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This KC publication, Excellence in Practice, represents one of the many ways KCs create and share knowledge to support our association’s strategic plan and the professional development of our membership.

The national chairs/co-chairs of our 27 KCs identified authors who would provide timely, thought-provoking articles on topics that are important to our KCs and our profession. The articles in this publication reflect best practices, current research, and emerging trends in student affairs.

A new feature of this KC publication is the inclusion of professional competency areas. Authors were asked to identify the competencies advanced by the knowledge in individual articles. These were included to support your own professional growth and also to serve as an important reminder of the broad professional knowledge and skills expected of student affairs professionals.

I encourage you to share this publication with your colleagues on campus. Reading these articles will expand your knowledge, perhaps challenge your thinking, and, we hope, stimulate learning and discourse to help us better serve our students.

Best wishes and happy reading!

Frank E. Ross III, Ph.D.
National Director of Knowledge Communities 2013–2015
NASPA Board of Directors
Vice President for Student Affairs
Northeastern Illinois University
At the 2013 NASPA Annual Conference, the Administrators in Graduate and Professional Student Services Knowledge Community sponsored a preconference session on “Collaborating Across Divisions to Meet Graduate Student Needs” (www.naspa.org/kc/agapss/conference.cfm). Student affairs officers who work with graduate and professional (G&P) students must partner with many constituencies to support student learning and development (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012). One goal of this collaboration is to create a campus environment that allows G&P students to navigate multiple career pathways.

A recent report from the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) highlights this necessity: The changing landscape of both the academic and non-academic job markets requires student affairs officers to develop their own professional competencies and to work across divisional lines on campus to further G&P career development (Wendler et al., 2012). The student learning and development professional competency mandate to “build and support inclusive and welcoming campus communities that promote deep learning and foster student success” applies to serving G&P students as well as undergraduates (American College Personnel Association [ACPA] & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA], 2010, p. 27).

Creating these coalitions can seem daunting: Traditionally, providing professional development for G&P students to prepare them for careers outside of academia has been seen as the sole responsibility of a centralized career services office. Such an office is vital for G&P students, but student affairs staff in and outside of academic departments and professional schools must also support centralized career services staff to promote G&P career success. The “Recommendations for Universities” section of the CGS (2012) Pathways report provides a framework for getting started.

**Case Study**—UCLA Responds to CGS Recommendation #2: Make Career Counseling Available to Graduate Students, and #3: Track Career Outcomes and Job Placement Information for Graduate Students.

At UCLA, we recognized that career counseling for G&P students comes from many different sources on campus, including a centralized career services unit; however, departments/offices did not know what others were
doing to provide professional development for their G&P students. In response, we partnered across divisions to create a Graduate and Professional Student Welfare Committee, including representatives from our graduate division, student affairs, career center, counseling and psychological services, students, departmental student affairs staff, and faculty. This initiative was supported by the vice chancellor for student affairs and vice provost and dean for graduate education. A subcommittee focused on developing a vision for career services for UCLA G&P students.

The subcommittee created a survey that was sent to student affairs officers in all academic departments. It provided an inventory of existing campus partnerships, faculty and staff time devoted to career services, and student needs. We used the survey to inform discussions to start a campuswide career services network of staff and faculty so they can work together to best serve G&P students exploring multiple career pathways.

The survey also asked about job placement tracking. Currently, only doctoral students complete an exit survey; master’s students are not surveyed nor are G&P students who leave their programs early. The survey showed that 20% of our academic departments do not track G&P job placements. The subcommittee is using this information to make recommendations at both the department/school and campuswide levels, including instituting a master’s exit survey, surveying students who leave programs before graduation, and tracking all G&P and postdoctoral scholar job placement 5 and 10 years post-graduation.

Case Study—IIT Stuart School of Business Responds to CGS Recommendation #5: Broaden the Focus of Graduate Education to Include Development of Professional Skills, and #7: Provide Opportunities for Graduate School Faculty to Engage with Industry, Government, and Other Sectors.

Feedback from employers and industry trends demonstrates that hiring managers are looking for more than technical skills from G&P graduates (Graduate Management Admission Council, 2013). At IIT Stuart, academic and cocurricular teams collaborate to offer an integrated suite of professional development initiatives to improve students’ workplace readiness. The Advancing Career and Education (ACE) program includes a two-semester seminar and a workplace experience. ACE provides career management guidance and supports international students’ cultural transition to U.S. workplace culture. The Professional Communication Advancement program builds on the traditional English as a Second Language curriculum by helping students develop a broad range of cultural, professional, and soft skills (Weiss, Rossetti, & Pecoraro, 2012).

We also developed the Industry Roundtable program series, which successfully brought together industry professionals and faculty. These events leverage faculty’s industry knowledge and connections to bring professionals to campus to discuss topics of mutual interest that relate to one of our specialized master’s degree programs. These events feature a networking reception for all participants. Current students are invited, but must RSVP, wear proper attire, and attend a pre-event preparatory workshop. By incorporating alumni and students, we provide openings for engagement at multiple levels that often result in career opportunities.

At both UCLA and at IIT Stuart, we encourage a campus culture that values the graduate degree as a pathway to multiple careers, and collaborate to promote the academic and career success of our G&P students. The first step toward doing that is assessment, evaluation, and research (ACPA & NASPA, 2010); solid data will allow us to prioritize resources most effectively to foster G&P success.
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Adult learners have been a consistent presence across higher education, and their numbers are increasing rapidly. According to Hess (2011), "The most significant shift in higher education is the massive growth in the adult-student population" (p. 1). With current economic trends (Kasworm, Sandmann, & Sissell, 2000) and increasing use of the new GI Bill (Radford, 2009), this student population is quickly becoming a critical presence in higher education and must be recognized as such.

Projected Growth of Nontraditional Students
Projections of Education: Statistics to 2020 (U.S. Department of Education, 2011) predicted that between 2009 and 2020, enrollment will increase substantially for students who do not fit the "traditional" 18-to-24-years-of-age model. With a projected 21% increase for students 25 to 34 years old and a 16% increase for students 35 years and older, the 9% increase predicted for traditional students pales in comparison.
In a white paper published for the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, Stokes (2006) confirmed that the majority of higher education students are nontraditional students. However, many 4-year institutions continue to focus primarily on the traditional first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students entering college immediately after high school. Stokes (2006) also noted that “the ‘traditional’ university may likewise become a thing of the past” (p. 2).

Inclusion
Many nontraditional students report feeling marginalized by their academic institutions. Schlossberg (1989) defined marginality as a sense of not fitting in, which can lead to self-consciousness, irritability, and depression. Many adult learners experience a college environment sometimes characterized as lonely, if not hostile (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012). When opportunities to recognize student achievement emphasize academic and engagement activities designed for traditional students, that perception is confirmed.

Recognizing adult learners in an intentional manner conveys that they do, indeed, matter. Involving key faculty and staff members in scholarship selection committees, writing stories and news releases about nontraditional students, and celebrating an awareness week, can be significant steps toward raising campus awareness.

Recognizing Adult Learners
To increase the success of adult learners, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2012) recommended that adult learner programs and services initiate and conduct recognition programs that bring together both the learners and those who support them. At the University of Arkansas, Off Campus Connections, a department that supports undergraduate commuters, also oversees programs that acknowledge the accomplishments of adult learners.

Nontraditional Student Leadership Award
Most student leadership awards recognize campus-focused engagement activities that are difficult for nontraditional students to fit into their multilayered lives. At the University of Arkansas, the Nontraditional Student Leadership Award selects recipients from a pool of nominees who demonstrate excellence as students and in their lives outside of the institution. Selection criteria include the following:

- Challenging personal situations or environment
- Leadership on and/or off campus
- Academic experiences
- Promise for the future

The recipient receives a $1,000 financial award from the alumni association. Such an endorsement is just the beginning of what could lead to lifelong relationships between the students and their alumni association.

Honor Society
Alpha Sigma Lambda (ASL) is a national honor society for adult academic achievers that seeks to honor dedicated adult students who, while skillfully handling their life responsibilities, achieve and maintain high scholastic standards. Although it can be difficult for adult students to be involved in a typical student organization, it is possible for an institution to sponsor an honorary chapter, thereby eliminating the need for officers and regularly held meetings.

Academic Achievement Certificate
A certificate of achievement is a simple but significant method of recognition. Off Campus Connections awards academic achievement certificates each fall and spring semester to nontraditional students who earn at least a 3.5 GPA for the semester.

Meal Scholarship
Kazir et al. (2007) stated that “alternative financial aid programs should be considered for adult learners, whose preference for flexible schedules and shorter course offerings often prevent them from qualifying for traditional aid” (p. 14). Brown (2012) suggested that financing postsecondary education requires creative and collaborative approaches. Off Campus Connections works closely with Chartwells Dining, which donates 20 meal plan scholarships for nontraditional students each year.

Inclusive Images
Nontraditional students are rarely featured in 4-year college publications. Schlossberg (1989) reminded us that all students want to belong and to matter. One way to communicate this message is through nontraditional student images. Off Campus Connections proposed a journalism class photo project featuring adult learners. The photos resulting from this project have since been used in campus promotional materials.
Summary
Providing support systems for adult learners is important not only during their transition to campus but also for overall persistence (Kasworm et al., 2000). According to Kazir et al. (2007), “postsecondary institutions are increasingly offering more flexible schedules, such as weekend-only classes, accelerated vocation programs, online instruction, and critical support services during nontraditional hours” (p. 14). Recognition is only one of many ways to assure nontraditional students that they are valued and are an integral part of the institution.
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The integration of equity, diversity, and inclusion in NASPA’s guiding principles conveys an imperative for higher education professionals. Through support, engagement, and advocacy for underrepresented populations, an inclusive campus environment can be created and nurtured. Moreover, by recognizing the internal and external factors of oppression that impact a particular identity group’s experience, practitioners can pinpoint mechanisms to counteract these marginalizing realities. In particular, for African American faculty, staff, and students, this awareness is crucial to understanding how they negotiate racially microaggressive acts that intertwine their personal and campus lives. Wing Sue et al. (2007) described microaggressions as “brief and commonplace verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group” (p. 273). These aggressive acts perpetuate stereotype threat, devalue social identity groups, and create a hostile and invalidating work and campus environment (Wing Sue & Rivera, 2010). Over the past several months, African Americans experienced painful reminders of racial microaggressions through the Trayvon Martin verdict and the Supreme Court decisions regarding Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin and Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act. These outcomes have had an undeniable impact on the national consciousness, and they have more acute implications for African Americans. Looking at the African American experience in the university environment, this article will focus on three forms of microaggressions: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations; their connections to the recent judicial rulings; and their impact on the university experience.
Microassaults are characterized by explicit racial, verbal, and nonverbal attacks intended to hurt via name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory interactions and often occur through systemic and environmentally aggressive acts (Wing Sue et al., 2007). The Trayvon Martin outcome served as another reminder for African Americans that race is inexplicably tied to a decreased sense of belonging and right to occupy space. African American males routinely report similar experiences of being assumed an “outsider” and subsequently followed and harassed on predominately White campuses. McCabe (2009) noted that African American men described numerous occasions where they felt others perceived them as a threat, leading campus staff and police to act on that perception and control African American men’s bodies and activities. As African American community members process the verdict, it is important to remember they may have faced experiences similar to Trayvon Martin’s. It is likely they have experienced purposeful discriminatory behavior by colleagues, student peers, faculty, or campus police, thus making it important to listen to and validate their stories.

Too often higher education professionals advocate for diverse groups yet continue to promote unconscious biases against those groups. Microinsults are communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person’s racial heritage and identity (Wing Sue et al., 2007). The aftermath of the Fisher v. University of Texas ruling continues to reinforce stereotypes and assumptions regarding diversity in admissions and hiring practices. With this decision, the Supreme Court not only left the door open for future debate over the merit of diverse admissions processes, it also reinforced the message that there is no definitive place for African Americans in higher education. Without a definitive stance on the value that diversity adds to the environment, microinsults will continue to persist. Admitted qualified students must continue to defend their place at the college against peers who assume race was the deciding factor in their admission. African American faculty and staff contend with the same microinsults in their work environments. Collectively, this exhaustive process erodes the sense of belonging for African American university members and lessens an institution as a whole.

In the majority opinion issued following the Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act decision, the chief justice asserted, “…voting discrimination still exists: no one doubts that,” but then goes on to offer justification for the removal of a strict scrutiny measure that aimed to prevent that precise occurrence. This decision illuminates the racial bias that African Americans fought to overcome that is now resurfacing in a more subtle manner in the form of microinvalidation. As it is defined, a microinvalidation is a communication that subtly excludes, negates, or nullifies the feelings or experienced reality of a person of color (Wing Sue et al., 2007). While the Supreme Court argued that the provision regulated states too tightly, in its aftermath a number of states changed their voting I.D. requirements, many of which have disparate negative impacts on African Americans and other minorities. One of these practices restricts the use of college I.D.s to vote. Rules such as these will present challenges to out-of-state and first-year college students. With many African American students attending historically African American colleges across state lines and voting for the first time, voter turnout will be impacted. In essence, this decision rescinded some of the agency and protections African Americans held within the American voting system. Unfortunately, what results is that African Americans and students of all races must become more vigilant about changing their I.D.s and understanding voting laws across states.

