Dear NASPA Colleagues,

On behalf of NASPA's 26 Knowledge Communities (KCs), I'm excited to present to you our Fall 2012 Knowledge Communities online publication. *Excellence in Practice*, is a compilation of articles written by student affairs professionals involved with our many KCs. Through our publications, the KCs work successfully together to align with NASPA's current strategic plan and to build the capacity to create knowledge.

In this edition, you will find articles that address topics such as student veteran growth and trends, group-specific involvement for students with disabilities, student affairs as cultural facilitators to support intercultural development in study abroad, to developing value-based ethical leadership and much more. It is our hope that the articles provide some new knowledge about our field, ideas to consider implementing, innovative ways of supporting our growing student populations, or perhaps helps us consider the best ways to deliver our services and programs in student affairs.

This professional development product involves many people. With much gratitude and appreciation, I thank University Parent Media for their design, the NASPA staff for editing, the National KC Chairs for their effort and leadership, and to the authors for their time in writing and helping expand our knowledge on important topics.

Please share this online publication widely with your members and at any upcoming professional development programs this fall. Also, if you have not yet joined a KC, please take a moment to visit the KC page on the NASPA website and contact the leaders or simply join as many as you wish.

Sincerely,

Evette Castillo Clark, Ed.D.
National Director of Knowledge Communities 2011-2013
NASPA Board of Directors
Faculty, University of New Orleans
We had originally developed the UCLA GSO in response to Poock’s (2004) study of graduate student orientation practice. The Council of Graduate Schools recommendations led to an interest in testing more thoroughly whether our orientation was addressing the most critical needs of our G&P students. We realized that the GSO’s goals and outcomes remained constant since its inception. Wary of change for the sake of change but determined not to become stagnant, we sought a more sophisticated assessment plan for the GSO. To that end, we developed a logic model based on Alkin (2011) to describe and assess more fully the GSO’s short- and long-term goals and learning outcomes. This logic model was the focus of the assessment discussion at our conference presentation.

Higher Level Assessment: Using a Logic Model to Improve the GSO Planning Process
We continue to assess the GSO through traditional means: We conduct paper assessments of each workshop, and we collect data on attendees through our registration system that is connected to the Registrar’s records. We also send an online assessment tool to all incoming G&P students. We discovered through this traditional assessment that the program has reached a level of maturity and is doing well. We then asked ourselves: how can we assess this program further to inform small changes for continual improvement?

New Assessment Methods for UCLA GSO
The recent Council of Graduate Schools Ph.D. Completion Project (2008) recommended promising practices for improving Ph.D. completion rates. We developed a program logic model: a visual representation depicting the program’s resources, activities, and desired outcomes. Developing a logic model is a useful exercise that encourages communication about program processes and purposes, provides insight into what data need to be collected in order to understand how the program is working, and aids in determining evaluation questions. If you already are confident in your assessment of your program’s outcomes, a logic model can help you to find ways to change the process of your program to make it more successful.

Our logic model for the GSO directed us to focus on our G&P volunteers, because they are a critical resource required to operate it. Through a GSO volunteer survey, we learned that the primary motivations behind why our continuing G&P students volunteer are that they enjoy giving back, sharing what they know, and meeting new people. Therefore, we made our volunteer training process more professional, and gave the volunteers more responsibility (including titles). We also decreased volunteer downtime during the day.
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Adult Learners and Students with Children Knowledge Community

Spotlight on Minnesota and Virginia: How the Pregnancy Assistance Fund Has Changed the Face of Campus-based Support Programming for Undergraduates Who Are Pregnant or Parenting Children

Susan Warfield  
Program Director,  
The University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Student Parent HELP Center

Twenty-three percent of all undergraduate students are students with children (Center for Post-Secondary and Economic Success, 2011). This does not include undergraduates who become pregnant and exit without disclosing the pregnancy. Women aged 18 to 24 have one of the highest unplanned pregnancy rates of any demographic (along with poor and low-income women, minority women, and cohabitating women) (Guttmacher Institute, 2012), and women aged 20 to 24 have twice the unplanned pregnancy rate of women overall (Boonstra, 2009). Despite the high rate of unplanned pregnancy among college-aged women, students who are pregnant or parenting children through their undergraduate degrees remain for all purposes “invisible,” and campus-based supports for these students are limited. Unrecognizable to the campus community without their children and hesitant to self-identify, they often do not receive the broad spectrum of family and academic supports needed for success. Additionally, many institutions have no structured plan for identifying students with children, are surprised to hear that there are pregnant and parenting undergraduates on their campuses, and typically do not inquire about a student’s parenting status as a matter of course in advising or classroom contacts. Further complicating matters, parenting undergraduates are difficult to identify through demographic data. Parenting status is considered a legally sensitive admissions question and is often not tracked beyond highly protected Free Application for Federal Student Aid data, which creates barriers between at-risk students and needed services. Although there is little research on pregnant and parenting college students, professionals serving these students each day know the difference effective economic, family, and academic support programming can make in retaining and graduating these academically committed nontraditional students.

The federal Office of Adolescent Health (OAH) Pregnancy Assistance Fund (PAF) is currently engaged in work that will change the face of campus-based student parent programming. Created through a $25 million authorization of funding under the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act (Public Law 111-148, sections 10211–10214), PAF is funding 17 projects across the United States. Two states have PAF projects that will dramatically increase the number of programs supporting low-income undergraduates with children and our understanding of how to affect the academic outcomes of these students. Although most currently funded PAF projects focus on teen parents in high school, this article focuses on the two PAF projects targeting pregnant and parenting students attending college.

As the director of a program currently funded by PAF as awarded via the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) Young Student Parent Support Initiative (YSPSI), a technical assistance provider for the MDH, and someone engaged with the PAF program at the federal level, I am very familiar with this unique new funding opportunity. For the first time in the 28-year history of the Student Parent HELP Center (SPHC), we have been able to expand core programming by increasing staff contacts with and focused programming for our most at-risk, newly pregnant, and first-time parents under age 25. This expansion has been accomplished through the addition of a dedicated staff person responsible for improved early identification of and service delivery to college students who are or may become parents. A student parent outreach counselor has significantly increased community-based clinic outreach, program marketing, and direct contacts with the youngest first-time parents. With one term of a planned three-term cycle completed, we are already seeing an increase in staff-to-student contacts among grant-targeted students.

Through this funding, eight college-based student parent centers and programs across the state will be established, representing a broad spectrum of rural and metropolitan campuses: public, private, community, technical and tribal institutions, and both 2- and 4-year colleges. Combined with the expansion grants awarded to the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities SPHC and another long-standing campus program at St. Catherine University (Access and Success for Katies’ with Kids), this funding source could potentially affect hundreds of young pregnant and parenting students attending 10 institutions across Minnesota.
The Virginia Department of Health (DOH) is the awarded PAF grantee in the Commonwealth of Virginia. In this model, eight institutions are receiving PAF funding to establish Offices of Pregnant and Parenting Student Support to increase programming targeted to student parents on these campuses. Although the programs under development are located at community colleges, the program model is consistent across institutions; the Virginia DOH is centrally coordinating all sites, and a focus on preventing domestic violence is included.

Given the overall diversity in program models, institutions, regional demographics, and students served, these two projects may provide the greatest depth of data ever collected on pregnant and parenting undergraduates and student parent service delivery in higher education. Overall, PAF funds projects in 17 states and tribal nations, 15 of which are targeting services to teen parents or victims of intimate partner violence. Most of these projects target or partially target academic and college access outcomes for what will hopefully be a future cohort of college-bound parenting teens.

For student affairs professionals serving students with children, the PAF benefit goes beyond data gathered during the inaugural cycle of funding and now includes an upcoming funding opportunity for those wishing to start their own programs. A new funding announcement is expected to be released in November 2013. Though primary applicants must be state government agencies or tribal nations, college administrators can collaborate with those agencies to bring this money to their state and campuses. The OAH/PAF website at www.hhs.gov/ash/oah provides information about PAF activities. PAF has also created an online PAF Resource and Training Center as a resource for all professionals wishing to deliver evidence-based programming to teen parents and parenting college students, http://www.hhs.gov/ash/oah/oah-initiatives/paf.
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The author also had direct primary source contact and communications with lead administrators at OAH/PAF, the Virginia DOH, and MDH, who provided fact checking and details for this article.
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AFRICAN AMERICAN KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY

Utilizing Change for Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Prince F. Robertson
Graduate Student,
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

The structure and composition of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) illustrate the uplifting capabilities and the power of care for African American students and culture often unparalleled in any other context. HBCUs were established to advance opportunities for African Americans and to change the tumultuous conditions experienced by the African American race from the late 1800s through most of the 20th century. HBCUs were originally established to provide elementary education to African American families, which eventually evolved into a concentrated focus on higher education with college-level curricula. African American students espouse a strong tradition of togetherness, community, and a sense of belonging (White, 1998), and bring these cultural and value sets to the college environment. African American students are likely to attend an HBCU because of the cultural traditions and values that are familiar from their upbringing. Attending an HBCU gives African American students a sense of familiarity and comfort in knowing that they are able to be within like groups and feel less marginalized. Even though student enrollment at HBCUs lagged behind the rise in African American enrollment at other colleges between 1976 and 1994 (Nichols, 2004), African American students at HBCUs develop significantly higher levels of self-concept than those who attend predominantly White institutions (PWIs) (Berger & Milem, 2000). A closer look at the meaningful student and faculty/administrator interactions and engagement, as well as transformational leadership that is practiced at HBCUs, illustrates a positive climate for change and the potential for increased enrollments ahead.

Research shows that HBCUs strive to recruit and maintain strong faculty members who can also work in multiple roles. These faculty members serve not only as professors, but also as advisors and mentors. In this capacity, they strengthen student and faculty rapport and form a stronger connection by

The author also had direct primary source contact and communications with lead administrators at OAH/PAF, the Virginia DOH, and MDH, who provided fact checking and details for this article.
getting to know students beyond just their names. Students then develop a more intimate connection with the campus and a sense of pride and belonging. This personal relationship with the campus and faculty enhances the learning environment, which transforms their educational experience into an extension of their family. HBCU administrators and faculty consider themselves close-knit, and the familial ties encompass other staff and students; they are able to provide support and encouragement that some lack from not being close by their actual families. For many African American students, an HBCU campus is a home away from home.

It is no secret that a number of HBCUs lack financial resources, although many administrators and faculty at these institutions do not see this lack of funding as a deficiency. Administrators and faculty view it as intrinsic motivation, a sense of duty and devotion, and greater responsibility to create a unique student community. This summer, I had the privilege of learning firsthand how professionals employed at HBCUs genuinely thrive on African American student success. Although some of these professionals perceive work conditions as stressful and hampered by tradition, they also find it rewarding when their impact on students produces a successful college student experience. Administrators and faculty emphasize that they must be capable of multitasking, working as a team, adapting a cooperative teaching philosophy, and being “change makers” (Hirt et. al, 2006) to ensure student success at HBCUs. The administration should be dedicated to the evolution of change and positive transformation within HBCUs, have an Afrocentric leadership, and be student-centered and family-oriented. Leaders of HBCUs must adapt to ever-changing social and political needs through their management, which they hope will result in increased enrollment, quality faculty and staff, and improved programs that benefit the students they serve.

As a graduate student with personal experience at HBCUs, my recommendation for higher education professionals is to incorporate some of these same practices at their institutions. Create academic and cocurricular experiences that allow for rapport building, engage students beyond class work to serve as mentors if it is appropriate and organic, and foster environments where cultural pride can be explored and appreciated. Utilize change! As we practice in our chosen career pathway within student affairs and higher education, we must do everything in our power to reach students in all facets to enroll in these HBCUs. Not one university or college should be placed in a position where the doors are in danger of closing. If we, as a combined unit of educators and mentors, do not change ourselves and the ways that higher education institutions operate, the results could lead to losing future leaders.
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ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY

**Collegiate Recovery Support – The Basics**

Robert C. Reff
*Student Health Services, Oregon State University*

As I began writing this article, I started to write in the third person. It is the format used in scholarly work, and the format I require from my students. For this particular topic, however, it made the content seem cold and distant. My hope in writing this article is to motivate the readers to do more on their campuses to support students who are in recovery and to give voice to this group of dedicated, driven, and exceptional students.

