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Once again, I am pleased to share with you the amazing work from many of our NASPA colleagues. The 2017 NASPA Knowledge Community Publication showcases the ways in which the KC program creates and shares valuable and timely knowledge with our membership. I hope you gain valuable insight from and are inspired by this talented group of authors.

The following articles are grounded within NASPA’s four guiding principles — integrity, innovation, inclusion, and inquiry — that will serve as the foundation for the 2017 Annual Conference. In San Antonio, we will come together to engage in dialogue centered around our responsibility as educators to prepare the next generation of civic-minded students, who will work to transform the world around us. Given this focus, you will find reflected within the articles research updates, emerging trends, and promising practices that I hope will assist you in creating innovation and change on your campuses.

I want to take a moment to express my gratitude to the 2017 NASPA KC Publication Committee, led by Valerie Shepard, for their incredible efforts in contributing to the current body of knowledge within higher education. These individuals give selflessly of their time to NASPA in order to support and assist their colleagues across the organization in advancing our professional competencies.

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

As always, thank you for supporting the KC program, and I hope you enjoy the pages that follow.

Sincerely,

Pauline Dobrowski
National Director of Knowledge Communities
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The United States Department of Agriculture defines food security as “access at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life” (Coleman-Jensen, Nord, Andrews, & Carlson, 2011, p. 2). In 2015, 87.3% of U.S. households were food secure throughout the year; the remaining 12.7% (15.8 million households) were food insecure. Food-insecure households (those with low and very low food security) found it difficult at some point during the year to provide enough food for all their members, due to a lack of resources (Coleman-Jensen, Rabbitt, Gregory, & Singh, 2016).

Between one quarter and one half of all students face some type of food insecurity during their college careers (Crutchfield et al., 2016; Dubick, Mathews, & Cady, 2016). Food insecurity affects students in a variety of ways: missing class, dropping a class, or having to choose between buying a textbook or buying food (Dubick et al., 2016). Reports have also shown that students who face food insecurity are also more likely to face housing insecurity. Data show that students who attend community colleges, students of color, and students with mental health issues all suffer from housing and food insecurity at higher rates (Dubick et al., 2016). Given the multifaceted aspects of these challenges, colleges and universities must take a more proactive approach to the food issues facing students. A particular focus of student affairs is wellness and the education of the whole person. When a student cannot get food—a basic necessity to lead an active, healthy life—it challenges an institution’s ability to facilitate education.

Food insecurity has received increasing attention over the past several years and in 2016, in particular. Different national organizations such as the National Student Campaign Against Hunger and Homelessness and the Wisconsin HOPE Lab have looked at the intersections of food insecurity and other economic issues, such as housing insecurity (Goldrick-Rab, Broton, & Eisenberg, 2015). The California State University System commissioned a similar report (Crutchfield et al., 2016) to investigate the same issues. Some articles have looked at approaches to directly assist students (Nargi, 2016); however, in all of these reports and articles, common themes and action steps have emerged.

Colleges and universities can take a variety of approaches, but all institutions should begin by assessing the biggest challenges to students. No comprehensive research has been conducted to firmly establish the prevalence of food insecurity among college students (Dubick et al., 2016). In gathering data, organizations should be able to show the disparity in the number of students who are believed to suffer from food insecurity versus the number actually affected. Researchers at the Wisconsin HOPE Lab are studying the question of what occurs when economically insecure students enroll in college and face costs that
are beyond their reach. What they have learned is that a growing number of low-income undergraduates experience food and housing insecurity, even when those students work and receive financial aid (Goldrick-Rab et al., 2015). The California State University System took the approach of developing a comprehensive list of the services that all of the campuses offer and made it available to students on all campuses. These services range from food pantries and housing offices to the advertising of the single point of contact where students can access housing or food on every campus. The system then set about to bring all of its campuses together to determine both best practices and next steps to address the crisis (Crutchfield et al., 2016). This report was one of the first to address food insecurity across an entire state’s university system.

In addition to these efforts, national organizations such as the National Student Campaign Against Hunger and Homelessness (NSCAHH) have been working for several years to address food insecurity on campuses. In NSCAHH’s most recent report, Hunger on Campus, researchers concluded that colleges should pursue a wide range of creative ways to address food insecurity, including the creation of campus food pantries, campus community gardens, food-recovery programs, and coordinated-benefits access programs. More significantly, policymakers should take steps to improve students’ access to existing federal programs, including expanding the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) eligibility requirements for college students, simplifying the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) process (particularly for homeless students), and adding food security measurements to the annual National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (Dubick et al., 2016). California enacted a law in September 2016 that enables students who qualify for the Restaurant Meals Program (RMP)—an optional component of SNAP that gives counties the discretion to allow homeless, disabled, or elderly people to use their benefits for prepared meals—to purchase freshly cooked food at on-campus food facilities. Under the new law, postsecondary institutions in counties participating in RMP will be required to register as approved food vendors. The bill also establishes a fund to support partnerships between food banks and on-campus kitchens, as well as codifies existing practices to support SNAP campus outreach (Pham, 2016).

The College and University Food Bank Alliance (CUFBA) has also been working directly with colleges, universities, and students to address its core issue: providing food to students. With more than 316 member institutions, CUFBA connects institutions to each other, allowing them to share best practices and strategies to address issues common to many campuses. In addition, CUFBA collaborates with other national organizations, such as NSCAHH, in gathering data, writing reports, and providing policy solutions to local and federal government agencies.

An example of the types of programs that participate in CUFBA is Kingsborough Community College (KCC) in Brooklyn, New York. At the KCC Urban Farm, fresh vegetables are grown during the spring, summer, and fall and distributed to students. Approximately 20 to 70 students per week are able to access fresh vegetables that they would not normally be able to get; however, this number represents a small percentage of those affected by food insecurity. The farm succeeds, though, in “catalyzing thought and dialogue” around the issues while also keeping food insecurity “on the administration’s radar” for discussion (Nargi, 2016).

By 2020, 65% of all jobs in the economy will require a postsecondary education (Goldrick-Rab et al., 2015). Given this ever-increasing need for educated workers, people will continue to pursue education, regardless of whether they can afford it. Colleges and universities will need to determine how best to assist students in countering these challenges to academic success. Whether it is by better coordinating resources as the California State University System sought to do, determining how to assist students in accessing state resources for food assistance, or starting a food pantry on campus, institutions must begin to confront the issue that affects such a high percentage of students.
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According to the U.S. Department of Education (2011), graduate/professional students (GS/PS) make up one third of America’s college population. While completing their degrees, the majority of GS/PS work full or part time and support families by rearing children or caring for aging parents. GS/PS may also experience insecurities related to Impostor Syndrome. This is particularly true for first-generation GS/PS who may not feel as if they “belong” in the academy. These pressures can have serious consequences for some students, and they are not currently being addressed on our campuses.

The Need for Inclusion

GS/PS are truly “inside the pressure cooker” as they deal with constant demands on their time. Despite the unique challenges GS/PS face, most student affairs preparation
programs do not include in-depth discussions on how to best meet GS/PS needs. Not to mention that much of the dialogue within the field of student affairs is grounded in student development theory and practice that focuses more on undergraduate, traditionally-aged students. The lack of emphasis on GS/PS in student affairs has created a situation where as many as one third of student voices are often left unheard. Including GS/PS in conversations about supportive student services and advising is essential for these students to succeed. In many ways GS/PS have become the silent minority on our campuses, particularly when we consider how often social norming programs and alcohol and other drug education programs focus primarily on undergraduate students. This type of programming is much needed among the GS/PS population.

**Turning to Prescription Drugs**

GS/PS often turn to prescription and illicit drugs in an effort to cope with the demands of their programs and their home and/or work lives. We know for example, that one in five U.S. college students (20%) report abusing prescription stimulants at least once in their lifetime (Feliz, 2014). GP/PS are most likely to abuse prescription drugs as a way to cope with academic pressures (Feliz, 2014).

- Fifty percent indicate prescription drug abuse as a means to improve academic performance.
- Forty percent report misusing or abusing prescription drugs to stay awake.
- Twenty-five percent report that they misuse or abuse prescription drugs to improve academic performance.

When we extrapolate graduate student numbers from these statistics, we quickly discover that GS/PS abuse prescription medications as much as, if not more than, undergraduates (Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Drug Misuse Prevention and Recovery [HECAOD], 2016).

In 2015, the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Drug Misuse and Prevention conducted the College Prescription Drug Study (CPDS), a multi-institutional survey of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. The survey was administered to over 27,000 students at both large public and small private colleges. A total of 3,918 students responded (14.2% response rate). Results indicated that, overall, graduate students were more likely to use prescription drugs such as pain medication, sedatives, or stimulants for nonmedical reasons (27.4%) than were undergraduate students (24.8%; HECAOD, 2016).

**Frequency of Use and Access**

According to the CPDS, 6% of GS/PS reported using pain medications for nonmedical reasons, 6.8% of GS/PS reported using sedatives, and 12% reported using stimulants. Roughly a third (30%) reported that it is easy or very easy to obtain prescription sedatives. Over 48% reported ease of obtaining prescription pain medications or stimulants.

Most GS/PS (nearly 60%) reported obtaining prescription medications from friends. GS/PS also reported the following reasons for prescription drug misuse: relieving perceived physical or emotional pain, getting high, getting to sleep, relieving anxiety, and improving grades. When asked, GS/PS estimated that 12.9% of other students use pain medications, 14.5% use sedatives, and 24.2% use stimulants.

**Relieving the Pressure**

Most of our campus alcohol and other drug prevention and intervention programs are designed, implemented, and delivered with undergraduate students in mind. Programs targeted to GS/PS, however, may require a different approach. In 2013, Turley advocated for two strategies that specifically address this population.

**Appreciative Advising**

First, Turley (2013) suggested that academic advisors and other essential support staff should receive training on preventing, recognizing, and addressing issues related to anxiety, mental health, and addiction. According to Bloom et al. (2007), the relationship between graduate students and their graduate advisors is the most important factor in terms of graduate student success. The University of Charleston School of Pharmacy recently restructured the advising process for professional pharmacy students by implementing appreciative advising. The key to the appreciative advising model is to engage the student at a level where she feels safe to share her concerns and aspirations (Hutson, He, & Bloom, 2008). The advisor serves more as a mentor, helping the student to investigate her interests. By asking open-ended, positive questions about the student’s dreams and goals, the advisor can help guide the student in her decision-making. Through appreciative advising, the advisor becomes invested in the student’s progress and maintains an expectation of ultimate success.

**Yoga and Mindfulness**

Turley (2013) also recommended that graduate programs offer, even require, courses that teach yoga and mindfulness techniques to help students cope with stress and anxiety. For example, graduate student associations at large comprehensive universities such as the University of California at Davis host weekly yoga and Zumba® classes. Louisiana State University School of Dentistry also offers yoga. New York University’s MindfulNYU is an award-winning meditation and mindfulness initiative that promotes wisdom, compassion, and well-being on campus. In addition to curating resources that are available online, MindfulNYU includes daily yoga classes, group meditation, large-scale events, and mindfulness workshops. There is evidence to support that such programs work. Beck et al.
(2015) reported that stress levels of graduate students were high at the time they started their graduate programs, but after attending five of six yoga classes, these same students had significantly lower levels of perceived stress.

**Generation Rx**

Another program that could help to better reach GS/PS is Generation Rx. The mission of Generation Rx is to educate people of all ages about the dangers of misusing prescription medications. Since 2009, the College of Pharmacy at The Ohio State University, the American Pharmacists Associations, and the Cardinal Health Foundation have partnered to provide open-source educational materials designed to help prevent the misuse/abuse of prescription drugs with Generation Rx. These ready-to-use resources include presentations for undergraduate traditional students as well as presentations designed for adults. The adult modules are suitable for sharing with students at the graduate/professional level.

To learn more about Generation Rx or to download materials, visit: www.generationrx.org.

**Conclusion**

As student affairs professionals, we must engage in dialogue about how to best support one third of our student population, and this includes efforts to curb the misuse of prescription medication. Although GS/PS may have some needs that are similar to those of undergraduates, the approach to address the varying needs and demands placed on GS/PS needs to be different. Reconsidering how we advise these students, how we teach them to manage anxiety and stress, and how we educate them about prescription drug misuse is necessary to effectively help GS/PS to succeed.
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There are 4.8 million college students, or 26% of all undergraduates in the United States, who are raising dependent children (Institute for Women's Policy Research [IWPR], 2014). The majority of student parents are enrolled in community colleges, for-profit institutions, or non-degree-granting programs. Over one million, or 23%, of student parents are pursuing bachelor’s degrees at four-year public or private not-for-profit colleges (IWPR, 2016a). Of these student parents, only 17.4% earn a bachelor’s degree within six years; when all types of institutions are included, only 3.5% of student parents attain bachelor’s degrees within six years (IWPR, 2016b). Of those student parents who had a baby before the age of 18, only 2% obtain a college degree by age 30 (Hoffman, 2006).

Many student parents at four-year institutions begin their postsecondary educations at community colleges; others enroll directly. Baccalaureate degrees can offer a more secure pathway to self-sufficiency for student parents, especially single parents. On average, each year of additional schooling increases an individual’s income by 10% (Kaushal, 2014). The benefits are not just economic, and they affect the entire family as well. Research has shown that postsecondary education has positive effects on children's test scores, health, and behavior and also on mothers’ behaviors that can affect teenage childbearing and substance abuse by their children (Kaushal, 2014).

The Program Evaluation and Research Group (PERG), in collaboration with the National Center for Student Parent Programs, both at Endicott College, completed a groundbreaking study last year: Baccalaureate Student Parent Programs and the Students They Serve. Funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, this study takes a look at several programs across the United States that support student parents in public and private not-for-profit four-year colleges and universities. It also shares the experiences of and impact on almost 300 student parents and alumni who attend or attended schools with robust student parent programs.
Finally, the authors make policy, research, and other recommendations that draw from these findings. (The full report can be found at www.endicott.edu/PERG.) This article focuses on survey findings from 224 current student parents under 35 years old, from eight public and private four-year institutions across the United States.

The “Typical” Student Parent
The typical student parent in our sample is a female in her mid-20s who was barely an adult when she had her first child. She currently has between one and two children under the age of 7; the average age of the youngest child is 3.6 years. More likely than not, she considers herself a single parent—often lacking both support and contact with the other parent. She has a 40% chance of having been raised primarily by a single parent. She may be the first in her family to attend college and could be part of any racial group(s).

Student parents in our sample are likely to be poor, although the majority work or are looking for work while enrolled in school. They are likely to use public assistance, especially for food support and child care. Not surprisingly, student parents experience high levels of stress from many sources that are often related to the challenge of balancing work, school, and home needs.

Motivated by the desire to support her family and be a role model for her children, the typical student parent enrolls in a four-year school after becoming a parent, often transferring credits from a community college. Almost one third have found that they have needed to “stop out” of school for a while, one or several times. Becoming pregnant is the biggest single reason for these breaks. The typical parent has a self-reported average GPA of 3.2.

Most parenting students do not take part in on-campus activities very often, which contributes to a sense of isolation. Supports that are most important for the majority of students are on-campus child care and child care subsidies; staff to help with their needs and to provide related support and information; emergency financial assistance; and family-friendly spaces, activities, and policies. While many students report that the student parent services on their campuses do a good job of meeting their needs, almost as many report the opposite. This includes students who are aware of all of the available resources, as well as some who are not.

Some schools—such as University of California at Berkeley, Portland State University, St. Catherine’s University, and University of Massachusetts—provide “open” programs, which are a critical resource for all parenting students. Institutions that offer small “wraparound programs” (such as Endicott College, St. Catherine’s University, and Wilson College) for single or particularly vulnerable parents can have differing requirements. Students in these programs submit separate applications, agree to requirements and are closely tracked.

Student parents in wraparound programs are more likely to live in centrally located campus housing, feel less isolated, and report less stress. They have a much higher likelihood of getting help with parenting issues. They are also more likely to report positive changes in their children. According to the parents in all of the programs, most of the children are more proud of their parents, more interested in school themselves, and express more desire to attend college. Academic performance has improved for many of the children, as has behavior at school.

Family-Friendly Campus Toolkit
Expanding on the knowledge gained and data collection tools developed for the Kellogg study, PERG has enlisted eight more two-year and four-year public and private colleges and universities to pilot a Family Friendly Campus Toolkit. Funded by the U.S. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the toolkit offers tools and guidance for colleges to engage in a self-assessment process of services and supports for student parents and their children. It offers guidance for setting up a campus task force, a self-assessment rubric, suggested institutional data points, a profile of resources template, student survey and focus group questions, and other documents. It will be publicly available in spring 2017 at www.endicott.edu/PERG.

There is more to learn about student parents and how to best support them. Even more important, however, is how to implement what is already known. Ideally, schools will find ways to report on institutional and other information about student parents, create or strengthen services for them, and see better graduation rates as a result. This will help not only current families but also future ones.
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Across the nation, African American women are disproportionately underrepresented in leadership positions within institutions of higher education (Alexander, 2010; Becks-Moody, 2004). Their leadership contributions are sometimes marginalized, as scholars have found it difficult to formulate clear ideas about female leadership in general (Hall, Garrett-Akinsanya, & Hucles, 2007). For African American women in the academy, the diversity they bring to the table—in terms of experience, background, appearance, educational level, beliefs—may further confound leadership research on this population. Despite the differences in these women’s roles and experiences, Collins (2001) contended that “what connects them all is their struggle to be accepted and respected members of the society, and their desire to have a voice that can be heard in a world with many views” (p. 29). Alexander (2010) also noted that although there is an interest among African American women to serve in leadership positions on college campuses, not many find they are afforded the opportunity to serve in senior-level leadership roles.

Additionally, Davis and Maldonado (2015) addressed the double standard African American women encounter when race converges with gender—a double standard that affects their access to leadership positions and, in some cases, puts into question their ability to lead. There is also a dichotomy in how women are represented in the literature. For example, studies on leadership have been largely conducted by and focused on male leadership (Dunn, Gerlach, & Hyle, 2014).

Despite the barriers to promotion, tenure, pay, or advancement, African American women continue to seek open access to senior-level positions in the academy, though many still find themselves navigating a “chilly climate” (Becks-Moody, 2004). Illustrating this point, Alexander (2007) identified the struggle of being overwhelmed in dealing with tangible/visible and intangible/invisible obstacles for African American women as an additional barrier (Alexander, 2010).

In addition to the conventional pathways to career advancement (described below), Hinton (2012) developed a theoretical model—Nexus of Black Leadership Efficacy (N.O.B.L.E.)—based on a 2001 study that advances the notion that the journey to a senior-level position begins prior to graduate school or other professional opportunities. The model identified four connections to leadership and professional development: family background and early education, higher education experiences, career experiences, and transitional and growth experiences. Experiences from early childhood...
(e.g., leadership roles held in school or religious affiliated activities), parental role modeling and support, and college engagement positively influence one’s ability to navigate the higher education environment. In addition to drawing upon one’s own personal experience, African American women can benefit from the professional development opportunities and support systems listed below.

**Mentoring**
Mentors serve as a valuable resource in helping African American women with career advancement. They serve as a sounding board, identify areas of strength, and provide feedback for areas of growth. Further, mentors are instrumental in helping to find strategies for exposure and experiences that can lead to upward career mobility. Mentoring relationships can be either formal or informal, and are not limited to senior-level administrators, supervisors, or faculty members; peer or horizontal mentoring can be beneficial as well.

**Sponsorship**
Sponsorship is another way to secure upper-level positions. A sponsor can be most easily described as an upper-level person who is well connected and influential, allowing his or her protégée to network with those who otherwise would have been inaccessible and also introducing her to professional opportunities (Hewlett, 2013). African American women administrators should be open to sponsorship from unexpected sources, such as White men.

**Professional Association Involvement and Networking**
Getting involved in a professional association is a catalyst for personal and professional growth. It is a forum for exchanging ideas and best practices with colleagues, presenting research, and networking with colleagues across all leadership levels. Association membership raises one’s professional profile and allows exposure to a broader range of colleagues and peers.

**Leadership Development Programs**
There are a number of professional development programs to engage in on campus and through association membership. Below is a brief sampling of professional development opportunities that focus specifically on helping women to move into key leadership roles.

**NASPA's Alice Manicur Symposium**
The Alice Manicur Symposium is sponsored by the NASPA Center for Women. Offered every two years, the symposium is designed for middle-management women who are considering a move to become vice presidents of student affairs.

