushing forward with change in higher education and in other social contexts.
Women of Color as Intersectional Change Agents
It is imperative for women of color to understand our spheres of influence and harness our power therein. Women of color bring with them cultural community wealth and funds of knowledge that make them uniquely positioned to successfully approach the complex issues that face our institutions (Yosso, 2005). This asset-based approach invokes the rich history of women of color as change agents and harnesses the power of intersectional identities as assets and a means of resistance, rather than solely one of oppression, as is often seen with deficit perspectives. Women of color in student affairs should embrace their roles as catalysts for systemic change by utilizing the understandings and tools from their intersectional experiences to facilitate change.

To do this, women of color might reflect on their own identities as change agents, engage in multiple mentoring relationships, and aspire to transformative leadership roles within the field. This requires women of color to recognize present structures of power and oppression as well as understand and develop their various intersecting identities. Understanding the current landscape both within and beyond higher education is critical to dismantling inequities present within our systems. This means reading widely in order to stay current and deepening one's understanding of the higher education landscape.

Crucial to understanding that landscape is also exploring one's own identity as a change agent. It is about exploring why one feels compelled to see change occur, contemplating how one would like to see that change manifest, and determining what experiences nurture one's soul as a woman of color and inspire an identity as a change agent. Committing to reflection habits, whether through writing or discussion with others or establishing annual self-assessments, is an excellent way to nurture development and challenge oneself to engage in meaningful change.

In terms of mentorship, women of color in student affairs should seek mentors within this growth process, connect with other women of color who are on similar journeys, and challenge the systems around them to become more inclusive of intersectional identities. More experienced mentors have the ability to both support growth as well as challenge individuals to refine their goals as a change agent. Connecting with other like-minded women of color can energize one's own efforts and provide an opportunity to come together for a united collective impact. This collective impact has the ability to create a shared vision of sustainable change in order to shift institutional thinking to become more inclusive of a range of ideas and honor an understanding of individuals as complex beings. Women of color can accomplish these goals by engaging with and taking leadership positions within their local or national organizations as well as dedicating time both to being mentored as well as to mentoring up-and-coming leaders.

In order to make systematic change, women of color cannot be bridled by fear and must be unafraid to become transformational leaders. It is our collective responsibility to provide a voice for the voiceless and utilize our unique perspective to confront challenges that exist within our local and national contexts. Transformational leadership calls on women of color to identify these challenges, envision the changes, and work within our communities to execute those changes. This means maintaining a growth mindset and continuously seeking opportunities to enhance and exercise your leadership skills.

Supporting Women of Color: A Call to Feminism
Beyond for women of color, this article is also a call to feminism for all individuals, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or other identities. All student affairs professionals should commit to serving as allies, mentors, and sponsors of women of color. Student affairs professionals can act as allies for women of color by supporting their efforts as change agents, establishing a culture of inclusivity, and creating a space in which the voices of women of color can be heard and their suggestions acted on. On a micro level, these acts enable women of color to feel validated within their communities and confident to engage in the process of change knowing that both their presence and perspectives are respected. On a macro level, these acts work to dismantle many of the historical inequities that women of color have faced by recognizing the importance of this group in facilitating systemic change.

As a Latina rising through my student affairs program and now as an assistant professor of higher education, I have felt the undeniable strength that has been gained as a result of exploring deep within myself what it means to be a change agent and how to cultivate a community of women of color and allies who are also invested in change. It is my hope that this article will not only speak to women of color in student affairs and in the communities they serve but also provide insight for those who support and encourage them in creating systemic change.

References


NASPA partners with CollegiateParent on this journal. Just think what we could do for you!

Are you looking to enhance student, family and community engagement, especially with your FIRST-GENERATION and SPANISH-SPEAKING communities?

CollegiateParent offers the cost effective communications tools you and your teams need in:

- ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS
- PARENT AND FAMILY PROGRAMS
- ORIENTATION/FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE
- FINANCIAL AID
- MULTICULTURAL, DIVERSITY & INCLUSION
- RESIDENCE LIFE
- HEALTH AND WELLNESS
- CAREER SERVICES
- DEVELOPMENT & FUNDRAISING

Talk to us about our English and Spanish:

- Specialty Content Packages (6 or 12 article) for websites, newsletters and social media
- Digital newsletters
- Ready-to-share print guides
- Fully and semi-custom print guides for Student Affairs departments and events

START TODAY WITH A FREE WEEKLY ARTICLE TO SHARE WITH YOUR COMMUNITY AT COLLEGIATEPARENT.COM/PARTNERS. To find out more, contact Liza Purvis at lpurvis@collegiateparent.com or 303.625.1712