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Incoming graduate and professional students often confront ongoing and unique challenges. Learning the academic and social norms of departments or schools often takes place inconsistently, and every student—and program—is different. Aside from what is presented at orientation, students enter their programs with varying degrees of familiarity with the graduate environment. Graduate students who identify as BIPOC, first generation, and/or low income often feel underprepared going into their graduate programs (Shepard & Perry, 2022). Students who are unsure of what to expect in graduate school are likely to have anxiety, a lack of confidence, imposter syndrome, or negative self-efficacy as they embark on their studies. The COVID-19 pandemic only exacerbated these challenges, but this new landscape of the graduate student experience presented an opportunity to innovate graduate support through the development of a virtual summer transition program as an early touchpoint.
Program Overview

Given what is known about graduate and professional students at large as well as within the USD community, our initiative supports the successful matriculation of incoming graduate students, especially those who identify as BIPOC, first generation, low income, and/or any other marginalized identity (Pontius & Harper, 2006). Investing in the overall success of a diverse and growing graduate and professional student population means creating ways to enhance their sense of belonging and self-efficacy. To achieve this goal, O’Meara et al. (2017) recommended that practitioners invest in efforts that strategically create a sense of community and provide access to resources and information. So, we developed the Graduate Student Success Program (GSSP) and implemented the pilot in August 2021. The GSSP sought to achieve three outcomes: (1) cultivate the development of skills for holistic success as individuals entering graduate school, (2) increase self-efficacy via a strengths-based curriculum, and (3) establish a sense of belonging within and across schools and programs as well as the greater USD community.

The GSSP is a cross-unit collaboration between Graduate Student Life, the School of Leadership and Education Sciences, the Knauss School of Business, the School of Peace Studies, and the School of Law. Its development has been an intentionally collaborative process to ensure that we are meeting the diverse needs of all graduate students at USD and making space for the nuances of each school’s culture. Cross-unit cooperation to design programs and workshops have proven successful in improving communication and overall systems of support for graduate and professional students (Elkins Nesheim et al., 2007). We continued engaging other campus partners in developing and implementing the content of our program, including but not limited to the Graduate Writing Center, the Career Development Center, and Copley Library.

In the pilot year, each school personally invited its students to the GSSP. We held the program virtually over three days, with three sessions scheduled for each day. We had 126 registered students; approximately 48 to 78 students logged in daily, and the majority of them remained engaged on Zoom for the entirety of each day’s programming. Of the 126 registrants, 35% identified as first-generation college students and 59% identified as BIPOC. In the postprogram assessment, the highest-rated sessions included “Imposter Syndrome,” “Financial Wellness,” and “Working Toward a Career.” Our data attest to the interest among graduate students for this program and the topics covered, and they also indicate that our participants more than reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of graduate students at USD.

From a holistic standpoint, skills for success encompass not only academic skills but also financial, professional, and socioemotional skills (American College Health Association, 2019; Bain et al., 2011; Marcus, 2019). Our sessions covered a range of topics, such as minimizing debt in graduate school, cultivating community and belonging, and strategically navigating career development. We also discussed combating imposter syndrome as well as finding support and setting boundaries. From a panel of faculty members who were identified as advocates for supporting graduate students, students got advice on making the most of their interactions with professors (Curtin et al., 2013; Lechuga, 2011). Strengths-based sessions featured speakers who communicated in an empowering tone that emphasized the competence and worthiness of students. Students were prompted to generate inspiring mantras to serve as powerful reminders throughout graduate school. Furthermore, with the collaboration of multiple schools, students had opportunities to establish a wide social network outside of their programs, which can be an additional form of support.

Although participants might have been able to gain these insights throughout their graduate journey, this foundation allows them to maximize—right from the start—the opportunities that graduate school has to offer. Distinct from the procedural content of orientation, we created an intentional yet informal space to engage in dialogue as a way to allay any
uneasiness about entering graduate school. As a result, participants were better equipped to overcome any challenges, knew where to get support, and felt empowered to step into this next chapter of their lives.

**Impact Assessment**

Pre- and postprogram evaluations measured our indicators of success. In this feedback, students reported on their sense of self-efficacy, feelings of preparedness, and sense of belonging to the USD community. Although sense of self-efficacy was consistently high before and after the program, the most stark increases were observed for sense of belonging and preparedness. For graduate students, a strong sense of belonging has been found to affect completion rates, mediate the effects of microaggressions, and ease network-building within a student’s department and across campus (O’Meara et al., 2017). Additionally, the Graduate and Law Student Experience Assessment was modified to include the GSSP so there can be long-term evaluation of its impact. We can expect that the GSSP will contribute to positive outcomes for law students (their self-efficacy, confidence as students and scholars, and engagement with the USD graduate student community).

**Conclusion**

As the graduate and professional student community continues to grow and diversify, it is incumbent on institutions to provide resources and support. The GSSP meets this need by creating a virtual space for incoming students to engage with the campus community and familiarize themselves with available resources. Furthermore, it is our hope that when these participants go on to become alumni, they will fondly look back on their time at USD and continue to engage with the campus as they transform the world. The GSSP has proven to be a successful framework, and it can be adapted at other institutions.

**REFERENCES**


Asian Pacific Islanders Knowledge Community

What Dismantling Race-Conscious Admissions Means for APIDA Communities

Michelle K. Chan, Ph.D.
Inclusive Training Specialist
Utah Department of Health and Human Services

Chen-Hong Tony Chen, M.S.
Assistant Director, Community Initiatives
Boston University Health Promotion and Prevention

Natalie H. Sin, M.Ed.
Trojan Success Initiatives Coordinator, Student Basic Needs
University of Southern California

Diana Ali, M.P.P., L.S.W.
Associate Director, Policy Research and Advocacy
NASPA

Monica Nixon, Ed.D.
Vice President, Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
NASPA

Key Terms

affirmative action: A set of procedures made to eliminate, remedy, or prevent unlawful discrimination among applicants on the basis of a protected class such as race and sex (Legal Information Institute, n.d.).

Asian penalty: Bias against people of Asian descent, particularly in relation to docking standardized test scores and/or limiting the numbers of applicants of Asian descent in U.S. college admissions processes (Carnevale & Quinn, 2021).

Students for Fair Admissions Inc. (SFFA) v. President and Fellows of Harvard College (2022) and SFFA v. University of North Carolina et al. (UNC) (2021) are landmark U.S. Supreme Court cases in which justices struck down colleges' and universities' use of race-conscious admissions. The decision effectively reversed both lower court decisions and Supreme Court precedent upholding race-conscious admissions. SFFA argued that race-conscious admissions policies violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. These cases center Asian, Pacific Islander, and Desi American (APIDA) identities in particular, because SFFA represented Asian students in its case against Harvard, arguing that race-conscious admissions harm White and Asian students.
model minority myth: Stereotype of Asian Americans as hardworking and more deserving than other racially minoritized groups, which contributes to a harmful perception of universal success that masks inequity and harm (Lowe, 2015).

perpetual foreigner stereotype: The idea that Asian Americans do not belong in the United States and are fundamentally attached to their ancestral heritage, regardless of their generational ties and/or legal status in the United States (Harpalani, 2022).

race-conscious admissions: The use of applicants’ race as one of the considerations in a holistic admissions process (Legal Defense Fund, 2023).

White proximity: The perception of one’s own or a group’s social status as having similar benefits to White privilege; often used interchangeably with the terms White-passing or White-adjacent.

Community Context and Impact
The Supreme Court rulings are two of many historical moments that have contributed to blame and exclusion toward—along with misconceptions about—the APIDA community. From the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 to Japanese American incarceration during World War II, to attacks on Asian Americans during the Vietnam War, and to stereotypes often perpetuated in entertainment and media, the United States has had an established history of targeted discrimination and aggression toward APIDA people (Takaki, 1998). More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic brought a significant increase in anti-Asian racism and hate crimes (Stop AAPI Hate, 2022). The unique experiences among APIDA members remain invisible and dismissed across social, political, and legislative paradigms.

The topic of race-conscious admissions has been contested among APIDA community members in part because affirmative action is perceived as favoring Black, Latinx, and Indigenous students at APIDA students’ expense, particularly at elite universities (Harpalani, 2022). Opposition to affirmative action among Asian Americans has tended to reflect immigration experiences, lack of information or misinformation campaigns, and distinctions in structural privilege among ethnic communities (Garces & Poon, 2018; Ruiz et al., 2023). To understand the origins and context of these allegations, it is important to identify the various racial stereotypes and paradigms that complicate APIDA experiences and perspectives on university admissions, including the model minority myth, perpetual foreigner stereotype, and assumptions of Asian White proximity in Western society and the Asian penalty in admissions decisions (see Key Terms; Harpalani, 2022). These stereotypes fuel a larger racial ideology that pits minority groups against one another.

SFFA followed the example of others in tapping into harmful model-minority stereotypes and using Asian Americans to provide “racial cover” (Garces & Poon, 2018, p. 2) for dismantling race-conscious admissions and to disrupt coalitions advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion, despite long-standing support for affirmative action among Asian Americans (Garces & Poon, 2018; Lee, 2021). Amicus briefs filed in federal cases by Asian American organizations and coalitions highlighted the benefits to APIDA students of race-conscious admission practices and the harm to these students that will occur with a failure to consider race as one of many factors in admissions. In California, where race-conscious admissions were first banned, enrollment numbers for Asian American students have not increased (Bleemer, 2022). Ending race-conscious admissions is not a solution to addressing existing bias and barriers that APIDA, Black, Latinx, and Indigenous students encounter in accessing equitable pathways in higher education.

Implications
Given the landscape of the rulings’ effect on the APIDA community, the NASPA Asian Pacific Islander Knowledge Community (APIKC) calls on the higher education community to improve data collection on APIDA in higher education and advance opportunities
for civic engagement among APIDA constituents. Disaggregating data is permissible and advisable to highlight the complexities among the APIDA diaspora (U.S. Department of Education, 2023); to dispel the practice of treating the APIDA community as a monolith; and to review and refine outreach, recruiting, retention, and culturally inclusive resources and programming. Civic engagement within the APIDA community has grown over the past few years, most notably in voter turnout overall and as the largest minority group in every battleground state during the 2020 elections (TargetSmart, 2020). In the most recent Asian American Voter Survey (APIA Vote, AAPI Data, & Asian Americans Advancing Justice, 2022), 82% of respondents ranked education as extremely or very important in their voting decisions, 73% worried about experiencing discrimination, and 69% favored affirmative action programs. These results suggest that APIDA communities highly value issues related to education, racism, and hate crimes. Recognizing APIDA populations as a major political force in legislation and exploring distinct experiences can allow us to more effectively develop, deconstruct, and address race-conscious admission policies and practices.