**NASPA Women's Leadership Institute**
Sponsored in partnership with Association of College Unions International (ACUI) and National Association of College & University Business Officers (NACUBO), the Women's Leadership Institute is open to women from a variety of functional areas in student affairs who are interested in becoming senior leaders in higher education and who share a passion for the field.

**African American Women's Summit**
The African American Women's Summit is a pre-conference session offered at the NASPA Annual Conference. It is designed to address success strategies for African American women administrators in higher education.

**HERS Bryn Mawr Summer Institute**
This two-week residential summer institute is geared toward upper-level administrators and covers a wide array of skills and knowledge for career ascension.
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The mission of the Asian Pacific Islander Knowledge Community (APIKC) is to educate and inform NASPA members about the current issues, trends, and research facing Asian Pacific Islanders in higher education. We actively nurture and support the professional development of students and professionals through a variety of programs and by providing leadership and involvement opportunities within the KC (APIKC, 2016).

In 2010, the APIKC developed and completed a signature initiative known as the Legacy Project. Spearheaded by Hikaru Kozuma and Karlen Suga, 2009–2011 APIKC national co-chairs, the Legacy Project documented the history and evolution of the KC. Guided by the power of storytelling, a group of self-identified Asian, Pacific Islander, and Desi American (APIDA) new professionals conducted interviews with seasoned colleagues who had been at the KC’s early stages of formation during the 2009 NASPA Annual Conference (Kozuma & Suga, 2012). Their findings were published as a book chapter in Ching and Agbayani’s Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Higher Education: Research and Perspectives on Identity, Leadership and Success (2012). In the past six years, the APIKC has experienced tremendous growth. Kozuma and Suga (2012) wrote, “fifteen years ago, one might have found one or two sessions focused on APIDA issues at any regional...
or national NASPA conferences” (p. 162). In contrast, there were 38 sessions offered by self-identified APIDA presenters at the 2016 NASPA Annual Conference.

To assess the APIKC’s overall impact, the current Research and Scholarship Committee crafted the 2016 APIKC Impact Survey. The 32-question, anonymous survey was administered in August 2016 to the APIKC membership; it covered the following areas:

- Membership (Personal and Professional Development)
- Society (Public Policy and Advocacy)
- Education (Research and Scholarship)

Of the 68 respondents, about 54% of them were members of the APIKC for at least four or more years, and all seven NASPA regions were represented among the respondents. In terms of professional level, the survey allowed for multiple selections, and the respondent pool included students, faculty, and staff (21% graduate student level, 3% faculty, 47% new professional, 16% mid-level, and 21% senior level).

Impact on Membership

Survey questions were divided into two categories: personal development (connectedness and mentoring) and professional development (networking and educational/career advancement).

Overall, respondents provided a positive picture of their experience as an APIKC member. The majority (76%) indicated that they felt a sense of community. When asked if they felt connected to other APIKC members, 56% agreed/strongly agreed, while 27% felt neutral, and 17% disagreed/strongly disagreed. This shows members felt a strong sense of community and connection to the organization but may have faced challenges connecting with members. Whether through the APIKC E-Mentoring Program or from an informal connection, 74% of the respondents currently have and/or previously had a mentor who is a member of the APIKC. Moreover, 62% of the respondents stated that they have not served as a mentor within the APIKC. This finding may reflect the fact that most of the respondents who took the survey identified as a new professional with less than six years of experience. The impact on membership shows that the APIKC serves its purpose as an avenue for building community and connections among APIIDA professionals in the field and that it remains a platform for mentorship.

Seventy-two percent of respondents have used their APIKC connections for networking; however, less than half have utilized these connections for career advancement in the field. Additionally, 34% of respondents used their APIKC connections for educational advancement as it relates to the pursuit of graduate programs. The most prevalent networking opportunities occurred during the NASPA Annual Conference, as 94% of the respondents agreed that networking opportunities are available there. When respondents were asked if they are able to identify an APIKC networking opportunity within their NASPA region, the response difference between yes (53%) and no (47%) was minimal, indicating that networking opportunities vary, depending on NASPA region. With that said, there is a need to explore how the APIKC can provide more and unique networking opportunities in different regions.

Impact on Society

Survey questions were divided into two categories: public policy (issues related to the APIDA population and APIDA college students) and advocacy (visibility and involvement of the APIKC).

The majority of respondents (97%) agreed that the APIKC must go beyond educating members and should be actively advocating for APIDA students and public policy issues in higher education. More than half of respondents (67%) have seen the APIKC advocate for public policy issues at least once in the past year. Yet, 47% felt such advocacy happened infrequently or never, which indicates a need for increased presence and visibility in advocacy. When asked, “What are the top three public policy issues that the APIKC should be advocating for?” the following topical areas emerged several times:

- Resources, education, and advocacy for marginalized communities including LGBTQ, undocumented, and first-generation students, as well as ethnic subgroups (particularly South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Islander communities)
- Collection of disaggregated data
- Social justice (Black Lives Matter, ethnic studies, solidarity/coalitions, activism)
- Affirmative action and admissions

The renewed emphasis on advocacy for subgroups reflects emerging research on data disaggregation. The University of California (UC) system revised its data collection methods pertaining to admissions applications and institutional research functions in 2007, providing an excellent model of disaggregated data collection for institutions across the United States to adopt. UC data forms now include 23 options from which APIDA students can self-identify (Dizon, 2011). In 2013, the National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education, led by Dr. Robert Teranishi, began an Asian American and Pacific Islander data quality campaign called iCount, which aims to raise awareness of the ways in which data on APIDA students reported in the aggregate conceals significant disparities in educational...
experiences and outcomes between APIDA subgroups” (Teranishi, Lok, & Nguyen, 2013, p. 5). Disparities in educational access are also reflected in a 2014 report by the National Center for Education Statistics, which found the ratio of enrolled Asian American to Pacific Islander students to be 20:1 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). This indicates areas of potential growth in data collection for the APIKC.

Impact on Education
Survey questions were divided into two categories: research (participation in presentations and publications) and scholarship (topics, sources, and applications to practice).

Of the survey respondents, 67% have presented at a regional or annual NASPA conference, with 42% of this group having presented on a topic related to the APIDA population and 17% having their sessions sponsored, recognized, or promoted by the APIKC. In terms of producing written work, including articles published in peer-reviewed journals and scholarly publications, 37% of survey respondents have done so. Of this total, 21% have written on a topic related to the APIDA population, and 6% of these articles have been sponsored, recognized, or promoted by the APIKC. With regard to research in the scope of the Impact Survey, it is evident that the presence and selection of topics related to the APIDA population are of interest for publications and conference sessions. Clearly, there is a strong need for more sponsorship, recognition, and promotion of these efforts by the APIKC.

More than half of APIKC members (56%) indicated that they are often required to rely on scholarship (journal articles, conference presentations, workshops, webinars, and blog/social media posts) to inform practice in their current positions, although not all scholarship is on a topic related to the APIDA population. Interestingly, 67% of APIKC members sought out scholarship on their own, even if their positions did not require it, and intentionally integrated it into their practice. Nonetheless, a majority of survey responses (68%) indicated their source for scholarship came directly from the APIKC or a source related to the APIKC. Thus, the APIKC is a necessary gateway that provides meaningful and useful scholarship to NASPA members on significant topics that directly relate to the APIDA population as well as to those connected to the broader field of higher education.

Limitations, Considerations, and Next Steps
Although the survey revealed many notable areas of strength and areas for improvement, the Research and Scholarship Committee recognizes that the responses are not a complete representation of the APIKC, where survey respondents made up only 10% of the total APIKC membership. Furthermore, the scope of the survey was broad and the questions offered general ranges or categories as response options. Nonetheless, this is the first step of the APIKC Legacy Project 2.0. As done in the initial Legacy Project, the committee plans to conduct follow-up interviews with the respondents who volunteered their contact information. The committee will present its findings at the APIKC Business Meeting and as a General Interest Session at the 2017 NASPA Annual Conference, with the intent to develop action steps and constructive dialogue to address the perspectives highlighted by the Impact Survey. The purpose of the initial Legacy Project was to identify the needs of APIDA professionals during the formative years of the APIKC. Measuring the impact of the APIKC at this particular point will aid in defining and sustaining its mission and legacy for generations to come.
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The evolving landscape of student affairs assessment reflects the maturation of this relatively new functional area. Roper (2015) described the path for student affairs assessment not as a straight line but as a terrain that is neither flat nor smooth. It was not all that long ago that this subject was not taught in graduate classes in student affairs; in fact, it seemed like an “extra assignment” for someone doing work in student affairs. Over the past 20 years, this functional area has gained traction and has blossomed. Schuh (2015) cited the current century as the turning point for the integration of student affairs assessment into the regular practice of student affairs and into its own scholarly discipline.

Both NASPA and ACPA-College Student Educators International, another higher education professional association, created interest groups in their professional association structures, and these associations provide specific opportunities to present on this topic at their annual conferences (ACPA, 2016; NASPA, 2016). NASPA’s Assessment, Evaluation and Research Community (AER KC) and ACPA’s Commission for Assessment and Evaluation made a professional association home for those who did student affairs assessment (ACPA, 2016; NASPA, 2016). Both NASPA and ACPA are inclusive of any individual who is interested in assessment, regardless of the connection to his or her specific role (ACPA, 2016; NASPA, 2016). As of 2016, NASPA’s AER KC has the second-largest membership of the knowledge communities and it receives many submissions seeking KC sponsorship to the annual conference.

Upcraft and Schuh’s Assessment for Student Affairs: A Guide for Practitioners (1996) was one of the first books available for student affairs practitioners. It put forth several reasons why we should do assessment in student affairs. Survival, quality, affordability, strategic planning, policy development and decision making, politics, and accreditation were some of the reasons spelled out in that text and later reiterated in their follow-up publication Assessment Practice in Student Affairs: An Applications Manual (Schuh, Upcraft, & Associates, 2001). These familiar “yellow books” were the seminal texts in graduate classes and on the shelves of professionals.

The private market produced companies that supported student affairs assessment; a notable example is Student Voice (now Campus Labs). Their website tells the story of how their technology company came about: “While on a roadtrip to an out-of-state football game in 2001, two friends came up with a novel idea: create a business focused on collecting student feedback to help improve campus services” (Campus Labs, 2016). From that original idea, Campus Labs evolved to serve as many as 350 member...
Over the past two years, several new books have been published on the topic of student affairs assessment, including a joint publication from ACPA and NASPA, Coordinating Student Affairs Assessment: A Practical Guide (Yousey-Elsener, Bentrim, & Henning, 2015); Student Affairs Assessment: Theory to Practice (Henning & Roberts, 2016); Assessment in Student Affairs (2nd edition; Schuh, Biddix, Dean, & Kinzie, 2015); and Leading Assessment for Student Success: Ten Tenets That Change Culture and Practice in Student Affairs (Bingham, Bureau, & Duncan, 2015).

Adding to the credibility of assessment as a scholarly discipline in student affairs, SAAL and Oregon State University are publishing the online peer-reviewed Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry. In its inaugural issue, authors included well-known student affairs leaders such as Larry Roper, Marilee Bresciani Ludvik, and John Schuh (Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry, 2016). The periodical focuses on the topic of inquiry (i.e., assessment, evaluation, and research) in student affairs. Its mission states that "this journal provides a scholarly space for addressing practice and theory in student affairs inquiry by highlighting both the universal (e.g., foundations of student affairs assessment) and the local (e.g., single-institution assessment projects)" (Newhart, 2016).

Due to the evolving landscape in student affairs assessment, the NASPA Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community is reevaluating its role in this work and in the professional association’s needs. As Roper (2015) said, "The future success of those doing what is currently narrowly described as assessment is connected to the ability to engage in deep reflection, intentionality, transcending constricted categorization, and demonstrate bold leadership to reframe the work" (p. 12). Where does the NASPA AER KC go from here to support its members?
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Frequently threats to campus safety are occurring at a rapid rate (Robers, Kemp, Rathbun, & Morgan, 2014). Gone are the days when, after a crisis occurred, there was time to create learning opportunities about the crisis itself, the response, and the recovery. These past 18 months alone (2015-2016), numerous complex instances in which campus communities were simultaneously responding to direct and indirect campus threats have occurred. Campuses do not have the luxury of responding to every indirect threat, but there is danger in missing an opportunity to discuss these threats, as they have the potential for direct campus unrest and/or violence. This article will offer examples of three indirect campus threats, the ancillary impact to campuses, and recommendations to increase opportunities to address indirect threats.
College campuses can be an incubator to confront complex social issues and learn from devastating tragedies. These events allow for serious consideration of how interwoven on- or off-campus incidents can create a ripple effect with implications for campus climate (Langford, 2004). The following examples are a few of the many opportunities where incidents could have indirectly created concerns to campus safety:

- Brock Turner Rape Case: A Stanford student was convicted of sexually assaulting an unconscious student. The Stanford community was directly impacted, but this case in particular shined a harrowing light on campus sexual assaults, how they are handled, and outcomes to the victims (Mangan, 2016).
- Black Lives Matter Protests: After a number of police-related killings, Black communities across America were angered by systematic police brutality cases. Video footage highlighted how the flagrant misuse of power fueled racial angst. These protests shattered any belief that communities lived in a post-racial society, and students of color began to share frustrations over their voices being silenced (Biemiller, 2016).
- Pulse Orlando Shooting: The mass killing of 49 individuals who primarily identified as LGTBQ reminded administrators that this community is still very much targeted and met with visceral hate and judgement. The question of where is it safe to express oneself became a major question/concern (Supiano, 2016).

These three examples reflect broader social issues that can manifest as campus safety concerns: violence against women, racial discrimination/brutality against people of color, and attacks on the LGTBQ community. In each case, the group has been historically oppressed and sought to be treated equally in the eyes of the law, society, and the university campus. Thus, college campuses have to consider the need for corporate activism to mitigate or manage impacts to the campus climate (Broadhurst, 2014). When acts of violence and oppression occur off campus, students look to campus administrators to respond as an act of solidarity for the community. When this response does not happen, the campus climate can shift to one that lacks trust or lacks confidence (Langford, 2004).

**Action Steps**

Student affairs administrators must continue to assess their campus and community climates in order to best serve their students. Social media has erased the campus border; events that take place across the country directly affect our students (Block, 2016). Students have organized sit-ins, protests, discussions, and programs on their campuses for events that happened elsewhere in the country. Now, campus administrators must be attuned to what is going on elsewhere—and how it can affect their students. These recent events had an effect not only on the student population but also on the larger campus community. Many student affairs administrators are members of the identity groups that have been targeted by violence, and they have been profoundly concerned and hurt. Consequently, many new administrators turned to student affairs–based Facebook groups or other social media sites to process with colleagues, only to get into an intense debate in a place they thought was “safe” for unpacking their thoughts and emotions (Ahlquist, 2014).

Another stressor that has resulted from recent events is the negative perception of police and the criminal justice system (Biemiller, 2016; Jaschik, 2016). Several videos of police officers killing unarmed Black people have instilled in people of color a very serious fear of law enforcement. Many student affairs administrators have expressed disdain and distrust of a judicial system that does not appear to prosecute and convict in these shootings and in cases of rape (Student Affairs Professionals, 2016). As student affairs administrators, we need to reframe how we assess and respond to national events and how we address their impact on our campuses. The following actions may help:

- Become more cognizant of national and international events, and what ties your students may have to them. With social media, all events have the potential to become local. Create opportunities for and eliminate barriers to prompt campus discussions, marches, vigils, etc.
- Do not forget about your staff. Remember that staff members are also directly affected by these events, and they may need assistance in processing their thoughts and emotions before they work with the students and the community. Although, in the past, it may have been the role of the administrator to silence his or her opinions in order not to influence students, this is not a trait of our modern era of leadership.
- Begin a new dialogue with public safety and the local police. Look for ways to reintroduce public safety staff to the campus community, to help both law enforcement and the campus community understand each other’s roles. Stress the diversity of the campus and how national events have brought tensions that may be repeated on your campus if there is not a clear partnership.
- Continue to listen to your students and staff, and see where they have concerns. When a national event happens, realize that students may not feel safe on your campus out of fear of copycat acts. Work to make sure that these students have a chance to share their voice and that the campus remains open to academic freedom and sharing of ideas.
• Find a way to discuss concepts such as trigger warning in academic settings, and address how they work with or affect academic freedom. Bring faculty into the discussion on the importance of creating an academic learning environment for all students.

Conclusion
One of our primary responsibilities as student affairs administrators is to make sure that all students can pursue their education in a safe learning environment. In order to do this, we must constantly adjust to the dialogue occurring on our campuses. This past year, it has become even more evident that this dialogue is not bound by our campus borders, and so we need to adjust our approach. Just because an incident happens across the country does not mean it will not infuriate, inspire, and cause our students to take actions on our own campuses.
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With the increased number of people with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASDs) in the general population, there has been a significant surge in the number of students with ASDs on our campuses (Gillespie-Lynch et al., 2015). With this increase comes the need for strategies that will help not only students with ASDs but all students who attend institutions of higher education. Implementing the Universal Design strategies discussed below may bring us closer to meeting social justice goals and inclusion of all students, regardless of their abilities.
Issues that are common to all student populations include increased anxiety, poor time-management skills, and improper social skills, as shown in Figure 1 below:

![Students Without Autism](image1)

![Students With Autism](image2)

Figure 1. Issues faced by all populations of college students. This figure illustrates that many of the issues faced by students with ASDs are the same issues faced by all students: anxiety, time management, and proper social skills.

Universal Design is “the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design” (Center for Universal Design, 1997, para. 3). According to the Learning Opportunities Task Force (2003),

> A core concept of Universal Design is that by anticipating and planning for the diverse needs of potential users during the design process, the resulting product or outcome will better suit the needs of all users... When applying the concept of Universal Design to instruction, the benefits are much the same. Anticipating and planning for the diverse needs of students, including but not limited to students with disabilities, results in a better learning experience for all students. (p. 1)

Because many strategies available to assist students with ASDs can benefit multiple populations, these strategies are in line with the concept of Universal Design. Examples of these strategies include calming methods such as counting to 10, deep breathing, mindfulness, exercise, and talking to a friend, counselor, or coach. Other strategies include receiving tips and training on organization, time management, proper social interaction, and social etiquette. The following are learning and development strategies that can be employed to assist students with ASDs and students who may or may not have documented disabilities but who struggle with issues such as anxiety, disorganization, poor time management, and underdeveloped social interaction skills.

**Anxiety**

Anxiety is an overwhelming issue for many students on the spectrum. We also know this is true for many college students with other diagnoses (Regehr, Glancy, & Pitts, 2013). Creating a meditation room, especially in each residence hall, can assist students on the spectrum with sensory needs and provide all students an opportunity to de-stress. These rooms have Universal Design measures such as comfortable furniture (e.g., beanbag chairs), soft lighting and colors, and sometimes a small water feature. Additional strategies that can be used to decrease anxiety include teaching mindfulness techniques (Alfred, 2016) and other calming methods (visualization, use of stress balls and stress toys, relaxation exercises, etc.). Effectively utilizing these strategies may produce benefits such as a greater sense of community in residence halls, more positive experiences with student affairs personnel, better grades, and improved institutional attitude all the way through graduation. Positive interactions may also contribute to student retention.

**Organization and Time Management**

Organization and time management are, unquestionably, keys to success for all college students. Unfortunately, many students, with and without disabilities, come to college lacking these essential skills and need support in order to develop them.

Using a calendar is the most important organizational technique for college students. It is surprising how many incoming students still rely on their parents or others to keep track of appointments and do not use any type of calendar—electronic or paper—to manage their classes, lives, or meetings. Getting students started with Google calendar or another electronic calendar will help them to develop an organizational system that they can have with them at all times, on their phone or another device. This electronic means of tracking meetings, appointments, classes, and homework is also beneficial in that it allows for reminders to be set.

Some students prefer paper calendars, but these may be misplaced or lost. If using a paper calendar, schedule, or agenda, students should come up with strategies to keep track of this valuable aid. Whether it is an electronic or a paper calendar, putting classes, meetings, exercise, personal/family time, and study time all on the calendar is essential.

You can encourage this practice in your offices by booking appointments and showing students how your own calendar is organized and utilized. This type of modeling will assist the visual learners who need to see, as well as hear, an idea. For those who learn best by viewing or hearing step-by-step examples, there are captioned YouTube videos such as “How to Stay Organized in College: Planning From the Syllabus” (Hope, 2016).

