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I am delighted to share with you the 2019 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.

In Los Angeles, we will gather to honor and celebrate 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 our profession. Given this focus, you will find reflected within the articles research updates, emerging trends, and promising practices that I hope will assist you in innovating and creating change on your campuses.

I want to express my gratitude to the 2019 NASPA KC Publication Committee, led by Tracy Poon Tambascia, for their contributions to this current body of knowledge within higher education. I also want to thank the numerous authors who contributed content on behalf of their respective knowledge communities. Both of these groups have given selflessly of their time to NASPA in order to make this publication come to life.

I hope that you find time in Los Angeles to engage with 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.
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Over the past several years, free tuition programs have become popular options for many states and politicians to offer. These programs seem to provide resources to citizens who presumably would not otherwise have access to postsecondary education while creating a more educated workforce for the jurisdiction. Most of these programs focus on students who are enrolling at community colleges and public four-year institutions. But because of the way many of these programs are structured, they do not affect the students who need the most support. Instead, they often benefit the students who need the tuition support least.

Government support of higher education has occurred in myriad ways over the years, including the Morrill Act of 1862, the GI Bill of 1944, and the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965. Each of these examples either funded the actual creation of institutions (Morrill Act) or created tuition programs for students (GI Bill and the Pell Grant program from the HEA of 1965), which allowed the country to benefit from an increasingly educated population. The benefits of a college-educated citizenry include adults who are healthier, more likely to vote, and more likely to be employed. Moreover, two thirds of future jobs will require a postsecondary degree or credential (Ma, Pender, & Welch, 2016). Through these programs, the government is seeking to fund an economic driver while creating opportunities for students to gain knowledge and job skills without saddling them with debt. However, the way the programs are structured—both in how students gain access to the dollars and what costs can be funded—challenge this potential goal.

As Tiffany Jones, director of higher education policy for Ed Trust, has stated, “People assume free college means free, and they’re not understanding that too often these policies don’t cover the costs of attendance” (Smith, 2018). Free tuition programs can take many forms, but the most popular state-level programs are those considered “last-dollar programs.” Last-dollar programs cover only remaining tuition after other forms of federal and state aid have been used. These programs often do not cover the needs of the poorest students, as these students likely do not have to pay tuition and fees anyway owing to their
income level. However, these students often struggle with other college costs, including housing, transportation, and textbooks. The cost of college attendance comprises several components, including tuition, other fees, room and board, books, transportation, and other living expenses. Free tuition programs cover only one portion of this equation.

To maximize the equity of the opportunities for students who would not normally attend college due to cost of attendance, versus lowering the costs for students who can afford other college-related expenses due to free tuition programs, two organizations, The Education Trust and Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP), have created criteria by which governmental programs can be judged. The Education Trust's eight criteria for "equity driven free college policy" (Jones & Berger, 2018) include the following:

1. Helps low-income students cover living (i.e., nontuition) costs
2. Covers the cost of fees (in addition to the cost of tuition)
3. Covers the cost of tuition for at least 4 years of college
4. Cover the cost of tuition for bachelor's degree programs at four-year institutions
5. Provides benefits for adult and returning students
6. Does not impose GPA requirements beyond what is needed to maintain eligibility for federal financial aid
7. Does not impose enrollment intensity or credit accumulation requirements beyond what is needed to maintain eligibility for federal financial aid
8. Does not demand the repayment of aid

The Education Trust encourages programs that create equity to maximize their impact by structuring them in a way that encourage and increases students’ completion of four-year degrees. Similarly, IHEP looks to responsibly steward taxpayer dollars toward students of limited means (Poutre & Voight, 2018). The review criteria it uses include the following:

- Invest first and foremost in low-income students
- Fund nontuition expenses for low-income students
- Include four-year colleges
- Support state need-based grant programs
- Avoid restrictive or punitive requirements

A review of both programs’ criteria shows that the programs focus on low-income students, tuition for four-year institutions, and avoiding onerous eligibility requirements. In this way, both organizations aim to be able to best focus aid on those populations that need it most and often have the most difficult time completing degrees.

Other organizations take a different approach to the free tuition issue. The College Promise Campaign is a national, nonpartisan initiative to build broad public support for funding the first two years of higher education for hard-working students, starting in America's community colleges. The campaign's website describes the organization's approach as it seeks to build broad public understanding that funding the first two years of a community college education for students working toward graduation is an investment in America's future. In addition to these efforts, the campaign has also researched how to best help students complete their course of study.

In their study Promise with a Purpose: College Promise Programs “Built for Completion,” the College Promise Campaign, Complete College America, and Achieving the Dream advocated for states, cities, and institutions to
incorporate an intentional framework for student success into College Promise programs, such as free tuition programs. The report seeks to inform program developers about how they can increase graduation rates. The report shows that program recipients are most likely to graduate if they:

- Complete 30 credits per year (including fall, winter, spring, and summer terms),
- Meet at least monthly with their assigned counselor, as well as
- Visit with faculty in person (i.e. use office hours).

Some ways that institutions can make completion more likely include: making remedial courses co-requisites, not prerequisites; ensuring that students register for all classes based on their degree maps; and providing students with financial affordability support (Report, 2018).

As shown through these various examples, there are many ways to create access to higher education for students. The programs listed do not include any of the approaches that have been implemented by private institutions, such as New York University’s free medical school tuition program, or the approach by many Ivy League schools to provide cost of attendance to students whose family income falls below certain levels. All these efforts make strides and increase access for those who would not normally attend four-year colleges. As state and federal policymakers develop free tuition programs for both community and four-year colleges, thoughtful considerations of the various pitfalls, total cost of attendance, equity, and completion of four-year degrees should be considered, and the purpose behind the programs should be fully developed. Efforts should focus on creating programs that address the totality of the costs of college and promote completion of programs, not on creating politically popular programs.
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Graduate students in American colleges and universities represent about 14.7% of all students, and their numbers are on the rise (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2018). Garner (2009) asserted that there is a perception among many student affairs administrators that “the graduate student is completely self-aware and entirely developed upon entering graduate school, almost as if the development of the student ceases upon graduation from an undergraduate institution” (p. 4). Have the graduate and professional students who have successfully navigated their way through all their undergraduate student development programs reached the limit of their development? I certainly do not believe this to be true!

Health professions and related programs were the third most conferred master’s degrees between the years 2000–01 through 2015–16 (NCES, 2018). Over the same period, health professions and related programs was the most conferred doctoral degree in the United States (NCES, 2018). At the NASPA 2018 annual conference, my colleagues and I, representing State University of New York (SUNY) Downstate Medical Center, shared a few examples of our comprehensive support network to help our students navigate their academic programs and the institution. Support for our talk was overwhelming. The programs we shared were specific to our student counseling services, our College of Medicine’s peer...
wellness program, and Career and Residency Exploration (C.A.R.E.) programs (Alger, Akhtar, & Putman, 2018). Anecdotally, I’ve noticed that many graduate medical health professional students are on the surface Type A (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974), or competitive, focused, intelligent, and always in a hurry. However, these students need help developing an inclusive environment to foster their academic and personal success, similar to undergraduates. Success and persistence for these students begins with understanding the transitions that occur between either undergraduate education or the workforce and being a graduate or professional student in the health professions specifically.

SUNY Downstate Medical Center, my campus, is a stand-alone graduate health professions and medical campus in Brooklyn, New York. This urban campus is home to five colleges/schools, and approximately 1,800 graduate medical professional students. The rigor of SUNY Downstate’s programs is intense; for example, our second-year medical students study for 6 weeks before taking their U.S. Medical Licensing Exam (Step 1). Not passing this exam significantly alters their academic progress, so students are understandably anxious about it. There is a lack of empirical work discussing the specific mental health challenges graduate students face, apart from alcohol and other drug use and abuse. I know from experience that some of the most common reasons students seek our counseling services are anxiety about academics, eating disorders, and self-esteem or self-confidence.

Our counseling center sees students with developing eating disorders. These are not necessarily common body image-related eating issues, but issues related to not eating at all or not getting appropriate nutrition. Some students spend so much time studying that they don’t even make the time to eat! Some have also expressed concerns about how they can be a healer when they identify as extremely wounded. This speaks volumes to the pressure students put on themselves. Consequently, our staff is trained on how to identify when a student is in crisis; protocols are in place to ensure students are triaged appropriately. When a student reports they are in crisis, staff is able to determine whether the student should receive immediate care from a mental health professional or if they can be scheduled for an appointment in the future. Regardless of the complexity or severity of the issues students may present, they are never left alone when they report they are in crisis.

Our student counseling center is staffed with a part-time director and two part-time counselors. The counselors’ hours allow a flexible range of availability to accommodate students’ schedules. The counselors also find it to their advantage to be part time so they can establish their own private practices outside their work with the institution. Students are offered up to 12 counseling sessions per year as a short-term approach to navigating their mental health concerns. With careful coordination to ensure students are seen by physicians not participating in their clinical training, the University Hospital Department of Psychiatry serves as a longer-term solution, or students are referred to private practices.

Following our NASPA 2018 presentation, my colleagues and I also received several inquiries about how to logistically develop a robust peer mentorship program for health sciences graduate students who might be facing significant mental health challenges. We worked with students to identify the needs of fellow classmates. The students created the program on their own! Our peer mentor program is an entirely peer-led, designed, and evaluated initiative, supported and funded by the Office of Student Affairs. Designed for first-year medical students, the program features second-year medical students serving as mentors to several incoming students, providing facilitation for seven transition-related and wellness-related topics presented in small-group sessions. These small-group sessions are designed to encourage dialogue between students to normalize feelings of isolation, fear, and other stress-related factors. At year end, mentees are invited to share their experience. Their feedback is used to modify the following year’s program, to ensure it remains relevant. Program recipients reported a 7% decrease in depression when compared with another SUNY institution using psychometricly validated scales (Kim et al., 2017). Students also presented their program successes at the Association of American Medical Colleges national conference.
Finally, even though medical students have selected a profession, they still need career services; our C.A.R.E. program provides these services. This program curriculum, based on our students’ academic year, facilitates career mentoring by faculty, upper-class students, and alumni. Students are also provided specialty advising by their clinical advisors and are offered specialty selection programs and research mentors. Prior to and during the residency process, students are engaged in activities and workshops, such as selecting a specialty, interviewing strategies, and engaging in practical opportunities to coach them through the process.

Graduate and professional students steadily comprise a larger portion of the students on U.S. campuses, and they are not done baking yet! Students who participate in co-curricular programming are able to develop self-reflective behaviors by learning through critical, affective, and cognitive experiences. How are you purposely supporting graduate and professional students on your campus?
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As higher education institutions move toward inclusive practices, a gap remains between the ways many universities both define and support posttraditional students. Posttraditional students, which many used to call nontraditional, have seen not only a change in verbiage but also a shift in their defining qualities. Soares (2013) explained, “Post-traditional learners are individuals already in the workforce who lack a postsecondary credential yet are determined to pursue further knowledge and skills while balancing work, life, and education responsibilities” (p. 2). This shift in verbiage represents an acknowledgment of the transformation occurring in society. While many higher education policies still view students in a traditional linear life plan, (i.e., full-time undergraduate student), other students are seeing life through a blended approach, incorporating different parts of their life together at a single time (Aslanian, 1983, p. 558). By examining posttraditional students through theoretical models, including Tinto’s 2016 writings regarding his model of student departure and Schlossberg’s (2012) theory of transition, several practice and policy changes can be made by administrators to better support posttraditional students.

Tinto’s Theory of Student Departure, written in 1975, is a well-known theory regarding retention and is the basis for many policies, procedures, and retention programs. However, in one of his most recent writings, Tinto (2016) redefined the idea of retention, explaining: “Students, however, do not seek to be retained. They seek to persist. The two perspectives, although necessarily related, are not the same. Their interests are different” (p. 1). Tinto went on to define self-efficacy, sense of belonging, and perceived value of the curriculum as significant reasons students persist. Current policies and procedures rarely emphasize these three areas, creating a gap between a student’s wishes for their higher education experience and an administrator’s view of the experience.

Posttraditional students also face gaps when they transition back to the classroom. Job advancement or career changeover (e.g., military to student) are examples of transitions that posttraditional students might encounter. The term transition is defined as “any event or nonevent resulting in change in relationships, routines, assumptions, and roles” (Anderson, Goodman, & Schlossberg, 2012, p. 39). These transitions may be planned or unplanned life events. No matter the cause, if student affairs professionals understand that posttraditional students may be going through transitions similar to those of traditional undergraduate students, campus policies can reflect a willingness to support this group. Schlossberg’s (2012)
theory of transitions has four main pillars: (1) situation, (2) self, (3) support, and (4) strategy. Support encompasses not only the organization or institution itself but its people the student would be turning to for help (Workman, 2015).

Takeaways: Support and a Sense of Belonging
As noted in both Tinto’s (2016) and Schlossberg’s (1984) theories, support and a sense of belonging are tangible first steps for administrators to redefine how they perceive their students.

Sense of Belonging
The first area administrators need to address is students’ sense of belonging on a college campus. Policies need to start focusing on what Tinto (2016) stated, that “students have to come to see themselves as a member of a community of other students, faculty and staff who value their membership—that they matter and belong” (p. 1). Often, posttraditional students are in a separate silo from traditional students. When student affairs professionals design programs, policies, and activities, posttraditional needs are the afterthought. To counter this, Tinto (2016) provided a great next step, saying, “In the social realm, institutions can take steps to provide for a diversity of social groups and organizations that allow all students to find at least one smaller community of students with whom they share a common bond” (p. 1). As we direct our missions and visions for departments, we can create this shared sense of belonging. Missions and visions that emphasize student experiences, student support, and community development can provide a tangible reminder for administrators as they implement policies and procedures. By emphasizing our knowledge of students’ desires to be included in every activity we create, we will not only design a more supportive environment but also assist both students and administrators toward their goal of persistence.

Support
As an example of posttraditional students, student veterans are a population that can benefit from the changing climate in higher education. At a minimum, universities provide certification for veterans’ benefits. However, there is often a lack of additional resources or services that directly support veteran students. Because the military is reducing its numbers and increasing the educational benefits provided under the current G.I. Bill (Kirchner, 2015), this population will be expanding. Student affairs administrators are in a place to design initiatives to help this group transition into college life. Designing programs that educate faculty and professional staff should be a top priority for administrators. According to Griffin and Gilbert (2015),

“...Our findings suggest that while veterans’ offices and advocates were helpful in terms of providing information and guidance in navigating bureaucratic systems, encounters with administrators who did not have accurate information or who were perceived as rude and unhelpful made transitions more challenging and uncertain. (p. 90)...

In addition, student veterans are typically older, independent, and on their own since high school; some have families; and they do not participate in the activities that their undergraduate counterparts do—all of which create barriers that are unique to this group (Francis & Kraus, 2012). To counter these issues, a second option for administrators is to intentionally train advisors for military students similar to advisors that are dedicated to student athletes. Rubin (2015) explains that [Student athlete] advisors can have a crucial role in assisting student athletes succeed in other areas of campus life and beyond, not just their sport. Using this same principle, having a committed, well-educated advisor proficient in student veteran needs, could benefit student veterans, much like the student athlete, in their success at the higher education institution.

This is just one example of a population that could benefit from the suggested changes. Redesigning missions, visions, policies, and practices with both Tinto (2016) and Schlossberg (1984) as base theories will positively affect posttraditional student persistence, creating a more supportive and intentional environment.
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Approaches to establish an adequate academic and professional standing to advance in student affairs administration vary along individual, institutional, demographic, experiential, and personal values and interests (Hammonds, 2012). Kanter (1977, 1993) explored the structure and opportunities, examined proportional employee representation, and investigated factors and implications related to career limitations and barriers to advancement in corporate and professional settings. Research on career trajectory limitations for professionals of color in the areas of student affairs, faculty, and academic leadership outlines societal, internal, and governmental barriers as consistently challenging across gender, faculty, and professional lines (Daniel, 2011; Hammonds, 2012; Jackson & O’Callaghan 2009; Wordlow, 2018). These factors compel exploration into the unique challenges and specific strategies for career trajectory planning by Black student affairs professionals.

Establish Voice and Values

Amey, Jessup-Anger, and Tingson-Gatuz (2015) explain the value of gaining familiarity with decision making, policies, and information networks and establishing mentor relationships as tools to learn an institution’s organizational and political realities. While learning the university, Black professionals must clearly state, articulate, and live by a self-defined system of values. Values, according to Kouzes and Posner (2008), “silently give direction to the hundreds of decisions made at all levels of the organization every day” (p. 65). No matter the position within the organization, Black professionals must identify spaces to share their values—through discussion; in writing; and with
supervisors, direct reports, and colleagues. By establishing these core beliefs, Black professionals are positioned to establish a value agenda prior to any assumptions or other environmental factors that may undermine the foundation of a solid transition into the organization.

**Leveraging Assessment**
One critical factor in career growth is developing the ability to leverage measurable outcomes and data to express the breadth and scope of effective job performance. The collection, utilization, and communication of data is key to a professional’s success, whether in assessing programs, allocating resources, or determining the ability of an institution to meet accreditation standards (Birnbaum 1988; Henning & Roberts, 2016). Integrating assessment into daily practices allows Black student affairs professionals to effectively express work in language and terms that executive leaders, fiduciary stakeholders, and colleagues in the academy will embrace. Henning and Roberts (2016) discussed the emphasis placed on assessment by senior student affairs officers. Black professionals who seek those roles benefit from developing assessment plans and increasing familiarity with tools to measure learning, revenue impact, program success, and student completion trends. This focus provides an invaluable resource for executive leadership while developing skills that will be useful in the future.

**Early Ownership of the Evaluation Process**
Shapiro and Stefkovich (2011) postulated that “society contains many groups that have not always been given equal treatment and/or have not had a level field on which to play” (p. 114). Black professionals are a member of one of the groups referenced in this discussion. Within the context of student affairs, Amey et al. (2015) discussed the increased stress and transitional dissonance that new professionals, especially people of color, experience in settings that provide little or insufficient onboarding. The lack of adequate training is exacerbated for professionals who “might be unsure about the questions to ask or are afraid of appearing insecure” (Amey et al., 2015, p. 24), which increases reluctance to seek feedback. An additional barrier can be caused by the crisis-focused nature of some supervisors within the student affairs enterprise, which may intersect with a lack of clear training, these issues can be especially compounded for Black professionals who may already experience a disconnect within the milieu of a department, division, or campus.

Historically, lack of clarity about responsibilities has been a barrier to retention of new and senior-level black professionals in higher education (Hammonds, 2012; Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009). When mitigating this historical issue, an important equalizer lies in clarifying the evaluation process. Whether new or seasoned employees, Black professionals benefit from familiarity with the standards, measures, and expectations for performance evaluation within an organization. While evaluation and feedback may be an annual process from a supervisor’s perspective, it is often detrimental for Black professionals whose first introduction to evaluation standards comes at the end of an academic year. To avoid the historical pitfall described above, Black professionals should take the additional step of requesting standards for evaluation and feedback from their supervisors in the beginning, as well as initiating discussions to ascertain key performance indicators and supervisory priorities. Once performance expectations are clear and agreed on, they should immediately be committed to writing and returned to the supervisor to confirm a shared understanding. In a unionized environment, it is equally imperative to review and understand standards for evaluation and corrective action within the appropriate collective bargaining agreement, to ensure that the supervisor is adhering to those guidelines.

**Creating Support Systems**
In a study of leadership practices among professionals in student affairs, Daniel (2011) postulated, “Black professionals highly value and embrace the kind of leadership behaviors and activities that inspire, support, and acknowledge their employees for their contributions” (p. 100). Wordlow (2018) examined the career advancement of Black women in chief academic officer roles, noting an “emphasis on the role of mentorship in career development” (p. 110) among participants in her study.
At the nexus of career advancement is the establishment of a support system built on mentors who are available for honest ideation, dialogue, and critique. Black professionals may rely on mentors to provide guidance in developing professional career trajectory plans, navigating challenges to values within the college environment, and balancing personal lives and career. Mentor relationships can be useful when mitigating nuanced factors often exacerbated by micro- and macro-aggressions within institutional contexts.

**Conclusion**

Developing career trajectory strategies for Black professionals in student affairs requires mentorship, a focus on assessment, clarity of evaluation standards, and the development of targeted skills that will enhance the career ascent. Black professionals who initiate the levers suggested above are positioned to sustain and thrive within campus administrative environments.
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"Our heritage gives life to our spirit" is a Chamorro proverb that lays a foundation for knowing, being, and understanding. The Chamorro people of Guåhan (Guam) believe that no decision shall be made without the consent of a strong woman leader, the maga’håga (Cunningham, 1992). Similar beliefs of the unique power, influence, and leadership of Indigenous Pacific women are shared throughout Oceania. The Indigenous Pacific population is among the fastest growing, and more than 51% of it is women; however, within the educational industry there remains a clear absence of Indigenous Pacific professionals who can serve as leaders (U.S. Census, 2014; Empowering Pacific Islander Communities, 2014). Although the literature calls for the diversification of culturally sustaining leaders (Perez Hattori, 2016), an underrepresentation of women of color remains (Hune, Moses, & Turner 2011). Additionally, a dearth of literature exists about Indigenous Pacific female leadership in higher education (Ideta, 1996). To address the visible absence of Indigenous Pacific women in senior administrative roles, on higher education boards, as CEOs, and in professional associations, one must understand the untapped cultural leadership resources innate in Indigenous Pacific women.

The following research questions were foundational to this research journey which honors Indigenous storytelling as a decolonized research method:

- How does the cultural heritage of Indigenous Pacific women in higher education shape their leadership philosophies and behaviors in higher education?
- How do the leadership philosophies and behaviors of Indigenous Pacific women in higher education influence their interests in advancing into senior administrator positions?
Summary of the Literature

Remembering, survivance, and regeneration are Indigenous Pacific beliefs which support the sacred duties of indigenous communities to educate the youth in order to perpetuate language and values (Aguon, 1979; Souder-Jaffery, 1992; Underwood, 1988). Indigenous worldviews include specific analysis of indigeneity, resilience, and leadership. Indigeneity is centered on one’s relationship to the land, common spiritual bond, language use and sacred history (Holm, Pearson, & Chavis, 2003). Historical and current leadership frameworks provide a contrast between Western hegemonic narratives and indigenous leadership. The indigenous leadership model from Minthorn and Chavez (2015) served as this study’s conceptual framework, with a focus on four tenets: (1) who we are, (2) what is known, (3) what we do, and (4) what we strive to embody. Philosophical foundations centered on existentialism, the ethics of care, relationships, and dialogue (Noddings, 2012). From a philosophical perspective, relationships that educational leaders possess are factors that affect their decisions and career paths. Literature on the diversification of college employees posits the need for more Asian Pacific Islander female leaders who can influence student retention.