The APIKC is dedicated to sharing knowledge and using our platform to highlight historical context, debunk myths of representation, and address barriers to APIDA inclusion in higher education. In alignment with APIKC goals, this piece serves as an initial effort to inform the greater APIDA and NASPA community of our position in navigating the complicated laws and policies that shape and are influenced by our community identity.
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Higher education is in a period of change. People across the country are questioning the return on investment for higher education (Mintz, 2022). Public trust in higher education has sharply decreased over the past eight years across political parties (M. Smith, 2023). Additionally, state governments are attacking and restricting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in their higher education institutions (Lu, 2023a). In this environment, how can staff involved in student affairs assessment report and share data when what they can report is restricted or their data are contested?

Student affairs data can shed light on higher education’s value and importance. This information provides evidence that can help decision-makers advocate for student learning, development, and success (Wise & Davenport, 2019). The data also evince the benefits of student programs and activities as well as areas for improvement (Schuh et al., 2016). This article contains suggestions on how student affairs assessment staff can work with and share data within the current higher education climate.
Ways to Work With and Share Data in Higher Education

Today's higher education environment is complex; each institution has its own cultural context. A higher education cultural context is made up of a variety of explicit and implicit factors affecting how members of the institution learn and develop (Montenegro & Jankowski, 2017). Moreover, every state has its own political situation, potentially imposing consequential changes to its higher education system. For example, Florida restricts its public higher education institutions from using federal and state funds on DEI activities (Lu, 2023b). Nevertheless, student affairs assessment professionals can navigate the current climate by continuing to follow these best practices:

Think about the story you want to tell.
Stories help convey important information quickly and effectively. Think about the main point you want to get across and then how to tell it in an engaging fashion. You can include the results with suggestions at the end of the story. An outline might be helpful to avoid getting bogged down in individual data points.

Determine your target audience.
Are you presenting to senior leadership or to a department? Is the audience familiar with assessment or brand new to it? Do they want details or just the big picture? Knowing your audience will help determine the most effective way to share your results.

Reflect how visuals would support your findings.
Visuals can sometimes help explain findings in a way that is easier to understand than numbers or words. You should consider how you can visually share primary findings to help your audience understand why they are important.

Consider both institutional and state contexts.
Knowing as much as you can about institutional and state contexts can help you share findings in an appropriate way (Wise & Davenport, 2019). Keep up to date with trends at your institution as well as state bills and legislation. If, for example, you work in a state with anti-DEI legislation that restricts spending on DEI programs, you can consider how to measure the impact of DEI in other ways. For example, disaggregating data can highlight groups that are smaller and may be minimized in the aggregate sample (Garcia et al., 2018). The Chronicle of Higher Education maintains a great resource for DEI-related legislation at https://www.chronicle.com/article/here-are-the-states-where-lawmakers-are-seeking-to-ban-colleges-dei-efforts.

If the assessment findings are at all negative, let the program staff and senior leadership know in advance.
Negative feedback can be frightening, but you can frame it positively as an opportunity to explore possibilities for improvement (Bullington-Miller, 2023). Let program stakeholders know of these results in advance. They can point out any factual inaccuracies and know that others might contact them about these results.

Ensure you can provide additional evidence or documentation as needed.
Keeping records of assessment methods and analyses can help critical or probing stakeholders use your data. People may have additional questions, and you can use these records to provide additional information. Such records also help to facilitate greater transparency of your assessment process, building trust in the data findings (Wise & Davenport, 2019). In today's climate, it is common for people to alter statistical results to obtain the findings they want, which reduces data quality and validity (G. Smith, 2023; Wise & Davenport, 2019). Data can also be racialized to support White racial interests (Garcia et al., 2018). For example, displaying overall retention numbers at a predominantly White institution may obfuscate the experiences of other underrepresented groups. Overall, follow proper analysis procedures and consider which voices are included and excluded so that your data are valid and accurate—and representative of myriad student groups.
**Use neutral language during your presentation.**

Rather than saying “we did better with more students joining this program,” go with “the program numbers increased by X% over last year.” Sticking to what the numbers suggest, rather than extrapolating how these findings affect programs, keeps the audience focused on the findings. Moreover, stating the facts helps the audience consider why these results occurred. For example, were higher program numbers found because of program changes, or were numbers lower due to COVID-19 or other external factors?

**Consider your institutional context and find allies to support you.**

Be aware of controversial topics such as DEI. Is it possible to use qualitative methods or another kind of analysis to report on these topics? In addition, find allies within and outside your division who support your work and can help you navigate your institutional climate (Wise & Davenport, 2019).

Although these changes and challenges in higher education may be confusing, frightening, or frustrating, we must continue assessment work. Assessment is extremely important, as it shows the effectiveness of a department, program, or activity and points to ways for improvement (Schuh et al., 2016). Our data assist in decision-making and help others understand the value of student affairs. Remember that you are not alone and can reach out to your colleagues at other institutions for suggestions and advice (Bullington-Miller, 2023). Student affairs assessment work is essential to higher education, and we can continue to do it together.
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Since the tragic event at Columbine High School, the number of school shootings has continued to rise, affecting more than 352,000 students and leaving an indelible mark on countless lives—especially those of school shooting survivors (Cox et al., 2023). As these survivors begin their higher education journeys, they encounter a multitude of challenges that go well beyond the classroom, affecting their mental health, identity expression, social experiences, and interactions with faculty and staff. To address them effectively, educational institutions must create a compassionate campus culture that recognizes and considers the trauma experienced by school shooting survivors, offering holistic support to empower them in their social and academic pursuits.

### The Challenges in Higher Education Faced by School Shooting Survivors

The journey of a school shooting survivor pursuing higher education is filled with a range of difficulties, from the emotional to the practical. In the following discussion, I delve into several significant examples.

#### Mental Health

School shooting survivors often experience significant mental health challenges due to the trauma they have endured. Some experience posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), which can be triggered by common occurrences on campus, such as a fire drill. Students who are diagnosed with PTSD, depression, anxiety, or other mental health challenges often isolate themselves, struggle to relate to peers, feel a lack of belonging on campus, and experience frequent anger and dissatisfaction (Shalka & Leal, 2022).
Academic Performance
The lingering effects of devastating trauma can adversely affect survivors’ academic performance, concentration, and ability to cope with academic responsibilities (Piskorik, 2022). These students may face challenges in staying on track with their studies, leading to a decline in grades and academic achievement.

Masking Identity
Due to widespread media coverage of school shootings, survivors are oftentimes recognizably linked to the tragedy if they disclose their hometown or high school (Piskorik, 2022). To create authentic relationships and avoid uncomfortable conversations, school shooting survivors may hide parts of their identities. Berkley et al. (2019) described the need to disguise oneself as a form of emotional labor. When people engage in surface acting—that is, by revealing only identities or experiences that are like those of people around them—they risk a sense of inauthenticity. The act of surface acting may exhaust students and lead to less engagement with their peers.

Social Isolation
Survivors may struggle to relate to their peers who have experienced similar trauma. Highly publicized school shootings can cause survivors to be perceived as celebrities to their peers, inviting evasive questioning about the event and making it difficult to connect (Piskorik, 2022). Difficulty making friends or relating to peers may lead survivors to isolate and feel disconnected from the campus community.

Creating a Trauma-Informed Campus Culture
A school shooting can deeply affect survivors’ sense of belonging; these individuals often feel disconnected from their peers. Therefore, a trauma-informed campus community must prioritize creating a culture of care and support for school shooting survivors. Faculty and staff using a trauma-informed approach must uphold consistent and high expectations as they work with students to develop competence and self-assurance to counter negative experiences with positive ones (Carello & Butler, 2014).

Fostering Meaningful Relationships
The significance of relationships in the context of trauma cannot be overstated. Extensive research by trauma psychiatrists has conclusively shown that strong, empathetic relationships play a pivotal role in facilitating successful recovery (Shalka, 2022). Conversely, a lack of these vital connections on campus often poses a significant challenge for trauma survivors, leaving them feeling isolated and unsupported. On a trauma-informed campus, there is a strong focus on helping all students build resilient relationships, ensuring that all students have a dependable support system to turn to in times of need. Campuses can create this environment by affording opportunities for relationships to flourish—through mentor–mentee programs, for example, or by providing avenues for students to connect in meaningful ways that encourage mutual support.

Improving Shared Understanding
Knowing that others understand trauma and its impacts is crucial for college student survivors, as many of them struggle with feeling misunderstood or isolated. Educating faculty and staff can play a vital role in increasing awareness and acceptance within campus communities. This effort involves a campus commitment to enhancing knowledge about trauma, embracing inclusive definitions, acknowledging the prevalence of trauma, and recognizing its multifaceted effects on individuals and groups. Professional development for faculty and staff may begin this conversation on campus; they should be instructed on identifying signs of trauma, supporting students, and knowing when to refer them to mental health professionals.

Evaluating Policies and Practices
The policies and practices in a campus environment can either perpetuate harm or promote healing. An example of a necessary practice on college campuses is fire drills; they are necessary for practicing fire safety and running routine checks on alarms and alert
systems. However, for a school shooting survivor, a fire alarm may cause distress if it somehow relates to their experienced trauma. Taking a trauma-informed approach means considering how policies and practices may be inadequate or even retraumatizing for students with harrowing histories. A trauma-informed approach to fire drills might be to notify students so they have ample time to prepare for the drill. It also involves being mindful of language and expressions that can communicate harm or make certain community members feel invisible.

Providing Meaningful Support
Supporting student survivors of trauma goes beyond immediate crisis responses; trauma-informed practice involves building skills to be attentive and supportive of the well-being and humanity of students throughout their healing journey. Ensuring their emotional well-being is vital for their effective learning. It is important to recognize that a history of trauma can affect students’ academic performance, even when the subject of trauma is not discussed in the classroom (Carello & Butler, 2014). Being present and allowing space for students to share are often impactful; however, referring students to mental health resources is essential. Following up with the student to check in on them in days and weeks after a referral reinforces the network of support that these students need.

Conclusion
The challenges faced by school shooting survivors in higher education demand a compassionate and proactive response from educational institutions. By building strong connections, enhancing collective knowledge, auditing policies and practices, and providing meaningful support, colleges and universities can create a nurturing environment where survivors feel understood, supported, and empowered to succeed both academically and personally. Through dedication, empathy, and a trauma-informed approach, we can forge a path toward healing and resilience for school shooting survivors on their higher education journey.
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Bodily autonomy and choice experienced a cataclysmic shift on June 24, 2022, prompting a significant change in the debate about freedom and autonomy for women as a gender minority. It was the day the Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health decision (Hanm, 2023) overturned Roe v. Wade. Political efforts to revoke women’s rights parallel a similar effort to curtail, if not abolish, the rights of transgender and gender-nonconforming (GNC) people. Roe’s overturning and the ongoing challenges to gender and reproductive autonomy at every level of government attest to a larger conservative effort to further marginalize women, womxn,1 trans, and nonbinary lives. The same antiabortion groups that backed the Dobbs decision are behind the majority of the antitransgender laws that are being passed across the country. For example, the Promise to America’s Children campaign is a national platform for consolidating the opposition to abortion and LGBTQ rights, advocating for politicians to “protect” children from the “promotion of abortion and politicized ideas about sexual orientation and gender identity” (Family Policy Alliance, 2021).