**Rationale**
Why support students in recovery? As Oregon State University (OSU) Vice President of Student Affairs Larry Roper stated when asked about his support for collegiate recovery community, “This is what student affairs is about... helping students achieve success. It’s a no brainer” (L. Roper, personal communication, June 27, 2012). When starting a collegiate recovery program, you may encounter people with concerns. Here are a few ways to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Affairs</strong></th>
<th>It is what we do; enough said.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td>The average grade point average of Augsburg’s recovery students is 3.2 <em>(n = 75)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Campuses have raised millions and built buildings by donations to their recovery communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Uninformed</strong></td>
<td>No...this isn’t a group home or treatment center. This is a service to students who want an environment that supports their success away from the distractions of drugs and alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Skeptics</strong></td>
<td>It is hard to estimate how many people are in recovery or how many people in recovery would choose us to seek their degree. Given that there are more than 114,000 Alcoholics Anonymous groups with more than 2,100,000 members worldwide (<a href="http://www.aa.org">www.aa.org</a>), there is a good chance that some of our students are already in recovery, and we can recruit more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Budget-minded</strong></td>
<td>There are a lot of models out there...some cost more than others. We can start small and see the response from our students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each campus that supports students in recovery has unique nuances. Programs take on two basic forms. The first form is a center model such as The Center for the Study of Addiction and Recovery (CSAR) at Texas Tech University. The center operates much like other centers in a traditional student affairs division with staff and resources. Their center is housed in the College of Human Sciences and offers academic programs along with traditional student support. The second approach integrates housing for students and can be found at Rutgers and Augsburg.
College. These programs house students together in small houses, residential buildings, or wings of established housing communities. Here are a few examples:

**Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX**
The Center for Study of Addiction and Recovery is led by Kitty Harris, Ph.D., whose book *Substance Abuse Recovery in College* provides important information on collegiate recovery support. She leads a team dedicated to spreading the recovery support model to every campus in America and overseas. That team can provide volumes of research, implementation guides, and strategies to launch recovery support on other campuses. It will also invite teams to its campus for specialized training and professional development. Team members are pioneers in putting the science in addiction and recovery support.

**Rutgers – New Brunswick, NJ**
The Rutgers team, headed by Lisa Laitman, MSEd, LCADC, has served students in recovery for the past 29 years. The Rutgers program provides housing, support, and programming for its students. Lisa and Frank Greenagel Jr., LCSW, LCADC, CJC, provide students with counseling, advocacy, programming, and academic support services, as well as fun. The students have countless opportunities to engage in activities on and off campus. They help to coordinate activities that bring together alumni and students. They blend enthusiasm, compassion, and boundless energy to plan such things as video game football competitions, camping, musicals, and meetings in New York City.

“I’ve gotten kicked out of every living situation ever. My whole life I’ve always been getting into trouble,” Neha M. said, adding that after 9 years in and out of college and recovery she is ecstatic to be able to truthfully tell people she is graduating. “They (her roommates at Recovery Housing) just took me as I was. That’s all I ever wanted in life was to fit in” (Intrabartola, 2011).

**Megan F., a 2007 graduate and former resident advisor of the Recovery House, stated, “Whenever Rutgers calls, I come running. I love the House and everything it stands for” (Greenagel, 2011).**

**StepUP – Augsburg College, Minneapolis, MN**
Patrice Salmeri directs the StepUP program in its mission to “help students champion lives of recovery, achieve academic success, and thrive in a community of accountability and support” (StepUP, 2012). She is a powerful force advocating for her students and a comprehensive and extremely successful program. With 75 students served each year and an alumni base of more than 500 students, the group plays a major role on the Augsburg campus.

The StepUP website provides excellent insight into the program and clearly demonstrates its impact. It charts the relapse rates per year (a remarkably small percentage), the home states of the students, the services students perform, and current news articles about recovery.

**Estimation of Need**
One of the first questions you may be asked is, “How many students do we have in recovery?” If you are on a campus that does not currently serve students in recovery, this can be a perplexing question to answer. Fortunately, CSAR provides an estimation formula in its curriculum for starting a recovery community. Utilizing that formula, Oregon State University, with an enrollment of 25,000 students, has an estimated 376 students in recovery (Harris, Baker, & Thompson, 2005).

**Organizations**
The following organizations specialize in support for collegiate recovery communities.

- The Association of Recovery Schools ([http://www.recoveryschools.org/](http://www.recoveryschools.org/)) supports both high schools and universities in their mission to advocate for students seeking education and recovery. The association holds an annual conference in July.  

---

**Intrabartola, 2011.**

**Greenagel, 2011.**

**StepUP, 2012.**

**Harris, Baker, & Thompson, 2005.**
Research & Articles
A great overview for student affairs professionals:

An overview of the active elements in support for students in recovery as well as research on efficacy:
- Do 12-step programs work? (answer yes):

Comprehensive text:

Curriculum:
- Harris, K. S., Baker, A. K., & Thompson, A. A. (2005). Making an opportunity on your campus: A comprehensive curriculum for designing collegiate recovery communities. (Funded by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment)

Conclusion
Go and do the work! Supporting students in recovery will positively affect your students, your work, and your campus. Others on your campus might also be interested in this work. They might be in the counseling center, health center, or student life. You may find allies within the faculty ranks, foundation board, and in the community. If you need help, reach out to another university that is doing this work. I have had the opportunity to meet some of the most dedicated, bright, selfless, and compassionate students and professionals on these campuses. I encourage you to begin this work on your campus and support your students in recovery.
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define their services and their efforts to maintain the university’s mission to serve diverse populations. Over the past 2 decades, 10 states have proposed ballot initiatives designed to end affirmative action and race-conscious policies in public education, public employment, and contracting. California was one of the first to do so, passing California Affirmative Action, also known as Proposition 209. Since then, six other states (Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Missouri, Michigan, and Oklahoma) have followed suit with similar measures known as civil rights initiatives, or in Oklahoma’s case an affirmative action measure. The remaining three states (Nebraska, Florida, and Washington) used generic titles (Ballotpedia, 2012). The majority of ballots were titled to suggest that the initiatives were in support of civil rights efforts (or were otherwise ambiguous) when in fact, they targeted state programs and policies that recruit and serve minorities and women in equal opportunity programs. The ballot wording represented efforts to end discrimination and arguably misled voters into thinking they were supporting a “civil rights initiative.” For example, the Colorado Amendment 46 (2008) was worded as follows:

An amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning a prohibition against discrimination by the state, and, in connection therewith, prohibiting the state from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting... (Ballotpedia, 2012)

In a narrow defeat of 50.81% vs. 49.19% (a difference of 36,088 votes), Colorado was the first state to reject an anti-affirmative action ballot initiative in November 2008. In 2011, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit ruled that the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative (2006) was unconstitutional. However, following precedent, higher education practitioners like those in the CSU example sought to proactively address potential implications for programming and services that support and serve minority students and women.

CSU established its Asian and Pacific American Student Services (A/PASS) Advocacy Office in the 1970s. The office was primarily charged with advocacy efforts and programming for APIs on campus. At that time, emphasis on advocacy for API students was a primary concern for administrators. A/PASS provided a representative voice for students within the CSU API community. Mentoring programs, outreach to residence halls, cultural events, and emphasis on cultural awareness defined the office’s purpose. This model continued until 2008, when discussions commenced regarding long-term viability of a student learning and perseverance model within an advocacy programmatic structure (Asian Pacific American Cultural Center, 2012).

Through correspondence, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs Linda Ahuna-Hamill discussed how CSU anticipated the implications of state legislation, like Amendment 46, for student services directed toward specific racial groups. Ahuna-Hamill discussed strategies that shifted its mission from that of an advocacy-based support office to that of an inclusive, comprehensive center that educated the entire campus community on Asian and Pacific American culture. The term “advocacy” was initially used to increase exposure of the diversity on campus. Over time, the mission has evolved to focus on diverse programming that would support student retention efforts. The move to focus on student persistence also coincided with new CSU standards to retain 80% of its student body. With these political and institutional factors, several offices shifted their “student services” identity to “cultural centers” to better serve as resources for the campus community.

The shift from student services to cultural center changed programmatic models of the past 4 decades and set a tone for its new mission as an inclusive resource for the entire student body. This change shifted an institutional identity away from an exclusive association. There was a fear that perceptions of exclusivity of A/PASS and other culturally specific services would become targets of the new legislation. Programatically, the center moved away from programming and focused priorities on areas such as fostering the identities of all students, collaboration between cultural centers, and retention outcomes. These shifts not only signal evolving institutional priorities, but are indicative of the way politics may influence concerns and future developments. As CSU progresses, it is important to campus administrators and practitioners that the spirit of student services, like A/PASS, and the mission to support students not be affected by Amendment 46.

Higher education must confront a constantly evolving landscape where demographic trends and political realms converge. The interplay between these traits continues to shape the way Asian cultural centers and student services define their mission and operate on college campuses. Assessing these changes is necessary to determine how institutional shifts constrain the services that are delivered and the effect on API populations.
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Envision the bookshelves in your work space. How many large report binders do you have sitting there, staring at you, taunting you about their state of neglect? Student affairs units are teeming with great data, but communicating those data to the right people clearly and concisely enough for them to be used in daily practice can be a challenge. In this article, we will present some techniques that have helped us improve the utility of assessment reports and products, including audience considerations, information portability, and data visualization techniques.

Knowing Your People
We always recommend a reverse-order thinking process when planning an assessment. Who will ultimately use the information, and what format will make the results most useful to them? By thinking this through at the onset, you can avoid unnecessarily working with information that is interesting but not useful. By asking the questions below, you will develop a better understanding of the types of reporting products you want to develop:

▶ What is their use for the information?
▶ What is their level of familiarity with the subject?
▶ Do they prefer to read details or just the punch lines?
▶ Are they interested in methods or do they simply want findings?
▶ Who, in addition to the primary intended audience, might read your results?

Most higher education administrators need to convey information to larger lay audiences such as boards, students, parents, community members, and business partners. You can reduce the need for multiple iterations of the same information by keeping the lay audience in mind from the onset. The table below presents some lay audience tendencies to bear in mind as you write:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lay audiences:</th>
<th>What you can do:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have limited understanding of</td>
<td>• Use familiar data formats such as frequencies, percentages, whole numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative findings</td>
<td>• Integrate relevant qualitative data when available to provide context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect concrete answers from</td>
<td>• Clearly explain what findings mean and present recommendations for programmatic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts</td>
<td>administrative, and/or policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are fairly resistant to</td>
<td>• Identify and address likely objections and alternative interpretations in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasion</td>
<td>advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are able to process limited</td>
<td>• Involve key stakeholders in the process of interpreting results and generating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amounts of information</td>
<td>recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on scanning and cues</td>
<td>• Provide contextual cues such as arrows, headings, labels, and bold type to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help quickly orient reader attention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Nelson, Hesse, & Croyle, 2009).

Assessment reporting is not the kind of writing you would do for academic journal submission. Do what works best to get your point across to your audience, even if that means violating the rules of the APA Publication Manual! Arrows, bold print, call-out boxes, bullets, and headers can all be effective tools to convey your message.

Knowing Your Reporting Options
Now, back to those big binders on your shelves. Comprehensive reports often go unread, so do not be afraid to consider alternative reporting formats. The right form of communication will help information get put into practice. Think about the preferences and needs of your primary audience. Perhaps more useful than full reports would be executive summary pages.
Let’s Get Visual

No matter what form your reports take, they will likely include visual representations of data such as tables, bar charts, pie charts, line graphs, and maybe even infographics. The trick to being effective with visuals is using the right type of graphic for the right data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphic</th>
<th>Appropriate Uses</th>
<th>Tips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Data tables | • Make overall comparisons of data  
• Display individual numeric results | • Trends are better shown in graphs  
• Use shading and borders to draw the eye  
• Cluster similar data  
• Bold important cell values |
| Pie charts | • Display limited number of proportions  
• Show the relationship of parts to a whole | • Not too many slices!  
• Legends and lines that highlight slices  
• Show percentages for each slice |
| Bar charts | • Demonstrate magnitude  
• Demonstrate comparative magnitude  
• Identify relative differences or patterns | • Bars can be horizontal or vertical  
• Select axis scales that fairly represent without distortion  
• Strategically order categories |
| Line graphs | • Display sequential data  
• Display trends  
• Highlight before-and-after differences | • Use arrows or text to highlight key events or data  
• Select axis scales that fairly represent without distortion  
• Do not use too many trend lines |

We often see line graphs misused to display categorical data, which is better done in a bar chart. Bar charts are the most versatile for displaying numbers and categorical data, whereas line graphs are the best for showing change over time because the line implies motion.

Regardless of the graphic you select, when presenting data visually, always be sure to—
• Use brief descriptive titles.
• Use data labels right in the graphic or keep legends in close proximity.
• Cite your sources.
• Use whole numbers except when decimals are truly necessary.
• Provide brief narrative interpretation.
• Check colors for sufficient contrast in case they are printed in black and white.
• Use visual cues such as arrows, bold print, and color.