Methodology

Qualitative narrative design aligns with Indigenous Pacific traditions of storytelling to build respect and acknowledge relationships, and it allows the storyteller to share in their way and at their pace (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). This study used storytelling to understand the personal narratives, lived experiences, opinions, feelings, perceptions, knowledge, and aspirations (Benham, 2007).

Wisdom

The voices of eight maga’håga resulted in six emergent themes with subthemes. Use of the Chamorro language (which is defined in parentheses) was intentional to honor and validate indigenous ways of knowing and being.

Theme One: Cultural Heritage Cultivates the Leader

The manmaga’håga (plural) cultural upbringing was grounded in their ancestries, which fueled their leadership philosophies, beliefs, and behaviors. The experiences that the manmaga’håga shared were described through the three subthemes of natibu (indigeneity), minagåhetna (authenticity), and fuestan-famalo’an (female empowerment). The ability to be authentic was supported by cultural practices and traditions. Knowledge of cultural heritage was healing and empowering.

Theme Two: Relationships Are Central in Leadership

Relationships framed the manmaga’håga roles and responsibilities in higher education, along with the three subthemes of inadahi (care), na’i-aturidat (empower), and chenchule’ (reciprocity). Empowering others was viewed as a part of one’s purpose, and reciprocity was a required component of successful relationships.

Theme Three: Community Inspires Wisdom and Strength

Two subthemes of inafa’maolek (collective responsibility) and famai’che’cho’ (resilience) emerged. Collective responsibility was a primary purpose of leading. Creating environments and a sense of belonging for others was inherent. Resilience reinforced personal and cultural leadership behaviors, particularly in understanding and navigating the Western leadership environment.

Theme Four: Lessons Instill Growth and Purpose

Challenges the manmaga’håga experienced increased skill sets and reinforced intrinsic motivations. The lessons learned developed their abilities to be influential leaders with courage and strong political acumen.

Theme Five: Mentors Are Significant Along the Journey

Fafa’nå’gue (mentors) served as navigators who instilled strength, guided careers, and helped define purpose. Mentors also instilled the importance of gifting others.

Theme Six: Advancement Is About Legacy, Not Title

The aspirations of the manmaga’håga focused on preserving their taotao (people) and tåno’i (land), and on creating pathways for mañe’lu (sisters) over personal goals of obtaining high-level administrator positions.
Findings
Descendants of ancient matriarchal leaders, the eight Indigenous Pacific women in higher education today have as their goal the nourishment of the youth who they believe are destined to build a better future. Their shared narratives illuminated that caring for students, community, and the environment required developing and nurturing meaningful relationships with others. In addition, their connections to one’s cultural histories, practices, and experiences are instrumental in developing leader confidence, capacity, and purpose. Genuine dialogue is a catalyst to one’s personal growth and development. Lessons learned from personal experiences, teachers, and mentors influences one’s career aspirations. And bridging cultural community into the workplace mission is believed to increase retention of Indigenous staff and students.

Recommendations
The collective voices of the manmaga’håga have led to the development of the following recommendations for higher education administrators and practitioners. Administrators must examine current employment and retention practices to improve recruitment and professional development through intentional partnerships with Indigenous Pacific community organizations. A transformation of leadership paradigms, praxis, and pedagogies is needed to incorporate Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and learning, particularly by teaching Indigenous research methodologies at the graduate level and by eliminating the use of oppressive terminology. Recommendations for practice include (a) developing an online database for an Indigenous Pacific Women in Higher Education Genealogy Project that collects and provides information on conferences, meetings, journals, research, and professionals that are of Indigenous Pacific decent; (b) creating a Sisters of Oceania Network to provide a space of courage and shared narratives; and (c) developing an Indigenous Pacific Women Leadership Pipeline that uses storytelling as a method of cultivating leaders. In closing, these recommendations must be recognized by educational leaders as indispensable components of diversifying female administration with Indigenous Pacific women.
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Technological advancements transformed the landscape of student data in higher education. Higher education institutions value student data to inform decisions, and technological advancements improve how higher education leaders apply that data to practice. Student data encompasses beyond personal information, grade point average, test scores, or total credits. Higher education institutions collect massive amounts of data in the hope of understanding and anticipating student successes and challenges. Data mining informs predictive data analytics to suggest students’ success and retention—two key factors that appeal to leaders in higher education. The past and present applications of student data raise concerns for the ethics and responsibility with handling sensitive information; however, university leaders must not ignore the future promises of data mining in hopes to propel student success and retention efforts.

Past Applications of Student Data
Historically, school administrators have understood student data primarily to include information about attendance and student performance (Hutt, 2016). However, since the 1800s, the use of student data has developed to reflect societal, economical, and political demands—alongside technological advancement. Examples include educational standardization and accreditation, financial aid and budgeting, and the G.I. Bill and draft deferments during the Vietnam War (Hutt, 2016). As the applications for student data become more sophisticated, the need for protection and privacy becomes a priority in education.

What Is Data Mining?
Data mining combines elements from computer science, education, and statistics to understand large amounts of data (Romero & Ventura, 2012). Additionally, data mining
provides insight on “meaningful correlations, patterns and trends” (Gartner Group, n.d.). Data mining utilizes various models and algorithms, such as decision trees, chi-squared automatic induction, and artificial neural networks (Luan, 2002). Data mining and advancements in student data remain as a new concept in higher education; however, corporations and government agencies apply consumer information on a daily basis (Luan, 2002). Data mining in Fortune 500 companies informs targeted marketing, best practices in customer service, and proactive cybersecurity measures—all of which are applicable in higher education (Luan, 2002). Data mining leads to effective and efficient data analysis through automation rather than traditional coding done by assessment committees or administrators. Traditional methods of data analysis and assessment results in untouched data in archives after research projects. Data mining involves gathering existing and new information to analyze trends and produce predictions. However, there are institutional guidelines that confer administrators to recognize the ethics of allowing algorithms to touch student data. In June 2016, Goldie Blumenstyk explores in The Chronicle of Higher Education that universities are acknowledging student data and privacy. Higher education administrators are choosing to "keep their data in silos" from outside researchers and data mining to be sensitive of student privacy (Blumenstyk, 2016). Although there are many industries that rely on the benefits of data mining consumer data, higher education institutions are beginning the conversations of data mining and their quality service and commitment to students.

Current Applications of Student Data
Data mining will continue to become more routine as higher education explores the ethical implications over time (Sabourin, Kosturko, FitzGerald, & McQuiggan, 2015). In December 2014, Blumenstyk published a piece to The New York Times about students’ digital footprint and success. Various universities have adopted the practice of tracking students’ swipe history and correlating the data with student engagement (Blumenstyk, 2014). Blumenstyk highlighted the effectiveness of triaging students by flagging academic and wellness concerns on a tracking system administered among professionals. Online platforms for student tracking provide a system to identify and support students at risk (Blumenstyk, 2014).

Data mining does not provide quick solutions but it does facilitate conversations to make data-driven decisions. Rayane Alamuddin, Jessie Brown, and Martin Kurzweil overviewed that student data drives research, application, and representation (2016). By using student data, higher education informs "research to build basic knowledge, application for educational improvement, and representation of learning and accomplishment" (Stevens & Kurzweil, n.d.). Data mining applied in research may improve pedagogy through empirical testing and development (Alamuddin et al., 2016). Data mining reflects in policy work by "allowing more sophisticated analysis" (Alamuddin et al., 2016, p. 10) and effectively informing trends among more complicated variables. Policy work relies on effective data visualizations that can digest complicated information into influential graphics, such as infographics and charts. The results from data mining transform how policymakers and higher education administrators influence constituents to understand current trends and allocate government resources (Slade, 2016). Through data mining, predictive analysis becomes more appealing to administrators because universities can direct how best practices can be applied to respective student populations.

Future Considerations of Student Data
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is the foundation of higher education’s views on student information. Research with student data ensures confidentiality of the student and respects the purview of the Institutional Research Board; however, the process becomes more complicated in student affairs practice. Additional training for administrators is recommended to increase competency and certification to manage confidential student data while considering scope of responsibility and mandated reporter status.

The integration of digital technologies and student data gives opportunities to test boundaries and explore ethical standards. Stanford University and Ithaka S+R, a not-for-profit research service, collaborated to develop a
project called Responsible Use of Student Data in Higher Education to begin the national and global discussion (Stevens & Kurzweil, n.d.). A facet of this project explores and "raise[s] new questions about the ethical collection, use, and sharing of information" (Stevens & Kurzweil, n.d.). Institutions should revisit policies related to student data to include language of transparency and responsibility, in collaboration with existing resources such as the Responsible Use of Student Data in Higher Education project. Additionally, educational policies, such as FERPA, must remain relevant to anticipate future innovations in student data. Higher education cannot ignore the power to influence policymakers and student constituents and to benchmark rankings with student data. Digital advancement continues to create new pathways of data mining and application. Policymakers must consider how institutions will be held accountable for handling student data in anticipation of changing technology. Ultimately, respect for student data must remain a priority and the center of any data-driven assessments and changes.
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Historically, free speech on college campuses has been upheld by student affairs administrators to protect progressive speech, revolutionary ideas of social change, and marginalized populations promoting their causes. The recent spread of politically charged alt-right speakers (from both on campus and off campus), protest groups, and challenges to free speech zones has caused many student affairs administrators to reevaluate their policies while trying to protect the ideal of free speech. Administrators must grapple with restricting some forms of speech and with what the long-term impact of that decision could be.

Free Speech in Higher Education

Freedom of speech is the ability to offend the government or those in power in public spaces of the entity without taking that entity's welfare into account (Terada, 2011). Two defining historical markers—the Vietnam War and the civil rights movement—frame what is considered The New Left Movement to free speech on college campuses (Lewy, 2018). During that time, dissatisfaction with leadership led faculty and students to take an active stance on social issues and mobilize thousands of individuals across campuses to protest against the war and civil rights violations. College campuses can become hotbeds for
In response to campus protests, administrators have tried to help the student body understand freedom of speech versus freedom of expression as it relates to maintaining order on campus (Herbeck, 1991).

Freedom of speech is a right offered under the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights, along with the ability to assemble and have a free press. Because the protection is vaguely worded, campus administrations have attempted to support free speech in varying iterations for decades (Herbeck, 1991). In an attempt to support students’ freedom of expression and their ability to impart opinions and share them openly, administrations have developed policies since The New Left:

To accomplish their mission, colleges and universities need to be a place where students and scholars are free to consider a broad range of ideas, most especially those that test conventional wisdom or the prevailing viewpoint. (Herbeck, 2018)

Campus administrators have attempted to support freedom of speech by providing designated free speech zones where any individual can freely express themselves. Conversely, safe spaces, which were created in response to student feedback, were designed to counter triggering experiences or micro aggressions on college campuses—allowing students who may identify as marginalized individuals to share experiences free of ridicule (Jacobson & Cato, 2016). Both policies have been criticized for not going far enough or for going too far. Regardless, as the landscape of the student population changes, campus administrators must balance the expectation that free speech will be safeguarded with the assurance that students’ college experiences align with their values.

Student Activism

Student activism has been a cornerstone of the free speech conversation. As students’ concerns arise, campus environments can quickly lose order. Administrators have tried to maintain order through student codes of conduct, assembly ordinances, and other protocols that include hate speech in the campus community. Students do not always agree with these policies and have taken their grievances to the court system.

- In Papish v. Board of Curators of University of Missouri (1973), the court established "the mere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of ‘conventions of decency’.

- Another court case that challenged free speech policy was Doe v. University of Michigan (1989). The Eastern Michigan court established that “the university could not regulate speech because it disagreed with the ideas or the messages sought to be conveyed.”

These two examples are just a few early court cases that established limits on restricting student free speech on campus. However, in The New York Times, David Schultz, a professor at the University of St. Paul, was quoted as saying that “our society as a whole understands that—if you can justify censuring others, those exact weapons can be used against you” (Tugend, 2018). His remarks were in response to protesting campus speakers, which has become a contemporary free speech issue. Student groups have demanded that university presidents rescind speaker offers or have heckled or shouted down speakers because of opposing political views. Campus officials have instituted a heckler’s warning, both to allow students to express their displeasure and to give the speaker an opportunity to complete their engagement. This approach does not always work, especially in the case of controversial speakers. In recent cases, pressure from student mobilization has caused speakers to be disinvited, has disrupted the engagement, or has forced the engagement to be canceled. In this regard, some scholars suggest free speech becomes free speech if you agree.

Implications for Practice

This developing nuanced form of free speech and student activism provides student affairs administrators the opportunity to reevaluate their policies. Institutions are still operating on free speech zone guidelines that grew from the 1980s (Demaske, 2008). Thus, administrators need to be more malleable to the new forms and frequency of"
protests that could occur outside the free speech zone, whether on social media or on campus.

Student affairs administrators should engage in the following:

- Review and rewrite procedures: Take the opportunity to review policies on free speech, campus speakers, and protests from on-campus and off-campus entities.

- Anticipate the climate of their students and community: Student affairs administrators must anticipate local and national events that may cause protests.

- Be knowledgeable: Administrators must be aware of who is being brought to campus by their students or outside groups. Administrators no longer have the luxury of being uninformed about how an artist’s or political figure’s views align with the institution’s mission, vision, and student population.

- Balance social justice with long-term policy: A balance must be maintained to not limit free speech in order to protect students from hearing speech that contrasts their views. Limiting free speech stifles critical thinking in the long term.

**Conclusion**

Administrators continue to grapple with how to support free speech on a college campus. Over the past century, campuses have made several attempts to create boundaries for freedom of expression, such as free speech zones, hate speech codes, and safe zones. However, these attempts continue to be challenged. With the rise in student protests and the use of social media, administrators should think globally about how students can express themselves online as well as in their interactions with guests who oppose their views.
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In this explorative review, we examine the educational practices of 13 Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Knowledge Community (KC) campuses as leading examples from across the country of institutions that are cultivating a civic ethos to prepare students for civic participation. Narratives and data collected from surveys of these campuses reveal that civic education is occurring at every point along the college journey, from introducing all first-year students to free speech policies to offering senior-year experiences that engage students in the local political process during election season. We have examined the work of these campuses within two learning domains grounded in the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Civic Engagement Value Rubric: (1) civic competencies—the combination of observable and measurable knowledge, skills, abilities, and behaviors; and (2) civic action—“wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community” (AAC&U, 2009, p. 1).

Theoretical Underpinnings

Many higher education leaders are calling for a civic imperative to ensure that future generations become skilled in what noted public intellectual Benjamin Barber (1992) called the “arts of democracy.” Reflecting on the long history of colleges and universities preparing students for citizenship, college president Richard Guarasci (2018) noted, “In the past, this has simply meant teaching the practices of citizenship; today, it involves building civic
competencies through active engagement of students, faculty, and staff as participants in democratic culture” (p. 28). On KC campuses, this active civic engagement work is grounded in a wide range of theoretical thought, from student development and leadership studies to critical theory. Campuses noted using Astin’s Leadership for Social Change Model, AAC&U’s A Crucible Moment, BreakAway’s Active Citizen Continuum, and contemporary work on diversity and intersectionality, including works by bell hooks and others. This scholarship informs both the pedagogical and civic engagement domains that emerged in our research.

Civic Competencies
Civic competencies are categorized into three key areas: civic knowledge, analytical skills, and participatory skills (Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts Roohr, Liu, & Rios, 2015). To educate students in civic competencies, KC campuses engaged students in a wide array of activities to address all three areas. Table 1 illustrates the range of civic activities and the frequency of offerings.

Knowledge
From Portland to Annapolis, nearly all KC campuses hosted forums, debates, and experiential opportunities for students to enhance their knowledge of core democratic principles and political systems. Visits to local city councils and state legislatures provided opportunities for students to network with local officials while witnessing firsthand the process of lawmaking and policymaking. Otterbein University students engaged in an annual Day at the Statehouse sponsored by AAC&U of Ohio, where they met with state legislators and participated in critical conversations about supporting student aid in the state budget.

Analytical Skills
In partnership with social science classrooms (mostly political science, sociology, and public administration) and in co-curricular workshops, campuses offered opportunities for students to deeply explore current social issues. On one campus, students were asked to unpack the 2020 census by critically examining the impact of the new census plan on marginalized LGBTQ communities and immigrants. During a large-scale debate on Otterbein’s campus, students engaged in a deep, critical inquiry of the U.S. military’s intervention in the contemporary North Korean conflict.

Participatory Skills
At East Carolina University, students attended a program called Citizen U that offered workshops to teach and inspire students to work collaboratively, develop community partnerships, and get involved in U.S. democracy. These kinds of civic participation skills were usually honed through experiential activities, the most common of which was civic dialogues. One campus offered a 5-week intensive experience for students to

Table 1
Frequency of Civic Activities on KC Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Engagement</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Dialogues</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Building Efforts</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for Social Change</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Speech</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising for Communities</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Engagement</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Improvement</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Public Meetings</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protests</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Civic Associations</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on Community Boards</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions/Boycotts</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means represent responses scaled as: 1 = Never and 4 = Frequently
practice civic dialogue skills, during which they learned to communicate effectively about a wide range of current social issues while exploring their own identities and building relationships across political differences.

Civic Action
All KC campuses noted that they engage students in community to prepare them for future civic participation. Research has illuminated a direct correlation between students’ community service and both their commitment to civic engagement ideals and their own political self-efficacy (O’Leary, 2014). Usually housed in student affairs offices of leadership, civic engagement, community engagement, student government, and student involvement, campuses engaged students in both simulated and real-life, hands-on civic work. Partnering with organizations like The League of Women Voters, local government offices, nonprofits, and county boards of elections, students ventured out into local the community to address some of the most important social and economic issues facing the nation. On some campuses, service learning was housed entirely within academic affairs, but most campuses collaborated with academic departments in developing cocurricular civic action work, with faculty members serving as presenters, workshop facilitators, and panelists.

Student Citizen Leaders
At several institutions, a specific cohort of students—a team of "civic engagement fellows"—were responsible for sustaining partnerships with nonprofits and government agencies in the community, recruiting other students, and mobilizing student volunteers to take action. At Otterbein University, these students were trained at The Center for Community Engagement by both faculty and staff as a new generation of citizen leaders, interrogating multiple forms of social inequality while developing social change tactics, deliberating across affinity groups, and making collaborative decisions.

Getting Out the Vote
Not surprisingly, many campuses focused their civic action on voter registration, awareness, and mobilization. For example, at the University of Nevada, Reno, students were trained in Voting 101 workshops on their campus before taking their skills to local high schools where they hosted Vote Power!, a program that, according to one survey respondent, inducted young voters into the registration process.

Campus Elections
To educate students about the pathway to public service, civic action focused on the campus election process. Several campuses brought in the national program Elect Her to provide a running start for college women interested in politics. The program taught students how to create campaign messages, communicate effectively, and engage voters on their own campus. According to Elect Her, students who participate in campus student governments are more likely to run for office as adults (https://runningstartonline.org/programs/elect-her).

Challenges to the Teachings of Democracy
Although civic work has become ingrained in the mission of U.S. higher education institutions, its realization comes with a particular set of challenges. While many campuses noted the usual barriers to work in student affairs—a scarcity of resources for programs and inadequate staffing—civic work had its own unique hurdles. In a nation torn in half by partisan politics, much civic work has become suspect, with campus stakeholders questioning programs to ensure that all activities are proven to be nonpartisan. One campus noted that people assume any event about political engagement is, in fact, partisan. These tensions may persuade campus administrators to not take the risk of offering important programs because they might be misinterpreted or could generate backlash. Other campuses shared that even faculty members move away from democratic engagement and civil discourse because they feel unprepared to facilitate these discussions on campus.

Some KC campuses also described a culture of apathy among their students, finding it difficult to get students energized about civic issues, especially when students are not local and, therefore, are far less likely to care about neighborhood issues or to want to sustain their local engagement. Most campuses noted that the biggest barrier to civic work was competing for students' time.
Overcommitted students were working full time and entrenched in the rigor of their disciplines, leaving little time outside class to get involved. One unintended consequence of the limited number of students who were committed to civic work was that they did not benefit from diverse perspectives, mainly because the involved "liberal students" did not have opportunities to engage with those of "a more conservative mindset."

**Toward a Generation of Civic-Minded Citizens**

KC campuses shared numerous best practices to cultivate civic knowledge, build civic skill sets, and engage students in direct civic action, all with an underlying hope of developing civic-minded citizens. They worked toward a set of affective outcomes, most of which fell within what researchers call a "civic dispositions domain" where students develop open-mindedness, motivations for future civic engagement, concerns for the welfare of others, community connectedness, a sense of political efficacy, civility, ethical integrity, and mutual respect (Torney-Purta et al., 2015). However, one of the most interesting civic skills campuses hoped their students would develop was the ability to identify "avenues for active civic participation in their community." If higher education can do one thing for students before they graduate, it is to open a door to the community, widely and without resistance, so that students can see the depth of work left to be done and imagine themselves, given the skills they have acquired, taking the lead.
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The charge to cultivate campus climates that foster student belonging and success is a priority. The integration of sensory rooms and equipment within higher education environments can provide dedicated spaces to support student belonging and success. In this article, the authors present a brief overview of sensory rooms, including their design, intended impacts, and applications for student affairs administrators.

Sensory rooms can target and assist the social, emotional, and sensory needs of students with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), autism, and sensory processing disorders (Fun and Function, n.d.; Green Hills Area Education Agency, n.d.; Ray, 2017). For students with sensory processing disorders, for example, sensory rooms can help enhance bodily awareness by providing intentional forms of sensory input to strengthen this sense. The safe, controlled environment of the sensory room is also an asset for students with autism to lower stress, as well as for students who have experienced trauma to heal in a soothing atmosphere. Sensory rooms also offer benefits for the entire student population when viewed as an element of Universal Design (Fun and Function, n.d.; Green Hills Area Education Agency, n.d.; Ray, 2017). Universal Design promotes the development of built environments that are as fully accessible and functional as
possible for the widest range of potential needs (Tobin & Behling, 2018). For example, a sensory room can be viewed more broadly than only an accommodation for students with disabilities, as a sensory room offers developmental benefits for all members of the collegiate population who need a place to disengage from the constant hustle and bustle of campus. Grounding and calming activities performed in a sensory space can support all students in managing stress and emotions through relaxing activities (Bayer et al., 2011; Rickey, 1998).