With this national context, we focus this paper on the individuals in the LGBTQ community who are most often attacked and at risk in the United States: transgender and GNC people. We first provide an overview of what transgender and gender-expansive people are already facing in college, discuss how antitransgender legislation is affecting this student population, and share a call to action about our obligations as higher education administrators and faculty to advocate for our trans and GNC students and colleagues.

---

1 This term encompasses and acknowledges that within this diaspora, gender identity has space for multiple gender expressions without factoring in importance.
Context and Literature
The existing literature clearly indicates that campus climate and infrastructure tend to be poor, if not downright hostile, for transgender and GNC students (Siegel, 2019). Experiences include harassment and discrimination, and transgender and GNC students report a significantly lower sense of belonging, despite boasting rates of participation in “educationally meaningful experiences” similar to those of their cisgender peers (Dugan et al., 2012, p. 732). Beyond the educational experience itself, Platt (2020) found that transgender and GNC college students, compared with their cisgender peers, exhibit the highest levels of distress and clinical symptoms of depression, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder on nearly every indicator. Further, GNC students and transgender students are not the same, though these two groups are often collapsed into one category by faculty and staff and labeled as “trans.” This conflation hides the reality that GNC students are reporting the most acute and distressing feelings related to trauma, nonconsensual sexual experiences, abuse, and depression.

It is also important to note the resilience, resistance, and kinship that trans and GNC students develop in college. Nicolazzo (2016) highlighted the strategies that these students engage to “navigate gender-dichotomous collegiate environments” (p. 538). In short, they foster resilience in themselves, resistance toward hostile university environments, and kinship among similarly identified peers to succeed and thrive in college. Nicolazzo found that students use the word resilience as a verb, meaning it is an action to be practiced and a skill to be nurtured; in the same way that the students describe the ability to “do gender,” they learn to “do resilience” to preserve their safety and dignity.

Added to the challenges already faced by transgender and GNC students is the tidal wave of antitransgender legislation being introduced across the country; such bills negatively affect college students specifically. So far in 2023, 590 antitrans bills have been introduced in 49 states; 80 have passed and 358 are currently active (Trans Legislation Tracker, n.d.). University-specific targets include athletics, physical and mental health, academics and curricula, and general safety as it relates to antitransgender violence. The antitransgender K–12 sports bills make it significantly harder for trans students to be competitive at the college level and recruited by coaches (Fischer, 2023). Bans on gender-affirming care affect the ability of state-funded university health centers to deliver relevant care to transgender and GNC communities. Additionally, negative portrayals of transgender and GNC people in the media have had negative impacts on these students’ mental health (Platt, 2020). At a curricular level, the inclusion of trans people and topics in K–12 education is already rare and stigmatized; new laws banning instructors from teaching these topics will further limit trans-affirming knowledge as students enter college. Finally, these bills criminalize the mere existence of trans and GNC people and galvanize transphobia in the communities in which they live. For trans people, 2022 was the deadliest year on record, with particular impact on trans women of color (Hamm 2023). Transphobic violence and rates of harassment, discrimination, and bias incidents on college campuses continue to increase and are frequently underreported (Weise et al., 2021).

Recommendations
With these chilling realities in mind, higher education professionals, including faculty, need to approach supporting trans and GNC students as a responsibility, not an opportunity. This is a call to action. We must explicitly acknowledge that trans and GNC students are affected by every level of policy, not just university policy. As higher education administrators and faculty, we have an obligation to examine systems just as we do people. Said examination should include proactively educating ourselves about state and national antitrans laws and thinking critically about how they may show up on our campuses. For example, response can take the form of closely auditing forms, providing gender-inclusive
housing, and supporting organizations that exist to advocate on behalf of these communities and to enhance access to ownership of one’s identification. At the University of California–Davis, the process of examining these policies resulted in the Gender Recognition and Lived Name (GRLN) initiative. This initiative aims to address systemic inequities faced by the trans and GNC communities, while ensuring that not only students but faculty, staff, and alumni alike can have their accurate gender identity and lived named reflected in university-issued identification documents (University of California–Davis, 2023). This initiative also created a toolkit to assist trans and GNC students and staff in navigating the UC system. Included in this toolkit are HR resources, educational courses and workshops, clear and concise processes to report discrimination, and a glossary to help the overarching campus community become familiar with appropriate and inclusive language. Ultimately, if institutions prioritize implementing and educating informed gender nondiscrimination policies, then individuals and departments will be held properly accountable—which will support trans and GNC resilience (Siegel, 2019).

Conclusion
We call on you, the higher education community, to think about how to prioritize the trans and GNC community at your institution. We recommend that you start by acknowledging gaps that exist and/or admitting that this community was never afforded the attention, space, or recognition they deserve. Acting goes far beyond surveying these communities; it extends to asserting statements of solidarity, creating transparent action plans with realistic deadlines and information on what follow-up may look like, and, above all, challenging policies that perpetuate the erasure of the trans and GNC communities.
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Indigenous Critique of Student Transition Theory
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[T]his conceptualization of student development theory in many ways may maintain higher education’s role as a tool for assimilation and perpetuate colonization.
— Reyes & Tauala, 2019, p. 51

Native Americans live in a country that has, historically, had in place policies and practices aimed at their removal, and Native communities continue to experience racism on many levels (Waterman & Lindley, 2013). Though it is important to understand the historical barriers and challenges of Native students, it is more important to understand the cultural richness and historical worldviews that many Native communities still carry today. Our Native students find themselves on their ancestors’ lands yet feel like they are in a foreign place. Their ability to stay grounded in their cultural practices and ceremonies (such as through smudging, storytelling, gift-giving) keeps them engaged with their communities even while physically away from them.

Higher education institutions pride themselves on their unique campus communities and their students’ sense of belonging. Though this is a helpful theoretical mindset, one must critically evaluate the spaces and resources these institutions provide for Native students. Nancy Schlossberg and colleagues

With feet planted on the ancestral lands of the Keyauwee, Saura, and Occaneechi Band of the Saponi Nation, I hold to the Indigenous paradigms of our ancestors. Though the Keyauwee and Saura are no longer here on Turtle Island, we honor the continuation of our people on our Native lands. This work in student affairs is done for our Native students who are currently navigating a system designed to exclude their personal and ancestral practices and knowledge. This critique of student development theory is done for the Native students who aspire to use their accomplished education to give back to their communities.
(1995) provided the field of student affairs with two foundational theories: mattering and marginality, and transition. Her collaboration in Goodman et al. (2006) defined transition as “any event, or non-event, [that] results in charged relationships, routines, assumptions, and roles” (p. 33). Schlossberg’s transition theory is known for its four Ss: (1) situation (trigger and timing of situation); (2) self (personal and demographic characters, and psychological); (3) support (type, function, and measurement), and (4) strategies (modification to situation).

This article introduces a framework using Brayboy’s (Lumbee) (2005) tribal critical race theory (TribalCrit) and Horse’s (Kiowa) (2005) Native American identity development and its three common principles (See Figure 1.0) to address the benefits and gaps in Schlossberg’s transition theory (Schlossberg et al., 1995).

**Conceptual Framework**

As the lens through which to critique Schlossberg’s theory, I use the overlapping principles in Brayboy (2005) and Horse (2005). Three common principles of the two theories guide this critique: (1) Indigenous cultural philosophies and worldviews, (2) the importance of storytelling to the cultural community, and (3) liminality. This framework examines worldviews/philosophies, the centering of individual stories, and the lack of space for Native students within Schlossberg’s transition theory.

**Critique and Reconstruction**

The basis of Schlossberg’s theory is the assumption that the environments students enter are compatible with their lifestyles and responsive to their cultural practices. This is not the case for Native students. Higher education encourages individualistic mindsets under the guise of personal growth and catalyzes the self-centered nature of higher education upon Native students. Additionally, this theory does not include the critical recognition of the isolating environment that campuses create for Native students. When applying the framework, Schlossberg’s theory can be critiqued for failing to recognize the Indigenous ways of knowing (Pillar I), cultural practices of transitions (Pillar II), and the spaces of belonging that Native students seek when they arrive to campus (Pillar III).
Reconstruction using the conceptual framework would focus on the second S, self. This process emphasizes the individual’s introspection—that is, to think about themselves through an individualistic lens. This reconstruction would add a third category—community engagement—to recognize its importance in the transition of a student from a collectivist community. This category gives space to Native students to center their collectivist worldviews and philosophies (Pillar I), practice their cultural traditions of sharing familial stories with the campus community (Pillar II), and know they can find a space of belonging on their campus (Pillar III).

**Implications for Student Affairs Practitioners and Administrators**

Organizations should be conscious of their role in Native students’ campus transition. The reconstructed version of Schlossberg’s transition theory places a responsibility on administrators to give a space for Native students to stay connected and engaged with their community as they transition to their campuses. This effort can include opportunities for partnerships with nearby tribal communities or strengthening resources available for Native students. Our colleagues at Mars Hill University and Western Carolina University have partnered with the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (EBCI) to design a space for EBCI and other Native students to connect. Another implication is for institutions to allow Native students to practice their cultural ceremonies when entering campus (e.g., smudging their room). Our colleagues at Syracuse University are modeling the way for institutions to partner with their local fire marshal to design a policy to allow this sacred ceremony of transition and cleansing to occur.

**Limitations**

Just as no ethnic culture is monolithic, this framework does not address all Indigenous cultures. This framework also recognizes that not all Native students were raised on tribal lands; some may have grown up in urban areas outside of tribal lands—and thus have experienced their Indigeneity in their own way.

**Conclusion**

The introductory quote reminds us that the development and application of our field’s foundational theories were rooted in the acculturation and assimilation of cultures other than those of Eurocentric individualism. Student development theories are core to student affairs practices and policies. Therefore, it is essential to update these theories to align with today’s higher education landscape. It is also important to understand that these theories perpetuate individualistic paradigms in which the individual is examined without accepting community influence. This critique offers a more community-centric paradigm in which the student is examined through a community-based approach to support systems.
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International education is, and will remain, an essential aspect of higher education. Technology enables us to be more “local” than ever before while respecting and valuing the differences across our field. One way to remain aware of and engaged with these differences is through involvement with the various organizations that support our work. Professional organizations are a space to come together to share ideas and resources. Several organizations exist in the field of international education. In addition to the International Education Knowledge Community (IEKC) and NASPA are NAFSA, the Forum on Education Abroad, Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), and Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). These groups provide resources, training, and networking opportunities. They also act as a platform for collaboration and knowledge sharing. Involvement with these organizations affords professional development opportunities and engagement with peer communities of practice. Memberships can help us stay current with the latest trends in international education and enhance our skills and knowledge.
Within international education, the physical distance itself can sometimes make creating and nurturing connections more difficult. We believe this challenge makes our professional organizations even more essential to the future of our field. The following article contains summaries of research about professional development and engagement with peer communities of practice alongside our personal reflections on engagement with professional organizations. We hope this article sheds light on what they might be able to do for you and with your involvement.