A good time-management technique for your students is using the timer or alarm (audio or vibrating) on a phone or a watch. For some students, this feature can help manage their days; others need a more visual approach, such as the Time Timer application (app), which can be downloaded from the iTunes store. Most traditional-aged students have
grown up using digital clocks and have difficulty with or do not use analog clocks. Digital clocks, however, do not show the passage of time, and that is where Time Timer is helpful. This app, which can be downloaded to your student’s phone or computer, shows the passage of time in red and shows how much time students have left. This app may also be a good tool for managing computer gaming or TV time, as the app can be placed in a small corner of the screen. This visual prompt can also help with time left for an exam, time to get to class, study time, etc. There are similar apps, but this is the one the authors recommend because it has been used successfully by many students.

Social Interaction
Another challenge for students with ASDs, and a part of the definition of autism, is issues with social interaction. Most people on the spectrum struggle with nonverbal communication. Because many college students are more adept at socializing through screen contact, working on socialization skills is good for all students. Ways to increase social interaction skills might include encouraging structured socialization time or having an area of campus set aside for no cell phone use. Residence halls can have screen-free evenings, when students interact with one another in person. This can be especially useful for students on the spectrum as well as students who are naturally shy, introverted, or otherwise socially awkward. Starting the evening with a structured activity—instead of just hanging out—can be a great equalizer. Try board game night or Lego night; one campus had success with ballroom dance and salsa night. Try an activity in which everyone learns something and with which most participants have little experience, allowing all students to be on a more equal level.

Personnel and Universal Design Strategies
The Universal Design strategies mentioned above should not end with providing the tools to students only. Students would also benefit if student affairs and residence hall personnel were aware of some of these strategies and able to assist students as they develop them further. For example, there are many challenges associated with living away from home for the first time—in particular, living among strangers and in close proximity to individuals from very different backgrounds. To assist students in becoming acclimated to the college environment, personnel who oversee residence halls and other student affairs areas may benefit from training on strategies that may have traditionally been associated as beneficial only to those with ASDs, such as the aforementioned calming methods, organization and time-management skills, and social skills. If student affairs and residence hall personnel are prepared to assist students in navigating the social interactions associated with college life, the incidence of conduct issues may decrease.

Overall, many of the universal design approaches that are good for students with ASDs are good for all students. This concept of Universal Design is helpful for academic, housing, and cocurricular experiences and will further the development and integration of college students no matter their age, experience, or academic or social level. Including those students who think or act differently is good for everyone—students, faculty, staff, and society as a whole, and is a positive step forward in terms of social justice and inclusion.
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Fraternity is at a turning point—a critical moment. One might say heightened media coverage fueled the fire to bring us here. While the scrutiny has perhaps never been greater, the media does not define this crux. Others might say the high profile incidents mounting on college campuses landed us here. While those shine a light on what must be transformed, they also do not define this moment. What makes this moment—this crossroads—distinct, unlike any other in our long history, is the unprecedented collaboration of leaders and organizations working together toward change (Horras, 2016).

In his letter on the future of fraternity, Horras (2016) outlines the new priorities for the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) and provides a call to action to its members.
Through the process of collaboration within and among chapters, the NIC aims to change the culture of fraternity and to affect campus communities by:

- Creating an effective grassroots program for all Interfraternity Councils (IFCs) and providing exceptional support for “Focus Campuses” in an effort to strengthen and build healthier fraternity communities;
- Developing consistent educational programming for all IFC officers, staff, and volunteers;
- Creating a database that allows members to make data-driven decisions, share best practices, and streamline operations;
- Leading sophisticated public relations efforts to advance the “Fraternity Brand”; and
- Producing effective advocacy programs that strengthen higher education partnerships and utilize governmental and legal affairs (Horras, 2016).

Higher education is also at a turning point. Graduation rates, rising costs, college effectiveness, student learning, sexual misconduct, mental health concerns, alcohol and drug abuse, and changing student demographics are issues that leaders in higher education report as their greatest challenges (American Association of University Professors, 2016; NAPSA, 2014; Wong, Green & Zhou, 2015). Greek life lives among these issues and liabilities. Fraternities and sororities—by their nature as private organizations led by undergraduate students and volunteer advisors, using self-governance structures and perhaps housing several students—are risky for colleges and universities. And because they affect so many of the other factors challenging higher education, college and university leaders must also be engaged in the efforts to change the culture, processes, and outcomes of Greek life on their campuses.

Change and Transition

William Bridges (2009) stated, “It isn’t the changes that do you in, it’s the transition” (p. 3). Bridges described change as situational and external, and transition as a “psychological process that people go through as they internalize and come to terms with the details of a new situation that the change brings about” (p. 3). Change comes from decisions that are made on behalf of individuals and organizations. Change can be defined by new legislation, organizational shifts, market shifts, or decisions that are outside an individual’s control. Transition is an internal process responding to change. Transition requires individuals and organizations to engage in a process of letting go of old ways and identities. It serves as the ending of some traditions and cultures, and movement into a neutral zone—where the old is no longer viable, but the new is not yet realized. Finally, transition requires psychologically moving through the neutral zone and into a new beginning. New beginnings are signaled by new energy and a new sense of purpose for making the new reality work.

Greek life has a long history on American college campuses. It also has more stakeholders than most other entities in higher education. Active undergraduate members, advisors, and alumni experience Greek life through membership and organizational continuity efforts. Greek life staff, student affairs officers, and other university officials perceive Greek life through the lens of university programming, student experience, and liability. National headquarters staff, fraternal partners, and governing organizations often view Greek chapters as part of a larger brotherhood/sisterhood and also as a contributor to the business structure of the organization. Even nonprofit charity organizations have some stake in the health and viability of Greek chapters. Given the complexity of these organizations and their stakeholders, cultural and behavioral change as well as individual and organizational transition seem like daunting tasks.

Rueter and Backer (2015) describe fraternities and sororities as organizations whose central emphasis is relationships; their decisions and program development are dispersed by chapter. The authors note that the model for change “emphasizes that authentic transformation is essentially a function of individual members and stakeholders who must be central to any explication of how change is planned or understood” (Rueter & Backer, 2015, p. 52). The daily decisions of undergraduate students—supported by local organizational advisors who are volunteers, and off-site national leadership—determine the level of adherence to policy and organizational goals of national fraternities and sororities as well as their cultural transmission. For campuses, the on-site Greek life staff, hired by the university, work to support the organizational change of individual chapters, coach student leaders, consult with volunteers, and hold the chapters to the values of the universities that recognize them as extensions of their missions.

Change is hard. Transition is harder.

Moving Forward

Horras (2016) described the call for change as “loud and clear.” He explained the necessity to “raise the mean” by rallying around a “common vision with clarity and direction to make a long-term investment in the larger system” (p. 2). He urged collaboration in order to move beyond conversation, create effective programs for IFCs, build healthier fraternity communities, create data systems and sources to aid in decision making, enhance advocacy programs and partnerships with higher education leaders and governmental agencies, and develop effective public relations plans. Horras pledged to lead the NIC using efficient business practices, accountability, and continuous improvement for its membership, and he asked for stakeholders’ patience through the process.
The NIC has undertaken a two-year study of fraternities and their relationships with alcohol, sexual assault, and hazing, using three commissions comprised of researchers, university administrators, and volunteers. The commissions have studied research and promising practices, and have concluded their work and made recommendations to the NIC.

“Organizations exist in a transactional relationship with their environments, since the two rely upon one another for necessary resources” (Reuter & Backer, 2015, p. 53). College and university leaders need to collaborate with fraternity and sorority leaders to engage in this process of change and to help students and staff support the transition to mutually agreed-upon outcomes. So often, fraternities and sororities influence many of the social aspects of campus. On many campuses, Greek organizations help alleviate housing occupancy issues and are often the leadership development choice for students. College and university leaders must own their important roles in working toward the desired change for Greek life on campuses, and they must educate university stakeholders about the processes and expected outcomes. Much change and even more transition lies ahead for Greek life. It is up to us—all of us—to move the needle on effective partnerships, accountability, and leadership.

To begin this process of transition and change, a number of facilitated discussions on the future of fraternity and sorority life will take place during both the annual meeting of the Association of Fraternity and Sorority Advisors in Boston, Massachusetts, and the NASPA Annual Conference in San Antonio, Texas.
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Higher education institutions often face big challenges when it comes to supporting those affected by acts of sexual violence. Those challenges present big opportunities for student affairs professionals to forge better practices for supporting marginalized college students who have experienced sexual assault—specifically those students who identify within the lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, questioning, intersex, aromantic, asexual, and agender (LGBTQIA) community. Since the publication of the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), higher education institutions have received increased criticism for their practices and policies concerning sexual assault prevention and response (Wilson, 2014). Despite this heightened attention, dialogue addressing sexual assault on college campuses tends to draw on narrowly defined gender assumptions. In a review of research addressing rates of formal and informal disclosure of sexual assault among college students, Sabina and Ho (2014) noted the scarcity of research regarding “disclosure and service utilization among lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer, African American, Latino, Asian American, Native American, disabled male, and international students” (pp. 221–222). This lack of population-specific research can compound the trauma of sexual assault survivors, as heteronormative assumptions may exacerbate victimization experienced by LGB people (Balsam et al., 2005).

Jordan, Combs, and Smith (2014) have found that first-year college women are more likely to exhibit lower academic performance following sexual victimization. In consideration of the compounded trauma experienced by LGBTQIA students when faced with heteronormative assumptions on campus during sexual assault reporting, further research needs to be conducted on sexual assault support services for LGBTQIA students and their influence on academic performance, sense of inclusion, and retention on college campuses.

**Marginality and Mattering**

Students are much more likely to engage with the campus community when they feel like valued members of it. Schlossberg (1989) has referred to this sense of value as “mattering.” Moreover, Schlossberg has asserted that a sense of mattering can act as a motivator. Conversely, marginality occurs when students do not feel as if they belong to the campus community. Schueler et al. (2008) offer numerous “strategies for fostering environmental inclusiveness,” including the “identification of LGBTQIA role models and mentors,” critically evaluating language used in documentation, and “hiring multiculturally competent student staff members” (pp. 69–76). Many researchers have identified language as a locus of propagating social norms. The aggregate of the linguistic identifiers that college students encounter on a daily basis, both formal and informal, coalesce to form a student’s sense of mattering. Schueler et al. (2008) have pointed to paperwork and forms as barriers to LGBTQIA students’ feelings of belonging and mattering—forms should not be constructed to communicate a salience of heterosexual and cisgender identities. Moreover, support service staff should receive specialized training on supporting LGBTQIA students. Regardless of the context, “using language (including pronouns) that an individual student identifies with in a given context at a given time is an important part of creating affirming, respectful, and safe spaces on campus” (Jourian, 2015, p. 19). Students already have a great number of traumatic questions to answer while reporting sexual assault, and having to explain aspects of their identity might prove too much for a student to handle.
The same consideration of language and avoiding heteronormative assumptions applies to prevention programs. Bazarsky et al. (2015) recommend including diverse sexual and gender identities in wellness programming, rather than solely relying on heteronormative examples. Student affairs professionals must develop health programming with which all students can relate. Inclusiveness can be increased before and during programing with conscious adjustments to language and content. If students are marginalized, they will not feel as if they matter and are more likely to mistrust the support services available on campus.

LGBTQIA people with multiple minority statuses can experience additional constraints or barriers to community services (Todahl, Linville, Bustin, Wheeler, & Gau, 2009) and may even regard predominantly used non-heteronormative identifiers as White-centric (Jourian, 2015). When college campuses consider improving the inclusivity of LGBTQIA students on college campuses, they must also keep in mind that other facets of students’ identities, including race, also affect students’ feelings of belonging on campus. Sabina and Ho (2014) have noted the dearth of research on the diverse experiences of minority college students following sexual assault. Lindquist et al. (2013) have examined the context of sexual assaults among undergraduate Black women at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and concluded that “efforts must be informed by cultural sensitivities to sexual assault among African American women” (p. 2456). Although this study was grounded in an assumption of a female gender identity in a heteronormative social context, it raises the important point that students inhabit multiple identities.

Conclusion

More population-specific research is needed for rates of formal and informal disclosure of sexual assault among LGBTQIA students, the efficacy of sexual assault support services for LGBTQIA students, the critical issues and needs of LGBTQIA students, and the varying concerns of students with multiple minority statuses. Moreover, student affairs professionals need to connect research on these topics to college student development theories on engagement, marginality, and mattering in order to more effectively support the academic success of LGBTQIA students who have experienced sexual violence.
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In 2016 NASPA adopted an Indigenous Protocol Practice Policy; it is to be used to acknowledge the traditional peoples of the host regions at conferences and events. Developed by the Indigenous Peoples Knowledge Community (IPKC) following the 2015 NASPA National Conference in New Orleans, the protocol reinforces the importance of practice when interacting with local Indigenous communities.

The intention of the protocol is to advocate for the respectful usage of media arts, music, performing arts, visual arts, and culture of Indigenous people (i.e., Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, and First Nations) and communities. It advances NASPA's most recent strategic plan—including offering ethical and moral considerations—while aligning with the guiding principles of integrity, innovation, inclusion, and inquiry (Cull & Antoine, 2016). The highlight of the protocol is consultation and coordination between the IPKC and NASPA in planning national and regional conferences and other events.

In a larger context, all educational institutions sit on indigenous territories. Many people live, work, and learn at these institutions and never know anything about these indigenous roots because of the systematic erasure of Native peoples. This protocol acknowledges the dispossession of land and promotes awareness and respect of indigenous culture. The protocol also disrupts those systems of silence, exclusion, and erasure; it seeks to establish healthier and reciprocal relationships, with the goal of reconciliation.

The 2016 Midwest Regional conference is an example of the initial implementation of the protocol policy at the regional level. This conference was an opportunity for Regions IV-East and IV-West (IPKC IV E/W) to come together to celebrate being “In the Heart of It All” and to adopt the protocol into the conference planning. As the Conference Committee began planning, it graciously reached out to the IPKC Regional Representatives to seek collaboration and advice, and to ensure Indigenous communities would be honored and visible throughout the conference. The committee started by revisiting the shared vision of the protocol, acknowledging that a great place to start is by ensuring Indigenous representation at the conference’s beginning and closing. The committee wanted to make sure that the conference started by recognizing Indigenous communities, asking for the blessing of the community for a great conference, and then ending the event on the same note. To facilitate this process, the IPKC IV E/W representatives reached out to tribal community members in the St. Louis area, seeking elders who would be appropriate and willing to participate; through these networks, they found an Osage elder and other community members to join the NASPA community at the conference.

The 2016 Midwest Regional Conference planning experience and outcomes represent a positive example of how to implement the protocol and how to incorporate more Indigenous practices into both the regional and national conferences. The collaboration that occurred during this process was exceptional, and IPKC was grateful to the committee for its efforts in adopting the protocol.
Beyond the Midwest Regional Conference, conversations continue around how to find more ways to include Indigenous practices throughout our conferences and our various institutions across North America, understanding that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to implementing the protocol.

As future conference planning committees are established, some suggestions to advance this protocol practice include:

- Reaching out early in the planning process to the IPKC representative in that region to establish a working relationship. If one is currently not available, reach out to the national IPKC co-chairs.
- Taking time to research and gain your own knowledge about the land, peoples, and communities where the event will take place.
- Reading the IPKC protocol practice document with the planning committee to familiarize everyone with its content and discuss its possible implications in the timing of the planning process.
- Having open lines of communication between the IPKC representative, the committee, local contacts, and welcomed members or elder of the host community.
- Understanding that an opening or closing ritual or prayer led by a local elder may vary in time, depending on the local traditions. It may be interpreted as disrespectful to ask them to speed up their portion to keep an event moving forward. IPKC representatives and/or a local contact may be able to assist in establishing an estimated schedule.
- Including language in the program guide and opening session that gives context to the protocol.
- In instances when an elder may not be available to attend, the protocol has established language that may be used to properly acknowledge the land, peoples, and traditions of the host community.
- Identifying or advocating for space in or near the conference venue for smudging. Smudging involves the burning of sacred plants, such as sage, tobacco, cedar, and sweet grass, in order to cleanse the room of negative energy.
- Creating an open space throughout the conference where local indigenous community members and elders may interact with IPKC and other members of the association. These spaces may be used for ceremony, smudging, storytelling, or community building.
- Encouraging conference presenters to use the protocol in their own presentations throughout the conference, to further institutionalize the practice within the association.

After institutionalizing these practices at national and regional conferences throughout the association, the next step will be to promote these practices at the institutional level in order to advocate for that same awareness and respect of Indigenous cultures at the local level.

Some initial ideas on implementing the protocol at the institutional level include:

- Researching the Indigenous histories of the land and people where the institutions are located.
- Establishing relationships with local Indigenous communities, welcoming them to campus and identifying ways to respectfully engage students with these communities.
- Reaching out to IPKC representatives for guidance on identifying local community contacts.
- Adding resources to existing Native studies or support programs to institutionalize a campus-wide effort to recognize and honor local Indigenous communities.
- Developing interdisciplinary studies courses related to local Native communities and land.
- Incorporating local practices during new student welcome orientations.
- Developing educational programming during family and alumni weekend reunions.
- Incorporating language on respectful usage of Native imagery, media, arts, etc., in student handbooks and other institutional policies.
- Recognizing local elders and community members during commencement and convocation ceremonies.
- Establishing landmarks or sacred spaces on institutional grounds to create visibility and public acknowledgment for these communities.

In an effort to create more inclusive and welcoming environments for Native students in higher education, student affairs practitioners can use the Indigenous Protocol Practice Policy to examine the ways they acknowledge and affirm the indigenous communities and land where these institutions are situated.
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With increasing pressure on universities to produce career-ready students—and national funding closely aligned with job placement rates—it is no surprise that universities, parents, and students place great worth on obtaining a high-quality job upon graduation. Employers have come to value qualities and skills like leadership, cultural fluency, and teamwork, which are typically learned through co-curricular experiences. A recent survey found that employers value volunteer experiences, internships, and extracurricular activities over the relevance of coursework and college grade point average (GPA) (Thompson, 2014).

Unfortunately, international students are not always the most engaged students on campus. This lack of involvement is due to two main factors: first, extracurricular activities play a more prominent role in universities in the United States than in other countries; second, many international students face more academic challenges than their U.S. counterparts and therefore spend more time on academics. With this information in mind, it is important to help international students realize the importance of being involved outside of the classroom—and how it can help them in their academic and career pursuits (Astin & Astin, 2000).

International students typically look to immigration advisors, faculty, and other student affairs administrators for advice on many university matters. How can we, as student affairs administrators and international student advisors, prepare international students, through the development of soft skills, to be competitive and marketable in a fierce U.S. and global job market? One way is to host intentional engagement opportunities to help these students develop leadership and career skills.
In 2013, James Madison University hosted the International Student Leadership conference, which was designed to build leadership skills and help students discover more about their career goals. During the conference, one participant expressed the need for international students to be provided with more tangible and practical experiences. This would help the students figure out what they ultimately want in a career, and how they can use these experiences when looking for jobs.

Student affairs administrators and international student advisors can also foster more long-term opportunities that will empower international students to get involved in co-curricular experiences on and off campus. International students often have unique challenges that are overlooked by the administration. If their initial transition experience is not positive, then they may choose to disengage from the campus community. Seeking student feedback and allowing them to advocate and create real change can also feed into a larger leadership opportunity. Another way to encourage international student involvement, engagement, and empowerment is through international student advisory boards (ISABs). An ISAB can help to resolve many of the issues that international students face.

In spring 2014, research was conducted via an e-mail sent to a listserv of international educators; the goal was to find out which universities offered an ISAB and how they typically functioned. Out of the 50 U.S.-based institutions that responded, 31 of them were private. The majority of these institutions enroll up to 300 international students (16%) and between 1,001 to 3,000 international students (15%), as demonstrated in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Internation</th>
<th>Yes - Have Advisory Board</th>
<th>No - Don't Have Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-300 (N = 16)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500 (N = 3)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000 (N = 15)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-3000 (N = 15)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3000 (N = 9)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Breakdown of institutions’ international student population and whether they offer an ISAB**

*Note: Data gathered from an e-mail survey sent to the NAFSA (NAFSA: Association of International Educators) inter-L listserv in February 2014 and compiled on April 21, 2014.*

In one specific example, the ISAB at Emory University is a mixture of thinking and doing, and students enjoy both the advocacy and programming aspects. Of those students on the ISAB in the 2014–2015 year, 90% of them said that their ISAB experience was more meaningful than their other leadership experiences, and almost all of them served again the following year. Some of the biggest takeaways that the students had from their ISAB experience were: (1) gaining leadership skills, (2) working and bonding with a diverse group of students, and (3) making a difference in the campus community through outreach and advocacy. One Emory University ISAB student shared in an end-of-year (2015) survey, “(The ISAB) has helped me touch the lives of people from around the world—kindred souls who have come from far and wide to gain education here in America. I wouldn’t trade this experience for anything else.”