As higher education reacts to public policy changes, it becomes important for professionals to adopt action strategies to best support the impacted populations. The microaggressions African American faculty, students, and staff face in light of these national outcomes is inadequately addressed on college campuses. As such, institutions must consider a number of best practices to support their affected populations during these times. First, creating a culture where vulnerability is encouraged will allow African American community members to have an environment of support and open dialogue. Doing so allows for trust and understanding to be reinforced and deepened. Next, critically examine institutionalized practices and norms that reinforce aggressive and marginalizing behavior on both the micro and macro levels across identity groups. Audit the institution and make improvements. Finally, recognize the emotional impact of unconscious bias on the individual and the university, and maximize opportunities for social justice trainings to occur on a daily basis. These small acts will engender a culture of inclusion that proactively addresses microaggressions and seeks to lessen the sting they render to underrepresented populations on campus.
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Underage drinking and binge drinking among college students remain major concerns, particularly for student conduct administrators. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2012) concluded that “virtually all college students experience the effects of college drinking—whether they drink or not” (p. 1). These effects include an annual average of 1,825 college student deaths, 599,000 students injured, 696,000 students assaulted by a student who had been drinking, and 3.36 million students who had driven under the influence of alcohol (Hingson, Zha, & Weitzman, 2009). Alcohol misuse also substantially impacts class attendance, performance on exams, overall grades, and retention (Arria, Caldeira, Bugbee, Vincent, & O’Grady, 2013; National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2012).

Yet another negative impact of alcohol misuse by college students is alcohol-related violations of student conduct policies, often one of the most common types of policy violations on a campus. Fortunately, policy violations offer a fertile opportunity for student conduct administrators to impact students’ drinking behaviors. We propose that student alcohol misuse can be greatly impacted by (1) incorporating motivational interviewing throughout the
conduct process, and (2) operationalizing the implications of treatment matching and operant conditioning when assigning sanctions for policy violations.

The techniques of motivational interviewing (rapport building, effective listening, affirming change-related statements, eliciting recognition of the gap between current behaviors and desired goals, etc.) have been quite successful at encouraging behavioral changes. In fact, Miller and Rollnick (2013) reported that of the more than 1,200 studies of motivational interviewing, the general consensus is that motivational interviewing creates significant effects (small to medium effect sizes) across a variety of behaviors. Therefore, a variety of fields, including mental health, conflict resolution, and law, have begun to incorporate the fundamentals of motivational interviewing. Student conduct professionals would be remiss to ignore this powerful technique and not incorporate it into their practices.

Specifically, motivational interviewing can be incorporated into the conduct process at various levels. Certainly, individual meetings with students (intake meetings, pre-hearing meetings, hearings, follow-up meetings with students, consultation, etc.) offer a prime opportunity. During these contacts with students, conduct professionals should facilitate genuine and thoughtful reflection by asking open-ended questions, offering affirmation, listening and reflecting, and summarizing effectively. Importantly, motivational interviewing should also be incorporated into less direct contacts with students (notice letters, outcome letters, etc.). Although these interactions do not allow for the give-and-take dialogue that is paramount in motivational interviewing, they do allow for the fundamental principles of motivational interviewing—nonjudgmental, student-centered, and goal-oriented practice. By incorporating principles of motivational interviewing, student conduct administrators will likely be more effective at impacting students’ future behavior.

Student conduct administrators should also consider the treatment matching literature and the fundamentals of behaviorism when assigning sanctions related to alcohol violations. Treatment matching literature suggests that alcohol treatment and education should be matched with the student receiving the services, based on level of alcohol misuse and on personal characteristics (Mattson & Allen, 1991). Notably, initial research on this theory showed support but it has since become increasingly debated. Still, a variety of efficacious alcohol programs for college students (Brief Motivational Interviewing, Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students: A Harm Reduction Approach, etc.) continue to rely on treatment matching as a core assumption of the intervention. Further, Hser, Polinsky, Maglione, & Anglin’s (1999) empirical work on treatment matching most closely mirrors the constraints of university conduct systems when attempting to curb misuse of alcohol. They matched subjects to the most reasonable treatment, given finite treatment options and consideration of the subject’s other needs (transportation, personal stressors, etc.)—just as conduct administrators attempt to consider all aspects of a student’s life and presenting characteristics when assigning sanctions. Under these conditions, treatment matching was shown to have significant effects. Additionally, the principles of operant conditioning suggest that learning and development, specifically related to the reduction in the presence of a behavior, are most likely when the response occurs soon after the behavior and when the level of response is perceived to be in proportion to the behavior (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2007).

Taken together, this treatment matching and operant conditioning literature suggests that conduct administrators can be most effective by appropriately scaling sanctions to the severity of alcohol violation. Graduated sanctioning, a way of operationalizing this understanding, is common practice in student conduct administration and should be strongly considered in sanctioning students who have violated alcohol policies.

In sum, educators should capitalize on the opportunity to impact students’ problematic drinking behaviors by incorporating motivational interviewing into their direct and indirect contacts with students while also incorporating the principles of treatment matching and operant conditioning into the sanctioning process.
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There are more than 11 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S., and more than 1.2 million are from Asian or Pacific Islander (API) backgrounds (Hoefer, Rytina, & Baker, 2012). Undocumented APIs are a minority within a minority, and there is little research on their experiences (Buenavista, 2013; Buenavista & Chen, 2013; Chan, 2010). We are educators who work directly with API students who have undocumented status and, just as important, we are also members of ethnic communities (Filipino, Taiwanese, and Cambodian) largely affected by undocumented immigration and deportation. Based on the dearth of research on undocumented API students and on our professional and personal experiences with this community, we offer a brief overview of key issues affecting this segment of the undocumented population and ask student affairs practitioners and administrators to consider how they can create a culture receptive to undocumented students that addresses the diversity of this group.

Undocumented API students face similar social, economic, and political barriers as their Latino counterparts. Due to legal constraints related to employment, undocumented APIs are subject to poverty, which severely impacts their ability to access quality K–12 schooling, higher education, health care, and social services intended to mediate challenges associated with low-income status (Ahuja & Chlala, 2013). The intersection between poverty and lack of legal status also constrains undocumented API students and families to live in areas with higher rates of policing and potential threats of deportation. Such stressors, in addition to lack of financial aid, are detrimental to college access and retention of undocumented API students, and are exacerbated by their racialization.

The criminalization of undocumented immigrants has conditioned a practice of “nondisclosure” in which undocumented API students do not reveal their status.
to avoid detection and deportation risks (Buena Vista, 2013; Chen & Buena Vista, 2012). However, this protective practice only perpetuates racial stereotypes of undocumented API students as ashamed of their status, academically sufficient, and having no interest in or need of educational support services. The misconception that API students do not face challenges in higher education represents and facilitates an onslaught of microaggressions directed toward those with undocumented status, including marginalization from programs and services designed to ameliorate undocumented student issues. For example, in our experience, it is not uncommon for APIs to lack a sense of belonging in undocumented student spaces that highlight or emphasize Latina/o cultural practices, migration stories, and community service opportunities. There have been more attempts to address educational barriers for undocumented students, but there remains a need to develop more aggressive markers of an undocumented student-receptive culture within colleges and universities. For example, the University of California (UC) system has demonstrated a consistent enrollment of undocumented API students (UCP Students Financial Support, 2012), perhaps due in part to the institutionalization of undocumented student programming. This article’s co-authors Angela Chen and Meng So both hold the title of undocumented student program coordinator for the Undocumented Student Program (USP) at UCLA and UC Berkeley, respectively. In their positions, they are central advocates for undocumented students and play an integral role in translating the ever-changing federal, state, and institutional policies into programs and practices that centralize and honor undocumented students.

The USP at UCLA (formerly known as the AB 540 Program) was created in 2009 under the direction of the vice chancellor of student affairs as a response to the organizing efforts of undocumented students and faculty and staff allies, and is strategically situated in the campus resource center (Bruin Resource Center). The USP at UC Berkeley was established in 2012 based on recommendations of an institutional task force and is an integral facet within the campus’ Educational Opportunity Program. Although they were developed independent of each other, each respective USP encompasses a holistic approach to service that asserts that undocumented student access and retention are directly related to their sustainability out of school. USP works in partnership with various campus departments to provide academic and financial aid assistance and advisement, mental health services, legal support networks, and programs related to housing and food security for undocumented students and their families. The establishment of such professional titles and spaces has signaled to undocumented students an institutional commitment to serving their needs and has communicated to the larger community that students with undocumented status are important members of the campus. Chen and So’s positions also reflect a related higher education issue, which is the significance of institutional leaders from diverse backgrounds. While the institutionalization of undocumented student support services has helped reach API students who do not often participate in student-initiated programs, we cannot dismiss the fact that as Asian American practitioners, Chen and So’s presence is a notable representation of the ways that API perspectives and experiences inform how outreach is conducted and support services are provided to undocumented API students. Thus, developing an undocumented student-receptive culture is necessarily tied to larger commitments to increasing diversity at all levels of higher education—from student, faculty, and staff representation to academic and student services development and programming.
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Higher education professionals frequently produce data or reports that can change hands repeatedly or end up in various public formats. Electronic documents make distribution easy and cheap, but their content can be easily manipulated or repurposed. Valid data can even turn into “mutant statistics” that take on a life of their own (Best, 2011). Thus, it is essential that careful consideration be given to how data are framed and packaged prior to “leaving the office.” If data relating to important issues are misunderstood or misapplied, the results can be problematic. However, you can take steps to reduce the risk of this occurring. This article discusses reporting practices to help you create data clarity and maintain data integrity even after reports have left your office.

Framing Data Dissemination
There are two primary considerations in preparing data for distribution: data clarity (are the data understandable?) and data integrity (are the data accurate?). You can create data clarity by the way you organize and format data in a report. Effective data presentation helps your audience understand and make appropriate interpretations about your data.

You can also protect data integrity before you distribute reports. Data integrity is threatened, in part, by the many ways that reported data could be extracted, repurposed, or combined. Although you cannot control how your reports are used, you can ensure that the context, origin, and original purpose of your data and analyses are firmly attached to them, and deliver reports in ways that reduce the ease with which they may be changed. Following some consistent and thoughtful practices in presenting data will help you produce clear, comprehensible reports that are harder to misunderstand or misapply—and that makes you look good (Bolten, 2012).
Best Practices for Disseminating Data Outside Your Office
Adapt “the five Ws” (who, what, where, when, why) for use in responding to data requests: Clarify how the data will be used, who the intended audience is, what specific data points need to be included, and for what timeframe. As you prepare the data, keep your audience in mind. Then, depending on the project, your needs, and the target audience, consider some strategies to help preserve data clarity and data integrity.

Data Clarity
(Partially adapted from Bolten, 2012):

- Keep it simple.
- Don’t waste anyone’s time—present what you need to present, accurately, in a straightforward way, meaningfully, and be done.
- For data reports you regularly produce, create a common reporting template and use the same layout and terminology each time. The data consumer will learn how to use common language when talking about data and will become more comfortable anticipating the information.
- Use context, benchmarks, and key indicators to increase interpretability. Avoid presenting data and leaving the audience thinking, “So what?”
- Avoid abbreviations, acronyms, and jargon. Use common naming conventions and terms. Provide a glossary or data definitions.
- Use units of measure that are accurate, understandable, and meaningful to the reader.
- Use page formatting tools: Consider page orientation, line spacing, page headers and footers, and margins. Include page numbers for longer documents.
- Use the “real estate” of the page strategically—keep it easy on the eye, and ensure there’s adequate “white space.”
- Pick your best content layout: Across or down? Chronologically or topically?
- Use graphs and charts only strategically and if they are appropriate for the data you need to present. They can be space savers and can efficiently show comparative or trend data.
- Strategically use (and don’t overuse) visual and text effects (borders, highlighting, bold or italic fonts) for emphasis or clarification.
- Keep font size and style of numbers simple and consistent. Avoid tiny fonts.
- Consider using “universal design” principles to make reports and data accessible to all. Pay attention to color, contrast, and screen reader compatibility.

Data Integrity:

- Prepare all reports with the assumption they will end up off campus.
- Assume pages will be extracted—place essential information on every page with headers or footers.
- Avoid “naked” data! Include notes and caveats to help the reader interpret accurately. Include the nature of the original request, intended audience, name of institution, reporting office, and report producer.
- Give reports, tables, graphics, and charts meaningful titles and captions so they make sense in isolation. Choose your words carefully.
- Prominently source your data and content. Report original data sources, data dates, and whether data are preliminary or final.
- Be aware of dates when using snapshot data (e.g., start of term, mid-term, final). Select the appropriate snapshot, and identify and define it in your report.
- Lock your reports as PDF files. If unlocked spreadsheets are requested, protect important cells and distribute a PDF along with the spreadsheet as a reference to the original data as it left your office.
- For data that are distributed in a draft report, consider adding a “Draft” footnote or a watermark to the page prior to locking as a PDF.
- If you give data to another office to publish or use for some purpose, ask to write the accompanying text and ask to see the final draft prior to publication.

Final Thoughts
You can never be certain that data disseminated outside your office will not be repurposed in unintended ways, but creating carefully planned and thoughtfully designed reports can help reduce the risk of subsequent data misuse. Good reporting practices also deliver dividends on campus. Consistently well-packaged data increase faculty, staff, and students’ comfort levels and familiarity with using data, which often leads to intra-campus dialogue. Well-designed reports can serve as models for other departments.
You can also capitalize on occasions of data reporting to initiate campus forums, creating the opportunity to explain the data and their presentation. Through the use of consistent best practices and open dialogue, a stronger campus climate around data and their proper use may be encouraged.

References

A crisis is an event, which is often sudden or unexpected, that disrupts the normal operation of the institution or its educational mission and threatens the well-being of personnel, property, financial resources, and/or reputation of the institution (Zdziarski, Bunkel, & Rollo, 2007, p. 5).