To understand the design and use of sensory spaces, one must explore how these rooms might take shape on campuses. Permanent space installations are one avenue for integrating sensory spaces (Ashland University, 2018). Student affairs administrators should consider the benefit of developing sensory spaces in places like residence halls, student unions, and libraries—places where a wide spectrum of students can access the space. Student conduct management is an emerging application for permanent sensory rooms on campus (J. Thierfeld Brown, personal communication, October 3, 2018). When considering incorporating the space for conduct purposes, the targeted behaviors should be promoted while a student is in the sensory rooms. Sensory rooms should not be used punitively; they should be used only as part of a behavioral plan as a reward, or as a break.

Typically, sensory rooms are therapeutic spaces that contain a variety of equipment that students with accommodation needs can utilize to stimulate, develop, and relax their senses. This can be achieved through tailored sensory input across multiple systems, including sight, sound, touch, smell, vestibular, and proprioception (Ray, 2017). Sensory rooms also improve people’s self-regulation and focus through purposeful activities, which reduces negative behavior from being overstimulated or under stimulated (Fun and Function, n.d.; Green Hills Area Education Agency, n.d.; Ray, 2017). Sensory rooms can contain bouncing balls that engage the entire body. Sensory rooms may also have whiteboards, which students can use to practice fine motor skills by drawing or using magnetic letters. Light walls, punching bags, and battle ropes can also be found in sensory rooms to allow for heavy work—stimuli that push or pull against the weight of the body to strengthen body-spatial awareness (Fun and Function, n.d.; Green Hills Area Education Agency, n.d.; Ray, 2017), which individuals need to calm their body. Mirror and Lego walls can allow students to use visual feedback while doing their activities. Bubble tubes are glass tubes that are lit from inside, and have bubbles that create patterns of light in the room. These bubble tubes are normally located in a quiet area and improve the environment with a relaxing visual, as the bubbles pass up and down the lighted tube, with the sound of running, babbling water. Students may bring a book to read in this area or perform a quiet activity such as lying in a beanbag chair or just relaxing. Other equipment includes body socks, a tactile center, rowers, and platform swings.

If a permanent space is not possible, sensory rooms and equipment can still be developed for temporary use. Higher education professionals can incorporate sensory equipment and elements as part of program development and event planning. Designated sensory spaces might be set up on a temporary basis to complement large-scale
programs that can be overwhelming, like concerts. Further, professionals across all functional areas can incorporate small sensory tools in their office spaces to facilitate direct student contact. A sensory bin, like a small tray or container filled with tactile stimuli like dry rice, might assist a residence life professional in calming a student after a conflict. Higher education administrators may explore the benefits of sensory spaces not only for students but also for staff. For example, in conjunction and consultation with Dr. Jane Thierfeld Brown, the Disability Knowledge Community (DKC) developed and hosted a sensory space at the 2018 NASPA Annual Conference. Based on verbal feedback at the Intersections of Identity Roundtable, conference attendees shared that the sensory space allowed participants to take a break from the anxiety of navigating both large volumes of people and large physical spaces connected with the scale of a national meeting (T. O’Sullivan, personal communication, October 29, 2018). Further, with a sensory space on site, individuals attended more of the conference because travel to and from personal hotel rooms was no longer the sole option for decompression and relaxation.

While the benefits of sensory spaces are bountiful for many populations on campus, some key points must be considered before moving forward with developing such a space. First, it is imperative to work in collaboration with institutional risk management and general counsel to assess possible legal concerns regarding the development of a sensory space; these concerns include the risk status of each individual, risks associated with each tool, equipment storage, staff training, and overall medical safety (New South Wales Ministry of Health, 2015). In addition to risk assessment, a clear budgetary plan must be put in place, including both initial startup and long-term maintenance costs (Ray, 2017). Given the scope of room construction, facilities staff must be an equal stakeholder in both designing and managing a sensory space. When designing and creating sensory spaces, the overall accessibility and centralization of the space within the larger campus footprint should also be considered, to ensure the space can be used most effectively.
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Nationally, high school graduation rates will begin to decline in the next decade; at the regional level, high school graduation rates will face significant decline in 16 states (Bransberger, 2017; Hussar & Bailey, 2017, p. 15). In turn, recent predictions suggest a 15% decline in the college-bound population between 2025 and 2029 (Barshay, 2018). Furthermore, fewer males will enter postsecondary education (Bransberger, 2017). As the population at the top of the enrollment funnel plateaus and tuition discount rates continue to climb to an all-time high of 44.8% (Valburn, 2018), institutions must holistically evaluate their enrollment strategies to sustain enrollments. Because enrollment professionals are faced with this looming reality of a diminishing pipeline of future students, they must formulate strategies to ensure that institutions, particularly tuition-driven institutions, can adapt to this declining landscape in order to maximize yield and meet enrollment goals. Applying the Principles of Good Practice (American College Personnel Association [ACPA] & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA], 1997) was a launchpad for this assessment based on our experiences at Regis College.

Kara Kolomitz
Vice President, Undergraduate Student Affairs and Enrollment
Regis College

Laura Bertonazzi
Dean of Undergraduate Enrollment and Retention
Regis College

A New Division Is Born
Following a decade of transitioning to a coeducational undergraduate student body after a long history as an all-women’s college at the undergraduate level, Regis College, a private Catholic university in greater Boston, was faced with a unique opportunity to redefine its operational practices related to undergraduate enrollment. After an institutional reorganization in the summer of 2016, the Division of Student Affairs, the Office of Undergraduate Admission, and the Department of Athletics merged into a single division. Prior to this reorganization, the Division of Student Affairs was a separate entity, with the Department of Athletics and the Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment and Marketing offices reporting to a singular division. The newly formed Division of Undergraduate Student Affairs and Enrollment was positioned to examine its undergraduate enrollment practices from preenrollment through graduation within a single vision and strategic plan.
This merger across departments provided a platform to unify enrollment practices by blending enrollment services and student affairs best practices. Traditionally, student affairs divisions are mission-centered entities, thus positioned to influence enrollment management operations in a mission-driven way—using the mission to recruit students who will apply, become accepted, enroll, and persist through graduation. ACPA and NASPA’s Principles of Good Practice (1997) noted, “Good practice in student affairs uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals” (p.3). In creating a unified division, the newly formed Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment engaged these good practices and focused on its institutional mission, the institutional strategic plan, and, most important, the students the institution was committed to serving. Divisional priorities soon came to fruition, which shaped the new operation.

Priorities
In anchoring its work within its mission and overarching student affairs philosophy, the new division had a clear understanding of its enrollment goals. This was a first action step for the merged division, because having an explicit understanding of institutional values is an organizational best practice (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Student affairs practices at Regis College influenced the enrollment operation in the following ways:

- **Leveraged institutional mission:** Through a comprehensive training and development process, admissions, athletics, and student affairs staff alike studied the mission of Regis College, learned how the mission guided the university’s operational goals, and assessed how the division and its many functions contributed to the strategic plan. These training opportunities were coordinated by the student affairs and enrollment senior leadership team, specifically the vice president of undergraduate student affairs and enrollment, the dean of student affairs, and the dean of undergraduate enrollment and retention. Then, staff roles and responsibilities were defined by the senior leadership team based on the skills and strengths of individuals within the entire team and in line with the mission, operational goals, and strategic plan.

- **Used data-based decision making:** Evidence-based practice is common within student affairs, and although all three entities used this practice for enrollment, they were underutilizing the available data. New assessment technologies allow enrollment professionals to make proactive decisions that maximize admissions-related returns on investment for events, travel, and activities based on measurable outcomes (Langston, 2017). Additionally, by assessing the existing retention data from student affairs and athletics, the admissions team could design its recruitment planning to complement the university’s retention strategies, while also considering demographic shifts of the high school populations.

- **Evaluated partnerships:** Student affairs best practices guide student affairs practitioners to be responsible stewards of our institutional, financial, and human resources (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). Therefore, at the onset of the division’s new organization, the senior student affairs and enrollment leadership evaluated each vendor and external partner that supported all three areas. In addition to assessing the return on investment for each contract, administrators evaluated whether these partners were able to influence enrollment goals and objectives. Just as our staff were entrenched in the goals and strategic objectives, the vendors needed to join us in this mission-driven approach. Decisions to continue with partnerships were based on a comprehensive assessment of the financial costs and benefits, utilization of data-informed decision making, and whether the partners matched our mission.

- **Developed competencies:** As a principle of best practice, student affairs professionals are expected
to engage in professional development and have the competencies to guide and manage their own teams (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). Leaders had to heed this principle when considering their enrollment leadership—there was a lot to learn, and quickly! Areas of competency development for our team included financial aid, strategic marketing, demographic and workforce analysis, and enrollment systems databases.

Lessons Learned
The first enrollment cycle under the new paradigm reinforced the value of leaning into an organization’s mission to guide strategic change. Using the Regis College mission as the new division’s anchor, the senior leadership team made strategic decisions in the context of this mission. In a time of great organizational change, this discernment practice offered a familiar framework for all staff. During a time of transition, the Regis College Division of Undergraduate Student Affairs and Enrollment had an articulated plan rooted in the Principles of Good Practice that provided direction. Student affairs practices were broadly applied to the work throughout the enrollment practice, from recruitment and event management, to orientation and parent services, and many activities in between.

Conclusion
At Regis College, the unified Division of Undergraduate Student Affairs and Enrollment is responsible for the undergraduate university’s enrollment and retention activities. By developing key priorities and leveraging the institutional mission, the division has been able to launch a holistic enrollment strategy using student affairs best practices. Whether a single division or separate entities, student affairs divisions are encouraged to engage their admission colleagues in key conversations about their mission and strategic goals, and explore opportunities to collaborate.
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On February 2, 2017, Timothy Piazza, a 19-year-old student at Penn State University who was pledging Beta Theta Pi, unknowingly became the face of a major change in the culture of sorority and fraternity life nationwide, after a fatal night of heavy drinking and purported hazing (Dickerson, 2017). The gruesome details of Piazza's last hours haunted the pages of newspapers, online media, and the dreams of fraternity and sorority advisors and professionals across the country for months. Conversations about drinking culture, hazing, and toxic masculinity within fraternities are not new to those who have been vested in the fraternal movement for the past decade. But for the first time in a number of years, Piazza’s story and those that followed it created a narrative on the state of Greek life across the country that led to decisive actions by universities and sweeping policy and procedural changes for chapters, campuses and headquarters.

The immediate changes came in waves and included institutions suspending Greek-letter organizations entirely or requiring them to relinquish their single-sex status; legislators debating whether to suspend Greek life statewide; campuses suspending alcohol-related events, redefining alcohol policies, or suspending all Greek life activities entirely; and numerous national headquarters and campuses ultimately closing individual chapters at an alarming rate (Rosenblatt, 2017). But the
most impactful change thus far has been stakeholders around the country facilitating conversations on how to change the status quo and redefine the Greek experience for those students we, as Sorority/Fraternity Life professionals, serve.

Conversations among key organizations like the North American Interfraternity Conference (NIC), the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC), the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA), the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Research, NASPA, and many others have led to the establishment of task forces and work groups aimed at creating frameworks, policies, guidelines, and best practices for fraternity or sorority advisors on campuses. Professionals in the field have begun to see some of the results from these conversations.

In addition to discussions among professional insiders to the fraternal movement, the June 2018 meeting of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities Council of Presidents included a discussion led by Penn State University President Eric Barron and Louisiana State University President King Alexander about the future of Greek-letter organizations on campuses and the role leaders in university settings can play in ensuring student safety going forward (P. McPherson, personal communication, July 25, 2018). This marks a stark shift in the voices joining the conversation, as administrators at the highest levels of campus leadership are taking note of the need for change. The conversations had by campuses, communities and individual chapters, demands the re-evaluation of the historical status quo surrounding acceptable behaviors in Greek life, and has forced incremental change—within policies, procedures, philosophies, and practices. These changes are being made in hopes of addressing the safety issues that arise when students and members choose to make hazing activities and alcohol consumption a central component to their fraternal experience. Tragedies like the ones that brought this culture to light will not end until the status quo detrimental behavior is addressed and changed.

Understanding the imperative for change, the NIC, along with its fraternal partners, announced plans to change this culture, in a press release on September 4, 2018. The NIC announced its “decisive action to enhance health and safety in fraternity communities” through “a standard prohibiting hard alcohol from fraternity chapter facilities and events” (H. Kirk, personal communication, September 4, 2018) starting September 1, 2019. This and the NIC’s Health and Safety Initiatives launched in 2017 aim to reduce the dangerous use and abuse of alcohol (particularly hard alcohol) throughout the fraternal experience. Campuses across the nation, especially those hosting NIC chapters, will need to re-evaluate their alcohol event processes and standards for risk management before the 2019 implementation date if they want to continue to support the NIC’s work.

Conversations are taking place throughout the fraternal world, asking the following questions: What can we learn from where we have been, and how do we move forward? To help answer these questions, fraternal movement leaders such as the NIC, NPC, AFA, and the Association of Fraternal Leadership and Values (AFLV) have joined with existing hazing prevention organizations such as HazingPrevention.Org to create the Anti-Hazing Coalition. The coalition aims to pursue and strengthen state hazing laws and significantly expand education and training for high school and college students (HazingPrevention.Org, 2018). This coalition marks an unprecedented shift in partnerships for the NIC, NPC, AFA, and AFLV. Historically these groups have not partnered with parents, but are now working with four families who have lost their sons to hazing in a fraternity. Allowing for conversation on the dangerous and deadly consequences of hazing and alcohol consumption from the perspective of the families personal experiences and heartache, allowing the parents of the victims to tell their stories (Svurlga, 2018).

In an interview with Stephanie Gosk for the Today Show, the parents of the victims said, “the goal is to turn tragedy into meaningful change” (Gosk, 2018). Through the coalition, these tragedies have the chance to change the status quo and provide more students
with the opportunity to have a positive experience in Greek life in the future. Similarly the work currently being done within our professional associations and on our individual campuses aim at impacting our current culture through philosophy, policy, procedure changes. These changes lead to enhanced education for students so that we can ensure a healthy future for the Fraternity and Sorority community as we lean into the next 100 years.
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As more people living in the United States become educated about and allies to individuals who identify as lesbian or gay, trans* people still face extreme violence, harassment, and discrimination within society and ostracization within the lesbian, gay, transgender, and queer community. The National Transgender Discrimination Survey (2011) surveyed 6,500 trans* individuals, revealing that 35% of respondents experienced alarming rates of negative and violent treatment within higher education, not only by students but also by staff and faculty. Gender-minority college students experience more mental health problems, psychological distress, and barriers than their peers (Woodford et al., 2018). Administrators, faculty, staff, and students still use a binary definition of gender, gender identity, and social constructs of identity (Goldberg, 2018). This perpetuates a culture of genderism and heterosexism that is thriving across college campuses.

Texts such as Trans* in College by Z Nicolazzo (2016) offer insightful empirical studies and evidence about trans* students’ experience as they navigate campus culture while balancing the complexity of their identities. The amount of empirical studies on trans* students’ experiences is increasing (Nicolazzo, 2016). This recognition is a small step in a much larger, systematic, and institutional shift that must occur. This manuscript will outline some barriers trans* students experience when navigating campus culture, the implications of those barriers, and future directions of practice educators can utilize to shift the heterosexism and cisgenderism culture that is present.

Barriers Trans* Students Experience
When arriving on campus, trans* students are forced to navigate a cultural narrative that is entrenched in an environment enriched in genderism and heterosexism,
which negatively affects the way trans* students see
themselves (Goldberg, 2018; Jourian, 2015; Woodford et
al., 2018). Trans* students' sexual identities may be fluid
and dynamic. Integrating into a culture that perpetuates
genderism and heterosexism can complicate trans*
students' understanding of their sexual and social identities
(Lev, 2004). Trying to balance interpersonal relationships,
institutional navigation, and dominant cultural practices
creates further barriers for trans* students (Marine,
2017). Often, campus cultural narratives contain aspects
of gender compliance and gender conformity (Goldberg,
2018), sending messages to trans* students that to be
socially and culturally accepted, they need to successfully
go through with the transition process.

Additional issues trans* students experience across college
campuses include a lack of faculty and staff education
about trans* issues, lack of campus resources, inadequate
counseling resources and health care that fails to meet
the needs of trans* students, housing problems, a lack of
inclusive bathrooms and locker rooms, and being subjected
to microaggressions from faculty, staff, and students
(Marine, 2017). People often tokenize trans* students and
force them to provide free educational labor about trans*
identities. The multiplicity of trans* identities makes it
difficult to develop institutionwide policies that would
protect trans* students (Goldberg, 2018), forcing trans*
students to navigate institutional procedures to find an ally
they trust—someone who will work to understand their
problems and be willing to mentor, consul, and understand
their lived experiences.

Future Directions of Practice
A complex analysis of one's own gender and perceptions
related to gender identity allows students and members
of the institution to develop positive relationships and
communicate about experiences related to gender
socialization and oppression (Burt, 2015). Asking questions
instead of making assumptions, in combination with
listening to the stories of trans* students' experiences
on campus, promotes greater understanding about the
issues and barriers trans* students face. Higher education
administrators need to develop nondiscrimination and
antiharassment policies to include gender identities and
expressions to create a more inclusive environment for
trans* students. Redesigning these policies will not solve
the overarching issues related to trans* oppression, but
creating a standing committee of professionals dedicated
to addressing systemwide adjustments directly related
to trans* issues will help improve cultural practices and
identify areas for improvement. More empirical studies of
trans* students' experiences on college campuses must
be done, and educators need to continue to stand up for
trans* students and their needs.

The root of each engagement strategy implemented
across campuses must have strong components related
to cultural competency awareness. When educators are
culturally competent, they can admit their personal biases
and stereotypes and seek additional understanding about
these issues (Cunningham, 2016). Awareness of these
assumptions leads to increased cultural competency
strategies through the practice of active skills. Suggested
strategies to help increase one's cultural competency
include being aware of the language one uses, which helps
increase the visibility of trans* students. Asking questions
instead of making assumptions in combination with
listening to the stories of trans* students' experiences on
campus promotes greater understanding of the issues and
barriers trans* students face. Education and awareness
are powerful tools to help prevent further marginalization
and tokenization of trans* students. Educators must
do their best to treat every student with equal respect
and opportunity. As Washington and Evans (1991) were
quoted as saying in McGill's (2013) article, "An ally works
to end oppression in his or her personal and professional
life through support of, and as an advocate with and for,
the oppressed population" (p. 195). Being an ally is a
continuous process.

When assisting trans* students to gain support from their
loved ones, allies can help them create a plan and explore
ways to facilitate conversations with their loved ones
about the student's gender and gender identity. Through
continuing critical self-reflection, asking tough questions,
and finding innovative solutions to campus wide problems,
educators will slowly but surely continue to make campus
environments open and safe for all students. It is the
The educator’s job is to ensure that every student on campus feels welcomed and safe. The process of becoming an ally is a continuous effort that expands and evolves as more information comes forward about trans* students’ needs. Eliminating genderism and trans* oppression on college campuses will take effort from all faculty, staff, and administrators who hold privilege and power within higher education and should not fall on the shoulders of trans* and non-binary students.
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A hundred years ago, higher education for Native American students looked vastly different than it does today, but the roots and ongoing implications of this history are not often shared or acknowledged in K–12 or postsecondary institutions. Higher education served as a tool of assimilation and removal, to strip culture, language, and kinship practices of Indigenous people to gain land and economic power (Adams, 1995). This legacy of cultural and land loss informs colleges and universities today as Indigenous families have had to overcome understandable mistrust of education. Reclaiming Indigenous spaces and histories requires reintroducing—a “re-storying” of those histories that dominant mainstream institutions have silenced (Goeman, 2013). This article presents a review of Indigenous participation in higher education, examples of empowerment spaces that create a sense of belonging, and implications for practice. Bringing these histories into student affairs practitioners’ knowledge base should influence future practice and policies.

As early as the 1520s, the Spanish conquistadors established Western-style colleges in the Americas, and in 1568 the Jesuits established a school in what is now called Florida (Carney, 1999). Funds were established in England and Scotland to provide support “for ye education of ye children of those barbarians in Virginia” (Carney, 1999, p. 23), and many early colleges, including Harvard, William and Mary, and Dartmouth, received financial support from these funds, which complicated the early colleges’ relationship...
with Native communities. These early colleges were more concerned with financial viability and missionization than with Native education. Very few Native men graduated during the colonial period, and there was no place in the Indigenous or non-Indigenous world for those who did receive a Western-style education (Carney, 1999).

Brutal boarding schools, driven by the philosophy “kill the Indian in him and save the man” (Adams, 1995 p. 52) and designed to strip collective values, instill individualism, impose Christian beliefs, and destroy language and culture, officially closed in the 1880s but operated into the 1960s (Carney, 1999). Some institutions of higher education played a role in supporting the boarding schools, and some began as boarding schools, including Haskell Indian Nations University, located in Lawrence, Kansas, and the University of North Carolina, Pembroke. The curriculum was one-way; it included no Indigenous history and was intended to provide a vocational, Christianizing education to produce servants (Carney, 1999). This is a complicated piece of history, and almost all Native families were affected by these schools. I have been asked why families sent their children to these schools. Some did so because they felt they had no choice; the children had to learn about and understand colonizers and their systems. Some children were removed and taken to these schools without family permission. Other families were threatened; if they did not send their children, rations would be cut, or people were threatened with violence. Even after these schools were closed, Native education came under public school control with little to no community voice.