Benefits of Volunteering for an International Professional Association

Engaging with peer communities of practice in international education can be beneficial in several ways. By connecting with colleagues from around the world, professionals can expand their networks and learn from others. Professional organizations offer opportunities for networking and knowledge sharing, which can enhance participants’ skills and knowledge. These organizations also provide resources, training, and conferences that can support professional development. Tran and Nghia Tran (2020) highlighted the importance of networking in the development of leadership and management skills appropriate for higher education. Networking can be done via conference attendance and discussion forums but also through sustained committee work and special interest groups. These authors also discussed how this networking can be parlayed into increased international opportunities for students with internship or work placement opportunities around the world. As professionals in international education, we make an unspoken promise to our students to support the development of their own international connections; this oath brings with it a responsibility to nurture our own connections.

Peer communities can provide a support system and access to mentors who can offer guidance and advice. Trust and colleagues (2017, p. 2) defined professional learning networks as “people, spaces, and tools that support professional growth” and highlighted the potential for sharing feedback, ideas, emotional support, and collaboration within these groups. Engagement with the various professional organizations in our field is a shortcut to building these networks. With the way many international educators are often siloed on their campuses—running offices of one or two to meet the full needs of the institution’s internationalization efforts—the power of these networks becomes even greater.

From our experience, we can attest that being involved with professionals from around the world can broaden professional networks, facilitate continual learning, inspire innovation, and provide a support system for personal and career growth.

Impact of Volunteering on Professional Outlook and Overall Development

Work in international education can be hard! It is still often seen as a bonus component to an education and not a key to a holistic learning experience. It is often seen as a means of raising funds, particularly in places where international students are charged a higher rate of tuition and fees. These pressures affect all of us in our roles, regardless of whether we recognize them, and it can be challenging to find colleagues who understand just what these pressures mean. For the two of us, when we log into our monthly IEKC leadership team meetings, we know that we will find a dozen pairs of willing ears to hear whatever is challenging us in that moment—and that a supportive group will help find available solutions or just continue to acknowledge us when there are none.

Volunteering in professional international education organizations can have a significant impact on professional outlook and overall development. By getting involved in such organizations, all of us can gain valuable experience and skills that can enhance career prospects. Volunteering in these organizations affords opportunities to network with professionals in the field, learn about the latest trends and developments in education, and gain exposure to different cultures and perspectives. This involvement
can help us to broaden our horizons and develop a more global mindset, which is increasingly important in today’s interconnected world. Volunteering also allows professionals to develop important skills such as leadership, communication, and teamwork, which are highly valued by employers and can be applied in a wide range of settings.

In addition to the professional benefits, volunteering can have a positive impact on personal development. It can provide a sense of purpose and fulfillment, and it can be an opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to society. Barton and colleagues (2022) cited the importance of developing flexibility, open-mindedness, and relationship building while undertaking a volunteering opportunity. Working in a new space with new people under new conditions can have value far beyond just staying current in the field. In her work examining the potential of the African American Women’s Summit to provide a counterspace for African American women to find understanding of their shared experiences within higher education, West (2017) found these women to be better able to “identify microaggressive incidents, find greater access to survival and success strategies, and develop a healthier standpoint” (p. 281). Although our experiences as educators will not always mirror those of these women, the experiences of our students often will.

**Conclusion**

If, after reading this, you feel inspired to expand your international education communities of practice, we encourage you to do so! From experienced upper-level professionals to new graduate students, all can contribute and are welcome to join us in the IEKC and any of the other groups mentioned here. The communities provide a platform from which to continually check our own positionality, reflect on it, and take action appropriately. Many of us did not come into the IEKC with any intention or aspiration for leadership. However, it came.
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Leadership
Professional Development and Engagement

An authentic connection with an individual who shares with you a similar racial or ethnic background lends itself to a sense of community, and this sense of community can strengthen a mentor-mentee relationship. Mentorship and sponsorship are integral to personal and professional advancement; they create a cycle of growth and success. This article shares the story of how the two authors built a professional relationship and remained present in each other’s lives for more than two decades. Mentorship and sponsorship brought the authors to advance and advocate for each other, and their relationship ultimately led to them to jointly volunteer to serve in leadership roles in the Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community. The article will also share six consejos (tips) for maximizing a mentoring relationship so it can evolve into sponsorship.

The initial relationship began while Dr. Nanette Vega served as an assistant dean of students at the University of Miami. Juan Carlos Matos was an active undergraduate student leader. The Office of Multicultural Student Affairs was his first exposure to the field of student affairs. His desire to serve in leadership roles, coupled with conversations with Nanette, fueled his growing passion to enter the field. Juan Carlos pursued a master’s degree at New York University. Upon graduation, he applied for an assistant director position at Fordham University. Nanette served as a reference for Juan Carlos. She had the opportunity to advocate for Juan Carlos and highlight his skills that aligned with the role at Fordham. This advocacy would not have been possible had there not been a foundation of trust and a positive relationship developed years prior.
Although both authors engaged in various professional development experiences with many associations, including NASPA, they were united by their identities as Latinx/a/o first-generation college graduates. Conferences served as a meeting ground on a mostly annual basis, allowing Juan Carlos and Nanette's relationship of mentor and mentee to evolve into one of colleagues. In 2020, they began to explore the possibility of working together and discussed applying to be co-chairs for the Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community. This opportunity to lead together was a full-circle moment that involved them in making a difference. Nanette inspired Juan Carlos to pursue a career in higher education, and what better way to pay it forward than to work together and share the experience of being a mentor and mentee to the next generation of Latinx/a/o student affairs professionals?

Through various leadership roles in professional organizations and at their own institutions, Juan Carlos and Nanette have had to be mindful about presenting their authentic selves in various settings. Batista and Collado (2018) explained, “It is critical for Latinx/a/o professionals to engage in lifelong learning through professional development and to take on leadership roles in professional organizations as a pathway to enhance their success in higher education” (p. 310). For Nanette, being an authentic leader has meant leading with high standards of integrity and taking responsibility for her actions. A proud Puerto Rican practitioner and scholar, she is intentional in mentoring and sponsoring the next generation of higher education professionals. Currently, she serves as the founding dean for the Office of Diversity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine. Nanette has established pathway programs into medicine for historically excluded groups pursuing careers in medicine. She has been recognized locally and nationally for her work in social justice and mentoring. Most recently, she received the 2023 NASPA Pillar of the Profession Award.

For Juan Carlos, being an authentic leader has meant being an unapologetically gay Afro-Dominican male who leads with a person-centered approach when supporting students and staff. Even the smallest actions that may have seemed insignificant have had a big impact on those around him. From growing out his hair into an afro to simply being “out” on campus, Juan Carlos has found that being the assistant vice president for student affairs for diversity and inclusion as a queer person of color at a predominantly White university has allowed him to connect with and inspire many people. His efforts were recognized by NASPA Region II when he received the 2022 Outstanding Commitment to Higher Education Award. Batista and Collado (2018) shared that “intentionally practicing authentic leadership, even when one must constantly negotiate who one is in varied spaces, is critical to the success of Latinx/a/o individuals in academia” (p. 302). As they resume their roles as Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community cochairs and work toward furthering NASPA's mission and purpose, Juan Carlos and Nanette strive to create meaningful relationships with their executive board and members. Taking the time to serve in a leadership role—while embracing the benefits of a professional relationship—is rewarding and can lead to professional growth for yourself, members of the Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community, and the organization.

**Why Mentoring Matters**

1. **Equal opportunities:** Mentoring professionals from historically excluded groups helps to address the systemic disparities and barriers they face in various domains of life, including education, employment, and leadership. By offering guidance, support, and access to networks, mentors can help level the playing field and create more equitable opportunities for individuals from historically excluded backgrounds.

2. **Skill development:** Mentoring creates a platform for skill development and knowledge sharing. People of color often encounter
unique challenges and experiences that may require specific strategies and skills to navigate successfully. Mentors offer to mentees psychological safety—that is, no judgment—as they acquire new skills and enhance existing ones, whether they are related to professional development, networking, or cultural competence.

3. **Building confidence:** Mentoring can significantly bolster the self-esteem of individuals from marginalized communities. By having someone who believes in their abilities, validates their experiences, and offers guidance, mentees gain confidence in their own potential and learn to combat imposter syndrome.

4. **Representation and role modeling:** The lack of diversity within student affairs leadership makes creating mentoring relationships with others who share similar identities essential. You can’t be what you can’t see! Representation matters! Having mentors who have achieved success in their respective fields can inspire mentees of color to pursue their own ambitions—knowing that it is possible to break barriers and succeed.

5. **Networking opportunities:** Networks play a vital role in advancing careers and accessing resources. Mentoring facilitates connections between mentees’ and mentors’ professional networks, increasing the chances of exposure to new opportunities and collaborations. This access to networks helps in overcoming the opportunity gap and fosters mentees’ professional and personal growth.

6. **Cultural understanding and inclusivity:** Mentoring people from historically excluded groups in higher education promotes cross-cultural understanding and inclusivity for both the mentor and the mentee. Both individuals can learn about different perspectives, experiences, and cultural contexts, which foster empathy and awareness. This understanding can help mentors become advocates for diversity, equity, and belonging, contributing to more inclusive environments and the dismantling of biases.

By investing in mentoring relationships, student affairs professionals can cultivate talent, empower individuals, and promote social and professional advancement for historically excluded groups. An important point to remember is that the mentorship relationship can look different for different people, and any level of engagement can lead to a lifelong relationship that can be passed on to the next generation of professionals.

Two decades after first meeting, Nanette and Juan Carlos will serve as the 2024–26 cochairs for the NASPA Latinx/a/o Knowledge Community. This is a full-circle moment for the two to work together as colleagues. Both answered a call to action to be a part of the change they want to see in serving the Latinx/a/o community and creating opportunities for others to be mentored and sponsored.
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Higher education fundraising has always been a challenge, but the COVID-19 pandemic certainly presented new and unique hurdles for those in the industry to navigate. Changes in enrollment, an increase in student debt, a shift in workforce needs, and other challenges have contributed to a need for fundraisers to shift gears and work collaboratively with campus partners to better serve students and their needs (Ruch, 2021). Over the past year, the Student Affairs Fundraising and Communications Knowledge Community (SAFC KC) has worked with partners such as the Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community as well as the Adult Learners and Students with Children Knowledge Community. These partnerships provided better insights on using collaborative partnerships to build out more streamlined fundraising plans that fit with an institution’s strategic priorities. By understanding an area’s specific needs, the SAFC KC was able to create a guideline that would better streamline the fundraising process—and thus succeed.
One of the most anomalous characteristics of student affairs fundraising is that we as professionals are not just fundraising for students in a certain major, hometown, class year, or organization. We are fundraising for every student. Because our programs and initiatives affect every student, we need to take a different approach to making our requests than other departments in high education do. We have to change how student affairs staff work with development colleagues across campus and strengthen the connections that student affairs has with each institution's priorities.