In an era of increasing frequency and severity of crises such as terrorism, campus violence, and weather catastrophes at or near higher education institutions, the need to engage in effective crisis and emergency management planning is stronger than ever. For years, scholars and practitioners have argued that crises are inevitable. Duncan (1993) argued that it is “impossible to work for any period of time in student affairs without facing a campus crisis” (p. 453). Many of us have experienced campus crises, and if we were lucky enough, we had a quality emergency operations plan to guide us.

Many campuses have not done effective crisis and emergency planning. Those that have may not be working from an effective model. Fortunately, there are some good models and guidance out there for higher education institutions and their leaders to use.

Before deciding on a model or approach to use, it is important that stakeholders understand some of the reasons why crisis and emergency management work is important to higher education institutions. The first reason is that the safety of our students, faculty, staff, guests, and neighbors is vital to the success of colleges and universities. Additionally, colleges and universities need to worry about the continuity of academic, business, and other operations; risk and liability management, and legal and regulatory standards; and a moral imperative (in terms of doing the right thing).

According to the new guidance, the following principles are key to developing a comprehensive higher education emergency operations plan that addresses a range of threats and hazards:

1. Planning must be supported by institution of higher education senior leadership.
2. Planning uses assessment to customize plans to the individual institution.
3. Planning considers all threats and hazards.
4. Planning provides for the access and functional needs of the whole institution of higher education community.
5. Planning considers all settings and all times.
6. Planning considers the individual preparedness of students, faculty, and staff.
7. Planning meets the requirements of all applicable laws.
8. Creating and revising a model emergency operations plan is done by following a collaborative process.

The particular steps that the new guidance gives are laid out sequentially and are easy to follow:

**Step 1 – Form a Collaborative Planning Team**
- Identify core planning team
- Form a common framework
- Define and assign roles and responsibilities
- Determine a regular schedule of meetings

**Step 2 – Understand the Situation**
- Identify threats and hazards
- Assess risk
- Prioritize threats and hazards

**Step 3 – Determine Goals and Objectives**
- Develop goals
- Develop objectives

**Step 4 – Plan Development**
- Identify course of action

**Step 5 – Plan Preparation, Review, and Approval**
- Format the plan
- Write the plan
- Approve and share the plan

**Step 6 – Plan Implementation and Maintenance**
- Train stakeholders
- Exercise the plan
- Review, revise, and maintain the plan

At first, it might seem that you need to be an expert in campus safety and emergency management to plan effectively, but all you need is a passion for keeping our campuses safe and then you can follow the steps outlined for you. The final goal is the written and tested emergency operations plan, but the process of planning itself has a lot of value and on its own should improve crisis and emergency management on campus.

Below are some additional resources that higher education institutions and leaders could use to learn more:

- [http://www.naspa.org/kc/cskc](http://www.naspa.org/kc/cskc): Contains a compilation of good resources on general and higher education-specific emergency management
- [http://training.fema.gov/EMI](http://training.fema.gov/EMI): Emergency Management Institute on-campus and remote trainings
- [http://www.redcross.org](http://www.redcross.org): Various training including emergency shelter certifications
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As we mark the 40th anniversary of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, we must also acknowledge a new wave in education. Some of this new approach to education is brought about by changing demographics of the higher education student population and some by changes in pedagogy. The authors interviewed six faculty members from three institutions about the changing nature of education and how disability services can adjust its provision of accommodations to meet the needs of students with disabilities and engage them in a rapidly changing academic environment.

This new wave in education continues to incorporate technology, is becoming increasingly interdisciplinary and interactive, moves beyond the classroom, embraces nontraditional timing, and works to meet differing learning, writing, and speaking styles. Clearly, technology has had a profound impact on recent changes in pedagogy. Examples include access to resources, video conferencing, and use of online discussions. Croston (2012) noted, “Technology has definitely changed the world of education. From new communication techniques to better access to information, education has never been as advanced. Technology has changed the way we view education, and the jury is still out on longer-term effects” (para. 6).

However, technology does not necessarily lend itself to improved access. As considered by Meyer, Rose, and Hitchcock (2005), “When technologies with radically new capacities are introduced, it takes people a long time to realize how to use those capacities creatively and productively” (p. 14). Moreover, other factors are influencing how education is administered due to the power, importance, and influence of interdisciplinary studies; the benefits of an interactive approach—perhaps to replace the intimacy that we lose through technology (Turkle, 2011); the popularity of study away programs; moving from the traditional timing of 4-year college degree programs; and efforts to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse pool of learners.

One aspect of the increasing diversity in higher education settings is the demographic of students with disabilities. The U.S. Department of Education (2012) indicated that
11% of all undergraduates reported having a disability. Of those who report a disability, 15% indicated a mental illness/psychological or psychiatric condition, 18% indicated ADD or ADHD, 31% indicated a specific learning disability, and 11% indicated a health impairment (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Twelve percent of college students reported a diagnosis of anxiety or treatment for anxiety over the past 12 months (American College Health Association, 2011). Access to education for students with disabilities encourages changes in the approach to education within the academy and adds to the definition of diversity.

Faculty interviewed in our study describe how pedagogy is changing and what influences their teaching. Faculty expand our awareness of the influence of global knowledge, technology, current student demographics, diversity and inclusive practices, legislation, interactive teaching, accessibility, individual differences, universal design, and a team orientation. Implications for disability services are significant and underscore the need to communicate and collaborate with faculty. We acknowledge a need for a fresh look at our approach to accommodations as pedagogy continues to incorporate technology, becomes increasingly interdisciplinary and interactive, moves beyond the classroom, embraces nontraditional timing, and works to meet differing learning, writing, and speaking styles. A Simmons College chemistry professor explains, “I have used Blackboard, eLearning, and Moodle to post lectures, practice exams, rubrics, and homework solutions. Textbook websites offer tutorials and online homework. Skype office hours are effective and popular. Students report that they access posted material an average of 10 times per week, which translates to increased ‘time on task’” (M. Berger, personal communication, July 2, 2013). Such practices will benefit some students with diagnoses of executive functioning disorders, learning disabilities, and anxiety disorders but may create access barriers for deaf and blind students using the technology without captioning, screen-reader accessibility, and/or sign language interpreters.

The professor continued, “With flipped class, new material is not introduced by the professor. Students are responsible for covering new content before class, and class time is used to solve problems and answer questions about the material.” Some students with chronic illness may struggle to keep up with the increased time on tasks. He noted, “We incorporated service learning into the curriculum, where students get to see firsthand how chemistry is used in the real world. This year, our analytical chemistry students analyzed the soil used in several community gardens in the greater Boston area for contaminants and reported the results to the community partners” (M. Berger, personal communication, July 2, 2013). It is clear from these course requirements that students with mobility impairments or wheelchair users will need carefully selected service learning and research sites with accommodations for transportation and on-site access. All of the accommodations necessary for access require the collaboration of faculty, student, and disability services personnel.

Going forward, disability services personnel will need to change the environment and the culture regarding access:

- We cannot continue to simply “apply” accommodations hoping to remove barriers to full access.
- We will need to advocate for the faculty, partner with them, and employ a problem-solving team approach.
- We will be called on to support an integrative and interactive pedagogy.
- We must act as positive role models for students, staff, and faculty, displaying an optimistic approach to our work.
- We are part of the system and must promote change from within the system.
- Legislation mandates a dynamic model that we must refine and maintain.
- We must work to keep education accessible and address data on current students (what do we know about them, what’s unique about them, demographics).

Disability services personnel should learn about the changes occurring in higher education pedagogy and adjust their work to meet the challenges these changes create, to improve the future and the overall quality of the institution, and to support the faculty.
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This article will review the implementation and evaluation of an experiential-learning model designed by an international men’s fraternity to foster developmental maturation throughout members’ collegiate careers. This initiative demonstrates the potential for the fraternal community to reposition itself as a cocurricular partner committed to the foundational goals of higher education (Reuter, Baker, Hernandez, & Bureau, 2012).

In 2007, the fraternity Lambda Chi Alpha, founded at Boston University in 1909, established an educational model termed the Lambda Chi Alpha Learning Model (LCALM). The model is grounded in transformative experiential-learning concepts emphasizing the development of a sense of identity. A core component of Kolb’s (1984) experiential-learning theory is the environment in which individuals interact with others and how that can facilitate learning. LCALM uses reflection as a critical element for fraternity members to make meaning of their experiences and develop increasing awareness of their thoughts, feelings, and values.
Significance of Experiential Learning
Kolb’s (1984) experiential-learning theory has long been cited as explaining learning in a cyclical manner of meaning making and transformative learning. According to Guthrie and Bertrand Jones (2012), student learning will be more significant if students are given the opportunity to reflect on their learning and development and that of their peers. By setting up structured environments for individuals to reflect on their experiences, such as those within the LCALM, advisors can help students gain understanding and further their growth (Guthrie & Bertrand Jones, 2012). As Guthrie and Bertrand Jones (2012) argued, “If learning from feedback is to be effective, programs should be designed to include dedicated time allocated for reflection after feedback is given” (p. 57). In other words, learning models should feature a period for participants to reflect and apply metacognitive and critical reasoning to the feedback. One of the ways the LCALM helped facilitate the importance of reflection was through journaling. By doing so, members were able to connect how their past experiences influence their present, gain greater self-awareness, and assess how their values related to others (Reuter et al., 2012). Reuter et al. (2012) stated, “Reflection is important, and [fraternity and sorority advisors] have a responsibility to create environments that support critical reflection” (p. 24). Thus, student affairs professionals can play a key role by implementing experiential-learning components, such as structured reflection, in learning modules.

Results of LCALM Study
Researchers from Lambda Chi Alpha sought to evaluate the effectiveness of their LCALM curriculum that began in the 2007–2008 academic year. Researchers anticipated that members of their organization who used the LCALM would experience increased self-awareness in comparison to those who did not use the model. Participants included more than 4,000 undergraduate males in approximately 200 institutions of higher education in the United States and Canada who were undergraduate members of Lambda Chi Alpha. The study measured self-awareness of members using the Self-Consciousness Scale developed by Fenigstein, Scheir, and Buss and compared chapter-level data through analysis by Lambda Chi Alpha’s Educational Leadership Consultants (as cited in Reuter et al., 2012). Similar to their hypothesis, researchers discovered that both members and chapters that used LCALM demonstrated an increase in self-awareness in relation to members or chapters implementing LCALM to a lesser extent. Most important, each new member class had higher scores than the newly initiated members before them, evidencing the significant impact of experiential learning in peer groups (Reuter et al., 2012).

Impact of LCALM on the Fraternal Movement
The research, implementation, and evaluation of LCALM highlights the Fraternity and Sorority Knowledge Community’s renewed emphasis on research and assessment initiatives as outlined in our ongoing strategic plan (NASPA Fraternity and Sorority Knowledge Community, 2012). Additionally, as a cocurricular community aimed at furthering the educational missions of institutions, Lambda Chi Alpha’s initiatives serve as an example of our community’s vision. There are well-understood issues threatening the fraternal movement, which enhance the necessity for additional research and programming similar to LCALM as the fraternal community seeks to reposition itself as a vital asset in the broader higher education mission.

References


Although scholars suggest that race can be used to predict student persistence (Astin, 1997; Reason, 2009), little is known about the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students in higher education, particularly their persistence to degree (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010). This lack of empirical study is problematic, as nearly 30% of LGBT students consider leaving their institutions due to hostile climate and discrimination (Rankin et al., 2010). In addition, both heterosexual students of color and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) students of color are more likely to perceive harassment at their institutions than White or heterosexual students (Rankin et al., 2010). Clearly, the intersections of minority racial and sexual identities can exacerbate negative perceptions of campus climate.

Similarly, the literature suggests that students of color and first-generation, low-income students both experience hostility, discrimination, and lack of institutional support on campus (Engle & Tinto, 2008; Fischer, 2007; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Rankin, 2005; Rankin et al., 2010; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Smith, 2011; Sorgen, 2011), and are less likely to persist to degree than White students or non-first-generation students (Engle & Tinto, 2008; Harper, 2006; Martinez, Sher, Krull, & Wood, 2009; Museus, 2011). In this study, we attempt to answer the following questions: Does having multiple marginalized identities influence intent to persist to graduation for LGBQ undergraduate students? And, additionally, does campus climate moderate intent to persist for LGBQ undergraduates?

Method
We conducted a secondary data analysis of the “2010 State of Higher Education for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People” report (Rankin et al., 2010). Participants in this survey included more than 5,000
students, faculty, and staff members from all 50 U.S. states, representing institutions in all Carnegie Basic Classifications. For the purpose of this study, we used data only from the 2,384 LGBQ undergraduate student respondents.

Our independent variables were LGBQ identity, racial minority identity, and first-generation, low-income status. The sample included 1,954 LGBQ undergraduate students, 488 LGBQ undergraduate students of color (POC LGBQ), and 177 LGBQ first-generation, low-income students (FGLI LGBQ). Further, we used the LGBQ climate scale developed by Rankin et al. (2010) to measure campus climate as a moderating variable. Our dependent variable was “intent to persist in college,” as indicated in the 2010 survey.

To investigate the influence of a compounded racial minority or first-generation, low-income identity on intent to persist for undergraduate students, we conducted Chi-Square Tests of Independence. Finally, we examined the influence of campus climate as a moderator in intent to persist, through binary logistic regression analyses.

**Results**

A Chi-Square Test of Independence indicated no relationship between POC LGBQ students’ racial identity and intent to persist: 29.5% of LGBQ students of color and 29.8% of LGBQ White students indicated that they had seriously considered leaving their institution due to the climate. The percentage of LGBQ White students did not differ significantly from LGBTQ POC students with regard to intent to persist, x2(1, N = 1930) = 0.17, p = .896.