Although many ISABs are primarily aimed at empowering the students, gaining their honest feedback, and providing leadership and advocacy opportunities, there are other benefits. Some of the survey respondents also said that creating an ISAB was part of their internationalization efforts. Additionally, an ISAB can help a university to move beyond just “racial” or “cultural” diversity by truly encouraging the students to thrive and lead the community: “Members act as campus leaders in encouraging discussion, collecting feedback, organizing programming, advocating for the needs, and raising the visibility of international students at the university” (ISAB survey respondent, 2014).

While many universities have other student advisory boards for different purposes, it is wise to consider creating a specific advisory board for international students. Whether the university has large numbers of international students or is looking to grow the numbers, ISABs can be helpful for the university and for students. When creating the board, consider whether the group will be “thinking,” “doing,” or a combination of both. If the main goal is to empower students and create leadership opportunities, providing them an opportunity to share their concerns and advocate for change can be extremely valuable. Additionally, consider the campus culture, the goals and objectives, and the ideal composition of the members (Scharf, Doshi, & Fox, 2015). Efforts made to empower and
encourage involvement among international students will pay large dividends—whether by actually creating an ISAB or by encouraging individual students to take advantage of opportunities on campus.

The sense of empowerment and set of experiences that come from being part of an ISAB makes the student committee members more marketable to future employers. Numbers of international students continue to grow in the United States and around the world, so it is important to provide worthwhile opportunities for them to learn skills outside of the classroom. ISABs are a meaningful way to provide those opportunities, and empowering students to take advantage of them will benefit the students, universities, and employers alike.
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Figure 1 & 2: Data gathered from the e-mail survey sent to the NAFSA inter-L listserv in February 2014 and compiled on April 21, 2014 by Elizabeth Matthews from Michigan State University for a NAFSA National Conference Presentation titled: ISSS International Advisory Board Program (IAB): A Tool for Empowerment in May 2014.
Today, one of the largest challenges that California community colleges (CCC) face is the lack of diversity within faculty ranks. Currently, 92% of CCCs are Hispanic Serving Institutions, yet colleges continue to enact practices that foster implicit bias. As such, critics have questioned whether CCCs are truly supporting the essence of social justice and inclusion when considering the needs of diverse groups on campus.

It is without surprise that the ethnic and racial makeup of the United States is becoming increasingly diverse. Recent California data illustrates this trend, i.e., 66% (U.S.
Census Bureau, 2015). Accordingly, student diversity at CCCs continues to increase; however, the racial and ethnic diversity among faculty of color is not keeping up with this demand. This trend is problematic for many reasons, including the overwhelming number of White faculty at CCCs despite the abundance of ethnic students (Jeffcoat & Piland, 2012).

People of color have found a place in community colleges (Hughes, 2015)—a place where students of color are more likely to begin their academic careers (Kurlaender, 2006; Sáenz & Ponjuan, 2011) in comparison to four-year universities, at 40% (NCES, 2015). The percentage of students of color in community colleges has risen to over 50% at most institutions (Jeffcoat & Piland, 2012), and numbers continue to climb (NCES, 2015). These numbers indicate the need for diversification within higher education—specifically, within community colleges, which particularly struggle to maintain equitable diversity across faculty and staff (Fujimoto, 2012). This disproportion is underscored by the chancellor’s office, noting that over 60% of faculty are White and less than 30% are faculty of color (California Community College Chancellor’s Office [CCCCO], 2014). Other scholars have also agreed that the rate of faculty of color teaching at colleges has not increased much (Jeffcoat & Piland, 2012) to meet the demands of the seemingly growing student population. In fact, recent data have shown that the ethnic makeup of faculty—both full-time and adjunct—has not changed (CCCCO, 2014).

Despite the diverse nature of students enrolled across CCCs, the Chancellor’s Office reported that 62.5% of full-time faculty members are White, 9.1% are Asian, 5.7% are Black, 14.7% are Latino, and 1% are Native American (CCCCO, 2014). In contrast, 68% of CCC students are students of color, with 42% of that group being Latino. These data clearly demonstrate the need to improve diversity within faculty ranks in California. The data also show the significant need to recruit professors who can better understand the experiences of minority students.

Literature review
Recent studies suggest that students of color benefit when faculty of color are hired. For example, Turner (2000) noted that having a diverse faculty improves the educational quality of all students, not only minorities. The Association of American Universities echoes this sentiment, indicating that without racial diversity, the educational experience of all students is diminished (1997). The biggest reason for this claim is that to succeed in today’s ever-changing global marketplace, students must develop skills that come from exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. Moreover, research supports the notion that faculty diversity has a positive effect on retaining students of color (Fuji, 2014).

The current lack of faculty diversity at institutions underscores the challenges that come with hiring people of color and draws attention to the overarching dilemma that exists. While some may claim that there are not enough people of color who possess the necessary skills to fill faculty positions, others question the ways institutions choose to implement hiring practices that are meant to support diverse student groups (Fuji, 2014).

Methodology
This study—as part of a larger effort to highlight the racial inequalities that exist within hiring practices as well as the need to diversify representation on college campuses in California—sheds light on the important impact faculty diversity has on historically marginalized student populations. As such, this study explored whether there were significant differences across students of color in success rates—that is, in attaining basic skills and in transfer success—when exposed to diverse faculty from CCCs.

Data for this study came from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (2014), commonly known as Data Mart. Data were collected from two queries: the Faculty & Staff and the Outcomes sections. Data were collected on full-time faculty demographics, student demographics, and student success of basic skills and transfer. The data represented full-time faculty (N = 6,676) and basic skills/transfer students (N = 1,306,080 combined) sampled in 116 CCCs, three of which were adult continuing education colleges. This study examined whether there were significant mean differences in students’ achievement rates based on ethnic full-time faculty groups who mirrored students’ ethnic backgrounds; data were also disaggregated by gender. As such, each ethnicity (African American, Asian, Latino, Native American) underwent four analyses. In total, 16 one-way analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were employed to analyze the dataset. ANCOVAs are typically utilized to analyze differences while controlling for a factor (e.g., institution size; Field, 2013). The dependent variable for this study was male and female basic skills success scores and male and female transfer success scores. Thus, four dependent variables were run independently in this study.

Key findings
The findings suggest that when there were more faculty members who resembled the demographic of the student, students from the same demographic were more likely to have higher mean score differences in areas of basic skills and transfer success. Specifically, African American, Asian, Latino, and Native American groups illustrated a significant difference in success rates. In sum, the increase in faculty diversity does make a difference in CCCs, particularly when the numbers of faculty members of color are increased.
Recommendations
Overall, the findings of this study warranted three major recommendations:

1. Institutions must create a well-balanced diverse faculty body. Having a diverse faculty could help improve student success rates in community colleges.

2. Colleges must eliminate implicit bias from the hiring process to address and improve rates of diversity on campus in order to close racial/ethnic disparities that currently exist.
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When student affairs practitioners think about masculinity, they typically focus on problems with collegiate masculinity. Men are less likely to engage academically (Sax, 2008), are less likely to persist (Ross et al., Kena, Rathbun, Kewal, Ramani, Zhang, Kristapovich & Manning, 2012), and are overrepresented in student conduct issues (Harper, Harris, & Mmeje, 2010). The literature and base of men and masculinities work is filled with scholars and practitioners examining these trends and developing potential strategies moving forward.

In our examination of collegiate men, however, we must also investigate ourselves. We cannot understand how students navigate privilege and negotiate and perform their gender if we do not also understand similar trends among staff members. In this article, we take a nontraditional approach to examine the intersection of discursive narratives involving men in student affairs.
Gender in Student Affairs
We have chosen to prioritize the term "men student affairs professionals" rather than "male" to emphasize the social construction of gender. While any species can be biologically male or female, only humans have the capacity to be "men." Genders are socialized along a discursive binary (Smith & Lloyd, 1978), and so-called men are conditioned through that socialization to possess masculine-perceived actions. If we think with Butler's (1997) concept of gender as performance, we begin to see gender as an ongoing performance that serves as a “reiteration of a norm or set of norms” (p. 538). Gender performance, then, occurs via the ways individuals communicate their perspectives on reality and enact social identities through discourse (Gee, 1992).

This concept of gender is useful in understanding the challenge to gender performance for men student affairs professionals and the competing narratives for how they should perform gender. While they receive societal messages regarding masculinity, they also receive messages about the femininity of student affairs as a profession.

Since its emergence as a field and through the work of early deans of women, student affairs practices have been associated with tasks stereotypically reserved for women (Duffy, 2010; Sturtevant, Strang, & McKim, 1940). Even as higher education has progressed chronologically, student affairs has maintained the gendered expectations of caretaking professions (Williams, 2000). Additionally, student affairs departments continue to be statistically weighted by gender, and NASPA has a nearly 2:1 ratio of self-identified women to men professionals (S. Reynolds, personal communication, August 15, 2016). The concept of the "dorm mother" epitomizes this thought process and still influences the perception of student affairs work outside the profession.

For men student affairs professionals, the association of student affairs work as "feminine" adds complexity to their gender performance. Schrock and Schwalbe (2009) found that men complete different "manhood acts" to prove their masculinity for others. Men may internalize the perception that they should demonstrate their masculinity through their chosen profession, which poses difficulties in the feminized role of a student affairs professional. Student affairs "caretaking" work cannot qualify as masculine under traditional social norms. The juxtaposition of role and societal norms creates dissonant messages for men student affairs professionals.

Potential Pitfalls
Men student affairs professionals carry with them the benefits of unearned privilege. While we do not claim that men professionals are purposefully perpetuating privilege, we do want to illuminate areas where discourse could be problematic. A cursory investigation into higher education leadership reveals that men continue to dominate the upper echelons of higher education despite being a demographic minority. How, then, do men navigate their privilege and perform their gender within the context of competing messages? Furthermore, what are some potential pitfalls?

The first potential pitfall is men unconsciously performing male privilege and patriarchal practices. Student affairs is a field that espouses social justice as a value (ACPA & NASPA, 2015), and we can easily get caught up in a competency-based approach to social justice. Men may well understand what to say and how to perform in a socially just manner as “one of the good guys” but still unconsciously benefit from the perpetuation of male privilege. Men student affairs practitioners who can both espouse social justice values and also profit from enacting leadership in the "great man" mold have compounded their opportunities for advancement by tapping into both contexts of discourse (Kezar, 2002). They benefit from a correct performance within the context of appropriate student affairs discourse, but they also benefit from societal underpinnings that showcase men as leaders. Jackson (2010) argued that this type of discursive inertia is how systems of power are “imagined, idealized and maintained” (p. 73), and student affairs is no exception.

The second potential pitfall is the ability to switch focus to another aspect of their identity and create false-front narratives. Intersectionality has great value in discussing identity, discourse, and power, but intersectionality can also be used to avoid difficult conversations. In dismantling patriarchal narratives, it is critical to give attention to masculinity. Just as we focus to redefine masculinity in positive terms for our collegiate men, there must be a greater focus on staff. It is too easy to switch to other identities in diversity conversations rather than focusing on deconstructing external masculine privileges brought into student affairs. Switching, in discussions, from gender to other identities provides a defense mechanism for men to alleviate the stress of competing internalized discourses on masculinity and to obscure their male privilege.

Conclusion
While this article cannot fully investigate the performance of gender by men student affairs professionals, it can serve as a discussion point for the potential issues that arise. At times, gender reframing can seem insurmountable, because it is being fought on two fronts. Though we examined men unconsciously absolving themselves of male privilege as a potential pitfall, we do not minimize the struggle or stress these competing discourses place on all genders, men included. Men professionals are expected to carry their traditional masculine norms into work, and that intersection is the very place we wish to examine further. Kegan and Lahey (2002) referred to the need to be able to look at the filter through which we see the world rather
than just through it. Rather than offering perspective recommendations, we hope this article can open a dialogue about our filters for gender performance by men student affairs professionals.
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There is a dearth of literature that addresses the influence of colorism on the experiences of Black/White biracial women who attend predominately White institutions (PWIs). Biracial women with a background of both Black and White racial heritages face challenges with integrating the two cultures while trying to establish a sense of belonging (Bettez, 2010; Rockquemore, 2002). My dissertation research focused on the impact of colorism on the experiences of Black/White biracial women attending PWIs in the South. I wanted to know the impact colorism had on how they negotiated their identities within the collegiate environment and what on-campus support systems existed. I used a narrative analysis approach to conduct semi-structured interviews with 11 Black/White biracial college women, followed by a photo-elicitation project to examine spaces on campus.

Colorism is a concept that suggests people of color discriminate against other people of color based on skin complexion (Hunter, 2007; Jones, 2000; Kilson, 2001). In examining campus environments, biracial students often negotiate and validate their identity to fit within the culture and look for supportive environments to express their identities (Chaudhari & Pizzolato, 2008; King, 2011).

However, many PWIs have do not have staff, programs, and spaces in place where biracial students can congregate. Such shortfalls can lead to negative emotions such as anger, frustration, and resentment because of students’ discomfort with claiming and displaying features of their racial identity; this is particularly the case for biracial women, who have been historically categorized into racial groups based on their physical characteristics, particularly around skin complexion (King, 2008; Stewart, 2008; Storrs, 1999).

The influence of colorism on identity negotiation was prevalent for all women in this study, with the exception of one woman who did not feel colorism had an impact on how she chose to identify. This particular woman had a clear sense of self and grew up with a strong understanding of both of her racial heritages. The other women described instances of discriminatory actions toward them based on their skin complexion; most frequent was derogatory name calling, such as “Oreo,” “White girl,” “the N-word,” and “yellow.” The women also negotiated their identity through the way they presented their language and altered their physical appearance—for example, wearing their hair curly or straight, depending on the cultural environment they
were in. For example, one woman felt less attractive when she wore her hair curly and commented on how she felt like society preferred the look of straight hair on women. Another woman perceived her curly hair as nappy and not cute enough based on her feelings of having to conform and straighten her hair.

The women used various strategies to validate their biracial identity on campus, such as joining student organizations, attending campus events and social gatherings, and taking academic courses that aided in their identity development. For the women of this study, the campus environment proved to be a significant factor in supporting or hindering identity negotiation. Some campuses were racially polarized; they were not inclusive or comfortable environments in which the women could engage with others similar to them, forcing these women instead to choose organizations or congregate in spaces targeted to one particular race. For instance, some women felt more connected to the Black community at their campuses, due to others perceiving them as Black on account of their complexion. Women at another campus felt that the institution supported all student backgrounds, which made for an easier transition and connection to the larger campus community, not just the Black or White community.

This study yielded information that can lead to collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs. Both entities can work with each other to address curriculum issues about the historical significance of multiraciality in society and emerging topics surrounding race and identity. Creating opportunities within the academic and cocurricular agendas would provide intentional arenas to understand and discuss issues of colorism within the larger context of race relations, specifically within the multiracial community. Campuses can host forums where faculty, administrators, and students can come together to discuss issues of race and inclusivity—particularly around the issues of racially mixed individuals. Further, campuses can encourage the formation of student organizations for racially mixed students so that they can come together to discuss their issues, celebrate and support each other, and educate others about what it means to be multiracial.

Based on the insights these women provided, institutions should consider conducting a campus climate assessment around race and inclusivity in order to understand what students and staff are saying about the diversity, race, and inclusiveness on their campus. Consulting firms or institutional assessment and planning offices on campus can conduct focus groups or administer surveys to faculty, staff, and students to ask questions about their perceptions of campus diversity and inclusivity, from the classroom to extracurricular activities.

Examining colorism within the context of racial identity negotiation is complex. Race relations and the racial stratification of racially mixed individuals into categories that do not align with how they identify are still issues. Institutions need to revisit their programmatic and service efforts that pertain to diversity, inclusivity, and acceptance of multiple identities, and reinforce the positive attributes of identifying with more than one race. Student affairs professionals must acknowledge racial and social issues on campus and look at how they are addressing these issues through intentional planning, teaching, and programming. They need to start conversations that will lead to initiatives, programs, and services that include individuals who identify with more than one race. Racially mixed students need to feel a sense of place on campus, which means we must have engaging and supporting environments that foster a healthy sense of self and community for this population.
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Student affairs professionals are expected to possess a wide variety of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in order to be effective in their jobs (American College Personnel Association [ACPA] & NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education [NASPA], 2016). However, factors contributing to the attainment of these professional competencies or current professional development needs have not been well documented in recent years.

Organizations such as NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) have all been involved with creating and disseminating different versions of these guidelines based on relevant needs of the profession; most notably in the 2007 ACPA professional competencies publication (ACPA, 2007). In 2009, ACPA and NASPA convened a task force to analyze the existing student affairs competency documents and recommend updates due to the rapid changes in the higher education environment. The task force’s final report was released in August 2015, and it included the following ten professional competencies:

1. Personal and Ethical Foundations (PEF)
2. Values, Philosophy, and History (VPH)
3. Assessment, Evaluation, and Research (AER)
4. Law, Policy, and Governance (LPG)
5. Organizational and Human Resources (OHR)
6. Leadership (LEAD)
7. Social Justice and Inclusion (SJI)
8. Student Learning and Development (SLD)
9. Technology (TECH)
10. Advising and Supporting (A/S) (ACPA/NASPA, 2015)

It is assumed graduate degree programs, professional development opportunities, and time in the field all contribute to student affairs professionals’ attainment of professional competencies (Burkard, Cole, Ott, & Stoflet, 2005), but what role might NASPA Knowledge Communities play in advancing professional competencies?

Understanding the professional development needs of the NASPA Knowledge Community (KC) membership is vital to the role of the professional association. It is the expectation of KC leaders to provide opportunities and experiences that will shape themselves and KC members into the professionals they desire to become. KCs are poised to fill the gaps where the NASPA Annual and Regional conferences, at times, fall short. KCs can ensure that the specific and unique topics of knowledge are being disseminated regularly to expand the professional development content offerings of the association. These
gaps, however, can only be addressed when input is solicited from the membership. This study sought to explore self-reported professional development needs of student affairs professionals by Knowledge Community affiliation.

**Methodology**

This quantitative study, conducted as part of a larger research project sponsored by the NASPA New Professionals and Graduate Students (NPGS) Knowledge Community, used data from a 58 question, online Qualtrics survey. The study utilized data from 1,364 self-identified student affairs professionals. The CAS functional areas of the participants varied greatly, with the highest percentage working in Housing and Residential Life Programs (17%) and the second highest percentage working in Campus Activities Programs (8%). Professional level of participants spanned from undergraduate student respondents to university presidents.

Participants were invited to participate via a modified snowball sampling method, which involved KC leaders who served as gatekeepers. KC leaders were invited to forward recruitment emails on to their respective member listservs during regularly scheduled timeframes.

For the purpose of this study, participants were asked to rank order the aforementioned ten professional competency areas (ACPA/NASPA, 2015) from (1) being most important to (10) being least important to their professional development needs. Although additional KCs have since been added, there were 28 recognized KCs at the time the present study was conducted in the spring of 2016. Responses were filtered by participants who self-disclosed membership in the 28 KCs. Participants were offered the ability to select more than one of their KC membership affiliation(s).