However, pockets of Native-focused higher education were reinforced as a direct result of Indigenous self-determination and changes in federal policy. Bacone College, a Baptist institution that was originally named the Indian College, was founded in 1880 and operated in opposition to the predominant philosophy of cultural assimilation. The Indian College offered a K–12 and four-year college curriculum. The institution has experienced financial and philosophical struggles but still operates as a two-year, tribally controlled institution. Navajo Community College (now Diné College) was established in 1968 as the “first college controlled and directed by Indians” (Carney, 1999, p. 106). Diné College’s success, combined with reactions to the 1969 Kennedy report titled “Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge,” led to several pieces of legislation that support Native education. The American Indian Higher Education Consortium was established in 1973 to support tribal colleges and universities (TCUs). Located on Native territory, TCUs serve community needs, centering language and culture. With Land Grant status, most are two-year institutions that offer vocational, certificate, and transfer degrees, and some, such as Haskell Indian Nations University and Salish Kootenai College, offer four-year degrees.

During the civil rights era, Native American studies and Native American student centers were founded at many non-Native Colleges and Universities (NNCUs; Shotton, Lowe, & Waterman, 2013), in opposition to the colonizing systems of higher education in mainstream institutions. At Cornell University, for example, the American Indian Program emerged through community, faculty, staff, and student advocacy in response to poor graduation rates and misleadingly inflated statistics of Native students. Established to support students, the American Indian Program grew to include Native American academic courses and to serve students through collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs (aiisp.cornell.edu). Cornell is located on Cayuga Lands, and Akwe:kon, the Native American residence hall that opened in 1991, was the first to be located on an NNCU. Akwe:kon includes Haudenosaunee symbols, has a kitchen, and holds Indigenous speaker events. The recently renamed American Indian Indigenous Studies Program has grown to include, in addition to faculty, a recruiter/student support specialist and a residence hall director, and it now boasts one of the highest Indigenous student graduation rates in the United States (aiisp.cornell.edu).

An understanding of Indigenous peoples’ experiences with higher education in the United States is a critical component of supporting and building a sense of belonging for Indigenous and Native students. Do you and your staff know whose land your institution occupies? Have you made connections with Native communities near
and at your institution? Have you helped your institution to understand and confront how it has oppressed and marginalized communities? Confronting a troubling past may be difficult and uncomfortable, but it is necessary. Restoring and restoring your institution’s past will help heal settler colonial and Indigenous communities, inform social justice efforts, and provide opportunities to move forward as a sustainable, healthy institution.

Today many institutions are integrating or deepening practices that acknowledge and engage Native presence on and near their campuses. For example, inclusion of Native Nation flags and acknowledgment of the original people of the land are respectful and welcoming practices that are only now gaining acceptance. Indigenous courses should be a natural part of the curriculum, not merely electives. Indigenous communities can be engaged in myriad ways beyond Native American history month. Community engagement will likely increase Native student success, enrich your campus, and help your institution’s journey into the next 100 years. Ask Indigenous faculty, staff, and students for ideas. Both respectful listening and relationship building are necessary, and both take time. Indigenous people are still here, and we are still practicing our Indigenous ways of being with an underlying philosophy of respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and relationality to each other and to all of Creation—ways we all need to practice into the future.
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The Institute for International Education reported that the number of American students participating in study abroad programs increases each year. As the number of students abroad continues to grow, the demographic composition of students participating in study abroad is changing (Institute of International Education, 2017). Many researchers have examined the barriers that make it difficult for students to study abroad. Lu, Reddick, Dean, and Pecero (2015) indicated rigid program structures, length of programs, lack of support from family, potential fear of racism, and lack of education about programs as obstacles for many students of color. These factors are important to consider as student affairs and international educators work to increase access and education for the students they serve. Evidenced by the literature, there is rich information to support program development and research in providing a comprehensive picture of the various experiences of diverse and marginalized student populations to create action steps that will foster an inclusive study abroad environment.

In November 2005, the U.S. Congress established the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. The commission's goal was to send 1 million students abroad every year by 2017—approximately 50% of undergraduates graduating that year—encouraging American students to pursue study abroad and increasing the diversity of those students (Lincoln Commission, 2005). Annually, the Institute of International Education’s (2017) Open Doors Report provides a clear picture of the state of study abroad. In 2015/2016, the number of students studying abroad increased from the previous year, with approximately 325,339 undergraduate students participating in study abroad programs—a 150% increase in participation from 10 years earlier (Institute of International Education, 2017; Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella,
Likewise, the number of students of color continues to grow, with approximately 27% of students participating in study abroad in 2015/2016 identified as non-White, a steady increase from 17% in 2004/2005 (Institute of International Education, 2017).

As the number of students who participate in study abroad increases, the breadth of literature on the topic has also increased over the past 10 years. Pope, Sanchez, Lehnert, and Schmid (2014) indicated that approximately 55% of college-bound students say they would like to study abroad during their college career, yet only 3% of students actually do. Pope et al. (2014) outlined five variables that influence a student's choice to study abroad: gender, level of parents' education, prior experience with international travel or study, age, and socioeconomic status.

Family support is a consistent factor in students deciding whether to pursue study abroad (Sweeney, 2013). While some students indicated a lack of support from family because their family had not traveled abroad themselves, others indicated a lack of support owing to family obligations that required they remain at home (Lee & Green, 2016). Students who could not travel because of obligations at home struggled with rigid program structures that require students to be away for a long period. Similarly, students who worried about staying on track to graduate on time to help support their family also struggled with studying abroad (McClure, Szelenyi, Niehaus, Anderson, & Reed, 2010).

Many students of color indicated they did not study abroad because of a lack of support or encouragement from their faculty (Lu et al., 2015). A study that discussed the amount of support students of color received from faculty members showed that although 93% of students were provided information about available study abroad programming, very few were contacted individually by a faculty member (Brux & Fry, 2010). This lack of outreach and support leads to a perception that study abroad is not meant for students of color. Owing to the lack of positive messaging about students of color studying abroad, many students may not consider it a possibility. As Sweeney (2013) outlined, many of these students can suffer from “people not like me syndrome” because promotional materials and outreach do not target students of color or students with disabilities to show similar students engaged in programming (p. 3).

A consistent barrier for students of color was the lack of awareness of available study abroad programs. Comp (2008) indicated that many students of color said they wanted to study abroad in a region that reflected their own cultural background, such as Africa, the Caribbean, or Latin America, but they did not know what programs existed. Because most American students study abroad in Western Europe, it can be easy for study abroad advisors and faculty to focus on those areas when promoting programs (Institute of International Education, 2017). Typically, study abroad has been promoted as an opportunity for students to learn about different cultures. While this may be attractive for White students at predominantly White institutions, this may not be the case for underrepresented students or students of color, who are the minority at their institution and are consistently engaged with those who are different from themselves (Salisbury et al., 2008).

Many students of color shared a fear of racism or discrimination abroad as one of the reasons they chose not to or had apprehension about studying abroad (Bryant & Soria, 2015; McClure et al., 2010). Many students of color can face hostile environments and marginalization on their home campus (Bryant & Soria, 2015). This treatment on their own campus can affect their decision to study abroad as it can ultimately affect their retention in higher education in general. Kinzie, Gonyea, Shoup, and Kuh (2008) showed that because of this marginalization, minority students could lack a sense of belonging to their home campus and, as a result, become less involved in campus events and activities, such as study abroad.

Through the development and increase of short-term programming, creation of intentional and accessible programming, and increase of outreach and education, many educators are working to make study abroad more accessible for marginalized student populations. As the diversity of students studying abroad continues to grow, the need for diverse program options also grows. This includes options in program length, course of study, location, and costs. Mills, Deviney, and Ball (2010) addressed the value of short-term programs for students and institutions alike. Short-term programs can cost less than studying for an entire semester,
and they provide working students or nontraditional students with the flexibility to continue their responsibilities at home while taking only a short break away.

Sanchez (2012) voiced the importance of involving family in decision making about study abroad to encourage students to participate in study abroad programs. This provides both an opportunity for families to feel engaged in the process and added encouragement to the student that it is possible to study abroad. Lee and Green (2016) further indicated that it is important to address the academic benefits afforded to students when they study abroad, to show the positive impacts.

Lu et al. (2015) described the initiatives put in place by an African American faculty member to reach out to African American students to encourage their participation in a study abroad program. Before the professor reached out to them, the students had not considered studying abroad. He intentionally built on his positive relationships with his students to show them the value of study abroad. This shows the importance of faculty reaching out to educate students on the possibilities, engaging them further in their education. Brux and Fry (2010) pointed to the importance of working with faculty members of color to provide students a role model or additional encouragement to participate in study abroad.

As the number of students studying abroad continues to increase and diversify, it is essential for student affairs educators to understand the various barriers these students face in participating in study abroad programs and the diverse nature of their experiences while abroad. As institutions around the United States work to accomplish the goals set forth by the Lincoln Commission in 2005, administrators, faculty, and staff must consider these obstacles when creating programming, implementing advising and outreach strategies, and providing support for students before they go abroad, while they are abroad, and upon their return home.
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Faculty members in student affairs and higher education master's degree programs influence leadership development through their unique expertise of academe and by supporting early career professionals. These faculty not only directly influence the graduate students in their courses and programs, but also support professional staff on their campus through their service commitments and research dissemination. The student affairs profession places a great deal of emphasis on the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators by ACPA–College Student Educators International and NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (2015). Faculty who work in minority-serving institutions (MSIs) balance leadership across multiple professional competency areas to navigate their institution's political landscape, conduct research, and teach a full course load. As student affairs educators gain awareness about students' needs at MSIs, faculty leaders can advance practices to address these needs, which may lead to positive transformational institutional change (Hernández, Hernández, & de la Teja, 2017). Faculty leaders at MSIs can empower student affairs educators as change agents through this process of self-awareness and can more effectively affect social justice and inclusion outcomes, resulting in more culturally inclusive campuses.

**Brief Literature Overview: Leaders of Color**

Since 1990, a general theme in the literature about leaders of color describes their capacity and need to morph mechanisms of oppression into effective vehicles of social change (Alston, 2005). Dillard (1995) and Case (1997) each found that leaders of color were keenly aware of others' perceptions in a social system where race matters, which in turn enabled them to transform ascribed deficits into strengths. This ebb and flow within cultures was advanced in Bell's (1990) study, which found that leaders of color needed to be biculturally fluent to lead in ways that resonated with their own racial group while looking for ways to connect with the dominant ways of working in White-majority contexts.

More recent work by Alemán (2007) and Parker and Villalpando (2007) corroborated earlier research by detailing the tension between educational leaders...
when Latinx/a/o educators and students challenged the status quo of leading schools, school districts, and other educational organizations. These authors used Critical Race Theory (CRT) to problematize the discourse and politics of education when discussing school leadership and organizational change by arguing that liberal ideology, color-blindness, and Whiteness reinforce the status quo by privileging leaders who use niceness, civility, and consensus building in their leadership practice.

**Brief Literature Overview: Latinx/a/o Leadership**

Latinx/a/o leaders offer a shift in theory and practice by relying on their cultural heritages and the extent of their life experiences (Alemán, 2009; Bordas, 2001; de los Santos & Vega, 2008; Haro, 1995; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). In their critical review of the intersection of race and leadership, Ospina and Foldy (2009) found that traditional approaches to studying leadership have viewed racialized or identity-based perspectives constraints to conducting research on leadership. These scholars have shifted this approach by arguing for more leadership studies that account for minoritized viewpoints and experiences as a source of strength and influence (Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Rodríguez, Martinez, & Valle, 2016). For Latinx/a/o faculty leaders in higher education, race often not only shapes their socio-psychological makeup, but also forms a large part of the collective identity from which leadership emerges and is enacted (de los Santos & Vega, 2008; Haro, 1990, 1995). Recent research on Latinx/a/o educational leaders, inclusive of K–12 schools and higher education, advances the vision of leadership practices and beliefs that are inclusive of the communities they serve (Hernández, 2017; Rodríguez et al., 2016).

As leaders on campus, Latinx/a/os serve in many roles, not the least of which encompasses being a community scholar and advocate who identifies needs and shapes a vision of what may be (Rodríguez et al., 2016; Turner, 2007). Working in MSIs that have high Latinx/a/o student enrollment but few Latinx/a/o staff, faculty, or administrators can create significant challenges but holds promise as a way to positively impact students’ educational pathways. Latinx/a/o leaders may likely find themselves as the sole committee member or faculty liaison to provide some form of continuity and advocacy for the high proportion of Latinx/a/o students on campus (Turner, 2007; Valverde, 2003).

**Reflection: Ignacio and Susana**

As Latinx/a/o faculty leaders who choose to work at a dual-designated MSI (Hispanic Serving Institution and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution), we understand the important role that Latinx/a/o faculty play not only in students’ lives but also in the student affairs profession. We strive to align our research, teaching, and service with our values: research on historically marginalized communities, (re)developing courses that include diverse readings and culturally inclusive pedagogy, and serving on committees that can influence social justice praxis.

The role we play in preparing student affairs professionals through graduate education is informed by who we are: first-generation students, children of immigrants, and beneficiaries of extensive mentoring. Each of us has taken on leadership roles on our campus while nurturing and maintaining mentoring relationships with colleagues across the country and through the career spectrum. We balance being mentored while mentoring others along the way—we lift as we climb.

Our involvement in NASPA and other professional organizations will continue to play an instrumental role in promoting belonging and student success for Latinx/a/o students. Research on Latinx/a/o leaders shows that leaders of color rely on multigenerational professional networks, as well as ongoing training and professional development, to develop their own sense of belonging (Hernández, 2017). Our hope is that Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community members will conduct research that considers the role of faculty leadership in MSIs in advancing Latinx/a/o student success. We hope our reflections stimulate potential follow-up studies to continue sharing the stories and contributions of Latinx/a/o faculty. Without a dedicated research agenda, the experiences and epistemological expertise of Latinx/a/o leaders will remain dismissed and invisible from the national conversation on college leadership development.
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There is growing attention to the increasing number of cisgender male college students involved in student conduct cases and their disengagement on campus. Cisgender men are involved in approximately 85% of the misconduct on campus but make up only 40% of the national campus population (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2012) since cisgender women students became the majority of college students in 1979 (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Cisgender men are more likely than cisgender women to be disengaged from student involvement (Hu & Kuh, 2001). Additionally, cisgender men are underrepresented in campus activities, civic engagement, and study abroad programs (Harris & Struve, 2009).

Capraro (2000) noted that college men “outnumber women in virtually every category of drinking behavior” (p. 308), such as binge drinking and alcoholism. College men hold the status as the largest population of victims of violence in every category except sexual violence (Farrell, 1993). And, men are more than likely to be the perpetrators of sexual assault (Farrell, 1993). Research has also shown that men seek professional help less often than women, including physical health and substance treatment, and have generally more negative attitudes toward seeking psychological support (Groesche, Wester, & Šedivy, 2010).

To understand these trends and improve men’s development in higher education, student affairs professionals first need to understand the social construction of hegemonic masculinity, its role on college campuses, and the pressure for men to conform to these increasingly narrow standards (Davis & Laker, 2004). A problem that emerges in the student affairs field is the lack of campus programs or sustained interventions to give men the opportunity to consider their gender identity, as well as gender’s influence on their decision making and worldview.

This article works to first investigate how the social construction of hegemonic masculinity affects college men’s development, using Bem’s (1983) gender schema theory as an introduction and the critical perspective given by Kimmel & Davis (2011) about men and masculinities. Second, the article states the critical components of creating and, more important, sustaining opportunities for cisgender men to consider the role of masculinity in their lived experiences.
Development of Gender Identity in College Men

An examination and application of Bem's gender schema theory will lend insight on how college men conceptualize and internalize the hegemonic construction of masculinity in society. Sandra Bem (1983) theorized that individuals construct "masculinity" or "femininity" at a very early age through a combination of individual observations and environmental interactions that reinforce or punish how someone acts per their perceived gender. Through these actions, a child learns to encode information by schema, or cognitive structures, as a guide to their gender (Bem, 1983). Children learn to match their attitudes, behaviors, and interests to evaluate "their adequacy as a person" (Bem, 1983, p. 605) closely to their gender expectations. Gender schema becomes a standard to judge oneself and teaches individuals early on that it has "intensive and extensive relevance to virtually every domain of human experience" (Bem, 1983, p. 608).

Hegemonic Masculinity and Its Rules

Building on Bem's theory, Kimmel and Davis (2011) critically examined masculinity and outlined the gendered expectations of men to explain how males become men in society. Kimmel and Davis stated that men follow strict rules—defined as "the Guy Code"—to conform to the hegemonic ideal of manhood in society. Hegemony is the process of influence in which men learn to "earnestly embrace a system of beliefs and practices that essentially harm [men], while working to uphold the interests of others who have power over [them]" (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 9). Men work to uphold the strict rules of manhood, and these expectation harm their own well-being. In society, men learn four central themes through observation and interactions: (1) "No sissy stuff" (a repudiation of anything feminine), (2) "Be a big wheel" (masculinity is measured by success, wealth, and power), (3) "Be a sturdy oak" (show no external emotion), and (4) "Give 'em hell" (take risks and live life on the edge) (Capraro, 2004; Kimmel, 2004).

Additionally, Michael Kimmel's (2008) qualitative research on college men in his work Guyland found more attitudes, values, and characteristics that collectively define what it means to be a man:

- Boys don't cry;
- It's better to be mad than sad;
- Don't get mad, get even;
- Take it like a man;
- He who has the most toys when he dies, wins
- Just do it, or ride or die;
- Size matters;
- Don't stop to ask for directions;
- Nice guys finish last; and
- It's all good.

The totality of these values creates a culture about masculinity that Kimmel & Davis (2011) outline as a culture of entitlement (a sense of male superiority with a diminished capacity for empathy), a culture of silence (devaluing help-seeking behaviors and being a silent witness to cruelty to others), and a culture of protection (sustain and promote antisocial and excessive behaviors).

These rigid gender norms result in a gender role conflict that restricts men's actions or beliefs in society, devalues alternative outlooks, and has negative consequences on the self or others in the community (Davis, 2002; Davis & Laker, 2004; Kimmel & Davis, 2011). Because only the smallest percentage of men can believe they possess these qualities assuredly, most men feel powerless in their gender roles (Kimmel, 2004). College men feel limited because they are fearful of how people might interpret their behaviors in relation to their gender. Edwards and Jones (2009) built on this research with a grounded theory that stated men perform masculinity per external expectations from society. Given these findings, student affairs professionals need to offer programs that present alternatives to the hegemonic notions of masculinity for cisgender college men.

Summation and Practical Framework to Interrogate Masculinity

In their 2011 chapter, “Mapping Guyland in College,” Kimmel and Davis outlined four practical suggestions for men to consider and interrogated the dominant iteration of masculinity in its historical, and cultural, formation.
First, they stated that a public discourse about masculinity is needed that “raises consciousness so that boys and men can become the authors of their lives” (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 12). To do this, adult men need to begin the conversation; they need to discuss the pressure they feel to live up to the unattainable ideals of masculinity and incorporate an awareness between the connection of shame and aggression. Second, these conversations need to establish a place for men to be vulnerable, honest, and open with each other to create a “band of brothers” (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 12). Kimmel and Davis suggested a facilitated conversation about the negative consequences of masculinity.

Third, they outlined the need to think and act creatively in designing new rites of passage for men because traditional markers of manhood are fading (Kimmel & Davis, 2011). Because young men are developing in an era with no clear blueprints for how to become a man, adult men must be involved in boys’ lives as role models instead of boys turning to other boys for the initiation into manhood (Kimmel & Davis, 2011). Last, “boys and men individually have a role in transforming themselves” (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 13) and being critically conscious of the messages about masculinity they receive from mass media. Conversations with these suggestions in mind work to support men in finding a “path of emotional authenticity, moral integrity, and physical efficacy” to self-author their own version of masculinity into adulthood (Kimmel & Davis, 2011, p. 13).

One workshop or program will not deconstruct all aspects of toxic masculinity, balance help-seeking behaviors, and remove the negative socialized notions of manhood for cisgender college men in higher education institutions. But it will give a space for men to consider how they developed their gender identity and what messages they received from mass media. Men need a sustained and ongoing conversation to give them the opportunity to see themselves as gendered beings. This could create a net impact on college campuses and empower students to challenge society’s expectations for men as they become adult members of the community.
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Despite a change in the 2000 U.S. Census policy that allowed participants to choose multiple racial identities, it was not until 2010 that colleges and universities were required by law to allow students that same opportunity when applying to school (Renn, 2011). Because that mandate is so recent, finding research and data on multiracial students before 2010 is difficult. As the multiracial population is finally starting to be seen on our campuses, are we starting to see support for the community?

Methodology
Over the course of six months, a five-cycle action research study was conducted involving six student participants at a small, predominantly White institution on the West Coast. The study was conducted to see how the institution could support multiracial undergraduate students, and how these students could build community among each other. Three variations of action research methods were utilized in the study, including four moments of action research from Altrichter, Kemmis, McTaggar, and Zuber-Skerritt (as cited in Kemmis & McTaggar, 1988), as the research moved in a circular motion as opposed to steps in a linear fashion. This served as the foundational action research cycle. McNiff and Whitehead’s action-reflection style cycles were also used (2011). Lastly, Coghlan and Brannick’s (2005) clock metaphor influenced the study because several research cycles happened simultaneously, like the hands on a clock.

Themes and Recommendations
Several themes emerged from the data, of which three will be explored in the following sections: monoracism and colorism in “safe” spaces, multiracial staff and faculty impact, and multiracial identity data collection and resources. These sections also include recommendations for professionals and institutions to improve their practices when working with multiracial individuals.

Monoracism and Colorism in “Safe” Spaces
During the study, the concepts of monoracism and colorism were never explicitly named, but they were described through examples and experiences. All participants shared that at some point during their time at the university, they had to justify or validate their identity to someone in a group or space. Unfortunately, that sometimes occurred in spaces such as cultural groups and identity centers, and the questioning of validity came from peers, staff, and faculty. Many times, participants were questioned because of their appearance or languages spoken, and they were consequently infuriated by the questioning of being “enough.” Participants shared that staff and peers would discuss with them that they would never know the full experience of being a member of the monoracial community, perpetuating the multiracial micro
aggressions of not being “enough.” Student participants reported that they would accept the comments and then move forward, either because those making the comments were the only community they had on campus or because they, as individuals, were too tired to challenge those comments that day.