One constant in student affairs fundraising is that we are always adapting, growing, and coming up with innovative ways to fundraise for student support. A one-size-fits-all approach will not work for us, and we need to avoid an explosion of solicitations from everyone, preventing an overcrowding of appeals from higher education institutions (Penney et al., 2019).

### Identifying Priorities

Strategic communication plans and a recognizable identity can help identify priorities and better allow student affairs to stand out while also remaining aligned with the institution’s priorities. In some cases, institutional leadership may assume that all student affairs programs are covered under the fees students pay, so these leaders may not consider student affairs fundraising a priority (Arminio et al., 2010). It is important that student affairs professionals align their fundraising needs with institutional priorities so that they can better position themselves with already existing fundraising efforts.

To help, the SAFC KC wrote a strategic priority action plan, available on our website (SAFC KC, n.d.). This action plan will help users work through a process to be prepared to present their fundraising needs to development colleagues so that the information can be employed in prospective donor meetings. This action plan can also help to create an identity for your needs and build marketing collateral. In addition to completing the action plan, we highly encourage users to employ data and quality pictures to help tell the story. The coupling of the action plan with other storytelling elements can be a way to show alignment with an institution’s priorities.

Before starting this action plan, users must have a strong understanding of what their institutions’ priorities look like. This information lays the foundation; additional needs can be built on it. For example, I worked through this action plan for my role at The University of Texas at Austin (UT Austin). I used UT Austin's strategic plan, Change Starts Here, to work the Division of Student Affairs projects, programs, and student needs into the areas of people, place, and pursuits (The University of Texas at Austin, 2023).

In addition to fitting our needs in with the strategic plan, our Texas Development team is part of a major campaign called What Starts Here (The University of Texas at Austin, 2023). This campaign was beneficial from the perspective of student affairs fundraising, because I was able to provide more university source material to back up my fundraising requests. At this point, I was close to being able to complete the action plan.

### Gathering the Information and Creating a Plan

Before moving through the action plan, take the following strategies into consideration.

#### Start Big

- What are the goals, mission, and strategic plans at your institution?
- How about in your student affairs division?

#### Get Smaller

- What programs, services, and so on align and intersect between these priorities?
- What do budgets and current gift operations look like?
Narrow Down and Finalize

› Choose one or two priorities to focus on. This could be whatever is needed most, such as a program need, a staffing need, or a scholarship.

› Set aside time to devise an action plan.

Once you’ve gone through this list, you can complete the action plan. We encourage you to work with campus partners, the SAFCKC, and any other stakeholders—such as professional organizations or other professionals in student affairs fundraising—who can support you in this effort.

The idea of the action plan is to get you to start thinking big and then break things down into smaller pieces. We often hear how our institutions feel siloed and that they fail to communicate with one another. This action plan allows you to remedy that problem by speaking with your colleagues and peers and building what they say into your plan. Outreach and data collection may take some time, but the result will be worth the effort.

Conclusion

Student affairs fundraising is not what it used to be—and never will be again—but with the access to a fleshed-out action plan on the SAFKC website, users can meet challenges head on. By collaborating with campus partners, understanding your institution’s strategic priorities, and completing an action plan for your department, you can be poised to fundraise with confidence. Starting with a big picture and working on the smaller details as you move through the layers will allow you to identify your champions, better define your programs and needs, and place you in a position for devising an identity and communication strategy that cuts through the noise. This action plan is just one of the many resources the SAFKC KC offers. We encourage you to reach out to us with any questions, take one of our quarterly professional development webinars, join our Facebook community, and subscribe to our monthly newsletter.
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Higher education professionals often find themselves on either the academic affairs side or the student affairs side of their institutions. Dividing higher education work into separate sides can create a disjointed experience that frustrates both students trying to navigate the institution and professionals trying to deliver services to students. This article presents some strategies to build stronger relationships with other professionals across institutional divides and leverage relationships into collaborative partnerships for a better student experience.

Bridging Gaps

Students often feel distant from the academic side of higher education (e.g., faculty, curriculum, deans); close familial aspects typically characterize the student affairs side. Student affairs units often assist students in fostering a social sense of belonging on campus, but students may not always experience the same academic sense of belonging when seeking connections in their chosen programs of study. It is recommended that student and academic affairs units, to streamline the support they provide, collaborate to help students bridge social, academic, and financial services (Cooper, 2010, as cited in Ozaki & Hornak, 2014). As higher education professionals, we are obligated to bridge this divide and help
students master their curricular requirements while simultaneously building supportive networks with peers, faculty, and administrators in academic affairs. By embedding student affairs–trained professionals within academic affairs units, institutions of higher education can create a streamlined student experience with less competition and resistance between academic and student affairs departments.

Whether through creating new positions or realigning existing structures, institutions have several opportunities to positively influence the student experience. “One-stop-shop” student service units are gaining popularity for bringing housing, enrollment management, financial aid, bursar, and advising under one department. There are several ways in which this approach could be successful, with appropriate cross-training of staff. First, adding one-stop employees to the academic advising office could afford students an opportunity to receive enrollment and financial aid assistance before, after, or even during their advising appointment. Second, cross-training academic advisors to have more knowledge about student activities, financial aid, and residence life/housing policies would allow them to provide more comprehensive assistance to students during appointments. Higher education administrators must seek new opportunities to streamline student services and improve the student experience.

Regardless of the existing institutional structure or the capacity to redesign student service units, opportunities may exist to give additional training to current staff. Academic program managers, coordinators, and advisors can build solid relationships with students as case managers, who can offer comprehensive student services. College students often look for someone they know and trust to help them troubleshoot issues. With exposure to other functional areas of the institution, staff can provide crucial support to students who are at risk of abandoning their academic plans.

Building relationships with colleagues across departments and divisions is an integral part of enhancing the student experience holistically. Students often express frustration when support staff provide conflicting information or different interpretations of policies and procedures. To expand our network is to build relationships with individuals across campus, understand their job responsibilities, and know how they support students. Through this practice, we can better help students by directing them to the individual who performs the next step in a process or is better equipped to help move them forward.

Implementing Change
Strong, collaborative partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs are crucial for creating a holistic learning environment. Traditional organizational structures that keep these two departments separate—ironically, often referred to as divisions—can hinder collaborative efforts. However, by adjusting the organizational structure, institutional leaders can create conditions that facilitate sustainable, productive partnerships that benefit faculty, staff, and students. The remainder of this section explores the benefits of adjusting organizational structures to facilitate partnerships between academic and student affairs, offering keen insights into the transformative potential this approach holds for the overall student experience.

Breaking Down Silos
Adjusting the organizational structure to disrupt and break down silos between academic and student affairs allows for increased communication, innovative collaboration, and cross-disciplinary cooperation. For example, some institutions have established a single executive leader overseeing combined units (e.g., vice president of academic and student affairs). Altering the organizational structure and creating positions or roles that formally build bridges between academic and student affairs facilitates agile leadership, centralized budgets, and joint committees. These steps can also eliminate hierarchical barriers, organizational waste (i.e., time, duplicative efforts), and force new or fuel existing partnerships.
between faculty and student affairs personnel. This approach can foster shared decision-making, yield interdisciplinary perspectives, and enhance the overall effectiveness of programs and services.

**Student-Centered Services**
Integrating academic and student affairs can lead to data-driven and student-centered services that truly address learners’ evolving needs more effectively (Strayhorn, 2019). Aligning academic support systems (e.g., writing centers, labs) with student affairs initiatives empowers institutions to provide comprehensive *wraparound support* throughout students’ academic journeys. Popular examples abound: living-learning communities, one-stop service centers, and bridge and federal TRIO programs, to name a few. By merging resources and knowledge, institutional leaders can develop high-impact, tailored programs that enhance engagement, well-being, and student success.

**Holistic Approach to Learning**
Creative, collaborative partnerships between academic and student affairs promote a holistic approach to learning by recognizing that academic success is deeply intertwined with personal and social development. Such collaborations allow academic personnel and student affairs professionals—together known as college student educators—to work together in new and different ways to cultivate an environment that supports students’ intellectual, emotional, and social growth. By coordinating efforts, institutions can create nurturing environments rich with opportunities for experiential learning, leadership development, and civic engagement—all while fostering community and a sense of belonging. Leveraging such partnerships can help create seamless transitions into and through college by aligning academic advising, career counseling, financial aid, and mental health counseling with classroom learning and student support services—all of which promote higher retention rates, greater college satisfaction, improved learning outcomes, and overall student success.

**Conclusion**
Adjusting the organizational structure to facilitate partnerships between academic and student affairs is a transformative step toward enhancing the overall student experience. Breaking down silos, focusing on student-centered services, adopting a holistic approach to learning, and prioritizing student transition and success are all potential benefits of such collaboration. Embracing this endeavor enables institutions to provide an integrated educational experience that prepares students not only for academic success but also for personal growth and lifelong learning.
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In a study on former student body presidents (SBPs), participants shared that student government (SG) experiences were akin to working in higher education, in part because of the access and engagement SBPs had with campus administrators (Goodman, 2021). Similarly, in a study of Black womyn SBPs at historically Black colleges and universities, participants attributed the successful navigation of leadership roles to the support from Black womyn in their lives, including administrators. One participant even considered her university president to be a mentor and described their relationship as meaningful (Hardaway et al., 2021). Proximity to senior administrators is rare, yet those in campuswide elected SG positions seem to have a closeness that many faculty, staff, and other administrators lack. Therefore, we want to illuminate contexts associated with this proximity, examine how the proximity affords students power, and discuss the ways it creates a responsibility for SG officials to lead in elevated ways.

A Study of Former SG Officers
In a study on former SG officers in postcollege public office (Goodman, 2022), there was a notable proximity to power afforded to student leaders that prepared them for future elected roles. For example, one participant, Charles, discussed the access he had in his role, including monthly meetings with academic deans, biweekly meetings with the provost, and weekly meetings with the chancellor. Similarly, participants Michael and Cici recalled having standing meetings with their university presidents as SBPs. Participants grappled with the amount of access they were privy to, which appeared as dissonance associated with their elevated leadership experience. Cici and Theo recalled memories of leadership experiences alongside the governors of their states, and Theo, because of his SG role, became familiar with publicly elected officials including members of Congress, to whom he contributed legislative ideas and support.
As these former SG officers reflected on the access these roles allowed, they acknowledged the responsibility inherent to the experience. Shirley shared, “I was definitely in places where other students weren’t…. I had to give speeches in front of thousands of people…presidents of colleges…and you know, just like these dignitaries that I was just like, ‘Whoa, this is interesting.’”

As part of her role, Shirley also met monthly with the dean of students and presided over major university changes with and alongside the university president and faculty senate. Proximity to power in this way was beneficial for in- and postcollege experiences. For example, a senior administrator took Paula to political functions and connected her with members of Congress for professional opportunities. She reflected on one “surreal” experience:

And I got two calls from [a Congressman’s] office. I thought it was a joke…. They offered me a position: intern. And, you know, usually, if at least during my time, to be an intern, you had to know somebody…. Your family was very well off. And I was very middle class, you know, lower in middle class, moneywise…. I was very lucky to get that opportunity. It was because of [my university administrator], who was very active in politics in our area [that I got the offer].