Data can be daunting or illuminating. Through your reporting decisions, you influence the experience your audience will have with data. Help more people to appreciate and use data by setting them up for success with thoughtful, user-friendly reporting mechanisms, and recycle those binders!
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One of the most challenging occurrences for student affairs professionals is the death of a student. In addition to supporting the family, staff may be tasked with logistics; caring for friends, living communities, classmates, faculty, advisors, and others; facilitating memorial services; and working with the press. Although the work is especially challenging, the comfort you can bring to families and friends can be life changing.

The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that the mortality rate for college students is lower than that of 18- to 24-year-olds who are not enrolled in college (Johnson, 2011). The cause of death can have a significant impact on how the campus community reacts, both in the case of those directly affected as well as those whose personal history may influence a particular reaction. In Psychological First Aid in the Aftermath of Crisis, Wayne Griffin writes, “...campuses also experience unpredictable tragedies that result in injury or death of students, faculty, and staff. These incidents may exacerbate existing mental and physical health problems and further affect students' ability to function” (Griffin, 2007, p. 149). In a recent study, suicide accounted for six to seven deaths per 100,000 students, which is higher than the number for those not attending college (Johnson, 2011). A violent death may have a widespread effect; “...violence that affects the entire campus may alter the educational atmosphere and have negative consequences for the university” (Waits & Lundberg-Love, 2008, p. 52).

Whatever the cause, a student death is a tragedy that can tax the time, energy, and emotions of student affairs professionals.

It is important to have a student death protocol in place before a tragedy occurs. Existing emergency response measures are likely to be of assistance, but student deaths are unique circumstances. Responses may differ greatly on campuses depending on the institution’s resources, philosophy, and history. Regardless of your location, it is important to have detailed plans in place to be able to respond in an effective, compassionate, and comprehensive way. You may wish to use the following questions as an audit for your preparedness for a student death.

1. How would the nature of the death (i.e., violence, self-inflicted) affect your response? Do you have multiple protocols?
2. How do you confirm the death?
3. Did it occur on or off campus? Do you react in the same way?
25. Group interventions—who staffs them? Best practices? Available to everyone?
26. Split families—if the parents are divorced, how might you have to manage working with two families that do not get along?
27. What do you need to know in order to help the campus community? What and who are your sources (i.e., social media, family, police, person of faith)?
28. Does the cause of death matter?
29. How involved was the student on campus? What is the Age of the student?
30. Is there support from the academic department? Family? Other?
31. Who is responsible for planning memorial or remembrance services? Is a service provided for each student?
32. Does the cause of death matter? How involved the student was on campus? Student’s age? Support from the academic department? Family? Other?
33. Where will you have it?
34. Who pays for it?
35. Who provides technology (slide show, etc.)? Flowers? Music?
36. If the family is of faith, can the service be of faith on a public campus?
37. Who plans, coordinates, and prints the program?
38. Can anyone speak at the service? Who represents the university?
39. Does someone from the university attend the home service? Send flowers, or a letter or card?
40. What is the posthumous degree policy? Who requests one? Who awards it?
41. Do you have relationships with area organizations of faith, hospitals, or funeral homes?
42. Who speaks with the media? What should be said?
43. Do you have plans for working with other institutions when siblings, significant others, and so on are involved? Who is the point person?
44. What changes when there are multiple deaths? Is the protocol the same?
45. Who needs support in the aftermath or at the onset? What types of counseling are available?
46. What is the plan for relieving first-line responders/self-care plan?
47. Who has continued conversations with the family of the deceased? How long do those last?
48. What checklists or template e-mails do you have in place?
49. Do you mark the anniversary of the death in any way?
50. Debrief—What was done well? What could be done better?

The conversations you have with your team while answering these questions should be thought-provoking as you grapple with your institutional philosophy, role assignments, and planning. Members of the Campus Safety Knowledge Community are happy to provide free consultation to NASPA members. Please contact the chair at jends@dso.ufl.edu for assistance in connecting with a campus expert.
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Almost every college or university in the nation has glossy pamphlets that call for their undergraduates to get involved on campus. These publications boast of the numbers of student organizations, diversity of clubs, and opportunities for growth. Additionally, scholars point out the value of undergraduates being involved in college. A student’s positive college experience can help increase socialization, retention, and self-efficacy (Astin, 1999). Campus involvement includes participation in student clubs and organizations, on-campus employment, leadership opportunities, and other activities. In a nutshell, becoming involved on campus is a pertinent factor for a wholesome college experience for all students.

A review of the current literature indicates a lack of research in the area of campus involvement for students with disabilities. A 2008 dissertation at East Tennessee State University echoes this finding (Alexis, 2008). Recent areas of research for students with disabilities have centered on getting these students to college, easing their transition, and providing reasonable accommodations for their academic success. However, since students with disabilities account for at least 11% of the student population in colleges and universities today, conversations about their involvement on campus, types of involvement, and reasons to become more involved must begin. This article explores the benefits and drawbacks of group-specific involvement for students with disabilities. “Group-specific” is loosely defined as a club or an activity that is specifically for students with disabilities. Examples include Delta Alpha Pi, the national honor society for students with disabilities, or programs administered by a disability.
Benefits

One of the main benefits of group-specific involvement for students with disabilities is the opportunity for peer interaction and support. This type of interaction is especially important for incoming first-year or transfer students. Peer interaction and support can range from academic to personal and social. For example, current students can provide information on navigating campus culture, receiving exam accommodations, or even making and maintaining friendships. Having more information about the situation they are in and getting the perspective of current students who have “been there, done that” can empower incoming students as they enter the unknown. Students in these positions can also play a vital role in reached out to mentor high school students with disabilities who aspire to go to college. Finally, new student orientation is also a venue where peer interaction and support from participating in a group-specific organization for students with disabilities is useful. Both parents and new students can benefit from the insight that current students can provide regarding attending college as a student with a disability.

Group-specific involvement for students with disabilities can also have an external, positive impact. These students can choose a related and relevant cause, such as the success of students with disabilities in college (or another cause), and they can use this group and its students to advocate on campus and in the community. For instance, a group-specific student organization can organize events during National Disability Month to engage students, staff, and faculty in current issues, challenges, or other facets surrounding being a college student with a disability. Recognizing that this is a student-led initiative will empower students with disabilities as a whole and encourage members of the campus or community to accept and understand the students’ strengths and weaknesses, like those of any other student population. Acceptance and understanding are among the keys to eradicating the stigma around disabilities.

Drawbacks

While group-specific involvement has several benefits, there are also drawbacks to consider. First, students with disabilities may be hesitant to disclose their disability to those around them, if it is not a physical or obvious disability. Their hesitation can have a variety of causes, including personal and societal. Participation in a group-specific activity will inadvertently disclose their identity. This apparent threat can prevent students from participating in efforts by student affairs professionals who are attempting to engage them in group-specific activities. Since this hesitation can have its roots in deeper concerns, it is challenging to address it during programming for students with disabilities.

Another consideration is that group-specific involvement for students with disabilities can reinforce the stereotype threat that they may experience in a college setting. Stereotype threat, introduced by Steele (2010), is defined as a stereotyped individual responding affirmatively to society’s negative view of her or him in certain situations. Because of the stigma surrounding disabilities, one must ask if a group-specific affiliation will increase the negative associations of being a student with a disability. As detailed by Walton and Carr (2012),
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Quinn performed a study in 2009 which found that students who were reminded of their mental health condition before taking a reasoning test showed a decline in their performance on that test. As student affairs professionals, we must consider whether this drawback will outweigh the potential benefits of group-specific involvement.

Group-specific campus involvement for students with disabilities is only one type of involvement. It can empower students with disabilities, but it may have deeper associated costs. As this conversation continues, we must consider the benefits and drawbacks of each type of involvement for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities must be involved on campus to enhance all students’ personal growth and the growth of the campus community. Student affairs professionals should continue to consider and maximize both accessibility for and participation of students with disabilities in campus activities.

www.naspa.org/kc
For decades, research has been an oft-mentioned, somewhat prioritized, but seldom-seen aspect of the student affairs profession. Without question, scholarly work informs our day-to-day interactions with students, advances our understanding of their characteristics and behaviors in and out of the classroom, and provides insight into their involvement and experiences (Jablonski, Mena, Manning, Carpenter, & Siko, 2006). The impact of fraternities and sororities and the outcomes of membership have long been studied (Jakobsen, 1986; Kuh & Lyons, 1990; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Pascarella et al, 1996; Student Life Studies, 1997; Wechsler, Kuh, & Davenport, 1996), and a content analysis of research on the topic has been completed (Molasso, 2005). Yet as a new generation of students and professionals joins our campus communities, a clearer, more modern picture of the fraternal movement is necessary that can confirm or refute widely held beliefs about fraternities and sororities and provide guidance to shape future programs and services (Bureau, 2007).

1. Establish more formal connections with the Center for the Study of the College Fraternity (CSCF) and the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) to promote funding opportunities for fraternity and sorority life research.

As it moves forward, the F&S KC acknowledges the need to educate professionals working in and near the field of fraternity and sorority life. Data-driven strategies to inform professional practice are key to improving the understanding of fraternities and sororities and to better serving their members and institutions. To this end, the F&S KC has committed itself “to promote research and assessment initiatives and support existing research on fraternities and sororities” (NASPA F&S KC, 2012). To advance its research agenda, from 2012 through 2015, the KC will—

Respondents represented those who have a shared interest in advancing fraternities and sororities and included all NASPA regions. The vast majority identified themselves as college or university professionals. Beyond demographic questions, survey feedback was open-ended and provided the leadership team with members’ opinions surrounding their institutions/organizations, their views of fraternity and sorority life, and the distinct role that the KC should play in addressing the most pressing and significant issues they identified. After coding the data and categorizing responses, key themes emerged. Not surprisingly, safety and risk management were identified as issues facing the fraternal movement. In addition, member retention, diversity and inclusion, values congruence, and institutional relevance were cited as pressing issues (NASPA F&S KC, 2012).

Of particular note was members’ belief that the KC was uniquely positioned to address the topic of research (or a lack thereof) on fraternal organizations, their members, and the campuses they inhabit. Similar calls for an intentional and directed research effort have been raised (Bureau, 2007). Five years ago, Bureau (2007) suggested 10 topics for consideration by professionals and graduate students alike when researching fraternities and sororities. They included the impact of culturally based organizations on retention of students of color, an examination of the hazing culture, the retention of senior members, the management of risk within fraternity and sorority communities, and the congruence of these organizations with their mission and values.
2. Centralize existing fraternity/sorority research, with the CSCF’s assistance, in a repository with easy access for NASPA members

3. Promote assessment in the fraternal movement

Progress toward these objectives is already under way. A member of the KC leadership team is actively engaged with the CSCF, the AFA, and others within and beyond NASPA to clarify the national research agenda and support existing and new initiatives. Equipping student affairs professionals with the tools to succeed at NASPA to clarify the national leadership team is actively engaged with already under way. A member of the KC Progress toward these objectives is incumbent upon the F&S KC to take the lead in creating new knowledge, consistent with the overall NASPA mission, to assist professionals who are working with these dynamic groups. In doing so, the KC hopes to advance campus-based ethical and values-based fraternity and sorority communities that further the educational mission of their host institutions. If you would like to learn more about this dynamic, exciting process, please visit the F&S KC website for more information; your input and involvement are welcome.

As one of the largest NASPA KCs, it is incumbent upon the F&S KC to take the lead in creating new knowledge, consistent with the overall NASPA mission, to assist professionals who are working with these dynamic groups. In doing so, the KC hopes to advance campus-based ethical and values-based fraternity and sorority communities that further the educational mission of their host institutions. If you would like to learn more about this dynamic, exciting process, please visit the F&S KC website for more information; your input and involvement are welcome.
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Historical media and academic literature in the United States portray a negative, disparaging image of East Asians. There is even more ridicule for East Asians who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT), or queer. This literature review reveals some ways that colonization and globalization create and feed horizontal oppression among gay and bisexual East Asian American men.

Prejudice between members of marginalized groups is also a phenomenon to be understood. Often called horizontal racism, this concept is the belief or act of enforcing a dominant system of discrimination and oppression. It can occur between members of the same racial group or between members of different, targeted racial groups. In the context of this literature, subjects such as horizontal racism are referred to as horizontal oppression. In this review, racism describes attitudes from dominant and toward subdominant identities; oppression describes attitudes held toward parties with subordinate identities by others who also hold subordinate identities.

Only a limited amount of empirical research and literature focuses on racial horizontal oppression within the queer community. A thorough review requires an interdisciplinary approach, including sources from inside and outside of higher education. To deconstruct queer horizontal oppression, I reviewed literature focused on masculinity, gender roles, dating, mass media, anti-Asian sentiments, and diaspora.

Anti-Asian Sentiments

There are many attitudes toward various racial groups, especially those that do not hold a White dominant identity. Often negative, these attitudes are rampant in the modern-day United States. Racism is not new, but has a long and rich history in its subtle and overt forms that many try to forget.