**Recommendation**
The first and most significant recommendation is for campuses to develop more education programming about multiraciality. Cultural and identity centers are a great place to have critical conversations about multiraciality. Determine if they offer programming to support multiracial education or if they focus primarily on monoracial/cultural education. Organizational advisors should also educate members of the culturally based groups on multiraciality and question the concept of being “enough” in their organization. For multiracial students, the concept of being “enough” is different for each individual, but it is invoked when they sense they do not fully belong somewhere, or only partially belong, because others point out that they are multiracial and not monoracial. Last, for some multiracial individuals, college is the first time they are being questioned as “enough,” and they may also be unsure why they are not fitting into a group they would have fit into prior to going to college. Administrators need to be open to listening to these students’ struggles and to help them navigate those spaces.

**Multiracial Staff and Faculty Impact**
Another overarching theme was that this study provided one of the first opportunities for students to discuss multiracial identity with a staff member who also identified as multiracial, and that was because of the researcher’s positionality. The participants never wanted to ask a staff or faculty member what they identified as, knowing the feeling of discomfort caused by that question. This made it harder for students to find potential mentors or to see someone who may understand a similar lived experience. Two of the participants shared that they felt affirmation and support in navigating an identity that previously felt ignored by faculty and staff.

**Recommendation**
Although staff and faculty have been allowed to mark themselves as multiracial on hiring paperwork—or change to multiracial if hired prior to 2008 (Kellogg & Niskodé, 2008)—students will not know who identifies as multiracial if staff do not share that part of their identity. Institutions should consider creating Multiracial Faculty and Staff Associations for visibility and support purposes. Such programs allow all members of the multiracial community to connect and possibly start a mentorship program. The staff association could serve as the model for potential multiracial student groups for campuses that do not have multiracial student groups.

**Multiracial Identity Data Collection and Resources**
When institutions collect data but do not disaggregate it, multiracial individuals may not get access to the same scholarships, resource centers, or student groups that their monoracial peers are getting, unless they are seeking them out or learning about them through peers. This was the case with some of the students in this study. Two participants shared that when they went to join the Black Student Union on campus, they learned that because they chose to identify as multiracial they did not receive a "congratulations on admittance" call from the organization, as those who identified as monoracial had. This call included additional campus resources the student participants did not receive until 2 weeks into the term. This lack of information caused the students to distrust the institution early in their collegiate careers.

**Recommendation**
Disaggregating multiracial student data will help universities generate additional resources to provide to multiracial students, depending on the racial groups with which the students identify. These data are important information to share with offices on campus, to illustrate the growth and diversity of the multiracial student population. The data collected for outreach purposes can be utilized several ways, including providing scholarship information, providing resource center contact information, and having multiracial faculty and staff call or email the incoming multiracial students to welcome them to their institutions. After doing this initial outreach, universities should create events or spaces for multiracial individuals to connect and explore their identities.
Conclusion
As institutions gather more data on the multiracial population and this community becomes more visible, higher education professionals should have more conversations about how they can support those individuals, and then follow through with actions.
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The NASPA Annual Conference is a wonderful event that brings together many student affairs professionals from a wide range of institutions, functional areas, and levels of experience. A few common threads that bind many of the new student affairs professionals and graduate students are a yearning to be involved, a drive to positively affect the world around them, and a thirst for knowledge. Graduate students and new professionals sometimes struggle to find a way to engage in the opportunities provided by NASPA because they assume they are too new to the profession, feel they lack knowledge or skill, or think they cannot make a significant difference in the field compared with others. Clance and Imes (1978) first described such feelings as the “imposter phenomenon,” seen in their interviews with highly successful, professional women—feelings of inadequacy, unworthiness, and lack of confidence. Higher education certainly has not been immune to the imposter syndrome (Parkman, 2016).

The 2018–2020 New Professionals and Graduate Students (NPGS) Knowledge Community (KC) co-chairs, Evette Allen and Antonio Duran, have called on the NPGS KC Leadership Team and constituency to #MakeYourMark. Among the several points that the KC Leadership Team hopes to help its members to #MakeYourMark is to encourage and support member efforts to engage in research. Specifically, the KC’s co-chairs have committed to “make an intentional effort to encourage its membership to consider their positions as scholars in the field” (Allen & Duran, 2018, p. 1). The NPGS KC is an incredible opportunity for graduate students and new professionals to network with colleagues across the nation, gain relevant practitioner and scholarly knowledge of current issues in the field, and serve in a professional community in some capacity. Moreover, as the #MakeYourMark campaign indicates, KC members have the opportunity to kickstart their career in student affairs through a professional organization.

As part of the #MakeYourMark campaign, the NPGS KC is focusing its initial efforts on two primary areas related to research. First, we as the KC’s Knowledge co-coordinators are working with several members of the broader NPGS KC constituency to conduct two different research projects. In addition to involving KC members in the research, these two
projects focus on topics that will explore the experiences of NPGS KC members. One is focused on graduate students and the factors that contributed to their decision on graduate schools and programs. The other explores the experiences of new student affairs professionals and the career path former residence life staff take after leaving housing. The researchers aim to present on both topics at NASPA 2020—the closing term for this NPGS KC Leadership Team.

Second, the NPGS KC Leadership Team is collecting and organizing information on all the different grants and sponsorships available through NASPA that support and facilitate research. Reaching out to the other knowledge communities, the various regions within NASPA, and NASPA as a whole, the KC plans to provide a reference that lists all of these opportunities to help NPGS KC members—and NASPA as a whole—find the means to help NASPA members more effectively #MakeYourMark through whatever research interests individuals may possess.

Through the NPGS KC Leadership Team’s research-focused efforts, the KC hopes to help NPGS KC members see opportunities to contribute to research efforts related to new professionals and graduate students in student affairs, and feel a sense of belonging within the broader NASPA research community. Belonging has long been recognized and acknowledged as not only a motivation but a need (Maslow, 1962; Strayhorn, 2012). Because belonging is symbiotic (Strayhorn, 2008), the NPGS KC hopes to help facilitate this belonging between NPGS KC members, other KCs, and NASPA as a whole. Additionally, by helping the members of the NPGS KC engage in these and other research opportunities, the Leadership Team hopes to help members be able to #MakeYourMark while providing an opportunity for them to connect to one another.

Participation in NASPA is not limited to research; the KC hopes to help individuals find other ways to #MakeYourMark in NASPA, such as serving on a committee, volunteering at the annual conference, or blogging for the KC! Feel free to reach out to us as the NPGS Knowledge co-coordinators, the NPGS co-chairs (Evette Allen and Antonio Duran), or anyone on the NPGS Leadership Team. However you desire to #MakeYourMark, the NPGS KC Leadership Team is here to help!
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Parents and family members play significant roles in college students’ lives (Baier, Markman, & Pernice-Duca, 2016). Daniel and Scott (2001) described how this population serves as active participants in their student’s college education. One of the most dynamic and powerful roles that parents and family members of college students play is that of an invaluable partner with colleges or universities in the success of their students (Daniel & Scott, 2001).

Few research studies have examined how parents and family members of first-generation college students perceive their roles in their students’ transition into the institution. Ward, Siegel, and Davenport defined a first-generation college student as a “student for whom neither parent attained a baccalaureate degree” (2012, p. 3). This research study, funded by a 2018 NASPA Parent and Family Relations Knowledge Community’s Research Grant award, sought to examine the parents’ perceptions. This qualitative study examined how the parents and family members of incoming first-year, first-generation college students at a regional public comprehensive university located in the South perceived their current roles in their students’ transition into the institution.

First-generation college students and their parents and family members navigate changing relationships when students pursue a postsecondary education more so than their continuing-generation college student and family peers. Covarrubias, Romero, and Trivelli (2015) identified, “The family context may be a particularly central reference point among first-generation college students. . . because of how families are valued and prioritized” (p. 2032). Parents and family members who hold a baccalaureate degree can share social capital with their college student,
allowing the student to navigate the social structures and resources of the academic environment. Parents and family members of a first-generation college student lack this social capital. Too often, first-generation college students withdrew from college courses because “they needed to figure out how to do college on their own” (Lightweis, 2014, p. 466). Parent and family program professionals should examine how resources and access to those resources can support parents and family members of first-generation college students in identifying the college environment that best supports their student’s success.

For many students who are either first in their family to attend college or potentially first in their family to graduate with a baccalaureate degree, this change in their relationship with their family members creates additional barriers to overcome during their collegiate tenure (Lang, 2015; Orbe, 2008; Wang, 2013). First-generation college students are routinely caught between the world of their home life and the demands of the academic institution, which frequently results in the difficult choices of which to prioritize (Mangan, 2015; Olive, 2008; Vazquez-Salgado, Greenfield, & Burgos-Cienfuegos, 2015). Family achievement guilt may also influence this changing familiar relationship. Covarrubias et al. (2015) defined family achievement guilt as “guilt that makes students feel uncomfortable for having more higher education opportunities and college success than their family members” (p. 2032). Parents and family members of first-generation college students do not intentionally seek to provide these barriers to student success. Rather, their “expectation of attending college... encouragement, and emotional support” (Dennis, Pinney, & Ivy Chuateco, 2005, p. 224) is routinely present in the first-generation college student’s transition into college. However, these barriers are unintentional byproducts of the lived experiences and changing relationships between parents and family members and their first-generation college students at this time of transition.

The sample population included the parents and family members of incoming first-year, full-time, on-campus, degree-seeking, first-generation college students enrolled for the fall 2018 semester. Participants were parents and family members who attended one of three pilot sessions of the university’s new half-day summer orientation and early registration advising program available for all incoming first-year students. Student affairs divisional staff members, including those who work in the functional areas of campus life, residence life, and diversity and inclusion, invited all parents and family members who attended the summer orientation program to participate in the study. Participants (n = 28) completed an eight-question, open-ended survey that asked them to reflect on their roles thus far in their first-generation college student’s collegiate experience and their perceived roles as their student prepared to begin college. Open coding was used to code the data, which included reading the responses for specific words and repetitive phrases from participants that may have aligned with the key concepts identified from researchers in the fields of parent and family programming and/or first-generation student experience. These similarities became coding categories that were then used to analyze key themes.

Several key themes emerged from this study regarding how parents and family members of incoming first-year, first-generation college students perceived their role in their student’s transition into and through the college experience. These roles included those perceived by parents and family members and those that were identified after intentional reflection opportunities. Perceived roles included parents and family members serving as a supportive resource for their students. Reflective roles included parent and family member involvement in pre-college decisions and admissions processes as well as their personal connectedness to the selected institutions.

A repeated theme identified by parents and family members was that they held a key role in supporting their student’s pre-college journey. When a student decides to attend an institution and pursue a postsecondary education, some parents and family members may become anxious or fearful about this new relationship with their student (Engle, Bermeo, & O’Brien, 2006). Multiple parents and family members in this study identified how they were invested in the recruitment and admissions processes, including encouraging pre-college planning early in the
student's high school journey, attending campus visits, discussing financial aid options, and being a sounding board in the selection process.

After their student decided to attend this university, parents and family members articulated how they felt connected to the institution of choice. Multiple respondents identified that they felt at ease and comfortable with the institution because of their role in their student's pre-college transition into the university. While some trepidation existed because of the newness of the higher education environment – as one family member stated "I am worried but excited for [my student]" – these parents and family members of first-generation college students gained confidence in their own ability to recognize resources and services available to their student, aligning with Daniel and Scott's (2001) goal of parents becoming partners with university resources for student success.

As first-generation college students began navigating the transition through college, and ultimately towards degree completion, parents and family members perceived their roles to be a critical support mechanism in their student’s transition. Twenty-five of the 28 respondents articulated specific strategies of how they will be a supportive resource and partner as their student makes sense of and experiences the collegiate journey. By providing a listening ear, attending university-sponsored parent and family programs and events, and engaging an intentional dialogue with their first-generation college student, these parents and family members are able to see themselves serving in many of the roles corroborated by early parent and family researchers (Carney-Hall, 2008; Daniel & Scott, 2001).

As one respondent stated, "I just need to know what university resources are available, so I know how to refer my student and what questions to ask."

The analogy of being pushed and being pulled through the college experience perhaps best exemplifies the differences encountered by family interactions with first- and continuing-generation college students. Parents and family members of continuing-generation college students frequently pull their student “through their first year [at the institution] with specific advice... about how to succeed in college” (Nichols & Islas, 2016, p. 59). Parents and family members of first-generation college students, though, are often more routinely identified as pushing their student through the first year of college with love and support (Nichols & Islas, 2016). Although they may not have the knowledge of campus resources, parents and family members of first-generation college students actively support their student's transition and educational journey.

Colleges and universities have an opportunity to reframe how they work with first-generation college students and their parents and family members. Administrators should shift from a deficit model of viewing first-generation students and their parents and family members as an at-risk population to an asset-based approach that acknowledges that for many first-generation college students, pursuing a college degree is an opportunity to bring honor to their family (Olive, 2008; Vazquez-Salgado et al., 2015). Staff who work with parents and family members should examine how colleges' parent and family communications and strategies, events, and orientation programming can best provide the cultural capital for the parents and family members of first-generation college students to pull their student through the first year of college with specific advice, similar to the experience of parents and family members of continuing-generation college students. Administrators should continue to examine how colleges acknowledge parents’ and family members’ experiences and validate their perceived and reflective roles. Administrators should also review current programs and provide information about campus resources. These steps will allow parent and family relations programs to remain inclusive to all parents and family members, including those of first-generation college students.
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The New Normal of Campus Life
The higher education landscape is changing. National data informs preventionists that although our college campuses generally do not reflect the racial diversity of the nation, college and university campuses are increasingly places that more minoritized students call home. This decades-long development demands that we shift our lens and expand our campus priorities, responses, and support for those minoritized students affected by violence to better reflect our new normal. Over the past several years, student affairs practitioners have been working inside a perfect storm of campus unrest: student activism following both the #MeToo movement and revisions to Title IX guidance, activism centered on reckoning with institutions’ histories of benefiting from slavery, and a reemergence of White supremacist groups’ visibility on campus. All these challenges create an institutional environment that makes innovative, inclusive, and anti-oppressive approaches, which seek to eradicate the multiple manifestations of oppression, essential to the safety and success of both survivors and the larger campus community (Barnoff & Moffatt, 2007).

What the data suggest about the experiences of students of color on campuses regarding violence calls for a conscious evaluation of our current color-blind approaches to establishing safe campus communities. A 2013 cross-sectional survey of 120 postsecondary institutions found that historically minoritized students experience sexual violence at significantly higher rates than their White male counterparts (Coulter, 2017). Specifically, cisgender women and transgender people experience higher rates of sexual violence than cisgender men, and students who claim an identity as both a racial and a gender minority on campus were exponentially more likely to report experiencing sexual violence (Coulter, 2017). Minoritized students are also more likely than White students to experience violence prior to matriculation. Survey responses from an online education program delivered in 2017 to nearly a million students across the country revealed that 16% of Native American/Native Hawaiian students, nearly 12% of Hispanic students, and more than 10% of Black students reported experiencing victimization prior to enrollment (EVERFI, 2018).
Defining the Problem
While the research above clearly identifies these students as being more vulnerable owing to their previous experiences with victimization, as well as potentially other factors (such as economic precarity), as of yet, most college campuses have not responded by developing sexual assault or other violence prevention programs that are designed specifically for their most vulnerable students (Mellins et al., 2017). From more than 100 institutions across the country that have completed EVERFI’s Sexual Assault Diagnostic Inventory, nearly every campus reported that it delivered tailored programming specifically to its first-year students and athletes (EVERFI, 2017–18), and more than half provided training to student leaders and students involved in Greek life. However, only a quarter of those campuses reported programming for LGBTQ students and less than 10% of campuses delivered prevention efforts specifically to racial and ethnic minority students (EVERFI, 2017–18). These data illuminate a significant gap between what students need and what campuses are providing.

Consider for a moment: As a sexual violence prevention or response professional, how often are you meeting with your colleagues engaged in diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts? Do you contribute to each other's strategic plans? Are there campus-specific goals that you have jointly articulated and that you share responsibility for executing? If not, why not?

Some might argue that while the goal of weaving social justice frameworks into the fabric of large-scale prevention work is nothing new, institutions' simultaneous compliance and avoidance of topics that include "White supremacy" and "oppression" make that goal difficult to achieve. Arguments that universities have increasingly strengthened White nationalism through ignoring the demands of student activists for inclusive communities (Chatelain, 2017) are direct and laden with solutions, but until we interrogate and deconstruct our own culture, we are not ensuring the safety of our most marginalized and oppressed students. We must not only include these topics in our staff meetings, strategic planning sessions, assessment plans, and leadership retreats, but also employ our best tangible resources and efforts to begin to understand the toxic relationship our respective institutions court and sustain with them. We must invest in frameworks that show the greater role oppression plays in the presence of violence across collegiate communities and work to create unified approaches to reframing and prioritizing all forms of violence.

Next Steps
What, then, might this look like? It can start with adopting a more transparent approach to violence prevention where advocates and preventionists exist as both content expert facilitators and engaged learners of cultural mores that affect students’ interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships with the root causes of violence. This can include the following:

- Make your department's stance against oppression clear. For example, Emory University's Office of Respect uses the tagline "We end violence by ending oppression."
- Include space for survivors of race-based trauma to disclose incidents of victimization and receive resources to continue their academic endeavors, ensuring that varied opportunities for general awareness raising on the components and impact social injustice are present.
- Encourage peer-to-peer dialogue to challenge concepts that historically minimize and harm members of their community.
- Utilize national and campus-specific data to gain an intersectional understanding of the community's narrative of violence and its impact.

Look carefully at prevention and awareness programs and consider how all the members of our community perceive these efforts. For example, bystander intervention programs are one of the few campus-based sexual violence interventions that have been well researched and show evidence of efficacy. For this reason, as well as
to comply with a federal mandate, they have been widely adopted by campuses in the past decade, both through in-person training programs and as a core part of the online education programs campuses deliver to their students. However, if these programs do not address the way in which a student’s racial and gender identity and expression shape their perceptions of harm, how others respond to them, and how others may respond if they intervene, they may be received by marginalized students as exclusionary. Strategies like this or events like Take Back the Night, without an intersectional lens that reflects more of the broad strokes of experiences found within the campus community, run the risk of being minimizing and centered on traditional White-facing tropes of violence awareness. We owe our students and communities social justice commitments that include their holistic well-being.
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According to data from the U.S. Department of Education (2017), the share of lower-income students pursuing higher education has increased, particularly in the past decade. Although many lower-income students qualify for federal aid, college affordability remains paramount to college students’ success. In addition to rising tuition, many college students struggle to afford textbooks (Cousteau, 2013) and living expenses (Kelchen, Goldrick-Rab, & Hosch, 2017). Managing the increasing costs of college attendance can be particularly burdensome for lower-income students, who are more likely to work longer hours, live with family, and forgo purchasing academic supplies to afford college (Broton, Frank, & Goldrick-Rab, 2014; Soria, Weiner, & Lu, 2014).

Research suggests campus climate may frustrate or support the college experiences and success of marginalized students (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008), including lower-income students. Through contributions to campus planning decisions, as well as efforts to promote engagement and build community, student affairs professionals play a role in determining what we have identified in our previous research as the campus climate for affordability (McClure, Ryder, & Mauk, 2017).

Campus Climate for Affordability

Campus climate may be defined as the degree to which campus conditions support values or activities regarded as important to colleges, such as the climate for diversity and inclusion. The interaction of three sets of conditions determines campus climate: the campus environment; policies, standard practices, and related organizational structures; and the behaviors of individuals and groups (Hurtado et al., 2008). Campus climate has been linked to important outcomes, including sense of belonging (McClure & Ryder, 2018) and academic success (Kuh & Associates, 2005). To assess campus climate, researchers...
and practitioners attempt to capture individuals’ perceptions and behaviors using multiple data sources, including surveys, focus groups, and documents (Ryder & Mitchell, 2013).

In our research, we applied the concept of campus climate to the condition of college affordability with an eye toward outcomes like sense of belonging. Table 1 presents an overview of factors that our research, and other literature, suggests can play a role in campus climate for affordability. The student profile (Factor 1) reflects the influence of the demographic composition of the study body. For example, lower-income students may find a climate for affordability supportive when many of their peers receive need-based financial aid and work to support themselves or their family. A campus’s physical features (Factor 2) can also affect its climate for affordability. A campus or community that features many high-end student housing complexes and retail stores may negatively influence its climate for affordability. We detail in our research how lower-income students struggle to pay for extracurricular and experiential learning activities, including education abroad (Factor 3). The same is true of coursework (Factor 4); students’ experiences with requirements related to technology and textbooks could engender negative attitudes about affordability. Factor 5 centers on the role of campus policies and management practices, such as the prices a campus sets for housing and the approach it takes to parking. Last, a campus can positively contribute to its climate for affordability by providing specific services for lower-income students (Factor 6).

Campus climate for affordability can have important implications for student success. Unanticipated expenses like utilities, library fines, and parking tickets can sometimes prevent lower-income students from progressing toward graduation (Broton, Frank, & Goldrick-Rab, 2014; McClure, Ryder, & Mauk, 2017). Costs beyond tuition may push lower-income students to work more, avoid campus and its pricey services, or make questionable long-term financial decisions, such as opening high-interest credit cards (McClure, Ryder, & Mauk, 2017). For some students, the ability to spend money on simple things like eating in the union with friends plays an important role in their sense of belonging (McClure & Ryder, 2018). Simply put, lower-income students may opt to transfer out, stop out, or drop out if they perceive a chilly campus climate for affordability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Factors That Influence Campus Climate for Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Student Profile | • Percentage of students who receive need-based financial aid  
• Percentage of students who work  
• Students’ access to spending money |
| 2. Physical Features of Campus/Community | • Luxury apartment complexes  
• Availability of affordable student housing  
• Concentration/location of living and dining options |
| 3. Student Extracurricular Experience | • Student activities fees  
• Membership dues for student organizations  
• Costs to participate in campus events  
• Learning communities for first-generation students |
| 4. Student Academic Experience | • Differential tuition policies  
• Technology and other academic fees  
• Costs of textbooks/availability of open access textbooks |
| 5. Campus Management Practices and Policies | • Parking fees and tickets  
• Housing fees and dining plans  
• Health center and pharmacy charges |
| 6. Financial Supports for Low-Income Students | • Emergency aid and housing  
• Child care options for adult students  
• Availability of need-based aid  
• Food pantry on campus |
Assessing Campus Climate for Affordability

We argue that student affairs professionals can improve their campus's climate for affordability by incorporating it into ongoing assessment efforts. What does it take to assess campus climate for affordability? As noted previously, climate assessments often draw on multiple data sources and commonly employ climate surveys to collect data from large, representative samples of people (Ryder & Mitchell, 2013). Conducting a climate survey draws on specific student affairs competencies related to assessment, including writing or locating valid survey items; selecting sampling strategies most likely to yield results that represent all students, with robust participation of marginalized students; analyzing results for positive and negative patterns; and reporting and sharing results. An important part of this process is analyzing institutional policies and practices to understand how they affect lower-income students, which may suggest potential survey items and highlight promising strategies to improve a campus’s climate for affordability. Survey results may raise more questions or require clarification, in which case data from focus groups, interviews, or social media analyses may provide valuable description and contextualization. By assessing and understanding campus climate for affordability, student affairs professionals can make decisions and engage in practices to meet the basic needs of lower-income students and ensure their success.
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Alexander and Helen Astin’s groundbreaking work on college student spirituality in the 2000s was a catalyst for higher education scholars to begin placing more focus on this traditionally less-explored aspect of diversity on college campuses (Schmalzbauer, 2013). Researchers soon found that students’ experiences with spirituality were heavily influenced by their spiritual, religious, or nonreligious identity. While worldview-majority Christian students have experienced the vast majority of opportunities to develop spiritually, worldview-minority students, such as Hindus and Muslims, and nonreligious students, such as atheists and agnostics, have experienced a greater degree of spiritual struggle and marginalization on their campuses (Bowman, Felix, & Ortis, 2014; Bowman & Small, 2012; Bryant & Astin, 2008).