Paula’s experience exemplifies the unique access to institutional leaders—including local and state elected officials—granted to SG officers. Ultimately, the proximity to power SG leaders have in their roles provides them with not only opportunities to connect with leaders but also the chance to transform these connections into professional experiences.

Implications

With this fact in mind, university administrators and SG advisors can begin with being mindful of how power manifests in SG. Further, they may reflect on who elevates into these spaces and whose voices are not only represented but also heard and valued. Akin to “a seat at the table” for SBPs (Goodman, 2021, p. 38), this type of leadership preparation, while privileged for some, constitutes a link to more agency and responsibility. This attention to power might also lead advisors and administrators to evaluate which specific positions receive training and if there is an equitable opportunity for connections and power. Relationships are part of access, as is engagement with and among administrators and government officials.

Still, the possibility of dissonance is there: students are ultimately still students, even if they are in spaces occupied by institutional leaders. As such, we offer a few recommendations to administrators and advisors as they work through this issue in SG, including leveraging connections and considering power dynamics and identities.

Leveraging Connections With Institutional and Elected Student Leaders

SG advisors should guide students on leveraging these institutional connections. It should not be assumed that all students know how to operate in executive spaces on campus and among senior administrators. For example, advisors could guide students on networking with the adults they interact with through their SG work and explain how these connections could be used in achieving future goals (e.g., political, professional, personal). Such guidance might include connecting current students to alumni who served in SG. This type of engagement could be expanded on in trainings; it can include naming the “hidden curriculum” of elected leadership and discussing promising practices not always passed down between administrations.
Considering Power Dynamics

Jittrikawiphol (2020) wrote about SG as a voice of the students and quoted one individual: “We’re having lawmakers reaching out to us directly to be, like, what’s going on with students? They could ask university administrators that, but they’re coming to us because they think they’re going to get information they’re not going to get otherwise” (p. 34). Advisors must also be cognizant of the power dynamics in these relationships between students and older adult administrators. For example, how can advisors prepare students to advocate for themselves—and the interest of their peers—to someone who holds considerable power and is often several decades their senior? Naming this very challenge is important for advisors to do with students, and they should use one-on-one meetings or advising sessions to discuss relevant strategies. It is especially important for advisors to consider the ways students’ voices are or are not centered on campus—and what potential systemic issues are present that challenge students’ roles or experiences.

Considering Identity

Finally, additional consideration could be given to SG leaders who hold minoritized identities, as they may often encounter spaces where individuals are not affirming of their race, gender, and/or sexuality. Advisors should work with these students in considering how their identities affect their work in SG; they should help develop tools for them to advocate in spaces that may not be as hospitable to their identities. However, the onus should not be wholly on students with minoritized identities to advocate for themselves. Advisors and administrators have a duty to ensure that staff members create spaces where all students feel that they can show up as their full selves; this includes a responsibility for advisors to seek out campus and industry trainings to develop intercultural skills and culturally competent advising approaches that enable them to best advocate for students who hold minoritized identities.

Conclusion

The work of SG officers is particularly important given how this form of student involvement appears on campuses. We hope this context—and these recommendations—can be useful in practice and for scholars exploring this topic further.
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According to the American Association of School Administrators (2000), Ella Flagg Young, the first female superintendent of a major city school system, stated as early as 1909 that “In the near future, we will have more women than men in executive charge of the vast education system” (p. 1). The inference was that she believed that education was a woman’s natural field and that women should not be required to do the larger part of the work while being denied leadership positions.

Unfortunately, Young’s prediction has, so far, not come true in North America. Historically, women in higher education faced difficulty in achieving upper-level administrative and faculty positions, and the situation remains even today. According to Johnson (2017), “In 2015, male faculty members held a higher percentage of tenure positions at every type of institution even though they did not hold the highest number of faculty positions at every rank” (p. 7). In addition, the salary men earned, on average, was
also more than $15,000 above that of female faculty (Johnson, 2017). Male presidents also outnumber female presidents. In 2016, women held only 30% of presidencies in institutions of higher education (IHE); however, more female than male presidents Ed.D.s and Ph.D.s. Women were also less likely to possess the chief academic officer role than men, holding 43.6% across IHE (Johnson, 2017).

Methodology
This study analyzed the trends and perceptions of female administrators in the state of Florida. This study was delimited to female employees in public and private Florida IHE who were also members of ACPA or NASPA. Only women who held titles of assistant dean, associate dean, dean, assistant vice president, associate vice president, vice president, assistant provost, provost, and president were considered and emailed to participate in this quantitative study. Emails were gathered from association databases. The population for this study included 74 female administrators in Florida at 2- and 4-year public and private colleges and universities who held the identified titles.

Six research questions guided this study:
1. To what degree do female administrators report discrimination at Florida IHE?
2. To what degree do female administrators report the importance of a mentor at Florida IHE?
3. To what degree do female administrators report discrimination in promotion or tenure advancement at Florida IHE?
4. To what degree do female administrators report cases of sexual harassment at Florida IHE?
5. To what degree do female administrators report pay inequities for women at Florida IHE?
6. To what degree do female administrators report discrimination in regard to professional development at Florida IHE?

The dependent variable was the self-reported discrimination of respondents. Reported discrimination was analyzed using the responses to 15 Likert-type scale survey items. Respondents could expand their responses through summary comments. The independent variables used in this study were gender, age, ethnicity, administrative position, income, and Florida institutional type at which respondents were employed. Data for all independent variables were gathered from a series of items requesting demographic information in the final section of the electronic survey.

Results and Trends
The final survey included five demographic items, 15 multiple-choice questions, and two free-response questions. Questions focused on mentoring, equality in funding, professional development, salary and service, harassment, and representation. Overall, findings reflected that treatment of men and women in many respects has been equitable, and the trend in recent years appears, based on data from this research sample, to be positive. This study identified several positive trends about women in higher education.

For areas in which perceptions of inequality remained, adequacy of childcare was prominent. Respondents perceived day care facilities to be inadequate. Funk (1995) noted that a major obstacle for women in leadership roles was that they experienced guilt over the time that they spent away from their families. Quality daycare may also help IHE to recruit employees with families to the institution. Lack of adequate day care was the most common source of perceived discrimination reported in this study: The researcher was 95% confident that the true mean response to the item about adequacy of day care on campus fell between 1.719 and 2.601 (with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree that adequate childcare was offered) from the 32 respondents who answered this question, suggesting that in all likelihood respondents leaned toward stating that day care was inadequate at their institutions (see Table 1).
Although women have made great strides in equality in higher education, men have continued to garner higher salaries (Johnson, 2017). This was the perception of respondents in this study. The confidence interval suggested that there may be more people who agreed than disagreed that female and male faculty members who were equal in degree and experience earned comparable salaries. Though much progress has been made, the problem of addressing historic inequities such as salary compression remains a challenge for most IHE (Johnson, 2017).

Respondents saw the inclusion of mentors to assist new and aspiring employees as an important area for women. Respondents reported positive female role models on their campus. Additionally, 23 of 32 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had a relationship with a mentor. When provided the opportunity, 26 respondents commented positively on the importance of female mentors. One respondent stated, “I believe that having a female mentor shows new professional women that there do not have to be limits on their achievement.” Administrations should nurture these connections, and schools should respond to this need and create a space for women to network with one another.

Table 1
Perceived Adequacy of Day Care Facilities Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is adequate childcare offered on campus?

Although the number of women in higher education administration has not historically equaled that of men in similar roles, the number and status of women on college and university campuses have increased since the 1970s, largely due to affirmative action laws, among other federal regulations and guidelines (The Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973). Women bring a unique perspective to administration, and IHE should continue to pursue them for such positions. However, issues such as childcare, pay disparity, and lack of mentoring need to be continually addressed to further support female faculty and administrators in higher education.

Conclusion
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The Success Coaching Knowledge Community (SCKC) was formed in 2022 to create a space for professionals to convene and share key resources. SCKC’s mission is to support student affairs educators in creating and implementing standardized definitions, practices, and processes for success coaching in higher education. The SCKC provides student affairs professionals the opportunity to create and define best practices and to receive professional development, training, and resources to support their efforts in success coaching.

The past 10 years have seen an increase in success coaching programs at colleges and universities across the country (Valentine & Price, 2023). Success coaching has become a highly practiced method of support that institutions nationwide (e.g., Arizona State University, Tulane University, George Mason University, Oberlin College and Conservatory) use to support their students holistically. As success coaching continues to grow, creating a shared understanding of success coaching and its benefits among student affairs practitioners is more important than ever before. The SCKC intends to lead these conversations through benchmarking, scholarship, and research.

The SCKC conducted research that showed hundreds of institutions have established academic, success, or peer coaching programs. Benchmarking revealed that each institution had a unique definition of coaching.
This research revealed commonalities and key themes: goal setting, action planning, personalization, collaboration/partnership, skill development, and students figuring out what success looks like for them. Based on this research, the SCKC created a definition for success coaching in higher education that embodies these key themes:

**Success coaching is working collaboratively with students to set goals, create action plans, develop skills, and determine what success means to them using an individualized strengths-based approach. Having a consistent definition of success coaching will help standardize the field’s best practices.**

### Success Coaching Programs in Higher Education

The demographics of the SCKC are varied. More than 200 institutions are represented across 300+ members covering all eight of NASPA’s regions. The SCKC has seen a variety of ways in which coaching is offered: academic coaching, peer coaching, and professional success coaching, to name a few. One of the SCKC objectives is to document the distribution of the various modalities across the field. In higher education, coaching programs can be situated in student affairs, academic affairs, or enrollment management. To demonstrate how coaching programs differ across the field, the authors examined three institutions of varying sizes, programs, and student populations.

At George Mason University, the success coaching team is housed in the Division of University Life (George Mason University, 2022). The team is composed of graduate success coaches, professional success coaches, and a leadership group consisting of various levels of professionals with coaching responsibilities in their job descriptions. At Arizona State University, the success coaching team is housed under academic affairs in the University College (Arizona State University, n.d.). Its team is made up of more than 100 peer success coaches who are trained and supervised by a group of full-time professional staff. At Coastal Carolina University, seven academic coaching specialists plus a director constitute the coaching team (Coastal Carolina University, 2023). These three institutions show the depth and breadth of how coaching can be effective in multiple settings and through different modalities. The SCKC hopes to collect resources from institutions across the country on their coaching programs and use the SCKC website as a library of training programs, job descriptions, and implementation resources, among other tools.
**Conclusion**

Success coaching is a proven method of support that improves retention and graduation rates; sense of belonging; and personal, career, and academic success (Bettinger & Baker, 2014). As institutions continue to create and implement coaching programs, they must remember the importance of continuing to evolve to support the changing needs of students to set them up for success for years to come.
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“Hi, Barbie!” Margot Robbie says with a huge sparkling smile on her face as she goes about her day in Barbieland in the summer movie Barbie. The bright pink colors and all the accessories remind me of my childhood. I remember playing with my Barbies as a little girl—I had this grand dollhouse that was pink and purple and contained all the clothes and shoes for my Barbies. I was able to role-play being a mom or a superhero, stepping into a world that was outside of my own.