**Findings**

Table 1 provides the number of respondents (n) for each of the 28 Knowledge Communities and presents the top three competency areas. In other words, the three lowest mean scores signified the top three professional competency area needs in terms of professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Community</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Ranked Importance (1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. in Grad and Professional Student Services</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>LPG (4.31) AER (4.39) SJI (4.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>LPG (4.03) AER (4.47) OHR (5.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SJI (3.65) AER (4.35) LPG (5.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>LPG (4.17) SJI (4.54) AER (4.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>AER (3.97) LPG (4.51) SJI (5.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men &amp; Masculinities</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>SJI (4.26) AER (4.71) LPG (4.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiRacial</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>LPG (3.71) AER (3.98) SLD (5.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Professionals and Graduate Students</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>AER (4.13) LPG (4.42) SJI (4.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Family Relations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>SJI (4.11) LPG (4.17) AER (4.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic and Class Issues in Higher Edu.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>AER (4.09) LPG (4.55) SJI (4.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality and Religion in Higher Education</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>AER (3.74) LPG (4.10) SJI (4.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Learners and Students with Children</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>AER (3.95) SJI (4.63) OHR (4.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Fundraising and External Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SJI (4.08) AER (4.25) OHR (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Partnering with Academic Affairs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>AER (3.98) LPG (4.73) SJI (4.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Programs</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>AER (4.04) SJI (4.14) LPG (4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>SJI (4.00) LPG (4.55) AER (4.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>LPG (3.53) AER (4.12) TECH (4.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>SJI (4.11) AER (4.22) LPG (4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AER (3.60) TECH (4.67) SLD (4.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness and Health Promotion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>AER (4.70) LEAD (4.77) SJI (4.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Student Affairs</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>LPG (4.18) AER (4.21) SJI (4.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>AER (3.74) LPG (4.23) OHR (5.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drug</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SJI (3.98) AER (4.26) LPG (4.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>LPG (4.27) SJI (4.57) AER (4.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>LPG (4.12) SJI (4.44) AER (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety and Violence Prevention</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>AER (4.33) LPG (4.38) SJI (4.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>TECH (4.50) A/S (4.77) OHR (4.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>LPG (4.00) SJI (4.02) AER (4.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications & Discussion

When data were aggregated it can be concluded the top three needs based on frequency for professional development of NASPA member respondents who affiliate with KCs are (1) Assessment, Evaluation, and Research ($f=27,96\%$), (2) Law, Policy, and Governance ($f=23,82\%$), and (3) Social Justice & Inclusion ($f=22,79\%$).

Members expect to discover tools and resources to sharpen their skill sets within their KCs. This is particularly the case due to having the number and variety of KCs, each offering specific focuses, enabling members to tailor their NASPA experience to their professional development plan. Members expect the KCs to provide professional development opportunities disseminated by the leaders of each community. As a result, it is important for KCs to fulfill their obligation in meeting the intersection of the professional development needs of the membership and the KC’s focus. Professional development offerings often utilize similar approaches, strategies, and support to guide daily practice. This is appropriate when focusing on professional development related to professional competency needs shared by multiple KCs. For example, if a particular KC is at a loss for how to meet a professional competency through professional development offerings, they could develop partnerships with other KCs who share similar professional development competency needs. However, when focusing on professional development related to professional competency needs in areas specific to the mission of the KC, these offerings should consider the diverse makeup of KC membership.

KC leaders and their leadership teams are implored to utilize the NASPA/ACPA Professional Competencies (2015) and their associated rubrics (2016) when developing opportunities and resources to meet the professional development needs of the membership. These principles held by the professional competencies ensure higher education and student affairs professionals are equipped to face the many challenges student affairs employees encounter. Often, KC leadership takes the approach of crafting professional development needs from the expressed interest of the membership. However, the KC program can also explore the additional method of rooting our work in the principles of the profession in efforts to develop our members holistically. By doing so, KCs allow their professional development offerings to be intentional, directed, and strategic rather than mainly dependent on the requests of the membership. The professional competencies should not be seen as a restriction but should encourage KC leadership teams to explore creative and innovative intersections when designing professional development opportunities.

By using the professional competencies within KC program planning, KCs will find themselves being more creative in their partnership outreach. Our hope is this initial insight into the KC members’ professional development needs can be a starting point for future partnership formations and professional development programs.
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Latinos are the largest minority ethnic group in California (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The U.S. Census Bureau (2010) predicts that by 2025, one out of every four students will be Latino. In 2009, Latinos had the highest high school dropout rate compared with other racial groups, including White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). A Pew Hispanic Center (2002) report found a disparity between enrollment of Latino students and degree completion; this disparity may create the negative illusion that Latino students cannot succeed in higher education, due to a lack of retention and persistence. This study’s purpose was: (1) to explore the impact of parental involvement on first-generation Chicana/o Latina/o transfer students in pursuing a college education and (2) to describe the awareness needed by educators and administrators to recognize the role parents play in their students’ educational success. The following research questions were central to this qualitative study:

1. How do first-generation Chicana/o Latina/o transfer students describe their parents’ involvement in their college educational success and its benefit to them?

2. How do familial capital and cultural capital assets contribute to first-generation Chicana/o Latina/o transfer college student success?

Currently, there is a narrow definition of parental involvement in higher education that does not include the cultural tendencies and customs of Latina/o families (Fernandez, 2002).

Summary of the Literature
Parental involvement is a key factor in student success (Gofen, 2009; Nora & Cabrera, 1996). Parental involvement has correlated positively with a child’s academic performance and can help to reduce the achievement gap in P–12 education (Lee & Bowen, 2006). Meaningful research studies have been conducted on the academic success of Chicano/Latinos in U.S. elementary and secondary education systems and on the need to involve and engage parents at those levels (Auerbach, 2004; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lee & Bowen, 2006). However, few studies have investigated the impact of parental involvement on college student success. We must gather the narratives of Latinos in higher education in order to meet their needs and assist in their success.
Latino Community College Transfer Students
According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), “almost half (49 percent) of Hispanic college and university students attended public 2-year institutions, a higher percentage than any other race/ethnicity shown (ranging from 33 to 42 percent)” (para. 6). Latinos are accessing community colleges as their entry point to higher education (Rendon & Valadez, 1993). The role of community colleges to successfully transfer Latino students to a four-year institution is one that must be addressed and examined if this student population is to be provided with meaningful resources and services.

Methodology
First-generation Chicana/o Latina/o students ages 20 to 35 who attended community colleges and successfully transferred with at least a 3.0 grade point average were interviewed. A grounded theory approach was chosen for this study based on the innovative ideas that may be generated in constructing theory from data collection (Charmaz, 2014).

Themes
The following themes were found as a result of the analysis of data from the 12 semi-structured interviews: (1) gratitude and appreciation to parents, (2) consejos, (3) first-generation moments, (4) parental support by any means necessary, (5) desire for parents to belong and connect, and (6) emotions/unspoken words.

Theme One: Gratitude and Appreciation to Parents
All of the participants shared a deep-rooted sense of gratitude and appreciation toward their parents’ impact on their educational success. Often, the participants had moments of realization during the interview of just how much their parents have done for them so they could strive to reach their educational goals. For example, one of the participants, Sandoval, shared, “I deeply appreciate my parents’ support because, I mean, I am the person that I am because of them, but also because of the opportunity that they granted me to get my education here because that has also shaped the person that I am” (Sandoval, Mexican male, 23, Mt. San Antonio Community College, Cal Poly Pomona).

Theme Two: Consejos
Consejos are defined as nurturing advice from parents in support of their children through communication that holds deep cultural and emotional empathy and compassion (Gaitan-Delgado, 1994). These consejos are a form of cultural and familial capital that has not been valued in traditional university settings (Yosso, 2005). Participants often reported how consejos gave them the courage to believe in themselves. Their parents sharing consejos of encouragement helped them to believe that success in their college education was attainable. Martha described how her parents have always encouraged and motivated her. The motivation was in the simple notion of checking in on her. She shared how a simple question—“How are you doing?”—always made her feel like they knew that her education was important. Martha stated:

The fact that they always kept me motivated and just always knew what to say in a sense, like, always encouraging, it made a huge difference. And so, it helped me, um, feel like I belong here in the states and also at school, because they’ve always made me feel like I’ve belonged in, like, in school, if that makes sense. (Martha, Guatemalan female, 23 years old, Mt. San Jacinto Community College, Cal Poly Pomona)

Theme Three: First-Generation Moments
As community college transfer students, most of the participants spoke about moments that highlighted their first-generation identity and experience. An example was having immigrant parents who did not understand what they necessarily had to do once they entered college, yet who have always been there for them to assist as they could. Jessica shared how the experience of transitioning into community college was hard for her. When asked if she thought it would be beneficial to have her parents engaged during her community college, she shared, I think so, but then again I’m the first student in my family to go to college, so my parents really had no idea—neither did I—as far as what I had to do. I feel like at that time I was more scared or shy to ask for help or go and ask if there was anything that they offered. It was actually a very tough experience for me to go to community college, because we didn’t know anything. My parents didn’t know;… I mean they rarely… They speak English, but they don’t know how to fill out an application. I’m the one usually that does everything. (Jessica, Guatemalan female, 25 years old, Pasadena City Community College, Cal State University, Los Angeles)

Theme Four: Parental Support by Any Means Necessary
The notion of “by any means necessary” captures the array of support that parents provide, whether it be saving up financially to help pay for books and tuition or driving far distances to do their part in making sure their students were successful. The stories painted the parents as holders of knowledge that captured their cultural and familial capital as contributors to their success. Culturally engaging practices are not valued or appreciated in the traditional format of institutions of higher education, making parental support a key theme.

Martha stated how her parents do things that only a parent would do, but also they do it because it is their way of giving support, whatever way they can. This type of support is different but appreciated by Martha. She shares:

“My dad will drive me to school sometimes; he used to do that before, when he had a chance, drive me to my school so that I could study on the way. And-um, and he does it, you know. He’s done that multiple times, and, I mean, that’s huge.”
**Theme Five: Desire for Parents to Belong and Connect**

A majority of the students shared a desire for their parents to be more connected to their college experience. As noted earlier, being a first-generation Chicana/o Latina/o transfer student creates additional stress factors. Participants expressed that they had to explain a lot about their college experience. Their desire for their parents to belong and connect to their college life was rooted in wanting their parents to understand what they were going through.

Elisa shared the desire she had for her parents to understand the transition to college as well as the overall experience. Elisa saw value in having her parents be a part of her educational goals and achievements along her journey. The following excerpt captured this point:

To help them understand what we do, what I’m trying to do, what I’m trying to achieve. Have them see the beginning, where you’re starting, like the excitement of it, and then towards the middle little stages—“I completed this. Now, I just need to do this,” or “I did this. I’m in this group. This is what we’re doing. This is what the outcome is going to be.” Then, of course at the end—graduation or whatever you’re working towards, have them see that as well, just to see that it was worth their while and our while too. (Elisa, Mexican female, 21 years old, Rio Hondo Community College, Cal State University, Los Angeles)

She continued to express her desire for her parents to be engaged, comparing it to the parent engagement model that she has seen as a youth in the educational system that created opportunities for her parents to come to her elementary school and feel a part of her learning.

**Theme Six: Emotions/Unspoken Words**

Conducting these interviews was both rewarding as well as emotionally draining. Too often students would remark, “I’ve never been asked that before,” or “I never thought about that.” All of the students had not been asked to consider their parents in their college experience. As Chicana/o /Latina/o, first-generation transfer students, they often struggled to find their voice, let alone the voice of their parents.

**Closing**

These students shared their stories as counter-narratives to the current nonexistent parental engagement model for Chicana/o /Latina/o students in higher education. Participants believed that their parents weren’t meant to be a part of their college education because of the lack of institutional effort to culturally engage their parents. However, many of them shared that their success in higher education is due to their parents and the participants’ own efforts to engage them in during their higher educational journey. Participants also expressed deep sentiments of appreciation to their parents for the different kinds of support that they have been able to offer.

**References**


Socioeconomic status has been receiving more attention as an identity aspect that influences how students experience higher education. In addition to tuition and fee costs, higher education often has other, optional costs that can create class hierarchies in academia (hooks, 2000) and impact student learning outside the classroom (Barratt, 2011; Martin, 2015). Student affairs educators need to be aware of challenges that low-income students face regarding campus engagement, and they should continue to develop competency around social justice and inclusion, generally, and class issues, specifically.

**Types of Capital**

Bourdieu (1986) is often cited for his research on capitals, including the trio of economic, social, and cultural capitals. Economic capital is the amount of wealth an individual possesses through cash and assets (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Bourdieu, 1986). For a low-income college student, economic capital is likely a combination of grants, scholarships, loans, family assistance (if any), and jobs— all of which are viewed “as a necessity” (Martin, 2015, p. 280–281). Social capital is the connection between one’s group memberships, relationships, networks, and resources (Adams et al., 2007; Bourdieu, 1986); it can lead to opportunities for such experiences as travel, shadowing, internships, and jobs upon graduation (Barratt, 2011). Low-income students tend to arrive on campus with memberships that are not as valued by academia. Cultural capital is the “knowledge and skills of the prestige class” (Barratt, 2011, p. 9). It includes what Bourdieu (1986) references as experience with highbrow activities, including reading specific literature, dining out at “fancy” restaurants, visiting museums, seeing plays, viewing art, and traveling. Cultural capital is often assessed through language choices, clothing, and behaviors around manners and tact (Adams et al., 2007). For low-income students, this often means less familiarity and more discomfort with the higher education environment, its way of life, and its experiential offerings. However, higher education offers opportunities to increase students’ capitals through engagement inside and outside the classroom (Barratt, 2011).

**Aspects of Campus Engagement**

Low-income students face several challenges with campus engagement. They often do not know where to find information or whom to ask (Barratt, 2011), and they have trouble navigating the system and figuring out how to converse with faculty and administrators (Lubrano, 2004). Low-income students also often lack the resources—time, financial, social, and cultural—to seek out forms of campus engagement (Barratt, 2011; Martin, 2015). Some aspects of higher education that can create class hierarchies (hooks, 2000) include residence life and housing, student groups, conferences and institutes, and travel.

Often, the first way students begin to engage on campus is through residence life, but such living and housing options can come at a variety of costs, with price increases for newer buildings and additional amenities. Add a required meal plan and the sticker price may be insurmountable for low-income students.
Low-Income students then face challenges with student group involvement. Whether it is a special-interest organization or club sport, which requires particular gear to participate, or honor societies, fraternities, and sororities—which come with hefty membership fees—the student group experience traditionally comes with some kind of price tag.

Even when students figure out ways to get involved, other informal educational opportunities may be out of reach. Informal learning, through conferences and institutes, occurs on and off campus, and it delivers curriculum on a variety of topics and skills pertinent to a student's academic discipline and/or future profession. Frequently, these opportunities take place during the evening or weekend, when low-income students may have family or work commitments, and have a fee associated with attendance.

In addition to conference travel, many college campuses have an increased focus on globalization and contributing to the greater good, which has resulted in colleges endorsing study abroad or trips to serve with others. This type of travel comes with many costs, including substantial time away from work and family, purchase of transportation and specialty items, medical clearances, and the purchase of a passport.

How Student Affairs Can Assist Low-Income Students
Student affairs educators are called to have competency in social justice and inclusion, including the charge to "create learning environments that foster equitable participation" and to "seek to meet the needs of all groups, equitably distributing resources, [and] raising social consciousness" (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 14). Assisting low-income students in finding ways to engage on campus would allow student affairs educators to practice this competency. Areas to consider include increasing awareness of low-income students on campus; assessing costs associated with programs; varying the time, day, and location of engagement opportunities; and directly marketing to low-income students.

Professionals in the admissions, institutional research, and student affairs assessment areas can often share information regarding student populations. Seek out statistical data on low-income students on campus (e.g., How many students receive Pell Grants or work study? What percentage of students identify as low-income?), then try to learn the stories of how low-income students experience your campus (e.g., What are their biggest challenges? What could help them participate in campus engagement more often?).

Next, assess the budget and how it is supplemented. It is often a common practice to deal with budget issues by passing the cost on to students. Registration and participation fees and dues can be a considerable barrier for low-income students. It may be insightful to sit down with your team and assess the costs associated with student engagement in your functional area and determine what modifications or accommodations you might be able to make to lessen or eliminate barriers based on income.

Acknowledging that all students are paying fees, analyze when events are offered and whether they are marketed to the entire campus community. Many low-income students work heavy hours during nights, weekends, and break times. Consider varying the time, day, and location of the opportunities offered through your functional area to increase the possibility that low-income students could take part. Then, assess the marketing of events. Are only traditional marketing and promotion efforts being used, such as websites, social media, flyers, and T-shirts? Try to figure out new marketing and public relations methods that could reach low-income students; it may be worthwhile to inquire about sending out emails to Pell Grant recipients or students participating in work-study.

Conclusion
Low-income students often face social justice and inclusion issues in their ability to engage on campus, as the costs of these opportunities often overshadow the benefits to their social and cultural capital. Low-income students need student affairs educators to recognize the social justice and inclusion issues they face in higher education and to challenge and support them in opening up more avenues of campus engagement that fit their resources and needs.
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The student affairs profession espouses the goal of holistic student development, of which spirituality is a critical component (Love, 2001; Sandeen, 2004). Though scholars have paid increasing attention to students’ spiritual development, less work has examined student affairs professionals’ spirituality and spiritual practices. A quantitative study that measured student affairs professionals’ self-reported spirituality, integration of spirituality into their work, and predictors of holistic, spiritually-infused practices revealed that some student affairs professionals struggle to integrate spirituality into their actual practices (Kiessling, 2010a). These findings raise two important questions: (1) How might student affairs professionals be effective advocates for integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development? and (2) How can student affairs professionals align spiritual programming with institutional culture and mission to offer students opportunities to learn about spiritual beliefs that are different from their own? With these questions in mind, this article will outline how
Of the 780 student participants, only 24 (3.1%) ranked Religious/Spiritual Activities and Interfaith Activities. This includes the types of activities that SDP offers: General Religious and Spiritual Engagement scale, two subscales activities such as multifaith celebration, programs designed for spiritual engagement as high. The Cocurricular Religious and Spiritual Engagement scale measures participation in spiritual engagement as high, and only 11 students (1.4%) ranked Curricular or Faculty-Led programming and mission alignment with partners and the institution. During the first four years, with assistance from a student intern, SDP sponsored student-focused activities, including overnight interfaith retreats; programs on secularism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Catholicism; trips to local religious sites; photo blogs; faith boards; student belief panel discussions; and a clothing drive.

After two years of implementing the SDP, staff committed to participating in the Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey (CRSCS). The CRSCS “is a theoretically based and empirically validated assessment tool designed to assist campus leaders in creating positive climates that embrace the challenges and realize the possibilities of supporting diverse religious and non-religious worldviews on campus” (Interfaith Youth Core, n.d). Administered in spring 2014, the CRSCS provided a baseline of our students’ experiences (Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Interfaith Youth Core, 2014); just over 780 students (10.5%) completed the survey. These results provided a snapshot of what our students experienced in a broad sense and how they compared to students at 52 other institutions who had taken the survey between 2011 and 2014.

CRSCS results confirmed that our students had few opportunities and reported lower than their counterparts for religious and spiritual engagement or participation in courses, campus programs, or (informally) in out-of-classroom situations. Among the most significant findings were results for two specific factor scales. Based on a 5-point Likert scale, with 4–5 ranked as high, only 11 students (1.4%) ranked Curricular or Faculty-Led Religious and Spiritual Engagement as high, and only 12 students (1.6%) ranked Cocurricular Religious and Spiritual Engagement as high. The Cocurricular Religious and Spiritual Engagement scale measures participation in activities such as multifaith celebration, programs designed to encourage students to discuss issues of life meaning and purpose, and interfaith dialogue. Within the Cocurricular Religious and Spiritual Engagement scale, two subscales include the types of activities that SDP offers: General Religious/Spiritual Activities and Interfaith Activities. Of the 780 student participants, only 24 (3.1%) ranked General Religious/Spiritual Activities high and 10 (1.3%) ranked Interfaith Activities high. These findings confirmed that the challenges faced by SDP were formidable in terms of our students’ experiences and opportunities.

Many educators and researchers have worked to elevate the importance of spirituality in educational contexts (Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Parks, 2008; Tisdell, 2006). The Graduate School Curricula, a study scale that measured the extent to which spirituality topics were included in student affairs professionals' graduate school curricula, indicated that graduate school preparation programs do not typically include concepts of spirituality (Kiessling, 2010b). Respondents reported low emphasis on learning about spirituality in their graduate programs, with 86% reporting never or rarely having taken a graduate course that dealt with religious pluralism, and only 8% reporting a high frequency of attending a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to spirituality. This lack of focus on spiritual development during graduate preparation may leave professionals less prepared to design and implement spiritual development programs, decreasing such program opportunities for college students.

Alignment With Institutional Culture and Mission

As staff, we want to ensure that our work is relevant to students. This section outlines how we strive to infuse SDP efforts with relevance for our students’ experiences. Civility and respect as societal norms are critical needs in a global society wrought with mistrust, misunderstandings, and societal unrest. Recognizing the related nature of civility and diversity has expanded SDP’s vision and resulted in partnering with various campus entities. Our institutional mission places high value on preparing students to live wisely in a diverse and global community. Close attention to institutional culture—including mission, goals, and strategic plans—are coupled with programmatic efforts to provide pertinent opportunities for students. In line with the value of living wisely, we have intentionally embraced notions of helping students live wisely in a global society through recognition of diversity as inclusive of religion, spirituality, race, and nationality (Patel, 2015). This broader vision enhances our ability to work more effectively within the institutional culture to impact students.