The mass media perpetuate stereotypes of femininity, docility, and exoticness (Erbentraut, 2010c). The East Asian stereotypes of docility and femininity allow negative sentiments against this group to continue to be condoned in the gay community (Erbentraut, 2010a). Anti-Asian, anti-fat, and anti-aging prejudice are among the dominant forms of oppression found within gay male culture. There is a common dating exclusionary triad: no fatties, no femmes, no Asians (Erbentraut, 2010c). These prejudices are epidemic in the wider community of gay White urban American affluent men (Erbentraut, 2010a).
Asians in Media

In-group racial horizontal oppression can be traced to assimilation, acculturation, and homophobia, which have long been institutionalized into the fabric of U.S. society. The homophobia of heterosexual Asian men toward queer Asian men is largely responsible for the systematic horizontal oppression of queer Asian men toward one another (Erbentraut, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c). Because all Asian men are portrayed as effeminate, queer Asian men further perpetuate this stereotype. A well-known and controversial example of this was the 2004 spread in Details Magazine: “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?” The piece showcased an Asian male who presented an ambiguous “Gay or Asian?”

Gay Asian and Diaspora

In his research on Filipino gay men, Manalansan (2003) discussed how Filipino men have to negotiate between Filipino and American sexual and gender traditions; more specifically, between bakalita and Western gay ideologies. Bakalita is a Tagalog term that encompasses homosexuality, hermaphroditism, cross-dressing, and effeminacy (Manalansan, 2003). Although the Philippines is not a part of the East Asia region, it is the best example I could find that mirrored the lack of language used in East Asian cultures for the nuances of gay sexuality. In my experience of speaking three dialects of Chinese, there is a lack of formal gay vernacular used in sexual and gender depictions. The lack of formal language and written history concerning gay sexualities can be attributed to the lack of colonial history in East Asia. This history may also contribute to the lack of research on men who both identify as East Asian and queer.

Global Queering

Global Queering, an idea that has sparked considerable debate among LGBT scholars, is defined as a proliferation of LGBT identities across the globe (Jackson, 2005). The concept is highlighted by racial and culturally homogeneous queer sexualities as shown by the increasingly more visible queer residential areas (Erbentraut, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Jackson, 2005; Rushbrook, 2002). As Global Queering finds its way into the gay Asian Diaspora (Altman, 1993) due to the overwhelming influence of the United States as a global economic, political, and cultural superpower (Altman, 1997; Gawthrop, 2004), queer Asian Americans find themselves dating more White-Anglos (Gawthrop, 2004). Altman (1995) attributed these relationships to two contradicting factors: the need to assert a universal gay identity invoking similarities with queer Westerners and, on the other hand, the proud embrace of a newly asserted “Asian-ness” that could potentially undermine an “assumed solidarity” with gay White-Anglos. These trends show traces of horizontal oppression that can also be tied to assimilation and acculturation.

Conclusion

Identities are often too generalized and universalized. Manalansan (1997) asked a great question of who bestows legitimacy in the narration of gay and lesbian development. Available literature, research and even LGBT identity development models and theories show that this legitimacy is centered around a monolithic association of gay identity with White gay masculinity. The intent of this review was to change this monolithic association by focusing on various forms of horizontal oppression.
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Wellness and health promotion within institutes of higher education has evolved over the years to take on various definitions and to manifest in diverse scopes of practice for campus communities. Throughout the years, several seminal documents have emerged, aiming to create guiding principles for practicing health promotion in higher education. In 2001, the Standards of Practice for Health Promotion for Higher Education (SPHPHE) (Allen et al., 2007) was published, focusing on guiding principles for the mission and scopes of practice for health promotion units; an updated version of the SPHPHE was released in May 2012. In 2006, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS, 2012) first published the standards and guidelines for the functional area of “Health Promotion Services.” CAS is a widely used document for many functional areas in higher education including wellness and health promotion.

Although standards and guidelines are instrumental in providing health promotion services, more essential is building a deep understanding of the fundamental concepts by which these services can be carried forward. Health promotion, as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, is the process of enabling people to increase control over and improve their health (WHO, 1986). The Ottawa Charter (1986) proposes three strategies in practicing health promotion: (1) advocating for health to create the essential conditions for health, (2) enabling all people to achieve their full health potential, and (3) mediating between the different interests in society in the pursuit of health. The Ottawa Charter (1986) also details five health promotion actions: build healthy public policy, create supportive environments, strengthen community action, develop personal skills, and reorient health care services toward preventing illness and promoting health.

Wellness is a more contemporary concept emerging from health promotion. WHO defines wellness as the optimal state of health of individuals and groups. Wellness has two focal concerns: the realization of an individual’s full physical, psychological, social, spiritual, and economical potential; and the fulfillment of the individual’s role expectations in the family, community, place of worship, workplace, and other settings (Smith, Tang, and Nutbeam, 2006).

In practice, wellness and health promotion initiatives are characterized under three categories of prevention: universal, selective, and indicated (WHO, 1986). Universal prevention targets the general population; selective prevention targets subsets of the population with specific risk factors; indicated prevention targets individuals deemed at risk. The Institute of Medicine extended this framework to place a diagnosis at the threshold where prevention ends and treatment/maintenance begins (Institute of Medicine, 1987).

As such, the evolution of health promotion as an aspect of public health within institutions of higher education requires an in-depth understanding of benchmarking data to quantify areas of strengths and weaknesses. There have been two benchmark surveys for health promotion in institutes of higher education: the Health Promotion in Higher Education Survey in 2003 and the Health Promotion Services Benchmark Survey in 2005. These surveys provided essential information with regard to the state of health promotion on college campuses. However, the transformations and changes around what this information means to health promotion professionals demand a more comprehensive examination of the current infrastructures and resources available at institutions across the nation.

From November 2011 to February 2012, the Wellness and Health Promotion Benchmark Survey 2012 was sent to directors and leaders of wellness and health promotion units in institutions of higher education. The survey aimed to gauge the infrastructure and resources that support health promotion professionals and practices. In addition, it included questions on referencing relevant health promotion documents and standards, reporting within institution structures, and managing student/ staff responsibilities and support. For the first time in benchmarking history, we used the American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II survey to establish eight dashboard indicators for student health behaviors.

The results of the survey gave us insight into the diversity of infrastructures, support, and practices, especially as a reflection of various frameworks in operation. As we move forward in public health, especially in the setting of higher education and amid the diversity of each institution, we need to be open and flexible in understanding public health through various lenses. This fluidity is a unique characteristic of public health that should be welcomed in its entirety and embraced in the evolution of the field. Thus, benchmarking is a critical instrument to establish key measurements and to understand our current state of practice in order to move forward.
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American College Students
Examining Rational Myths and Native American College Students

Tara Leigh Sands
Residential Coordinator for Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, University of Rochester

Stephanie Waterman
Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership, Warner School of Education, University of Rochester

One of the programs available at NASPA 2012 was “Examining Rational Myths and Native American College Students,” led by Tara Leigh Sands, Stephanie Waterman, Melissa Raucci-Youngs, and Kristen E. Willmott. The goal of this program was to identify the rational myths—the unexamined assumptions that influence policy and programs based on what seems rational and beneficial—with regard to Native college students (Pascarella, 2006). Designed as part of an explanation on rational myths, the program provided the opportunity to discuss how rational myths are affecting Native college students across the United States and Canada.

One of the rational myths discussed financial aid. Guillory and Wolverton (2008) discovered that when several higher education administrators and policymakers at institutions and areas with high Native American populations were asked what contributed to their college persistence, the number-one answer was financial aid. However, when Native American students at those same institutions were asked what contributed to their college persistence, the number-one answer was family. The students named financial aid as a barrier to persistence, but only after issues such as single parenthood (Guillory & Wolverton, 2008). The same higher education administrators reported that “...if the financial barriers were removed, Native American students would persist” (Guillory & Wolverton, 2008, p. 70). One can imagine the policies that administrators may have crafted based on the assumption that financial aid is Native American college students’ primary need for college persistence; yet, the administrators’ assumption was incorrect. So, how does this rational myth affect Native American support and persistence?

Another program that may be influenced by a rational myth is the underrepresented student support office, which is designed to serve all underrepresented students regardless of cultural context. This becomes a problem, as Native students are not simply another ethnic group; they have political status as members of sovereign nations, a fact that is often ignored (Deloria & Lyle, 1984; Gonzales, 2003). By treating Native students at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) as just another group of color that can be serviced by a one-stop office, the PWI recognizes only one aspect of indigeneity: race. The PWI also ignores the political, while indigenous students define themselves according to tribal traditions in addition to federally defined terms (Garroutte, 2003). This policy only recognizes the racial group of indigenous students and does not consider their sovereign status. Without examining the different needs and cultures of indigenous students, a single support unit on campus could encourage isolation; however, for smaller campuses this arrangement may be the only option.

Other rational myths discussed include scholarships, mascots, trainings, campus culture, and Native culture. Participants shared their own experiences and other rational myths they have experienced. A heavily discussed topic was that of Native American mascots and issues related to removing these mascots. The counterargument heard across campus with these mascots is the view of honoring Native culture, with no recognition of the harm from stereotypes and lack of cultural awareness used with these mascots. The other argument is the history of the mascot at the institution. The mascots build upon and create stereotypes that are not realistic and do not honor the culture of any tribe. Overall, each of the rational myths discussed seemed to highlight a negative impact on Native American college students.

At the end of the presentation, participants were asked to reflect on a few questions. What are the assumptions behind some Native American scholarships? How is Native identity determined at your institution? How do assumptions affect Native student experiences? What structures on your campus perpetuate rational myths? How do you recognize when assumptions are driving policy? What are the best practices of your institution to avoid policies based on rational myths? What are some practices that we can consider to help us avoid rational myths? What can we do? How can we challenge rational myths? The answers to these questions can help us begin understand and move away from rational myths that affect Native Americans’ college experience. Removing them can create and enhance a positive college experience for all students.

Going forward, what can student affairs practitioners and scholars do to combat the rational myths that exist on institutions of higher education? This question and its answer can begin to break down the stereotypes and common problems that Native American students face in higher education. A desired outcome of the program was to begin to recognize and challenge rational myths on campus. We are in a unique position to move beyond these rational myths and create an inclusive community for all students.
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INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY
Student Affairs Professionals as Cultural Facilitators to Support Intercultural Development in Study Abroad

Cherie Pettitt
Assistant Professor, Minnesota State University, Mankato

Daniel Macari
Associate Professor, St. Cloud State University

Internationalization and the production of interculturally competent students are increasingly emphasized goals among many colleges and universities (Harman, 2005; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Study abroad is the most commonly utilized strategy (Knight, 2006; Lincoln Commission, 2005) and is gradually becoming accepted as an essential component of all academic majors as a means of helping to develop future global citizens (Bolen, 2007). Unfortunately, there is a deeply rooted yet faulty belief about study abroad that cross-cultural contact will automatically lead to intercultural learning, development, and competence, which will then help create future global citizens (Bennett, 2009; Vande Berg, 2009; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009). Bennett (2009) conveyed his concern with the incongruence between the stated goals of traditional study abroad and its design. Study abroad often includes only tours, visits to museums, and cultural lectures; activities that do not lead to intercultural gains (Bennett, 2009; Vande Berg, 2007). Yet the stated goals of study abroad include intercultural learning gains (Bennett, 2009). Thus, the primary purpose of our study was to assess differences in intercultural development among graduate students who studied abroad with a cultural facilitator and intercultural pedagogy, who studied abroad without a facilitator or intercultural pedagogy, and who did not study abroad (control group). The student affairs professional served as the cultural facilitator.

Drawing from Sanford’s (1966) theory of challenge and support, Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, and Paige (2009) of the Georgetown Consortium Project, the largest assessment of U.S. student learning as a result of study abroad, concluded that the single most important intervention with regard to student intercultural learning is the presence of a cultural facilitator (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009). A cultural facilitator may plan and lead the presojourn orientation and reentry sessions to ensure that intercultural concepts are presented to meet the goal of helping students increase their intercultural competence. In addition, the cultural facilitator can help students navigate reverse culture shock upon their return. During the study abroad, cultural facilitators can help support students who may struggle with adapting to cultural differences and challenge students appropriately when the natural tendency while abroad is to stick with what you know and what is safe.