I was excited when the trailer for the Barbie movie came out and looked forward to seeing the imaginary world come to life. The day came, and my best friend and I both dressed up in Barbie pink; we grabbed a large popcorn and pop and sat down in the theater. To my left was a young girl and her family. And to my friend’s right was another group of young women dressed up in pink and sparkles. It felt like we were building community without even saying a word. The whole world of women seemingly came together in a united front of womanhood.
We are introduced to Barbie's many Barbie friends along with Midge and Skipper, two discontinued Barbie-adjacent dolls. Barbie takes us through her morning routine of waking up, showering, getting dressed, and eating her perfectly cooked breakfast. She then continues her day, greeting all the other Barbies and Kens, and we are quickly introduced to the main characters for the remainder of the film. As things progressed, it became clear to me that I was not seeing a Barbie who looked like me within Barbie's inner circle.

In the movie, Simu Liu has a main character role as one of the Kens, but out of the many Barbies, the only two Asian Barbies in the movie (played by Ritu Arya and Ana Cruz Kayne) did not have major speaking roles. While some will say, “At least there was some representation,” there is still no meaningful and intentional Asian American representation in blockbuster movies in Hollywood. Blockbuster movies are made for the white gaze, so who is the Barbie movie made for?

I never saw myself in my Barbies. My Barbies were white unless they were from a Disney movie like Princess Jasmine from Aladdin or Pocahontas. I primarily saw myself through that (white) lens when I played with them. As a Korean transracial adoptee with white parents, I did not find it odd that my Barbies looked like my parents. When I did get a doll that looked like me, with the same almond eyes and brown skin, something clicked within me, and I realized what I had been missing by playing only with white Barbies.

In the main song from the Barbie movie, “What Was I Made For?” by Billie Eilish, the lyrics describe the realization Barbie has about her life’s purpose. She was a Barbie in the plastic world and then came to life in the “real” world. Being adopted, I often wondered growing up what my purpose was, what I was made for in a sense. I often struggled with being in this liminality, inhabiting situations of uncertainty, and being in this in-between space (Kovach et al., 2022) that could also be described as third space, where I was trying to figure out social norms and balancing them with my own experiences. Bhabha (1994) described this third space concept as a way to focus on power relations between identity constructions. This space is where new identities are constructed, as opposed to what society has deemed as correct based on colonizer influence. There is neither one nor another, but both. By growing up in a world where I mostly saw only white people, and then as I grew older and came into contact with more racial diversity, I was lost in this space of whiteness, Asianness, and being an adoptee.

This liminal space is similar to Barbie’s own realization that there is a world outside of Barbieland, and when she realizes that, her idea of what her purpose is changes. This space that Barbie is in is what I grappled with as an adoptee going into a world where people see me differently. Growing up, I lived in a bubble where I knew I was adopted and I knew I did not look like my parents or my peers, but I was shielded in ways by not learning about racism and oppression. Whether or not that shielding was the right choice, when I went to college, I realized that how I saw myself was different from how the world saw me. I was hit with more overt societal expectations: Others assumed that I did not know English, that I would not be interested in certain topics other than math, and that I could not get any leadership position that I wanted based on my own merits, but rather that I was the “diversity” hire. I did not see other Asian American women in leadership roles at my university. While I was having these experiences, I had to create and define how I saw myself as a transracially adopted Asian American. This negotiation of space is constant and changes when there is an intake of new information (Bhabha, 1994).

When I walked around campus, I would see other Asian students, but I was afraid to interact with them because I felt like I did not belong with them. I felt like a fraud being around them. When Barbie came to the real world, she was very obviously not part of the normal society. She did not act like others and did not understand societal rules. I felt like I did not
know the rules for being around Asian students who understood Asian cultures and could speak languages that I would never understand. These students had ties to specific foods and smells that I would not know. How was I supposed to be able to fit in when I would act just like the other White students?

So, as I sat in the movie theater, I reflected on the types of women who were represented in the film and why some were left out. Was this something that I was used to? Yes. I have very rarely seen myself in mainstream films, and I was disappointed to sit through a film celebrating womanhood and feel left out. Historically, transracial adoption has been viewed as a humanitarian act; in fact, it has colonizer influences and harmful repercussions for adoptees (Haerens, 2011). In the real world, I am the only transracially adopted Asian American and often Asian American “Barbie” in the spaces I most often navigate. I situate myself in higher education as the “Barbie” that I did not see as a student. All the younger students and young women who are looking for themselves in this world need other leaders and mentors who look like them. I am Transracial Adoptee Asian American Barbie, and I look forward to the day when it is normal to walk by other Transracially Adopted Asian American and Asian American Barbies and exclaim, “Hi, Barbie!”
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Certification and veteran affairs (VA) professionals inform veterans and military-connected staff, students, and faculty (i.e., military stakeholders of institutions of higher education [IHEs]) about new or changing VA, Department of Defense (DoD), and state-specific policies. These professionals also develop campus processes to put those new policies and policy changes in place within existing systems. Information gaps, including unclear and untimely policy notification, can adversely affect the experiences of IHE military stakeholders. This article identifies issues related to the dissemination and operationalization of federal and state policies at IHEs and shares promising practices for ensuring that issuing agencies, campus leaders, and the military work together to fill information gaps.
Information Gaps

The most common information gaps at IHEs occur between stakeholders and IHEs or between IHEs and issuing agencies. IHE military stakeholders, who are often students, regularly complain about being unaware of policy changes and requirements. Two examples include the 2021 dual certification requirement when reporting tuition and fees and the 2022 change to a new verification requirement for Chapter 33 (Post-9/11 GI Bill) beneficiaries. Implementation of the 2021 dual certification requirement affected the timeline for refunds for beneficiaries. The 2022 verification change resulted in delayed payments for many beneficiaries and increased work for the VA; these outcomes were due to a failure to properly inform students (at IHE and issuing-agency levels) and a failure of students to read and respond to institution and agency updates. Additionally, in cases in which beneficiaries were unable to meet the requirement, the burden of attendance verification fell on school certifying officials through a cumbersome process of email notification and communication with VA claims examiners.

Promising practices to combat information gaps include implementing the most effective approaches to reach an institutional population, responsibly sharing information in a routine way and place, and employing accountability measures that show evidence of information receipt. Understanding your populations is critical. Commuter and online campuses may have luck with sending only emails. Campuses with more traditional models may need to post signs where foot traffic is high. An IHE that primarily serves dependents may not want to post information only near the veterans’ lounge, as dependents are less likely to visit it.

Additionally, investigating email interactions and website traffic data or launching a survey may help to identify how a population prefers to be reached. Once campus leaders pinpoint a communication strategy, they should execute it in a routine way—one that does not flood recipients with messages. Communication should be purposeful and curated to deliver only the most necessary information first. Recipients can develop a reading cadence that allows for longer emails if they know where the most important information is. Finally, accountability measures can be put in place to remind recipients about when they received information. Read receipts and even holds can both serve recipients and protect institutions.

Lack of Guidance

Another challenge IHEs face is difficulty discerning how policies are meant to be applied. A lack of formal literature or guidance from issuing agencies makes it hard to clarify what policies do and do not include/cover and what limitations and/or exceptions are involved. For example, during a recent National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NASFA) conference for international educators, they announced a policy update about faculty-led study abroad coverage. This information was not communicated via formal channels or during monthly trainings. However, when questions regarding the NASFA update were raised during an Association of Veterans Education Certifying Officials (AVECO) federal updates session, someone verbally confirmed that a change was approved—with a caveat that nothing official exists to establish an implementation date for certifying officials or IHE stakeholders to follow.

Promising practices that could better prepare IHEs for policy implementation include seeking language clarification from issuing agencies and communicating honestly with stakeholders about a lack of guidance where appropriate. Voicing concerns and questions back to policymakers is an important step in the policy production and implementation process. IHEs should seek clarification from those persons writing and administering the policies that affect IHE military stakeholders.

When a policy is unclear, IHEs should share that information with their military stakeholders. Likewise, stakeholders should also voice concerns when proposed policies lack actionable administrative
language. IHEs should do their own research and advocate for their needs and the needs of others. A searchable repository of state and federal policies and training benefits that affect military stakeholders would be a useful resource for certifying officials and IHE staff.

Policy Alignment
Finally, federal/state policy and institutional policy alignment is necessary to ensure that beneficiaries are not hearing opposing directives. When institutional policy is immovable or does not make space for changing state and federal requirements, it is difficult to serve students, faculty, and staff who could benefit.

Promising practices include consulting institutional legal departments to ensure institutional policy reflects state and federal policy and to ensure beneficiary-facing offices are aware of policies that affect their day-to-day operations. All IHEs should have a process by which policies are created and reviewed. Helping those in charge of these processes better understand new and changing state and federal policies can help institutions keep their policies up to date. However, as many policies are adjusted at initial roll-out, institutional leaders should be careful not to change institutional policy too quickly, lest they need to make multiple adjustments. Additionally, policymakers and the DoD should regularly inform offices working with beneficiaries about changing policies to ensure they are operationalizing them appropriately. Institutions should consider keeping a list of contacts who can speak directly to how new policies are accounted for by institutional processes.

Other Promising Practices
To close information gaps that may originate at the campus level, staff should remember that many military stakeholders do not apply for education benefits and/or do not self-identify as veterans/service members at their IHEs; moreover, there are no government or institutional requirements for veterans/service members to do so. Thus, it is likely that there exists a population of military stakeholders, at many institutions, who do not participate in institutional military/veteran support services and may not be included in military stakeholder notification lists/communication channels at the campus level.

Yet, the nature of (certainly some) VA and DoD policies, such as the recent PACT Act, necessitates that all military stakeholders be made aware, regardless of whether stakeholders have chosen to take education benefits or to self-identify at their IHEs. It is important for campus leaders to pursue broad and inclusive approaches to delivering policy information to military stakeholders across campus. Possible approaches include posting brief announcements (noting where to go for more information) on (nonmilitary-specific) online, campus-wide hubs or portals; posting fliers across campus (as some colleges and department may be located far from military services support offices); and pushing information directly to college and department staff, who can use their notification channels (e.g., regular academic advisor meetings, college newsletters, faculty and staff meetings) to ensure policy information is equitably disseminated across a variety of potential audiences.