In line with preparing individuals to live wisely, over the past year SDP partnered with various areas to enhance greater respect and civility. For example, the president of the institution created a semester theme of civility and invited a prominent scholar to speak on civility and religious freedom. SDP helped promote this program, thus moving forward the overarching goal of SDP while supporting the president and the institutional mission. Other partnerships have included (1) presenting sessions on how to find and link one's mission in life with one's
career at annual academic workshops, and educating students about SDP efforts; (2) advocating for a student prayer room and, through discussion with department directors, securing shared student space; and (3) developing with community religious leaders a religious and cultural holidays calendar to distribute to the university community members.

**Words of Encouragement**

SDP seeks to serve students in an area of learning and development often neglected in higher education. We want to encourage professionals who strive to contribute to this important area. Though our CRSCS findings indicate room for improvement, these results provide valuable perspective on the realities our students face. We recognize the need for increased opportunities for students and the need for more staff professional development related to integrating spirituality into cocurricular programs. One of our upcoming student affairs professional development sessions is about religion and culture; it is titled "We Are a Community of Beliefs."

We are aware that partnerships are essential. As you consider collaborations, be alert to initiatives at your own institution by those who may share similar goals. Our most effective partnerships have been developed by identifying opportunities in which our interests in supporting student spiritual development are aligned with our partners overarching goals, and our efforts are mutually supportive. Partnerships, experimentation, and perseverance, coupled with hope, flexibility, and patience, are key ingredients for serving students in settings with or without foundational structures, dedicated positions, or significant resources.

**References**


Fundraising for Diversity

Fundraising and philanthropy in the 21st century has never been more important to higher education institutions. Private and public colleges alike would not be able to reach their fiscal obligations or curricular goals without the philanthropy dollars that donors provide to supplement tuition and other sources of institutional income. Student affairs has traditionally been less involved in fundraising, but that has changed in the past 10 years. One area in which student affairs had limited philanthropic engagement is addressing identity-based opportunities that can lead to new donors and advocates. Students on campus, with cultural and gender identities, have benefited from student affairs support and services, and these individuals are often overlooked as willing alumni donors.

New Funding Sources

According to Livingston (2012), minorities are traditionally underserved by nonprofits and larger philanthropic institutions in the United States; they are also underrepresented as fundraisers and board members. Higher education is no exception, and the increasing number of racially and ethnically diverse people living in the United States now offers an opportunity to develop new and distinct forms of philanthropy (Pettey, 2001). Identity-based philanthropy is a movement that empowers marginalized communities to organize giving to issues that they deem as most pressing, bringing an emphasis on race, gender, gender identity, religious beliefs, ethnicity, disability, and other identities to the forefront of philanthropy donors and development officers (W. Kellogg Foundation, 2012). Identity-based philanthropy has proven to be a new source of fundraising for nonprofits and educational institutions.

Philanthropy is often defined by the literature through a wealthy-White-male lens (Drezner, 2013). Simply described, traditional fundraising thinks of asking for money only from “rich White males.” A study by the W. Kellogg Foundation (2012) reported an increase in minority communities giving. Sixty-three percent of Latino households now make charitable donations. Nearly two-thirds of African American households donate to organizations and causes, totaling $11 billion each year. With the increased diversity at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) and the changing landscape of diversity across campuses, now is the time for student affairs divisions to think creatively and progressively on maximizing fundraising initiatives.

Target Groups

Since the 1960s, most PWIs have seen an increase in students of color and marginalized communities, and many of those graduates have gone on to be successful in many fields and endeavors. Many alumni of color want to support and be engaged with their alma maters, but it is how they are engaged that matters. Many former alumni of color never gave because they were not asked, or they felt the university did not care about their experience. Each person counts, and student affairs departments have a unique opportunity to align themselves with students of color as well as affinity and identity constituent groups. Those students who attended Black student union meetings, belonged to a Black Greek letter organization, worked with the LGBT pride center, or were part of the campus Latino community may be good candidates for identity-based fundraising.
Strategy
Philanthropy occurs because of common relationships and values within a given culture, resulting in a better society (Wagner, 2016). Student affairs professionals may use campus organizations and collaborations to engage these identity-based groups and alumni. The initiatives in student affairs around fundraising can and should include identity-based fundraising. People may wonder where to begin with identity-based fundraising. Campuses can start with surveying these identity groups, focusing on those that have a large number of alumni. This may be followed with meeting and listening to stories of alumni experiences, meeting with the chief diversity officer to form a partnership, holding a training with advancement services to understand the needs related to fundraising, meeting with staff to know what initiatives alumni and community members would give to, and creating a timeline. Partnering with Career Services to attract corporate entities that have a recruitment goal or mission around diversity may be another strategy. It will take senior leadership in student affairs to be committed to this cause. With budget cuts and many multicultural programs and offices underfunded, identity-based philanthropy is something that can gain support and fill a need within student affairs. For example, at the University of Louisville, the LGBT Center raises over $250,000 a year through a special event called the “Feast on Equality.” This is possible due to a collaboration between offices of Student Affairs and Advancement.

Barriers
Identity-based fundraising is often limited to one person on staff who is from that identity or affinity group but who has other responsibilities, such as a director of multicultural affairs. To be effective, more than one person and all parts of the university must be on board and put the time and effort to prospecting, cultivating, and stewarding possible donors. There is a need to invest in marketing materials, setting a campaign goal, and developing a donor list. The major opportunity for most campuses includes working through the Advancement Office to code students outside of the normal information related to academic discipline or major. Additional coding that students may wish to be identified with includes race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, first-generation college status, or campus leadership involvement. Coding students early, having them self-identify, and keeping track of how former students were involved while they were attending the institution provides the initial connection in developing the donor relationship for a possible gift (De Sawal & Maxwell, 2014).

Conclusion
The demands for unfunded mandates and services in nonacademic areas have pressured many institutions to increase student affairs programs and services without proper funding (Schoenecke, 2005). Identity-based services, events, and programs are faced with reduced funding in an increasingly tenuous higher education funding climate. Fundraising in student affairs around identity-based philanthropy requires the same level of strategy and resource support as any other student service initiative (Meriwether, 2016). By involving current affinity groups and alumni of color, and coding different identities, student affairs can engage another subset of donors and develop a fundraising model that can enhance opportunities for student success and support.
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How many times have we seen students nod along in orientation about the big educational possibilities ahead, only later to see them stalled on steps to declare majors or failing to balance academic and social interests? In this article, we focus on partnership as an ideal strategy to create spaces for reflection and interpersonal connections that improve student success. We believe that these partnerships benefit the student populations served as well as the partners involved.

Building Collaborations
Building collaborations across student and academic affairs remains an evergreen topic in higher education, as evidence confirms the effectiveness of partnerships in helping students integrate learning across all facets of their formal and informal campus experiences (NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education 2004). For example, residential programs and advising services that were organized collaboratively resulted in higher student retention, student-faculty interactions, and student learning, compared to programs without such distinctions (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2010).
Effective partnerships also may be critical to foster student reflection and “self-authorship”—particularly since student affairs professionals actively support students in clarifying and acting from internally examined values rather than unconscious directions from others (Baxter Magolda, 2008, pp. 270–271). Partnerships also facilitate a type of group authoring in which values and common purpose are crystallized through reflection and shared knowledge. For example, members in an International Transitions Committee at University of California Irvine brought their shared expertise to support a common goal: bring resources together seamlessly for entering international students. This resulted in a “one-stop shop” model of information for students, and the team earned NASPA honors (Excellence Bronze award - 2013) for this successful collaboration.

Partnership skills also promote professional competencies that are deemed essential for student affairs practitioners, particularly to foster student learning, social justice, leadership, and assessment of progress in these areas (NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015). For example, partners who work to promote student learning, justice understanding, leadership development, or assessment often benefit from the signature practices of reflection and collaboration used in these respective domains; these practices strengthen the group’s abilities to collectively envision common goals and attain desired student, organizational, and societal changes.

**The Big Idea of Student Success With Reflective Partners**

The 2017 NASPA conference theme encourages members to “go big” across several areas; ensuring students’ overall success, persistence, and completion remains among the biggest ideas in education. While success often is measured by institutional metrics that include degree completion rates and other information, a big idea now and in the future may be to add considerations about partnership work. Measuring the unique ways that partnerships contribute to campus goals—e.g., the extensive number of partners who bring diverse resources to support common goals—may make visible the often intangible processes in place to support students. Specifically, partnerships may best illustrate Tinto’s (1993) key principle for academic integration by showing “institutional commitment to students” (p. 146).

**Partnerships Also Promote Deeper Learning**

Kuh (2008) noted that high-impact practices deepen faculty, staff, and student interactions, and student learning applied to new situations, and these findings can guide understanding about how practitioners and faculty model high-impact partnerships. If the quality of interactions and knowledge applied to new experiences deepens learning, then partnerships should continually broaden capacities to address student issues innovatively. Important shifts have occurred in higher education; educational strategies are moving from teaching focused solely to instruct to teaching intended to motivate creativity and integration (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Partnership work sets explicit expectations that are attuned to these needs for learner engagement. Learning takes place flexibly in and beyond formal classrooms, with partners actively engaging in order to attain goals and to understand the complexities of a whole range of student experiences.

**Overcoming Challenges**

Although the aforementioned big ideas may seem obvious as goals for higher education, they have not been achieved nationally. Educators have only recently started to explore the full potential behind Kuh’s (2008) high-impact practices, as these individuals are largely limited by structural, budgetary, and philosophical silos that partition learning in selected spaces. However, collaborative approaches may help to address some of the daunting challenges associated with enhancing student success and engagement.

Creating seamless learning environments has proven to be among the greatest challenges to support students. Distinctive philosophies and roles across academic and student affairs create silos that limit partnership work and real student opportunities for personal growth and learning connections (O’Connor, 2012). To foster learning integration, faculty and staff collaborators need to determine the types of purposeful, learning-through-action opportunities to ensure meaningful student engagement (Kuh, 2008; NASPA & ACPA, 2004).

As frustrating as it is having students learning in disconnected, unaligned ways, it is undoubtedly worse to have little information or assessment data to gauge what students learn in campus spaces. Research is needed to understand actual proficiencies that are demonstrated as a result of classroom and other learning interactions (Barr & Tagg, 1995). It is encouraging that approximately 84% of administrative representatives from over 1,200 institutions of higher education report their development of student learning outcomes, but a bit disheartening to see little use of this rich information for internal planning or other institutional efforts (Kuh, Jankowski, Ikenberry, & Kinzie, 2014, p. 44). There is clear interest in understanding what students learn during the college years but limited work in partnership to consider assessment results and examine evidence holistically. These are aspects that help support organizational and student improvements.

**Priming for Big Opportunities**

In the coming years, higher education will welcome increasingly diverse students and will require more nuanced understanding of all the learning opportunities available to promote success, engagement, and integrated learning and life skills. Historically, student affairs
practitioners and faculty are positioned from partnership practices to bridge student learning gaps by promoting real-world and complementary learning spaces (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). However, fostering partnerships requires explicit planning and institutional priorities to view learning and educational endeavors holistically (Eickmann, 1989).

As we continue to embrace big ideas about student learning and success for the future, academic and student affairs partnerships provide strategies and professional development opportunities to create substantive change for all engaged.
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To effectively support our students in identifying future possibilities that align with who they are and what they feel passionately about, career development must be a holistic, four-year process. That process, while led by the career center, must be embedded in all aspects of campus life. To support this kind of career development, it is critical to adopt a comprehensive approach that shifts our focus from a transactional “find a job on the way out” mentality to one where all students—from those enrolled in art history to those enrolled in computer science—have opportunities to explore who they are and how that affects their future pursuits. A developmentally-structured outcomes framework for effectively integrating career development across the student experience can support campus efforts to reimagine the transition from college to career.

The Role of Development in Careers
Employers emphasize the importance of new hires who can think critically, communicate effectively, manage ambiguity, have a strong sense of self and an appreciation for difference, and collaborate across difference (Hart Research Associates, 2013; Jobs Outlook, 2016). This shift in thinking represents a developmental change that can occur with the right support mechanisms, learning processes, and partnerships (Baxter Magolda, 2004). To promote this development and to support graduates who embody the qualities employers seek, institutions should consider building a holistic, developmental approach to career exploration. Departments such as orientation and first-year programs, residence life, student activities, and others with significant student engagement opportunities are key partners in promoting this type of developmental shift and in helping students understand how to effectively translate what they learned throughout college into a future career.

Integrating Career Development Across the Student Experience
Research on learning environments that promote holistic development suggests that partnering with students and challenging them to critically examine what they believe, who they are, and what they know can support these developmental shifts (Baxter Magolda, 2004). The Developmental Leadership Outcomes Framework, originally built from research that demonstrated a need to structure learning outcomes in a scaffolded way (Christman, 2013) can support career development efforts that are more holistic. The framework consists of four phases: exposure (learning about something for the first time), exploration (critically considering multiple ideas about a concept or idea), ownership (deciding one’s own thoughts about ideas), and synthesis (integrating ideas about own values, beliefs, or understanding with career) (Baxter Magolda, Cardone, Christman, & Zylstra, 2009; Christman 2013). This framework encourages students to explore ideas, decide for themselves about those ideas, and integrate them into their work. To support career development, student affairs professionals can leverage this framework when constructing approaches to working with students—regardless of our functional area and regardless of their majors.

Career Outcome One: Exposure to Possibilities
Exposing students to the hundreds of career possibilities that exist is central to this first phase. This means helping students uncover who they are and how they enjoy working as well as showing students future career pathways as a way to introduce them to new ideas and possibilities. Simply providing opportunities and activities for students early in their campus experience is not enough; practitioners, regardless of function, must support opportunities for students to be exposed to new possibilities for their futures. This can happen through engaging alumni to talk to students about their career paths through campus programs, taking students to visit
different kinds of work environments that also connect to their majors, or using social media channels like Snapchat to have employers show students what it is like to work for their organization. This can be further supported by providing space for students to intentionally map a campus experience that connects their learning and career interests with campus curricular and co-curricular experiences. When this happens in conjunction with exposing students more broadly to future career paths, educators can help students hone in on things that can also support preparing them more intentionally for their futures. In other words, if a student is exposed to a future career in teaching, marketing, and lobbying, that student could look for similarities in the skill sets needed for those career paths and start to map how, through campus experiences, those skills may be developed.

Outcome Two: Exploration
A key component of supporting holistic development is helping students explore multiple ways of seeing the world (Baxter Magolda, 2004; Christman 2013). This can be applied to career development through helping students see their strengths play out in the world. For example, a student may go to college certain she wants to major in business. When asked what made her choose business, that student may respond with, “My dad is in business and he likes it.” The student cannot articulate why because she has not truly explored what this means. Through intentional opportunities for exploration—through job shadowing opportunities, networking with alumni, or immersion programs that help students connect coursework with career possibilities—the student will start thinking about what it means for her to work in business, the kinds of environments in which she might find herself, and how that aligns with her values. Ultimately, what matters most is that students can make a decision about a career path that is informed and self-directed. In the exploration phase, student affairs professionals must help students examine the different kinds of environments that exist, how they relate to those environments, and what it means for their future (Christman, 2013).

Outcome Three: Ownership
Students who take ownership over their futures critically examine their opportunities, consider how they align with personal values and interests, and act on what they discover. In the example of the student who came in to college wanting to major in business, exposure to new possibilities and opportunities may lead her to decide to work for a nonprofit or small family organization, rather than a large, Fortune 500 company. What is most important here is that the student has made a decision based on her own needs and interests. This can support students’ confidence in their career choices.

Outcome Four: Synthesis
The synthesis phase is the culmination of all of the previous phases. Students who have fully explored who they are, the possibilities for their future, and the value in their careers will ultimately bring all those things together in a profession. The ability to live authentically and in a manner congruent with their beliefs within a work environment is characteristic of the synthesis phase.

Everyone’s Big Opportunity to Play a Role
The entire campus can play a role in supporting these holistic career outcomes. Whether it is with student staff, student leaders, or service learning immersions or through teaching a course, each person on campus can play a role by asking key questions to scaffold students’ development along each of these phases. Creating opportunities for students to reflect on not just what they are doing now but how it connects to their futures can play a pivotal role in the career development process.
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College and university counseling center administrators cite anxiety and depression as the most common concerns students have when seeking help from university counseling services (Reetz, Krylowicz, & Mistler, 2014). Although the two conditions are distinct, studies show that there is a great deal of overlap in their symptoms and diagnoses (Eisenberg, Golberstein, & Hunt, 2009). Data from a national survey of college students provide evidence of this high rate of comorbidity: 31% of respondents reported that in the past 12 months, they had been so depressed it was difficult to function; 50% reported feeling overwhelming anxiety during the same period; and over 50% of those who reported suffering from anxiety also reported suffering from depression (Davoren & Hwang, 2014).
Student-athletes cite mental health and wellness as their primary health and safety concerns (Hainline, 2014). With more than 460,000 student-athletes competing for National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) institutions each year, it is important to understand how their mental health needs may coincide with or differ from their non-athlete peers. Much of the current research comparing student-athlete and non-athlete mental health is mixed. Some studies report lower levels of mental health concerns among student-athletes when compared with their non-athlete counterparts (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009); others report student-athletes are at an increased risk for depression or anxiety (Wolanin, Gross, & Hong, 2015). Many of these studies, however, use relatively small samples from a limited number of institutions. Using a larger sample of college students—student-athletes and non-athletes included—Davoren and Hwang (2014) found that after controlling for demographic variables, including gender, race, sexual orientation, and transfer student status, student-athletes were less likely than their non-athlete peers to report experiencing symptoms of depression or anxiety.

The American College Health Association’s National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) allows for a comparison of student-athletes and non-athletes on a large, national scale. Data were collected between 2008 and 2014, and include over 200,000 full-time college students (10% of whom reported participation in a varsity sport) attending four-year institutions. Student-athletes do report experiencing both depression and anxiety but are statistically less likely to report experiences of either when compared with college students who are not varsity athletes (see Table 1).

While athletics participation may act as a protective barrier for some, it by no means insulates student-athletes from mental illness. Those student-athletes who do report struggling with anxiety or depression are more likely than student-athletes without the same mental health concerns to engage in substance use and other risky behavior, and they report that their struggles have a direct effect on their academic work. With so few student-athletes receiving professional help, there is an opportunity for athletics personnel, faculty, and campus administrators to encourage student-athletes to find and use the resources that are available to them.

Among college students, depression and anxiety are related to difficulties with relationships (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009), problems sleeping (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009), increased frequency of alcohol consumption (Weitzman, 2004), non-medical prescription drug use (Weyandt et al., 2009), risky behavior while drinking (Martens et al., 2008), and academic difficulties (Eisenberg, Golberstein, & Hunt, 2009).

The data presented below, using a student-athlete-only sample from the ACHA-NCHA surveys, support these findings from a student-athlete population.

- Student-athletes who reported feelings of depression and anxiety were more than twice as likely to report that intimate relationships had been difficult to handle in the last 12 months, when compared with their student-athlete peers who did not report feelings of depression or anxiety.

- Student-athletes with mental health concerns reported significantly greater problems with sleep difficulties in the past 12 months and significantly less quality sleep in the past seven days when compared with student-athletes who did not report having mental health concerns.

- Both depression and anxiety were linked to a greater likelihood of alcohol consumption in the past 30 days among female student-athletes, and anxiety alone was linked to a greater likelihood of alcohol consumption among male student-athletes. There was no evidence, however, linking depression and anxiety to an increase in binge drinking (defined as five or more drinks in a sitting) in the past two weeks (see Table 2).

- Student-athletes who reported experiencing symptoms of depression or anxiety were more likely than their student-athlete peers without the same mental health concerns to report using prescription drugs without a prescription in the past 12 months (see Table 2).

- Student-athletes who reported experiencing symptoms of depression or anxiety also reported experiencing nearly 50% more negative consequences while drinking, when compared with a student-athlete population not suffering with depression or anxiety. Among these consequences are doing something they later regret, forgetting what they did, engaging in risky sexual behavior, and contemplating self-harm. For example, 24% of depressed student-athletes have reported engaging in unprotected sex in the past year while drinking, compared with 17% of those not suffering from depression.