The academic objectives of a study abroad are important for meeting curricular requirements. However, the intercultural objectives of the study abroad should be equally important. If not, why go abroad? Academic objectives could likely be met through such things as readings and films, without traveling abroad. Unfortunately, faculty who lead study abroad come from a variety of disciplines and may or may not be competent in the intercultural development pedagogy essential for intercultural gains in students who are studying abroad. Taking into account the numerous intercultural and global competency recommendations of the NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) competencies for the student affairs profession (ACPA/NASPA, 2010), and the likelihood that short-term study abroad opportunities will continue to increase, pairing student affairs cultural facilitators with academic faculty may help develop the necessary intercultural objectives. Student affairs professionals are positioned uniquely to colead study abroad and serve as cultural facilitators because of their knowledge of student development theory and practice, and because of their ability to reinforce the importance of intercultural competence through their daily interactions with a diverse student body. Many student affairs professionals are trained in student development; however, more formal training is needed in intercultural theory, pedagogy, and developing a plan for increasing their own intercultural competence.

While more research is needed, our data suggest that a cultural facilitator and the intercultural pedagogy utilized...
pre-, during, and postsojourn were important to prevent students from regressing in their intercultural development after studying abroad (Petitt & Macari, 2012). We hypothesize that the cultural facilitation during the experience helped students feel challenged and supported (Sanford, 1966), which improved their intercultural development. In addition, the pre- and postsojourn pedagogy better positioned the students to maximize their study abroad experience.

Until college and university administrators, staff, and faculty address the issues of providing intercultural pedagogy to those who study abroad, they are only partially fulfilling their missions to create interculturally competent students and global citizens. In the future, student affairs professionals may play an important role to enhance the student intercultural development outcomes of studying abroad. College and university administrators should provide student affairs professionals with formal opportunities to enhance global and intercultural competencies through coleading study abroad, international courses, and intercultural trainings. A partnership between faculty and student affairs professionals can help prepare students for living and working in a global world by increasing their intercultural competence.
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These strategic recruitment decisions to attract Latino students present a new set of issues that warrant further exploration (e.g., college choice, transition to college, student engagement, retention), but the first year in a student’s college career is essential for long-term success (Nora, Barlow, & Crisp, 2005; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989) and instrumental to future positive academic experiences (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1987). Because Mexican Americans represent the majority of Latinos in Texas—indeed, in the country—this qualitative study specifically examined the first-year experiences of eight Mexican American students enrolled in a Texas HBCU.

Theoretical Framework

The selected framework for this study was Jalomo and Rendón’s (2004) transition to college model for nontraditional students, which encompasses three key tenets: separation, validation, and involvement. According to Jalomo and Rendón, separating from home life to an unfamiliar institutional environment can be a traumatic process. “Consequently, separation needs to occur gradually, allowing students to move slowly toward healthy individuation, while still maintaining ties to their family and culture” (p. 41). Upon matriculation, students encounter various academic and social challenges, but validation has the power to transform students’ doubt into confidence. More specifically, “[v]alidation is an enabling, confirming and supportive process initiated by in-and out-of-class agents that foster academic and interpersonal development” (p. 44), and it is the precursor to involvement.
Involvement is exemplified with institutional connections that extend beyond ethnic subgroups or subcultures and includes the larger campus community.

Methodology
This qualitative study utilized purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002) to identify and select an HBCU in Texas and to recruit and select participants. The university was selected based on its publicly stated interest in recruiting Latino students, and it received the pseudonym “Texas HBCU.” Eight students (four females and four males) who self-identified as Mexican American and as current second- to fifth-year students at Texas HBCU participated in this study. Students were interviewed twice, and each interview was digitally recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using a general inductive approach (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Thomas, 2003).

Major Findings
Four major findings emerged from this study. First, all of the participants, many of whom were first-generation college students or from low socioeconomic backgrounds, described the support and encouragement they received from Texas HBCU students, professors, and staff prior to enrolling in the university. These precollege interactions with institutional agents informed the participants’ college-going aspirations and ultimately led to their decision to pursue their degree at Texas HBCU.

As first-year students, participants encountered and responded to educational, social, and cultural challenges, and they drew upon their precollege knowledge and experiences to navigate their first year. Their first-year experiences consisted of a distinct physical and cultural relocation from their hometown to the university. They also encountered new academic expectations and negotiated relational and emotional separation processes from family and friends.

The next major finding relates to the participants’ in-class validation and perceptions of the university’s learning environment. Faculty-student interactions were key to students’ academic transitions and persistence because professors were accessible to students and available to meet or answer questions outside of office hours.

Finally, campus involvement in this study was influenced by official university activities (e.g., student athletics or choir) and employment responsibilities. Students used their official campus activities as a springboard for additional involvement activities. In some cases, however, time constraints due to external responsibilities limited participation in organizations and campus traditions.

Discussion and Implications for Student Affairs Professionals
The findings from this study offer three key implications for HBCUs. First, it is important for HBCUs leaders to connect with Latino family members. Parents and extended family members are instrumental to the college-going process for Latino students, but in most cases, the participants’ family members were unaware of the university’s historic mission to educate African Americans. HBCUs should include parents in new student orientation and should also consider translating marketing materials into Spanish to better inform and connect with Latino families.

In addition, HBCUs should offer multicultural trainings for professors and student affairs administrators. Students discussed the academic support they received from the university, yet they found it difficult to identify campus role models or Latino representation on campus. Educating staff and professors on cultural norms and promoting the rich heritage of this emergent population can foster greater institutional commitment among Latino students.

Finally, HBCU administrators should support Latino student organizations through involved advisors who offer nuanced mentorship, cultivate leaders, interpret university policies, and provide financial support, when possible. Latino student associations, fraternities, and sororities have distinct mission statements and operating procedures, and dedicated advisors should ensure that organization officers receive training and support to develop their respective groups. By supporting these organizations, administrators can also help connect Latino students to the larger African American campus community.
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Beyond bad dogs: Toward a pedagogy of engagement of male students

Osvaldo Del Valle
Learning Community Coordinator, California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo

I have been conducting student conduct sessions, in one form or another, for 8 years. Whether it is directly adjudicating a student conduct case or supervising new professionals in this area, every once in a while I will be involved in a larger and involved case with other colleagues in Residence Life. I recall a case where four students, two male and two female, were involved in an alcohol incident. Three resident hall directors (RHDs) shared the responsibility in overseeing this case: I had the two males, and the two females were split by two other RHDs. All students were underage and were consuming alcohol in one of the male students’ room when a resident assistant discovered them.

One day, after having already met with my two residents, I happened to run into one of the RHDs involved in this case. I asked the RHD if they had a chance to meet with their resident, and the RHD replied in a matter-of-fact tone, “Yes, I did. I gave her a warning for the infraction.” I replied, rather perplexed, “A warning? Wait, did you send out her sanction letter already?” The RHD had made a decision without discussing the case with colleagues to corroborate all of the stories. Protocol at most institutions dictates that all adjudicating officers confer with each other regarding all the parties and their involvement in the infraction. To sum up, after further testimony and corroboration of statements, the female student who received the RHD’s warning sanction to was indeed the person who actually purchased and transported the alcohol to the residence hall. However, what was more problematic in this case was the RHD’s flippant attitude and rationale: “She seems like a good girl.” How does one quantify that? What does this student’s presumed demeanor have to do with this judicial case? My colleague allowed presumptions to influence his decision-making process. He allowed biases about “good girls” to cloud his judgment, though this bias was not evident to...
Multiracial and Transracial Communities: A Special Bond

Joy Hoffman
Director of the Cultural Center, Whittier College

Multiracial people and transracial adoptees share a unique bond. Both may identify with distinctive family dynamics, have issues related to environmental context and identity, and even desire to expand the multiple checkboxes currently on the census. Although I do not identify as multiracial, some of my experiences as a transracial Korean adoptee align with the experiences of multiracial individuals more than those of monoracial backgrounds. This is not to say that I “get” what it is like to be multiracial. I do, however, understand the complexity of identity. People who do not know me see an Asian woman. What they do not know is that I identify as Asian/Korean but have two other salient identities: transracial adoptee and one who is more comfortable with dominant (White) culture. This becomes complicated, if not a little uncomfortable, when people expect me to speak Korean or share knowledge about Korean culture. Some of my multiracial friends and colleagues have shared similar stories of how their looks “throw people.” These factors and anecdotes contribute to a complexity of identity and produce challenges for multiracial persons and transracial adoptees. Several parallels can be drawn between these two populations, adding to the strength of the case to educate student affairs professionals on supporting, counseling, and advising students who are exploring their multiracial or transracial adoptee identities. It also builds the case for including transracial adoptees in NASPA’s Multiracial Knowledge Community.

Transracial adoptees may associate with more than one ethnicity or race during their developmental journey. This parallels student development theories addressing mixed-race populations and may be instructive to the field of student affairs in addressing their needs. Renn (2000, 2003) and Wijeyesinghe (2001) developed two unique perspectives on the identity development of mixed-race individuals. Renn suggested that there are many different forms of identity development for multiracial students, and for some, their development varies in different settings. Specifically, Renn explored tensions that may emerge when different settings or spaces interact. These models may not reflect my experiences specifically, but I can appreciate the challenges one might face regarding group understanding, lack of resources, and tensions in various settings.

Multiracial identity models may help practitioners understand the intricacy of identity and significance of environmental context, but racial identity development for transracial adoptees—or children with adoptive parents of another race—bears the complexity of little to no contact with biological parents or native cultures (Brodzinsky, Scheckter, & Henig, 1992; Friedlander, 1999; Grotevant, Dunbar, Kohler, & Esau, 2000; Steward & Baden, 1995). This is one of the primary differences between multiracial and transracial adoptees.

Bronfenbrenner’s (1989, 1993) developmental ecology theory suggests that development is influenced by elements of process, the person, context, and time (PPCT). He further classifies environmental contexts as consisting of microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems, and macrosystems. According to Bronfenbrenner, the interaction (process) of the person with various contexts over time influences development. In a recent study (Hoffman, 2011), 12 transracial (raised by White parents) Korean American adoptees were interviewed in person and encouraged to respond to journal prompts and/or follow-up phone interviews. Participants were asked how their journey of ethnic identity development influenced their college experiences. Whereas the participants in this study reported multiple challenges that stimulated development of higher order thinking and identity in light of each of the three microsystems, many of the most significant challenges emerged as separate adoptee, White, and ethnic identities converged. This developmental process took time and was not fully achieved during the undergraduate experience. Findings concluded that a more intricate journey occurs in identity development and suggests that racial and/or ethnic identity development is an ongoing process affected by the environment, systems, and experiences that interconnect throughout an adoptee’s lifetime.

Implications for student affairs professionals include theory-informed interventions for transracial adoptees and other students who face significant intersection of multiple identities. Much like multiracial individuals, transracial adoptees need a space to explore their complex identities and experiences. Such space can emerge through coursework, programs, student organizations, and services. The complexity of identity can continue to be informed through the study of multiracial students, with contributions and parallels drawn between transracial adoptees. However, the study of transracial adoptees will also continue to have its own set of unique characteristics. Practitioners can learn a great deal from both populations, as the number of multiracial students and transracial adoptees continues to rise on our college campuses.
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NEW PROFESSIONALS AND GRADUATE STUDENTS KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY
The Importance of Understanding and/or Being a Millennial Within Student Affairs

Daniel Hirsch
Assistant Director of Residence Life, Grinnell College

Michael Pulju
Graduate Student, Colorado State University

Defining the Millennial Student
In higher education, the term “Millennial,” or those born after 1980 (Gavatorta, 2012), is often tossed around as an adjective to describe a typical college student. Also called “Generation Y” (Gavatorta), Millennials have an obsessive need to communicate via technology. Although we just barely make the cut to be considered members of Generation Y ourselves, we were still interested to read about how others think we like to communicate, our innate sense of entitlement, our strong work ethic, and our knowledge and use of technology. Using these characteristics to paint a bigger picture, our generation has been described as “resilient but simultaneously overloaded and stressed out with the worries of the world, literally” since we desire so much stimuli from what happens around us (Bland, Melton, Welle, & Bigham, 2012, p. 364).

Millennials in Student Affairs
Acknowledging the unique characteristics of Millennials is becoming more relevant, as the vast majority of current graduate students in student affairs programs and new professionals in the field belong to this generation. Millennial professionals are influencing higher education in many ways, such as significantly contributing to staff diversity and having parents who are as actively involved in their lives as the students with whom they work (Bland et al., 2012). Perhaps the most significant impact is their knowledge and utilization of technology. At their oldest, Millennials were born in the 1980s, so they grew up during the technological revolution that the Internet has provided. This familiarity with technology makes them the first generation of “digital natives,” whereas by comparison all previous generations are “digital immigrants” who have been forced to shift perspectives in order to accommodate this technological onslaught (Young, 2012).

Millennials and Technology
Generation Y’s relationship with technology has both benefits and challenges in the context of a career in student affairs. They can use platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn to connect with each other both personally and professionally. Some even contend that Facebook enhances its users’ involvement in their physical environment when viewed through a lens of Astin’s (1999) theory of student involvement. “Facebook has the potential to shape college interactions, just as brick-and-mortar student unions traditionally do on campuses” (Heiberger & Harper, 2008, p. 34). Astin (1999) believes that programs, activities, and resources should encourage more involvement; since Millennial professionals have grown up with this technology, they are also easily able to use it to connect with the undergraduate students they support.