To help mitigate the unique struggles of worldview-minority students, some colleges and universities have...
hired campus chaplains who are able to empathize with, advocate for, and represent them (Kazanjian, 2006; Schmalzbauer, 2013). In the past ten years, Hindu chaplains in particular have been increasingly vocal about their work in scholarship and online forums, and a common thread in their testimonies has been their function as “translators” between Hindus and non-Hindus on campus. This work has enabled Hindu chaplains to remain visible on campus while ensuring that their students are seen and heard.

The Experiences and Struggles of Hindu Students

In the past decade, a new crop of literature has emerged on the college experiences of worldview-minority students, including Hindus. For example, Kumar (2016) found that Hindu students are often stereotyped for being exceptionally intelligent, bound to certain majors and careers, and having practices deemed archaic and strange. Kurien (2005) discovered that some Hindu students are grappling with what it means to be Indian and Hindu on their campuses and in America at large. Pressures inside the Hindu community can induce stress over whether one is Indian or Hindu enough. In some cases, factions emerge within Hindu campus groups between those who believe that Indian culture and Hinduism are endangered and require defending, and those who are more comfortable accommodating Western or American cultural norms (Kurien, 2007).

The Emergence of Hindu Chaplains

In the past ten years, Hindu chaplains have been hired at the University of Southern California, Georgetown, Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton, as part of a growing trend in American higher education to break from traditional norms when it comes to campus chaplaincy (Kazanjian, 2013). Historically, only worldview-majority Christian students have enjoyed the benefit of a chaplain representing them on campus (Xia, 2017). This historical legacy of Christian chaplaincy has created some uncertainty about what Hindu chaplains do. Asha Shipman, Hindu chaplain at Yale (2017), noted, “The word chaplain evokes a chapel—a Christian structure with a constellation of assumptions and expectations surrounding it—including a congregation of worshipers. Set the word Hindu alongside, and there lies a great conundrum” (p. 1). This uncertainty presents Hindu chaplains a good opportunity to clarify their roles and functions on campus.

The Role and Experiences of Hindu Chaplains

Vineet Chander (2013) was hired to be the first Hindu chaplain at Princeton University. He quickly began to recognize the importance of an active presence working with Hindu students. He described his role as a “co-religionist” and “trekking guide” for his students, someone who could “sympathize with the challenges faced by Hindu students in ‘owning’ the particularities of their tradition” (p. 108). Chander also found himself providing “translation” between Hindu students when differences arose, and also between the Hindu community and the university community as a whole (p. 108).

When Neil Krishan Aggarwal (2011) functioned as a Hindu chaplain at Yale, he categorized his work on campus as an “interlocutor” that provided “translation” between Hindus and non-Hindus. He wrote in State of Formation that Hindu chaplains must “find a way to translate our traditions for a broad audience without apologetics [defending the supremacy of Hinduism] or sacrificing internal diversity in return” (p. 1).

Both Chander (2013) and Aggarwal (2017) employed the concept of translator when referencing the role they played as chaplains to Hindu students. This included both translating the beliefs and practices of Hinduism to non-Hindus on campus, and translating between members of the Hindu student community when differences arose. Victor Kazanjian (2013), dean of intercultural education at Wellesley College, explained that “the different social languages of religion and spirituality . . . function like different languages, and as a result when persons speak about their religion, spirituality, or spiritual practices, rarely do we understand what is being spoken without translation” (p. 101). He added, “This role of translator between students of different spiritualities has become a key task of chaplains, student life professionals, faculty members, and student leaders who are engaging issues of religion and spirituality on campus” (p. 101).
Conclusion

Institutions and Hindu students benefit from the visible, active, and welcomed participation of Hindu chaplains. However, more work needs to be done to understand the functions that Hindu chaplains perform and how they are influencing the experiences of Hindu students. Finally, further research might explore the “translator” motif at greater depth. With more attention and scholarly focus, student affairs professionals could partner with Hindu chaplains to ensure that Hindu students experience the spiritual and academic gains enjoyed by worldview-majority students.
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While postsecondary education institutions have sought to garner financial support from their alumni, perceived disparities of giving capacity by identity and subsequent societal inequities have historically led fundraisers to view alumni from marginalized backgrounds as recipients rather than providers of charity (Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Rovner & McCarthy, 2015). Ultimately, many alumni have been repeatedly ignored by fundraisers and thus left without the voice that philanthropy provides in shaping the future of their alma mater. This has implications for private support of postsecondary education and the research that informs fundraising strategies.

The focus on donors with the perceived ability to make a financial contribution has led to an empirical and practical knowledge base developed through research on a homogeneous group of donors, namely those who are wealthy, White, and male. Thankfully, an emerging line of research has begun to explore giving by alumni of different identities (albeit still fairly limited to race, ethnicity, and sex\(^1\)) (e.g., Drezner, 2013; Drezner & Huehls, 2015; Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Rovner & McCarthy, 2015). Garvey and Drezner (2013) offered the conclusion that appeared consistently across the newer body of research: “Minority alumni have unique histories with their colleges and universities, sometimes making it difficult for them to look past negative and marginalizing experiences to create meaningful connections and mutually beneficial relationships with their alma maters” (p. 74).

\(^{1}\) The limitation of considering only the female-male binary is an additional limitation of the research thus far.
However, alumni engagement and fundraising efforts that focus on student affairs priorities, particularly those related to social justice, provide an opportunity for minoritized alumni to reconnect with their institutions as change agents as well as financial supporters. At the 2018 NASPA Student Affairs Fundraising Conference, hosted at the University at Albany, presenters shared their successes raising private dollars to expand access, opportunity, and inclusion. The following four examples offered at the conference highlight the potential for student affairs work that focuses on social justice to increase donor engagement and fundraising.

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
Angie Dimit (adimit@illinois.edu), director of advancement for student affairs, shared that a predominant focus of fundraising at the institution had been scholarships for new students. Student affairs saw a unique opportunity to raise scholarship funds for student persistence and retention, an area where student affairs practitioners are experts and where there was a great need for measurable impact. Additionally, Dimit noted that while alumni who enjoyed their student experience were providers of financial support, those who had poor experiences may also be willing to support if they could see the impact of their funds. For example, alumni who are committed to helping build a different future are partnering with the university to raise funds for The Bruce D. Nesbitt African American Cultural Center, which had a temporary location for several years after the original building was deemed structurally unsafe.

University of Utah
Erica Marken (erica.marken@utah.edu), director of undergraduate advancement, described the growth in funds and capacity of Community Partners, a multiyear mentoring and scholarship program for first-generation, low-income, and minority students. Students in the program meet multiple times per semester with and often shadow their mentors, who are often "C-suite" executives. While the gift of each mentor's time is tremendously valuable in expanding the students' social capital, each mentor also provides an annual gift of $2,000. These funds go directly back to the students in the form of a scholarship, thereby reducing their debt burden and time allocated to employment and simultaneously allowing them to focus more on their life as a student. In its first year, the program had eight mentors and ten students and awarded $4,750 in scholarships; the 2018–19 academic year marks the program's fifth year, with 21 new (out of 125 applicants) and 24 returning students, 48 mentors, and more than $108,500 in scholarship awards.

Texas Tech University
Larry Phillippe (larry.phillippe@ttu.edu) and Blayne Alaniz (blayne.alaniz@ttu.edu), director and assistant director, respectively, of student disability services, shared how their office began raising private funds to meet budget gaps and, ultimately, to expand programming. The university serves more than 3,000 students with disabilities, including services delivered through a specialized learning/tutoring center. The department’s self-developed fundraising handout communicates to donors that all gift amounts were appreciated and impactful: $1 could purchase drinks or snacks for students during tutoring and $500 could cover tutoring services for one student for a semester. In 5 years, the targeted (but fairly minimal) efforts by the office’s staff have increased the number of scholarships awarded to students with disabilities from 6 to 20. In 2017–18, the endowment provided more than $46,500 in scholarships, with expected growth to more than $50,000 by the fall of 2019.

Stanford University
Anita Husen, former director of the Markaz Center for students who identify with or who are in interested in Muslim experiences, touted expanded support for students during the Islam holy month of Ramadan. During this time, many Muslims observe intense prayer, a strict fast from sunrise to sunset, and nightly "breaking of the fast" celebrations called Iftar. In 2018, the earlier timing of Ramadan meant that the entire month occurred during an academic semester. Through partnerships among Markaz, the Muslim student group, the student government, and the campus development office, $8,760 was raised from gifts of between $20 and $1,000 to offer 30 days of meals (compared with the usual 10). Meals cost about $750. In addition to the financial support, the celebrations saw gifts of time through volunteer opportunities.
The Pathway to Social Justice and Alumni Donor Engagement

Those seeking more information about the programs highlighted above are welcomed to contact the respective professionals. Additionally, joining the NASPA Student Affairs Fundraising and External Relations Knowledge Community and attending the 2020 Student Affairs Fundraising Conference are excellent ways to learn more about fundraising specific to our profession. The book Engaging Diverse College Alumni: The Essential Guide to Fundraising written by 2018 conference keynote Mary Beth Gasman (along with colleague Nelson Bowman III) offers great practical insights and tips to enshrine social justice in fundraising. And the newly created journal Philanthropy and Education offers contemporary empirical insights.

Conclusion

The 100th anniversary conference themes of “Belonging & Student Success,” “Community & Democratic Engagement,” and “Leaning Into the Next 100 Years” are important for NASPA and also for our campuses. Having funding to sustain these themes may be even more important. As our institutions lean into the next 100 years and become more reliant on philanthropy, student affairs fundraising will undoubtedly continue to expand. This may be new territory for professionals who have traditionally focused internally on developing and supporting students. As the torchbearers of social justice on our campuses, we have not only a responsibility to continue to expand these efforts, but also a tremendous opportunity to engage former students who may have been ignored in traditional alumni advancement efforts and bring their voices to the table.
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Collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs has long been an aspirational goal for colleges and universities. Since the early 1940s, student affairs has developed as a field that addresses outside-the-classroom experiences. In the American Council on Education’s (1949) Student Personnel Point of View, student affairs professionals were urged to collaborate in the academy and to coordinate with faculty. Evolving into a shared educator role between student affairs and academic affairs, Keeling & Dungy’s and Keeling’s (2004, 2006) Learning Reconsidered I and Learning Reconsidered II serve as a roadmap for creating curricular and cocurricular experiences focused on student learning and student success. These two documents, along with headway made with living-learning communities in the late 1990s and early 2000s, give student affairs and academic affairs a practical model for partnering, with two specific outcomes: student learning and student success (i.e., retention and graduation).

Living-learning communities, service learning, and coordinated career strategies are three examples of what Kuh (2008) described as “high-impact practices,” which include both curricular and cocurricular aspects. These practices are a good start to models of true collaboration. More collaboration is needed to increase the high-impact practice effectiveness and results of student success. A
focus on student learning and student success as shared goals between student affairs and academic affairs creates rich experiences for students. For example, the University of Southern Utah built a collaborative model for retention with shared responsibility and accountability for student success. The ASCEND (Affordability, Support, Culture, Engagement, Nudges, Data) Model serves as one example of academic and student affairs creating shared goals for student success; namely, retention of students (Southern Utah University, 2018).

Another example of collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs is the shared responsibility of educational experiences in and out of the classroom. Universities across the nation are evaluating and creating 21st century core curriculums. Partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs are critical in this work of reconstructing general education.

This is new territory for partnerships. Typically, re-designing the core curriculum is considered academic work, reserved for the faculty. Ideally, the cocurricular experience supports classroom learning. Partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs assist in re-creating a 21st century general curriculum. How do educators lean in to these partnerships? Because higher education is underfunded and resources are limited, how do universities leverage student affairs and academic affairs partnerships to achieve student learning and student success? Data and narratives from professional associations such as the National Association of Colleges and Employers, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Association of College and University Housing Officers–International, Association of College Unions International, and others provide frameworks for collaboration between curricular and cocurricular outcomes. What results do we seek as a university community? All of the resources focused on student success (curricular and cocurricular) should be leveraged for best results.

In the ACPA and NASPA (2015) joint document, Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators, the Professional Competencies Task Force identified ten competency areas for student affairs professionals to master. One critical competency in partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs is Assessment, Evaluation, and Research.

Assessment, Evaluation, and Research

With a focus on student learning and student success, student affairs and academic affairs can achieve common university goals. Competency development in assessment, evaluation, and research (AER), as defined by ACPA and NASPA (2015), includes the ability to design, conduct, critique, and use various AER methodologies and the results obtained from them, to utilize AER processes and their results to inform practice, and to shape the political and ethical climate surrounding AER processes and uses in higher education. (p. 20)

Although many master’s degree programs offer a course in assessment and evaluation, student affairs professionals typically hold a rudimentary level of competency. Developing higher levels of competence, as suggested by the ACPA and NASPA (2015) publication, increases university-wide and systemic understanding of student learning and student success, which is critical in partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs.

With a well-developed competency of assessment, evaluation, and research, student affairs administrators are positioned to be good consumers and producers of research. Partnerships steeped in research and assessment create foundations for evidenced best practice in student learning and student success. Assessment, evaluation, and research is a bedrock for future collaboration, including the redesign of core curriculums. Student affairs professionals create the cocurriculum with students and must be able to utilize assessment, evaluation, and research to guide best practice and to work with academic partners for expected results. Student affairs and academic affairs are two sides of one coin; they impact one another throughout the curriculum and cocurriculum.

More research is needed to highlight student success outcomes. Student affairs and academic affairs professionals, can create collaborative research projects focusing on student learning both in the curriculum and the cocurriculum. Recent collaborative research efforts are minimal in the literature. Models developed
through evaluation and assessment would strengthen the connection between a strong core curriculum and a cocurriculum focused on best practice. New research agendas between student affairs and academic affairs are needed to move forward with best strategies for student learning and student success.

The Student Affairs Partnering with Academic Affairs Knowledge Community highlights such partnerships and recognizes the necessity of leaning into learning paradigms identified through assessment, evaluation, and research that supports such partnerships and strategies. As state and federal funding models change, and as the student experience focuses on building competence, a seamless approach to learning in the core curriculum can be achieved through partnership. Leveraging resources, talents, and research between academic affairs and student affairs creates a student experience focused on success for the learner.
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As university career centers continue to receive national attention and elevation on college campuses and welcome more diverse students, the approaches that career development professionals utilize must be understood and evaluated. Current and future career development practitioners must utilize an interdisciplinary and multifaceted set of knowledge, skills, and abilities to prepare students for success (Dey & Cruzvergara, 2014). Paradigms outside the traditional fields of career counseling, vocational psychology, and career development practice offer career centers helpful approaches for assisting all students. The framework of multicultural education presents considerations for innovative university career centers looking to bridge equity and operational excellence. This article introduces multicultural education dimensions, demonstrates their relevance to career services, and operationalizes the foundational dimensions for career services practice.
student needs. The following sections outline five foundational dimensions of multicultural education that university career center staffs should consider as they engage the reality of diversity today.

**Considerations for Career Counseling, Advising, and Coaching**
The functions of career counseling and career exploration provide students with skills and mechanisms to define and understand their own development and trajectory (Pipkins, Rooney, & Jaunarajs, 2014). Two dimensions of multicultural education are critically important to operational excellence: content integration and knowledge construction. Content integration articulates information and knowledge from multiple viewpoints and collective understanding (Sultanova, 2016). Knowledge construction encourages programs and services to help students discern how cultural assumptions and frames of reference affect one's understanding of knowledge (Sultanova, 2016). When synthesizing these dimensions holistically, career centers can affirm and amplify students' unique demographics and backgrounds in a more nuanced way. Career center staff can advocate for tools, information, resources, programs, and processes that limit inequity and bias. Ultimately, the integration of a multicultural education framework challenges career centers to cultivate an environment that engages the complexity of social identity, career trajectories, and career center operations.

**Considerations for Experiential Education**
High-impact experiential education has a positive impact on student learning and institutional outcomes (Eyler, 2009). Two dimensions of multicultural education—equity pedagogy and prejudice reduction—are timely as college and university career center staff expand experiential education opportunities. First, equity pedagogy articulates that educators facilitate training and development in a manner that encourages achievement across all racial, cultural, socioeconomic, and language groups (Sultanova, 2016). Career center staff must think analytically about leveraging human and organizational resources, institutional mechanisms of support, and external partners to provide equitable access to and experiences for all students. Second, prejudice reduction aims to help students contextualize the influence of one's racial and ethnic identity about both dominant and nondominant social groups (Sultanova, 2016). When implemented systematically, university career centers can frame experiential education as the mechanism to understand social identity in terms of one's career trajectory and the world of work, and not simply as an opportunity for skill acquisition and development. By building spaces such as identity-based career communities for processing, reflecting on, and understanding experiential learning activities, students obtain a more holistic understanding of what their future could be. Overall, the integration of these dimensions of multicultural education challenges career center staff to think about integrating equity into their day-to-day practice and in collaboration with various parties.

**Considerations for Employer and External Relations**
Employer relations has been an essential practice to career development work for the past three decades, as it creates systematic pipelines for leadership development within organizations (Hoover, Lenz, & Garis, 2013). The foundational dimension of an empowering school culture advocates for individuals across multiple aspects of social identity to experience equality in terms of processes and opportunities (Sultanova, 2016). In addition to creating opportunities for connection points, career centers must conduct a broader evaluation of what philosophical, operational, and contextual realities affect the overall external strategy. The process of building an empowering culture requires a critical understanding how the current system may be creating inequity and bias (Banks, 1993). Therefore, career centers must evaluate the factors, resources, and outcomes that drive external partnership development. This evaluation should illuminate whether students are being underserved and lead to stronger and longer-lasting partnerships. Ultimately, the integration of this domain dares university career centers to ensure that success can be obtained for all students.
Closing Thoughts
Multicultural education, as a framework, argues for educational organizations and environments to critically assess and evaluate their systems, structures, and mechanisms of support to ensure the success of all students. If college and university career centers aim to create truly equitable environments, frameworks must be utilized to emphasize systemic and organizational analysis. The future of student success and belonging are dependent on higher education organizations providing the best environments possible. Higher education career centers can contribute to this goal by creating programs, processes, and services that emphasize the dimensions of multicultural education.
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As the United States enters a new era of political turmoil, students are once again at the center of national efforts advocating for change, as they have been throughout U.S. history. This article examines the role that higher education, and specifically student government, plays in the nationwide call for civic engagement.

**Historical Roots**

The extracurricular world of higher education was largely initiated and created by 19th and 20th century students in the United States who sought a varied college experience free from the rigidity of academia (Bank, Delamont, & Marshall, 2007). Because extracurricular activities were outside the realm of the academic parts of the institution, they lacked the control of academic and university officials, who were often in conflict with students about the university’s operations and priorities. Students often used these extracurricular activities, such as debates and school newspapers, to critique and challenge university leaders and their policies.

During the Progressive Era of 1890–1920, administrators created student governments as a mechanism to accommodate the various student clubs and organizations (Bank et al., 2007). These governments, comprised of students elected by their peers, created their own status system that was recognized by the university. From the institutions’ perspective, student government was meant to be a bridge for communication between university leaders and to co-opt students, not necessarily give them the power to make decisions and implement policies that affect the student experience. But throughout the 20th century, colleges increasingly used student government to harness student energy to promote the progressive values of citizenship, service, and civic engagement.
Students throughout history have been at the forefront of major changes in American values and attitudes from a wide variety of areas, such as relations between the sexes and races, advocacy for civil rights, and social norms (Altbach & Cohen, 1990). Student governments are uniquely positioned to represent student voices across the nation and lead the charge in advocating for political and societal change. The power and influence of student governments varies widely across the country, and they have a significant, albeit somewhat complicated, role in higher education. Nonetheless, student affairs practitioners who work directly with student government leaders have an opportunity to influence productive relationships between the students and campus administrators, and facilitate conversations about political activism.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CAMPUS

In the United States, student government is both an oxymoron and a central feature in the overall shared governance of a university (Bank et al., 2007). The self-contradiction occurs because no student government has true 100% decision-making power in any of the university’s functions, and, in many cases, their powers are severely constrained. Still, these student leaders have a unique position to influence university decision makers and to promote democracy despite its limitations. Unsurprisingly, at times this puts the students and university administration at odds, creating tension over the extent to which students believe the university can control their decisions, and vice versa.

Additionally, tensions can arise between student government officials and the student body they represent, for example, when the student body believes that these elected officials represent the interests of only a small segment of the student population while ignoring or working against the rest of the students’ concerns or priorities (Bank et al., 2007). Tensions can also arise when the students feel their student government is catering to university priorities at the direction of campus administrators. These tensions can put student affairs professionals who work directly with student government leaders in a precarious position—they must balance the responsibility of enforcing university policy at the behest of their supervisors, who are often the campus administrators in conflict with students, while trying to empower student leaders to assert their power and make their government more legitimate and influential on campus.