- Thirty-one percent of student-athletes with anxiety and 27% of student-athletes with depression say that they believe these mental health concerns have had a direct negative effect on their academic work.

While both student-athletes and non-athletes freely report experiencing struggles with mental health concerns as well as substance use and problematic academic work, comparatively few in both groups actively seek mental health help. The ACHA-NCHA data indicate that student-athletes and non-athletes are fairly similar in their reports of currently seeking help and in their reported willingness to potentially seek help in the future. When comparing
just those students who reported feelings of depression in the past 12 months, 22% of student-athletes received an official diagnosis and/or treatment, compared with roughly 26% of non-athletes. Neither student-athletes nor non-athletes, however, are averse to the idea of seeking help, at least in theory. Using the same ACHA-NCHA data, two-thirds of student-athletes overall reported that they would consider seeking help from a mental health professional in the future, compared with 71% of non-athletes.

Student-athlete mental well-being reaches far beyond the topics discussed here and includes body image and disordered eating, suicide ideation, gambling, education-impacting disabilities, and athletics retirement among others. There are resources available to assist campuses in their efforts to encourage student-athletes to seek mental health help, to destigmatize help-seeking behavior, and to provide best practices in working with student-athletes who do present with mental health concerns. Several of these resources have emerged from the NCAA Innovations in Research and Practice Grant Program, which was designed to support research aimed at furthering student-athlete well-being. These resources include an interactive website that educates student-athletes on making mental health referrals (www.supportforsport.org) and a University of Michigan program focused on destigmatizing mental health needs and increasing awareness around mental well-being (http://athletesconnected.umich.edu). These resources are available to all campuses. In addition, the NCAA Sport Science Institute published Mind, Body and Sport: Understanding and Supporting Student-Athlete Mental Wellness (2014), which became the foundation for a consensus document titled: Inter-Association Consensus Document: Best Practices for Understanding and Supporting Student-Athlete Mental Wellness (2016).

This document contains four overarching best practices for identifying and managing student-athlete mental well-being, including:

1. Formal care should be provided by a licensed practitioner with "cultural competency relevant to providing care to both a college-age population and to athletes" (p. 7).

2. All institutions should have a written Mental Health Emergency Action Management Plan that includes information on managing certain high-risk situations (e.g., suicidal and other threatening behavior) as well as a written Routine Mental Health Referral Plan. Both plans should include information on providing training to key personnel on the signs and symptoms of mental health disorders.

3. Institutions should consider adding mental health screening to their pre-participation examinations. Suggestions for instruments are included in the publication.

4. Institutions should provide educational programming to key individuals with whom the student-athletes are in frequent contact, including peer athletes, faculty athletics representatives, and coaches. The programming should include information on identifying mental health disorders and addressing mental health concerns, and on developing a culture of self-care.

Athletics in college carries with it unique stressors not felt by non-athlete peers, including the time demands of sports, navigating athlete and student identity, pressures to perform athletically, etc. It also, however, provides the potential for an enhanced support system from both peers and coaches. As previously mentioned, student-athletes report in comparatively lower numbers than non-athletes that they suffer from the mental health concerns of depression and anxiety; they also, however, are less likely to seek help when facing mental health problems. Educating student-athletes on self-care and how to recognize mental health concerns in others, destigmatizing help-seeking behavior, and developing a collaborative institutional plan for working with student-athletes who are suffering from mental health concerns or disorders are important ways that institutions can address student-athlete mental well-being.
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Table 1

| ACHA-NCHA Data for Prevalence of Depression and Anxiety by Gender and Athlete Status |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Males                           | Females                          |
|                                  | Student-Athlete | Non-Athlete | χ²   | Student-Athlete | Non-Athlete | χ²   |
| Feelings of depression in the past 12 months | 21%   | 27%    | 151.83 | 27%   | 34%    | 210.78 |
| Feeling of anxiety in the past 12 months     | 32%   | 41%    | 226.05 | 49%   | 57%    | 276.56 |

Note. Because gender is highly related to both depression and anxiety (Eisenberg, Golberstein, & Hunt, 2009), results are separated by sex. All within gender differences are statistically significant, p < .01.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHA-NCHA Data for Relationship Between Depression/Anxiety and Substance Use Among Student-Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol consumption past 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking past two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmedical use of prescription drugs past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol consumption past 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking past two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmedical use of prescription drugs past 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates a statistically significant within gender difference, p < .01.
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Teaching leadership is a contact sport that requires skill, understanding, and some andragogy (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005). This article will discuss the prevalence and importance of programs/programming in leadership development on campus. In a survey of student affairs job descriptions, 70% of the randomly selected postings called for some program/programming knowledge in order to be considered (Whitney & Smith, 2014). Programs are the connective tissue of student engagement and learning: “Programmatic intervention is a planned activity with individuals or student groups that is theoretically based and has as its intent the promotion of personal development and learning” (Saunders & Cooper, 2001, p. 310). Programs/programming are how we contribute to the campus curriculum; they are the primary methods for applying student development theory to practice (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Contributing to student learning requires attention to the design of the learning experiences, which includes an assessment of learning (Fried, 2012).
Program development within student affairs leadership education is congruent with the professional competencies (NASPA & ACPA, 2015). The competencies of Leadership, Student Learning and Development, and Advising and Support are all addressed in program development. The words leadership and program seem to have multiple definitions within the literature. Common attributes describe programs as theoretically-based activities, series, events, and learning experiences that contribute to the goals of the institution/division/programmatic area. In short, programs are planned (e.g., tasks, descriptions, structures, interventions, and activities) to address identified needs (e.g., for action, for students, toward a goal, for learning and development).

Program Management Model
In student affairs literature, the first program development model appears in 1973; over the past 43 years there have been revisions and additions to that original cube model. Haber (2011) renews the look at the cube model with the formal leadership program model providing a way to contextualize programs holistically. This model takes an overall look at students, strategies, and structure.

Moving from beginning to end is important in program development, with many steps in between. For many student affairs professionals, the craft of programming almost seems a natural skill, so the activities incorporating all activities building up to the day of can be taken for granted. The model presented has been created by mapping all student affairs program models into a more contemporary approach: project management. Project management as a discipline and as an approach to work starts with the initial concept and moves to the end. This end is well beyond the day of the event; it includes functions like thank-you notes, reports, financial matters, the analysis of learning outcomes, and even pre-planning for the next program.

The word management in the title of the model is purposeful, especially in light of the special audience of leadership educators. Contemporary definitions of leadership are centered on leadership as something we do with others. Management, on the other hand, is something we do to others and things. With regard to program development, the management of activities is key to the movement from start to finish. Leadership addresses the relationship of the collaborators moving back and forth within the roles of leaders and followers as expertise and function come into play. The steps of the program management model include:

- **Program Definition** – initial concepts, needs assessment, theoretical framework, planning team
- **Program Planning** – learning outcomes, budget, calendar, marketing, communications, space, risk management
- **Program Execution** – deliverables, implement assessment plan, staffing, final checks, day of
- **Program Monitoring** – Plans A, B, C, etc., program control, risk management, the unplanned/unanticipated situations
- **Program Close-Out** – after-action report, money issues, contract closeout, recognition, assessment loop, reporting, and future administrative plans

This project management approach to the entirety of program development/delivery helps to ensure the quality of the program. By operationalizing these functions that we, as student affairs professionals/educators, do regularly, we can use this method to teach our students the ways of our world. These steps address the concerns of the NASPA & ACPA (2015) Professional Competencies to “lay out essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions” (p. 7) at all three levels.

Theory and Action
The program management model enhances esoteric project management by incorporating the use of college student development theory within the basic foundation of campus-based programs. These theories help us to contextualize this work. Using a theory, we can better address our assessment plans as well as our andragogy (i.e., in adult learning, the use of andragogy versus pedagogy is purposeful, because college students are considered adults). Whether one would consider him- or herself as more of a theory person or an action person is addressed in Assessment Reconsidered (Keeling, Wall, Underhile, & Dungy, 2001); there, the authors remind us that theory and action are one in the same. We are using theory—and action—either by design or default.

Assessment
Student affairs practitioners’ and leadership educators’ contributions to the curriculum on any campus are important (Fried, 2012). Assessment is vital for our leadership programs, student affairs programs, and academic programs (Suskie, 2009). By understanding the experiential learning that happens within our leadership development programs, we can demonstrate how our work can tie into the curriculum and the lives of our students. Corey Seemiller (2014) has done a lot of work to help us become more intentional about designing programs. Her work on competencies and resources to connect leadership within any academic accreditation standards is a gold mine in terms of cross-campus connections. Connecting the expertise of student affairs with a partnership with academic faculty can also improve delivery and the connections with the students and the curriculum.
Close-Out
Broadening and deepening our roles and functions as educators add to the common identity of our campus and our work in student affairs. By attending to our programming through intentional development, we professionalize our work and approach. Implementing a plan based on the foundations of college student development and leadership theories demonstrates their place in the action and experience of learning and living. The understanding of theories contributes to our expertise. Finally, modeling assessment practices is twofold: it is one of our professional competencies and it is the data in data-based decision making. Program development is a skill of many student affairs professionals; attention to how we pass this acumen from seasoned professional to entry level is important.
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As we navigate the complex world of student engagement, we are often faced with the challenge of connecting our students’ passions and areas of study with campus initiatives that inspire, encourage, and foster development. With the wants and needs of incoming students constantly evolving, an institution’s sustainability efforts have become an increasingly crucial factor in a student’s choice of college (O’Toole, 2015). So how do we focus on sustainability in order to establish a culture of dialogue surrounding environmental, economic, and social justice?

This article seeks to encourage innovative practices that bring sustainability to the forefront of student engagement and that expand upon a previous presentation by Shea Alevy and Lindsay Luzania: “Sustainability and Self-Authorship: A Contemporary Approach to Student Engagement” (2016).

Sustainability explores how to meet the “needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 8). In addition, sustainability was identified as one of three “threads” that are woven into most of the competency areas in the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners (ACPA/NASPA, 2010, p.5). Recognizing the environmental, social, and economic elements of sustainability helps to provide a comprehensive platform from which student passions can be leveraged.

By utilizing the interdisciplinary nature of sustainability, Baxter Magolda’s Self-Authorship Theory (2004), and a national survey of student engagement (O’Toole, 2015), student affairs professionals can bring purpose and impact to the social agency of our student populations. A crucial goal in the effort to encourage sustainable activism is to engage students in exciting campus sustainability initiatives or individual projects that can take advantage of individual passions. Recent data suggest that sustainability programming can capitalize on the desires of student populations as civic engagement and environmental conservation become increasingly popular movements among college students. The Princeton Review’s 2015 College Hopes & Worries Survey found a campus’ sustainability efforts to consistently be in the top five factors that incoming college students consider when deciding on a college (O’Toole, 2015).
these trends of student preferences and applicable theory surrounding student development, our programming efforts have the opportunity to foster environments where students can identify their own beliefs, recognize how they relate to sustainable practices, and learn about the organizations or initiatives that will allow them to turn their values into action.

Theory to Practice
When given the opportunity to engage in a meaningful dialogue with a student—be it during a student organization event, academic advising appointment, conduct meeting, or any other form of student interaction—Baxter Magolda’s Self-Authorship Theory (2004) has proven to be a useful tool when identifying how a student can approach sustainable activism. To provide a summary, this theory sequences student development with four phases: a student follows formulas or knowledge obtained from other sources, moves to the recognition of a need to establish their own beliefs, establishes their own values, and finally solidifies their identity through congruent actions (Baxter Magolda, 2004). Self-authorship also segments the areas of student development into three sections: cognitive development (how students reach their idea of the truth), intrapersonal development (how students establish their identities), and interpersonal development (how students construct relationships) (Baxter Magolda, 2004). Strategies to facilitate these discussions include validating the student’s capacity to understand, creating an environment for the student to learn, mutually constructing meaning, and exploring opportunities for further application (Kiteau, 2010). One example of applying student passions to sustainable activism could be a student who is passionate about photography. He claims to care about sustainability and is a very charismatic individual but does not believe his skill set is conducive to creating change in the field of sustainability. He believes it is solely the physical scientists and politicians who are influential in the sustainability movement. How do you encourage this student to leverage his skill set to create an impact in the community and among his peers?

You could start by encouraging him to think of how individuals are not solely persuaded by scientific and political research and discourse; they are also persuaded by the inherent impact and symbolism of visual media and images (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). In fact, given the increased presence of social media and digital marketing, photography and visual arts may provoke a sequence of emotions that are otherwise unreachable through traditional text and verbal forms of communication (Harper, 2002). These strategies capitalize on the interpersonal development area of self-authorship and challenge the way a student may feel about building relationships with others and how our society may create connections to the work of public figures, scientists, artists, and activists. This interaction could lead to a recommendation for this student to personally explore the emotions provoked by images in sustainability-focused publications or even take on a visual arts project that can call attention to a social, environmental, or economic cause about which he is passionate.

Moving Forward
Although this article provides limited theory and examples of connecting student passions to sustainable activism, it can provide a crucial starting point when thinking about ways to engage students who may not be inclined to participate in sustainability events or go out of their way to serve as change agents for environmental, social, or economic justice. As more information becomes available to us about technological advances, natural disasters, and many other elements of sustainability in our world, it is imperative that we channel our efforts toward communicating the impact of these discoveries and encouraging our students to make a difference.

It is critical to recognize that all students, regardless of their interests, can be stakeholders in bringing clarity, momentum, and vibrancy to the sustainability movement as we strive to make our world a better place to live. As student affairs professionals and educators, we have a tremendous role in shaping the experience of our students. When we think about the effect of our work, we can have an exponential impact on our society for generations to come, and there is no greater calling than that.
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Student affairs professionals can no longer afford to consider information technology (IT) anything other than a strategic resource for the provision of student services and programs. NASPA and ACPA have made this clear for the profession through the inclusion of Technology as one of the 10 Professional Competency areas. As they would with the other competencies, professionals throughout all student affairs areas should evolve their technology use and application as a shared responsibility with our IT colleagues. This article provides recommendations for several key groups within student affairs.

New Professionals
As IT increasingly plays a key role in student affairs, new professionals should reflect on how graduate programs prepared them for their current roles within the academy. As part of this reflection, consider the knowledge about technology you learned formally. Regardless of how much knowledge that is, the Technology Competency calls for student affairs practitioners to gain the “knowledge, skills, and dispositions that lead to the generation of digital literacy and digital citizenship within communities of students, student affairs professionals, faculty members, and colleges and universities” (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 32). Within the first three years of employment, new professionals should consider how their departments offer professional development opportunities that contribute to their IT skills.

New professionals should also consider the following:

- How might your department or particular functional area use technology to meet the needs of students and fulfill your departmental and divisional goals?

- How can you use technology to interact with fellow colleagues and students within your assistantship or first full-time position after graduation?
Without a basic understanding of how technology intersects with student affairs, we may fall short of the professional competencies that undergird our practice. While student affairs graduate programs are called to prepare their students for the ubiquity of IT demands in the workplace, graduate students and new professionals must also hold themselves accountable for keeping up to date with best practices.

Information Technology Professionals in Student Affairs

Information technology–related positions are now found throughout student affairs, both in the form of IT operational units that exclusively serve student affairs, as well as others who “wear the IT hat” to represent their units’ technology needs. In both cases, the key is to achieve an understanding of the issues facing each group in order to reach the collaborative tipping point. The tech team and the student affairs team must trust each other’s collective expertise and deliberately choose to find the optimal balance of “functional” and “technical” for the solutions needed to support unit operations.

For those who are part of IT areas that serve student affairs, it is important that staff understand and appreciate the mission, goals, and objectives of individual units as well as those of the collective student affairs division. Does this mean that your web developers have to be able to quote Chickering’s vectors? Probably not, but it is recommended for any technologist to embrace the general concepts that drive student affairs practice and, more practically, their unit’s business operations. For example, weaving Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) and other student affairs theory into facilitated discussions with IT may improve how to support those units. Also, ensure that IT staff members are considered part of the overall student affairs team; encourage them to participate in the same activities, including professional development, strategic planning, and student engagement.

Mid-level Professionals

Given the many technological and communicative touchpoints students have with our areas, the integration of IT practices into student affairs work is a key responsibility for mid-level professionals (who are defined for the purposes of this article as assistant, associate, or full directors with both supervisory and budgetary responsibility). Cabellon (2016) recommends that these individuals grow their work capacity by exploring how their respective programs and services could include technology to reach a broader audience.

Mid-level professionals should consider:

- How can we use technology to deliver programs or services?
- How do we connect the data we collect to the university’s central student information system?
- How do we allocate budgets to support our departmental use of technology to inspire innovative practice?

Student affairs and IT colleagues should catalyze ongoing campus change by including technology as a layer or stand-alone topic as part of any cocurricular efforts, grounding these efforts in existing literature. For example, staff from student leadership programs (Ahlquist, 2015) might elect to use electronic portfolios as reflective tools (Bresciani, 2006; Dalton, 2007) or as catalysts for civic engagement (Gismondi, 2015). As more mid-level professionals enhance their digital mindsets, the greater chance the university has more opportunities to connect and engage with its students.

Senior-Level Professionals

For senior-level student affairs professionals, the idea of an IT Competency can be daunting. After all, many of the senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) in the field were not brought up with technology, so understanding its relevance and use is something that must be worked at to be fully understood. In his Leadership Exchange article, Joe Sabado states that SSAOs “must provide transformative leadership and the necessary oversight to ensure their organizations are taking full advantage of technology investments, while appropriately balancing risks” (2015, p. 23). The leadership role, then, is one in which the leader fundamentally creates an environment that embraces technology. Through strategic plans, actions, policies, and initiatives, divisional leaders can prioritize the importance of digital technology competence for staff and programs at all levels.

In order to achieve the outcomes outlined in the NASPA and ACPA competencies, SSAOs should educate themselves about the impact technology has on students and staff; better understand the role technology not only can, but should, play in our field; and provide leadership and oversight to those in their organizations in order to incorporate and leverage technology in all aspects of student affairs work. This is a positive disruption in our field; it is up to the leaders (SSAOs) to fully embrace it, enhance our digital fluency, and ensure that our divisional priorities incorporate technology in any long-range plans (Kolomitz & Cabellon, 2016).
Conclusion

Student affairs professionals must deliberately evolve their understanding and use of technology at all phases of their careers and at all levels throughout the profession. The integration of technology into operations is a shared responsibility of both IT and student affairs. By investing in technology as a resource to be leveraged in all areas of student services and programs, we may gain a deeper knowledge of technology’s potential to recruit, engage, and graduate our students.
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Maya fidgeted in her chair as she contemplated the question from my interview protocol: “What is it like to be undocumented on this campus?” Her long exhale was followed by an emotional response: “It’s really difficult for me. I don’t know who I can talk to about my status, and feel invisible.”

Maya’s response echoes a common sentiment felt by undocumented students across many college campuses. Currently, there are about 11.3 million undocumented immigrants living in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2015). Approximately 15% of them are youth under the age of 18 who have received much of their K–12 education in this country (Gonzales, 2007). Every year, 65,000 undocumented students graduate from high school, but only 13,000 pursue a postsecondary education (Contreras, 2009). College access for undocumented students is met with a myriad of challenges, ranging from a lack of guidance from high school counselors to shouldering the cost of higher education without the assistance of federal financial aid (Contreras, 2009; Flores, 2010; Garcia & Tierney, 2011; Gonzales, 2016; Muñoz, 2013).

As colleges and universities in the United States continue to enroll undocumented students, institutions must develop inclusive policies and practices to ensure that undocumented students graduate from college in larger numbers. Until federal policies change, faculty and college administrators should be responsible for assessing how to support the undocumented student population at their campuses; they should not place the responsibility on the students and their families. This article provides an overview of four considerations related to the experiences of undocumented students, with corresponding institutional practices that campus administrators and faculty could implement to better support this student population.
Creating Inclusive Campus Environments
While having an inclusive campus environment helps all students thrive academically and socially, it is important to recognize the particular needs of undocumented students and how a hostile campus environment may further marginalize this population. Some colleges and universities may have an overall institutional commitment to serving students around racial, socioeconomic, and gender diversity but often disregard legality as an area of need. When asked about undocumented students, community college educators who participated in Jauregui and Slate’s (2009) study “felt institutions were not doing enough and more support could be provided” (p. 199). Faculty and administrators can work together intentionally to ensure that undocumented students and their families, despite their immigration status, feel welcomed into all spaces on campus. Creating task forces to assess and specifically address barriers and challenges that undocumented students encounter can serve as a first step toward fostering a more inclusive campus environment. Representation from offices such as financial aid, admissions, legal services, and the counseling center are most prudent for these task forces.