The Internet and smartphone technology are also regularly used to access information quickly on any topic that arises from virtually any location. Many Generation Xers and Baby Boomers who supervise Millennials find that this combination of interconnectedness and instantaneous access to information results in tasks being completed quickly and efficiently (DeRuiter & VandeWaa, 2010). Some, however, voice a dissenting opinion and struggle to grasp how a Millennial could be effective in juggling so many simultaneous tasks.

Technology can also hinder Millennials’ ability to be successful in the workplace. Millennial professionals tend to rely heavily, if not solely, on digital communication, and in a collaborative environment such as student affairs, this can cause tension in the workplace (Gavatorta, 2012). The digital world can be an easy avoidance of or escape from the physical world for those who are accustomed to using contemporary technology. Many colleagues, and particularly supervisors, have acquired their skills with digital communication after establishing themselves in the field of student affairs. This generational gap can create difficulty when attempting to communicate, and many Millennials will need to be intentional about their approach to connecting and engaging with colleagues (Gavatorta).

Millennials and Job Searching in a Tough Economic Landscape
The search for employment can be challenging for anyone. “[Especially] in this age of information and a worsening economy, it is likely that [Millennial] applicants will carefully research career options before they engage on their...”
Millennials and the Future

Millennials are not going away. They comprise the vast majority of the student population we work with and represent a rapidly growing influx of new student affairs professionals. Millennials are multiskilled, appreciate an immense amount of information, and can excel in the right environment. Additionally, they welcome change, are able to thrive in ambiguity, and desire support from their supervisors and peers (Heiberger & Harper, 2008). For older generations working with Millennial students or staff members, it is important to understand their motivations, passions, and purpose, as these often drive what they seek in a position or career. For Millennial graduate students and new professionals, it is important to acknowledge what makes our generation unique and capitalize on our strengths in the job search and throughout our careers.

Another way Millennial job seekers are increasing their marketability is by enrolling in master’s degree programs. Even then, the experience level of graduate students is rising, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to elevate oneself above other applicants. Varying the graduate school experience—by searching out diverse opportunities in a wide range of offices to provide multiple perspectives and skill sets—can make the difference that employers seek (McClellan, 2010). Again, the more flexible a Millennial job seeker can be in the search process, from experience base to desired position and institution, the more prepared he or she can be to navigate the challenging job market.
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The perception among many university officials is that parental involvement in the lives of college students is increasing at an alarming rate (Keppler, Mullendore, & Carey, 2005; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Parents have often played a role in their children’s college experience; however, “since the late 1990’s, college and universities have noted a cultural shift in the relationship between most parents and their traditional-age college students” (Wartman & Savage, p. 1). Popular media and university professionals have called the parents of the current generational cohort of students as “helicopter parents” in reference to their tendency to hover over their students, waiting to intervene on their behalf (Donovan & McKelfresh, 2008; Wartman & Savage). Both the media and college professionals have cautioned that the helicopter parenting prevalent in today’s society may inhibit students’ ability to achieve autonomy.

Despite the number of news stories about the negative influences of helicopter parents, research suggests that some level of parental involvement can assist students in being more successful both socially and academically (Carney-Hall, 2008). Several studies have indicated that a strong attachment to parents can result in better adjustment to university life (Hiester, Nordstrom, & Swenson, 2009; Kenny, 1987 1990; Kenny & Donaldson, 1991, 1992). Based on the findings drawn from these studies, the following is a list of recommendations for university administrators regarding the relationship among the institution, the student, and the student’s parents.

1. University administrators should not characterize all parental involvement as “helicopter parenting.”

Many parents are involved in the lives of their college students; however, the behaviors associated with helicopter parenting do not reflect the behaviors of all parents. Wartman and Savage
(2008) have suggested that we broaden the definition of parental involvement to include “parents’ showing interest in the lives of their students in college, gaining more information about college, knowing when and how to appropriately provide encouragement and guidance to their student . . . .” (p. 5). Several institutions are taking a more positive approach to their work with parents. Many institutions have created Parent Relations Offices and now offer separate orientations for parents.

2. University administrators should be cautious about overgeneralizing research on the Millennials

The popularity and availability of generational research has made it very easy for college and university administrators to overgeneralize the information about Millennials and their strong ties to their parents to the entire student population. Howe and Strauss (2000, 2003) have widely illustrated the fact that Millennial students embrace their close relationship with their parents and that they often encourage their parents to intervene with college officials on their behalf. However, the conclusions that have been popularized about Millennials are for the most part based on White, middle- to upper-class students who have college-educated parents (Donovan & McKelfresh, 2008). Research indicates that first-generation college students have different experiences with their parents than those of the stereotypical Millennials (Auerbach, 2006; Ceja, 2000; Lange & Stone, 2001; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Although first-generation students may still report close relationships and frequent contact with their parents, it has been reported that their parents are far less likely to intervene with college administrators on their behalf.

3. University administrators should study the K–12 literature on parental involvement to inform practice at the collegiate level.

The literature on K–12 students indicates that at all levels of schooling, high levels of parental involvement result in social, personal, and academic growth (Wartman & Savage, 2008). From kindergarten through grade 12, parents consistently hear the same message from school authorities: Be involved and your student will be successful.

Higher education should pay closer attention to the messages that parents hear in the K–12 arena and acknowledge the growing body of literature that links parental involvement and student success. Colleges and universities should recognize that for numerous reasons, parents are part of the college process. If administrators have a better understanding of the parental experience in the environment leading up to college, perhaps institutions can alter their expectations and see parents as partners in the educational process, rather than adversaries.

4. University administrators should evaluate the messages parents receive from campus offices and develop a clear institutional philosophy on the role of the parent within the educational process.

University administrators need to evaluate the often inconsistent messages that they are sending to parents about a parent’s place within the campus community. Lang and Stone (2001) have pointed out that for many parents; their first contacts with an institution are the admissions office and the financial aid office. The college admissions process has become increasingly competitive. As colleges become more deliberate in their recruitment efforts, they are recognizing that parents have a strong influence on where their students go to school; as a result, admissions officers are heavily including parents in the process. Additionally, financial aid awards are generally based on parents’ income, so parents are truly partners in the financial aid process. If admissions and financial aid professionals are sending a message to parents that they are an important part of the educational process, what expectations does this set for parents as they interact with other areas within the college or university? Generally, the next experience is orientation, where parents interact with several offices and hear conflicting messages that actively promote parental involvement but also stress letting go, student privacy, and student independence. These conflicting messages can be sources of frustration and confusion for many parents, particularly those who are from lower socioeconomic backgrounds or have not attended college themselves (Auerbach, 2006; Ceja, 2000).

Ulloa and Faulkner (2005) recommend that “college officials should embrace parents as partners instead of isolating them as nuisances or worse, adversaries” (p. 26). Parents are part of the educational process. University administrators can continue to find unique and special roles for parents within the institution to further foster student success.
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SPIRITUALITY AND RELIGION IN HIGHER EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY
Bridging the Divide Between Religious and Nonreligious Students
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Much research in the past decade indicates that the number of people identifying as nonreligious in the United States is rising. The American Religious Identification Survey (Kosmin & Keysar, 2008) found that 15% of the population considers itself nonreligious, a 7% increase from 1990. The number of nonreligious students on college campuses is also increasing. In their book Souls in Transition: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of Emerging Adults, Smith and Snell (2009) indicate that nearly 60% of emerging adults identify with a religious tradition, but the fastest rate of growth among college students is the nonreligious.

More recently, the Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey (CRSCS), which measures undergraduate students’ perceptions of key climate dimensions and profiles attitudes and behaviors related to religious diversity and interfaith engagement, has identified a divide between religious and nonreligious students on some of the campuses surveyed during the 2012 administration (Rockenbach & Mayhew, 2012). Initial CRSCS findings demonstrate that on campuses where students who identified as Christian were the majority, those students often perceive their campus as safe for expressing their own identity and safe for other religious identities; nonreligious students on these same campuses are likely to indicate that campus is not a safe space for the open expression of their beliefs. As more college students continue to identify as nonreligious, what can be done to bridge the divide between the two groups, while affirming both identities?

Actively addressing issues related to religious identity and development is relatively new to higher education. Some may argue that issues related to faith should be left off campus. However, the Higher Education Research Institute’s national study Spirituality in Higher Education (2003) indicates that many college students are, in fact, interested in issues related to spirituality. Daloz Parks (2000) argues that college is the perfect time for students to engage in questions around their religious or nonreligious identity. In addition, many “hot-button” issues on campuses intersect with religion in some form. Catholic institutions remain in a heated debate on the health care mandate (Nelson, 2012). Secular student groups have been denied recognition at some religiously affiliated institutions (Grasgreen, 2012). And stories have surfaced regarding the debate around open membership for religiously affiliated student groups (Smietana, 2012). Student affairs staff need to be able to address the concerns of students from all religious and nonreligious traditions in order to help students engage one another productively.

The growing body of research cited above indicates that particular attention should be paid to helping religious and nonreligious students engage with one another. We suggest the following strategies for student affairs professionals who desire to bridge this divide and promote a campus climate that is inclusive of both religious and nonreligious students.

- Conduct staff trainings that focus on religious literacy, identity, and inclusion of religious/secular beliefs. To navigate conversations about religious identity with students, staff and faculty need to have basic understanding of (1) tenets of different traditions, including nonreligious traditions and (2) day-to-day issues that are likely to arise in residence halls, cafeterias, and worship spaces when working with students who are actively practicing their tradition.

- Advocate for environments and structures that allow students to explore and practice their own traditions. For many students, a community of peers who have similar beliefs is critical; this is especially the case for students who are more likely to feel ostracized from the norms of campus culture. Speak up to support devoted prayer rooms for Muslim students and to allow atheist students to organize on campus. When your campus considers whether to add a Hindu or Humanist chaplain to the ministry staff, say yes!

- Create learning spaces that allow diverse religious and nonreligious students to come together respectfully and safely. Encourage students from all faith or nonfaith backgrounds to talk about their values and work together in order to promote understanding among students who may be very different from one another. This helps establish the kind of behavior we want our students to demonstrate as future leaders and engaged citizens. Student affairs staff can create opportunities, such as retreats, living-learning communities, facilitated conversation, and social action projects that invite all voices to the table. Sociologists Robert Putnam and David Campbell (2010) tell us that when people from different traditions come together through common activities, they are likely to have a more positive opinion of the person who is different.
and of that person’s religious tradition as a whole.

- Take time to “do the work” to reflect on one’s own religious or nonreligious commitments in order to mentor others. Staff and faculty who are comfortable with their own faith or nonfaith background are more likely to invite students’ religious or nonreligious identities into safe curricular and co-curricular spaces. These professionals can serve as mentors who can listen and share religious, spiritual, and philosophical insights and struggles so students know they are not alone.

College campuses have the unique opportunity to bring together students from religious and nonreligious backgrounds to intentionally foster mutual understanding. Student affairs staff can utilize the strategies described here to promote campus environments that foster pluralism, respect, and justice for students from all philosophical backgrounds.
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Members of the Student Affairs Fundraising and External Relations Knowledge Community recently met at the historic Brown Hotel in Louisville, Kentucky, for the annual Student Affairs Development Conference. More than 60 student affairs and fundraising professionals attended the conference. One of the primary topics of conversation was cultivating parents as donors to institutions of higher education.

Increasing numbers of college parents are becoming benefactors and volunteers for their children’s institutions. According to the Council for Aid to Education’s Voluntary Support of Education Survey, parents gave nearly $540 million to U.S. institutions of higher education during 2010. The amount is increasing each year, making parents one of the fastest growing donor constituencies.

Rob Henry serves as Executive Director of Emerging Constituencies for the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). As the keynote speaker for the Louisville conference, Henry said, “There is so much money [with parents]. I am always surprised that we don’t go after this constituency group in greater numbers.” He discussed the impact of parental giving to student affairs, and why it should be a target market for a student affairs development team, if it is not already. He suggested, “There is an emotional connection for the parent since it is their child at your institution. You should also be thinking: I have this parent for a lifetime—not just the 4 or 5 years that the student is on campus.” Some parents develop such an affinity that they continue to give long after their student graduates. And after graduation, parents typically have additional disposable income, since they are not spending it on tuition.