Furthermore, a Chi-Square Test of Independence indicated no relationship between FGLI LGBQ students’ first-generation/low income identity and their intent to persist: 28.8% of LGBQ FGLI students and 30.1% of LGBQ non-FGLI students indicated that they had seriously considered leaving their institution due to the climate. The percentage of LGBQ FGLI students did not differ significantly from LGBTQ non-POC students with regard to intent to persist, x2(1, N = 1954) = 0.12, p = .732.

Using intent to leave as the dependent variable and climate, sexual identity, racial identity, and first-generation, low-income status as predictor variables, binary logistic regression analyses revealed that campus climate significantly predicted intent to leave (omnibus chi-square = 156.841, df = 1, p < .01).

**Discussion**

The results from this study suggest that support structures for students with multiple marginalized identities are needed on college campuses. Although our results indicate that compounded marginalized identities were not significant in relation to intent to persist, it is important to note that nearly 30% of all LGBT-identified students express the desire to leave campus at some point in their college career. We believe this alarming rate suggests that improvements to campus climate are necessary, and that higher education professionals must work together to assess the current realities on their campuses to make necessary changes for and with students.
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One is hard pressed to log onto The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Wall Street Journal, or even a lively Twitter feed without seeing cries for relief from the rising cost of higher education and decreased availability of financial aid to help students through graduation. The headlines (and the students) wail about average indebtedness, now reaching $27,253 (FICO, 2013), while loan servicing organizations point to decreased family contributions to education while costs rise.

These issues present many concerns about the financial future of our students—their ability to make future consumer purchases, pursue advanced education, and pursue careers that suit their interests. Research shows the profound effect of student finances (specifically their debt) on their retention and completion. Recent data from a statewide assessment of four-year public institutions in Ohio show alarming results: 22.9% of students have taken fewer classes in order to work more, 31.5% of students have considered dropping out of school because of their finances, and 37% of students report that their finances have caused them to neglect academic work (Center for the Study of Student Life, 2011).

Representative of this, we are beginning to see financial wellness emerge as a key component of holistic wellness
models on campuses across the country. This trend is being matched, albeit at a much slower pace, by the development of financial wellness efforts on college campuses. Financial education and literacy are nothing new in the world of education, but many campuses are beginning to take a more universal approach, away from the standard presentations and lectures. These new approaches involve time-tested techniques in health promotion: social norms campaigns, peer educators, one-on-one motivational interviewing, and environmental techniques to address multiple levels of challenges.

The Ohio State University houses its peer financial wellness program within the Student Wellness Center. This unique positioning, within the Office of Student Life, allows for a comprehensive approach to our one-on-one financial coaching appointments. Within these appointments, we have seen three key trends emerge regarding students: Their financial situation has a strong effect on their stress levels; their financial situation, in some cases, is worsened by their high-risk behaviors (specifically alcohol abuse); and their nutritional levels are greatly impacted by financial constraints.

As anxiety surpasses depression as the leading cause of admittance into counseling centers, it is important to take note of the role that student financial stress plays in that trend. Students are showing stress around two financial issues, the first being the current debt that they are accumulating and the second being their future prospects for repaying. Data from the statewide Ohio survey show that, at 4-year public institutions: 48.6% of students worry about meeting monthly expenses, 39.3% feel large or extreme amounts of stress because of their student loan debt, and 68.6% feel stressed about their finances in general. In conjunction, only 77.3% of students felt they would be able to pay off any debt acquired as a student, and 26.5% predicted that the amount of money they owe will cause them a large or extreme problem in the next 5 years (Center for the Study of Student Life, 2011). These numbers, coupled with decreased job prospects, can lead to increased stress levels of our student populations.

Addiction and substance abuse are commonly affiliated with financial trouble, specifically in older adults. However, increasingly we are seeing the merger of two high-risk student areas: alcohol consumption and increased discretionary spending. As students continue to use student loans to finance their education, we are seeing them increasingly using student loans to finance “wants” including alcohol for consumption. College students spend just over $5.5 billion dollars a year on alcohol (Eigan, 1991), and in many cases that we see, alcohol surpasses all of their other non-essential expenditures.

Finally, students frequently cite cutting costs as an outcome of their current financial situations. Traditionally, these cost-cutting measures are applied to expensive costs associated with education such as new textbooks. In addition, recent data from the 2011 Student Experience in the Research University Survey shows an increasingly alarming data set: close to 10% of students skipped meals to cut costs (Stuart & Kaye, 2012). Locally on campuses we have seen this trend manifest itself in the creation of student food banks at institutions to help support students and their dependents. Furthermore, we are anecdotally seeing students increasingly making decisions to eat regularly off of value menus at local fast food establishments. Students describe to our peer coaches some common concerns including not being able to navigate the grocery store, not knowing how to purchase and prepare food on a budget, and needing tips on how to reuse extra food.

Moving forward, we are excited to see expanding financial wellness efforts in student affairs units across the country. Financial wellness efforts, unlike financial education efforts, cannot operate in a silo on college campuses. True value in our financial wellness efforts rests in being able to drill down, beyond the basic knowledge of financial concepts, and provide our students with holistic interventions to help address underlining wellness issues, manage their day-to-day life, plan for the future, and feel confident in the decisions they are making. Additionally, financial wellness programs provide another outlet for our messaging around high-risk behaviors and are a critical additional touch point for services and referrals in the development of comprehensive student support services. It is crucial for student affairs staff to help student understand financial wellness and its implications for a healthy lifestyle during and after their time on campus.
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“To effect reform, educators need to make a conscious decision to nurture Indigenous knowledge, its dignity, identity, and integrity by making a direct change in school philosophy, policy, pedagogy, and practice . . . ” (Battise, 2008, p. 89)

The purpose of this piece is to consider the ways we can authentically support Indigenous students and scholar practitioners by using Indigenous knowledge in student affairs. To be clear, this is not a comprehensive discussion of indigeneity; nor is it meant to essentialize the cultures, experiences, and thoughts of Indigenous peoples.

Who Are Indigenous Peoples?
Generally speaking, Indigenous Peoples refers to the first peoples of a place that have distinct linguistic, historical, and cultural ties to that place. The Indigenous Peoples Knowledge Community (n.d.) describes our organizational identity and the spirit of our work as “…an all-inclusive group of student affairs professionals and students identifying as Native American/First Nations/Alaskan Native/Native Hawaiian heritage, including international Indigenous nations, and any persons with a shared concern about the betterment of Indigenous students in higher education” (para. 2). As such, we are deliberate in delineating the unique status of Indigenous peoples from non-Indigenous peoples and the impacts indigeneity has on our participation in higher education.

Brayboy (2005) described this Indigenous status for Native Americans as “liminal” in that they are political/legal as well as racial subjects, a status applicable to other Indigenous Peoples within the context of U.S. colonialism, such as in Hawai‘i, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. Indeed,
liminality speaks to different and differential implications that being Indigenous have for Indigenous Peoples, such as rights to nationhood and the preservation of language and culture, that are not afforded to other populations such as ethnic minorities. Liminality also subjects Indigenous Peoples to U.S. colonial policies such as imposed definitions of who is Indigenous by virtue of racial signifiers such as blood quantum (e.g., Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921), which, in turn, determine access (or exclusion) to resources; or the reality of U.S. plenary authority over the affairs of Native American nations (U.S. vs. Kagama, 1886). In short, the unique sociohistorical circumstances of U.S. colonialism and imperialism over Indigenous lands, cultures, and, ultimately, peoples yield equally unique sociopolitical experiences and consequences (e.g., historical trauma). The challenge for us in higher education then is to understand how these circumstances and consequences inform our interpretations of the experiences of Indigenous students and scholar practitioners.

Indigenous Knowledge as Tools for Analysis, Design, and Practice

As scholars of higher education, we know that the organization of student affairs and explanations of student performance are based on conventional student development theory, its shortcomings well-documented as having been largely developed around "traditional" students (i.e., White, male, typically college age) (Guardia & Evans, 2008). Freitas, Wright, Balutski, & Wu (2013) highlighted the need for higher education to instead use Indigenous knowledge systems to understand Indigenous student development, explain their educational experiences, and use these knowledge systems to foster meaningful educational engagement. Indigenous knowledge is relevant, rigorous, place-based, and mindful of liminality. There is a rich body of literature on Indigenous education that helps to guide us in this endeavor (e.g., Capriccioso, 2006; Benham & Stein, 2003; Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, 2013; Pavel, 1999).

As an example Freitas et al. (2013) discussed the influence of Indigenous knowledge in designing our transfer program (HeavyRunner & DeCelles, 2002; Huffman, 2001). While we included successful transfer program hallmarks such as academic preparation, Hawaiian knowledge was the organizing principle to purposefully “demonstrate the presence and relevance of Hawaiian people and culture in higher education” (Freitas et al., 2013, p. 87). Unsurprisingly, this approach resonated with our students and staff, so it became, as Battise (2008) suggested, the foundation for the whole of our work as it catalyzed our thinking (and practices) to indigenize student affairs.

Our Way Forward: Indigenizing Student Affairs

Battise’s (2008) thoughts are central to my thinking about transforming our field: Using Indigenous knowledge is a best practice for student affairs not simply for Indigenous Peoples. Authentically supporting Indigenous students and growing our community of Indigenous scholar practitioners by using Indigenous knowledge will, I submit, advance the field and, in turn, higher education. After all, Indigenous knowledge has sustained and nurtured Indigenous Peoples since time immemorial. Shouldn’t we at least consider the ways this wisdom could help us navigate through the next century?
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Conceptual Foundation and Research

In “Student Affairs Without Borders,” Ludeman (2008) identified multiple factors influencing how students are served within the context of higher education. He indicated it is imperative to develop a global higher education framework to internationalize student affairs and services and to develop professional global competencies. Developing a global mindset begins with training and experiences provided to graduate students and emerging student services professionals. Ludeman noted graduate preparatory programs are increasing their number of experiential components for students and also internationalizing the curriculum.

Osfield (2008b) emphasized the importance of international partnerships as “critical to the advancement of the internationalization of student affairs and higher education, [and include] partnerships with respective countries, regions, and around the world” (pp. 213–214). Partnerships such as graduate student and professional exchanges increase student and staff mobility. Student affairs administrative leaders must define and expect global competencies from emerging student services professionals and provide training that includes experiences and expectations of fostering international partnerships. These competencies will prepare practitioners to serve globally diverse student bodies while simultaneously promoting global perspectives to the students with whom they work. Global competencies facilitate expectations of understanding student affairs and services in a variety of cultural contexts.

Attaining Global Competence

Festervand and Tillery (2001) documented the impact of field experiences, or short-term academic study abroad experiences, on graduate students and faculty. Their study revealed that field experiences allow participants to establish direct contact with another culture and examine their perceptions and biases. International education and study abroad are areas that are progressing toward competency-based evaluations and exams to measure the outcomes of the experiences (Rundstrom Williams, 2005).

U.S. graduate students in “helping” professions who desire global competence face considerable obstacles. The large
size and geographic location of the United States may result in a somewhat myopic view of culture (Jurgens and McAuliffe, 2004). According to Jurgens and McAuliffe (2004), courses and experiences that explore cultural issues provide individuals in counseling and other “helping” fields with opportunities to more fully develop cultural competencies, enabling them to work more effectively as helpers in a pluralistic society. Field experiences are often defined by such topics and provide a venue for graduate students and professionals to address global competence (Osfield, 2008a) and gain experience working with an increasingly more diverse campus that represents many nationalities and requires culturally competent, sensitive student affairs professionals (Barlow, 2003).

Rundstrom Williams (2005) concluded that individuals who participate in international field experiences generally show a greater increase in intercultural communication skills than individuals who do not. In addition to applying newly gained knowledge in professional and academic practice, students and practitioners returning from an experience abroad become ambassadors who share their experiences with individuals across campuses (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). Also promising is the extension of global competence learned during field experiences into the domestic operations of returning students and professionals. Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard (2006) explained that intercultural awareness is not limited to improving one’s understanding and acceptance of cultures outside of the United States. By increasing students’ intercultural sensitivities, individuals are likely better prepared to address diverse cultures within the United States.

Moreover, Rundstrom Williams (2005) emphasized the benefit of culturally rich experiences on U.S. campuses, such as participation in various religious services, cross-cultural relationships, and diverse ethnic celebrations. These experiences build communication skills and deepen an individual’s exposure to cultural differences. Building intercultural communication skills is integral to becoming a globally competent student affairs graduate student and practitioner. On-campus, cross-cultural programming and international field experiences afford students and professionals the opportunity for intercultural growth.

**Conclusion**

Jackson (2008) stated that educators have the potential and responsibility to empower students to become competent, sensitive global citizens. Osfield (2008a) suggested making global competency a student affairs graduate program graduation requirement, or perhaps part of licensing criteria, supporting the internationalization of higher education. In either case, it is clear experts in the field of international education, student affairs, and higher education have determined the significance of global competence.

Two major themes surface regarding graduate international field experiences in higher education. First, there is a prevailing trend toward short-term experiences abroad, also known as international field experiences, typically connected to an academic course or inquiry. Second, there is an opportunity for graduate and professional development programs to provide learning environments for participants to develop global competence. As a result, student personnel graduate programs and student affairs professional associations are developing ways to address the need for practitioners to gain both domestic and international intercultural experiences. Another topic for further inquiry is the role of student affairs professional associations in developing global competence guidelines for graduate programs and professionals. To better understand education internationally and meet the needs of increasingly global student populations, student affairs graduate students and professionals must gain global competence.
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Introduction

The 2010 U.S. Census summary data and demographic projections for the country revealed a huge growth of the Latino/a population (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, 2011). Despite this demographic trend, there is a critical shortage of Latino/a professionals in the health care industry; this shortage negatively impacts the ability to provide quality and culturally congruent health care to the largest racial/ethnic group in the country. According to Komaromy et al. (1996), it is imperative to have a diverse health care workforce because patients tend to gravitate to health care providers from their own cultural background. Diversity in health care is necessary not only to reflect the demographics of the country but also because diverse perspectives are necessary for Latinos/as’ advancement in, increased access to, and equity in health care (Mitchell & Lassiter, 2006).