Understanding the Disclosure Process
Some undocumented students choose to be open and public about their immigration status, while some others find it difficult to share for various reasons (e.g., social context, stigma, personal trauma, or campus climate). One study (Muñoz, 2013) reveals that undocumented students often lie about their status to school personnel or avoid speaking about their undocumented identity. These practices are part of the coping skills undocumented students employ to go through college, but they lead to high levels of stress and anxiety. Research on undocumented youth activists suggests that disclosure of legal status can be an empowering and an educational tool for students—one that is usually facilitated through peer solidarity groups (Muñoz, 2015, 2016; Nicholls, 2013; Seif, 2011). On occasion, undocumented students are able to identify at least one institutional staff member whom they trust and who can help them throughout their academic journeys (Cervantes, Minero, & Brito, 2015).

Faculty and university administrators should keep in mind that the disclosure process is unique for each undocumented student. State, local, and institutional contexts can play a crucial role in whether a student chooses to disclose. For undocumented students, if disclosing their legal status to a campus entity or person is met with ambivalence or the person lacks the knowledge to support undocumented students, then they are unlikely to return to that particular office or person. The lack of institutionalized awareness of undocumented students contributes to students’ hesitation to disclose their legal status. College and universities should consider ways to build solidarity groups among undocumented students—not only as a mechanism to gain and exchange knowledge among fellow peers, but also as a way to establish a supportive presence on college campuses. Institutions can visibly show support and solidarity for undocumented students by participating in United We Dream’s national coming-out day (United We Dream, 2016). It is important to note that not all undocumented students will be comfortable talking about their legal status, but college and universities do need to provide space for those dialogues to transpire.

Educating Administrators on How to Work With Undocumented Students
It is concerning that administrators, staff, and faculty do not know about the needs and experiences of undocumented students, especially when administrators can be influential in students’ college trajectories (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Literature indicates that finding a supportive person within the institution is often a “hit or miss” scenario (Pérez & Rodríguez, 2011). When undocumented students receive inaccurate information from administrators, they may experience additional stress, potential financial constraints, or other negative consequences (García & Tierney, 2011). To better support undocumented students, college administrators should attend trainings on undocumented students as an entire unit or department; moreover, these trainings should be part of college-wide onboarding processes. Through these practices, universities can move beyond having one designated individual as the sole holder of this knowledge and minimize the risk of losing that knowledge if that person leaves the institution.

Navigating State Policy
In-state tuition policies vary across the nation. California and New Mexico, for instance, provide state aid as well as in-state tuition, while Arizona and Virginia offer only in-state tuition for students who have a Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) work permit. On the other end of the spectrum, Georgia and Montana have passed legislation that bans undocumented students from enrollment. While the state of California has witnessed a surge in resource centers for undocumented students within the University of California system, campus climate issues with regard to equity and resource distribution continue to be a challenge (M. So, personal communication, June 2, 2016). Given these tuition and state aid variations, college administrators should monitor such policies in their state and critically examine how these policies affect how undocumented students are served.

Conclusion
Given the outcome of the recent elections, higher education institutions can no longer stay silent about supporting undocumented students. The threat of deportation and the removal of DACA will have a devastating impact on the educational attainment for undocumented students. Creating an institutional plan for undocumented students in order to offer support and
alleviate anxiety is key. In addition, increasing institutional competency levels about undocumented students can better facilitate students’ successful navigation of the college experience and begin to improve campus climate. Developing inclusive environments, understanding the disclosure process, ensuring all administrators know how to work with undocumented students, and understanding the context of state policy are all opportunities for institutions of higher education to provide support to undocumented students.
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Over the past decade, academic affairs professionals have realized that military-connected students can benefit from targeted academic programmatic support while making their transition to a college or university setting. Given the authors’ combined experiences in working with military-connected students and other veterans program administrators, we observe that the most common forms of support tailored for this student population are Veterans Affairs (VA) education benefit assistance, academic success (such as tutoring or assistance for adaptive needs, due to a disability), and various activities that focus on social support (campus-wide veterans’ pride events, student veteran-coordinated activities such as picnics or sporting events, and community service days).

Research on military-connected students has increased exponentially during the past several years; however, little is known about the experiences of student service members and veterans through their multiple, intersectional, and often competing identities. Despite attempts by various organizations to provide transition support and academic success, the stark reality is that these organizations often do not reflect the true diversity of military members, nor do they address the competing identities veterans may embrace throughout their educational experience.
Studies suggest that the biggest concern in a veteran’s transition into postsecondary education is learning how to navigate the benefits (education and health), and that general, nontraditional student concerns such as time management and child care are also present. Interestingly, studies that have focused on a sub-demographic within the veteran community, such as women, do not appear to find different results in participant needs or address concerns that do not neatly fit under the umbrella of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and psychological issues (Baechtold & De Sawal, 2009; Rumann & Hamrick, 2012). However, if asked, it is likely that women veterans, veterans of color, LGBTQI veterans, or student affairs professionals whose identity differs from the narrative of the stereotyped White heteronormative male combat veteran may offer additional insight into the matter. The authors advocate for academic affairs research that employs intersectional approaches to research design, which will provide better understanding into the needs of these subgroups. With the availability of intersectional research, intuitive models of best practice will result, thus allowing university professionals working with military-connected students to better approach program development and implementation in a holistic manner that serves the entire population, including minority military-connected students.

This article discusses some ways that campuses and researchers are inadvertently marginalizing military-connected students in their attempts to aid them through a blanket identity of “veteran.” The authors’ intention is to help the reader understand how an intersectional approach to campus programming can lead to more supportive programs and services for all military-connected students. While research has shown that student success is enhanced when campuses provide environments that are both inclusive and supportive, a gap exists in the research connecting those findings to what an inclusive and supportive environment might look like for student veterans (Grimes et al., 2011). In order to jumpstart a conversation on this observation, we have identified three points of concern that we feel must be addressed in research and military-connected campus services going forward.

The Veterans Center as a Transitional Space on Campus
Veterans centers are increasing throughout the country as veterans continue to enroll in institutions of higher learning at high rates (O’Herrin, 2011; Vacchi, 2012). Veterans spaces must become transitional spaces that enable separated service members to integrate to a postmilitary life while feeling supported in their transition. A negative example of an environment is a space that has been designed to resemble a recruiting office or command headquarters as opposed to a casual study lounge and gathering space. Many individuals overseeing veteran service offices may have been career military, serving 20-plus years; however, it is important to remember that most student veterans were not career military, choosing to leave the service for a variety of reasons. So, an office that emulates a militarized environment may do the opposite of what is intended, which is support military-connected students.

We would also like to note that campus partners referring to the veterans center as the only opportunity for veterans to connect and engage on campus may limit a veteran’s knowledge of and engagement with appropriate places to seek support and resources. Vacchi (2012) argued campuses should not view student organizations as a panacea, as some groups, especially those that are poorly organized or isolated, may do more harm than good. Instead, consider using the veterans lounge on campus to host other campus or community-based affinity groups (women’s center, Black cultural center, etc.) to provide military-connected students with a greater opportunity to connect with the organization that best meets their individualized academic and/or social needs.

The Benefit of Skill Development in Cultural Competence and Conflict Resolution
Several questions were raised at the 2016 NASPA Symposium on Military-Connected Students about how to reclaim student veteran lounges on campus from becoming a “hangout” for some veterans who engage in behaviors such as overt sexism. Audience members who have experienced the use of inappropriate, racially charged language by their peers within military-connected student lounges also expressed concern. They felt that this behavior deterred some students from seeing the lounge as a safe space that fosters support for all veterans. Those audience members were primarily seeking advice on how to address these instances when they occur.

As campuses establish programs that increase the cultural competency of the military, those running the veterans center should in turn also be increasing their own cultural competency. Many campuses offer training on how to support the LGBTQI population, first-generation college students, sexual assault survivors, and others. In addition to the veterans service providers, any student veteran in work-study or leadership roles on campus should also be encouraged to attend these trainings. Taking a leadership approach that emphasizes cultural competency knowledge will better prepare military-connected office leadership, staff, and students to improve engagement in these situations. An additional conflict resolution technique would be to educate peer leadership on how to utilize a Socratic approach in office and leadership management. For instance, asking, “Can you tell me what you mean by that?” is a better strategy than confrontation, which can escalate when sexist or bigoted behavior is observed.
Fostering the Intersectional Identities of Military-Connected Students

Campus service providers must intentionally engage with non-stereotypical veterans in ways that provide them an opportunity to define their military and life experiences; these providers must also offer them transition support as they move forward in their education. In terms of programming considerations, campuses are encouraged to go beyond the mass media stereotypes in order to address the lack of engagement from the veteran population. Veterans program administrators have expressed difficulty in programming participation overall, but specifically among women veterans, who are less likely to attend veterans events or seek services through veterans support offices (O’Herrin, 2011).

Campuses often host panels or speakers comprised mostly or entirely of White male combat veterans; however, they focus exclusively on the female military experience through such tools as The Invisible War (Ziering & Dick, 2012), an important documentary regarding sexual assault in the military. While we do need to provide space to discuss the traumas specific to service members, we need to do so in a way that is constructive and affirming of the individual veteran’s experience. Campuses are encouraged to seek gender and racial diversity in all their panels and speakers, as well as highlight veterans outside of traditional military experiences (e.g., a LGBTQIA veteran during LGBTQIA history month or a Latino immigrant veteran during Latino heritage month).

Closing

In conclusion, we want to encourage veteran program administrators, researchers, and other campus partners to engage students in dialogue that is constructive and that focuses on the whole student. When veterans are only given the opportunity to speak of their lived experiences as a veteran, the importance of acknowledging and supporting their intersectionality can continue to be denied. However, if we provide opportunities for them to speak of their other identities—of which veteran is just one part—we can start to examine the importance of those identities in their military experiences. Transition assistance must go beyond explaining benefits processing and rolling student veterans through orientations designed for more traditional students. It is imperative for student affairs professionals to understand that by providing holistic and person-centered care for the most marginalized of our student veterans—such as the unacknowledged female combat veteran; the gay veteran who served under Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell; the veteran of color who may experience discrimination in his or her daily life—we are able to provide for all.
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Recently, at universities across the United States, mental health has become a rallying call for struggling students. Many articles and critiques have been written about mental health issues, with researchers and student affairs educators arguing that a high percentage of undergraduate college students struggle with mental illnesses (Gil, 2015) and that campus environments cause significant stress for their depressed, anxious, and perfectionist students (Baker, 2014). Although these experiences are worth considering holistically, some institutions experience these issues at an even higher rate than others. In particular, students enrolled at art and design schools disproportionately face mental health issues, including overwhelming anxiety, depression, relationship issues, or adjustment difficulties (Grant, 2010). One must question why this situation exists: Why do art and design students experience higher rates of mental illness? And what resources can these institutions provide to help their students confront these challenges?

Art institutions around the country are defined by their degree-granting programs. Frequently, these establishments are small, independent, private colleges founded for the purpose of advancing the skills and education of artists. Because many courses at art and design institutions are rooted in techniques and practices—such as learning how to draw and sculpt in multiple...
dimensions—traditional methods of evaluation, such as examinations and papers, are insufficient to measure student progress. Therefore, more practical methods, such as performance-based assessments, are necessary to measure and provide feedback on actual skill attainment.

The critique method of evaluation is commonly used in art institutions to assess the educational progress of art and design students (Grant, 2010). Art students must quickly internalize and apply classroom knowledge and create original work on demand, while college students enrolled in traditional disciplines may merely work to understand and internalize classroom concepts (Grant, 2010). Therefore, art students are operating at the highest level of Bloom's revised taxonomy, a hierarchical index detailing the cognitive demands of learning techniques, almost immediately upon entrance. Traditional college students, in contrast, are not yet expected to function similarly (Krathwohl, 2002). Thus, students at art institutions must utilize more complex cognitive structures at earlier stages in their development to produce creative and acceptable products and to satisfy their course requirements.

One can assume that expecting students to engage in difficult cognitive tasks before they have mastered the essential concepts and skills would lead to significant increases in levels of stress and anxiety. Furthermore, it is clear that students feel an intense pressure to perform and to compete with their classmates. In one student newspaper article at Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD), a student stated,

**SCAD in reality stands for The Savannah College of Art and Design, but the letters have become an acronym for the unofficial school motto, ”sleep comes after death.” Many SCAD students say they rely on all-nighters...to get their assignments in on time (Vahal, 2015, para. 1).**

As mentioned above, the cognitive stress students experience from creating original artwork is further compounded by the instructors' evaluation process. After students spend numerous three- to six-hour class periods designing their artistic pieces in studio courses, instructors host a “critique” open to peers, university staff, and faculty. During this process, attendees scrutinize the created artwork, suggesting deficiencies and possible improvements (Grant, 2010). In a classroom environment where they are expected to be vulnerable and "reveal a lot of personal information about themselves...in the artwork they create" (Grant, 2010, para. 20), this evaluation can be an intellectually and emotionally damaging process. Furthermore, as Grant (2010) discusses, the process of self-disclosing intimate information through their art can be trauma inducing, and the critique process itself can retraumatize students, forcing them to repeatedly recall and reexperience moments of intense pain. In describing and detailing the critique method, Oh, Ishizaki, Gross and Do (2013) caution against unexamined use of this procedure, and suggest that this evaluative method deserves careful reflection. Students navigating this formal review process can be intimidated and confused by industry experts, and they can be left feeling insecure or demoralized by overly harsh and public criticisms (Oh, Ishizaki, Gross, & Do, 2013). Overloaded with these intense courses, heightened expectations, and continuous critique, many art students, unsurprisingly, struggle with mental illness.

Despite the increased prevalence of mental illness on art college campuses, these institutions often provide only minimal resources to support struggling students. Grant (2010) found that across several art institutions, counseling centers were inadequately staffed; typically, one counselor was employed full time, with one or two part-time counselors providing additional support. Unfortunately, this staffing issue is not limited to art schools. Thirty-two percent of higher education institutions, whether private or public, maintain extensive wait lists for trained therapists; despite national outcry, counseling centers have received limited additional funding to increase staffing levels (Baker, 2014). Even when art students have access to trained counselors on campus, they will most likely experience a lengthy wait time before being helped.

**The question remains:** What can be done to help these students? How can educators and administrators promote positive mental health and provide appropriate resources?

Institutions should look to implement a range of proactive and reactive methods to actively address the mental health needs of their student body. SCAD’s student counseling provides a great example of proactive engagement through their workshop series featuring such topics as “How to Benefit From an Art Critique,” aimed at helping students make sense of criticism and give constructive feedback without damaging a peer’s self-worth (Raus, 2014). To offer students the full range of support and resources necessary for their academic and personal growth, the art institutions themselves must reevaluate their use of the critique method of assessment, expand counseling services to meet the needs of the student body (the general rule is one counselor for every 1,000 students; Alters, 2015), and dedicate funding and staff members to advance mental health promotion through programs and staff committed to building positive resiliency practices among students. By creating programs and services designed to cultivate students’ capacities and strengths, art institutions can foster students’ self-authorship development as well as their ability bounce back from moments of distress (Larcus, Gibbs, & Hackmann, 2016). Art institutions have a responsibility and an opportunity to promote positive mental health behavior in their students; by focusing on these thriving measures, educators can simultaneously support those who are struggling with mental illness and develop positive-resiliency practices in the campus body as a whole.
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Support networks, such as social media groups and mentors, are established approaches that assist professionals in progressing their careers in the field. However, women of color, on both the giving and the receiving ends, do not always use these strategies effectively. Too frequently mentors serve as “yes” voices to mentees’ desires and behaviors, failing to challenge the mentee to truly cultivate growth. Challenge in this regard includes an alternative perspective to ideas and goals, which in turn benefits the mentee from more inclusive feedback. Simultaneously, social media groups often lack direct accountability regarding online media presence, such as contentious posts or professional perceptions, which adds to the preexisting barriers women of color encounter. Combined, these two mechanisms produce increased feelings of support but not enough challenge to thrust women of color further.
Without effective mentoring, women of color in student affairs could suffer from a lack of equal career advancement, in comparison to Caucasian women and men, as well as a lack of support in their work environment. Hune (2010) found that Asian Pacific American women in the field encounter barriers to advancing up administrative ranks, including not having access to mentoring and being overlooked for departmental and campus-wide leadership roles. Similarly, a study observing African American women in student affairs revealed obstacles to career advancement, which included the lack of a supportive professional environment and lack of networking (Belk, 2006). These studies not only cite mentoring as a gap for women, but also the role of professional interpersonal relationships in helping women reach the upper echelons of their careers. The numbers are dismal for women of color who are senior student affairs officers, as this group still encounters gender and racial discrimination in the workplace from inequitable salary compensation and lack of recognition for their contributions (Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Research suggests that student affairs could lose talented women of color if insight on successfully overcoming these disparities is not provided.

For women of color to successfully navigate careers in student affairs, challenge within supportive networks must be provided. Consistent with Sanford’s Challenge & Support theory (Sanford & Adelson, 1962), an environment that is overly supportive yet does not provide an adequate balance of challenge will yield minimal individual growth toward professional development and advancement. This is also true for the reverse imbalance of excessive challenge within an environment or from a mentor. Sanford highlighted that challenge and support are not mutually exclusive, and the two must coexist to be truly impactful to overall growth.

In order to establish an environment that incorporates challenge and support, a supportive relationship built on trust is essential. Murray (2016) reinforces that candor allows women of color to understand the type of relationship being formed. She found that the style of mentoring provided to women of color, such as being free from judgment, pushed women to positively develop. In a society where women of color can become polarized against one another, primarily stemming from macro-level societal issues, trustworthiness is critical. Once trust is established, receiving necessary challenge and support becomes routine and easier to incorporate into a mentoring relationship.

Challenge and support are important to combat inequalities that women of color encounter, and existing research has long recommended the use of the two. However, another concern is the unequal and inconsistent integration of accountability. According to Pathways to Higher Education Administration for African American Women, “mentoring is the most common on-campus service activity for administrators” (Jones, Dawkins, McClinton, Glover, & Brazzel, 2012, p. 38). Because mentoring is so common, actually holding the mentee accountable to their goals can become stagnant, due to inconsistent interactions. It is the responsibility of the mentor and mentee to ensure an active relationship is maintained—for example, consistent communication regarding career updates, continuous discussion of goals and their implementation, and sharing of professional opportunities. Taken a step further, the relationship should also include setting expectations around challenges and maintaining a feeling of connectedness through activities such as lunch dates, monthly video chats, or collaboration on a professional project. It is this sort of active engagement between the mentor and mentee that can help formulate the mentee’s professional goals and foster more accountability within the relationship.

Informal support network groups should explore methods to strengthen online relationships and encourage accountability among members. Examples include hosting weekly spotlights of colleagues to encourage camaraderie and create a sense of connectedness with one another, or implementing ongoing discussions focused on issues and strategies directly related to women of color. This community-building effort enhances rapport, which can create a more comfortable environment for holding other colleagues accountable. Most social media groups are developed as a means to connect persons with similar interests. Yet, because these groups are online, there is a lack of direct accountability for controversial posts, creating a culture of passivity by glancing over the content versus engaging with the colleague to cultivate a discussion about the material. Due to lack of personal relationships, colleagues often refrain from addressing contentious posts publicly, resulting in a lack of challenge within the space.

These informal support network groups should be used to encourage one another to share resources, as well as to challenge members to use the network to positively impact their public perceptions. Informal support groups typically do not have structured boundaries like formal mentor/mentee relationships do; therefore, professionals tend to “scroll and watch” passively rather than engage with women colleagues as a means of support. Challenge and accountability must become more pronounced in online media spaces, as this feedback serves as a resource for women of color.

There is much discussion on how to discover and obtain mentors, build one’s networking circle, and support the advancement of women of color in the field. However, much of the research focuses on obtaining mentors and support groups versus the maintenance and growth of these relationships. The conversation around challenge, accountability, and support is rooted in trust and authenticity—components significant to any thriving relationship. Creating space for these kinds of professional
relationships for women of color allows for mentoring and support networks to prosper. It is vital for women of color to capitalize on the full benefits that mentors and support networks provide. The challenge and accountability aspects of networks and mentors are the pieces that elevate professional development to the next level. As colleagues, we must remember to be receptive and to reciprocate balanced, supportive, yet challenging practices in order to sustain women of color within student affairs.
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