Also presenting at the Student Affairs Development conference were Michael Kuhler, Director of Development for Student Affairs, and Barbara Jones, Vice President for Student Affairs, both at Miami University in Ohio. Miami University has a strong parents program and a 40-family parent council that aids in fundraising activities for student affairs. Jones indicated that “student affairs units have the most contact with parents out of anyone else in the university.” Therefore, it makes sense that student affairs development officers are primarily the ones responsible for courting parent donors. Many parent programs are already in place within student affairs. For example, parent orientation, parent visit weekends, and parent councils are already commonplace. Therefore, student affairs development officers are able to weave giving opportunities into these preexisting events.

University of Minnesota’s annual parent survey indicates that 82% of parent programs now actively fundraise. Gift officers regularly reach out to parents who have the potential to be major donors. As institutions continue to rely on parents as donors to student affairs, fundraisers...
must adjust strategies. The same strategies that work for alumni at the institution do not necessarily work for parents. For example, parents want to support programs that assist in their students’ success, such as leadership development programs or career centers, whereas alumni may be more prone to donating to historical programs of which they were members. The more successful parent fundraising efforts further define their market using strategies such as parents in certain ZIP codes or parents of scholarship recipients.

Landa Nehls, parent of a Dartmouth College sophomore, indicated that she received a letter from the institution asking her for a large donation just 1 month after her daughter started as a new student on the New Hampshire campus. When she did not respond to that letter, another one followed 2 months later, asking for a smaller amount. Parent and even grandparent donations at Dartmouth do make an impact. The Dartmouth parent website imparts:

An ethics class that changes lives.
Competitive athletic programs.

Superb scholar-teachers accessible to every student. Opportunities to create and serve. Financial aid. The dreams and aspirations of bright young men and women crisscrossing daily on an old, historic green. In 2010–2011, your gift to the Parents and Grandparents Fund is fueling these parts of the Dartmouth Experience and more. Thank you.

To learn more about the initiatives that parents support at that institution, visit http://parents.dartmouth.edu/support/gift_impact.html.

Overall, in a time of declining state support and smaller endowment returns, parent donors are a welcome benefit to supplement existing programs and establish new ones within the field of student affairs. In the same way that parent programs grew on our campuses in the 1990s, we are now seeing the same growth in parent fundraising today. However, University of Louisville Vice President of Student Affairs Tom Jackson reminds us what is really important: “We know there’s a lot of money with parents. But it is not about the money. It is about the relationship.”

Follow the student affairs fundraising conversation on Twitter with hashtag #NASPAded.

Following the releases of seminal works such as Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered 2, there has been a heightened emphasis on the need for partnership between student and academic affairs to enhance student learning (Cook & Lewis, 2007). An example of such collaboration is the growing population of student affairs professionals fulfilling job responsibilities in both student and academic affairs. Although the need for collaboration between student and academic affairs is well documented, little research has been conducted regarding student affairs educators serving in academic roles (Violanti, 2007). These professionals are different than traditional student affairs educators in that their responsibilities often result in them being “caught in the middle” of academic and student affairs roles and cultures” (Violanti, p. 7).

Both Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered 2 outline several potential areas to bring student and academic affairs together, including career development, academic advising, living-learning programs, and service-learning (Cook & Lewis, 2007). These areas also provide opportunities for student affairs educators to fulfill academic roles and responsibilities. In an effort to increase awareness of and participation in these partnerships, the NASPA Student Affairs Partnering with Academic Affairs Knowledge Community (SAPAA KC) has created groups that focus on niche areas: Academic Advising, Career Services, Learning-Learning Communities, and Service-Learning and Civic Engagement.

**Academic Advising**

Few areas exemplify Violanti’s (2007) “caught in the middle” effect more than that of the academic advisor. This role often has a much closer relationship with faculty than most other student affairs professionals, and the advisor can call on these connections to bridge the gap between faculty members and students. Research has clearly shown that forming strong relationships with faculty has a strong positive impact on student retention, persistence, and overall satisfaction with the higher education experience (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Knowing who among the faculty students can turn to when they have questions about undergraduate research or graduate programs can help create a strong academic experience.

Academic advisors can help illuminate other connections as well. Showing the relationship between cocurricular leadership roles or a specific internship and a student’s academic experience may seem obvious to those in the profession, but it is often less so to the student. At
the other end of the spectrum, competent advisors can also help facilitate faculty buy-in when they are faced with unfamiliar student affairs concepts, such as learning objectives or cocurricular involvement.

Career Services
Because career advising evolved from academic advising and career counseling (Hughey, Nelson, Damminger, & McCalla-Wrggins, 2009), it should come as no surprise that career advisors often find themselves walking a thin line between academic and student affairs. At many institutions, career advising, counseling, exploration, and development have traditionally been viewed as issues addressed by student affairs professionals; however, some institutions, such as Texas A&M University, house career services within the division of academic affairs rather than student affairs.

During a time where many students need to explore career options and reflect on their interests and abilities, collaborating with faculty to develop experiential education opportunities that complement academic curriculum, such as internships and cooperative education, is becoming increasingly important (Evans, 2003; Hughey et al., 2009). In this context, career advisors can help students apply learning to work. Moreover, many career centers engage in first-year seminar programs that incorporate career learning into the curriculum and facilitate classroom presentations by partnering with faculty (NACE, 2004). As such, career advisors are able to fulfill academic responsibilities and aid students throughout the career decision-making process, both inside and outside of the classroom.

Living-Learning Communities
A growing body of literature shows that various forms of learning communities contribute to the enhancement of faculty-student interaction and, ultimately, student learning (Shushok & Sriram, 2010). Research shows that “residence-based programs consistently enhance student-faculty interactions … and are more effective than other learning communities in harvesting desired student outcomes” (Shushok & Sriram, p. 71). However, the success of these programs is predicated on the collaborative partnerships formed between student and academic affairs.

Student affairs professionals in living-learning communities often engage in program quality management, establish a sense of community, and promote student learning (Schroeder, 1994). They constantly partner with faculty to have a positive impact on student outcomes such as learning, satisfaction, development, and persistence (Shushok & Sriram, 2010). Thus, professionals serving in this capacity help bridge the gap between student and academic affairs.

Service-Learning and Civic Engagement
Service-learning offices are housed in both academic and student affairs divisions across the country. In either setting, professionals find themselves balancing between the need to guide faculty in how to connect learning objectives in the classroom with what the students are learning in the community. Ash and Clayton (2009) postulate that many faculty struggle to foster students’ personal growth in addition to encouraging the academic and civic learning that takes place in service-learning. Some faculty believe that personal growth is outside their scope as educators. Ash and Clayton have found that personal growth is essential to a student’s development and should not be dismissed. Although we are educating students on the content in their specific field, students should also fine-tune skills such as how to navigate difference, how to communicate effectively, and how to work in a team—all of which will help them in their future careers. Student affairs professionals housed in service-learning units can weave student development theory into their practice to foster student learning, growth, and development.

Conclusion
Over time, the roles within the academy have evolved. Faculty have gone from being the sole authority figures to serving alongside student affairs educators, resulting in the need for collaboration between student and academic affairs. This change is well documented and has brought with it numerous opportunities to provide enriching learning experiences for students, especially in the areas of academic advising, career development, living-learning programs, and service-learning. But with these new opportunities come challenges, and student affairs educators should explore these avenues while being mindful of our history and strengthening the academic connections that it gives us.
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Values-based leadership and ethical decision-making are hot topics. However, the expectations and frameworks surrounding these characteristics are often unclear. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2007) state, “[l]eadership with integrity is a complex process that includes the moral development of an individual, the influence of role models, values-driven leadership, and the organizational environment” (p. 209). One must “work through complex problems and engage in a process that includes reflection before action” (p. 180). Reflection may be unfamiliar or uncomfortable for some students who have never directly articulated their values and/or their rationales for ethical decisions. Therefore, they sometimes struggle finding congruence between ethical intentions and actions. The purpose of this article is to analyze values-based, ethical decision-making processes and examine the process of resolving ethical dilemmas, it is important to examine ethical decision-making frameworks. Ethical decision-making frameworks can help individuals “reach a more informed and carefully analyzed decision before [they] take any action…[t]oo often, we are tempted to quickly put out fires or react to pressing dilemmas without engaging in a process that would provide some assurance that the right decision was made” (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007, p. 208).

Ethical Frameworks

Many ethical frameworks come from the Josephson Institute, an organization whose mission involves “improving the ethical quality of society by changing personal and organizational decision making and behavior” (Josephson Institute, 2012a, para. 1). This institute created The Six Pillars of Character—trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship—providing a “common lexicon” to help individuals reflect on their own ethical decision-making processes as well as those of other diverse groups (Josephson Institute, 2012b; Wilken & Walker, 2004). The institute’s Bell, Book, and Candle Test offers another decision-making framework. The bell symbolizes being alerted and warned of an ethical issue. The book represents acknowledging any laws or policies that would hinder one’s choices. The candle shows how one’s decision will look in the light to conclude whether one acted with reason and fair-mindedness (Josephson Institute, 2010; Pinnell & Eagan, 1995).

Moreover, Kitchener (1984) identified five principles guiding ethical decision-making: (1) autonomy (the free will to make a choice and/or action); (2) nonmaleficence (doing no harm to others); (3) beneficence (promoting good for others); (4) justice (treating others equitably); and (5) fidelity (honoring commitments). These guidelines provide an ethical decision-making framework for identifying the problem and potential issues, considering ethical guidelines internally and consulting with others, pondering courses of actions and consequences associated with those actions, and implementing the best course of action. Kitchener’s framework offers the decision maker an opportunity to examine situations from multiple angles, weigh pros and cons, and attempt to find a utilitarian-centered outcome.

Conclusion

This article analyzes values-based, ethical decision-making frameworks. Human beings are complex individuals; therefore, we do not posit that there is one particular methodology or framework to cultivate values-based, ethical leaders. Dialogue about core values, ethical considerations when making decisions, and the power of reflection can take place anytime, anywhere. Thus, leadership educators must challenge students to justify ethical decisions, moving past superficial rationales while supporting critical thinking and reflection in and out of the classroom.
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As “sustainability” becomes more commonplace in our institutions, each of us is becoming more aware of the fact that we must rise to the challenge of promoting sustainability in whatever capacity we can. Each of us is at a unique stage in the process of promoting sustainability, but it is important that we not allow our own journey to limit the possibilities for implementation.

While we may know that sustainability can be a positive recruitment tool and a cost saving initiative, we may not fully understand the intricacies of sustainability’s role in our professional lives. Therefore, it is essential that all of us be able to recognize the formalized role of sustainability in higher education, the roles we must play, and the goals and strategies commonly associated with implementation practices.

**Institutional Commitments**

As sustainable practices gain popularity in higher education, we are seeing a variety of avenues for making formal commitments to sustainability. The styles of commitment and implementation have evolved significantly over the past decade (Taylor, 1999). Many institutions are now choosing to publicly announce their interest in promoting sustainable efforts through participation in external programs such as the American College and University Presidents’ Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) and Sustainability Tracking, Rating and Assessment System (ACUPCC, 2012). Other institutions are choosing to promote sustainable practices internally by implementing programs, tracking greenhouse gas emissions, and even establishing sustainability planning documents (Markham, 2012). Both strategies have their benefits and must be carefully selected in order to meet the institution’s needs, values, and mission.

**Identifying Key Players**

Jessica Bilecki, a former fellow in the Yale Office of Sustainability, states, “It is the job of offices of sustainability to bring all the stakeholders to the table, and facilitate planning and implementation of programs and initiatives that will work for all parties” (2012). One of the most difficult aspects of true sustainable development at a college or university is the need for such a large and diverse group of individuals to be involved in the planning process. Leaders for sustainability in higher education need to make sure that at least one representative from each administrative and academic unit is invited to participate in the planning and implementation process.

Since true sustainability cannot occur without buy-in from all on-campus entities, it is both admirable and necessary for all employees of the college or university to identify themselves as a leader in sustainability, and communicate such leadership to the sustainability professional(s) who are responsible for coordinating efforts. An individual need not have a formal educational background in sustainability to be involved and effective in a program’s implementation (Bailey & Keen, 2012).

**Common Sustainability Goals**

Once sustainability planning committees are in place, they are charged with the hefty task of identifying goals for achieving compliance with institutional commitments. In some cases, goals are outlined in the commitment itself. Others are vague and require the group to respond to the unique needs of the campus. It is common to see some form of the following goals in institutional sustainability plans:

- Carbon neutrality and energy reduction
- Environmentally preferable purchasing guidelines
- Sustainable land and pest management
- Increase in recycling rates
- Reduction in landfilled waste
- “Green” cleaning standards
- Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification
- Sustainability education (Stewart, 2010)
- Increased civic engagement

**Common Implementation Strategies**

Each college or university will encounter a unique set of challenges and triumphs when implementing sustainability goals. Infrastructure development, education, and programming must be at the forefront of everyone’s mind. Unique implementation mechanisms will be discovered, although the following common program models in the field have proven successful for a large number of institutions that are working toward sustainability:

- Eco Reps: This student peer-to-peer sustainability education program is typically a residential living organization, though some thrive as traditional student organizations.
- Composting: A simple composting program can be a great introduction to waste minimization efforts on campus.
- Ride Share Board: A simple website that allows students, faculty, and
staff to post dates and locations for planned trips lets them easily connect with others on campus to reduce the number of cars on the road.