Research findings show that Latinos/as are medically underserved (Komaromy et al., 1996; Zayas & McGuigan, 2006). Medically underserved persons are those who do not receive sufficient primary care (Schrop et al., 2006). Latinos/as make up only 5.9% of the entire health care workforce (National Council of La Raza, 2009) even though they make up 16% of the U.S. population (Ennis et al., 2011). Mitchell and Lassiter (2006) recognized that underrepresented students, such as Latinos/as, who complete health profession degrees are more likely to practice in communities with underserved populations. This qualitative study focused on the realities of becoming health care professionals, the actions and experiences leading to successful completion, and insight to ensure a significant increase in the volume of Latinos/as who successfully complete health professions degrees.
Theoretical Framework
I used the academic resilience framework of Perez, Espinoza, Ramos, Coronado, & Cortes (2009) as a counter-story to the research that frames Latino/a students in an academically deficient perspective. The academic resilience framework was employed to identify the personal and environmental protective factors leading Latino/a allied health graduate degree alumni to remain academically resilient and to successfully progress through the allied health professions pipeline. Furthermore, the cultural asset-based work of Yosso (2005) was applied to categorize these factors into a framework that sees personal, family, and community resources employed by students of color as sources of strength rather than insufficiency.

Methodology
Because the purpose of this study was to capture the voices and experiences of Latinos/as who graduated from allied health graduate programs, testimonios (life narratives) were utilized for data gathering. In this study, testimonios focused on a specific time in the participants’ lives (experiences in allied health school) much like those in Espino (2007) did. Through testimonio methodology, participants shared their stories and were given an opportunity to heal as they shared their narratives (Aleman, 2012).

Selected Major Findings
During allied health school, some study participants felt socially isolated. Furthermore, since becoming socialized into their profession was a big part of the allied health school experience, participants cited the need to mute gender, ethnic, racial, and sexual preference identities. Not all participants realized they had put their identities on hold to become socialized into their allied health profession, but many noted the suffocating effect this pause had on them. Contact with family during allied health school allowed participants to be themselves free of pressure and the watchful eye of faculty and peers who would soon become their health profession colleagues. Family support was vital to student success and well-being.

This study supports Perez et al.'s (2009) academic resilience theory. The factors that Perez and his colleagues theorized about (personal and environmental protective factors) emerged in this study as elements that were imperative for participants’ allied health school success. Moreover, as the data were analyzed, they clearly showed community cultural wealth tenets. These findings support the notion that students are succeeding not alone, rather, with the knowledge, assistance, and support of their families and communities—communities that research has depicted as deficient and educationally inadequate.

Implications
Latino/a allied health students come from cultures where community is valued over individuality (Yosso, 2005). This alone is one of the most important pieces of knowledge to take away from this study. Therefore, it is imperative that allied health administrators, faculty, and staff realize the networks created within allied health school are superficial and are not enough to provide students the support they will need to be successful in allied health programs. Although all of the participants did well academically, there was a need for more holistic support, which, thankfully their parents and peers were able to provide.
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For several years, I have been deeply engaged in research on the academic and social experiences of college males, with an unapologetic focus on historically underrepresented, underserved, misunderstood, and otherwise vulnerable populations such as gay and bisexual college males of color. Of course, I’m not alone in this endeavor; I am joined by members of my research team comprised of doctoral advisees, master’s students, and ambitious undergraduates all committed to conducting research on groups that are rarely seen or heard in the literature. Over time, we have conducted research about varying topics, including early aspirations of male collegians (Strayhorn, 2009), Black males at predominantly White institutions (Strayhorn, 2008; Strayhorn & DeVita, 2010), and, more recently, gay and bisexual males of color (Strayhorn & Tillman-Kelly, 2013).

Conducting research on gay and bisexual males of color is not without challenges. First, it can be enormously difficult to recruit participants to the study, especially due to issues of masculinity and gender role expectations that tend to take on heightened importance in cultural and ethnic communities of color. College males who subscribe to traditional masculine scripts may be less inclined than other peers to accept themselves (or others) as gay or bisexual (Jenkins, Lambert, & Baker, 2009). They may also downplay the importance of researching such topics and sharing their experiences with others, as a way of preserving heteronormativity, enacting hypermasculinity, or performing heterosexuality (i.e., “passing as straight”).

If we have learned anything at all from years of research on this topic, we recognize that not all gay and bisexual college
males of color resist invitations to talk candidly with their male peers, and neither do they all perform heterosexuality consciously. We have found that there is enormous diversity among gay and bisexual college males of color. And in both subtle and obvious ways, many factors, such as race/ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, religion (and others), coalesce and simultaneously influence the experiences, choices, and behaviors of gay and bisexual males of color who live at the intersection of multiple social locations. And it is this intersectionality that deserves collective reflection as we discuss homosexuality, or the state or condition of being erotically attracted to members of the same sex.

What Is Intersectionality?
Intersectionality provides a framework acknowledging that individuals hold multiple social identities simultaneously and that the confluence of those identities shapes the ways in which individuals navigate a matrix of domination—that is, interlocking systems of oppression such as racism and sexism—and how individuals and groups experience the world socially, economically, and politically. As I’ve said elsewhere, “Intersectionality makes visible what might otherwise be seen as ordinary, irrelevant, or go unnoticed altogether” (Strayhorn, 2013, p. 238).

The Study
Since I was interested in probing the intersectionality of homosexuality for gay and bisexual males of color, I sought participants who met the sampling criteria and demonstrated a capacity for talking about their experiences, reflections, and beliefs. To date, more than 50 gay and bisexual males of color from multiple campuses have participated in the study. More than 70% identify as “African American or Black” or “Hispanic or Latino.”

Findings
Several themes can be identified using a rigorous qualitative analysis approach that draws on comments from participants as a way of “giving voice” to those who are marginalized in society, in certain campus environments, and in more local communities. For instance, we’ve learned that gay and bisexual males of color use a menagerie of terms and labels to “identify” themselves. Some adopt popular terms (e.g., gay, bi, queer) while others reject or politically resist such labels and prefer to use “gender nonconforming,” “same gender loving,” “mostly straight,” “pansexual,” or “just me,” to name a few. These differences have significant implications for theory, research, and practice.

Implications
Future theorists should consider points raised in this article when formulating new or revising existing theory. Most current theory on gay students assumes a near-linear developmental trajectory marked by “coming out” to self and others with traditional labels. Applying intersectionality to homosexuality reveals how social identities coalesce for some gay students, thereby creating a unique social location where they negotiate different identity tags or labels (or create new ones) and move along the developmental continuum at different rates and velocities. Future models should incorporate this understanding.

Although my current studies clarify the ways gay and bisexual college males of color employ various labels for themselves and others, it is less clear why they settle on these terms and the meaning they make of each. Are “gender queer” and “gender nonconforming” equivalent? Is “same gender loving” a synonym for “gay” to them? These questions and more should be investigated in future research studies based on both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Lastly, college student educators must be aware of this information when working with students of color who identify as gay or bisexual. Preconceived notions about sexuality, gender scripts, and preferred labels can influence educators’ expectations and blind them to paths of professionalism. Rather than assume or assign a label or term, educators are encouraged to ask questions, engage students meaningfully, and allow students to name their own reality. After all, the intersectionality of homosexuality isn’t homosexuality, as we once believed, at all.
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The racial structure of our society has become more complex with the recent documented increase in multiracial individuals. Race is no longer being seen as a set of clearly defined and delineated categories. The conversation around race and how we view it will only become more multifaceted as this population continues to grow. The 2000 U.S. Census gave individuals the ability to choose, for the first time, more than one race with which they personally identify. Data from the 2010 Census, therefore, was the first time changes within this racial demographic could be assessed. The results found that among American youth, multiracial individuals are the fastest growing racial/ethnic group in the country (Saulny, 2011). As such, it is vital that we as student affairs professionals reflect on our level of preparedness in meeting the needs of this group. We must ask how and if our campuses are assessing and developing plans to support this growing student population. Unfortunately, many institutions and staff within higher education have limited resources and services specific to these students.
Campus offices designed to support and retain historically underrepresented groups often operate from a monoracial framework. Cultural centers and race-specific student services emerged at colleges across the United States during the 1960s and 1970s to provide support to and advocacy for the increasing number of students of color. While these services are still very much necessary today, it is important for these offices to reflect critically on how their programs meet, and will continue to meet, the needs of changing racial demographics among current and future students (Literte, 2010). Many multiracial individuals do not ever feel fully accepted in one or all of the racial groups with which they identify and often feel the need to choose one identity over another (Renn, 2000). As a result, programming and services with an exclusively monoracial focus can inadvertently reinforce feelings of displacement for this group. As student affairs professionals, we are aware that college is an optimal time for identity exploration and development; by unintentionally sending the message to multiracial students that they must choose one aspect of their identity over another, we fail to provide opportunities that help them develop as their whole selves (Roper & McAloney, 2010).

There are, however, many ways to implement services and support strategies for multiracial students. Providing programs that intentionally explore the concept of mixed-heritage experiences is a way to begin raising awareness about the unique issues faced by these populations. Films and discussions about interracial family dynamics and multiracial identity development are positive introductory events that promote such awareness. Other program ideas include interactive panels and student art exhibits that depict their multiple cultural experiences. If the student leadership is present, it can also be valuable to help students initiate organizations around their multiracial identity to allow space for peer support and advocacy. Additionally, institutional and departmental changes can be made to help create more inclusive environments for these students. For example, some cultural centers at colleges and universities are rewriting their mission statements to specifically recognize multiracial students and acknowledge their experiences through programming and services (Wong & Buckner, 2010). Joint programming among race-based offices, centers, and student organizations is also a constructive way to create dialogue and spaces for those who identify with multiple races and/or ethnicities (Literte, 2010).

Not only do these approaches and frameworks aid in the holistic development of multiracial students, they can also provide strong advantages for the overall campus communities as well. Implementing programs and services around the topic of multiracial identity helps to foster cross-cultural communication and discourse. It also helps set the foundation for students to explore and celebrate naturally existing intergroup diversity (Ozaki & Johnston, 2010). The topic of multiracial identity ultimately reminds us that all identities are complex, and that our development is never quite complete. Diversity is often seen as a community’s greatest strength, and building more inclusive spaces for all identities only enhances such an existing asset.
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In all areas of higher education, new professionals and graduate students are increasingly members of the Millennial cohort. The Millennial Generation was born between 1982 and 2003 and will have attended college as traditional-age students between 2000 and 2021 (Winograd & Hais, 2011). Despite the fact that only half of the generation has reached adulthood, many generational attributes have already been published about them in popular media, most notably Time magazine’s cover story titled, “Millennials: The Me Me Me Generation” (Stein, 2013). An underexamined attribute of this cohort and its self-efficacy is the way in which Millennials work in their communities to create change.

Civic Engagement
Civic engagement “means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference.” (Erlich, 2000, preface, p. vi). Often, civic engagement is measured by observing a set of behaviors.

Flanagan and Levine (2010) have observed longitudinal shifts in the kinds of civic engagement behaviors that are popular. The behaviors measured include belonging to at least one group, attending religious service at least monthly, belonging to a union, reading newspapers at least once a week, voting, being contacted by a political party, working on a community project, attending club meetings, believing that people are trustworthy, and volunteering (Flanagan, Levine, & Settersten, 2009). Millennial students are participating at rates lower than previous generational cohorts in all civic engagement activities except one: volunteering. Measuring behaviors is a method to determine how much people, especially students, are participating in their community, but it is not the whole story.

Civic Agency
Civic engagement is purely a series of behaviors—it does not examine self-efficacy. Civic agency is a student’s ability to engage in his or her world, and his or her belief in transforming that world (Boyte, 2008). Civic agency is not
a set of activities but a set of feelings and personal beliefs that he or she has about how to take responsibility for and make changes within a community. Developing civic agency requires movement from an activity-focused mindset (i.e., "I do service in my community") to a civic identity (i.e., "I see a need in my community, and I feel responsible to consider the systems and resources available to address it").

Many higher education institutions and divisions of student affairs espouse the grand ideals of instilling and supporting students’ sense of civic agency. Traditionally, this is attempted through structured programs ranging from academic-based service learning to intensive co-curricular simulation programs. However, there is great tension between student affairs professionals’ intentionality and student spontaneity and empowerment.

**Challenges to Teaching Civic Agency**

Civic education programming within student affairs is often facilitated by a staff member who encourages students to use the knowledge and skills of the civic arts. In these programs, students practice collaborating and identifying problems within their community, which is helpful. What could be unhelpful is when students begin to associate their feelings of agency and actualization only within pre-planned or scripted campus activities. Most education labeled as civic or leadership on campuses happens in scripted, staff-created environments. Though educators seek to create activities that simulate the trying experiences students might face in life, distancing the real world from everyday campus life might stunt the development of Millennial students’ civic agency.

Pedagogies that signal that only staff-created programs are true civic experiences could lead to a harmful set of assumptions students might learn and apply to their lives after graduation (Illich, 1968). Assumptions such as, “I have power when a staff member places me in a low-income community and gives me resources to deliver,” or “I am able to lead when an authority figure [i.e., an advisor] gives me a script to follow.” New professionals and graduate students are taught to believe it is helpful when students begin their civic learning process by attending a program that imitates everyday issues, providing activities and facilitators as training wheels. But how do we ease them off of the training wheels and help them see beyond the simulations, allowing them to recognize everyday situations as leadership and civic moments, if our pedagogies do not adequately address this connection?