SUPPORTING STUDENT POLITICAL ACTIVISM

In the aftermath of the tumultuous 2016 U.S. presidential election, campuses have often been at the center of national social and political discourse. As a result, students across the country have been engaging in various forms of political activism. This has put the spotlight on not only student activists but also student governments at higher education institutions. A study on the adult political behavior of former student activists compared the level of political activity postgraduation between radical student activists and institutional activists (student government members) following the 1960s civil rights era. The study showed that these students are very active as adults in multiple dimensions, including protests, community activism, campaign participation, and voting (Fendrich & Lovoy, 1988). This has continued to manifest on college and university campuses in various ways in the present day, and administrators have been challenged to respond to students’ demands for institutional and even societal change, reflecting the wide spectrum of political ideologies across the country. Educators should be invested in helping to facilitate this dialogue among campus student leaders to create a future generation of engaged and enlightened citizens who feel empowered to exercise civic duties.

In many ways, student governments have represented a microcosm of U.S. politics. Mannheim’s theory of political generations argues that generational differences are shaped by major political and social events that occur during young adulthood, between the ages of 18 and 25 (Fendrich & Lovoy, 1988). Student government leadership provides a space for growth and exploration of personal passions that can lead to advocacy and future political involvement. The role of student
affairs professionals and departments has increasingly become to create a learning laboratory on campus to help students develop their leadership and broaden their perspective through various activities outside the traditional academic classroom. Student government leaders are more likely to pursue elected positions in the future; therefore, student government advisors across the country have an opportunity to create programming on their campuses that prepares these students to become productive and ethical leaders.

What’s Next for the Student Government Knowledge Community?

In 2017, student affairs practitioners across the country worked collaboratively to envision a new community within NASPA, the Student Government Knowledge Community (SGKC). The SGKC’s goal is to provide quality training, engagement, advocacy, and advising for student government leaders and advisors through the compilation and development of resources, training, and research. The SGKC intends to create spaces online and in person to have open dialogue about current issues and to share best practices in how to engage students through civic leadership. Together, the SGKC hopes to be a resource for student governments and advisors across the country. The needs and influences of student government leaders vary by institution and region, and as alumni and student affairs practitioners, our knowledge community believes in the power of student government to affect positive change on and off campus.

As a NASPA professional, consider joining the Student Government Knowledge Community to share best practices and serve as an advocate for student activism and leadership.

References


The data examined in this manuscript outline a potential lack of congruence between students’ social media postings when using a department-provided #hashtag while volunteering. Buschlen, Esterline Perkins, and Kiurski (2018) examined four years of public domain messaging (n = 3,012), the findings led to several suggestions related to the practice of #hashtag use while students volunteer. Because leadership serves as one of the professional competencies defined by American College Personnel Association – College Student Educators International (ACPA) and Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA), student affairs professionals must understand how leadership works, how it emerges, and, most important in this case, how it is showcased. Often, leadership and service to others are inseparable (Buschlen & Goffnett, 2013). The process of developing the skill of leadership in young adults requires that leadership educators create opportunities for students to reflect on their own development while providing feedback to students who are continually honing their leadership identities (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). This should help drive the development of the leadership competency for emerging leaders (ACPA & NASPA, 2015).

Buschlen et al. (2018) examined a sample of messages (n = 3,012) attached to a set of department-provided #hashtags while students were serving others (see Figure 1). The messages were collected from popular social media sites: Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, over the span of four years (2012–16), using several internal and external search tools. The data were collected to simply find and report what students were communicating both in text and with images, using the provided #hashtags.
#ExpressYourself

For millennials and generation Z, social media has become the tool of choice for social engagement, marketing, collaboration, and keeping others informed (Krishen, Berezan, Agarwal, & Kachroo, 2016). Both generations of students use social media for a variety of reasons, including community building, self-gratification, entertainment, and expressiveness (Botterill, Bredin, & Dun, 2015). These groups, whose ages range from 18 to 29, compose the largest demographic using social media (Duggan, 2015). Because both groups tend to rely on social media daily, it was a logical step for many volunteer centers to align social media usage with service projects, to allow students to share their stories and successes.

Higher education generates many opportunities for students to serve community partners (Dugan, 2006). Colleges and universities provide fertile ground to develop the involved citizen, one who is willing to serve communities around the world (Buschlen & Warner, 2014). During these service experiences, students are often asked to engage in deep reflection to more fully understand their civic charge and to understand why they serve others (Buschlen & Warner, 2014). The Social Change Model of Leadership (SCM) outlines the seven C’s of leadership, and one of those C’s is congruence (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996). In the SCM, congruence is defined as behaviors that are consistent between thoughts and actions to better understand and know oneself (HERI, 1996).

Campus volunteer centers often create unique #hashtags for participants to use while serving others during daylong and weeklong events, such as an alternative break. An alternative break is an experiential learning opportunity that started in the early 1990’s and provides an alternative to the traditional spring break through issue-based service (http://www.alternativebreaks.org/). Buschlen et al. (2018) utilized content analysis to examine the alternative break data and then categorize the data into a set of thematic message typologies (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service in Action</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Sightseeing</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Connections</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reflections</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>3,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Messenging by Channel

**Figure 2: Messenging by Percentage**

- Service in Action: 18%
- Personal Reflections: 25%
- Travel/Sightseeing: 30%
- Group Connections: 17%
- Promotions: 7%
- Other: 3%

n = 3,012

www.naspa.org
#WhatDidTheySay

After examining and cataloging the data collected from the websites, six major themes emerged. Themes are outlined below from the largest percentage to the smallest.

1. **Traveling/Sightseeing = 30%**
   Group photos or selfies in a vehicle; map screenshots; photos of road signs, planes, landscapes, housing, food, and so on; and photos or references made when driving to or from the site or when sightseeing. Sample: “Driving through the Smokey Mountains. #wwwAWB.”

2. **Personal Reflections = 25%**
   Posts related to signing up for the service trip, discussing site locations, and so on. Sample: “It’s amazing how much can be put in perspective in a week. I’ll never forget this trip and the amazing people we met. #wwwAWB.”

3. **Service in Action = 18%**
   Posts that highlight students actively engaged in an event or act related to their service site. Sample: “I’m thankful for the opportunity to serve this county with @wwwVolunteers.”

4. **Group Connections = 17%**
   Posts that communicate events or acts done as a group that are not travel or service related. Examples include cooking meals together, socializing, and/or sharing inside jokes. Sample: “Site leaders telling each other bedtime stories #wwwAWB.”

5. **Promotions = 7%**
   Posts related to the volunteer center, university, host site, fundraising, or media coverage. Sample: A photo of a student or students wearing university apparel or holding a university flag.

6. **Other = 3%**
   Posts that do not have a category. Sample: “Playing Mafia at 2am because who needs sleep? #wwwASB.”

#WhatDoesItMean

The time that students spend serving in communities plays a key role in their leadership development (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Universities want students to employ their freedom of speech while using social media. Conversely, if a student wants to play “video games at 2am,” they should feel free . . . but leave off the #hashtag. In this project, a mere 18% of the examined messages focused on the act of service to others. One can argue that teamwork and personal reflections are also part of the leadership development process. One can also argue that posts about food, travel, and destinations do share aspects of the service project that may help promote future trips to other students. Still, associating the department-provided #hashtag with items not related to service, leadership, community engagement, and the like, outlines a potential disconnect between the actual practice and the purpose behind the idea.

#WhatShouldWeDo

As campus volunteer centers associate #hashtags with service projects, Buschlen et al. (2018) suggested that this practice be continued but enhanced to further the development of a positive leadership identity for students. #Hashtag use provides a wonderful platform for students to memorialize the service act and to represent their college or university in positive ways. Volunteer centers should consider the process of “listening” to what is posted by monitoring student #hashtag use before, during, and after a service program takes place. Buschlen et al. (2018) suggested that centers use the #hashtag to solicit posts as data for assessment purposes while measuring student learning and leadership growth. Volunteer centers may consider a brief training session on how best to use the #hashtags, giving students an understanding of how the #hashtags represent the individual who is posting, the service group, and the larger university community. Centers may consider adding theme days, message gatekeepers, or policies—not to deter freedom of speech or expression, but to engage in stronger message congruence.
#Conclusion
Students should align their language, thoughts, behaviors, and actions with leadership-based values to represent both a vital stage toward understanding their “self” and an important step for authentic leadership making (HERI, 1996). When posting a message regarding a service event, a student should have the freedom to do what they think is best. Keeping in mind that there is a larger audience reading that post, the goal should be to increase message congruence with the social change elements found in the student’s service acts.
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College personnel must understand the life and performance-altering effects of alcohol in order to guide collegiate athletes toward awareness and preventive strategies for success in life and in athletic competition. Having presented programs on high-risk drinking, sexual assault, and sexual health to more than a quarter million collegiate athletes over the past 21 years, I have a comprehensive understanding of how stressful their lives can be and how their work hard/play hard attitudes can be detrimental to their academic and athletic performance. Student-athletes juggle academics, busy practice and travel schedules, missed classes, and intense pressure to perform for their teams and campuses. While student-athletes manage stress in many ways, this article focuses on the effects of alcohol use and abuse and how student affairs professionals can help guide athletes to make positive choices related to alcohol.

Collegiate athletes engage in high-risk drinking more frequently than non-athlete students (Cimini et al, 2015). Athletes are competitive by nature, and they often compete with teammates to drink more. Celebratory drinking after a win is perceived as a norm (Clark, 2016). Members of a Division I football team told me they drink excessively because they can’t stand the behavior of other drunks at parties. The number one reason college students drink is to loosen up in a social setting, and athletes follow this norm (SIUC/Core Institute, 2013).

Several years ago, students started to share that they drink to black out. For some, this happens weekend after weekend, hindering academics and athletic performance. High-risk drinking, which is defined as five drinks for men and four drinks for women within two hours, frequently interferes with a successful college education. Twenty-five percent of academic difficulties result from
alcohol abuse (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, n.d.a.).

The body metabolizes and flushes out one drink per hour. One drink is equivalent to 5 ounces of wine, 1.5 ounces of hard liquor, or 12 ounces of beer (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, n.d.b.). When more is consumed, the brain absorbs the excess alcohol, shutting down one area after another. The prefrontal cortex is affected first. It controls abstract reasoning, emotions, impulse control, long-term planning, ability to read social cues, and executive functioning (Advancing Science Serving Society, n.d.). Students engage in atypical behaviors then wake up the next day with regrets.

The area of the brain that regulates the fluid in the body is affected next. Alcohol is a diuretic, causing people to urinate out more fluid than they take in. This dehydrates the body and brain, causing an electrolyte imbalance. Full recovery from dehydration can take days (UC San Diego, n.d.). As a result of the dehydration, student-athletes experience increased risk for injuries, decreased appetite, and loss of muscle mass, which results in decreased strength and performance (UC San Diego, n.d.).

When consumed in larger quantities, alcohol releases a toxin in the liver that reduces testosterone for men and women. Testosterone is necessary for muscle recovery and muscle repair, muscle mass development, and overall athletic performance (UC San Diego, n.d.). Alcohol interferes with the production of adenosine triphosphate, which is essential for muscle energy and endurance (Firth & Manzo, 2004).

Human growth hormone (HGH), which is needed to build and repair muscle, develops when one sleeps. Alcohol interferes with the pattern and duration of sleep. If five or more drinks are consumed, 70% less HGH develops (Better Drinking Culture, n.d.). Sleep interference also prevents the student-athlete from feeling well rested and reduces attention and concentration. One night of high-risk drinking negatively affects athletic performance and cognitive skills for the next three days. If an athlete binges two nights in a row, these skills are affected for five days (Firth & Manzo, 2004).

Education is key to helping student-athletes perform to the best of their ability in the competitive arena and in life. Social norming messages are extremely effective. Students often misperceive the number of students who are engaging in high-risk drinking or the quantities they consume. Sharing positive messages is crucial. By doing so, student-athletes gain an understanding of the behaviors that are typical of their peers.

Culture starts at the top. If an athletics department develops a strong life skills program and the coaches buy into it by advocating for positive choices, athletes will buy in as well. Many coaches establish a no-drinking policy while in season. Teammates look out for one another to enforce this policy. Peer mediation is effective, as athletes hold one another accountable to perform to the best of their ability.

Athletic departments often function within a bubble. Because of the percentage of student-athletes on campus, athletic departments should collaborate with other departments, such as wellness, the Dean of Students Office, counseling services, and academic affairs, to collectively advocate for student-athletes’ well-being. Collegiate personnel can look for the red flags that indicate that a student-athlete might be struggling with alcohol abuse. In the classroom, an athlete’s grades might begin to decline, or the student might start to ask for extensions on deadlines. Outside the classroom, they might show up late or start to miss meetings or practice, or their performance in practice or in competition may begin to suffer. They might smell like alcohol or their grooming might start to decline. Whether in or out of the classroom, faculty, coaches, and staff can work together to raise red flags regarding a student-athlete’s health before it is too late.

It is important that college personnel provide student-athletes strategies for abstaining from alcohol or practicing safe consumption and offer effective techniques to manage peer pressure. For example, if student-athletes do not want to drink, they can tell peers they must get up early for practice, for competition, or for class. They can volunteer to be a designated driver or a spotter at a party. They can also dump a drink down the sink and fill the cup or bottle with water, or not drink the cup’s contents to avoid refills.
Some students need to hear that it’s okay to not drink. Developing leadership programs that promote self-esteem, healthy communication, networking, and life goals can help student-athletes build the self-confidence to say “No thanks” to drinking, to drink smaller quantities, or to reconsider certain unhealthy relationships. One exercise could be to have students reflect on their circle of friends and whether they are making responsible choices. If they aren’t, the facilitator can suggest that it might be time for the student to look for friends who have their priorities in the right places.

Promoting alcohol-free events that provide opportunities to party without social lubricants is another strategy to support student-athletes. A student from the University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh started hosting alcohol-free parties through a program titled Party.0. The turnout was tremendous. Drinkers attended because it gave them an excuse not to drink. Many said that they developed more meaningful conversations, made better friends, and learned that all they needed was good music and good people to have fun. (See www.party.0.org to learn more.)

Alcohol awareness needs to be an ongoing conversation, as the effects of alcohol on overall student-athlete health and success can be harmful. Student-athletes lead stressful lives, so student affairs professionals and athletics personnel should work together to help create a positive educational culture that builds self-esteem, provides alternatives to drinking, and teaches strategies to manage stress in healthy ways.
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When thinking about sustainability, the old adage “reduce, reuse, recycle” comes to mind. This narrow understanding of sustainability assumes two things: The first is that sustainability is about environmental degradation and knowledge must be gained in matters such as recycling, Earth Day, food waste, and campus beautification. The second is that sustainability is primarily associated with liberal White elitists or what one scholar titles, “the unbearable whiteness of being green” (Harper, 2007). This view is flawed because it provides a very limited and incomplete definition of sustainability, one that focuses on environmental factors but fails to see the social, economic, and cultural elements.

Two impactful examples of an all-encompassing environmental justice approach to sustainability can be found in the respective mission statements of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) and the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals program. AASHE (2005) “defines sustainability in an inclusive way encompassing human and ecological health, social justice, secure livelihoods and a better world for all generations”. The UN (2015) further clarifies that sustainability should address “a range of social needs including education, health, social protection, and job opportunities, while tackling climate change and environmental protection.”

The Sustainability Knowledge Community, in alignment with environmental justice movements such as those of AASHE and the UN, understands that sustainability is more than a simple physical environment issue. Due to the ever-changing complexities of our global climate and our current campuses, it is essential to consider sustainability as a subject that addresses multiple interconnected human issues such as racial injustice, gender equality, distribution of wealth, integrity, food security, holistic wellness, and community service.

Colleges and universities influence students who, in turn, impact society when they become scientists, social workers, engineers, teachers, doctors, and other social change agents. This is why higher education — and, therefore, student affairs professionals — must be at the forefront of this sustainability paradigm shift. We must envision sustainability as a multidisciplinary concept that ties together quality of life issues and must share this vision in teachable moments with our students.
Although, admirably, NASPA and the American College Personnel Association – College Student Educators International (ACPA) have added a paragraph regarding campus sustainability to their most recent Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators joint document (2015), the focus is broadly on personnel and the allocation of resources. Kevin Kruger, NASPA president, should also be applauded for his opening remarks at the 2018 NASPA Annual Conference, where he explicitly referenced climate change as a priority for student affairs professionals to acknowledge. These are great first steps and student affairs professionals must continue the momentum!

We must follow the lead of a small group of colleagues in ACPA who years ago embraced an interconnected approach and published a monograph that explicitly detailed how and why student affairs must reassess sustainability. The authors offered this advice: “We could use the new paradigm (that considers problems in complex, interrelated ways) to communicate about sustainability: one inclusive of environmental health, social justice, and economic strength, in order to keep our message relevant and inclusive.” (ACPA, 2008, p. 5).

Sustainability is a global issue that touches all themes of the social justice dialogues that we regularly facilitate with our students — dialogues that include gender and racial inequality, economic development, food insecurity/homelessness on campuses, environmental health, and many other important intersecting issues. It is now time to redefine sustainability through a social justice lens to help us understand how sustainability complements our personal and professional lives, as well as our interactions with students.

The following quote best encapsulates how student affairs must reframe the narrative to students: Sustainability is “having sturdy family relationships; living in freedom from threats, violence and coercion; having adequate income or livelihood; and enjoying health and wellness. It also involves the security of the community, nation and planet . . . severe structural inequalities between people: women and men, people of color and white people; people from the United States and other nations. . .” (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2007, p. 4).

References


Capturing attendance with card swipes. Collecting feedback with poll clicks. Tracking online visits with logins. Student data are gathered at multiple points each day, but what do the data mean? What stories are realized in the data? What missed opportunities are hiding?

Student affairs divisions often lack the time, expert-level competency, and appropriate staffing to conduct thorough assessments. When student affairs departments collect data, an outside academic or institutional research (IR) office typically does the assessment work because it is staffed with data scientists—people who know how to work with numbers. However, Gagliardi and Wellman caution that the scope through which the data are assessed may be “topically stove-piped,” meaning an IR office’s approach likely fits with campus priorities but may not match the requesting student affairs department's original intent (2014, as cited in Gagliardi, Parnell, & Carpenter-Hubin, 2018, p. 48).

Yet student affairs practitioners truly understand the contexts for why the data matter. Staff members who work closely with students often are aware of nuances that shape data, which may be overlooked once generalized statistics are generated for a report. Intricacies influenced by students’ intersectional identities, for example, may not be represented on paper but may be recognized by student affairs staff who work in diverse communities, collect data at the source, and intend to focus on the “people behind the numbers” (Gagliardi & Turk, 2017, p. 11). To humanize the data, student affairs practitioners must strengthen their competencies in data assessment and evaluation.
and make responsible, student-centered use of the data in decision making (Brooks & Thayer, 2016, p. 30).

Finding Meaning in Student-Centered Data Use

Effective data assessment can help student affairs practitioners understand students’ experiences, evaluate their sense of belonging, create holistic definitions for “student success,” develop meaningful learning outcomes, identify gaps in services, and make data-informed decisions about advocacy and resource management. In turn, increasing, demonstrating, and documenting the value and role of student affairs work in higher education become easier.

Many college and university presidents are calling on practitioners to assess the efficacy of student learning outcomes (Gagliardi, Espinosa, Turk, & Taylor, 2017, as cited in Gagliardi, Parnell et al., 2018, Location no. 1019). What if, for example, each of the data points collected in the classroom and at cocurricular events were plotted alongside a student’s course schedule and grades earned, and student affairs staff could follow along and predict that student’s academic success? A staff member who is tracking a student whose grades are declining but whose cocurricular involvement is high might intervene and suggest that the student adjust their schedule (cocurricular or courseload) or use tutoring services.

Suppose further that student affairs information technology (IT) staff adapted a vendor product to automate a process that superficially compared grades versus involvement and delivered real-time alerts to practitioners about students at risk of reaching probation. In this scenario, the data alone could not explain why the student’s performance was declining, but an astute student affairs practitioner might take that information and reach out directly to the at-risk student to discuss possible hurdles and devise a plan to get back on track. A practitioner might also make note of the student’s cocurricular involvement and contact the advisors of the respective organizations to learn more or suggest extended mentorship to help the student meet milestones from matriculation to graduation. (For more information about identifying students for intervention, see Burke, Parnell, Wesaw, & Kruger, 2017, pp. 20-22.)

This student-centered approach to data assessment might have several realized outcomes, including increased student satisfaction and retention, adaptive and responsive policies, added resources to better serve to students, and data-backed opportunities for future planning (Gagliardi et al., 2018, pp. 160-169).

Recommendations for Practitioners

In a 2018 report, Parnell, Jones, Wesaw, and Brooks noted that 83% of student affairs mid-level staff and 68% of student affairs front-line staff use data to influence individual students (p. 13). Given this reliance on data, student affairs practitioners must strengthen their competencies in the areas of data use and compliance (see the American College Personnel Association/NASPA Technology competency, 2015, pp. 33-35), and valuable, ethical, and political data design (see the ACPA/NASPA Assessment, Evaluation, and Research competency, 2015, pp. 20-21). In doing so, they will become better data stewards, help promote a culture of assessment, and contribute to students’ success.

The authors of this article have a combined 33 years of student affairs work experience and provide the following recommendations for practitioners at all levels:

- **Students:** Students should seek out courses on data analysis and data science, and student affairs higher education programs that promote data-driven decision making. They should consider participating in a campus-sponsored NASPA Undergraduate Fellows Program, if available.

- **IT professionals in student affairs:** Student affairs IT professionals should work closely with campus IT and IR units to bring student affairs into top-level data governance discussions and to develop a divisional data strategy.

- **New professionals:** New professionals should be intentional about the data they collect (e.g., gender, ethnicity), apply critical analysis to the data to
promote the success of all students, and provide more senior-level professionals with the context they needed to make appropriate, data-driven decisions.

- **Mid-level professionals**: Mid-level professionals should support new professionals as good data stewards and fit their findings to the context of the organization's broader scope. Where data can inform program design and evaluation and intervention strategies, mid-level professionals should liberate the findings, encourage new solutions that make meaningful differences in students' lives, and provide consultation and recommendations to senior-level professionals.