- Bike Share Program: Many universities have seen success by collecting and refurbishing lost/unclaimed bikes on campus, buying sturdy locks, and allowing students to “check out” a bike when needed.
- Revolving Loan Fund: Some campuses have been able to use student fees, endowments, or grant funds to start a revolving loan that can fund large energy-saving projects with a short payback. The payback funds are then returned to the program to implement new projects.
- Recycling Program: Owing to economic and geographical restraints, some institutions struggle with ease or access when it comes to recycling. A committed team on campus can greatly improve existing programs or help to establish new ones.
- Earth Day/Campus Sustainability Day Events: Campus Sustainability Day occurs on October each year and Earth Day occurs in April. Both dates are excellent times to highlight sustainable programs or events.

The route that individuals, departments, and institutions choose to take on the road toward sustainability will vary greatly. Individuals should allow themselves to truly evaluate this topic and the role it can serve in improving daily interactions with people, the environment, and the economy. Choosing to collaborate with a diverse group of invested individuals will enrich the experience for the entire campus and community. As Dan Garvey, President of Prescott College, said, “I just don’t want people to be discouraged in their attempt at greatness” (Frolich, 2012). Each of us plays a vital role in the institution’s success, regardless of the formalized sustainability commitments that may or may not be established.

The Sustainability Knowledge Community is committed to informing NASPA members of trends and issues relating to sustainability implementation in higher education. If you are interested in sharing your institution’s story, please participate in our online survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/SustainabilityImplementation. Results will be made available in the Knowledge Community’s newsletter.
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Communication Technologies

In the beginning, there was sneakernet (The Jargon File, Version 2.6.2, 1991). We shared files as needed by copying them to a portable drive and carrying or intercampus mailing them to those who needed them. There were many issues with this approach. One was file redundancy, from multiple versions of files without a way to reconcile the differences. Retrieval of information was inefficient; there was significant latency, and if you needed something, you waited for it to be delivered. Privacy was a problem, because once a file was shared, you had little control over where it went. Capacity was limited by the media; if you had only a 3.5” floppy, you were limited to about 240 megabytes of data. Out of these needs, shared drives became the standard in shared electronic workspace.

“It’s a trap!” is one of the more popular phrases from the film Return of the Jedi, said by rebel leader Admiral Ackbar when the Alliance forces are met with an ambush during their attempt to blow up the Death Star (Marquand, 1983). Although we as student affairs professionals rarely have the opportunity to lead a strategic attack against the Galactic Empire’s ultimate weapon, we are often faced with leading a charge of changing the ways we use our shared electronic workspaces. As part of our work, we all create information that we need to share with others, but we often fall into a series of traps as we try to determine the best ways to do so among a diverse group of technologies, colleagues, and sharing needs. This article will discuss technologies for shared electronic workplaces, list issues of these technologies, and suggest ideas for improving your shared electronic workplace.
Surprisingly, though, the issues of sneakernet persist in today’s shared electronic workspaces, and have been joined by other problems.

A shared drive is a “...common network folder(s) that can be utilized for storing files that need to be viewed/maintained by multiple users” (Saginaw Valley State University, 2012). When implemented correctly, shared drives can significantly improve latency, capacity, and privacy, but without the proper set of policies, redundancy is just as prevalent. We now have the added issue of unnecessary data being stored because someone believes that they might be valuable some day. A shared drive also introduces the problem of others changing or even deleting your documents and causing you to lose data. Finally, shared drives still are not universally accessible; many organizations require you to be within their internal network or to connect with a virtual private network to connect to this resource. Many users find this difficult if not impossible to do outside the office. Out of these needs, enterprise collaboration software was born.

Enterprise collaboration software systems can encompass a wide variety of solutions; one of the most popular is Microsoft’s SharePoint. Many of these tools offer document collaboration, versioning, and online access. Unfortunately, the addition of this technology has merely caused an incremental shift from one technology to another. Most organizations have discovered that they need a policy to stay organized and that no one technology is a panacea.

Information Management Policy
An information management policy is a set of rules for managing content in a shared electronic workplace. Such a policy allows us to control and track things like how long content is retained and what actions users can take with that content. “When it becomes easier to find data electronically versus [on] paper, you know your organization has achieved a successful file structure and set of guidelines” (McCorry, 2009, p. 3).

How do you get to this point?

Consider your environment: are you using a shared drive, using an enterprise content management system, or perhaps both? In what ways do you envision these system(s) being used? How do they interact with one another? Are you using this technology to store data or to share data? Your folder/file hierarchy should reflect your answer. If you are using the technology for sharing, make it easy for users to find things based on the topic. If you are using the technology for storing, develop your hierarchy with archival principles in mind, using folders to separate data by time period or years. Once it is established, users should stick with the existing hierarchy. Develop a process for modifying this hierarchy as needed, and for naming your files and folders. Many organizations have a standard set of acronyms; publish and maintain this list and ensure that users do not deviate from it in naming files. Have users label files with their functional area’s name rather than their own name. This will ensure that as staff transition, their documents and work will survive the change. Name items with the date only when appropriate. If the item is temporal, include a date in a standard format; yyyy-mm-dd is the most easily searchable and sortable (Canada, Alberta Government, 2005, December). If the technology you are using has the capacity to version files, use this rather than adding version numbers to the file names.

Ultimately, there is no one technology or policy that will work for all organizations or users. If you consider your needs, users, and organization, you can take control of your shared electronic workspace without becoming trapped by it.

Jediah Cummins is a Residence Life Coordinator at Texas Tech University and chair of the NASPA Technology Knowledge Community. Connect with him on Facebook at http://facebook.com/linnix or Twitter at http://twitter.com/JediahCummins.
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Although the presence of student veterans has nearly doubled on our campuses over the past 7 years (McBain, Cook, Kim, & Snead, 2012), it has only just started to surge, and this trend should continue for several years. Service members who enlisted primarily to serve a minimum term in the military, to then depart and use the GI Bill benefits as soon as possible, are eligible for their first full-time fall semester of classes in 2012. Although we will see gradual increases in our student veteran populations, we will not be overwhelmed as we were in the 1940s, when the GI Bill caused a near-doubling of the total U.S. college student population (Olson, 1974). However, with the Post 9-11 GI Bill being the most generous educational package in the history of the GI Bill programs (Vacchi, 2011; 2012a) and with an expected downsizing of the U.S. military following the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we will likely see noticeable increases of student veterans for the next several years.

How should concerned student affairs professionals approach the student veteran population? We should critically consider the veracity of the small body of contemporary research, because it involves few informed voices, is generally not grounded by a veteran’s perspective (Vacchi, In Press), and is not generalizable to all student veterans. If knowledgeable voices emerge to contest questionable ideas for serving student veterans, the average campus veterans’ advocate may feel more confident in agreeing that questionable benchmarking practices have little value. A program that works for student veterans on one campus may not be appropriate for another campus, and reliable research by thoughtful scholars is the only way campus officials can know this with certainty. This latter point is of critical importance for campus professionals regarding programming for their own student veteran population: in the absence of comprehensive or trustworthy research, consult your own student veteran population regarding their needs for programs and services.

The NASPA Veterans Knowledge Community is beginning to address these issues with more intentional advocacy for a baseline of scholarly work on our student veteran population. Several foundational questions persist, the most obvious of which include “Who are student veterans?” and “What is veteran friendly?” To date, complete definitions of these two terms have been elusive, to the detriment of research on this burgeoning student population. During discussions in the spring and summer of 2012, the NASPA Veterans Knowledge Community has developed draft definitions of these two terms to begin a national conversation to help focus research and inquiry into student veterans.

NASPA’s initial definition of a student veteran is “…a student who is a current or former member of the Active Duty Military, the National Guard, or Reserves regardless of deployment status, combat experience, legal status as a veteran, or educational benefit use” (Vacchi, 2012a). It defines a population unified by one common experience: all student veterans have undergone military initial entry training and have had some degree of socialization to the military. Defining “veteran friendly” can be problematic because most people are unclear about who we are talking about as veterans. Given the above definition of student veteran, we can see that all efforts toward military friendliness and veteran friendliness would be encompassed by a common definition. The concept of veteran friendliness suggests facilitating an equitable and welcoming environment on our campuses for student veterans.

The NASPA Veterans Knowledge Community also supports the following broad definition of veteran friendly, which I advanced at a research conference in 2011:

A veteran friendly campus identifies and removes barriers to the educational goals of veterans, creates a smooth transition from military life to college life, provides information to veterans about available benefits and services, creates campus awareness of the student veteran population, and creates proactive support programs for student veterans based on their needs (Vacchi, 2011).

This general definition offers a philosophical approach for considering student veterans and building programs to support student veteran success.

Until a more robust and generalizable body of research emerges to better inform our practices, concerned professionals might take two possible approaches to supporting the success of student veterans. The first is to listen to your own campus’ student veterans and address their needs, keeping in mind that programming for veterans does not have to cost money. The second is to frame your thinking about student veterans as nontraditional students, rather than traditional students, and refer to that literature for ideas (e.g., Bean & Metzner, 1985; Smart & Pascarella, 1987; Weidman, 1989). From this literature, it is clear that social connections with other students, particularly with nonveteran students, is not as important for veterans’ success as it may be for traditional-aged students. Further, relationships with faculty in and out of the classroom become more important to retention and success, as faculty are the primary face of the institution owing to frequency of contact and can most affect student veteran perceptions about the friendliness of the campus. Finally, a student’s treatment during the process of obtaining services can also affect student veteran persistence. If a student veteran perceives a high degree of resistance to getting necessary services, then this may influence a decision to depart college or at least depart your campus: neither of these are desirable end states.
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The Violence Against Women Act was originally passed in 1994 and has typically been renewed easily with bipartisan support. Currently, however, the Violence Against Women Act is stalled in Congress. The House and Senate have passed competing Violence Against Women Acts, but a reconciliation between the bills has not been reached. Although there is bipartisan support for the bill, other issues currently being debated in Congress may overshadow the Violence Against Women Act, and some doubt whether differences between the two bills will be reconciled any time soon (Berman, 2012).

The Violence Against Women Act has strong rules to hold offenders responsible for their actions against women. It also provides programs and services to victims of violence. According to the White House Factsheet on the Violence Against Women Act, criminal justice response has improved since the Violence Against Women Act was passed. Additionally, victims and their families have had access to the services they need to become safe and rebuild their lives. The White House has reported several civil improvements since the law was passed, including fewer people experiencing acts of domestic violence, victims reporting more crimes and being better able to access help, and states changing their laws to increase the severity of punishment for crimes typically committed against women. This law has had a positive impact on our country and is important for the protection of women (The White House, n.d.).

For those working in higher education, the Violence Against Women Act as currently written does not have direct implications for practice. However, the version of the bill that has passed in the Senate will require major changes in public reporting of crimes that occur on college campuses. The Senate’s version of the Violence Against Women Act includes an expansion of the Clery Act. The Clery Act requires colleges and universities to track and report stalking, domestic violence, and dating violence that are reported on campus. While advocacy groups support adding the provision, some in the field are worried that the addition of the provision would complicate compliance with the Clery Act without actually improving safety on campus (Smith, 2012).

Additionally, the Senate version would require colleges and universities to create new on-campus disciplinary procedures in response to stalking, domestic violence, and dating violence-related crimes. Higher education administrators, staff, and students would have to understand these newly created procedures, and the procedures would require a timely resolution to reported crimes. The Senate version would also require that victims receive their rights in writing and that on-campus prevention programs increase in number (Love, 2012).

Previous versions of the Violence Against Women Act have not included additional reporting requirements for the Clery Act. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how the Senate version of the bill would help or hinder administrators, students, or programs. However, the current reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act has provided clarification on where the Clery Act falls short on reporting specific crimes whose victims are typically women. If the current Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act becomes law, colleges and universities would have to report on more crimes that occur on campus, increasing the amount of time and effort administrators spend on federal reporting. However, this additional reporting could provide transparency and accountability for such crimes and potentially result in safer campuses for all students.

Since the Violence Against Women Act is currently stalled in Congress, it is difficult to know whether higher education administrators will be required to report on more types of crimes. Administrators will have to wait to see if the Senate and House can compromise on the bill so the Violence Against Women Act can be reauthorized. Only time will tell if the Senate’s provision to including stalking, domestic violence, and dating violence within the Clery Act reporting requirements will remain within the bill, or if it will be lost during negotiations with the House.
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