If new professionals are Millennials who have only learned to lead in simulation, could they be bringing some incorrect assumptions about civic agency and leadership into the workplace? Could the continuation of our current on-campus civic education models and pedagogies be inhibiting the civic agency of future student affairs professionals?

**Suggestions for Practice and Future Research**

Student affairs professionals should work to keep students from developing the belief of unilateral power when working to create change. It is important to consider carefully the pedagogies used by student affairs professionals. Working with students requires scaffolding the experiences so that students gain both increasing autonomy and adaptive skills. For example, investing a larger portion of time into structured first-year student programming helps students practice skills they will use in future activities (student organizations, government, etc.) where students have more autonomy. Still further research should be conducted to examine how students’ efficacy toward creating change develops when staff no longer controls the students’ environment.

For new professionals and graduate students, it is important to understand how these Millennial trends might manifest in them. Millennial new professionals and graduate students are often searching for nurturing environments and rapid advancement, looking for employers that will invest in them (Ng, Schweitzer, & Lyons, 2010). They do not include themselves as members of their campus and local communities. It is important for new professionals to reflect on their own identities in these contexts. Instilling a sense of civic agency in others can be enhanced if new professionals embrace their own civic agency and engage in their world to create change.
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By definition, NASPA knowledge communities (KCs) are formed for the purpose of exploring interest in student affairs topics in order to “create and share knowledge through the delivery of educational research, programs, and products” (NASPA, 2013). In addition, by identifying a topic of interest within NASPA, the formation of a KC is sometimes a step in the development of a new professional field within student affairs.

The Parent and Family Relations KC is an example of that type of development. Formed in 2004 under the leadership of Carolyn Stirling and Joyce Shotick, the original goal of the KC was for professionals who found themselves working closely with the parents of their students to share information.

Parental involvement with colleges and universities, however, was not a new phenomenon in 2004. Miami University of Ohio traces parental involvement as far back as 1916, when the institution welcomed parents to sporting events, serenades, smokers, luncheons, and dinners. Other colleges and universities were close behind. Texas A&M University began organizing Mothers’ Clubs in 1922. The University of Illinois formed a Dads Association in 1922 and a Mothers Association in 1923. At schools around the country, campus traditions developed around football-focused Dads Day and spring teas for Moms Day (The Association of Former Students, n.d.; Illini Union Parent Programs Office, n.d.; Stewart, 2010).

Parents were not only taking advantage of opportunities to spend time on campus; they were also contributing financially to the colleges and universities their children attended. At Texas A&M, parents supported the Aggie Band and the library. Southern Methodist University families sponsored tree-plantings and provided meals for students who couldn’t go home at Thanksgiving. The University of Illinois raised funds for safety projects and campus beautification. Soliciting money for scholarships was a common theme. Relationships between higher education and parents were strong and positive throughout the first half of the 20th century (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

That all changed in the 1960s and 1970s, however, when college students began to assert their independence. At Stanford University, Parents Weekend “died a sudden
death in the late '60s when students weren't particularly eager to have their parents on campus, and families were a little uneasy about setting foot on the students' turf” (Duncan, 1989, p. 53).

Colleges and universities kept parents at arms' length following enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Activism by Baby Boomers persuaded schools to identify students as their constituency, changing their message to parents to: “let go.” Nevertheless, a few schools maintained relationships with parents, and a small number even began their parent/family programs during the Vietnam era. At Syracuse University, parent services were created in response to the upheaval of the 1970s. Student protests, along with the financial impact of cutbacks in student aid funding, led Syracuse to open a parents’ office in 1972 (Severino, 1989).

Many institutions continued parent relations through fundraising efforts, seeking donations from families for all the same uses as previously—scholarships, student activities, and campus improvements. In 1985, a conference was introduced specifically for sharing information about parent fundraising. The annual Parent Fundraising Conference has continued for more than 25 years, and parents are now widely recognized as a unique audience within the advancement field.

By the 1990s, parents were back on campus, often accompanying their sons and daughters at orientation, and parent/family programs ballooned. A 2013 survey of parent/family programs nationally shows a surge of programs during the 1990s, followed by a near explosion between 2000 and 2010 (Savage & Petree, 2013).

### When Were Parent/Family Programs Started?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–1979</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–1989</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–1999</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2010</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–June 2013</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With parents showing up for student orientation, colleges and universities developed orientation programs geared toward parents. Family weekends replaced the moms and dads events of years past. Newsletters and parent handbooks helped define “appropriate involvement” during the college years. A major difference in the new iteration of parent relations was that colleges and universities were defining the relationship and purposefully enlisting family members’ help in delivering student development messages.

The topic of “parents” kept cropping up in workshops at various higher education conferences, and, in 1995, Susan Brown of Northeastern University organized the first conference of Administrators Promoting Parent Involvement (APPI). The then-named National Orientation Directors Association (now NODA) introduced its Parent Services Network in 2000, and the APPI conference was held annually until 2008, when the Association of Higher Education Parent/Family Program Professionals was established. With a professional organization formed, work began with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) to adopt standards for parent/family programs. The standards were approved in 2010, and Parent/Family Programs are now represented on the CAS board.

Parent/family issues continue to be a topic of conversation among NASPA members, but working with families has become a career in itself. Just as a number of other KC fields are represented by professional organizations—international education, college health, fraternity/sorority life, disability services, and campus safety—parent/family relations has become both a continuing conversation and a functional area within student affairs. Those of us who work with parents and families benefit by the big-picture conversations, collaborations, and advocacy offered by the KC, as well as the attention to applied practice and focused conferences provided by a professional organization dedicated to parent/family services.
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The importance of spirituality as part of holistic identity formation has been discussed in the context of student affairs for the past 75 years, and despite a movement to secularize college campuses in many ways, the spiritual component of student identity development continues to be a meaningful endeavor (Kocet & Stewart, 2011). As the spiritual landscape of the university has undergone substantial change recently, new models of faith-based communities have developed to meet the current needs of students in their spiritual development (Winings, 1999). One such model is the creation of intentional spaces for the celebration of different spiritual practices, such as a multifaith center (Kasanjian, 2013). In this article, I will explore the success of the multifaith center model and illustrate how a faith-based campus can create a similarly positive environment for multifaith programs. In addition, I will demonstrate the ways in which a Jesuit campus, as a result of its core values, provides unique opportunities for the spiritual development of all its students, using Jewish life as an example.

A multifaith center creates several opportunities for student identity development. It encourages a multiplicity of faiths and spiritual practices, creating a space in which all...
spiritual endeavors can be explored. Moreover, a multifaith center also promotes an environment of formal and informal cross-cultural exchange and multifaith dialogue. This not only fosters in students a deeper understanding of one another, but also empowers students to deeply explore their own spiritual identities (Haughey, 2009).

It may seem that a campus rooted in the traditions and values of one particular faith might be a challenging place to explore diverse spiritual practices. However, on a faith-based campus, affiliated with and grounded in religious values, the conversations regarding faith and spirituality are held as integral to student identity development. These conversations are encouraged to occur in the foreground of student life. Consequently, many of the incredible moments of cross-cultural exchange can happen organically throughout the campus rather than in a designated location; at many faith-based colleges, there is an opportunity for the entire campus to serve as its multicultural center.

Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles (LMU), a Roman Catholic institution rooted in the Jesuit and Marymount traditions, is one such community, as it defines within its mission an opportunity for celebrating the diversity of faiths.

The service of faith also honors the reality of religious pluralism on our campus and embraces interfaith dialogue in formal and informal contexts. The desired outcome of such encounters moves us...to mutual respect and understanding, deepens appreciation of one’s own faith, and creates opportunities for engaging others who share a longing for meaningful lives. (LMU Mission Statement, 2001, para. 1)

As such, the assets of a multicultural center on a college campus can actually exist across the entire campus; all cocurricular programming can become an opportunity for spiritual development.

I have experienced this as LMU’s campus rabbi and Hillel professional. On other campuses, Hillel may exist separately from the rest of university life, but at LMU Jewish life is fully integrated. Jewish holidays and Shabbat meals are celebrated across the entirety of campus and draw in students of all backgrounds, faiths, and spiritual practices. Cultural celebrations such as Chanukah are celebrated in the residence halls, as collaborations between Hillel and the Resident Ministers. Because the campus promotes open conversations regarding faith and spirituality, its students, faculty, and staff are curious and excited to experience other traditions (Haughey, 2009). For Jewish students who are examining how their Jewish identity fits in with their broader identity, this environment normalizes their spiritual development (Winings, 1999).

Furthermore, rather than feeling defensive over the boundaries of Jewish practice as a way to maintain their Jewish identities, Jewish students eagerly share this part of their lives with others (Adler, 2004). This environment allows them to see themselves as an integral part of LMU’s diverse landscape.

While spirituality and the commitment to spiritual development currently exist at colleges across the country, the faith-based campus that welcomes a multiplicity of faiths and spiritual practices has a unique opportunity to create a multicultural center out of its entire campus, enriching the experience for students, faculty, and staff and for those from a variety of religious and spiritual traditions.
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Although not historically involved in securing private gifts for institutions of higher education, student affairs units are emerging as valuable partners in comprehensive development and fundraising strategies (McAlexander & Koenig, 2001; Pumerantz, 2005; Raymond, 2008; Sun, Hoffman, & Grady, 2007; Thomas & Smart, 2005). Recent inclusion in development and fundraising efforts is due to student affairs’ ability to build connections between the donor and the institution. To ensure student affairs’ success in development and fundraising—and, thereby, the benefits received from participation in these activities—it is important to engage in practices that are effective.

Recent research explored student affairs development and fundraising practices in order to gain an understanding of how student affairs units engage in such activities and the effectiveness of those approaches.

Crowe (2011) used a questionnaire sent to a national sample of chief student affairs officers at large, public institutions to gauge how student affairs units engaged in development and fundraising. Fresk (2012) expanded the research by conducting the same study with a sample of student affairs units at medium and large private institutions. The results from the two studies were then compared to determine similarities and differences based on institutional type.

An analysis of the data revealed minimal differences between public and private institutions, and any existing differences were linked to the model of development and fundraising adopted by the institution (Fresk, 2012). Private institutions tended toward a centralized model—one in which a central office secures gifts for all units in the
institution—whereas public institutions tended toward a decentralized model—one in which dedicated development officers or fundraisers are placed in specific units to raise money for that particular entity. Regardless of the model adopted by the institution, the research indicates that all student affairs administrators interested in securing funds for their units would be well served by the following activities:

- **Champion inclusion in institutional campaigns.** Data revealed that across institutional type and organizational model, the only consistent predictor of success was inclusion in an institutional campaign. To increase chances for inclusion, the student affairs unit must identify funding priorities and clearly articulate how those needs connect to institutional priorities and overall campaign goals.

- **Maintain strong relationships with institutional development and fundraising staff.** Whether centralized or decentralized, most participants acknowledged the importance of maintaining strong relationships with those ultimately responsible for coordinating the development and fundraising activities of the institution. Often referred to as institutional advancement staff, maintaining open lines of communication with these individuals ensures awareness of student affairs funding priorities, increases opportunities for collaboration, and promotes inclusion of student affairs in donor identification and assignment.

- **Learn about institutional advancement.** Respondents reported lack of training and preparation as a challenge or barrier to success in student affairs development and fundraising. For those not involved in the daily activities of development and fundraising, learn the general language and functions by reading basic student affairs fundraising literature (e.g., Advancement Work in Student Affairs: The Challenges and Strategies [Miller, 2010]) and engage in conversations or informational interviews with institutional advancement staff. Having a basic understanding prompts more effective communication and relationship building with institutional advancement staff. For those who are or will be involved in development and fundraising, read a breadth of institutional advancement literature; the Handbook of Institutional Advancement (Buchnan, 2000) is a good place to start. Attend conferences and workshops (e.g., the NASPA Student Affairs Fundraising and External Relations Conference, the CASE Summer Institute series), and participate in training or workshops sponsored by institutional advancement offices.

- **Use best practice models.** A majority of the participants reported engaging in only certain components of the fundraising cycle, with identification and cultivation practices being least reported. Although student affairs administrators are often pressed to focus on the short term and secure funding as soon as possible, failure to properly engage donors through the entire fundraising cycle leads to decreased success in the future. Student affairs administrators must view engaging in development and fundraising as an investment, and maintain a holistic perspective to ensure long-term success.

Reliance on private gifts to support higher education has reached critical levels as other revenue sources continually decrease and institutions look to keep tuition affordable. Whether connecting with current students as potential future donors or maintaining relationships with alumni, parents, and corporations as current prospects, student affairs units are increasingly an integral part of securing those private gifts. Now, more than ever, it is imperative that student affairs administrators position themselves for success in development and fundraising by engaging in proactive training and preparation, fostering strong relationships with institutional advancement staff, and advocating for the inclusion of student affairs in institutional advancement efforts.

---
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In the winter of 1871, James Garfield (the future U.S. president) attended a dinner in New York with fellow alumni from his alma mater, Williams College. A professor from Williams served as the after-dinner speaker that evening and used the occasion to plead for more money to fund buildings, laboratories, libraries, research equipment, and faculty salaries. Not to be sold, Garfield stood up and countered, “The ideal college is Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other” (Rudolph, 1956, p. vii). Mark Hopkins, of course, was a highly esteemed professor and mentor to Garfield and many other students at Williams. In his portrayal of Hopkins tutoring a single student, Garfield depicted an idyllic moment in the history of American higher education that aptly captured the core of the learning experience in college: faculty-student interactions.