- **Senior-level professionals**: Senior-level professionals should strategically examine team members' consultation and recommendations and compare them with the organization's road map. Senior-level professionals should advocate for the means to improve programming by providing data-informed direction up to campus-level or systemwide leaders and other stakeholders and by offering a range of possible implications, particularly when budgets and resources are tight or when the long-term vision is unclear. Last, senior-level professionals must model a data-informed mindset for all, meaning they are intentional about developing the technology competencies of all staff by building up their skills and knowledge.

By the nature of their work, student affairs staff have unique opportunities to foster student growth in critical thinking, communication, and problem solving. Student learning and development can and should be assessed, preferably in house, with data already being collected in multiple ways by practitioners who see the faces behind the statistics.

---
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Background

According to the Migration Policy Institute, approximately 11.2 million undocumented immigrants were living in the United States in 2013 (Zong & Batalova, 2016). About a million were under the age of 18 and 4.4 million were under the age of 30 (Passel, & Lopez, 2012). A report by the UndocuScholars Project further estimates that about 200,000 to 225,000 undocumented immigrants are enrolled in college, accounting for about 2% of all college students and about 10% of all undocumented immigrants (Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco, 2015). These figures convey the need for efforts to bolster the retention and graduation rates of undocumented students.

One such effort has been the creation of undocumented student resource centers (USRCs) across campuses. USRCs provide access to college opportunities for undocumented high school, transfer, undergraduate, and graduate students, as well as students from mixed-status families.

This article documents the emergence of USRCs across the country and looks at how these institutional support structures are creating the conditions for undocumented students and students of mixed-status families to thrive.

The best practices offered can help institutions, particularly emerging minority-serving institutions (MSIs), learn from each other and adopt practices that stress both a student-centered and a capacity-building approach. Such information can also inform policymakers’ understanding of the importance of USRCs for responding to the presence and needs of undocumented students and ensuring their educational success. The purpose of this article is to summarize the Cisneros and Valdivia (2018) report, which highlights USRCs as viable structures for supporting undocumented students in higher education. The goal of the Cisneros and Valdivia report was to expose academic and administrative leadership to the possibility of USRCs and contribute to the generation of practice-related opportunities for enhancing undocumented student support services across MSIs. The report defined USRCs as physical structures on campus designated as centers that provide a space for undocumented students and students of mixed-status families to obtain institutionalized support.
Undocumented Student Resource Centers

Emergence

According to Cisneros and Valdivia (2018), the development of USRCs across institutions of higher education was often attributed to mobilizations by and on behalf of undocumented students, both on and off campus. Most USRC practitioners described long histories of student mobilization leading to the development of institutionalized support services. Student mobilizations led to the creation of institutional task forces charged with creating a cohesive plan for developing institutional support for undocumented students (Cisneros & Valdivia, 2018). The strategic institutional advocacy of undocumented students, staff, and faculty composite of these task forces helped establish institutional procedures for responding to the presence and needs of undocumented students.

Structure, Services, and Resources

Approaches to USRCs vary by context and are reflective of an institution’s capacity and organizational structure. Cisneros and Valdivia (2018) noted that although most USRCs operate as stand-alone centers with specialized staff, others have been merged with multicultural student centers or offices for international students and use existing staff as de facto undocumented student specialists. Consistent across all models, however, is the clearly defined and promoted institutional support for undocumented students.

USRCs often create and sustain an extensive campus referral network and can provide customized support via on- and off-campus partnerships. It is not uncommon to see counselors, academic advisors, financial aid officers, and attorneys (among others) hold regularly scheduled office hours within USRCs. The following services are typically provided by USRCs: academic advising, counseling, financial aid, career counseling, transfer services, legal services, and Undocu-Ally training. Additionally, USRCs provided several resources that similarly enable undocumented student success: lending library/book vouchers, lending technology, emergency grants, food pantry/meal vouchers, parking permits/bus passes, scholarships, work-study, and internships. Community partnerships similarly help facilitate the accessibility of many of these resources.

Staffing and Responsibilities

According to Cisneros and Valdivia (2018), most USRCs operate under the leadership of one full-time coordinator or director, while others utilize one or two part-time positions to fulfill similar responsibilities. USRC practitioners serve as content experts for the institution. Practitioners in these positions are often responsible for staying abreast of changes to immigration and education policy, relaying that information to students and other institutional stakeholders, and facilitating programs responsive to students’ needs. They also serve as institutional experts. Practitioners in these positions describe having to be knowledgeable of different institutional processes and functional areas to find solutions to unestablished institutional procedures for undocumented students.

The Benefits of USRCs for Students and Institutions

USRCs provide several benefits to colleges and universities. At the top of the list is the way USRCs help students feel. Visible support structures help students feel welcomed and supported. Such spaces provide students with an opportunity to form a community among similarly situated others. Being able to interact with individuals (students and staff) with similar experiences empowers students to feel more comfortable asking for help. USRCs help validate students’ experiences and procure a sense of belonging, thereby enhancing their educational outcomes.

By allocating services and resources, USRCs not only help attract students to the institution but also help students see options to persist. USRCs signal an institution’s prioritization of inclusive excellence and help formalize institutional supports that affirm its status as an undocu-friendly campus. By centralizing undocumented student services, USRCs help practitioners intentionally work with undocumented students and intervene when necessary. By tracking students and providing resources, USRCs can assist students from admissions to graduation, thereby improving persistence, retention, and graduation rates.

Implications for Policy

The findings of the Cisneros and Valdivia (2018) report yield several implications for policymakers. Recognizing
the role of policymakers in driving national conversations and local implications for undocumented student success, the following recommendations include implications for developing and supporting USRCs:

- Expand the creation of USRCs to institutions in states with high shares of the total immigrant population (e.g., TX, CA, NY, NJ, NV, FL).
- Develop USRCs at institutions within states that extend higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants.
- Cultivate a USRC network.
- Increase funding for undocumented student services.

Implications for Practice

The findings discussed in the Cisneros and Valdivia (2018) report offered several implications for institutions with existing and emerging USRCs:

- Create a space for voices of undocumented students.
- Leverage campus and community partnerships.
- Make a long-term investment in USRCs.
- Assess institutional context, capacity, and organizational structure.
- Increase the capacity of USRCs.
- Develop sustainable funding opportunities.
- Engage allies.

Attention to these key areas would bolster institutional efforts to retain and graduate enrolled undocumented students. USRCs make it clear that undocumented students are integral members of campus communities and, therefore, should receive services and resources to support their educational attainment.
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Introduction
Military-connected students and student veterans attend 96% of all institutions of higher education (Queen & Lewis, 2014) and comprise more than 5% of students nationally (Radford, Bentz, Dekker, & Paslov, 2016). As this population increases, so too do contributions to the body of scholarship. Researchers, both those in their graduate studies and those with extensive experience, have furthered literature on student veterans in higher education. Over the past year, about two dozen studies have been published, almost half in scholarly journals and half in support of educational pursuits. Several authors explored student veterans through a strengths lens focused on student success. Others focused on nontraditional aspects of student veterans. Even if articles did not solely focus on student learning and development, the authors made practical recommendations that affect this competency. This review includes 13 recent studies and concludes with actionable recommendations for practitioners.

Student Learning
Recent studies shift the focus from student veterans’ transition to campus to student veterans in the classroom.
Blackwell-Starnes’s (2018) autoethnographic study investigated the sense of belonging in the classroom after the course withdrawal of a student veteran. Blackwell-Starnes considered pedagogies that support an academic sense of belonging in veterans. Humphrey’s (2018) ethnographic study on student veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injuries (TBIs) highlighted a need for classroom strategies to help students successfully navigate the transition from military to higher education. Vanacore (2018) studied childhood adversity, social supports, and their effect on veterans’ grade point averages (GPA). The researcher hypothesized that both childhood adversity and veteran status would have independent, negative impacts on GPA and that veterans with a history of childhood adversity would have lower GPAs than their civilian peers. The findings could not be substantiated, and the researcher recommended that further research be conducted to determine how resiliency would affect academic outcomes. Morris, Gibbes, and Jennings (2018) examined how military experiences relate to student experiences in the field of geography, the major with the highest proportion of military-connected students. Military-connected students in the study were less inclined to seek additional cultural experiences than their civilian peers. This trend is at odds with the traditional motivation of geography students. Faculty and practitioners can support their students by being aware of and compassionate to their students’ experiences.

Other authors focused on learning outside a traditional classroom. Similar to the findings of Morris et al. (2018), Dame (2018) concluded that student veterans may not see the value in study abroad owing to overseas deployment, although those who completed a study abroad experience, on reflection, recognized its value. She then proposed a course for student veterans with a study abroad component. Hodges’s (2018) pilot course educated civilians on veterans’ needs, including service-learning projects that centered on veteran service organizations. Smith’s (2018) service-learning project focused on business communication through the pairing of civilians and veterans. Smith sought to analyze the military–civilian gap in hopes of addressing cultural and language barriers and prejudices. The civilian students’ appreciation of veterans increased, as did their interest in continuing relationships and future project development with veterans and military-affiliated participants, and the veterans reported further understanding of the civilian perspective. Darcy, Swagger, and Cordeiro (2018) determined the needs of their student veteran population through focus groups, using Schlossberg’s mattering and marginality as a framework to understand student veteran academic and social experiences.

**Student Success**

Another theme in recent literature has been student success. Stroble (2018) conducted a case study of successful student veterans who had previously struggled with the transition to higher education. Vacchi’s (2018) life-history narrative study explored student veteran success. Findings from both studies indicated that each successful student veteran had a relationship with a social influencer who was beneficial to their success. Social influencers can be higher education staff, but more often they include family and faculty. Vacchi’s findings, although not generalizable, mirrored Bean and Metzner’s (1985) model for nontraditional students, with implications for student affairs practitioners in that social programming was not as important for student veterans as their academic influences and finances; that is, the most important factors to student veteran success are timely processing of veterans’ benefits and positive faculty interactions, particularly those that support self-authorship.

**Adult Learners**

Adult learners and nontraditional students were also considered. Cicchino’s (2018) study sought to understand resiliency in adult learners and student veterans at a community college. The study found that nontraditional students’ levels of resilience were similar to traditional college students. Tilman’s (2018) study sought to understand factors associated with student veteran persistence and the students’ perceptions of their faculty’s and staff’s attention to and concern for their development. Interpersonal validation emerged as the central factor affecting student veterans’ intentions to persist. Blackwell-Starnes (2018) also noted similarities between student veterans and nontraditional students.
Implications for Practitioners

Scholars are also recommending specific, actionable advice for practitioners, mostly about cultural competence. Arminio et al. (2018) noted the need for staff acculturation to support students. In several studies, faculty also reported that they either need or desire additional training to properly support the student veteran populations on their campuses (Cross, 2018; Darcy et al., 2018; Sullivan & Everett, 2018; Wild & Mahapatra, 2018). Cicchino (2018) recommended training for all who work with student veterans. Humphrey (2018) recommended training for staff and administrators to work with students with PTSD and TBI. Darcy et al. (2018) included suggestions for tailored practices to support student veterans and service members on campus, such as student–faculty interactions, student group interactions with a Student Veterans of America chapter, and other events to support cultural awareness on campus.

Other recommendations were made for classrooms. Vacchi (2018) suggested that faculty meet students where they are and support student veterans’ nontraditional needs. Humphrey (2018) recommended constructivist pedagogies and active-learning strategies, such as student-centered learning, problem-based learning, and contextual teaching and learning.


Conclusion

This past year saw a continued expansion of scholarship pertaining to student veterans. Shifting away from the exploration of transition experiences, researchers are looking heavily at student learning and development. Emerging themes in literature are student learning in and out of the classroom, considering nontraditional aspects of student veterans, and student success in college. These studies, and those that focus on other professional competencies, have practical recommendations for those who work with student veterans to assist in student learning and development.
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In the past decade, the way higher education has responded to mental health and associated crises has changed drastically. Nationwide, students are matriculating with more complex mental health disorders than was seen in the past (Hunt & Eisenberg, 2010). By recognizing the signs of a mental health problem, working to reduce stigma, being aware of the resources our campus counseling centers provide, and intervening with students of concern, student affairs practitioners can remain actively engaged and not be passive bystanders. From residence life to student activities to career services, we owe it to our communities to be their proactive eyes and ears on campus.

The literature presents ample evidence that mental health concerns and illnesses are most likely to manifest during adolescence. Although depression and anxiety are the most commonly diagnosed, we also see students with substance use disorders, psychotic disorders, eating disorders, and nonsuicidal self-injury (Wood, 2012). Barriers to help remain for many students, with one of the most common being the belief that what they are experiencing is just part of the stress of college life (Downs & Eisenberg, 2012). Research has also shown that students from certain backgrounds—including men and students of color, as well as students who identify as LGBTQ, international, or veterans—are less likely to ask for support than others, and this creates other obstacles (Twentyman, Frank, & Lindsey, 2017; Wendt & Shafer, 2015). Although the problem may seem challenging, student affairs practitioners can play a role in breaking down these barriers, normalizing help-seeking behaviors, and encouraging support.

One way that student affairs practitioners can play a role in supporting students experiencing mental health distress is by developing a culture of care. One tool for building this culture is actively engaging in bystander intervention. Bystander intervention is recognizing a potentially harmful situation or interaction and choosing to respond in a way that could positively influence the outcome (https://wellnessnetwork.utexas.edu/BeVocal/bystanderintervention.html). The first step student affairs practitioners must take to support students experiencing emotional distress is to recognize it in their students. The
website of Counseling and Mental Health Center at The University of Texas at Austin (http://cmhc.utexas.edu/afriend.html) at The University of Texas at Austin states that signs of emotional distress include the following:

- Trouble sleeping
- Vague physical aches and pains, lack of energy
- Loss of interest in activities the person once enjoyed
- Depressed or lethargic mood
- Lack of motivation
- Excessive tension or worry
- Restlessness, hyperactivity, pressured speech
- Excessive alcohol or drug use
- Decline in academic performance, drop in class attendance
- Social withdrawal
- Changes in eating patterns
- Self-injury (cutting, scratching, burning)
- Unusual or exaggerated response to events (e.g., overly suspicious, overly agitated, easily startled)

If you notice these signs in students, it is important to reach out to them and to provide support. This is important because it may prevent their emotional distress from reaching a crisis level and possibly even suicidal thoughts. The sooner students get connected to the support they need, the better.

Although noticing these signs may be simple, it can be difficult for student affairs professionals to intervene and help their students. Many barriers prevent student affairs practitioners from intervening. Example of barriers include: not knowing what to say or how to help, fearing that you'll embarrass the student, thinking that another colleague will help the student. In order to get past the barriers, it is important to consider why student affairs practitioners may be motivated to intervene. These reasons include showing care for students, being concerned that students’ emotional distress will get worse, feeling terribly if something bad happened to students, or understanding how hard it can be to reach out for help. The more practitioners can do to channel these motivations, the easier it will be to help.

This leads to the final step of bystander intervention, taking action. Practitioners who cannot find the courage to talk with troubled students need to identify another trusted resource on campus who can. Here are a few ways to support a student experiencing emotional distress:

- **Listen carefully and with sensitivity.** Use active listening skills. This includes making direct eye contact with your student, sitting in an open and relaxed posture, using I-statements to list behaviors you noticed, and asking open-ended questions.

- **Be honest and direct, but nonjudgmental.** Share what you have noticed and why it concerns you. For example, "I've noticed that you've been missing class a lot lately and you aren't answering your phone or text messages like you used to. I'm worried about you. How have you been doing lately?"

- **Make a referral.** Suggest the student contact the counseling center or another trusted resource on campus. Encourage him or her to call and make an appointment right then and there. Offer to accompany the student to the counseling center.

- **Follow up.** Let the student know that you'll be checking back with him or her later to see how things turned out.
One way to ensure that your campus is ready to talk about emotional distress with students is to provide training to all student affairs staff. Many packaged gatekeeper training programs (examples include Question Persuade Refer, Kognito, Mental Health First Aid, LivingWorks, and Syracuse University’s Connect Program) are available for campuses to purchase. Gatekeeper training programs are interactive workshops that provide members of the campus community with the knowledge and skills they need to intervene and support a student who is experiencing emotional or suicidal distress. In consultation with the counseling center, make sure to find which one best fits the need for your campus. If none of them do, or if you don’t have the budget to purchase one, work with your counseling center to build your own.

Being aware of what the campus counseling center provides or what resources may be located in the community can be extremely helpful. If a student is in crisis, can someone walk him or her over to the counseling center? What if a situation occurs after business hours or on the weekend? Simple dialogue with partner offices can help inform the situation. Understanding practitioner self-care is also a best practice; we need to understand where our role in responding begins, and where it ends. Practitioners must recognize they cannot take the place of such resources and must focus on getting a student to these resources. Practitioners must work to cultivate safety, empathy, and warmth for students, and also know when and how to connect them to further campus or community resources.
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I am aware of how my own White privilege is connected to systems of power in the workplace, but within my corner of student affairs, my awareness does not automatically translate into action-oriented work toward equity and social change. I need to do something with my awareness so that it is present in my daily work. I must intentionally seek to understand and make meaning of how race and gender intersect for me—how my Whiteness affects the ways I show up as a woman and how my race and gender intersect in my feminist praxis. Inspired by Sarah Rodriguez's "call to feminism" in Women of Color: Architects for Systemic Change in Tomorrow's Higher Education Landscape (2018), this article calls women in student affairs to move beyond awareness toward integration, interweaving the precepts of multicultural feminism (Hurtado, 2010) into our personal leadership philosophy.

Multicultural feminism recognizes the multiple identities of women and requires privileged groups to embrace self-reflexivity and accountability (Hurtado, 2010). The distinguishing tenets of multicultural feminism suggest that conflicts among women emerge from differences in power, that our social location within our identity is a part of our lived experience, and that historical and social constructs are present in our differences (Zinn & Dill, 1996).

Multicultural feminism focuses on both multiculturalism, which seeks to preserve cultural identity, and feminism's promotion of equality (Schachar, 1999). Schachar's work acknowledges that this is a "trichotomy," where our differences are respected, where we intentionally work to preserve the cultural identity of groups we may not belong to, and where our policies reflect this intersection of cultural preservation and equal rights (1999). In this article, I assert that the inter-relationship of one's leadership philosophy and multicultural feminism may serve as one space to infuse cultural preservation and equal rights into workplace policies and practices.
Feminism: Application Beyond Personal Identity

I acknowledge the term feminism does not fit everyone; for some, feminism is a compartmentalized part of their private lives, while others reject the term all together. But unless we are deliberate and intentional about the theoretical foundations driving our professional work, we stand to perpetuate hegemony in higher education, which in itself can be viewed as an unethical leadership practice. Whether a student affairs leader identifies as a feminist, they can apply the tenets of multicultural feminism to their leadership philosophy by acknowledging that women’s differences are power based and that lived experiences are distinctive based on one’s social location within their cultural identity. Gender intersects with our other identities to affect our daily academic and administrative work.

The Competency of Leadership: From Theory to Practice

A leadership philosophy guides how we make decisions; it keeps us focused in times of crisis, when we are most susceptible to making biased and self-serving decisions. Many student affairs leaders describe philosophies like servant leadership, where leaders serve first (Greenleaf, 1970); transformational leadership, where leaders motivate and lift others through trust and admiration (Bass, 1985); or ethical leadership, where decision making is driven by a commitment to ethical behaviors (Brown & Trevino, 2006). If we integrated these philosophies in a multicultural feminism framework, what would they look like?

My personal leadership philosophy is rooted in ethical leadership. In my early years as a counselor, servant leadership guided my work. But when my career transitioned into student affairs, I embraced our industry’s charge to practice social justice and influence policy for social good. Simultaneously my leadership philosophy evolved into one primarily informed by ethical leadership. I rely on my leadership framework most during times of uncertainty. I apply my framework to understand and analyze situations, asking myself (and often my peers), what is the ethical thing to do?

Because ethical leadership is my own lens, I will share how I layer on a multicultural feminist approach in my work as a student affairs professional. An ethical leadership philosophy requires student affairs professionals to demonstrate a spirit of authentic honesty in one’s words and actions. I understand this to mean that we recognize and acknowledge painful truths. When tragedies such as murders and bombings take place that involve or target certain communities, how should an ethical leader respond and support diverse members of our workforce? Ethical leaders informed by multicultural feminism create the space and time needed for the team to grieve, recognize that situations may affect people differently, and acknowledge without defensiveness or excuses the role of privilege in these differences. Multicultural feminism in ethical leadership practice moves beyond honesty to integrity, “representing reality as fully and completely as possible” (Northouse, 2015).

Thus, threading together ethical leadership and multicultural feminism into a cohesive framework is more than an academic exercise; rather, it can inform daily practice in how student affairs professionals are present to our colleagues and to our students. I will use a career center case study to demonstrate another example of how to apply an integrated approach. Career services departments coordinate career fairs and prepare students to interact with corporate recruiters who have high expectations for student professionalism at these events. Many career centers use photos of traditional-aged students dressed professionally to help students understand standards of professional attire, and I would venture that most center staffs make an intentional effort to include images that represent the racial diversity of their student population. This demonstrates positive development in the awareness of student affairs staff, but when viewed through a multicultural feminist lens, one might see additional opportunities to enhance inclusion through a more complex understanding of intersectionality. The examples of professional attire may unintentionally reinforce a hegemonic definition of professional attire that cements cisgender norms or that encourages the covering of distinctive cultural modes of expression. When we practice ethical leadership and multicultural feminism, interweaving culture and equality into policy, we might create a professional attire campaign that includes a
transgender or gender nonbinary person, a Black woman wearing her hair in a natural style, and a woman wearing a hijab. These are just examples, but they demonstrate a more complex understanding of inclusion. With an integrated ethical and multicultural feminist approach, student affairs professionals can bring a more complex understanding of identity, positionality, and power to our practice, and we use our own place at the table to raise awareness, create inclusive opportunities, and promote equal rights.

Conclusion: My Epilogue to Student Affairs
Multicultural feminism requires action; incorporating the framework into our personal leadership philosophy should help our work in higher education lead to change. As student affairs professionals, we are agents of social change for both our students and our professional peers. A multicultural feminist leadership framework provides a way to understand ourselves more honestly, to enhance consistency and integrity in our actions, to build true equity and inclusion, and to influence change.
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