Conclusion
Because they are on the front lines of military beneficiary service in higher education, military and veteran support staff must stay informed of new and changing policies; communicate with military-connected faculty, staff, and students about how these changes could affect their benefits; and remain aware of how internal policies might need to change to align with new or altered federal and state policies. Alternatively, policymakers should ensure policies are written with operationalization in mind, such that they may be implemented without undue burden.
After a century, ahead of the 2024 Summer Olympics in Paris, the Seine River reopened to swimmers in 2023, standing as a testament to the powerful impact humans can have on ecosystems. Due to heavy pollution, swimming in the Seine was banned; yet, through commitment and collaboration, French leaders created a plan of cleaning and mitigating future pollution issues. This remarkable achievement serves as a compelling reminder of humans’ significant influence in the health promotion process and increasing control over the health of a community and its inhabitants. Our personal health and the viability of civilization depend on the health of planetary ecosystems:

“This land doesn’t belong to us. This land belongs to seven generations down the road. I pray that the water that we drink, the water that we swim in, will be there for our great great great grandchildren. As well as all over the world. I pray that the land that we walk on, the trees that we enjoy, will be there for our generations to come. These things, they all come together with health. Health of humans. Health of the animals. And health of the Mother Earth.”

— Closing Prayer by Okanagan Nation Elder, Grouse Barnes, at the 2015 International Conference on Health Promoting Universities and Colleges
With nearly 4,000 institutions of higher education (IHEs) and approximately 15.4 million undergraduates in the United States in highly diverse ecosystems, the power and priorities of campus spaces affecting our health are shifting. We as a human family must recognize our interdependence with all the species cohabitating with us; our personal health is directly affected by the health of the ecosystems in which we live, work, and play. Populations of indicator species, reflecting the health of our ecosystems by their abundance or absence, such as bees and fireflies, are decreasing at alarming rates (Reilly, 2020). Scientists evaluate data points and identify the influences of stress on the species from pollution, habitat loss, and climate change. Pollinators play a crucial role in crop yields and influence consumer costs of produce. The impending predications highlight both the need and the path for action.

**Salutogenesis:**

**Focusing on Promoting Health and Well-Being Over Preventing Disease**

Institutions of higher education have a unique opportunity and responsibility to ... lead by example and advocate to decision-makers for the benefit of society.

— Okanagan Charter, 2015 (p. 5)

Sustainable campus planning can offer ecosystem benefits. Carefully curated areas, built around the nonnative grass lawn of colonial Europe and adorned with ornamental, nonindigenous species, do not contribute to a sustainable vibrant native ecosystem. Facilities and campus planning departments can increase biodiversity with native species plants and trees; these options require less water, less use of traditional chemicals, and less fiscal maintenance.

By embracing salutogenesis solutions, we build the desired outcomes of healthy environments for all species. IHEs can create habitat restoration spaces on campus and participate in community conversations, promoting regenerative work integrates indigenous biodiversity back into community spaces.

Increasing well-being at IHEs could be achieved through the successful reintroduction of indigenous species and integrated pest management (IPM). The advantages of using IPM over traditional chemical pest control is support of the common agenda of healthy ecosystems. Balancing physical, cultural, biological, and control methods, IPM has proven more effective and environmentally friendly than conventional pest control (Desneux, 2022). The University of Missouri launched its IPM program in 1972, reinforcing its long-standing commitment to mitigating pest damage and protecting human health.

Taking into consideration local climates and soil conditions (such as xeriscaping in drier climates), facilities and campus planning departments can choose specific indigenous plants, thereby supporting local wildlife while restoring habitats for important pollinators. Ornamental nonnative plants do not attract pollinators as effectively and are sometimes toxic. Another benefit of indigenous species is lower maintenance costs due to their ability to tolerate seasons and elements, thereby decreasing staff maintenance time and other valuable resources (Maseyk, 2019). Overcoming current cultural perceptions of aesthetics can be addressed by university leadership though the direct involvement with the whole community and its input in the planning process.

Research has repeatedly shown the health benefits to humans of engaging with an ecosystem through a multisensory experience. Use of native species adds another dimension of interaction though the natural fragrances emitted. Neurological research has shown that scents are strongly tied to memories (Bentley, 2023).

One example of a campus that made a commitment to sustainable space is the University of Texas–Dallas. Its Monarch Waystation welcomes such native pollinators as bumble bees, mason bees, honeybees,
and monarch butterflies, all of which contribute to the pollination of flowers and produce-yielding plants. Students, staff, faculty, and alumni invest in the restoration and preservation of the declining and endangered ecoregion Blackland Prairie. Providing land-based learning in these spaces and contributing to the reinvestment in our ecosystems facilitate a sense of contribution, meaning, purpose, and connection with others and land—a multisensory experience. The link between human health and planetary health has been firmly established, and we can now explore avenues for humility and gratitude rather than dominance and exploitation.

**Looking to the Future**
The U.S. Health Promoting Campuses Network (USHPCN) is committed to helping campuses achieve healthy people, places, and planet in a manner that is relevant to their populations, culture, and environment. Cohort groups are guided by USHPCN leadership, adopting the Okanagan Charter appreciating unique campus needs. Persistence, collaboration, mental agility, long-term actions, data monitoring, and evaluation are crucial to the success of sustainable and regenerative campus planning. Well-being is typically not included in campus master plans. The high turnover of leadership and the transient nature of students also lead to short-term initiatives. Professionals trained in the process of health promotion have the relevant skills and can be essential in enhancing and sustaining efforts, enabling campus populations to increase their control over their health and its determinants. To align and identify promising practices that support long-term well-being goals, we can create coalitions, inspired by a framework of collective impact, built on a common agenda, continuous communication, and use of data—allowing facilities management, health promotion, town-gown relations, and master planning departments to work as a team.

**Conclusion**
Health promotion leaders can become top advocates for well-being, embracing equity, health of the planet, and the health of all its inhabitants. By mobilizing partnerships with environmentalists, ecologists, campus planners, students, and community members, we can enhance human health by prioritizing the planet and cultivating environments that benefit all species for future generations.

**REFERENCES**


Mother. Practitioner. Scholar.

These three words form our shared identity as five womxn in student affairs who not only serve our campus communities on the ground but also seek to produce scholarship to better steward our field. We have been turned away from publications by scholarship gatekeepers who believe that research belongs solely in the realm of the faculty. We posit that our combined decades of practice working directly with students have imbued us with the unique ability to make meaning and validate our positionality as scholars. Herein we affirm the mother identity as equal to the scholar and practitioner identities, and we illustrate how assumptions about our role as a mother within student affairs can limit our capacity to perform an academic identity. We identified three themes that thread the fabric of our experiences of our mother-scholar-practitioner identity together: presumptions of how we use our time, the validity of our scholar identity, and motherhood as it serves our practitionership.
We use narrative inquiry—through stories and in relation to cultural discourses—as a qualitative approach to understanding experience (Chase, 2011; Lemley & Mitchell, 2012) to explore the reflexive, self-perpetuating relationships between motherhood, student affairs practice, and our aspiration of contributing meaningful scholarship to the greater body of student affairs literature.

As five women who have not observed the mother–practitioner–scholar identity in the literature, we are compelled to shed light on the evolving role of women in a field that Smith (1989) characterized as an embodiment of the feminized qualities of emotion, behavior, and caregiving. We expand the body of literature on the student affairs “mamapreneur” (Burmicky et al., 2022) by examining the entrepreneurial facet of this concept: our desire to produce meaningful scholarship. Table 1 illustrates our mother–practitioner identities. We hope to inspire both practitioners and professors to interrogate the implications of the field’s strict feminization and to examine its role in shaping the value attached to the contributions of those who do not hold faculty titles.

Presumptions of How We Use Our Time
Most student affairs practitioners do not spend their workdays in the presence of a supervisor or colleague; our work takes us into formal and informal gathering spaces, along with private offices, to support student development. We work flexible hours that often extend beyond the typical 9-to-5 business day. As such, each of us has experienced moments when coworkers have presumed that our mother identities supersede our scholar or practitioner identities when we leave the office. Jamie noted that colleagues frequently deny the scholar aspect of her identity within her workplace because of unsubstantiated assumptions about her role as a mom. Coworkers in a former workplace commented that she probably could not join team activities outside of the business day due to having to “get home to her baby.” Allison was encouraged to quit her Ph.D. program by her faculty supervisor because of assumptions about her ability to accomplish high-quality academic work alongside parenting and professional responsibilities.

Our trifaceted identity often means that we must be more focused and use our time efficiently. Because we do not receive support to pursue scholarship during the business day and then manage our household operations when we come home, Delilah uses lunch breaks to conduct research and write—or does so late at night when other family members are sleeping. Similar experiences among our group lead us to advise readers not to automatically discount or exclude mother–practitioners as scholarly stewards of our field, because of our perceived status as primary caregivers.

Table 1
Mother–Practitioner Identities of Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Practitioner Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ph.D. in progress</td>
<td>Assistant dean of an academic college; private midsized university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Senior director for student affairs of a medical school; flagship public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Director of student success curriculum and coursework; Hispanic serving institution; large public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delilah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Student success professional; small public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ed.D. in progress</td>
<td>Student affairs professional at a medical school; midsized public university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity of Scholar Identity as Equal to Practitioner Identity

As we expand our scholarly endeavors and achievements, coworkers often perceive them as secondary to our practitioner and mother responsibilities, which are never doubted. The legitimacy of our scholar identity, however, is always in question. Valerie was once asked to defer first authorship on a conference presentation proposal so that a faculty member could use it for their tenure package, thereby suppressing her scholar identity. Danielle struggles with having her work viewed through a lens of legitimacy, especially by faculty. She asserted that because her assistant professor appointment is not tenure track, and because her office is an administrative unit, efforts by her team are considered valid only when they partner with traditional teaching and assessment bodies. In her doctoral program, Allison was met with skepticism that she could vacillate between practitioner and scholar identities, let alone embody them simultaneously. “I was not intellectually capable of engaging in scholarship or scholarly activities as a staff member,” Allison said. She added, “A trusted mentor warned me of conducting ‘me-search’ by placing too much importance on my own experiences as a student affairs practitioner as an area of sociological inquiry.”

Motherhood as It Serves Our Practitionership

Our identities as mothers shape our practice in the workplace. At her most recent first-year student orientation, Valerie was referred by one student to another as “the cool frat house mom” of the medical school. She frequently keeps this persona image in mind when she communicates via email with students. “How can I say what I want in a caring way that also demonstrates the severity or importance of any given situation?” she asks herself. Similarly, Delilah says she is known to many as an “on-campus mom” because she challenges and encourages her students to work toward goals. She reminds them that even getting out of bed to try their best that day is a success. Because caring is socially constructed and embedded into the foundations of both motherhood and student affairs work, the identities tied to these areas often feel inextricably intertwined.

Conclusion

We believe our narratives offer meaningful viewpoints that integrate what we have experienced with what we can contribute to the future education of student affairs practitioners and to how faculty and staff can work together in higher education. Our findings highlight the complicated intersections of mother–practitioner–scholar and our aspirations to wholly embody this identity as one that is singular in nature rather than of three disparate components. Our experiences as mothers inform our student affairs practice, which in turn motivates our scholarly point of view. We bring a distinct perspective to the research space as legitimate experts and stewards of our field.
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