Times have changed since the days of Garfield and Hopkins. Given today’s institutional demands for research and teaching in the promotion and tenure process, many faculties have had little choice but to distance themselves from the student experience. Although there are certainly exceptions to this modern trend, most faculty readily acknowledge that they are too preoccupied to interact with
students in any meaningful capacity outside the classroom (Golde & Pribbenow, 2000). After all, it’s “publish or perish” on many campuses.

In the wake left by faculty at the turn of the 20th century, student affairs professionals moved in to fill the void and to build an infrastructure for educating the whole student. In fact, many student affairs professionals see themselves as educators, not as administrators, and they are actively seeking to “reconsider learning” (ACPA & NASPA, 2004). Some might even say that student affairs professionals have become the Mark Hopkinse of the present era. Despite student affairs professionals’ admirable interest in student learning, a wealth of evidence demonstrates that students benefit most when they interact outside the classroom with faculty, not necessarily with student affairs professionals. In fact, numerous studies (including some studies that have entered their fourth decade of research on these topics) show that faculty-student interactions outside the classroom are positively correlated with enhancements in student learning, personal development, cognitive thinking, problem solving, student satisfaction, and academic achievement (Arum & Roksa, 2010; Astin, 1993; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2004). In sum—and though faculty are generally less apt to interact with students outside the classroom than their student affairs cousins—when faculty do choose to interact with students outside the classroom, those interactions tend to contribute substantially to student success.

Many of us working deep in the trenches of student affairs may feel slighted by the above findings, but we also might rest a little easier knowing that the remarkable impact we have on students is greatly underestimated in the research literature (Bensimon, 2007). Indeed, student affairs professionals function as vital gatekeepers on college campuses, and our ability to partner with faculty across the aisle is critical to cultivating environments that are conducive to student success. Consequently, a critical question for all of us in the Student Affairs Partnering with Academic Affairs Knowledge Community is this: How can student affairs professionals more effectively collaborate with faculty to promote student success?

Of the many possible answers to this critical question, faculty-in-residence (FIR) programs pose a particularly salient option. Various types of FIR programs exist across the country, but they generally involve contracting with faculty to live on campus so that the learning that happens inside the classroom can be expanded to include the often-profound learning experiences that happen outside the classroom. Given the voluminous literature on the advantages of faculty-student interactions, there is reason to believe that FIR programs would have a direct and marked benefit on student success. Some research even adds that faculty-student interactions benefit the faculty themselves because they often become better educators (Sriram, Shushok, Perkins, & Scales, 2011). Moreover, student affairs professionals are often cited as being crucial partners to the effectiveness of FIR programs (Armstrong, 1999).

FIR programs can be remarkably effective at fostering faculty-student interactions outside the classroom, contributing positively to student success and offering concrete examples of how student affairs can best partner with academic affairs. Though more research and practice is warranted, we have reason to stand in the spirit of James Garfield and announce that an ideal college incorporates a FIR on one end of a log and a student on the other.
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I once had a client who happened to be a former student-athlete say, “I’ve finally learned to master my me.” My first thought was “what the heck does that mean,” but probably not in those exact words. When we took time to process what was meant and the importance of that statement in his life, it was apparent that this client was referring to a shift in how he viewed the world and his overall approach to life. Instead of focusing only on the one or two things that he felt made him who he was, which caused a high level of stress when they were not going well, he branched out and was able to create a sense of balance in other areas that made him feel more whole as a person. In essence, this client was referring to the concept of wellness.

How does this relate specifically to athletics? More often than not, fitness and physical ability are overemphasized or become the main focus of importance when addressing athletes. As long as he or she can perform at a high level or complete the task in question, little importance is given to other attributes of life that make up the whole person or allow for a sense of balance. Nevertheless, it is often these other aspects of life that allow for the continued growth and development of a healthy lifestyle during an athletic career or long after one comes to an end. To help athletes develop these other aspects of life, professional sports organizations, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and even many high schools have placed an increased emphasis on personal development programs and wellness education. The potential impact of embracing this kind of education is tremendous; unfortunately, sometimes the main focus still remains on how this will improve performance. The reality is that having more well-rounded athletes may take a small amount of the focus off of sport, but the ultimate payout is the athlete with better coping strategies, better decision-making skills, fewer incidents off the field, and a healthier lifestyle focus that may in fact prolong his or her career. Additionally, you’ll be developing individuals who are more willing to make a difference in their communities because their level of investment is much more grounded.

What is wellness? “Wellness” generally refers to a conscious and dynamic process of becoming more aware of healthy lifestyle practices, while at the same time making choices that can lead to a better-rounded or more fulfilling lifestyle. Most models of wellness suggest between 6 to 12 interrelated dimensions, each of which are essential to the quest for optimal wellbeing. Common dimensions of wellness include physical, social, spiritual, environmental, emotional, intellectual, vocational, and cultural.
Though people generally put different amounts of time and energy toward each dimension at different times in their lives, it’s those people who overly focus on one or two dimensions at the expense of the others who are the most easily knocked out of balance. This especially applies to athletes who, as mentioned earlier, are often taught from an early age that the one dimension they should put the most energy toward is the physical. Also, keep in mind that student-athletes generally have unique demands on them that other students may not, which may further add to a sense of imbalance. Examples include greater demands on their time due to balancing academics with practice and competition, pressure to perform in order to maintain scholarships or playing time, increased scrutiny related to the expectations of others, and the perception of feeling constrained whereas other students get to be “normal.” Complicating this is the fact that many athletes are socialized in a way that teaches that vulnerability is weakness, that they have to be “mentally tough,” or that they have to fight through pain to be successful. As a result, they are often less likely to seek help when it’s needed. So, what happens when an athlete becomes overwhelmed, injured, or physical ability begins to decline? Well, it’s those individuals who embrace the concept of total wellness, or as my client put it, the concept of “master my me,” who have an easier time with transition and finding balance that makes the rest of life worthwhile.

It’s important for all of us as student affairs professionals to recognize that we play a major role in promoting wellness education for all students, including student-athletes who are sometimes overlooked because of the perception that their needs are already being met elsewhere.

So, what can we do? Here are a few simple suggestions to start the process.

1. If not already in place, one of the most effective things that can be done is the development of a good collaborative relationship between the athletics department and the counseling services at your school. Increasingly, colleges and universities are hiring counselors who specialize in the counseling of athletes, while some institutions have even gone so far as to create counseling or sport psychology positions within their athletic departments. Benefits of having an identified person within counseling who understands and is attached to the athletics department include improved comfort level of student-athletes seeking services, better communication about the needs of athletes being seen, and a potential reduction in liability concerns related to coaches and athletics administrators having a regular point of contact for consultation when issues arise.

2. Make wellness an important part of your own life. Why should it be important to them if it’s not important to you?

3. Be willing to get to know your student-athletes as well as you know your other students. By doing so, you are more likely to recognize when there is a lack of balance and can make an appropriate referral if needed.

4. Did I mention collaboration between counseling and the athletics department?

Wellness education for most institutions is a work in progress. With more than 450,000 students now participating in collegiate sports at NCAA member institutions, we have an opportunity to impact not just the culture of athletics, but the cultures of our institutions and society as a whole. If we can get student-athletes to embrace wellness and develop the skills associated with mastering their “me,” we will be developing more balanced students and stronger athletics programs, while at the same time creating a future generation of alums who are living more fulfilled lives and in a better position to give back.
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The Student Leadership Programs Knowledge Community (SLPKC) fosters a dynamic, resource-rich environment for higher education professionals who have an interest in collegiate leadership training, education, and development. As the largest NASPA knowledge community, the SLPKC leadership team recently discussed the need to learn more about its members. In 2007, the SLPKC distributed a survey. The results provided necessary, but now outdated, information. In the early months of 2013, the group implemented a membership feedback survey, hoping to better understand if the SLPKC was reaching its audience effectively and delivering excellent professional development to members. The survey was designed in collaboration with many SLPKC team members.

**Participant Demographics**
First and foremost, the leadership team sought to understand the overall demographics of its members. Participants represented a variety of functional areas, including, but not limited to, leadership development...
programming, student activities, service-learning and volunteerism, residence life, and multicultural affairs. They had a wide variety of years of experience in higher education, but primarily participants reported more than 3 years of full-time experience. In fact, nearly one third of respondents indicated they had 10 or more years of experience. Similarly, position level varied, but predominately new professionals and mid-level managers were represented.

Additionally, this survey asked what theories or models are used in student leadership programming, in order to gauge national trends in leadership development. The majority of respondents indicated that their institutions used the Social Change Model (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996) most regularly, followed by the Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2007), Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 2002), and Emotionally Intelligent Leadership (Shankman & Allen, 2008). A smaller number of respondents indicated that they used an in-house leadership model at their institution. The programmatic options offered most frequently included workshops, retreats, and conferences. Finally, assessment practices varied, but predominately consisted of surveys. Other forms of assessment included journal reflections, pre- and post-tests, focus groups, and peer evaluations. Ultimately, the results showed consistency among respondents and will provide the leadership team with a better understanding of what members are offering nationwide.

Knowledge Community Feedback
In addition to learning more about its members, the leadership team wanted to know how effectively its services had been delivered. Overall, respondents indicated that the SLPKC was successful in providing professional development opportunities along with educating members on issues within the field. One method of professional development that is particularly impactful is the SLPKC-sponsored webinar series. While only about a third of respondents stated they had attended an SLPKC-sponsored webinar, the vast majority indicated the experience was satisfying or extremely satisfying.

The SLPKC newsletter also serves as an effective mode of professional development. Eighty percent of respondents stated they had read an issue of the SLPKC newsletter, with a staggering 98% rating the newsletter as satisfying or extremely satisfying. These results seem to indicate that the webinar program and newsletter have proven to be fruitful methods of professional development and information dissemination.

One of the areas for improvement demonstrated by this survey was the connection between the members and the SLPKC leadership team. More than 73% of respondents reported feeling disconnected or extremely disconnected with SLPKC leadership. Additionally, 71% of respondents reported a similar sentiment with respect to regional representatives. Overwhelmingly, respondents reported a desire to connect with leadership members and regional representatives, along with becoming more involved in the KC in a variety of ways, including helping to plan or present webinars, submitting blog or newsletter articles, or even as a member of the leadership team.

Overall, the survey results indicated that, while members report a significant lack of connection with SLPKC leadership and regional representatives, the newsletter and webinar series represent well-established methods for creating meaningful connections.

Closing the Loop
As with any assessment, the usefulness of a survey can be measured only by the impact it has on implementing improvements. The SLPKC leadership team had a chance to examine the findings of this assessment and spent some time discussing its implications. The low response rate (n = 130), and feedback that participants feel disconnected from KC leadership indicate that more targeted outreach must be done. One of the key ways to engage members seems to be working through the regional representatives. In particular, drive-in events and SLPKC meet-ups at annual conferences may allow members to meet KC leadership face-to-face.

Finally, the SLPKC leadership team intends to be more intentional with its approach to professional development. People who read the newsletter or attend a KC webinar report high levels of satisfaction, but there are still a number of members who are not aware these opportunities exist. Rather than trying to generate new knowledge, the team plans to use and promote already existing resources. In conclusion, facilitating a survey such as this has allowed the SLPKC leadership team to better understand its audience in an effort to offer the best professional development resources to its members.
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Sustainability is often an intangible idea that floats around in the ethos of academia. In reality, sustainability can be boiled down to our everyday actions. Did you choose to ride your bike today? Did you remember to turn off the lights before you left your room? Are you eating meat for lunch? These simple actions scaled up across a university can have a massive impact on our planet. So how do you turn these daily actions into programs that can directly affect your university’s consumption of our natural resources? The following five simple programs can be implemented at your university this fall to engage students living on campus to change their ways and help the planet, along with the people on it.
1. **Cardboard collection for residence hall move-in.**
   Every year, millions of students across the nation move into residence halls lugging cardboard boxes filled with stuff. The students will stay in their rooms, but the cardboard boxes often are thrown away. To help reduce waste generated by the move-in process, you can provide designated locations at each residence hall where students can drop off their cardboard. The drop-offs will help send the message to campus residents that sustainability is a top priority. Make sure the locations have high visibility and good signage. Check up on them throughout the day, otherwise contaminated sites could send the wrong message and compromise what you are trying to achieve. Student or staff volunteers to assist at the corrals will greatly increase recycling rates and help reduce contamination.

2. **Near-zero or zero waste events.** Almost every university has some type of picnic or dinner to kick off the new academic year with incoming students. To really set your welcome meal apart from others, try making it a near-zero waste event. According to Katharine Mieszkowski (2007), there are 46,000 pieces of plastic litter floating in every square mile of ocean. Near-zero waste events can drastically help reduce the impact a university’s generated waste can have on the planet every day. In order to do this correctly, you need to be conscious of what you are buying and serving for the event. If you are purchasing items that can’t be composted or recycled, then you don’t have a shot at holding a near-zero waste event. Waste sorting stations staffed by student workers or volunteers will ensure that materials are being sorted into the proper streams. At the end of the event, try to get rough numbers of materials diverted from your hauler to share them with the campus community.

3. **Waste audit.** According to Annie Leonard, creator of The Story of Stuff (2007), we have used one third of the planet’s natural resource space to create the stuff that makes up our lives. To help bring this waste of natural resources to light, try putting together a waste audit. Wait until the weather gets a little colder, because this program can get stinky. Collect 24 hours’ worth of trash from all the residence halls and dining centers (or just one dumpster if you want to start small). Pick a public location and drop it all out onto tarps and gather as many student volunteers as you can to sort through all the waste. The waste should be sorted into three main categories: recyclables, compostables, and true trash. All materials should be weighed to give a breakdown of what could have been composted or recycled from the waste stream. Be sure to establish safety guidelines that include a control plan in case of exposure to dangerous or toxic materials that can be found in the trash. This program is not for the faint of heart, but if run in a high-traffic area with good signage, it can have quite an impact on students’ perceptions of how much waste we produce in a typical day and what they can do to help reduce it.

4. **Engagement campaign.** By developing an engagement campaign that gets students to commit to taking on sustainable behavior choices, you are helping not only the planet but your bottom line as well. Some universities spend millions of dollars every year on energy that could be better utilized to fund engagement campaigns just like the one described here. Build a simple website that allows students to log in and make different levels of sustainability commitments. In exchange for these commitments, the students should receive energy-efficient prizes (CFL lightbulbs, remote controlled power strips, etc.) as well as stickers and T-shirts that help market the campaign. An engagement campaign can be as complicated as you want, or you can keep it simple as a way to promote sustainability awareness among students.

5. **Peer education program.** “Social marketing” is a hot phrase used all around the sustainability field. But what does it mean exactly? Simply, people change their behavior by listening to advice from others they trust, such as friends, family, and colleagues (McKenzie-Mohr, 1999). With your department’s support, you can hire a student staff member for each residence hall on campus, to create a group of peer educators. The next step is to establish the goals you want this peer education program to accomplish. You can start by executing the four programs listed above and sprinkle in some of your own ideas.

Implementing sustainability on campus is not as hard as it sounds. Keeping it simple and achievable is a great place to start, and as the culture becomes more accepting of sustainable initiatives on campus, you can begin to tackle larger initiatives that will take a little more time.

---
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During the summer of 2013, the NASPA Technology Knowledge Community conducted a survey to explore technology use among higher education professionals. The data, scheduled to be published in fall 2013, will be used to inform the development of a set of technology professional standards. A preliminary theme that has emerged from the findings is the importance for student affairs professionals to possess the ability to communicate in technology-based mediums. Breaking that theme down to more specific terms, it was deemed necessary for the author to understand that tone in computer-mediated communication (CMC) can be misconstrued and that professionals in this field need to learn how to communicate effectively across these mediums. CMC is generally defined as any communication that happens between two electronic devices (Mshvidobadze, 2012).

A recent infographic released by the Internet marketing firm Qmee (2013) indicated that each minute more than 204 million e-mail messages are sent, 278,000 tweets, and almost 2.5 million Facebook posts. As society relies more and more on CMC, researchers are exploring how humans communicate with and without technology and are gaining extensive information about the adaptation of human communicational norms (Walther, 2012). Their findings demonstrate that the introduction of each new technology creates the need for new parameters and adaptations of the basic linguist process, regardless of the specific medium.
Research in the field of technological communication provides insight as to how individuals adapt to communication with and without standard visual and auditory cues (Walther, 2012). Similar statements can be interpreted very differently depending on the “tone, emphasis, and expression” (Kruger, Epley, Parker, & Ng, 2005, p. 926) of the speaker/writer. “Because email communicators ‘hear’ a statement differently depending on whether they intend to be, say, sarcastic or funny, it can be difficult to appreciate that their electronic audience may not” (Kruger et al., 2005, p. 925).

Ideas that are obvious to some could be perceived completely differently on the other end of the computer. CMC often lacks paralinguistic cues that make conveying emotion difficult through printed words; these cues include gesture, emphasis, and intonation, which are exceptionally important when the content of the message is ambiguous (Kruger et al., 2005). Beattie (2003) suggested that the use of nonverbal cues in communication is important to the creation and development of interpersonal connections and relationships.

To complicate the absence of nonverbal cues in CMC, communicators tend to use their own experiences as a reference or anchor point for how others will perceive, react to, or feel about their encounters (Kreuger et al., 2005). This egocentric approach is not limited to CMC but is seen as a generality among humans, being shaped by what is known or has been experienced. If human understanding of what a person is saying or writing was as simple as translating words and syntax into thoughts and ideas, misunderstandings would be much more limited. Complex communication, however, requires much more, and, therefore, misunderstandings will occur (Kruger et al., 2005).

As technologies evolve, they are also changing the all-or-nothing nature of verbal and nonverbal cues present in the first generation of CMC. More and more platforms are integrating dynamic and static visual cues to accentuate communication through technology (Walther, 2012). Recent technologies, such as Skype and Google Hangout, have provided CMC tools that allow participants to use verbal cues, nonverbal cues, and technology concurrently, while other sites and services offer digital representations of communicators through photos, avatars, and digital biographies to fill the gaps in the lines of communication.

The bulk of the currently available CMC research suggests that the absence of nonverbal cues stymies the development of social-emotional connections and leads to impersonal and hostile online relationships. In contrast, Walther (2012) posed an alternative to these findings, stating that the lack of nonverbal cues makes it “more difficult to perform instrumental, rather than relational, communication” (p. 404). Without nonverbal cues, communicators can struggle with disorientation and a lack of coordination. Additionally, Walther (2012) demonstrated that, in general, communicators adapt to the cues that are currently available within the style of communication they are using, leading researchers to consider the possibility that verbal and nonverbal cue systems are somewhat interchangeable.

To help ensure that the overall tone and meaning behind CMC messages are properly received, authors can take small steps to combat misunderstanding and miscommunication. McKay (2013) suggested reading a message several times before hitting send to help ensure the use of the proper emotions and tone. Often the simple rearrangement of content can greatly influence the overall tone of the message. Another solution is the inclusion of common phrases such as “please” and “thank you” (McKay, 2013). Generally, people understand these phrases to be gracious and respectful.

Although globally integrated through technology, the worldwide use of CMC cannot be considered monolithic. Communicators come from varied cultural, economical, spiritual, and educational backgrounds and require the same variety of communication strategies and techniques (Walther, 2012). There is little or no chance to recall a poorly written or improperly toned e-mail once the send button has been pressed (McKay, 2013). Time should be taken to ensure messages not only are contextually and grammatically correct, but also contain the proper tone and appropriate syntax for the situation.
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Student veterans represent one of the most unique types of students found on our campuses today. Moreover, although research and scholarly activity have only recently begun to explore and explain this burgeoning population, we know that thinking differently about this population can help all higher education professionals serve student veterans better. One of the first tactics scholars and professionals use when describing various student populations is to delineate the ethnic demographics of a given population or to talk about students with regard to family income strata. This can be done for veterans, and largely all nontraditional students, but viewing veterans this way may not inform our understanding of this population well, and may serve to reinforce negative stereotypes.

One of the most common and incorrect stereotypes about student veterans, which persists due to the malingering memory of the Vietnam era (Vacchi & Berger, in press), is that veterans come from poor families. In fact, much like most undergraduate students, the veteran population underrepresents the lower 40% of family incomes across the nation (Kane, 2006; Watkins & Sherk, 2008). Allowing...
our own preconceived notions and stereotypes to guide our interaction with any student population can obstruct student success, so we should seek to inform ourselves with the best information available. That source, for many issues regarding student veterans, may be veterans themselves until the academic literature becomes robust enough to help inform professionals in higher education about veterans as students.

So how do we think about veteran diversity? Although ethnic diversity can play a role in differences among veterans, it is among the most integrated and least conflicted subcultures in our nation. Simply stated, veteran diversity is explained best by exploring the military service and experiences of a given veteran. Experiences are so influential that over a long career you may find, for example, that similar military experiences may make the persona of veterans with greatly different ethnic backgrounds quite similar. The rest of this article will give some examples as you engage with your growing student veteran populations.

Military Service
The first area of diversity for veterans is determined by the service in which a veteran served our nation. For example, Marines are largely agreed to be the most intense of all the services, while the Air Force may be regarded as more corporate and businesslike in a traditional sense. This does not mean that Marines lack professionalism and airmen cannot be intense, but speaks to a broader understanding of basic subcultural tendencies. Another comparison might be that the Army and the Marine Corps focus their philosophy around the soldier or Marine because these organizations put “boots on the ground” in battle. In contrast, the Navy and Air Force are weapons systems-centric, meaning that the boat or air platform is the focus of the environments in these services.

Rank and Years of Service
The next area of diversity has to do with how high a veteran rose in the ranks and how long military service was for a given veteran. When you interact with a retired military officer, (typically over 40 years old and in your graduate schools or employed at your university) and a former junior enlisted service member (typically undergraduates and under 26 years old), you will notice a marked difference in conversation style, perspective, and life experience. In addition, the more senior a veteran was while in the military, the more leadership experience and strategic perspectives emerge from the veteran. In a forthcoming chapter in the Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research, Vacchi and Berger (in press) describe a continuum of socialization to the military that affects the individual veteran and his or her perspectives about the military. Essentially, the more years of service, the more a veteran was socialized into the military culture. This continuum can also be affected by the final aspect of diversity: combat experience.

Combat Experience
As generations pass, periods of peace and war come and go, and this affects the diversity of veterans. While longer periods of service will typically create a more intense socialization to the military culture, prolonged exposure to combat can create an intense socialization for junior members of the military. Consider three broad categories of combat experience among veterans that represent diversity among veterans: no combat experience, a combat deployment without intense combat, and a combat deployment with intense combat exposure. There may also be peacetime deployments to other countries in which a veteran may have been immersed in a foreign culture, such as Germany, Japan, or Korea.

This brief discussion of diversity among veterans is not intended to be definitive, but rather to give us all pause before we jump into traditional diversity stereotyping and consider that there may be a different way to view diversity among our student veteran population. Given that roughly 85% of our student veterans are undergraduates, and this is the population on which we focus as student affairs professionals, we may be most interested in which service our veterans served in, how long they served, and whether or not they served in combat, rather than traditional ethnic and socioeconomic markers.
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Challenges facing women professionals in higher education have changed little over the years. Perceptions of leadership, balancing the needs of self and others, and relationship building (including mentoring and sponsorship) are key concepts in negotiating barriers and achieving success for women in higher education. Building relationships has become a primary tool for women to gather support and overcome challenges. Turner, Norwood, and Noe (2013) explained, “It is vital for women to form varied networks including women who are or aspire to be in administration, both internal and external to their institution, in order to develop strategic resources” (p. 12). Over the past few years, the means by which women forge relationships is changing. The purpose of this article is to challenge traditional notions of how women can build networks and to advocate for the consideration of social media platforms as a means to develop relationships and navigate barriers.
According to Gilligan’s (1993) Theory of Moral Development, women work toward balancing relationships, care, and compassion for themselves and others. A transition from self-centered survival gradually progresses toward the recognition of one’s needs as being equally as important as the needs of others. During this shift, women relate “goodness” with sacrificing individual need and expression. One way this happens is that women hide their own voice in an attempt to fit in with the dominant social norms. It is during this growth and self-discovery that social media platforms help women find their voice and garner affirmation, confidence, and balance. These platforms offer women a reprieve from the norms because they are empowered to design their own communities that highlight their own voices and the voices of other women. Interactions on social media, including affirmations and supportive conversations, typically occur within the confines of the platform, away from the pressures that may be experienced at a home institution. These networking communities provide a safe haven for exploration, to step beyond one’s comfort zone, while concurrently working to support and affirm others.

In a 2007 op-ed in The Washington Post, Deborah Tannen (2007, para. 10) stated that many studies find more women using affiliative speech, meaning women tend to show more support by lifting and affirming another’s thoughts and comments. Women use conversation to build relationships and rapport with others, but generally prefer to do so in a less public setting. Tannen made these observations well before the advent of heavy social media usage, but her theories are well aligned with the type of support women can gain through online networks.

Social media allows for a variety of women to be heard. Online communication provides an avenue for both introverts and extroverts to connect in comfortable ways. For those who seek to engage, but also appreciate the time to process conversations, social media is an excellent forum. It may be difficult for individuals who identify as introverts to engage in a room full of people they don’t know; the anxiety of doing such can disappear when communicating online. Eventually, online connections often evolve into in-person, or “in real life” (IRL) relationships where in-person introductions are less awkward and more natural. For the extroverts of the world, social media can mirror a need to gain energy from socializing and connecting with people.

Social media also has an uncanny ability to take down political and positional barriers within and across institutions. An important relationship for the advancement of women is a connection to women in senior leadership positions. In the political climate of a traditional university setting, it may be difficult to build relationships with senior-level administrators. Junior-level staff often have little access to deans, vice presidents, provosts, and presidents. Generally, those in higher-level positions who engage on social media want to connect and converse. As such, it is easy to surround oneself with circles of connections at every level and from every corner of the globe, developing relationships with mentors, sponsors, and advocates.

For introverts, extroverts, new professionals, and university presidents, social media presents an opportunity to begin a conversation. Social media in isolation will not build authentic and lasting relationships. Follow-up is important to building more meaningful connections. Transitioning a conversation from online to IRL is up to the individual seeking the relationship, and women are adopting the strategies outlined below to make this transition gracefully:

- Formal thank you cards are a simple and personal way to connect. Notes do not have to be lengthy and are a great way to follow up after conferences, meetings, and calls.
- Offering to connect for a phone conversation or a video chat provides a richer experience and allows time for more in-depth conversations.
- Offer to meet in person over coffee at a conference or at a visit to their institution.
- Share book recommendations, articles, upcoming documentaries, and even individuals as resources. Connect these resources to people’s passion and interest areas.

Ways for women to develop relationships and network across political, professional, and generational lines are expanding beyond traditional means. Through platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and blogging, the levels of Gilligan’s (1993) development theory are intersecting. Through idea and resource sharing, supportive conversations, words of affirmation, and empowerment, women at all levels are finding their balance between caring for self and others, for the betterment of both the individual and the collective whole.
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